

**Family Language Histories:
Three generations of Greek Cypriot origin in London**

by

Nikoula Floka

*Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy*

Department of Educational Studies

Goldsmiths, University of London

October 2013

Declaration

I hereby declare that this work is my own.

Nikoula Floka

31 October 2013

Acknowledgements

I would never have been able to finish the present thesis without the guidance of my supervisors, the contribution of the participants and the support from my friends and my family.

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my main supervisor Dr. Charmian Kenner for her excellent guidance, insightful comments, caring, patience, enthusiasm and constant support and encouragement since the first day of my academic journey. The good advice, help and support of my second supervisor, Dr. Anna Traianou, has been invaluable, for which I am extremely grateful.

I share the credit of this thesis with the participants since their 'voices' are my co-authors. It would have been impossible to write this thesis without their precious and deeply appreciated contribution.

My parents, my brothers and sister have given me their unequivocal support throughout my studies, as always, for which my mere expression of thanks does not suffice.

Last, but by no means least, I thank my friends Angeliki and Fivi for their support and understanding during the last years of this journey.

Abstract

This thesis investigates in depth three case studies of families of Greek Cypriot origin, bringing up their children in London. Each family consists of three generations: grandparents, parents and children. My aim is to explain why, although the families have similar ethnic and linguistic backgrounds, their children have very different outcomes in terms of language maintenance or shift. My interest in this question arose through my role as teacher in the Greek community language school that all the children attend. I use a qualitative case study approach to explore the linguistic lives of the participants through semi-structured individual interviews with grandparents, parents and children. My study appreciates the complexity and uniqueness of each family and the journey of their languages over the years. I reveal the linguistic experiences of the first generation before and after they migrated from Cyprus to England, and of the second and third generations who were born and grew up in London. I analyse the factors which informed their choices with respect to abandoning their heritage code, or reviving or reinforcing it. Included in my analysis is the important effect of language ideologies on family language policies, made particularly complex by the participants' diglossic background in which Standard Modern Greek holds more social and political power than the Cypriot dialect. Through the in-depth analysis of my participants' accounts, the concept of 'family language history' emerges as an explanatory tool. This concept involves the inter-relationship between language ideologies as they are created and contested within particular socio-political circumstances, and the decisions taken by each generation about which code should be used in specific contexts within the family and the wider society. I draw on Bourdieu's theoretical ideas about symbolic domination and the convertibility of linguistic capital into other forms of capital, and the concept of counter-hegemony, to explain how my participants negotiate the maintenance of the two varieties of their heritage language in an English-dominant society.

Abbreviations (in alphabetical order)

CD: Cypriot Dialect

EL: English Language

EMS: English Mainstream School

FLP: Family Language Policy

GCS: Greek Community School

HL: Heritage Language

HLM: Heritage Language Maintenance

HLS: Heritage Language Shift

LM: Language Maintenance

LI: Language Ideologies

LS: Language Shift

SMG: Standard Modern Greek

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1: MY RESEARCH JOURNEY	1
1.1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.2. AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION	1
1.3. SHORT INTRODUCTION TO THE PARTICIPANTS- RATIONALE OF MY CASES OF INTEREST-RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	4
1.4. OVERVIEW OF REST OF THESIS	7
CHAPTER 2: THE CYPRIOT HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND LINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE	8
2.1. INTRODUCTION.....	8
2.2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF CYPRUS.....	8
2.2.1. Discussion	9
2.3. CYPRUS: SOCIOLINGUISTIC LANDSCAPE	10
2.3.1. The linguistic situation	10
2.3.2. Diglossia	12
2.3.3. Structural differences between SMG and CD.....	14
2.3.4. Functional differences between SMG and CD.....	15
2.3.5. Political and ideological dimension of the diglossic situation in Cyprus.....	17
2.4. CONCLUSION.....	19
CHAPTER 3: LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE AND THE EFFECTS OF LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES	21
3.1. INTRODUCTION.....	21
3.2. HERITAGE LANGUAGE (HL).....	21
3.3. NATION AND LANGUAGE	22
3.4. LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE (LM) AND LANGUAGE SHIFT (LS): DEFINING THE CONCEPTS.....	23
3.4.1. LM and LS: factors which affect the phenomena	23
3.4.1.1. The three generation process	23
3.4.1.2. Other interrelated factors	24
3.5. FAMILY: A CRITICAL DOMAIN	27
3.6. LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES.....	29
3.6.1. Multiplicity of ideologies.....	30
3.6.2. Mediating function of ideologies.....	32
3.6.3. Awareness of speakers	34
3.6.4. LI in the interest of the group or individual	35
3.6.4.1. LI in the interest of nation state opposed to other nation states	35
3.6.4.1.1. LI, nation state and the notion of authenticity.....	36
3.6.4.2. LI in the interest of dominant social powers within a nation state	37
3.7. CONCLUSION.....	38
CHAPTER 4. LINGUISTIC CAPITAL, INDIVIDUAL AGENCY AND FAMILY LANGUAGE POLICY.....	39
4.1. INTRODUCTION.....	39
4.2. SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND SYMBOLIC DOMINATION	39
4.3. HUMAN AGENCY	40
4.3.1. Bourdieu's theory of capital.....	42
4.3.2. Bourdieu's theory of capital as an analytic framework for the present study.....	43
4.3.2.1. Linguistic capital convertible to economic capital-economic profits	44
4.3.2.2. Linguistic capital convertible to social capital-social benefits	45
4.3.2.3. Linguistic capital convertible to symbolic capital-status/solidarity	47
4.4. ROLE OF LI IN ETHNIC IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION.....	49

4.5. DISCUSSION	51
4.6. FAMILY LANGUAGE POLICY (FLP)	52
4.6.1. <i>Forms of FLP</i>	52
4.6.2. <i>FLP: components</i>	53
4.6.3. <i>FLP: additional driving factors</i>	53
4.6.4. <i>FLP: a dynamic form of language management</i>	55
4.7. LANGUAGE BELIEFS AND LANGUAGE PRACTICES: A DISPARITY.....	56
4.8. CONCLUSION: LOCATING MY STUDY WITHIN THE FIELD.....	56
CHAPTER: 5. METHODOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE	59
5.1. INTRODUCTION.....	59
5.2. THE MEANING OF CASE STUDY WITH REGARD TO THE PRESENT INQUIRY	59
5.2.1. <i>The rationale of employing case study research</i>	61
5.2.2. <i>Generalization</i>	62
5.2.3. <i>Reflecting on my methodological choice</i>	63
5.3. THE RESEARCH DESIGN	64
5.3.1. <i>Data collection techniques and analysis</i>	64
5.3.1.1. Conducting the interviews	64
5.3.1.2. Contextual notes	68
5.3.1.3. Reflective notes.....	69
5.3.1.4. Ethical Issues	70
5.3.1.5. Data analysis	71
5.4. CONCLUSION.....	71
CHAPTER 6. ANALYSIS: MARIANTHI'S FAMILY	72
6.1. INTRODUCTION.....	72
6.2. LANGUAGE HISTORIES	72
6.2.1. <i>Marianthi's grandfather</i>	72
Migration rationale	72
Linguistic capital before migration: English, SMG, CD.....	72
Linguistic capital: alterations over the years	73
The need for social advancement	73
Social network of co-ethnics/ institutional support	73
Spouse's linguistic capital.....	74
LI and the EMS.....	74
Visits to homeland.....	75
HL use in the current years.....	75
<i>Discussion</i>	76
6.2.2. <i>Language history: Marianthi's grandmother</i>	77
Migration rationale and socio-educational background	77
Linguistic capital before immigration: English, SMG, CD.....	77
Linguistic capital: fluctuation within the years.....	78
The need for rapid linguistic adaptation	78
LI and the EMS.....	78
HL use in the current years.....	79
<i>Discussion</i>	79
6.2.3. <i>Language history: Marianthi's mother</i>	80
Childhood linguistic experiences	80
Greek Community School educational experiences	81
Linguistic capital fluctuations: adulthood	81
Spouse's linguistic capital	81

Children as HL socialization agents	81
Greek Community School and HL revitalization	82
<i>Discussion</i>	82
6.2.4. <i>Language history: Marianthi</i>	83
Primary socialization	83
EMS	83
GCS	83
Her mother's involvement in the GCS parents' committee	83
<i>Discussion</i>	84
6.3. LI: ENGLISH, SMG, CD	84
6.3.1. <i>Marianthi's grandfather</i>	84
English as a <i>lingua franca</i>	84
EL: the power of its convertibility to other forms of capital	84
The paradox of <i>counterhegemony</i>	85
HL: production and reproduction of relevant LI	85
Symbolic domination within a counterhegemonic space	86
Symbolic domination and the dominant HL ideology	86
LI responsive to past experiences and future aspirations	87
LI about the SMG and the GCS over the years	87
<i>Discussion</i>	88
6.3.2. <i>Marianthi's grandmother</i>	88
LI: past experiences, future aspirations and linguistic capital convertibility	88
The paradox of <i>counterhegemony</i> -symbolic domination within <i>counterhegemonic</i> spaces	89
<i>Discussion</i>	90
Discussion on both Marianthi's maternal grandparents' LI	90
6.3.3. <i>Marianthi's mother</i>	90
Submitting to the dominant language ideology	90
HL convertible to a symbolic capital	91
HL use enacting ties to ethnic identity	91
Symbolic domination within a counterhegemonic space	91
<i>Discussion</i>	92
6.3.4. <i>Marianthi</i>	93
Submitting to the dominant language ideology	93
HL: challenging its value	93
HL use convertible to a symbolic capital	94
LI: ties of SMG to aesthetics	94
<i>Discussion</i>	95
6.4. FAMILY LANGUAGE POLICY: MARIANTHI'S FAMILY	95
6.4.1. <i>FLP: Marianthi's grandfather's linguistic contribution</i>	96
HL use deterioration	96
Promoting the bilingualism of younger generations	96
SMG hegemony	96
Continuous and consistent use of HL	97
<i>Discussion</i>	97
6.4.2. <i>FLP: Marianthi's grandmother's linguistic contribution</i>	97
Promoting bilingualism	97
HL capital enrichment through cultural familiarization	98
SMG hegemony	98
<i>Discussion</i>	99
6.4.3. <i>FLP: Marianthi's mother's contribution</i>	99
Promoting and encouraging bilingualism	99
Investing in the grandparents' linguistic help	100

Promoting interactions with heritage monolingual speakers in London.....	100
Prompting sociolinguistic experiences in ethnic institutions in London.....	101
Investing in regular visits to homeland	101
Submitting the hegemony of official HL varieties.....	102
GCS: homework involvement	102
<i>Discussion</i>	102
6.4.4. <i>FLP: Marianthi's positioning</i>	103
Reflecting on her English dominant linguistic capital.....	103
The Grandparents: primary HL recourse and motivational force for HL use	103
SMG interventions	104
HL use with other HL socialization agents within the English context	104
Overseas visitors from the home country.....	104
Sociolinguistic experiences in ethnic institutions in London	105
Attending the Greek Orthodox Church.....	105
GCS	105
Cypriot context: converting HL capital to other forms of capital	105
<i>Discussion</i>	106
6.5. GREEK COMMUNITY SCHOOL: PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS	106
6.5.1. <i>Marianthi's grandfather</i>	107
LI and GCS: contestation versus submission	107
GCS: the past and the present	107
<i>Discussion</i>	108
6.5.2. <i>Marianthi's grandmother</i>	108
GCS: the past, the present and the paradox of her LI changeability within the years	108
<i>Discussion</i>	109
6.5.3. <i>Marianthi's mother</i>	109
GCS past experiences	109
GCS: present perceptions.....	110
<i>Discussion</i>	110
6.5.4. <i>Marianthi</i>	111
'...Greek School is important...'/ '...Greek School is boring...'	111
Rationalizing the use of English in the GCS	111
Resisting SMG dominance.....	112
<i>Discussion</i>	113
6.6. SUMMARY	113
CHAPTER 7. ANALYSIS: MICHELLA'S FAMILY.....	115
7.1. INTRODUCTION.....	115
7.2. LANGUAGE HISTORIES.....	115
7.2.1. <i>Language history: Michella's grandmother</i>	115
Migration rationale and socio-educational background	115
Linguistic environment of the workplace in the host country.....	115
Social network of co speakers in London	116
Establishing her household	116
HL use in the current years	117
<i>Discussion</i>	117
7.2.2. <i>Language history: Michella's mother</i>	118
Childhood linguistic experiences.....	118
GCS	118
Linguistic environment of the workplace	118
Establishing her own household	119
HL use in the current years	119

<i>Discussion</i>	120
7.2.3. <i>Language history: Michella</i>	120
Linguistic capital alteration over the years	120
7.3. LI: ENGLISH, SMG, CD	120
7.3.1. <i>Michella's grandmother</i>	120
Recognizing EL power.....	120
Resisting EL hegemony.....	121
LI: discourses of difference	121
Resisting SMG hegemony.....	122
HL use: mark of ethnic belonging.....	122
Promoting multilingualism.....	123
<i>Discussion</i>	123
7.3.2. <i>Michella's mother</i>	123
Submitting to the penetrating power of English	123
The EMS as a significant point of HL linguistic capital alteration	124
HL use enacting ties to ethnic identity	124
Submitting to SMG hegemony	125
SMG capital convertible to an economic capital and a symbolic capital.....	125
CD and its convertibility to a social and to a symbolic capital.....	125
<i>Discussion</i>	126
7.3.3. <i>Michella</i>	126
HL use and its convertibility to social and symbolic profits.....	127
Reproducing family discourse	127
Submitting to dominant SMG LI	127
Reproducing dominant SMG LI in the GCS setting.....	128
HL use tied to ethnic identity	128
<i>Discussion</i>	129
7.4. FAMILY LANGUAGE POLICY: MICHELLA'S FAMILY	129
7.4.1. <i>FLP: Michella's grandmother's contribution</i>	129
Continuous and consistent use of HL.....	129
HL enrichment through family history	130
HL enrichment through cultural familiarization	130
Familiarization with traditional Greek food making.....	130
Familiarization with Greek music	131
SMG socialization	131
<i>Discussion</i>	132
7.4.2. <i>FLP: Michella's mother's contribution</i>	132
Investing in the grandparents' linguistic support.....	132
Continuous and consistent use of HL.....	133
Exchanging views on effective language practices.....	134
Promoting bilingualism	134
Promoting interactions with other HL speakers in London.....	135
Promoting sociolinguistic experiences in ethnic institutions in London	135
Investing in regular visits to Cyprus and to Greece	135
Investing in supportive educational material.....	136
SMG socialization	136
<i>Discussion</i>	137
7.4.3. <i>FLP: Michella's positioning</i>	137
HL use in the home domain	137
HL use with the grandparents	137
SMG linguistic socialization	138
HL use outside the home domain	139

HL use outside the English context	139
<i>Discussion</i>	139
7.5. GREEK COMMUNITY SCHOOL: PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS	140
7.5.1. <i>Michella's grandmother</i>	140
GCS as a site of 'modern' language teaching	140
GCS and SMG further development	140
<i>Discussion</i>	141
7.5.2. <i>Michella's mother</i>	141
GCS: the paradox of her LI changeability within the years	141
GCS: SMG convertibility to an economic and to a symbolic capital	142
<i>Discussion</i>	142
7.5.3. <i>Michella</i>	142
Discourses of conflict	142
Reproducing family discourses about GCS	143
<i>Discussion</i>	143
7.6. SUMMARY	143
CHAPTER 8. ANALYSIS: ALEX'S FAMILY	145
8.1. INTRODUCTION	145
8.2. LANGUAGE HISTORIES	145
8.2.1. <i>Language history: Alex's maternal grandfather</i>	145
Migration history	145
Linguistic capital fluctuation over the years	145
Childhood linguistic experiences	145
Spouse's linguistic identity	146
Current HL use	146
<i>Discussion</i>	146
8.2.2. <i>Language history: Alex's maternal grandmother</i>	147
Migration rationale	147
Linguistic capital: alterations over the years	147
The urge for social integration	147
Spouse's linguistic identity	147
Current HL use	148
<i>Discussion</i>	148
8.2.3. <i>Language history: Alex's mother</i>	148
Childhood linguistic experiences	148
The vital role of her CD monolingual grandmother	148
Current HL use	149
<i>Discussion</i>	149
8.2.4. <i>Language history: Alex's father</i>	149
Childhood linguistic experiences	149
EMS	150
Adult linguistic experiences	150
Discussion on both Alex's parents' language histories	151
8.2.5. <i>Language history: Alex</i>	151
8.3. LI: ENGLISH, SMG, CD	152
8.3.1. <i>Alex's maternal grandfather</i>	152
EL use: a distinctive mark of prestige among immigrant group members	152
EL use: 'being Greek doesn't have to do with the language'	152
Promoting a provisional bilingualism for the younger generations	153
<i>Discussion</i>	153

8.3.2. <i>Alex's maternal grandmother</i>	153
LI: EL the key to success in England.....	153
EL use: '...you learn to be a Cypriot without using the language...'	154
Allying with dominant LI about SMG.....	154
<i>Discussion</i>	155
Discussion on both Alex's grandparents' LI.....	155
8.3.3. <i>Alex's mother</i>	156
EL use and the younger generations	156
EL use and double ethnic identification	156
CD LI: changeability within the years	156
<i>Discussion</i>	157
8.3.4. <i>Alex's father</i>	157
LI: EL and younger generation's future advancement	157
EL use enacting ties to Greek Cypriot ethnic identity.....	157
Submitting to dominant LI about SMG.....	158
<i>Discussion</i>	158
Discussion on both Alex's parents' LI	158
8.3.5. <i>Alex</i>	159
LI: submitting to English monolingualism.....	159
LI: HL.....	159
Language use and Ethnic identity.....	160
<i>Discussion</i>	161
8.4. FAMILY LANGUAGE POLICY: ALEX'S FAMILY	161
8.4.1. <i>Alex's grandfather's contribution to FLP</i>	161
Discrepancy between LI and linguistic practices	161
8.4.2. <i>Alex's grandmother's contribution to FLP</i>	161
Discrepancy between LI and linguistic practices	161
<i>Discussion on both Alex's grandparents contribution to FLP</i>	162
8.4.3. <i>Alex's parents' contribution to FLP</i>	162
Ethnic socialization experiences.....	162
<i>Discussion</i>	162
8.4.4. <i>FLP: Alex's positioning</i>	162
Visits to Cyprus.....	163
Social encounters with his paternal grandmother	163
Greek Cypriot festivals in London	163
<i>Discussion</i>	163
8.5. GREEK COMMUNITY SCHOOL: PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS	164
8.5.1. <i>Alex's grandfather</i>	164
Changeability of LI over the years	164
8.5.2. <i>Alex's grandmother</i>	164
Changeability of LI over the years	164
<i>Discussion on both Alex's maternal grandparents' GCS perceptions and expectations</i>	164
8.5.3. <i>Alex's mother</i>	165
GCS: past experiences	165
GCS: present perceptions.....	165
8.5.4. <i>Alex's father</i>	166
GCS: past experiences	166
GCS: present perceptions.....	166
<i>Discussion on both Alex's parents' GCS perceptions and expectations</i>	166
8.5.5. <i>Alex</i>	167
'...I do not like Greek school...'	167

<i>Discussion</i>	168
8.6. SUMMARY	168
CHAPTER 9. ANALYSIS –COMPARISON OF THE THREE FAMILIES.....	169
9.1. INTRODUCTION	169
9.2. 1 ST GENERATION.....	169
9.2.1. <i>Age of immigration</i>	169
9.2.2. <i>Linguistic environment of the workplace</i>	170
9.2.3. <i>Greek Cypriot social network</i>	170
9.2.4. <i>Spouse’s linguistic identity</i>	171
9.2.5. <i>FLP with reference to their children</i>	171
9.2.6. <i>Family language policy with reference to their grandchildren</i>	173
9.3. 2 ND GENERATION	174
9.3.1. <i>HL use fluctuation within the years</i>	174
9.3.2. <i>Family language policy</i>	174
9.3.3. <i>GCS and HL learning: the paradox</i>	176
9.3.4. <i>Partnership between grandparents and parents</i>	176
9.4. 3 RD GENERATION	176
9.4.1. <i>LI and HL use: a complex interrelationship</i>	177
9.4.2. <i>LI: SMG and CD</i>	178
9.4.3. <i>HL use, LI and GCS experiences</i>	178
9.4.4. <i>Family discourse and group belonging</i>	179
9.5. SUMMARY	180
CHAPTER 10. CONCLUSION.....	182
10.1. FAMILY LANGUAGE HISTORIES	182
10.2. IMPLICATIONS OF THIS STUDY	184
10.2.1. <i>Educational implications</i>	184
APPENDIX 1.....	200
CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS	200
APPENDIX 2.....	203
SAMPLE OF INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTION.....	203
APPENDIX 3.....	211
SAMPLE OF REFLECTION NOTES	211

Chapter 1: My research journey

1.1. Introduction

In this chapter I will discuss my autobiographical experience as a teacher in the GCSs (Greek Community Schools) in London. I will describe how this journey began and I will outline the changes that took place over the years. Moreover I will present an overview of my thesis.

1.2. Autobiographical information

My place of origin is Greece. This is the country of my birth. I am the product of the Greek educational system concerning both my schooling and my first degree studies. My ways of thinking about, understanding and interpreting social reality have been partially informed by the social institutions operating within my home country. I have been the recipient, the producer and other times the contestant of discourses constructed, produced, reproduced, contested and negotiated through my social encounters within the Greek social milieu.

My profession is inextricably associated with a powerfully influential social institution, the Greek Mainstream School. I am a professional primary school teacher. I am a representative of the official educational policies and the mediator of ensuring their enactment in the micro context of a school class. My role is to achieve goals and objectives defined, elaborated and delimited by policy makers. I had two years teaching experience in Greek educational institutions before my relocation to Britain. However I had an extensive familiarity with the Greek educational system as a student at primary, secondary and higher education level.

I moved to England in the summer of 2004. I was seconded by the Greek Ministry of Education to teach the younger generation of the Greek and Greek Cypriot communities who currently reside in this country. These schools operate outside the English mainstream education. They were founded in response to the failure of the mainstream education system to meet the needs of the ethnic minority children and their communities (Wei, 2006). They 'represent individual and community attempts to organise themselves voluntarily to privilege other histories, languages and cultures' (Creese *et al.*, 2006, p. 25). They constitute 'a significant language and literacy resource' promoting bilingualism and biliteracy (Robertson, 2006, p.57). Additionally they are important sites wherein 'different languages can be juxtaposed, not only to create learning opportunities, but to signal and construct identities' (Martin *et al.*, 2006, p.8).

My first year of teaching experience in the Greek Community School (GCS) was decisive for my further professional and personal development. I was called to teach in an educational setting which differed greatly to my previous understandings, shaped perceptions and expectations about the teaching and learning procedure. Back in my country of origin, my schooling along with my teaching experiences took place in a monolingual educational context operating within a monolingual society. I used to teach students with whom I shared a common mother tongue, the Greek language, which is the official language in the Greek state. This is the linguistic channel of communication within the school setting. Its use is widespread in all different contexts of daily social life. It is the language in authority, acknowledged as such and submission to its power is unquestioned. Thus my professional duty, regarding my students' linguistic abilities, concerned the enrichment of their already naturally acquired native language and their familiarity with various forms of literacy activities with the use of this language.

But, more importantly, I shared common social experiences with my students. We had all been socialized within the same culture with regard to 'shared operating procedures, unstated assumptions, tools, norms, values,...conventions about what to pay attention to and how much to weigh elements that are sampled' (Triandis, 2001, p. 908). We were all recipients of official discourses produced by policy makers and the media. Therefore, we could construct meanings together by recalling common cultural practices and representations of our daily life. Our commonalities could effectively be used to promote learning, ensure mutual understanding and efficiently support the negotiations and interactions within the classroom context.

However, all my previous shaped understandings of the educational reality had to be reconsidered after joining the setting of the GCS. I had to accept and perform a new role as a teacher in an educational setting which was perceived as subordinate to my students' mainstream schooling. I was trying to develop my students' linguistic abilities in a language that was neither the official language spoken in Britain nor my students' mother tongue. As I will explain below, the Standard Modern Greek (SMG)—the target language in the GCS- could be called a second or even a foreign language for the great majority of the young students. This is because most of their families speak the Greek Cypriot Dialect (GCD) or exclusively the English language (EL). Moreover, community school learners are of Greek origin but their place

of birth is England. They are the offspring of intraethnic or interethnic marriages¹. Their parents were also born in England and received their formal education in the EMS (English Mainstream School). Their grandparents immigrated to Britain around five decades ago in search of a better quality of life, further professional development and economic advancement.

So, the students attending lessons in the GCS are the descendants of Greeks and Greek Cypriots who have established their households in the dominant English society. All three generations²- grandparents, parents and children- have been living, acting, interacting, and negotiating meanings through social interactions within the host society. They have developed a network of ideas, values, beliefs and knowledge which draw elements from both their heritage culture and the dominant English culture. Thus they have internalized two 'culturally specific meaning systems' (D' Andreade, 1984) even though their identification with them may vary. They have been socialized through cultural practices and interactions with members from both the minority and majority group. Moreover they lead their lives through different languages, switching linguistic channels depending on context and interlocutor.

Therefore my teaching experience in the Greek Community School and my gradual familiarization with my new students' bilingual and bicultural lives was the starting point of a process which transformed my professional development. I had to respond to the needs of an unfamiliar setting wherein multilingualism was the norm and not the exception. My lack of experience of teaching the Greek language as a second or a foreign one meant that I had to try to construct approaches which could meet my new students' linguistic needs and also fit with their 'culture of learning', from the EMS (Chao-Chung, 2006).

I felt the need to explore further the new educational context and understand in more detail my new students' ways of seeing the world. I was specifically intrigued by three particular characteristics of my students: a) their varying levels of bilingualism, from being competent users of the Greek language to only speaking at a basic level, b) their negative attitudes towards the community school and c) their claims for a Greek ethnic identity even if they made

¹ The term *intraethnic marriage* refers here to spouses who share a common place of origin while the term *interethnic marriage* regards spouses whose place of origin differs.

² For the needs of the present study I refer to the first Greeks and Greek Cypriots to immigrate to England –my students' grandparents- as *the first generation*. I use the term *second generation* for their children –my students' parents-, and the term *third generation* for their grandchildren –my students-.

little effort to learn Greek. Back then, I was trapped within discourses which suggested an incontestable link between language and ethnic identity. I viewed group membership as static and impervious to context, time and historical processes. However, my decision to register for the MA in Education course was the beginning of a long, challenging academic journey involving dismissal of previous assumptions and an introduction to new ways of interpreting social reality.

My MA studies constituted a vital point in my desire to research further the GCS and mainly the children and families participating in it. At first, my interest focused on families who had succeeded in maintaining their heritage language. My MA final report focused on grandparents' significant contribution to their grandchildren's linguistic and cultural development (Floka, 2006). This study used a sociocultural framework to examine how young children learn as novices alongside older and more experienced members of the Greek culture. It linked with both Gregory et al.'s (2004) and Kenner et al.'s (2007) studies that show the influence of the grandparents on their grandchildren in transmitting literacy practices and values. My MA report study was the driving force for my decision to start a new academic journey focusing on three children who are students at the GCS, to explore in depth the complexities of their linguistic lives.

1.3. Short introduction to the participants- rationale of my cases of interest-Research questions

I chose to focus on these three students due to their different outcomes in Greek school, despite their commonalities in background. All three were in the same class of six children which met two afternoons each week for two hours. I was their community language teacher for two years. They all attended regularly. They were the same age (nine years old when the study started). They were born in London and attended mainstream primary schools. Alex and Michella were both children of an intraethnic marriage; both their parents were of Greek Cypriot origin. Marianthi's parents did not share a common place of origin. Her mother was Greek Cypriot but her father was of Sicilian Italian origin. All the children's parents were born and educated in London. Their grandparents immigrated to England some decades ago but at different points in their lives. All three children expressed negative views about their community schooling. Alex claimed that *'I do not like Greek School; it is boring...it is like your mum and dad have to force you to come to the Greek School'*. Similarly, Michella stated that *'it*

is boring...I do not know...it is because you do not enjoy doing that'. Marianthi agreed with her other two classmates by commenting that *'there should not be schools for Greek*'.

However, each of the three students differed regarding their competence. Alex was a dominant English speaker. His Standard Modern Greek (SMG) was at a basic level. He commented *'I do not understand Greek...I know how to say 'με λένε' (my name is)...and some other bits but that's it*'. Alex could decode a text written in SMG but he had great difficulties in deciphering its meaning. Michella had high oral, writing and reading competency. She also had the linguistic flexibility to articulate the same meaning using either English or SMG. However, her linguistic repertoire was stronger and richer in the EL than in the SMG. Marianthi was a bilingual speaker whose level of understanding the SMG exceeded her productive skills. Moreover, she had difficulty in expressing her views using the Greek language.

The above briefly described commonalities and differences between the three students intrigued me both professionally and academically. I felt the need to enquire into their different linguistic histories. But this required approaching their families since the family context is the cornerstone of heritage language (HL) use for immigrants living in a host society (Fishman, 1991; de Klerk 2001; Edwards and Newcombe, 2005; Pauwels, 2005). Being aware of the potentially significant role of grandparents as well as parents in children's learning, I decided to investigate the inter-relationship between the three generations in each family to find out whether and how this affected language maintenance (LM) or language shift (LS).

Such an in-depth investigation necessitated a methodological approach which would reveal the particularities and the uniqueness of each family regarding their efforts for HL use and maintenance. The case study approach seemed to be appropriate for the detailed exploration of their linguistic lives. I decided to use semi-structured interviews of grandparents, parents and children for the data collection which were further supplemented with notes taken over the years of my involvement in the field. I started my investigation with the aim to identify the factors that differentiate the three families' HL use. At this stage, my analysis used theoretical inferences from the fields of LM and LS. However, after conducting the first interviews with two of the families (Marianthi's family and Michella's family) and while analysing their accounts, I became aware of the complexities of their diglossic background.

A significant theme that emerged from the analysis of these data regarded the interrelationship of the participants' linguistic choices with their perceptions about three linguistic channels; the EL, the SMG and the CD. So for them, the term 'heritage language'

referred to two codes, the standard variety and the vernacular. Therefore, I had to extend my theoretical readings and the theoretical background of this study to include a discussion about the linguistic situation in Cyprus. Moreover, I had to employ a framework that would provide the means to explore the participants' perceptions about languages and their impact on their linguistic choices and decisions. The literature of Language Ideologies (LI) fitted this purpose. Furthermore, I had to use a theoretical base that could inter-relate family members' language conceptions with their linguistic practices. The Family Language Policy (FLP) literature seemed appropriate to provide the means to explore the participants' LI with reference to the HL use in both or each or even neither of its two forms.

Thus, I started exploring further the impact of the diglossic background on the participants' linguistic identities. So, I enriched the three young children's linguistic profiles with differences that regarded both their familiarization with the two forms of the heritage code and their awareness about their linguistic disparities. So, for Alex, who had basic SMG skills, the Cypriot dialect (CD) was an unknown code. Michella used the SMG with confidence and she was also a fluent CD speaker. Her metalinguistic awareness meant she could differentiate between the two codes at their grammatical and lexical level. Marianthi, who had difficulties in using the SMG with fluency, was aware of some of the linguistic differences between the SMG and the CD but her metalinguistic awareness appeared to be lower than Michella's.

Concomitantly with my deep immersion into the literature I conducted the second interviews with the participants. At the same time my research questions were refined to embrace the multidimensionality of the participants' linguistic cases. So, this case study seeks to explore in depth the following questions for grandparents, parents and children in each family:

- What is their use of language/s in different contexts over their lifetime?
- What are each participant's perceptions concerning the significance of the English Language, Standard Modern Greek and the Cypriot Dialect?
- How does each family negotiate ethnic language maintenance?
- How does each participant view the role of the Greek Community School with regard to language teaching and learning?
- How do all the above inter-relate to affect the child's language maintenance or shift?

1.4. Overview of rest of thesis

In Chapter 2, I explain the Cypriot historical background and linguistic landscape. I provide information about the families' place of origin with a detailed description of the differences between the two varieties of the heritage code. This chapter offers an introduction to the complexities hidden in the participants' linguistic lives closely inter-related with their diglossic origin.

Chapters 3 and 4 present my theoretical framework. In Chapter 3, I discuss the notion of HL and its ambiguous meaning with reference to my research. I also review the findings of studies conducted in the field of LM and LS with the aim of locating the factors that affect these phenomena. I then discuss language ideologies (LI), their meaning and their effects on social actors' linguistic decisions. In Chapter 4, I extend the discussion about language ideologies with a specific focus on social actors' exercised agency either in accordance with or against dominant discourses. This is followed by a discussion of the field of family language policy (FLP) that acknowledges the decisive role of language ideologies in LM or LS. The theoretical ideas elaborated in these chapters provide the lens through which I later explore my research questions.

In Chapter 5, I explain my methodological perspective and I describe the research design of this study.

In Chapter 6, I analyse the data collected from the members of Marianthi's family.

In Chapter 7, I analyse the data collected from the members of Michella's family.

In Chapter 8, I analyse the data collected from the members of Alex's family.

In Chapter 9, I compare the data collected from the three families detecting their commonalities and their differences.

In Chapter 10, I introduce the concept of *family language histories*, which emerged from my analysis of the collected data. Finally, I consider the implications of my findings for educational policy and practice.

Chapter 2: The Cypriot historical background and linguistic landscape

2.1. Introduction

In this chapter I will discuss the structural, functional and ideological dimensions affecting the Standard Modern Greek (SMG) and the Cypriot dialect (CD). An account of the Cypriot historical background will shed light to the complexity of the linguistic situation in Cyprus which influences the language histories of my participants. A historical narrative about Cyprus will locate the construction of a Greek Cypriot identity through three prevalent discourses which are interrelated in a complex way. The first advocates a complete identification with the Greek state. The second promotes a distinctive Greek Cypriot identity. Both the above emphasize total separation from the Turkish state. Greek Cypriots seem entangled within various political messages as they unfold within the years of their complex history.

2.2. Historical background of Cyprus

Cyprus became part of the Ottoman Empire in 1571 and Turks from Anatolia began settling across the island. During the three centuries of Ottoman rule Turks and Greeks lived in great proximity while maintaining their distinct religious beliefs and practices. The Turkish Cypriots identified with Turkey, the Ottoman Empire and the Muslim religion and the Greek Cypriots identified with the Byzantine Empire, the Greek language and the Orthodox religion. The independence of Greece in 1830, reinforced Greek Cypriots' aspirations for unification under the umbrella of one state. In 1878, the Ottomans handed control of Cyprus to Britain in exchange for guarantees that the latter would use the island as a military base and to offer their support and protection to the Ottoman Empire. But in 1914, after the outbreak of the First World War and the entry of the Ottoman Empire on the side of Germany, Cyprus was formally annexed to the British Empire. In 1923, Turkey relinquished its right to Cyprus and in 1925 the island was declared a British Crown colony.

In 1950, a controversial unofficial referendum for self-determination showed that 96% of the Greek Cypriot population favoured Enosis (union) with Greece. Resistance to the colonial power intensified to an armed struggle against the British colonial authorities during 1955-1960. Thus, Britain was impelled to consider the option of granting independence. In 1960 the Greek and Turkish ethnic groups accepted an independence document which assigned Greece, Turkey and Britain as guarantor powers of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the new state and provided for Britain to keep two military bases on their former colony. In 1963 the

Greek Cypriot President³ of the new state proposed a number of constitutional amendments which aroused the opposition of the Turkish Cypriot community, leading to interethnic conflict from 1963-1967.

Intra-ethnic division also arose among Greek Cypriots, between those who argued for immediate 'union' with Greece and others supporting 'union as a future possible act (Loizos, 1974). In the early years of the following decade, a military group initiated an operation of 'killings, violence and intimidation against the government' (Papadakis, 1998, p. 152) culminating in a *coup d'etat* by nationalist Greek Cypriots in 1974. Fear developed among the Turkish Cypriot community and Turkey reacted by launching a military invasion that resulted in many casualties. Turkish troops occupied the northern third part of the island. Cyprus was divided into two parts separated by a demilitarized zone called the 'Green Line', and guarded by UN peacekeepers until the present day. It was in this divided state that Cyprus became a member of the European Union in April 2004.

There are two ideologies or as Philippou puts it 'discourses of identity' (2007, p. 71) that have turned Cypriot society and subsequently Cypriot education into arenas of conflict after the events in 1974: *Hellenocentrism* and *Cypriocentrism*. The former is supported primarily by the right-wing political party operating in Cyprus. It emphasizes the 'Greek' aspect of Greek Cypriot identity (Papapavlou, 1997; 1998) and promotes the ideal of *Hellenism* (ellinismos meaning Greekness) as a united force among people of Greek origin all over the world. It is a concept that first emerged during the 19th century as a nationalist Greek movement that stressed the revitalization of the Byzantine Empire, known as the Great Idea (Megali idea). In contrast, Cypriocentrism is mainly supported by the political left and emphasizes the Cypriot identity-citizenship which all communities residing in Cyprus share (Spyrou, 2001).

2.2.1. Discussion

The long history of Cyprus reveals that the two ethnic communities that reside on the island maintain rigid ethnic, social and mainly linguistic boundaries. Even though the Constitution of 1960 declares Greek and Turkish as the two official languages spoken on the island very few people speak Turkish on the Greek-Cypriot side⁴ and few speak Greek on the Turkish side.

³ The Greek Cypriot president Makarios led a dual role being at the same time the archbishop of the Greek Cypriot Christian Orthodox Church.

⁴ The use of Turkish in the southern part of the island, the non-occupied areas are nominal. Nevertheless its official status is evident in some official documents, in passports and in banknotes, but few Greek Cypriots speak it.

Cyprus has no official national song, the Turkish Cypriots use the Turkish one and the Greek Cypriots use the Greek one. There are four different flags used as symbols of nationality, the Greek Cypriots use both the Greek and the Cypriot one while Turkish Cypriots use both the Cypriot and the Turkish one. So both communities express an extended loyalty to their homelands.

2.3. Cyprus: sociolinguistic landscape

2.3.1. The linguistic situation

But does the Greek Cypriot community identify with one common Greek Language? The linguistic situation in the island is described as diglossic where two varieties, the demotic Greek 'standard modern Greek' (SMG) and the Vernacular 'Greek Cypriot dialect' (CD) inform Cypriots' daily interactions (Papapavlou and Pavlou, 1998). Standard Greek is not spoken as a native language in Cyprus with the exception of the Greeks who have relocated to the island permanently⁵ or reside in it for a limited period of time⁶. The majority of the population in the non-occupied areas of the Republic of Cyprus are native speakers of Cypriot, a variety traditionally described as a dialect of Greek (Newton, 1972a; Kontosopoulos, 2001).

The formation of the Cypriot dialect is roughly placed between the 7th and 14th centuries AD (Terkourafi, 2007). Written monuments from the CD are preserved from the 14th century (Moschonas, 1996). It is considered a part of the Modern Greek dialects which are collectively traced back to the Hellenistic Koinè and associated with the diminishing influence of Constantinople (Tzitzilis, 2000; Ralli, 2006). Nevertheless, unlike most Modern Greek dialects, the CD along with the Greek varieties of the Pontus, Cappadocia and Southern Italy remained outside the boundaries of the Greek state when it was initially established in 1830 and later expanded to its present form in 1948. But what is unique about the CD is that it continues to be the first language, the mother tongue of the majority of the population in a country other than Greece.

According to Sciriha (1995) only 4% of the population reported understanding Turkish and only 1,8% affirmed speaking it; it is worth noting that the participants verifying knowledge and use of the Turkish language were over thirty years old. Additionally, according to the 2001 Cyprus census only 0,05% of the population reported that the language they speak best is the Turkish language.

⁵ According to 2001 census, 2,5 % of the population are Greeks who live permanently in Cyprus and their native language is the Standard Modern Greek, the official language of their country of origin.

⁶ This category includes students who study in the University of Cyprus, teachers, army officers and other people who come from Greece and move to Cyprus in search for a better professional development.

Arvaniti (2006a) argues that there is a tacit assumption that the SMG used in Cyprus today is not different from the SMG used in Greece and therefore this is a largely neglected topic. She refers to differences between the form of SMG spoken in Cyprus in comparison to the one used in Greece. She attributes such a phenomenon to the influence of English and the observed inferences from the CD along with the increasing use of the Standard form in semi-formal occasions. She names the new rising linguistic variety as Cypriot Standard Greek. Meanwhile, Terkourafi (2007) argues that it is false to perceive CD as a static entity while she underlines the existence of a dubious premise for perceiving the two linguistic codes, SMG and CD, as 'sufficiently homogeneous to remain distinct from each other' since 'internal homogeneity is a myth' (p.61). Such a view overlooks the variability within each variety along geographical and social axes. In such a sense CD is further divided into 'town speech' and 'village Cypriot' or 'village speech' (Newton, 1972b). Village and town Cypriot form a continuum with village Cypriot as the basilect and town Cypriot as the acrolect (Kayrolemou and Pavlou, 2001; Goutsos and Karyolemou, 2004). The former is a term used to describe a host of geographically based linguistic varieties (Newton, 1972b). The latter is a variety used by the educated speakers-mainly from the capital, Nicosia- and can be viewed as the standard form of the vernacular (Aravniti, 2006a).

Karoulla-Vrikki (2004), documents that the current status quo between the two varieties, SMG and CD, was present in Cyprus even in the years during the British colonial rule. The CD was used in local informal situations while the language of education was the Standard Greek. The form of the latter, in those years, is known as 'katharevousa' which was the official language in the Greek State from its creation in the 19th century till 1976. The 'Katharevousa' bore the label of the high variety and it is an artificial language based on classical Greek and the isolation of any non-Greek features. Its choice as the National Greek language reflects the prevalent ideology during the years of the foundation of the Greek State regarding the return to classical roots and the continuity and unity of Hellenism under the discourse of the glorious past in ancient Greece that had to be maintained as 'pure' and powerful through the language used by the descendants and inheritors of the Great Greek civilization. So 'katharevousa' became for both Greece and Cyprus the language of education, administration and law but the majority of the population used in their informal interactions in Greece the 'dimotiki' and in Cyprus the CD which were different to the national language in terms of morphology, syntax, phonology and vocabulary. But after a long period of arguments and political contradictions referring to the problems caused by the diglossic situation in Greece (known as the 'glosiko

zitima' meaning the 'language question'), Modern Greek, based on the 'dimotiki' was nominated the official language of the Hellenic Republic and the Republic of Cyprus in 1976. So, the linguistic situation in Cyprus in terms of the officially recognized language, has been closely connected with the political arrangements and policies applied in the Greek State. But what are the particularities of a diglossic sociolinguistic situation?

2.3.2. Diglossia

The relationship between the linguistic codes used for formal and informal interactions in Cyprus bears the characteristics of a generally stable state of affairs as it is described by Ferguson's (1959, 2003) classic study on diglossia. Ferguson selecting Arabic, Modern Greek, German and Haitian Creole and their respective linguistic communities defined diglossia in terms of function, prestige, literary heritage, acquisition, standardization, stability, grammar, lexicon and phonology that differentiate the two languages of each speech community. He notes accordingly that 'diglossia is a relatively stable language situation in which, in addition to the primary dialects of the language (which may include a standard or regional standards), there is a very divergent, highly codified (often grammatically more complex) superposed variety, the vehicle of a large and respected body of written literature, either of an earlier period or in another speech community, which is learned largely by formal education and is used for most written and formal spoken purposes but is not used by any sector of the community of ordinary conversation' (Ibid, p. 354). This divergent and highly codified variety that bears all the above characteristics would be the SMG in the Cypriot linguistic milieu. But what are the social implications of a diglossic context?

According to Ferguson, in diglossic situations there is a distinction between two varieties of the same language (dialects) - a high variety (H) and a low variety (L). The two varieties coexist in a speech community in a kind of complementary distribution. 'Formal' domains of linguistic behaviour such as public speaking, education, religious texts and practice are dominated by the H norm which is considered to be more prestigious. The L norm is used in informal situations, conversations, jokes, the market, the street and any other domains not reserved for the H norm. Nevertheless, Ferguson argues that there are also diglossic situations where the two languages are not genetically related, they constitute two different linguistic codes (extended diglossia) and the one dominating the H domains has the greater international prestige or it is the language of the local power elite. Accordingly, diglossic situations are characterized by a specialization of function for H and L and the importance of using the right variety in the right situation. The domains of use of each variety are highly compartmentalized

and the existence of boundaries between them is regarded as decisive for the weaker or lower variety to survive (Baker, 2001). The H variety is considered more prestigious, superior, more beautiful, more logical, better able to express important thought and such a belief is held also by speakers whose command of H is limited.

The feelings of superiority of H in comparison to L are so strong that L is reported as 'not to exist' whereas members of a diglossic community appear to prefer to hear 'a political speech or an expository lecture or a recitation of poetry in H even though it may be less intelligible to them than it would be in L' (Ferguson, 2003, p. 349). The power and supremacy of the H is further reinforced by an existing sizeable body of literature which is considered to be highly valued by the speech community. But H is a variety learned by the speaker by the means of formal education. On the contrary, L is the language naturally acquired at home; it bears the status of the mother tongue and comprises the medium of early socialization for the child. In diglossic communities where the two varieties are genetically related the H is given the label of the 'language' while the L is usually a dialectic form of the H. The term 'dialect' is identified as a related form of a 'language' and its existence is historically the outcome of either convergence or divergence. Language is considered to be the superordinate term which can be used without reference to its dialects. On the contrary dialect is the subordinate term and it can establish its presence and value only with reference to the language to which it belongs. As Haugen underlines 'every dialect is a language, but not every language is a dialect' (2003, p. 412).

In the following part of the present chapter I will illustrate the sociolinguistic situation of Cyprus through three distinct dimensions: the structural, the functional and the ideological. The first two are involved in the way the terms 'language' and 'dialect' are used; the structural refers to the description of the language itself and the functional concerns the description of its social use in communication. The main consideration of a structural account is the genetic relationship of the two codes. The functional account focuses on the way the speakers use the codes they master, the social functions of each language and the prestige attached to each one of them. The ideological dimension of the Cypriot sociolinguistic context will reveal the prevalent ideologies associated with the two codes used on the island. All three accounts provide the reader with enlightening information about the complexity of the participants' heritage linguistic capital. The analysis of the collected data will reveal the participants' ideological standpoint towards the two varieties when both of them undertake a subordinate role due to the influential power of another dominant language, English, in the UK context.

2.3.3. Structural differences between SMG and CD

The major differences between the SMG and the CD are reported in the domains of phonology and lexicon. The pronunciation of CD has received influential elements from other languages like Turkish, Arabic, Italian and French, the languages spoken by the colonized powers who have occupied the island throughout the centuries (Newton, 1972a; 1972b; Davy et al. 1996). The CD's distinct sounds are /dʒ/, /ʃ/, /tʃ/, /ʒ/ where the first two are the ones more commonly found even though none of them constitute part of the phonological inventory of SMG (Papapavlou, 2001). In the CD the underlying phoneme /k/ turns to /dʒ/ (for example, /ketó/ (look at) is turned into / dʒitó/ and the underlying phoneme /x/ turns into /ʃ/ (for example, /xena/ (goose) is turned into /ʃina/. Moreover voiced fricatives such as /v/, /ð/ and /ɣ/ are lost when occupying an intervocalic position. Some other examples of CD occurrences are: in morphology the retention of an ancient final nasal /n/ in the accusative singular ('semeran' instead of 'semera' in SMG meaning today); in syntax the post position of clitics (e.g. 'proskalo se' instead of 'se proskalo' in SMG meaning I invite you) and in lexicon ('patiha' instead of 'karpouzi' in SMG meaning water melon). Many lexical items have been integrated from other languages but they have been adapted into the phonological elements of the variety and into its grammatical structure. So many words used in the CD constitute loanwords from Turkish, Arabic as well as English (Papapavlou, 1989; 2004).

Terkourafi (2007) uses the term 'contemporary Cypriot Greek' and not CD because the latter, as a dynamic entity operating as an umbrella for the Greek varieties spoken in different parts of the island and during different periods, fails to single out the generalized variety which is actually spoken in the southern part of Cyprus in the current years. In her study she identifies the origins of some distinctive features of contemporary Cypriot Greek with four main sources. Specifically she uses examples from all four levels of phonology, morphology, syntax and lexical semantics so as to explain the *discourse of difference* under which the CD has been represented at the structural level. So she claims that contemporary Cypriot Greek is characterized by: a) elements retained from ancient Greek that are unique to the contemporary CD, b) elements borrowed from other languages with which it came into contact, c) elements that CD shares with other Greek varieties, mostly South-Eastern ones and d) elements unique to CD which do not occur to any other Greek variety and thus should be considered as an innovation of the CD.

Structural differences between the two varieties cause problems in the communication between a SMG speaker with no previous experiences of linguistic encounters with CD speakers. Despite the fact that Cypriot is considered a dialect of Greek, SMG and CD-especially the village variety-are not mutually intelligible. Reports of communication failures between Cypriots and Mainland Greeks abound in informal discussions but are also found in scholarly publications remarking the 'phonetic peculiarity' and 'hard to understand' or 'deviant' nature of Cypriot speech (Terkourafi, 2007, pp. 61). Papadakis (2000) reports the case of Greek film distributors considering the use of subtitles to a Cypriot film about the Turkish invasion so as to achieve intelligibility by the Greek audience. In the same sense, Tsiplakou (2003) refers to reports by Cypriots having difficulties in extensively understanding the information given by programmes presented by the Greek TV channels when they were first exposed to the satellite TV of Greece-although they were taught SMG at school. So as Terkourafi (2007) argues 'it's official: Cypriot Greek is different, sometimes to the point of incomprehensibility' (pp. 61).

Nevertheless lack of intelligibility is not mutual; this incomprehensibility goes only one way (Newton, 1972b). Cypriots are familiar with SMG through their schooling, the media and increasing contact with Greece. On the contrary Mainland Greeks remain unfamiliar with the CD. Speakers of the standard have no difficulty in making themselves understood by Greek Cypriots. Thus during a communication instance between a SMG speaker and CD speaker, the first may have a difficulty in understanding the second but this is not the case when it comes to the Cypriot's linguistic flexibility and competence. Moreover Cypriots tend to use the unintelligible variety for Greeks –the village variety- only among themselves while switching to the Town variety when addressing speakers from Greece. The latter behaviour shows traits of accommodation to the SMG speaker (Papapavlou, 1998; McEntee-Atalianis and Pouloukas, 2001; Papadakis, 2003). All the above reveal the asymmetrical intelligibility between the CD and SMG.

2.3.4. Functional differences between SMG and CD

There is a clear functional differentiation of CD and SMG in Cyprus. SMG is the language learnt through schooling and is used in all forms of writing and in some formal forms of oral discourse such as news broadcasting. The CD is the Cypriots' mother tongue (Yiakoumetti et al., 2006); it is naturally acquired in the home environment and is used in all face to face interaction among Cypriots with friends and family members (Karyolemou and Pavlou, 2001; Arvaniti, 2006a). The CD is also used in the media but for humorous purposes such as television and radio comedies, captions for political cartoons and humorous commercials referring to local

products. A limited employment of a refined form of town Cypriot is used for television dramas to the amusement of the local viewers. The CD is found in a written non-humorous form only in poetry (Arvaniti, 2006a) and in online informal communication like e-mails and e-chats (Themistocleous, 2005). Cypriots use the dialect throughout their daily activities but switch into SMG in formal situations. The two codes find themselves in complementary distribution but there are cases where the two codes are in conflict (Panayiotou, 1996)⁷. There are several factors that dictate the selection of one code over the other prominent among which is the formal education wherein SMG is the legitimate language.

The existence of the dialect is not officially recognised at school. The curricula, for the primary and the secondary education treat the standard variety as the students' mother tongue and exclude their actual mother tongue. Both the teachers and the students are expected to use the SMG for formal learning within the classroom boundaries. The latest circular sent to all three sectors of state education characteristically maintains that 'educators should use SMG during class time and they should expect the same from their students...the Cypriot dialect is respected and can be used by students in certain cases for communication, such as in role plays representing scenes from everyday life...{which} should be performed within logical boundaries and not at the expense of the development of SMG' (my translation) (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2002). Research shows the teachers' negative attitudes towards the use of the Cypriot dialect at school and the SMG's monopoly in the educational procedure (Tsiplakou, 2003; Papapavlou, 2004). The educational system in Cyprus promotes the use and learning of SMG while ignoring the CD (Ioannidou, 2007). But because this 'institution has the monopoly in the large-scale production of producers/consumers' who identify a particular linguistic capital as legitimate or not (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 57) the speakers' attitudes towards the two varieties are accordingly shaped by the State language policy.

Papapavlou (1997, 1998) employing the matched-guised technique⁸, investigated the attitudes of Greek Cypriots towards the SMG and the CD. The participants, Greek Cypriot university

⁷ Moschonas (1996) underlines that speakers' evaluation that perceive the two varieties being in conflict are greatly informed by political and ideological oppositions between left and right political parties whose aspiration are reported in p. 9 (Cypriocentrism versus Hellenocentrism).

⁸ Lambert *et al.* (1960) introduced this technique as a method of investigating reactions to speech variants. Judges evaluate a recorded speaker's personality-along many dimensions such as ambition, intelligence, sense of humour e.t.c.-. They hear the same person reading the same passage in each of the two or more languages, dialects or accents. Nevertheless the judges are not aware that the speaker is the same person each time.

students were asked to evaluate the qualities of several speakers using the standard form on one occasion (one guise) and the dialect on another occasion (the other guise). The results showed that judges had more positive attitudes towards the SMG than towards the CD for eight out of the twelve dimensions such as among others kindness, education, intelligence, dependability and attractiveness. Specifically, those who use SMG were considered to be more educated, attractive, ambitious, intelligent, interesting, modern, dependable and pleasant than those who use the Cypriot dialect. Nevertheless, SMG speakers failed to achieve high rating in terms of sincerity, kindness, friendliness and humorousness, dimensions for which CD speakers were highly valued. This is also the evaluation that emerges from a number of ethnographic and sociolinguistic studies (Sciriha, 1995; Papapavlou, 1997, 1998; Papadakis, 2003).

However, even though the CD is associated with the low prestige variety in the sociolinguistic situation in Cyprus, its speakers have a clear sense that certain circumstances call for CD use and others for SMG use and evaluate speakers according to their skill in using both appropriately. So, Cypriots use the term 'kalamarizo' meaning 'speak like a person coming from Greece'⁹ to describe the linguistic behaviour of those who try to employ the SMG in linguistic situations where the use of CD is expected and considered appropriate. Using SMG in such instances may be considered pretentious and attracts ridicule. At the same time, speakers who use the CD in circumstances that call for the use of SMG are seen as uncouth and said 'not to know how to speak Greek' despite the fact that they may be educated and proficient in another language such as English. Thus, there are domains of language use where CD appears to bear a 'covert prestige' for its speakers especially under circumstances where the linguistic hierarchy alters positioning the L as the proper, the correct and the expected choice and the H as the illegitimate code.

2.3.5. Political and ideological dimension of the diglossic situation in Cyprus

Both linguistic codes, the SMG and the CD, are in complementary distribution and there is a wide apportionment separating the public from the private, the collective from the individual and the official from the unofficial. But the use of the standard form of the language does not

⁹ The word 'kalamaras' literally means 'person with quill/scribbler'; according to Arvaniti (2006a), it is believed that it was first used by Cypriots for the teachers coming from Greece to teach in the schools in Cyprus in the late 19th and early 20th century. However the term has taken a derogatory sense for some, indicating the negative feelings that Cypriots hold towards the Greeks whom they consider responsible for the Turkish invasion in 1974 (Papadakis, 2003)(it is believed that the coup et at against Cypriot government was initiated and supported by the Greek junta).

only operate in a complementary form, it also causes a number of contradictions that bring the two codes into conflict. But such tensions are always produced and forged by a number of political and ideological standpoints whose oppositions *per se* involve and inform the way the two codes are evaluated by their speakers. Thus, as already discussed in the piece about the history of Cyprus, political parties and their notions of 'Hellenocentrism' and 'Cypriocentrism' have 'used' the two codes for their future aspirations and interests. The first advocated for the SMG as a symbol unifying all the Greeks around the world while the second emphasized the existence of the CD as an emblem of potential independence and disengagement from the nurturing of the motherland, Greece.

Many scholars who analysed language policy in Cyprus (Karyolemou, 2002; Papapavlou and Pavlou, 2005) agree that the adoption of SMG and its current prestigious power is based on the rationale of national unity since linguistic and subsequently cultural homogeneity is believed to be achieved through one common and national language (Coulmas, 1988). But the aspiration of national unity through linguistic unity appears problematic for Cyprus with regard to two political notions. The first one refers to the establishment of a common language that will unite the whole Hellenic population all over the countries, as one nation around a centre, a common point of reference, the Greek State. The second one regards the unification of all different forms of the CD whose manifestations even the Greek Cypriots themselves find problematic due to the existence of some local varieties that bear the hallmark of unintelligibility. Nevertheless, both the above serve to put CD in a position of *difference* as an 'Exterior within an Interior' (Terkourafi, 2007, p. 74) meaning 'a non-Greek ...or some brand of 'mixed Greek'' within "pure' Greek' (Moschonas, 2004, p. 190). After all the establishment of SMG as an official language with the constitution of 1960 and its prevalence within powerful institutions such as the education and the media with the support of the State, distinguish CD as the 'other' that has to be ignored or devalued as such since SMG is the code that serves 'as an identity marker that constructs kinship associations with Greece' (Ioannidou and Sophocleous, 2010, p. 299).

Within this discourse that identifies SMG with a symbol that unites both Greece and Cyprus under the umbrella of Hellenism while unifying at the same time all the speakers of local varieties under a common linguistic code, policy rhetoric prompts a collective effort for protecting SMG against all 'exterior' forces. Moschonas (1996) considers that this further promotes the linguistic hegemony of SMG over the CD. He identifies such discourses with ideologies offering support and extended power to the standard variety for further domination

and legitimacy even in domains the dialect 'owns' exclusively. He also underlines that SMG may carry the title of the official language in Cyprus but it is still characterized as the descendant of a L variety (dimotiki)¹⁰ and this fact cumburs its acceptance as a H variety. Nevertheless, the Cypriot state has always followed the language reforms of Greece while Greek Cypriot and Greek education share common textbooks and curricula. So, Cyprus' political affiliations with Greece have been informing policies while producing ideologies that favour SMG over CD. At the same time feelings of solidarity and notions advocating a distinct Cypriot identity emphasize ideologies that praise the CD and support its exclusive hegemony in informal domains. The structural and functional differences between the two varieties along with the relevant ideologies reinforce each other; perceived differences produce related ideologies while ideological factors motivate individual linguistic choices.

2.4. Conclusion

In this chapter I have described the diglossic situation in Cyprus. Through historical discussion the chronic aspiration of many Greek Cypriots for *enosis* with Greece has become evident. This has led to a lasting association with the Greek State informing linguistic practices and choices, political aspirations, and educational objectives and has produced ideological standpoints. Two linguistic codes, SMG and CD, co-exist in complementarity but also in conflict. Their distribution is compartmentalized in different domains of daily interactions. The first is the H variety used in formal domains and learned through formal schooling. The second is the L code and constitutes the linguistic means of communication in informal contexts while it is acquired naturally within the family. The first is the language that attributes to the speaker prestige and high social status while the use of the second is associated with feelings of solidarity and familiarity. Both languages, with their structural and functional differences along with their ideological and attitudinal dimensions informed by historical processes constitute the current sociolinguistic environment in Cyprus, the place of origin of the participants in my study. This complex social context has been for the members of the first generation their place of birth, and of their early socialization but also the setting within they received their formal education. It also constitutes for all three generations a place to which they pay regular visits, meeting friends, relatives and members of their close and extended social network with whom they interact and 'update' their perceptions, views, evaluations and attitudes towards the two languages that co exist with the EL in their linguistic repertoire. In the next chapter I will begin

¹⁰ The diglossic situation in Greece is further elaborated in pages 11-12.

the discussion about the theoretical framework that will provide the means for analysing their accounts with relevance to the research questions. I will start with the finding of studies conducted in the field of LM and LS. I will then proceed with a discussion about the meaning of the term LI and their effect on social actors' language evaluation and language choice.

Chapter 3: Language maintenance and the effects of Language Ideologies

3.1. Introduction

In this chapter I will discuss the ambiguous meaning of the term HL for the participants of my study. I will continue by reviewing the findings of studies conducted in the field of LM and LS seeking to locate the factors that affect these phenomena with a specific focus on the role of the family. I then discuss language ideologies (LI), an under-researched dimension interrelating with actors' decision to preserve or abandon an ethnic code. I explain the meaning of this concept and the implications of some of its dimensions as identified by Kroskrity (2004).

3.2. Heritage Language (HL)

The term heritage refers to elements of past experiences which a person or a group deliberately sets out to preserve and pass on to the next generation (Blackledge and Creese, 2010). The HL can be included in the resources 'that someone wishes to conserve or to collect, and to pass on to future generations' (Howard, 2003, p. 6). However, when we are talking about HL we have to identify which language this is and why its preservation is important for the native speakers themselves and subsequently for the younger generations, in a new country where another language is dominant. But behind both the terms of 'heritage' language and 'dominant' language exist two implied assumptions: first that both the place of origin and the host society each have one official language and secondly that each one of these languages is homogeneous in terms of phonology, lexicon, syntax and morphology for the whole population.

However, such assumptions seem to capitalize on the myth of 'shared forgetting', a notion proposed as central to the social constitution of nationhood at least as much as shared memories (Joseph, 2004, p. 114). They put aside the differences among groups which are considered to constitute one nation while also selecting to erase memories of the time when they were not united as a nation. With reference to the present study both the place of origin and the host society appear as monolingual¹¹ societies with one official language, SMG and English respectively since these are the languages taught through formal schooling. It is the educational system that plays a decisive role in 'fashioning the similarities from which...[a]

¹¹ As I said earlier, Cyprus, after the constitution of 1960, is declared as having two official languages: SMG and Turkish. Nevertheless specific historical and political dimensions constitute the southern part of the island as monolingual even though such a statement does not respond to the reality of the linguistic situation in the island due to the wide use of the CD.

community of consciousness which is the cement of the nation stems' (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 48). Nevertheless we have to underline the existence of a variety of dialectical types used in parallel with the above languages even though such a case is only a matter of concern for researchers and their speakers and not for policy makers and power holders whose linguistic capital is the one recognized and accepted as the legitimate one.

3.3. Nation and Language

Nation and language are two terms that have become inextricably intertwined. Haugen (2003) underlines the power of a nation in minimizing internal differences whilst maximizing external ones. Nationhood is based on an ideal advocating internal cohesion and external distinction, drawing a boundary between 'us' and 'them'. Bauman (2004) identifies the nation building and maintenance task with the 'belonging-through-birth...belonging to a nation...a laboriously construed convention; the appearance of 'naturalness' could be anything but 'natural'...did not gestate and incubate in human experience 'naturally', did not emerge out of that experience as a self evident 'fact of life. That idea was forced...and arrived as a fiction...it congealed into a 'fact', a 'given'" (p. 20 -23). Such an ideal tends to disguise the belief that the nation has been invented, that it is an 'imagined community' since 'the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion' (Anderson, 1991, p. 6).

The 'discovery' of a national language constitutes a crucial part of the inventing or imagining of a nation. Makoni and Pennycook (2007) claim that languages were 'invented' through a process of classification and naming as is proven by critical historical accounts (p.1). National languages are integral in the establishment of a national linguistic identity in the sense that external distinction requires a nation to have its own language. The national ideal demands a single linguistic code so communication among its members can be achieved and exemptions can be established. But language is not only used as a means of communicating ideas among the members of a nation. It carries a heavy symbolism of nationhood, a medium under which speakers express solidarity and loyalty. It is considered as the 'distinctive' mark against the 'other' and often holds 'powerful connotations in terms of their {some group members'} sense of belonging and selfhood' (Blackledge and Creese, 2008, p. 535). By using the national language and by being competent speakers they prove their authentic belonging to a nation whose state borders may exist thousands of miles away but whose existence is actualized through the language. As the supreme symbol whose power can lead people to death or

violent expression of chauvinism, language can 'function as such a symbol for which some are ready to die or kill' (Tabouret-Keller, 1997, p. 319). Therefore, even when immigrating to a host country, HL appears as a 'linguistic treasure' that has to be maintained throughout the years as an unquestionable badge of a social actor's ethnicity.

3.4. Language maintenance (LM) and Language Shift (LS): defining the concepts

The term 'language maintenance' as the opposite to 'language shift' was introduced by Fishman (1965) and may refer to the behaviour of a whole community, a sub-group within it, or an individual. Fishman claims that the study of LM and LS 'is concerned with the relationship between change (or stability) in language usage patterns, on the one hand, and ongoing psychological, social and cultural processes, on the other hand, in populations that utilize more than one speech variety for intra-group or for inter-group purposes' (p. 76). Veltman (1991) reports that 'language maintenance is the practice of speaking one's mother tongue throughout one's lifetime' (p. 147). In contrast, LS indicates the experience of situations where one language is abandoned or slowly or rapidly displaced by another (Kostoulas-Makrakis, 1995). Veltman (1991) refers to language shift as a movement across a continuum ranging from language maintenance to language loss. For him, language loss is 'the abandonment of the mother tongue as a language of daily use and the 'forgetting' of that language' (p. 147). But what are the reasons which lead the speakers of a language to gradually exclude it from their linguistic repertoire?

3.4.1. LM and LS: factors which affect the phenomena

3.4.1.1. The three generation process

A substantial body of literature has been accumulated over the last decades investigating the patterns of LM or LS among immigrant communities and seeking to identify factors that accelerate or delay the phenomena. Fishman (1966, 1972, 1980) and Veltman (1983, 1991) were among the first sociolinguists to formulate the model of 'Anglicization' illustrating the impact of generation on HL use. Accordingly, the members of the first immigrant generation learn English but they prefer to use their home language, especially within their home context. Thus, their children grow up as bilinguals. But the second generation is educated in the educational system of the host country and they may prefer to use English, even when they speak with their parents (Lopez, 1996). When they establish their own households and rear children, their family language is English and they use mainly the dominant channel at home. Consequently the third generation grows up under a prevalent pattern of English

monolingualism and adopts the majority language as being its first language. Therefore, the knowledge of the HL appears to be fragmentary for these children. So, the three generation process of 'Anglicization' prevails, changing irreversibly the patterns of HL use among the members of an ethnic community (Alba et al. 2002).

The first generation of immigrants had fewer opportunities than the second for learning and practicing English. Therefore they hold a lower baseline in terms of competence and possibilities to use English, leading to higher rates of language maintenance and more positive attitudes towards their mother tongue (Tannenbaum, 2003). The second generation, which was born in England, was daily and strongly exposed to the new language within the school environment and the social context as a whole. This means that these children had more opportunities and a higher motivation to use English (Kipp et al., 1995; Fillmore, 1991). Portes and Rumbaut (2001) collected interesting data about the children of the immigrant second generation. Their conclusions demonstrate a decline in competence in the mother tongue over time and a simultaneous English dominance. Alba et al. (2002) examined the third and later generation of three different immigrant groups: Cubans, Asians and Mexicans. According to their findings the families which participated in the research speak only English at home and the children are expected to grow up as English monolinguals with fragmentary knowledge of their HL.

Language maintenance and shift studies have recognized the importance of HL use among the older and the succeeding generations for its successful preservation (Kostoulas-Makrakis, 1995). Language shift may take place slowly across several generations or may occur as a rapid process depending on the social situations the immigrant groups encounter in the host country (Smolicz, 1983b; Veltman, 1983). Fishman (1989) argues that: 'what begins as the language of social and economic mobility ends within three generations or so, as the language of the crib as well, even in democratic and pluralism-permitting contexts' (p. 206). Kanazawa and Loveday (1988) studying the Japanese immigrant community in Brazil, refer to the language shift towards Portuguese over three generations. The writers describe the initial borrowing and pidginisation in the first generation, the appearance of bilingualism and code-switching in the second generation and the tendency of monolingualism reached by the third generation.

3.4.1.2. Other interrelated factors

Myers –Scotton (2006) notes that there is one critical generalization that may be drawn from all studies on LM and LS phenomena. This refers to the parallel operations of many dimensions

that support either LM or LS, there is *'always a combination of factors at work'* (italics added, *ibid*, p. 89). In the same sense, Fillmore (2003) underlines that both external and internal pressures interrelate to shape the immigrants' linguistic choices. Myers-Scotton claims that the central factors in LM can be summarized as follows: a) demographic factors (referring to the number of HL speakers in the host country), b) occupational factors (regarding the linguistic demands of immigrants' professional environment), c) educational factors (associated with HL learning opportunities provided to immigrants by the host society), d) social networks factors (concerning speakers' opportunities to use the HL with co-speakers), e) group attitudes towards the HL as an ethnic symbol (related to the speakers' views about the association of HL with their sense of ethnic belonging), and f) psychological attachment to the HL as a vital part of self-identity.

Relevant to Myers-Scotton's list is Kipp et al.'s (1995) claim that the size and the distribution of the immigrant group bear an impact on successful ethnic LM. Giles et al. (1977) agree with the above but they also explain that both the concentration of the group members and their absolute number relates to their distinctiveness, their collective entity and subsequently the preservation of their distinct code. Kipp et al. (1995) also put emphasis on the educational policies of the host society and their vital role in supporting immigrant languages. The institutional support of the ethnic code in the form of schools or school subjects interrelates with its maintenance (Fishman et al., 1966; Giles et al., 1977; Holmes et al., 1993). Similarly, Fishman (1991) considers positive language education and immigration policies as not only important but also a prerequisite for the maintenance of the community languages. He justifies his view by supporting in his earlier work that minority LM requires literacy to be maintained later in life and schools hold the role of literacy-imparting institutions (Fishman, 1980). In the same sense, Fillmore (2003) underscores the influential power of the official educational policies which endorse English monolingualism by requiring from all students 'irrespective of language background and educational status, {to} meet adopted curricular standards as measured by standardized assessment in English' (p.10). She also expresses her concern about the proliferation of such external pressures on all immigrant communities around the world in the current era.

But ethnic language institutional support does not refer only to educational bodies. Both Fishman et al. (1966) and Holmes et al. (1993) stress the importance of the institutional support of the heritage code in the form of newspapers and religious services. Giles et al. (1977) suggest that the degree of an immigrant language use in the various institutions of a

nation, region or community relates to its linguistic survival. In such social contexts group members have the opportunity to use their language and to extend their network of co-speakers. The regular social interaction with community members in the HL counteracts the pervasive influence of the dominant language and allocates the immigrant channel the status of a code with practical and instrumental benefits (Tabouret-Keller, 1968; Clyne, 1985; Myers-Scotton, 2006).

Nevertheless, immigrant communities in which families are transplanted into unfamiliar linguistic territory encounter the challenge of their rapid adaptation to the linguistic demands of the host society. The acquisition of the dominant language becomes an object of desire which is viewed as the prerequisite medium for their social integration and advancement. In this sense, immigrants face a perceived dilemma which refers to either preserving their mother tongue, which is perceived as hindering their social inclusion, or shifting to the dominant language and accelerating their smooth adaptation and social acceptance. Fishman (2001) notes the disproportionate social, economic and political advantages afforded to the speakers of the dominant language. But he considers language maintenance to be a serious moral issue and criticises HL abandonment due to the asymmetrical power between the HL and the dominant language.

Fillmore (2003) agrees that the belief that English is more useful and more socially beneficial than HL, has a great impact on the gradual abandonment of the HL. In the same sense, Kibrik (1991) asserts that the high standard variety is more likely to become the home language in immigrant communities. Dorian (1998) adds to the latter claim by pointing out that when a code appears as a low prestige channel of communication, potential speakers avoid using it so as to avoid association with its unappealing image. Fillmore (2003) extends such a position by arguing that a) the desire not to be different from one's peers¹², and b) the desire to put some distance between oneself and one's immigrant origin due to the negative social connotation

¹² Fillmore's position can be questioned considering the growth of bilingual learners attending lessons in the mainstream schools over the years constituting their number the majority of the learners' population. Nevertheless, the bilingual learners' sense of difference continues to exist due to the phenomenon of 'language ideological disqualification based on monoglot ideologies' promoted, produced and reproduced within the mainstream schools (Blommaert, Creve and Willaert, 2005). Consequently, the mainstream educators fail to recognize the language skills that children may have in other languages or even not-standard varieties of the official code used in the school context. The young bilingual learners are treated as 'disqualified' and are doomed in an ever sense of difference to the ideal of the 'native speaker of the official language' that is promoted by the mainstream educators as a prerequisite for successful academic performance.

attributed to members of the immigrant communities, lead immigrants to 'give up' their languages.

Moreover, Kipp et al. (1995) stress the significant interrelationship between positive immigrant language evaluation by the members of the immigrant group and LM. Additionally, Johnson et al. (1983) consider the psychological construct of the subjective or perceived status of both the group and its language as carrying a mediating role in accounting for the group members' degree of group identification and their language behaviour. Fishman (1967) explains that when a minority language is in a diglossic relationship with a majority language 'the language or variety which is fortunate enough to be associated with the predominant drift of social forces tends to displace the other' (p. 36). In the same sense, Garcia (2009) underlines that it is 'the differences in power, value, and status conferred on each of the two languages that lead the group to maintain or abandon the home language' (p. 80).

Kipp et al. (1995) extend the list of factors that influence LM or LS at the individual level by including the birthplace, age, period of residence in the host country, gender, education status, prior knowledge of English, reason for migration and marriage patterns. Pauwels (2005) adds to the above by underscoring the persistent and consistent use of the heritage language as a prerequisite for successful HL transmission within the family domain. Furthermore, Döpke (1997) identifies the consistency in language choice, the creation of a need for the child to speak the HL and a rich HL linguistic environment provided to the children as the three key factors for achieving bilingualism by the younger generations. Moreover, Shin (2003) identifies the family domain as a vital site of HL learning and development. She argues that the parents' 'lack of knowledge about the facts and myths of bilingualism' (p. 17) appears as a contributing factor to HL shift. The role of family in LM constitutes a significant point of reference for the present study. But how does the existing literature view the role of the family in maintaining the HL across the generations?

3.5. Family: a critical domain

The majority of scholars conducting research identify the home language as the decisive site for HLM or HLS (Alba et al., 2002; Bayley et al., 1996, Kondo, 1998; Cho and Krashen, 2000). The 'intergenerational transmission' of HL is crucial to the vitality of the HL among immigrant communities. Alba et al. (2002) stress the valid contribution of the grandparents to the younger generations' bilingualism. Shin (2003) identifies the parents as the 'most significant source of HL input for immigrant children' (p.17). Similarly, Mehmedbegovic (2011) maintains

that 'in the process of first language maintenance parents are the key link' (p. 159). The home context constitutes a social space promoting bilingualism through immigrant language use. It can function as an 'unexpendable bulwark' in attempts at HL maintenance (Fishman, 1991). The members of the older generations, who are native immigrant language speakers, are those who can keep the language alive through memory and its continuous use with the younger generation (Garcia, 2005). Fishman (1991) advocates that language practice at home is the most critical factor in predicting language maintenance across the generations. Similarly, Pauwels (2005) identifies the family with 'the cornerstone for acquisition and maintenance' of HLs (p. 125). Fellin (2002) refers to the area of child language socialization as 'a crucial site' of HL transmission (p. 46).

Nevertheless, Fishman (2004) underlines the difficulties the immigrant families encounter in resolving the tensions between macro level linguistic demands of the host society and their micro level wishes for HLM. He comments accordingly that 'there is no widely available safe harbour in daily life' against the indisputable power of the majority language (p. 431). Spolsky (2004) argues that social and economic factors are likely to be 'major sources of changes' in the pattern of HL use within the family (p. 215). Canagarajah (2008) agrees with the latter by stating that an immigrant family has to 'negotiate its linguistic responsibilities with other social and economic pressures' (p. 170-171). Her research is based on data collected from Sri Lankan Tamil immigrant families in the USA, UK and Canada. Her findings illustrate that 'the family is porous, open to influences and interests from other broader social forces and institutions' (p.171). Canagarajah notes that the challenges for HLM differentiate accordingly to the various socio-historical conditions. She calls for a realistic acknowledgment of the difficulties that the immigrant families encounter by underlining that 'in the context of material inequality and ideological domination, families face a superhuman struggle for LM' (ibid, p. 172). Her findings make a special case for understanding the role of history in LM since her participants reproduce discourses prevalent in their home country since colonial times. For Canagarajah 'family is shaped by history and power, at times reproducing ideological values and power inequalities' which are associated with the family members' past experiences even before the years of their relocation (ibid, p. 173). The informative power of historical experiences and the ideological values they inscribe on the members of a family are two significant social dimensions that will be explored in my study. But what does the concept of ideologies of language represent?

3.6. Language Ideologies

Language Ideologies (LI) is an area of interest that has not received sufficient attention in considering intergenerational HL maintenance (Lo Bianco, 2003; Gonzalez, 2003; Jeon, 2008). Intergenerational language transmission is 'clearly affected by language ideologies as they interact with specific circumstances and prospects of HL acquisition, maintenance and re-acquisition' (Lo Bianco, 2003, p. 4). Specific language ideologies as 'a nexus of micro and macro social frames' can determine 'approaches and practices that can enhance or downplay the prestige of a given code, determine its roles and functions, and foster or hinder its use, transmission and thus, its vitality' (Fellin, 2002, p. 46).

Social actors map their linguistic behaviour by drawing on their social experiences. Both their primary and secondary socialization processes consist of linguistic encounters in various contexts of the social milieu. Such social interactions provide them with the opportunity to develop further their linguistic skills but also to become familiar with a variety of linguistic forms of their native language. Furthermore, they become aware of the plurality of linguistic forms used around the world and in different socio ethnic contexts. But most importantly, social action and interaction operates as a source of information about two significant dimensions of language: the referential and the social. The first represents the semantic meaning of linguistic expressions, the literal meaning of the words. The second reveals the social connotations attached to a term, or to an expression or even to a whole language. The latter dimension of language is particularly relevant to my study and I am specifically interested in analysing social actors' thoughts, representation and beliefs about their different languages. Such cultural conceptions about languages are rooted, constructed, produced and reproduced in their social experiences and create their language ideologies (LI).

LI is a field of inquiry that has been extremely productive in recent decades but it lacks unity and a single core literature (Woolard, 1998; Kroskrity 2004). The scholars involved propose a wide range of definitions which reveal 'a tension between emphasizing speakers' 'awareness' as a form of agency, and foregrounding their 'embeddedness' in the social and cultural systems in which they are enveloped' (Kroskrity, 2004, p. 496). So, Silverstein (1979) defines linguistic ideologies as 'sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use' (p. 193). His definition puts emphasis on the 'awareness' of a speaker who can reflect on the use of language, rationalize his/her actions and subsequently influence its structure. Irvine (1989) identifies LI with 'the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral

and political interests' (p. 255). Her definition underscores the power of sociocultural context that produces specific understandings about the interrelation between the social life and the linguistic means in use. Heath's (1989) definition also puts greater emphasis on the social facet by maintaining that the LI are 'self evident ideas and objectives a group holds concerning roles of language in social experience of members as they contribute to the expression of the group' (p. 53). Rumsey (1990) gives an even broader definition by claiming that LI are 'shared bodies of common sense notions about the nature of language in the world' (p. 346).

All the above views complement each other and provide different dimensions of the concept of LI. It becomes evident that the latter is a 'cluster concept, consisting of a number of converging dimensions' (Kroskrity, 2004, p. 500). Therefore a discussion on its main aspects can unravel its complexity while revealing its significance for my study. Thus each dimension analysed will be linked with the previous chapter in the linguistic landscape in Cyprus and with studies relevant to the present. The following argumentation echoes Kroskrity's (2004) work on the five layers of the LI which he claims partially overlap but can be distinguished analytically: a) multiplicity of ideologies, b) mediating functions of ideologies, c) awareness of speakers, d) group or individual interest, and e) role of language ideology in identity construction (my sequence).

3.6.1. Multiplicity of ideologies

The multiplicity of LI is implied in the plural form of the term. The meaning of the concept, in the modern literature, has escaped the heavy historical symbolism of the singular form- 'ideology'. The latter term is strongly associated with Marxist thought which identifies 'ideology' with a 'camera obscura' that distorts the reality of social life serving exclusively the interest of the ruling class. The production of LI is also tied to social power but admits to the plurality of cultural interpretations since they are rooted in and responsive to the experiences of their bearers' social position (Woolard and Shieffeling, 1994; Woolard, 1998; Gal and Irvine, 1995; Irvine and Gal, 2000, Kroskrity, 2004). Social life consists of multiple meaningful social divisions with reference to actors' age, profession, political alliances, ethnicity, gender, social class and other aspects. Each social position affords the holder with specific experiences of social action and interaction within the different contexts of the social milieu. Therefore, they are 'never uniformly distributed throughout polities of any scale' (Kroskrity, 2004, p. 502).

Nevertheless, as will be discussed in the following paragraphs, LI are created in the interest of a group or an individual and subsequently their production involves the exercise of power and

control by dominant collectivities. All three notions of ‘misrecognition’, ‘symbolic domination’, and ‘hegemony’, which will be explained shortly, interrelate with the formation, the production and the reproduction of particular LI, indicating the interplay between social powers and human beliefs. They also draw similarities with Marxist thought regarding LI’s role as a distorting lens of social life since they promote the ‘naturalization’ and ‘essentialization’ of particular cultural representations, ignoring the dimension of their historical and social construction. Nevertheless, the Marxist concept fails to capture the wide range of social representations articulated by the LI formed in the interest of and informed by the social experiences of their bearers. Social actors can enact their agency by creating alternative conceptions about languages that can differ from the discourses promoted by the dominant social powers. A potential conflict may arise due to the social diversity found both between social groups but also within them. So, social life and social experience constitute fruitful sites for the formation of multiple LI.

The Cypriot sociolinguistic landscape described in the previous chapter provides insights regarding the multiplicity of LI. Both the SMG and the CD are tied to particular representations that constitute firstly the code that indicates prestigious and powerful social identities, and secondly the channel that inspires familiarity and solidarity. Moreover, the political discourses of ‘Hellenocentrism’ and ‘Cypriocentrism’ produce and promote an additional set of LI relevant to their political aspirations. The former advocates the power of the standard variety sustained by its recognition as an official language and its symbolic importance for an imagined common Greek identity. The latter draws on a similar argument about the symbolic value of the CD as the Cypriots’ shared code but the political discourse endorses the empowerment of a Cypriot identity independent from both motherlands, Greece and Turkey.

The multiplicity of LI extends further when social actors experience migration. The relocation to a new social context entails the introduction to a different language, the familiarization with the associated LI and the gradual entanglement within them. Thus, social actors’ cultural conceptions about languages may suffer modification or even alterations. This appears almost inevitable for the immigrants whose mother tongue differs to the language widely used in the new sociolinguistic context. This is the case for the first generation participants in my study. My aim is to analyse their beliefs about the three codes of their linguistic repertoire. What are their cultural representations, their LI, about these languages? Do the LI promoted in their home country interfere with their perceptions about the two forms of their HL when used in a different social context? What are the younger generation’s views? What are the

commonalities and the differences in the conceptions about the three languages between the three generations and among the three families? But the answers to the above question require a further discussion about the other four dimensions of LI. What is the role of LI in an actor's social life? What are the processes involved in their formation?

3.6.2. Mediating function of ideologies

Woolard and Shieffelin (1994) maintain that LI are 'the mediating link between social structures and forms of talk' (p. 55). Relevant to this is Woolard's (1998) note that LI are 'representations, whether explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world' (p. 3). In the same sense, Kroskrity (2004) says that 'language users' ideologies bridge their sociocultural experience and their linguistic and discursive resources by constituting those linguistic and discursive forms as indexically tied to features of their sociocultural experience' (p. 506). Gal and Irvine (1995, 2000) and Gal (2005) further explore and analyse this role of LI, which they call as 'ideologies of linguistic differentiation'. For Gal and Irvine (1995) LI 'locate, interpret, and rationalize sociolinguistic complexity, identifying linguistic varieties with 'typical' persons and activities and accounting for the differentiation among them' (p. 972). They identify three semiotic processes that may 'recognize' or 'misrecognize' (Bourdieu, 1991) the differences among linguistic practices: iconization, fractal recursivity and erasure. They maintain that these processes concern 'the way people conceive of links between linguistic forms and social phenomena' and that they are 'the means by which the people construct ideological representations of linguistic differences' (p. 37).

The first process binds together the social image and the linguistic image in an essential and 'particularly apt' way (Gal, 2005, p. 26). Accordingly, 'linguistic features that index social groups or activities appear to be iconic representations of them, as if a linguistic feature somehow depicted or displayed a social group's inherent nature or essence' (Irvine and Gal, 2000, p. 37). Relevant to the above is Cypriots' representations about the CD and the SMG. As cited in the previous chapter they associate each one of the above codes with a speaker's particular qualities regarding his/her educational background, his/her social class and his/her personality. The analysis of the data collected for the needs of the present study will reveal to what extent such representations about the two linguistic channels are still valid in a different sociolinguistic context such as London.

The second part of the semiotic processes 'involves the projection of an opposition, salient at one level of relationship onto some other level' (ibid, p. 38). Gal (2005) explains that 'fractal recursions are repetitions of the same contrast but at different scales' and they refer to an opposition, a distinction or a difference that 'can be reproduced repeatedly by projecting it onto narrower and broader comparison' (p. 27). Lytra (2012) explains the operation of fractal recursivity in linguistic differences. The participants in her research are of Turkish descent in the UK and their accounts of language differences reveal various oppositions that extend further from the one regarding Turkish speakers versus English speakers. So, Turkish speakers further separate themselves through linguistic dichotomies that refer to native versus non-native speakers of Turkish and native Turkish speakers versus accented native Turkish speakers. This linguistic differentiation also takes place amongst Cypriots. So the main opposition refers to Turkish Speakers versus Greek Speakers. Nevertheless, the latter consists of two subcategories, SMG speakers versus CD speakers. But even the speakers of the dialect are further dichotomized into urban CD speakers versus rural CD speakers. The significance of such a partitioning process is that it operates as evidence for 'behavioral, aesthetic, affective, and moral contrasts among the social groups indexed' (Irvine and Gal, 2000, p. 37). Each form of linguistic opposition constructs the self against an imagined 'other' who is 'essentialized and imagined as homogeneous' (ibid, 2000, p. 39).

The above process of fractal recursion invites the operation of the last semiotic process, erasure. Erasure/s are 'forms of forgetting, denying, ignoring, or forcibly eliminating those distinctions or social facts that fail to fit the picture of the world presented by an ideology' (Gal, 2005, p. 27). This happens because a linguistic ideology is a 'totalizing vision' and therefore any elements that fail to 'fit its interpretive structure...must either be ignored or be transformed' (Gal and Irvine, 1995, p. 974). Erasure 'renders some persons or activities invisible....a social group or language may be imagined as homogeneous, its internal variation disregarded' (Irvine and Gal, 2000, p. 38). Kroskity (2004) notes accordingly that 'erasure of differentiation is a selective disattention to often unruly forms of variation' (p. 507). The process of erasure became evident in the previous chapter discussing the sociolinguistic situation in Cyprus. Research has shown that the form of SMG used on the island is different to the one used in the homeland, Greece. However, perpetuating political discourses tend to erase such disparities in the name of both the promoted belief of a common descent and the aspiration for future 'enosis' with the motherland.

All three semiotic processes create specific representations about languages and their speakers. They construct particular LI which interpret linguistic differentiation with reference not only to language/s but also to the speakers' perceived qualities. Such cultural conceptions provide the actor with an interpretive framework of linguistic behaviour and its referential meanings. These understandings and interpretations are not created in a social vacuum. They are rooted in social experiences which themselves are entangled within prevalent dominant discourses of long-term social separation and power relations. Thus, echoing Rumsey's (1990) definition, LI may appear as common sense beliefs that 'saturate' an actor's consciousness (Williams, 1980) to the extent that the messages they promote are conceived as inherently and eternally responsive to social reality. But does this mean that social actors are unaware of the LI they themselves draw upon to interpret linguistic behaviour and linguistic differentiation?

3.6.3. Awareness of speakers

Kroskirty (2004) agrees with Silverstein's (1979) emphasis on speakers' awareness but he posits a differentiation by claiming that the group members may display varying degrees of awareness of the LI which they receive, produce and reproduce. Kroskirty, employing Giddens' (1987) terms of discursive consciousness and practical consciousness, interrelates the first with 'active, salient contestation of ideologies' and the second with 'relatively unchallenged, highly naturalized and definitively dominant ideologies' (p. 504). The first refers to LI that members of a group can articulate, moderate, challenge or contest. In the following chapter I explain in detail how the actors can contest particular ideologies and the forms of social action involved in such a process. The second concerns ideologies which can be read from actual usage, and their powerful establishment constitutes them a common sense belief. Thus, Kroskirty is also in conditional agreement with Rumsey's definition but he clearly expresses his opposition to a view that implies the existence of a homogeneous view of LI within a cultural group ignoring their variation among speakers of different social identities. Relevant to this is Woolard and Schieffelin's (1994) note that LI are 'rooted in or responsive to the experience of a particular social position' (p. 58).

The previous chapter has also shed light on Cypriots' awareness of the LI enacted in the island's sociolinguistic arena. So, Cypriots are aware of the different values attributed to each one of the linguistic codes that are used in complementarity in their daily lives. The maintenance of the CD use, despite official policies that almost ignore its appeal to the citizens, reveals an active contestation of dominant language discourses. Cypriots' recognition

of the dialect's moral value reinforces statements of resistance to policy makers' power. Nevertheless, the totalizing effect of the official language, the SMG, which is unquestionably considered the prestigious form, reveals Cypriots' submission to dominant ideologies. But the latter is inextricably linked to the individual interest regarding an actor's social recognition and advancement as a competent user of the language in power. So, how does the interest of a group or an individual relate to the construction of particular LI?

3.6.4. LI in the interest of the group or individual

Both Irvine (1979) and Heath (1979) agree that LI represent perceptions of language as they are constructed in the interest of an individual or a specific social or cultural group. Kroskrity (2004) echoes their views by noting that 'a member's notions of what is 'true', 'morally good', or 'aesthetically pleasing' about language and discourse are ...tied to political-economic interests' (p. 500). Similarly, Irvine and Gal (2000) maintain that LI 'are subject to the interests of their bearers' social position' (p. 35). The historical and sociolinguistic account of Cyprus, presented in the previous chapter, described two perpetuating notions about languages linked with particular political interests. So, each one of the political movements of 'Cypriocentrism' and 'Hellenocentrism' promoted and advocated a different ideology about the use of the Cypriot dialect responsive to each political party's discourse regarding the position of Cyprus with reference both to Greece and the occupied northern part of the island.

3.6.4.1. LI in the interest of nation state opposed to other nation states

The creation of specific LI in the interest of a particular social group is also manifested in nationalist programs of language standardization. The imposition of a hegemonic language tends to erase the linguistic variability between speaking communities within a particular socio-political context, such as a nation state. The Cypriot constitution of 1960 which declared SMG as the official language in Cyprus despite the wide use of the CD among the Cypriots, is representative of this process. But such a political act is inextricably associated with the institution of nation state since its foundation is heavily informed by the perceived equation of one nation-one culture-one language. The institution of nation state promotes the idea that the boundaries of a state should be coterminous with the boundaries of a cultural group (Gellner, 1983). It aspires to the foundation of cultural homogeneous states whose citizens consider themselves culturally distinctive in relation to other nation state collectivities. LI are used so as 'to promote, protect and legitimate' such political interests that aspire to maintain national demarcation (Kroskrity, 2004, p. 500).

This construction is dated to eighteenth-century German Romanticism and French Enlightenment. Scholars of these years conceived of languages as natural objects, independent and unaffected by human will, individual intent or particularities of social life (Taylor, 1999). Therefore, the difference of languages used by people 'could serve as an apparently neutral warrant for political claims to territory and sovereignty' (Gal and Irvine, 1995, p. 968). Colonialism exported these views and initiated the construction of nation states. Thus, the foundation of the nation states and the national languages is legitimized, recognized and justified by the belief that 'distinctly identifiable languages can and should be isolated, named and counted' (Irvine and Gal, 2000, p. 17). Their differences are stressed in a process of constant opposition and construction to maintain eternal boundaries. Thus external linguistic interventions appear suspicious under the perception that they jeopardize linguistic 'authenticity', which is conceptualised as the condition of a code's distinctiveness.

3.6.4.1.1. LI, nation state and the notion of authenticity

Bucholtz (2003) claims that 'the positioning of authenticity' powerfully designates 'some language users but not others as legitimate speakers of a given community' (p. 400). Authenticity reveals a bond to the past and to characteristics which remain immutable to social and cultural changes. It appears as an essentialistic position attributing inherent references to a speaker or a social group. Essentialism rests on two main assumptions: 1) group members look alike and therefore 2) groups can be easily and clearly delimited. Consequently, the 'real' or the 'authentic' member of a group performs specific behaviours by virtue of his/her biological and cultural origin. Essentialism promotes the idea of a shared identity among the members of a group. It empowers the sense of 'we' against the 'other' and designates the prerequisites for the recognition and acceptance of a social actor as a member of a group.

Both essentialism and the concept of authenticity endorse the idea of cultural distinctiveness of each ethnic group. They foster social contrasts through a process of underlining and reproducing classificatory differences between collectivities. But a paradox is evident in such a process. Differences between social actors become simultaneously important and unimportant. When the discussion relates to the relationship between groups, differences become valid proof of their clear boundaries. But when the relationship between group members prevails, their dissimilarities are diminished, downgraded so the idea of a strong solid group body can maintain its power and appeal. This reminds us of Irvine and Gal's (2000) semiotic process of erasure and it is inextricably linked with the nationalistic ideologies

produced and reproduced by the political doctrine of nation-state. Nation state as a powerful agent uses the notions of the essential cultural/linguistic unity and subsequent cultural/linguistic homogeneity as a vehicle to promote profound and strong collective identities (Anderson, 1991; Smith, 1991).

But, when a language is 'ideologized as distinctive and as implicating a distinctive kind of people, it is often further misrecognized...or revalorized, as transparently emblematic of social, political, intellectual and moral character' (Woolard, 1998, p. 18-19). Such a process of 'iconization' constitutes a fundamental tenet of LI (Irvine and Gal, 2000; Woolard 1998). However the identification of a language with a particular group or community and the consequent diagnosis of peoplehood by the criterion of language is 'not a natural fact but rather a historical, ideological construct' (Woolard, 1998, p. 16). Such representations tend to simplify actors' linguistic behaviour 'as if deriving from those persons' essences rather than from historical accident' (Irvine and Gal, 2000, p. 39). But because they are grounded in social experience they are 'saturated by cultural ideologies' (Kroskrity, 2004, p. 507) that promote the belief that a linguistic form is 'a transparent depiction of the distinctive qualities of the group' (Woolard, 1998, p. 19). Accordingly, such 'historical, contingent, or conventional' attributions appear as natural and factual descriptions of social life (Irvine and Gal, 2000, p. 36) while growing globally hegemonic in recent years (Woolard, 1998).

3.6.4.2. LI in the interest of dominant social powers within a nation state

But such naturalized powerful LI that 'drain the conceptual of its contingent historical content, making it seem universal or timeless' are not only constructed in the interest of particular nation states as opposed to other political and social entities (Woolard, 1998, p. 10). They are also created within the boundaries of a state as sites at which social groups promote and legitimize their interests. This reminds us of the process of 'fractal recursivity' proposed by Irvine and Gal (2000) referring 'to the projection of an opposition, salient at some level of relationship, onto some other level' (p. 38). So, intergroup oppositions are projected inwards onto intragroup relations. Subsequently, linguistic differences between social groups who reside in the same socio political borders are emphasized. A new set of LI is constructed and promoted that ties particular linguistic features to social actors' behaviour and morality. Among these, the standard language ideology (Milroy, 2001) or the dominant language ideology (Milroy and Milroy, 1999; Milroy, 2007) hold a prominent position, exercising a strong persuasive power leading to the phenomenon of symbolic domination. In the next chapter, I will discuss this phenomenon in detail with reference to the work of Bourdieu.

3.7. Conclusion

In this chapter, I explained why the term ‘heritage language’ appears ambiguous for my research, due to the complex diglossic situation in Cyprus, the families’ country of origin. My study is located in the field of LM and LS focusing on the role of the family. Therefore, drawing on relevant research, I explored the variety of factors affecting LM and LS among which the family has a prominent position. I also investigated the effect of a key factor, the speaker’s LI about their languages. I explained the meaning of this concept along with the implications of some of its dimensions, as identified by Kroskrity (2004). In the next chapter, I will change my focus to the ways that actors may be able to exercise their agency despite the effects of symbolic domination, with reference to Bourdieu’s theory of capital. Moreover, I will finish the discussion about LI by exploring an additional dimension identified by Kroskrity (2004), regarding the ties they enact between languages and actors’ social identities. Furthermore, I will describe the final part of my theoretical framework exploring the concept of family language policy and the research conducted within this field.

Chapter 4. Linguistic Capital, individual agency and Family Language Policy

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter I will continue the discussion about LI, showing how these may also be created by social actors with regard to their particular interests. I will focus on the phenomenon of symbolic domination and the possibilities of human agency drawing on the theoretical ideas of Bourdieu's and highlighting the ways in which linguistic capital can be converted into other forms of capital. The discussion about the concept of LI will be continued by describing the variety of interpretations that people can make about links between languages and social identities. The Family Language Policy (FLP) framework acknowledges the effect of LI on LM or LS in families of ethnic origin. Therefore, I will explain this framework and how it has been used by other researchers. Finally, I will locate the contribution that my study hopes to make to the field.

4.2. Social structure and symbolic domination

Social actors draw on their cultural conceptions about languages, their LI, to classify them into 'easy' and 'difficult', 'important' and 'unimportant', 'inferior' and 'superior'. Nevertheless views about the 'inequality' of languages do not receive much scientific support. So, on what basis do the speakers tend to evaluate languages by awarding prestige and status to specific linguistic channels of communication over others? Why are standard forms of languages, such as the SMG, given legitimacy and prestige over alternative non standard varieties, such as the CD? Bourdieu (1991) explains such a practice by arguing that speakers who are not users of an official language or a standard variety are subject to *symbolic domination*. For him, the value of a particular language derives from its legitimization by the dominant groups as well as dominant institutions such as schools and media. Consequently, speakers who belong to the lower level of the linguistic stratification, created by the perceived status and power differences between languages, are symbolically dominated and complicit in a *misrecognition* that the dominant language or the standard language of a society is inherently better. But how do the speakers become *symbolically dominated*?

Bourdieu argues that dominant languages have emerged historically as such in conjunction with the formation of modern nation-states. The official language 'is bound up with the state, both in its genesis and in its social use' and 'imposes itself on the whole population as the only legitimate language' (p. 45). The educational system is considered to play the decisive role for the construction, legitimation and imposition of an official language since 'teaching the same

clear fixed language to children...he (the teacher) is already inclining them quite naturally to see and feel things in the same way; and works to build the common consciousness of the nation' (p. 49). So the school, for Bourdieu, establishes the authority and legitimacy of the most highly valued linguistic forms and secures universal recognition of this legitimacy. But it is also the labour market that actively participates in the whole process of 'devaluing dialects and establishing the new hierarchy of linguistic practices' (p. 49). This happens when the educational system controls access to the labour market, affording the bearers of the dominant language with the appropriation of positions with economic advantage, along with symbolic profits associated with the possession of such a perceived prestigious social identity. Accordingly the 'dialectical relation between school system and labour market' creates professional opportunities with great economic advantages only to be pursued and occupied by these who have succeeded in the educational system as competent bearers of the legitimate code and as holding the 'educational qualifications valid nation-wide' (ibid, p. 49).

Symbolic domination, for Bourdieu, is 'a form of complicity which is neither passive submission to external constraint nor a free adherence to values' (p. 51). People submit to its power without consciousness or constraint since 'it is inscribed, in a practical state, in dispositions which are impalpably inculcated, through a long and slow process of acquisition, by the sanctions of the linguistic market...adjusted...to the chances of material and symbolic profit which the laws of price formation...of a given market...offer to the holder of a given linguistic capital' (p. 51). So he argues that the speakers' beliefs and evaluations about languages are informed by a symbolic linguistic power which is not consciously activated but its operation is implicit in a deeper level in a form of dispositions. But such an unconscious submission cannot explain the speakers' persistence in using linguistic varieties that cannot afford the label of an official or a standard language. On what basis do 'symbolically dominated' speakers resist dominant language ideologies by maintaining their local varieties and speech styles?

4.3. Human agency

Although Bourdieu's theory of symbolic domination is a powerful explanatory tool for interpreting people's adherence to dominant discourses and ideologies that evaluate official languages over local dialects, it fails to explain speakers' persistence in using linguistic varieties whose legitimacy and authority are not universally recognized. Bourdieu's views are partially consistent with the Gramscian notion of 'hegemony' (1971) which emphasizes that dominant ideas are particularly powerful and capable of penetrating the perceptions and beliefs of people belonging to all the levels of social stratification. Nevertheless, Gramsci maintains that

state control and dominant groups exerting power over society as a whole, need to achieve consent by polity for their powerful position to be sustained. Similarly, Blackledge (2004) underlines that hegemony is a reference term both for domination but also for integration. In the same sense, Fairclough (1995a) underlines that the concept involves dominant groups exercising their power but also achieving consent by subordinated groups.

But consent by the dominated groups does not mean that their members bend to the will of the dominant public discourse. Woolard (1985) refers to two forms of consent that can either involve an 'accommodative behaviour' or a 'collaborative consciousness'. She focuses on the issue of linguistic hegemony and explains that the fact that a language is spoken by the majority of a population cannot be indicative of assuming its hegemony. Accommodating to practices of coercion as they are perceived to be employed by dominant powerful groups and institutions does not imply the conscious accommodation to the conviction that members of subordinate groups are mere recipients and mere executives of the explicit or implicit messages of dominant public discourse. There are always spaces wherein the authority and legitimacy of an official language is suspended and the 'covert prestige' (Labov, 1972a, 1972b) of a HL creates an *alternative counterhegemony*.

The alternative power that the use of a dialect or a HL carries seeks freedom to be developed according to speakers' will or potential learners' aspirations. Its hegemony is enacted and exercised among group members in specific contexts wherein the local, the subordinate and dominated celebrates the actualization of the human agency over the structural determination. Consequently the hegemony of the official language cannot be stable or monolithic (Blackledge, 2004). Rather it is characterized by ambiguity and contradiction, and it is constantly shifting (Blommaert, 1999; Gal, 1998; Williams, 1980). Language beliefs and ideologies do not merely follow or exclusively stem from the 'official culture' (Kroskrity, 2004). Even in multilingual societies where one language holds the power of the official language and dominated groups strive for adaptation and integration, beliefs about language/s can contradict or challenge the official and dominant public discourse and culture that promotes an 'ideology of standard language' (Milroy, 2007). The same applies to societies where the dominant culture of the ruling class promotes a specific standard form of language as superior to these used by either local dialect speakers or accented speakers. But what kind of interest of ethnic groups can create such alternative counterhegemonic spaces while producing relevant alternative LI challenging dominant language ideology? Bourdieu's theory of capital can provide an insightful view of LI construction in the interest of a group or an individual.

Particular LI can be created with reference to the language/s convertibility to other forms of capital. This can appear as a condition for its/their transferability and maintenance. But what does Bourdieu's theory entail and why is it significant for the present study?

4.3.1. Bourdieu's theory of capital

Bourdieu (1986) defines capital as 'accumulated labor' which enables the holder to appropriate valued resources so as to enact specific practices. It operates as a resource of power, 'as a potential capacity to produce profits' (p. 241). For him, the term profit is not used in the strict sense of economic theory. He maintains that the exchange of particular forms of capital can afford the bearer with material, economic profits. But he also refers to cultural, social and symbolic profits. Bourdieu claims that there is an unequal distribution of each form of capital relevant to the social actors' position in the social stratification. According to his theory, cultural capital takes the form of educational qualifications. But his understanding of 'education' is not limited to a form of knowledge acquired only through institutionalized study. He emphasizes the role of the home context in 'educating' social beings when the older generations coach the younger ones. He ascribes great value to the process of the 'domestic transmission of cultural capital' which socializes young apprentices into and through particular behaviours (p. 243). He explains cultural capital 'cannot be transmitted instantaneously.....the work of acquisition is...an effort that presupposes a personal cost, an investment, above all of time' (p. 244). He also maintains that cultural capital 'can be acquired, to a varying extent, depending on the period, the society, and the social class' (p. 244). Thus, for Bourdieu, cultural capital entails specific skills which the social agent can acquire both through interaction with family members but also through interrelationship with other social actors within specific social contexts among which the educational institutions have a permanent position but not an exclusive role.

Bourdieu believes that cultural capital can function as a 'recognized legitimate competence', a symbolic capital in a 'disguised form' which can appear 'as authority exerting an effect of (mis)recognition' (p. 244). So, the symbolic form of capital affords the bearer with a status, a powerful impact of an immaterial power recognized as such within the specific social conditions where the bearer acts. It attributes to him/her significance and magnitude over other social actors whose position in the social classification limits or even prohibits their access to resources and skills which are highly validated by the wider society. But when such resources take the form of a network of relationships of 'mutual acquaintance and recognition-or in other words, to membership of a group' then the social actor indulges in the

possession of a social capital and its subsequent profits referring to both 'material profits, such as all the types of services accruing from useful relationships, and symbolic profits, such as those derived from association with a rare prestigious group' (p. 247). Bourdieu underlines the convertibility of the different forms of capital. He claims that cultural capital in the form of academic capital can convert into economic capital through the process of exchanging the former for a position in the labour market which can provide the holder with significant material profits. But, for him, the economic capital can also convert into cultural capital when social actors who possess economic resources achieve access to forms of knowledge and education with high financial price. Nevertheless all three types, economic, cultural and social capital, imply for the bearer the nomination of a symbolic capital and its derived profits regarding his/her recognition or misrecognition as a social being of status derived and inspired by the nature and quantity of different forms of capital.

4.3.2. Bourdieu's theory of capital as an analytic framework for the present study

The present research draws nuances from Bourdieu's theory of capital. Nevertheless, it is employed with reference to the construction of particular LI in the interest of a specific group or individual. The convertibility of a language to other forms of capital can bear an effect in the creation of particular cultural conceptions about language/s. The grade of such an effect can be closely associated with a group's or an individual's interest in material, social or symbolic profits achieved through the use or/and the maintenance of a linguistic code. It can also be relevant to future expectations regarding such profits. Thus, the convertibility of a particular linguistic capital to other forms of capital can interfere with its transferability to the younger generations. But what is the meaning of the term linguistic capital for my study?

I use the term linguistic capital to represent the participants 'accumulated' capacity with regard to their linguistic repertoire. Such a linguistic capital is both acquired through the informants' primary socialization and through their interaction with other social actors in their secondary socialization. Additionally, the participants' individual investment in effort and time contributes to its acquisition and its further enrichment and development. This linguistic capital is not static or monolithic. It appears as a process, a dynamic form of social expression according to which each linguistic code experiences fluctuations of use throughout the years. The set of the linguistic resources available to the participants in this study can provide the speaker with access both to membership of a particular group and to desired economic resources. It can also afford them with the relevant sentimental fulfilment of a sense of belonging to the group or the acquisition of material benefits and profits. The analysis will

reveal how each member in each family views the potential of each linguistic code to convert into other forms of capital defined by his/her own anticipated present and future profits.

I agree with Bourdieu's views regarding the intentionality of social practice with reference to the anticipation of specific profits. I understand the social actor as a person whose aspirations and expected future benefits inform his/her current choices for social action. Nevertheless, I also acknowledge the conditionality of his free will. Social beings operate within specific limits and under particular pressures which, as Williams argues (1980), are exercised from both 'an external force or the internal laws¹³ of a particular development' (p. 32). Accordingly, social action is performed within specific boundaries that can be both socially imposed and set by an individual's personal understanding of the social world and his/her role within it. So, the social actor operates within the conditions and the rules of various social settings but he/she also exercises his/her agency by inventing ways to express specific social behaviours and practices guided by his/her future aspirations regarding his/her access to particular resources and their subsequent profits. Such profits can be economic, social or symbolic.

4.3.2.1. Linguistic capital convertible to economic capital-economic profits

A linguistic capital can convert to an economic capital in the sense of providing the speaker with economic benefits. Such economic profits refer to the possession of material resources. Accordingly the use of a linguistic channel can afford the bearer with financial assets deriving from a successful career in the labour market¹⁴. My study aims at exploring whether the

¹³ The term internal laws, refers to an individual's cultural representations of social action limits. Such representations are responsive to his/her social experiences. This is relative to the creation of specific LI since such cultural conceptions can interfere with the value ascribed to a linguistic code and the social identities it indexes. Accordingly, social encounters that challenge and reject the legitimation of a communication channel can be conceived as indicative of the social limits set against its use. Thus, the social actor maps his behavior drawing from his/her LI that are created or even moderated by such social incidents. Such an explanation bears similarities with Bourdieu's theory of habitus in the sense of dispositions that are perfectly attuned to the demands of the various social contexts of social interactions (markets). Accordingly, he maintains that 'the law of the market does not need to be imposed by means of constraint or external censorship since it is accomplished through the relation to the market which is its incorporated form' (1991, p. 84).

¹⁴ This does not exclude the possibility that an economic capital can convert into a linguistic capital. So, an actor's financial prosperity provides the means of investing on learning a linguistic code that is only available only through private education. Moreover, his/her financial status interferes with his/her willingness to obtain supportive educational material for the enrichment and the development of his/her linguistic capital. The social actor's LI can be relevant to his/her financial investment on learning a language or even on improving his/her already acquired linguistic capital. Accordingly, LI can be created with reference to a language's convertibility to other forms of capital. When such cultural conceptions attribute a high value to a code, the social actor may decide to exchange his economic capital for a desired linguistic capital. Thus, LI can guide particular social activities (Fine and Sandstrom, 1993).

participants' LI inter-relate with the convertibility of their linguistic capital to an economic capital. Moreover, it intends to detect possible dissimilarities between the economic profits that the use of each one of the three codes affords the bearer. A historical approach to their family languages will examine such processes over the years and their possible alteration in response to different social circumstances. Additionally, the analysis of the collected data purports to uncover (if any) the impact that such a potential exchange may have on their LI, on their linguistic choices and on their future aspirations regarding their children's linguistic identities.

4.3.2.2. Linguistic capital convertible to social capital-social benefits

A linguistic capital can convert into a social capital affording the speaker specific social benefits such as the acquisition and development of a network of social contacts. The holder of a particular linguistic capital can use it as a medium for approaching and accessing individuals and groups who both value and use such a capital. Such an interest can be led by both instrumental goals and/or a deep sentimental need¹⁵. The first refers to the case of speakers who employ a linguistic channel only in order to establish communication with a community of speakers without any further identification with their place of origin and its perceived cultural performances. The second involves the fulfilment of a need to declare membership to a group, which the speaker perceives as significant for his/her own process of ethnic identification. The use of a particular linguistic capital can meet either or both the above objectives depending on the holder's aspirations. Accordingly, immigrants may employ the language of the host country so as to ensure their social adaptation without identifying themselves with the wider dominant group. Moreover, they may retain the use of their home language so as to both establish communication with group or family members and maintain their sense of belonging to their linguistic group.

¹⁵ Bourdieu (1991) also refers to the sentimental attachment to mother tongue. He notes accordingly that 'learning in language occurs through familiarization with persons playing very broad roles, of which the linguistic dimension is but one dimension and never isolated as such...(it) produces the emotional attachment to the 'mother tongue', whose expressions, turns of phrases and words seem to imply a 'surplus of meaning' (note 21, p. 263). He identifies the family with a 'primary market' wherein mother tongue holds a high value. However, he underlines that such a code may be devalued in other social contexts. For him, the only form of mother tongue indulging social acceptance and high evaluation in the plurality of the sites of social action (markets or fields) is the one used by the members belonging to the upper level of social stratification. Therefore, actors' led by the laws of markets incorporated in their habitus or their internal laws are 'even more inclined to invest in the acquisition of legitimate competences' at the expense of their mother tongue use (ibid, p. 83).

But, social capital can also convert into linguistic capital. An extended network of group members can support the learning and subsequently the maintenance of an immigrant code¹⁶. Moreover, in the micro context of an immigrant family, the social capital, translated into the presence of HL speakers, can sustain the preservation of the immigrant language and its transition to the members of the younger generations. However, as Coleman (1988) maintains, it is family members' involvement in intellectual matters with the children that provides for the latter's educational growth. For her, the institution of the family can be separated into three main components: the financial capital, the human capital and the social capital. The first refers to the family's wealth which is relevant to the availability of physical resources that can aid achievement. The human capital refers to the parent's or/and other caretakers' educational background and 'provides the potential for a cognitive environment for the child that aids learning' (ibid, p. 109). The third component, the social capital, concerns the relations between the children and the members of their immediate and their extended family. Coleman (1988) argues that the caretakers' human capital can be profitable for the children only in cases where time and effort is invested in their mental development. Parents' and grandparents' human capital can be 'irrelevant to outcomes for children (if it) is employed exclusively at work or elsewhere outside the home' (ibid, p. 110). Drawing on Coleman's theory, and employing it in the context of the immigrant family, the convertibility of the social capital to linguistic capital is relevant not only to the family member's HL competence (human capital) but also to the use of this code throughout their linguistic interactions.

The present study seeks to explore in depth the participants' views about the convertibility of their linguistic capital to social capital. But their linguistic capital consists of three different codes. Does each code's convertibility give the bearer different social benefits? How do these differences (if any) affect their LI, their linguistic identity and their efforts to transfer a channel of communication to the younger generations? How does the older generation's human capital relate to the younger generations' HL competence? What are the commonalities and the differences between the three families and among the three generations in each family?

¹⁶ Outside the immigrant context, the convertibility of the social capital into a linguistic capital can appear in two forms. Firstly, the wide network of co-speakers can provide for the actor's linguistic capital acquirement but also for its further development and enrichment. Secondly, an actor's socialization with bilingual speakers can operate as a motivational force for his/her decision to invest time and effort to learn additional languages. But such a decision can also interfere with his emotional attachment to such social contacts (beloved persons) or/and the convertibility of this code to other forms of capital (economic, symbolic). Thus, his/her cultural conceptions, his/her LI, can influence his/her decisions and subsequently his/her social actions.

4.3.2.3. Linguistic capital convertible to symbolic capital-status/solidarity

The two forms of capital discussed above are easily detected. A social actor's material possessions disclose his economic capital. His/her range of social networks reveal his/her social capital and his/her linguistic behaviour is indicative of his/her linguistic capital. However, echoing Bourdieu, the symbolic capital is a disguised form of benefit stemming from the procedure of capital exchange. Nevertheless, the symbolic value, which the speaker attributes to specific social actions may not be a tangible entity but its impact can operate in a powerful and invisible way. I agree with Bourdieu that a social actor can indulge in the prestige or the status endowed to him/her owing to his/her acquired forms of capital. Accordingly, the speaker of a prestigious linguistic code can hold a position of social recognition when exchanging his linguistic capital for a symbolic capital. As previously said, the value of a language derives from its legitimization by the dominant groups and the dominant institutions among which the official education and the media hold a permanent position. Social actors become recipients of the dominant language ideology (Milroy, 2007) and comply in a *misrecognition* that this code is inherently better than any other linguistic option.

Nevertheless, such a form of linguistic hegemony is challenged by the members of the immigrant groups who maintain the use of their immigrant code along with the use of the dominant language in the host society. Woolard (1985) interprets the latter phenomenon by discussing the contrastive status/solidarity concepts. She considers them as 'two competing dimensions of language' which amount 'not simply to a theory of social use of language, but to a guiding theory of social relations' (p. 739). Woolard claims that 'the distinction between status and solidarity reveals a significant fissure in the monolith of linguistic hegemony' (p. 744). For her, solidarity is associated with the transcendence of the affective standards over the instrumental ones. It appears as a form of resistance to the authority and legitimization of the dominant language. It exercises its power against the 'saturation of the consciousnesses' which the hegemonic discourses manage to achieve due to being articulated by powerfully influential institutions (Williams, 1980). Thus, dominated groups perform an 'accommodative behaviour' by using the dominant language (Woolard, 1985). However, they refrain from a 'collaborative consciousness' regarding its absolute and unconditional authority (ibid). Thus, they retain their immigrant code which affords them with symbolic profits, a symbolic capital which they consider as a significant dimension of their sense of belonging to a group.

The immigrant group members' cultural conceptions about both their HL/s and the dominant language are relevant to the symbolic value ascribed to each one of them. Both the dominant

and the immigrant codes can convert into a symbolic capital. But there is an essential difference between the symbolism that each language carries. The dominant LI put emphasis on the status afforded to the dominant language speaker. The immigrant LI underscore the role of the immigrant code as a symbol of unity and solidarity among the immigrant group members. The latter is heavily informed by the influential nationalistic dogma maintaining the equitation of one ethnicity =one language. Thus, immigrant group members become recipients of multiple LI which use both the dominant code and the HL as sites to promote the interests of the dominant and the immigrant group respectively. But each individual negotiates the meanings transmitted by such discourses in his/her own interest. He/she draws on particular social experiences to create his/her own LI which can be informed by the convertibility of each code to other forms of capital. The social actor is not a mere recipient of the discourses advocated by the social groups to which he/she declares or wishes to declare membership. He/she exercises his/her agency either by reproducing prevalent LI or contesting them by creating alternative representations about language/s. Such alternative cultural conceptions about HL may involve the sense of belonging to an immigrant group without speaking the immigrant language.

My study aims to explore the convertibility of the participants' linguistic capital to symbolic capital. What form of symbolic benefit does each code afford the bearer? How does each code's perceived symbolic value affect the participants' language ideologies, linguistic identities and their efforts to transfer it to the members of the younger generations? What are the similarities and the differences between the views expressed by the participants? The in depth analysis of the collected data aspires to provide answers to the above questions.

This research study aims at extending further Bourdieu's theory of capital with reference to the construction of particular LI in the interest of a specific group or individual. So, the perceived convertibility of a linguistic capital to economic, social or/and symbolic profits can interrelate with group or individual cultural conceptions about a language. Such perceptions about a linguistic channel can reinforce its hegemonic power or/and initiate the creation of counterhegemonic spaces where its use proliferates. So, with reference to the immigrant groups, a heritage language can gradually be abandoned if the speakers perceive that the only code that can be converted to social, economic or/and symbolic profits is the dominant channel. But, if group members consider their heritage language a linguistic capital that can provide them with social, economic or and/symbolic rewards, then the phenomenon of counterhegemony can appear. The latter provides for successful HLM over the years.

But for the discussion about LI to be completed, its fifth dimension should be explained and analysed. As previously said of LI 'they are not about language alone...rather they envision and enact ties of language to identity' (Woolard, 1998, p. 3). So, how do LI manage to envision and enact ties of particular languages with specific identities?

4.4. Role of LI in ethnic identity construction

Kroskrity (2004) maintains that LI are 'productively used in the creation and the representation of various social and cultural identities' (p. 508). LI use language in the production of specific discourses within which social actors construct and negotiate their identities. Moreover LI and speakers' identities 'guide the ways in which individuals use linguistic resources to index their identities' (Bavlenko and Blackledge, 2004, p. 14). In section 3.6.4., I described the LI that have been used by the powerful political institutions of the nation state since the early years of its foundations. In this way national language iconically embodies a group's distinctive cultural identity (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004). Thus nation states 'intervene in the idealized union of language and identity' by creating specific territorial identities (Tabouret-Keller, 1997, p. 319).

But the iconic linking between language and identity is not only used for drawing frontiers between states of political autonomy. It is also employed for marking boundaries within a polity. In section 3.6.4.2., I illustrated how the dominant language ideology enacts discourses of difference relevant to the speakers' form of linguistic expression. So, standard variety speakers have the power to access resources and benefits and can therefore claim powerful social identities. On the contrary, speakers of other varieties lack the opportunity and the linguistic means to gain positions of perceived status and social recognition. In the Cypriot context, each of the spoken varieties is culturally associated with particular social identities regarding the speaker's educational background, social class and political affiliations.

But of particular interest for the present study are the discourses produced by LI with reference to the link between language and identity for the immigrant communities. Accordingly, both the phenomena of LM and LS are explored by employing a theoretical framework informed by the link between the HL with the ethnic identity. Scholars attribute the first to the intrinsic interconnectedness of immigrant language and ethnic identity, while they interpret the second by advocating the detachability between them. Immigrant groups can consider their language as a vital 'core value', a core element that keeps the group together (Smolicz, 1999). Giles et al. (1977) propose that group members can identify more closely with

people who share their language than with those who share other important aspects of their cultural background, such as religion.

Giles and Johnson (1981, 1987) agree by arguing that common language prevails over other criteria for group membership. So for group members 'the value of their first language transcends any instrumental consideration, and represents a striving for self-fulfilment that makes the language a symbol of survival and, hence of autotelic significance' (Smolicz, 1999, p. 29). Therefore the immigrant language is preserved despite its lack of practicality in a dominant society. It appears as a stamp of proof for the immigrant group existence. It operates as a mark of 'authenticity' as advocated by LI that promote the idea of a mono-dimensional link between heritage language and sense of belonging to the group. But are the LI informed by the discourses associated with nation building the only ones relevant to the phenomenon of LM?

Tannenbaum (2005) observes that 'whatever the pattern of language maintenance, decisions in this regard usually rest on a strong emotional basis...language emerges as much more than a technical communication device. It functions as a symbol of individual's intimate relationships' (p. 248). Accordingly, HL does not represent only a national or group identity. It embodies close bonds with significant others, past experiences and involvement in various aspects of social life. It is inextricably associated with relational and sentimental ties that bestow on it a symbolic value. Such an emotional bond makes the HL a meaningful symbolic capital that gives the speaker the ability to maintain ties with desired social contacts.

Language can empower the sense of identification with a distinctive national background. But it acts in a complementary way along with other dimensions of social life that are relevant to the national community. Edstrom's (2010) second generation participant, coming from a mixed marriage of a Spanish and an Italian, reports stronger identification with her Spanish background as an outcome of both linguistic and non-linguistic factors. As the writer states 'age, interest as well as the geographical locations in which she spent the majority of her time shaped her impression of both countries and, together with her ability to communicate with family in both places, influenced her cultural identity' (p. 90). The participant expresses her cultural pride in her roots and her origin but such a feeling is not the outcome of her competency in the HL. Rather it stems 'more from a sentiment and respect for her parents than from any concrete knowledge of history, cultural practices, or experiences with daily life in Spain and Italy' (ibid, p. 91).

In the same sense, Edwards (1995) argues that HL is an important but not the only marker of an group identity. Therefore, its loss does not entail loss of identity. It will have an effect only on the immigrants' pattern of language use and not on the immigrant identity itself. Similarly, Eastman's (1984) comments that 'there is no need to worry about preserving ethnic identity, so long as the only change being made is in what language we use' (p. 275). Revealing the role of LI in creating an almost ineluctable connection between language and identity, Woolard (1998) states that 'simply using language in particular ways is not what forms groups, identities, or relations....rather, ideological interpretations of such uses of language mediate these effects' (p. 18).

Nevertheless, Fishman (1997) notes that a scientific view that advocates the detachability between language and identity fails to capture the degree to which an immigrant language is experienced as vital by those who speak it. In the same sense, May (2003) maintains that 'to say that language is not an inevitable feature of identity is not the same as saying it is unimportant' (p. 105). Some immigrant language speakers can hold passionate belief about the significance of their immigrant language use to their sense of ethnic identity. As Blackledge and Creese (2008) underline 'whilst it is certainly an oversimplification to treat certain languages as "symbols" or "carriers" of "identity", we are obliged to take account of what people believe about their languages' (p. 535-536). The analysis of my collected data will shed light on the participants' beliefs about the interconnection/ or not between HL use and sense of ethnic identity.

4.5. Discussion

Language ideologies are formed and articulated within specific political, historical, social and cultural conditions. They 'construe the intersection of language and human beings in the world' (Woolard, 1998, p. 3). They can be multiple but also 'partial, interest-laden, contestable and contested' (Hill and Manheim, 1992, p. 382). They reflect the political interests of the policy makers and they are tied to social powers. But they also represent perceptions produced in the interest of an individual. They 'underpin not only the linguistic form and use but also the very notion of the person and the social group as well as such fundamental institutions as ...child socialization...the nation state, schooling...' (Woolard, 1998, p. 3). They are created with reference to the interconnection between languages and economic, social and symbolic profits. But is there a theoretical framework that explores the role of LI in the family's linguistic choices with reference to the phenomena of LM and LS? In the next section I

will discuss family language policy (FLP), a new field of inquiry that views LI as a decisive dimension in a family's linguistic choices and behaviour.

4.6. Family Language Policy (FLP)

The language issues which concern the immigrant family, its linguistic dilemmas and decisions, can be explored within the framework of Family Language Policy (FLP). The FLP is a developing area of Language Policy (LP) studies and it particularly emphasizes the need to interrelate a 'top-down' and 'bottom-up' approach. Language policy scholars have tended to focus on public and institutional contexts such as the school and less on the intimate sphere of the home and the family. But FLP studies explore 'the individual family's perception of social structures and social changes' (Curdt-Christiansen, 2009, p. 352). The family domain is recognised for its critical role in the preservation of the immigrant languages (Fishman, 1991; Pauwels, 2005). It appears as the 'most common and inescapable basis of mother tongue transmission, bonding, use and stabilization' (Fishman, 1991, p. 94). This significant domain is also the focus of my study.

FLP, like language policies, includes aspects of ideology, practice and management. It refers to a 'deliberate attempt at practicing a particular language use pattern and particular literacy practices within home domains and among family members' (Curdt-Christiansen, 2009, p. 352). It is inextricably related to the family's cultural perceptions about languages since it offers a 'window into parental language ideologies' which reflect broader socially articulated beliefs and evaluations about language/s (King et al., 2008, p. 907). In the following paragraphs I illustrate the factors which may inform the policies employed by immigrant families as they are identified in the literature. My aim is to define the contribution of my study within the field. Moreover I intend to explain my approach to the FLP framework which I consider a complementary tool in the analysis of my participants' self reported language use and their efforts to maintain their HL.

4.6.1. Forms of FLP

The FLP may take the form of 'overt' (Schiffman, 1996) and 'explicit' decisions about which language will be used within the home domain during daily interactions. As such, the parents and the possible caretakers who linguistically interact with the younger generations explicitly justify the initiation of a particular 'habitual pattern of selecting among varieties' which composes their linguistic repertoire (Spolsky, 2004, p. 5). FLP can also be 'invisible' (Pakir, 2003) when it concerns non-governmental and spontaneous planning which can be contrary to

the visible official policies espoused by the state or other organized agencies using legal and regulatory means (Seidlhofer, 2003; Caldas, 2012). Furthermore a language policy enacted by the members of a family can be 'default' in the sense that it 'has essentially been determined by history and circumstances beyond the family's control' (Caldas, 2012). But whilst the latter may be less problematic for monolingual speakers who act and interact within monolingual societies, immigrant experience necessitates conscious action for the HL to maintain its usability in their linguistic lives. Nevertheless, 'the sociolinguistic reality is that FLPs lie along a continuum ranging from the highly planned and orchestrated, to the invisible, laissez-faire practices of most families' (Caldas, 2012, p. 352).

4.6.2. FLP: components

Spolsky (2004) maintains that the FLP may be analysed with reference to language beliefs, language practices and language management. Language beliefs refer to the LI held by the family members. Language practices emphasize the actual language use in different contexts. Language management concerns the specific actions taken to influence language practices. All three components are strongly interrelated since LI regarding the value of preserving the HL inform both the speakers' linguistic behaviour and their intervention strategies to ensure its maintenance and its transmission to the younger generations. Parental beliefs about languages motivate their practices which determine the child's linguistic development in one or more family languages (De Houwer, 1999). LI play a critical role in both the FLP and the child's language acquisition process (King, 2000, King et al. 2008). Shohamy (2006) perceives the FLP as 'a manipulative tool in the continuous battle between ideologies' (p. 450). In the previous section I gave a detailed account about the role of LI in social life, their effect on social actors' cultural interpretations about language/s and the powers involved in their creation. In the following paragraphs I will draw on the existing literature on FLP to identify factors that inform language policies implemented by immigrant families.

4.6.3. FLP: additional driving factors

Caldas (2012) presents four different family language policies of immigrant families that reside in New Zealand, Israel, Louisiana and Quebec and agrees with Curdt-Christiansen (2009) regarding the impact of macro factors on the FLP. He states accordingly that 'FLP is not developed or practiced in a vacuum...rather {it is} crafted in response to social, political, cultural educational and economic pressures'. (p. 373). Canagarajah (2008) emphasizes the role of history in shaping a particular FLP. Her participants reveal their colonially-influenced

linguistic experiences which have 'significant effects on contemporary acts of language choice in Tamil community' (p. 172). King and Fogle (2006) investigate the FLP of 24 families who are attempting to achieve additive bilingualism for their children and underline the effect of the parents' past language experiences over their employed policies. Schüpbach (2009) reports similar results when analysing the life story interviews of 14 immigrants to Australia from German speaking Switzerland.

Schwartz (2010) underlines the relationship of the family structure to the form of its language policy. Gregory et al. (2004) emphasize the critical role of the siblings in setting the FLP. Obied (2009) argues that 'older siblings may act as mediators of both languages in the home and support the younger sibling's emerging literacy' from her study on four Portuguese- English children and their siblings in Portugal. Additionally, Kenner et al. (2007) report the conscious effort of grandparents to maintain their grandchildren's ethnic linguistic identity, thus extending the range of 'significant others' who affect FLP. Kamo (1998) refers to the important 'ethnic' socialization that the grandparents enact when they are actively involved in the day to day family life. Ishizawa (2004) maintains that 'through ethnic socialization by grandparents, children may learn a minority language, a religion, a history of an ethnic group, or values that differ from that of the dominant culture' (p. 469). Ruby (2012) also shows how first generation Bangladeshi grandparents in the UK have undertaken the role of transmitting elements from their own linguistic and cultural identity to their grandchildren. Thus they have an impact on the overall FLP implemented by the three families in her ethnographic research study. So, both siblings and grandparents affect the principles and the form of the FLP employed by the immigrant families, moderating the linguistic environment of the children in favour of the HL.

Stavans (2012) also underscores the different impact of external forces on the FLP of families who belong to different socioeconomic groups. He argues that immigrant families with availability of educational, professional, vocational and economic resources have the opportunity to establish fruitful and effective policies by providing their children with language tutors, regular travelling to family members and relatives who reside in the home country and with media resources that connect the home domain with expressions of the ethnic culture. On the contrary immigrant families of low SES are mainly concerned with managing their social standing and economic advancement. Therefore orchestrated and conscious actions for maintaining the HL have a secondary and subordinate role. King and Fogle (2006) also report a high level of education relative to the total population among Americans who promote and support HL transmission and bilingualism. Nevertheless other scholars maintain that their

results contradict this argument since they found that the advanced educational level of their informants was negatively correlated with the maintenance of the heritage code (Doucet, 1991; Gardner-Chloros et al., 2005).

4.6.4. FLP: a dynamic form of language management

But FLP and the ideologies informing it are not static. Kopeliovich (2010) conducted an in-depth ethnographic study with a Russian Jewish family in Israel. Her participants reported the reconsideration of their linguistic ideology and its serious transformation under various competing demands. Caldas (2006) who implemented with his wife the one parent one language strategy to raise his older child accepted the alteration of his family language policy after some years. He maintains that the children's introduction to the EMS (English Mainstream School) and the influence of their peer group interfere with a family's bilingual strategy. Stavans (2012) identifies the members of the younger generations as the 'agents of change in family dynamics...the incipience of change and alteration in family relations, decisions and behaviour' (p. 14). Jeon's (2008) Korean American participants in USA report ideological shifts affecting their language practices due to the changes of their family life circumstances over the years. Her results indicate that 'Korean parents with young children hold assimilationist ideologies and speak to their children in English only {but} they shift to a more pluralist position and support their children's desire to learn Korean once the children are in college' (p. 66). Canagarajah (2008) reveals the changeability of FLP across three generations of Sri Lankan Tamils in North America, showing that communities prioritise cultural values over the maintenance of the immigrant code. She maintains that 'family is not a self-contained institution...{it is} porous, open to influences...{which} redefine {their} core values and social objectives' (p.170, 171, 173). Tannenbaum (2012) also states that 'behaviours can change, preferences be modified and ideological stances transformed...in response to changes in external and internal reality' (p. 64).

FLPs present great variety between families who reside in different countries and regions since the pressures they encounter are divergent (Caldas, 2012). Stavans (2012) agrees with the latter by stating that 'FLP is not only dynamic within the family but it is radically varied across families, cultures and social groups' (p. 14). Canagarajah (2008) argues that 'family is not a unitary construct within each community...{it} is riven with community internal conflicts and differences...families face diverse challenges that makes their attitudes and motivations different' (p. 171). The Tamil families she investigates perform different FLP shaped by their unique caste, class, and region to which they belong. She also emphasizes that since family is a

socially constructed unit, differences concern not only families within a community but also across communities who reside in different regions and social contexts. This confirms the dynamic features of a family and its unique FLP which are 'situated in space and time, open to socio-political processes influences and interests from other broader social forces and institutions' (ibid, p. 172-173).

4.7. Language beliefs and language practices: a disparity

Despite the fact that language ideologies and language beliefs constitute an underlying force in the formation and activation of a FLP, they are not always translated into practices (Gibbons and Ramirez, 2004). Schwartz (2008) conducted a large scale study examining the family policy factors affecting first language maintenance among second generation Russian-Jewish immigrants in Israel. She reports 'a clear discrepancy between parents' declared commitment to L1 maintenance and their reports on actual language practice with their children' (p. 415). Spolsky (2004) underlines the complex relationship between parental language attitudes and their application in everyday language management activities. Canagarajah (2008) emphasises that the family members 'acknowledge the importance of the family for transmitting the mother tongue, and yet fail to act according to their beliefs' since material inequality and ideological domination make their struggle for language maintenance 'superhuman' (p. 172-173). Schechter and Bayley (1997) also argue that a positive attitude towards the HL does not always translate to actual and systematic effort in using it. Fellin (2002) observing the interaction between the children and their caretakers in an Italian Alpine community reports that 'those who advocated the use of Italian as the language of child rearing, explicitly theorizing its advantages, did not practice what they preached' (p. 48)

4.8. Conclusion: Locating my study within the field

In this chapter I highlighted the ways that people can exercise their agency under the condition of symbolic domination by creating counterhegemonic spaces. Drawing on Bourdieu's theory of capital, I explained the possibilities of actors' contestation of LI with reference to the convertibility of their linguistic capital to other forms of capital. I finished the discussion about the LI by explaining their role in the construction of particular identities. I explained the theoretical framework of family language policy and I reviewed the research conducted within this field. I will be taking these ideas forward in the analysis of my data.

With regard to my own contribution, my study adds to the knowledge offered by the finding of other studies conducted in the field of LM and LS by exploring three families belonging in an

under researched group, the Greek Cypriots who live in London. Papapavlou and Pavlou (2001) and Gardner-Chloros et al. (2005) have also explored linguistic and sociolinguistic issues concerning the Greek Cypriot community in London but their findings stem from large scale quantitative studies.

The existing body of research on LM and LS includes a wide range of studies that use quantitative means (mainly questionnaires) for their data collection. My research employs a case study methodological perspective with the aim of providing an indepth analysis of the participants' accounts appreciating the uniqueness of each three-generation family case. So, my research adds to the few family case studies that exist in the field of LM and LS. Despite the similar theoretical perspective my study is different to other case studies exploring these phenomena. So, Guardado's (2002) case study explores the loss and maintenance of Spanish in Hispanic families in Vancouver but her family cases include only two generations, the parents and the children. These are also the generations that Kopeliovich's (2010) investigates in her small-scale qualitative study of a Hebrew-Russian bilingual family with eight children, comparing the parents' perspective on the FLP with their children's evaluation of it. The parents and the children are also the participants in Garcia's (2005) study of parental attitudes of families living in Paraguay. Her study reveals the complexity of a diglossic society but her participants have not experienced migration. The ten two-generation families participating in de Klerk's (2001) case study also lack immigrant experience. Her findings stem mainly from cross-language English/African marriages and she explores the language dynamics, attitudes and usage patterns of the two official languages in the participants' place of residence.

Bayley et al.'s (1996) case study of eight Mexican-origin families in Texas may include the grandparents in each family case but the focus of the investigation is the strategies employed for the maintenance of a language which holds the status of an official language in the participants' place of origin. The Spanish language is also the heritage code of the four families of Mexican-descent who participate in Schecter and Bayley's (1997) study on their language socialization practices. Similarly, Edstrom (2010) examines the experience of a three-generation Spanish-Italian immigrant family in the United States and the factors they identify as key in shaping their patterns of two official languages use. Suarez (2002) also investigates the maintenance of Spanish, the official language of the home country of her four family cases in New York. The official language, Bengali, of her home country, Bangladesh, is transmitted by a grandmother to her grand-daughter in Ruby's (2012) family case study. But Ruby's research

focuses mainly on intergenerational learning practices taking place between grandparents and grandchildren.

So, the findings of my study make a specific contribution to the existing literature of family case studies exploring the phenomena of LM and LS, by investigating three-generation families whose place of origin is a diglossic society. Moreover, as previously said, I provide an in-depth analysis of my participants' accounts by exploring their LI, an under explored area of intergenerational HLM. Furthermore, I use the FLP framework to analyse each family's efforts for HLM describing not only their linguistic practices but also their interrelationship as members of the same family who may or may not work together to maintain the immigrant code. My focus on the participants' detailed accounts calls for the employment of such a methodological perspective which allow their 'voices' to be heard and their stories to extend experience about the social world. In the next chapter I will describe in detail my methodological choice and my research design.

Chapter: 5. Methodological perspective

5.1. Introduction

The existing body of research on HLM and HLS includes a range of large-scale quantitative investigations that provide insights into the factors affecting the phenomena of LM and LS. Nevertheless, as Finocchiaro (1995) maintains, there is also a place for small case studies that 'help in lending a human dimension...{to the above concepts and in} gaining deeper insights into the process through the individuals undergoing LM/LS live' (p. 41). Accordingly, this research project seeks to fill the gap that Finocchiaro detects. It employs a case study methodology to explore in depth the experiences and the views of three generations within three families of Greek Cypriot origin with regard to the languages used in their homes and in their wider social context. Nevertheless, the term 'case study' appears ambiguous in the literature since it is not used in a standard way. In this chapter, I will explain the meaning of the term as it is used for the needs of my study. Moreover, I will discuss the advantages but also the limitations ascribed to case study research along with how this investigation addresses the latter. Furthermore, I will describe the methodological tools used for the collection of the data and the procedure of their analysis.

5.2. The meaning of case study with regard to the present inquiry

Practitioners from various fields such as law, medicine, psychology and education draw on the notion of case study to conduct their research. But, because its use varies across the disciplines, its meaning is not clear and fixed (Hammersley and Gomm, 2000). So, for Yin (1984), the case study is 'an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident' (p.23). Stake (1995) views case study as 'the study of the particularity and the complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity within important circumstances' (p. xi). Mitchell (1984) identifies it with 'the detailed presentation of ethnographic data relating to some sequence of events from which the analyst seeks to make some theoretical inference' (p.237). Hammersley and Gomm (2000) view the case study as a specific form of inquiry which implies: a) the investigation of one or a few cases, b) the collection of detailed information about each case across a wide range of dimensions, c) the construction of cases out of naturally occurring social situations and d) the collection of unstructured data and a qualitative approach to their analysis. Freebody (2004), discussing the use of case study in educational

research, identifies it with a distinctive approach of describing and understanding the uncertain, complex and fleeting properties of people's practices and experiences in particular social contexts.

The meaning that the case study takes for the needs of my present research draws nuances from all the above definitions. So, in agreement with Yin, my aim is to investigate the interrelationship of the participants' language histories, perceptions about languages and employed FLPs in their self reported 'real-life context'. Complying with Freebody (2004), I seek to understand the 'complex and fleeting properties' of the participants' language choices and language beliefs as they are practiced and experienced within particular social contexts throughout their life time. Their language histories are used not only as 'background knowledge' but as lived experience informing or even defining the participants' current linguistic identities. So, this study aims at both showing a strong sense of time and place and representing 'a commitment to the overwhelming significance of localized experience' (Freebody, 2004, p. 81). Moreover, echoing Stake (1995) I aim to understand the uniqueness, the particularity of each of my cases. Furthermore, following Hammersley and Gomm's (2000) proposed dimensions, the present inquiry involves a) the investigation of multiple cases in the sense of family cases within which is nested the case of each family member, b) the collection of detailed information about each case with reference to his/her language history, language beliefs and language practices, c) the construction of each case out of his/her self reported naturally occurring social situations, d) the collection of data stemming from semi-structured interviews along with their qualitative analysis. Furthermore, in agreement with Mitchell (1983), the detailed analysis of the collected data seeks to offer some theoretical inferences drawing on the existing literature and research relevant to the theoretical framework employed. The latter provides the means of interpreting the participants' accounts with reference to the research questions. Thus, my approach to theory is inductive since it generates from the participants 'voices', their own descriptions, revealed beliefs and perceptions.

My aim is to interpret my participants' complex and multifaceted linguistic realities over the years. I view their revealed 'realities' as multiple and individual in nature since they 'are the products of human intellects...intangible mental constructions, socially and experientially based, local and specific in nature ...dependent for their form and content on the individual persons...' (Guba and Lincoln, 1994, p. 110-111). So each participant offers his/her interpretation of his/her linguistic reality composed of his/her understanding both of his/her past experience

and of his/her present social existence along with his/her future aspirations. I view the knowledge that each participant holds and he/she provides about his/her linguistic life for the need of the present research as constructed over the years. Thus I comply with Stake (1995) who underlines that 'the world we know is a particularly human construction...{we} construct...{our} understanding from experience and from being told what the world is...knowledge appears to begin with sensory experience of external stimuli...these sensations are immediately given personal meaning...nothing about the stimulus is registered in awareness and memory other than our interpretations of it...no aspects of knowledge are purely of the external world, devoid of human construction' (p. 99-100).

Moreover I view each participant's interpretations of his/her linguistic reality as 'alterable' over the years informed by specific social-political-historical circumstances, personal goals and objectives. I locate my role as a researcher who seeks to interpret the participants' own interpretations of their linguistic choices, of their linguistic behaviour, of their perceptions about languages and the changeability of all the previous with reference to the research questions which navigate the present research. The theory holds the role of sets of meanings which provide the means for gaining insight and understanding of my participants' 'voices'.

5.2.1. The rationale of employing case study research

The advantages of the case study methodology identified in the literature are in agreement with the aims of my investigation. So, Stake (1995) claims that the benefits of applying a case study methodology arise from its emphasis on the uniqueness of each case. Moreover, Zainal (2007) argues that case studies 'help to explain the complexities of real life situations' (p. 4). My research appreciates both the uniqueness and the complexity of each family and each family member's language history. Each family is distinguished for its particular ways of negotiating which language is used, the degree of HL fluctuations throughout the years, the linguistic dilemmas under consideration and the degree of submitting to powerful ideologies which validate specific languages over others. Thus this research is driven by the particularities of each case which I strive to describe so as to interpret and understand the process of their development and establishment.

Flyvbjerg (2006) underlines the strength of case study in producing context-dependent knowledge. My aim is to produce knowledge dependent on and relevant to the participants' particular circumstances, their LI and their linguistic choices regarding HLM or HLS. And 'case study is especially well suited to produce this knowledge' by improving understanding and

learning about human affairs (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 223). As Stake (1978) maintains, the expectations from an inquiry accord with providing the audience with 'further understandings' (p.5). Such understandings are informed by experience and 'concrete experiences can be achieved via continued proximity to the studied reality' which the detailed accounts offered by the case study can ensure (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 223). So, the in-depth analysis of the data collected for the present study and the detailed description of the participants' linguistic lives will add to the readers' knowledge about the language dilemmas immigrant families encounter, leading them to maintain or to abandon their heritage code.

5.2.2. Generalization

Case study research has received extensive criticism on the base that its results cannot be generalized to the wider population. Echoing Flyvbjerg (2006), I believe that 'formal generalization is only one of the many ways by which people gain and accumulate knowledge....knowledge {that} cannot be formally generalized does not mean that it cannot enter into the collective process of knowledge accumulation in a given field of inquiry' (p. 227). My aim is not to produce universal generalizations applicable to the majority of the human population. As previously said, I seek to provide the reader/s with context dependent knowledge about the particularities of the cases under study. Thus, in agreement with Stake (2000), I perceive such knowledge as gained from the actor's experience with events and interactions that comprise his/her 'tacit knowledge' upon which new understandings are built (p. 20). I mean to provide the reader/s with a 'thick description' (Geertz, 1973) of the cases under investigation. My detailed description of the cases and the in-depth analysis of each participant's account and perceptions aim to enrich the readers' experiences about language issues in immigrant families. Thus, complying with the views of Stake (1978, 1994, 1995, 2000) and Lincoln and Guba (2000), I locate the significance of my findings according to their usefulness for the readers.

So, my case studies research aims to facilitate the readers' 'naturalistic generalizations' (Stake, 1978, 1994, 1995, 2000) and/or their judgement of the findings' 'transferability' to similar contexts (Lincoln and Guba, 2000). The former 'develop within a person as a product of experience....as readers recognize essential similarities to cases of interest to them' (Stake, 2000, p. 22-23) and may appear more significant to readers who are not researchers. The latter concerns mainly the inquirers who may be interested in transferring the findings depending upon the degree of their 'fittingness' to similar social contexts under study (Lincoln and Guba, 2000, p. 40). But for this to be achieved the researcher has 'to provide sufficient

information about the context in which an inquiry is carried out' (ibid, 2000, p. 40). Therefore, I provide detailed information about both the participants and the social contexts within which their histories develop in continuous reference to particular social circumstances, specific language beliefs and distinct ways of using languages in favour or at the expense of the HL. Thus, following Hammersley and Gomm's (2000) views, I try to investigate the context of each case in terms of both the wider social context and historically. So in agreement with Stake (1995), I 'appreciate the uniqueness and complexity {of my cases and their} embeddedness and interaction with {their} context' (p. 16).

5.2.3. Reflecting on my methodological choice

The case study approach has been criticized for the researcher's tendency to 'stamp...{his/her}...pre-existing interpretations on data as they accumulate' (Diamond, 1996, cited in Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 234). Flyvbjerg (2006) admits that such a statement 'sensitizes us to an important point' but he responds to it by claiming that 'case study has its own rigor... {in the fact that}...it can 'close in' on real-life situations and test views directly in the relation to phenomena as they unfold in practice' (p. 234-235). Furthermore, he also maintains that 'the question of subjectivism and bias...applies to all methods...{even} in the choice of categories and variables for a quantitative or structural examination' (p. 235). I agree with Flyvbjerg's arguments that perceive subjectivity as an integral part of the social inquiry. I also identify with Conteh's (2005) claim that 'your methodology is, in effect, a reflection of yourself and your values, the product of your decisions about how to act in a particular social and cultural situation in which you have identified a problem' (pp.97). So, I argue that the researcher's subjectivity informs the research process from its early beginnings. Echoing Taylor (2002), I believe that objectivity is not attainable since people's perceptions and interpretations are inevitably selective and are shaped by their previous understandings they bring to any situation or context. As Stake (1995) underlines 'we cannot avoid...interpretation...the researcher is the agent of new interpretation, new knowledge' (p. 99). In this sense, my study is bound to involve my interpretation of my participants' accounts.

The selection of the cases under investigation, the research questions I seek to answer and the theories I elaborate with reference to the latter are informed by my specific interests and my dual role as a teacher and a researcher. Hammersley and Traianou (2012) admit that 'each of the various roles that we perform in our lives involves not only distinctive goals but also assumptions about the nature and significance of pertinent aspects of the world' (p. 47). I agree with their claim that 'the effective pursuit' of answering the research questions involves

partial but not total suppression of assumptions and preferences that are relevant to the actor's other social roles (ibid, p. 48). Accordingly, without completely denying the interference of my professional role during the research procedure, I put effort into prioritizing my role as a researcher who aims at producing context dependent knowledge that can add to the readers' 'tacit knowledge'.

5.3. The research design

My research aims to capture the complexity of each case. In this respect, I agree with Stake (1995) when he argues that 'we study a case when it itself is of very special interest' (p. xi). The selection of my cases under investigation was led by my interest in exploring their uniqueness and particularities. I was intrigued by the three young participants' varied level of HL proficiency. I wanted to investigate further their linguistic lives, seeking to understand the processes informing their linguistic identities. I felt the need to explore their family background, drawing on the existing literature that identifies the family as a critical domain of either promoting bilingualism or contributing to HLS (Fishman, 1991; Edwards and Newcombe, 2005; de Klerk 2001). My role as the children's GCS teacher facilitated my access to their families and subsequently the collection of the data. All the cases are resources of detailed data collected by using qualitative research tools such as semi structured interviews. Furthermore, both contextual and reflective notes supplement the collected data and their in-depth analysis.

5.3.1. Data collection techniques and analysis

As previously said, the collection of the data analysed in my study involve semi-structured interviews and both contextual and reflective notes. I will proceed by describing how I used these data collection techniques along with the process of my analysis.

5.3.1.1. Conducting the interviews

As I said in the introductory chapter, the interviews conducted for the data collection in my study followed a two stage process. After gaining consent I interviewed each of the adult participants two times and each of the young children three times. I already knew my participants for a whole academic year as the GCS teacher before asking for their contribution to my study. I taught the children two afternoons each week. I also met regularly the young children's parents and grandparents at the GCS when they delivered or collected the children from their community language lessons. Moreover, I had the opportunity to socialise with them during the shows and the events organized by the GCS. The main theme of our

encounters was always focused on the young children's immigrant code learning and their efforts for maintaining it. Thus, when I explained to them my research interests and the aim of my study, they willingly accepted to help me since the interview appeared as a more detailed version of our informal discussions. I delivered to adult participants the following set of questions before conducting the first interviews with them:

1. Which language do you use within the home context and why?
2. During which daily activities do you use the ethnic language at home?
3. Why have you chosen to maintain the ethnic language?
4. How do you feel about your ethnic language?
5. What are your expectations from the Greek community school?
6. What are your own experiences of the Greek community school as students?

Relevant explanations were given to the young participants verbally during the break time in the GCS. The second interview took the form of an informal discussion where I asked for more details relevant to their perceptions about the two forms of the heritage code and their way of negotiating their diglossic background. I interviewed Alex, both his parents and his maternal grandparents. I also conducted interviews with Michella, her mother and her maternal grandmother as well as Marianthi, her mother and her maternal grandparents. All the interviews with the adult participants took place in their home. One out of the three interviews with the children took place in the school context. The participants chose the language/s they wished to use during the interview. So, all the members of Alex's family chose to use English. Marianthi chose to use English but her mother and her maternal grandparents used a form of the CD enriched with many SMG influences. Michella's mother and grandmother also used a form of the CD but with more influences than Marianthi's mother and grandparents. Michella used both the immigrant code and the English language, switching between the two codes when she wished to. All the interviews were voice recorded and transcribed in the whole of their length. The interviews conducted in the heritage code were translated into English respecting the meaning of the participants' utterances and maintaining their integrity.

The date and the time of the interviews were arranged to suit the participants' free time and availability. Each interview took the form of a friendly discussion, for example over a cup of coffee. I interviewed the parents and the children of each family on the same day when I visited their homes. Both Alex's grandparents and Marianthi's grandparents wished to be interviewed with the presence of their spouses and I respected their request. Though I felt necessary to do this to minimize the participants' sense of anxiety during the interview

process, I also acknowledge the impact it may have had on the collected data. My concern refers to principles of the traditional Greek Cypriot family that ascribe to the husband the power to lead conversations and to the wife a secondary role of listening and agreeing. I tried to diminish such an effect by addressing my questions personally to the female spouse so as to provide her with the space and the time to reveal her inner thoughts and perceptions.

An additional concern about the collected data refers to the impact of both my ethnic origin and my linguistic identity on the interview process. I acknowledge that both the participants' political affiliation¹⁷ and their perceptions about SMG speakers¹⁸ may have informed their view of my role as a member of the same immigrant group and a co speaker; seeing me either as an insider or as an outsider. This may have interfered with their level of sincerity, honesty and openness to me during the interview. To minimize such an effect I invested time and effort in building a rapport with them before conducting the interviews. As Miller and Glassner (2004) argue, 'rapport building is a key' to the process of reducing 'social distances that include differences in relative power that can result in suspicion and lack of trust, both of which the researcher must actively seek to overcome' (p. 133). My regular contact with the majority of the participants on a weekly basis provided me with the opportunity to extend our relationship to a deeper level than a superficial encounter between a teacher and the student's caregivers. I revealed to them my genuine interest in their children's heritage code learning since the early beginnings of our contact. I expressed my sincere need to learn more about their home languages and their way of negotiating the maintenance of a code with low social value in the dominant English society. I built the rapport that Miller and Glassner describe in the above lines after many informal discussions with the participants in every possible encounter we had by enquiring about their linguistic lives with reference to their children's linguistic identity.

My role as a teacher and a researcher appeared as two fold. First it ensured an easy access to the families. It also provided me with the opportunity to gather vital information about the families before conducting the interviews, enriching my contextual notes about each case. Nevertheless, I had to minimize the effect of my professional role as a teacher on my participants' responses during the interview. Thus, I asked for their contribution to my study

¹⁷ Relevant discussion about the Cypriot political parties and their aspirations is cited in the section 'Historical background of Cyprus' (p. 9).

¹⁸ Relevant discussion about the social connotations attributed to SMG speakers by the Greek Cypriots is cited in the sections 'Functional differences between SMG and CD' and 'Political and ideological dimensions of the diglossic situation in Cyprus' (p. 15-17)

after knowing them for a whole academic year. Moreover, I explained to them that the interview would be a more structured discussion about linguistic matters that we had already talked about during our encounters. Furthermore, I explained to them that my aim was to reveal their concerns and their efforts through a focused study. But, mainly I put emphasis on my deep need to learn as a 'novice' with and through their discourses so as to understand and to interpret the dimension involved in their HLM or HLS within their three generation families.

In the following tables I cite the dates and the duration of each one of the interviews conducted with my participants.

<i>Marianthi's family</i>	<i>Number, month, year and duration of the Interviews</i>
<i>Marianthi's maternal grandfather</i>	1 st : January 2007 (1:18h) 2 nd : February 2009 (1:05h)
<i>Marianthi's maternal grandmother</i>	
<i>Marianthi's mother</i>	1 st : March 2007 (0:57h) 2 nd : February 2009 (1:08h)
<i>Marianthi</i>	1 st : December 2007 (0:43h) 2 nd : March 2007 (0:38h) 3 rd : February 2009 (0:32h)

<i>Michella's family</i>	<i>Number, month, year and duration of the Interviews</i>
<i>Michella's grandmother</i>	1 st : May 2008 (1:38h) 2 nd : June 2009 (1:23h)
<i>Michella's mother</i>	1 st : March 2008 (1:49h) 2 nd : June 2009 (1:32h)
<i>Michella</i>	1 st : December 2007 (0:39h) 2 nd : March 2008 (0:48h) 3 rd : June 2009 (0:43h)

<i>Alex's Family</i>	<i>Number, month, year and duration of the Interviews</i>
<i>Alex's maternal</i>	1 st : October 2008 (0:52h)

<i>grandfather</i>	2 nd : September 2009 (0:44h)
<i>Alex's maternal grandmother</i>	
<i>Alex's father</i>	1 st : June 2008 (1:13h) 2 nd : July 2009 (0:58h)
<i>Alex's mother</i>	1 st : June 2008 (1:13h) 2 nd : July 2009 (0:45h)
<i>Alex</i>	1 st : December 2007 (0:27h) 2 nd : June 2008 (0:25h) 3 rd : July 2009 (0:32h)

Echoing Hammersley (2006), I believe that 'reality is constituted in the telling, rather than being independent of the telling' (p.11). My aim is to explore in depth the reality of the participants' linguistic lives and to give voice to the way they perceived it as described during the interview. Thus, echoing Miller and Glassner (2004), I believe that 'those of us who aim to understand and document other's understanding choose ...interviewing because it provides us with a means for exploring points of view' of our participants (p. 127). In the present study, their voices and their stories are further supported by data stemming from rich notes composed since the early beginning of this research project.

5.3.1.2. Contextual notes

The contextual notes that I have been keeping since the early stages of my study include incidents which I was able to witness both in the participants' homes and in the community school context, enabling my accounts for each case to be better informed and more thorough. I also drew on such occurrences to stimulate further discussion when I interviewed my participants for the second time. I wanted to reveal the uniqueness and the complexity of each case using additional data sources. Thus, I enriched the data collected from the interviews with observations that I made when visiting the participants' homes regarding the linguistic environment and the existing linguistic stimuli (the linguistic choice when interacting with each other, the linguistic choice regarding the newspapers and the books they read, the games the children play with and the TV channels which they watch).

I also observed my participants' interactions and language use during the two annual school 'dinner and dance' events and various shows organized and performed by the students of the GCS on special occasions such as Christmas shows, National Day commemorations and Summer Holiday shows (noting which language they used when interacting with co-ethnics and which language they used with their other family members when co-ethnics were present). Such events were an additional opportunity for interacting with them and exchanging views about the children's performances and various topics regarding HLM. Moreover I observed the three students' interactions during lessons but also during break time (noting their linguistic choice in the class and during break time and comments made to each other about their languages when working in teams during the lesson). Furthermore, many lessons were voice recorded. The latter gave me the opportunity to compose rich notes about class incidents where students expressed their views about the languages within their linguistic repertoire, prompted by the context of the lesson.

The selection of the contextual notes used in the analysis chapters is relevant with the identified themes and categories derived from the interpretation of the collected data and infiltrated by the theoretical background used for their analysis. They hold a complementary role of extending further the discussion of each theme and category of my analysis. Therefore, there is an imbalance of use of the data collected by the interviews and by the contextual notes in favour of the first. Nevertheless, I consider my contextual notes a vital part of my personal journey to deepen my understanding about my participants' linguistic lives and their views about their languages. They operated as a supportive mechanism of data collection that provided for enlightening aspects of my participants' heritage language use and heritage language views outside the context of the interview process.

5.3.1.3. Reflective notes

In agreement with Emerson et al. (2001), my 'writings produced in or in close proximity to the 'field'' produced a large corpus of reflective notes (p.353). The latter include my personal reflections after the interviews with all my participants. In these notes I refer to my negotiation of my role as a teacher and researcher, my thoughts about the process of my research and my reflections during the analysis of the data. These notes guided the extension of my theoretical framework and the modification of my research questions to their final form. They hold the role of an ongoing brainstorming activity, a process of interpreting and reinterpreting the collective data with the objective of achieving an indepth analysis. Their use is not evident in the analysis chapter in the form of extracts used in the identified themes and

categories. Nevertheless, they constitute an invisible power that affected my way of managing the analysis of the collected data through the lens of the theories used for the needs of the present study. My personal reflections constitute my academic 'treasure' that provided for my understanding of my cases, detecting the multidimensionality of each family's linguistic life.

5.3.1.4. Ethical Issues

I clarified my role as a researcher and informed the participants both about the aim of my research and their role as the research participants before asking for their contribution to my study. My professional role as a teacher in the Greek Community School offered me the opportunity to approach the three children's parents and grandparents so as to obtain their consent for their participation, both for themselves and for their children. Furthermore, I engaged the children in a discussion relevant to my research and I also asked for their own consent to participate in this investigation. I obtained a verbal form of consent by all the participants. Thus, their contribution took place in accordance with their will and their interests without disturbing their well being.

I tried to minimize their potential sense of anxiety and or/confusion about the requirement of the interview by giving them in advance a set of questions relevant to my research interests before the first interview. The second interview followed after a further period of time, during which I gained deeper familiarity with the participants. I followed their own wishes about the day and the time that I could conduct the interviews. Moreover, as previously said and following Crow et al.'s (2006) recommendation that 'better data are likely to result where there is trust and rapport between researcher and participants' (Crow et al, 2006, p. 86) I invested in building such a relationship with the participants before conducting the interviews with each one of them. As Glassner and Loughlin (1987) maintain 'establishing trust and familiarity, showing genuine interest, assuring confidentiality, and not being judgmental are some important elements of building rapport' (cited in Miller and Glassner, 2004, p. 133).

Additionally, I have guaranteed to the participants their confidentiality and anonymity and I have protected both of these throughout the research procedure. Following Hammersley and Traianou's (2012) recommendations, I have protected 'the sources from whom..{I have}..derived information, but also people referred to in the data' (p. 132). Thus, I have changed the names of the participants and I do not reveal the name of the GCS where the young children received their community schooling. I tried to conduct my study according to good practice and a sense of deep responsibility to my dual role as a researcher and a GCS

teacher. Throughout my research, I have respected and followed the ethical guidelines as they are described in the handbook of British Educational Research Association (BERA, 2011). Finally, I gained the approval of the Ethics Committee of my university to conduct my research

5.3.1.5. Data analysis

The analysis of the collected data is separated into specific themes and categories that emerge from the participants' accounts rather than being imposed on them prior to collection. Nevertheless, the categories have undergone many alterations before reaching their final form. The richness of the information received proved both fruitful and enlightening regarding the participants' linguistic choices and the processes involved in their linguistic dilemmas and decisions. Notwithstanding, the extensive body of the collected data hindered their separation into themes of social meaning and understanding. The analysis process bears similarities with a spiral making its way deeper into the data. So, the categories initially formed were further elaborated with reference to both the constant development of the theoretical framework employed and my deeper familiarization with the collected information. This relates to Palys's (1997) claim of the iterative nature of qualitative research, which he describes as 'cyclical but not merely repetitive...instead... {it} connotes increasing sophistication or change' (p. 298).

The analysis entails four main themes which are conceptually analytical but they overlap. Accordingly the analysis entails several themes discussing each participant's language history; their LI about the EL, the SMG and the CD; how these LI affect their contribution (for the older generations) or their response (for the young participants) to the FLP, and how LI affect their perceptions about and their expectations from the GCS. The latter theme is considered a part of each family's FLP regarding language management decisions and practices. Each one of the above themes is further separated in smaller categories stemming from the participants' expressed views and perceptions relevant to the research questions.

5.4. Conclusion

In this chapter, I described my methodological perspective and the tools I used for my data collection. Moreover, I provided detailed information about when and how I conducted the interviews with the participants. Furthermore, I explained both the role and the use of my contextual and reflective notes. In addition I described the process of my analysis and its final form as it is presented in the following chapters. In the next chapter, I will analyse the data collected from the members of the first family who participated in my study, Marianthi's family.

Chapter 6. Analysis: Marianthi's Family

6.1. Introduction

In this chapter, Marianthi, her mother and her maternal grandparents reveal the route of three languages throughout the years. Marianthi is the child of an inter ethnic marriage. Her father is of Sicilian origin. Both her parents were born and educated in London. Her maternal grandparents migrated to London in the early 1960 in search of a better quality of life. Their mother tongue is the CD but they accommodated the EL to respond to the linguistic needs of the host society. The vernacular is the immigrant variety they transmitted to their daughter and their granddaughters. Their linguistic capital experienced many alterations over the years. I first analyse the participants' language histories by identifying their self reported social circumstances that bear an impact on their heritage code use. I continue to reveal their perceptions about their languages. This will be followed by the analysis of the adult participants' contribution to the FLP and Marianthi's response to the latter. I finish this chapter with the analysis of the participants' perceptions about the GCS.

6.2. Language histories

6.2.1. Marianthi's grandfather

Migration rationale

Marianthi's grandfather migrated to London in 1960. His decision to join the Greek Cypriot diaspora in Britain was heavily informed by his family's low position in the Cypriot social stratification. He viewed his relocation as a decisive act that would ensure him a professional career with satisfactory material resources. His main concern was to support his family economically. His cousin had migrated to London some years ago. He ensured a position for him in the business he worked. Marianthi's grandfather accepted his invitation and moved to England. His cousin offered him accommodation for the first months of his removal. His first job was in a local Greek restaurant. This was also the place where he met his future wife.

Linguistic capital before migration: English, SMG, CD

Marianthi grandfather's place of origin is close to one of the biggest urban centres in Cyprus. He is the oldest child in his family. He attended lessons in the Greek Cypriot Mainstream School (GCMS) completing his primary education. This was an achievement given the specific sociohistorical circumstances, since education was considered a luxury mainly experienced by the people of high social and economic status. As he explains *'the priority was to find a job and*

to earn some money to buy food...but I liked school...I used to work in the afternoons in a local shop...I needed to support my family...but I never stopped school...it was hard but I was good and I managed to finish primary school...and you know back then only rich children could live as proper students...meaning that they did not have to work at the same time...'. Despite receiving his formal education in the GCMS, the main vehicle of communication outside its institution was the dialect. This is the code used with his family members and the members of his social network. Marianthi's grandfather's official education provided him with the opportunity to become familiarized with the EL since it was among the subjects taught. This fact gave him confidence for moving to a country where he was already familiar with the official language.

Linguistic capital: alterations over the years

The need for social advancement

Marianthi's grandfather moved to London with a linguistic capital which involved native CD skills and basic EL competency. He reports the linguistic difficulties he encountered during the first years of his relocation by saying that *'I faced many difficulties with the accent...you know it is different to learn a foreign language at your home country and then to move to the country where this language is officially spoken...they speak differently...I couldn't understand them in the beginning...I thought I knew nothing'*. Nevertheless, he rapidly abandoned his home language in favour of the language which seemed able to provide him with the opportunity to maximize the social profits offered in his new place of residence. He was focused on investing his energy in his professional career. His main goal was his social advancement. Thus as he explains *'I can say that after some years I started forgetting my own language...I did not have many opportunities to use it...my life was only my job...to do my best to be successful in London...to earn money...to have a good life....to send money to my parents...this is what I wanted more ...so my language was the last thing to care about...'*. HLS is inextricably associated with immigrants' social advancement in the host society informed by the belief that the dominant language is the only medium for successful integration and professional development (Fishman, 2001; Fillmore, 2003; Myers-Scotton, 2006).

Social network of co-ethnics/ institutional support

Marianthi's grandfather does not attribute the gradual abandonment of his mother tongue only to his desire to integrate successfully into the dominant English society. He also refers to the lack of opportunities for HL use with other members of the Greek Cypriot group in London. He says that *'...I did not have many Greek Cypriots close to me back then...'*. The existence of a

wide network of immigrant group members is decisive for HLM (Giles et al., 1977, Kipp et al., 1995; Myers-Scotton, 2006). Additionally, Marianthi's grandfather comments on the changes regarding both the demography of the Greek Cypriot community and its institutional support over the years since his relocation. He states accordingly that '*there were no Greek radio stations, any newspapers or TV channels that had to do with my home country...nowadays everything is easier...you can read the language more often...you can hear it everywhere...the community is bigger and there are facilities where you can find the language if you wish*'. For him, the current British sociolinguistic context, allows the proliferation of immigrant language use, encouraging and facilitating its maintenance. Both the demography of the immigrant groups and its institutional support interrelate with HLS (Fishman, 1966; Holmes et al., 1993; Myers-Scotton 2006)

Spouse's linguistic capital

Brown (2008) maintains that spouses' common ethnolinguistic background can have an impact on successful HLM. Marianthi's grandfather's wife is of the same ethnic background. She comes from a village in close proximity to his. The importance of the geographical position of their places of origin is decisive regarding the form of the dialect which both of them identify as their native language. Their similar dialectic codes allowed them to establish communication by using the dialect. This situation altered Marianthi's grandfather HL use practices by reintroducing the use of his mother tongue in his daily linguistic encounters. Both spouses used their common channel so as to exchange meaning and to articulate their thoughts and feelings. But they also allowed the dominant language to inform part of their oral production due to the social pressure they felt to adapt to the monolingual English social context. The two spouses practiced their skills regarding the EL with each other. Marianthi's grandmother, who lacked any previous knowledge of the official language, primarily prompted this. She viewed it as a great opportunity to enrich her linguistic abilities by asking her partner to use the EL when addressing her.

LI and the EMS

The two spouses established their household and soon they had two children. They raised their offspring in a household where both languages, English and the CD, were used. They socialized their children by the parallel use of the two languages. But as Marianthi's grandfather argues, the dominant language in their home context was the dialect. He states that '*we used English and Greek with the children...but I think that we used more Greek when they were young*'. But the uneven distribution of the two codes grew bigger when their

children entered the EMS. He explains that *'but then they started school and we started speaking more English...because we were trying to learn the language with them and with their help most of the times...and we wanted them to be good at school...and you know at that time the teachers advised us to use only English for the children to learn...and it was convenient for us because we could learn more from them...everything was about learning good English...'*.

Marianthi's grandfather's utterances illustrate the impact of the specific sociohistorical conditions which informed his linguistic choices after founding his own family. He underlines his continuous effort to learn the dominant language of the host society. He pinpoints the detrimental effect of the mainstream schooling regarding his family linguistic ecology. He recalls the encouragement he received to abandon his immigrant language in favour of his children's academic progress. He reveals the LI articulated by the EMS that valued the EL over the heritage code. Both spouses were the recipients of the dominant language ideology which they accepted as a 'common sense' representation of the proper way of acting in the host society. Consequently the HL use was doomed to elimination since it did not afford the speaker with any social profits in such a context. On the contrary its maintenance was viewed as an obstacle for the immigrants' further social development and integration. Fillmore (2003) puts emphasis on the influential power of official educational policies and ideologies against successful HLM.

Visits to homeland

Pauwels (2005) views visits to the home country as decisive for promoting HLM. Marianthi's grandfather attributes the gradual disempowerment of his CD native skill to his rare visits to Cyprus. He imputes the latter to economic reasons. He states accordingly that *'I remember the first time I visited Cyprus since the day I migrated to London...seven years had passed...I went back and I had forgotten to use the language...I couldn't even recall easy daily expressions...this is what happens when you stop using the language and at that time I used mainly English...and I did not have the time or the money to visit Cyprus very often..'*

HL use in the current years

Marianthi's grandfather regained his fluency in his mother tongue when he grew older and his children established their own households. His retirement provided him with time and the material resources to visit his homeland regularly. Moreover the Greek Cypriot community in London grew bigger and he developed a strong social network of Greek Cypriots who he meets daily. Thus he repositioned the distribution and the use of the two codes, the CD and the EL.

He currently admits that his heritage language dominates his linguistic interactions. This is his primary linguistic choice when socializing with his daughters and his grandchildren. His HL use has undergone another change responding to the needs of his present way of life. Nevertheless another code has appeared in his linguistic interactions. It is the SMG.

Marianthi's father has been familiarized with this language since he was a student in the GCMS. Moreover, he listens to the programmes broadcast by the Greek Radio Station in London daily. Furthermore, he has equipped his household with a satellite TV. He reads the Greek Cypriot newspapers published in London on a regular basis. For all the above forms of media resources the legitimate language is SMG, the official language in Cyprus. He is aware of the negative social connotations ascribed to his mother tongue. He is involved in cultural interpretations which constitute the CD as a code inferior to the SMG. He is the recipient of ideologies which impose the need to use the officially recognized language so that the speaker can gain relevant social profits. But he does not reject his mother tongue. He identifies himself with a dialect speaker. Nevertheless, particular factors which will be analysed below inform his utterances with linguistic elements which are associated with the modern language.

Discussion

Marianthi's grandfather maintains that a) his need for rapid integration and social advancement in the host society, b) the lack of a network of immigrant language speakers, c) the lack of any form of media resources associated with the immigrant code, and d) the rare visits to the homeland affected his HLS. His historical account reveals the fluctuations regarding the use of the three languages over the years. His linguistic choices and practices are informed by the complex interrelationship between LI that promote or even impose on the speaker the use of a particular code. So, when living in Cyprus, he spoke mainly the CD. Despite the fact that his official schooling promoted the use of the SMG, the dialect seemed to be the linguistic capital that could be exchanged both for a social capital and for an economic capital. The linguistic demands both of the labour market and of his social network directed his linguistic behaviour. Thus he resisted complying with the official discourses that imposed the standard variety as the only valuable channel of communication and of social advancement.

Nevertheless his relocation to England involved his introduction to a new set of LI that promoted and even imposed an inextricable link between dominant language use and successful social integration and development. He accepted their penetrating power by seeking to exchange EL capital for material and social profits. His wife further empowered such

interpretations by reproducing relevant LI. Additionally, their children's schooling offered a strong legitimation of the dominant language at the expense of HL use. However, these linguistic representations have not been static. He currently participates in *counterhegemonic* practices that challenge the authority of the EL. This does not imply the rejection of the dominant language within English society. It refers to the complementary use of the HL as a linguistic choice that can afford the bearer with particular social profits among the Greek Cypriot community.

6.2.2. Language history: Marianthi's grandmother

Migration rationale and socio-educational background

Marianthi's grandmother migrated to London in 1963. She comes from a family of low educational and socioeconomic background. She had to work from a young age to support her family's monthly income. Her parents worked in the agricultural sector selling the products they cultivated in the small area of land they owned. She states that '*I come from a very poor family...my first memories are all about poverty, finding ways to have some food and working in the fields...very hard years which cause me sadness...*'. Her career as a student in the GCMS was very short. She attended lessons for three years. Thus her educational background is poor. Her primary socialization involved the exclusive use of the CD. This is the code she used with her family members and her social contacts. She relocated to London at the age of nineteen at her uncle's invitation. He offered her accommodation till she got married. Moreover he found her a low paid job in a local restaurant where she worked as a cleaner.

Linguistic capital before immigration: English, SMG, CD

Marianthi's grandmother moved to London lacking the English linguistic capital. She states accordingly that '*when I first came to London I knew only to say 'yes' and 'no'...it was really hard for me because I couldn't understand anything*'. Her linguistic repertoire involved the exclusive use of the CD. Her short experience in the GCMS familiarized her with the SMG. Nevertheless it was the use of the dialect that could be exchanged for social profits in her homeland. Therefore her linguistic choices in Cyprus challenged the authority of the dominant language in favour of her social integration.

Linguistic capital: fluctuation within the years

The need for rapid linguistic adaptation

Marianthi's grandmother continued using her mother tongue with her uncle and his wife in the first years of her relocation. However, she called for their contribution to learn the dominant language. She explains that '*I was desperate to learn English...I even asked my uncle and my auntie to stop using our language when speaking to me...I had to learn and I needed help from the people I had close to me... and with them it was easier because they knew my language as well and they could translate everything into English...I think they helped more than anyone else with the language in the first years*'. Thus the dominant language gradually occupied a prominent position in her linguistic repertoire.

She met her husband and they established their own household. Despite the fact that they initiated their linguistic interaction with the use of the immigrant code, the host language rapidly dominated their exchanges. As previously reported by her husband, this was greatly supported and encouraged by her wish to advance her linguistic skills in the EL along with her desire to integrate socially and professionally into the host society. Canagarajah (2008) comments that the immigrants who lack dominant linguistic capital show greater motivation to learn it than the members of the immigrant group who hold even basic relevant skills. However, she did not abandon her mother tongue. Notwithstanding, the distribution of the two codes became uneven in favour of the dominant channel. The latter channel affected her linguistic choices during the years of her children's primary socialization. But it became her primary medium of interaction with her offspring after they entered the EMS.

LI and the EMS

Marianthi's grandmother admits that the LI promoted by the EMS had a negative effect on her HL use pattern. She explains that '*I used both English and Greek with my children... but when they went to school we started using more English...the teachers told us that it is best for them to hear only English at home...not to get confused with the other language...and I learned a lot from them... because till then I knew English the way I heard it and most of the expression I used were wrong and they kept correcting me and I learned more...*'. The unquestionable authority of the educators in the English school imposed the exclusive use of the dominant language in the home context. Both spouses accepted and followed the school's recommendation without further questioning. Thus, their home domain altered to an English dominant linguistic environment. But such a context seemed linguistically profitable for the

parents whose main concern was to develop good knowledge of the legitimate code which appeared to be the primary prerequisite for their social integration and progress.

HL use in the current years

Marianthi's grandmother, like her husband, did not retain a steady and unchanged linguistic repertoire. Her current linguistic identity involves the extensive use of her mother tongue. Her heritage language regained its power after her retirement. However, a new code entered into her linguistic choices, the SMG variety. All three channels occupy their own position in her daily interactions. However, her mother tongue is currently the most prominent. Her language history reveals that specific sociohistorical circumstances impose and direct the level of its use and its distribution.

Discussion

Marianthi's grandmother entered the host country as a CD monolingual speaker. The monolingual English society conditioned her smooth integration through her rapid linguistic adaptation. She accommodated to such linguistic behaviour at the expense of her mother tongue. But she never abandoned her HL since her social network included immigrant language speakers. Both codes were in parallel but uneven use. Such a pattern continued through the years of her immigration till the recent decade. Nowadays, like her husband, Marianthi's grandmother uses her mother tongue with the majority of her social contacts. Her retirement initiated the immigrant language dominance over her linguistic interactions. Moreover, her daughter's persistent emphasis on transmitting to the younger generation the official form of their home language led to her familiarization with the SMG. Thus her contemporary linguistic repertoire involves the use of the CD dialect with her husband and her Greek Cypriot social contacts, the use of all three codes with her daughter and with her grandchildren, and the employment of English when her interlocutors are dominant language speakers.

Marianthi's grandmother's linguistic life reveals asymmetry between the three languages. Her historical account describes the way particular social conditions impose the learning and use of a dominant code at the expense of the heritage code. Her utterances illustrate that linguistic behaviour is informed by the benefits associated with the use of a particular code within specific sociohistorical conditions. Her reports highlight the mechanism activated when the social actor decides to invest in a specific linguistic capital with the expectation of transforming it to desired social and material profits. Her descriptions also reveal that dominant language

ideologies can produce the belief of a *common sense* linguistic behaviour that identifies EL as the only medium for social integration and advancement.

Marianthi's grandmother submitted to the will of such dominant discourses. Nevertheless, she never stopped using her mother tongue. She established a household where the *counterhegemonic phenomenon* was actualized. But this does not seem a deliberate act. It was mainly a consequence of her poor EL proficiency. Her children were raised in a bilingual household but the superiority of the official language was daily confirmed by its extensive daily use. However, her current linguistic behaviour involves the intentional use of the HL with her grandchildren. She strategically maintains this linguistic channel when interacting with them. She clearly challenges the superiority of the EL over her heritage code and her house continues to be a *counterhegemonic space* at present. However, this space also reproduces the dominant SMG ideologies when interaction with the younger generations is involved. A *counterhegemonic paradox* appears, since the use of a different dominant language is promoted within a household that resists the hegemonic force of the EL. This is heavily informed by the future aspiration for her grandchildren regarding the convertibility of the SMG to other forms of capital. Marianthi's grandmother seems to seek a balance between current social demands, future social profits and her inclination to use her mother tongue when both the context and the interlocutor offer this linguistic option.

6.2.3. *Language history: Marianthi's mother*

Childhood linguistic experiences

Marianthi's mother was raised in a bilingual household where both the EL and the CD were in parallel use but in uneven distribution. When she entered the EMS, the dominant code gained power over the heritage one. Nevertheless the dialect continued to inform the majority of her interaction when spending her summer holidays in Cyprus with her mother, her sister and her maternal and paternal grandparents. But she also used the EL in the homeland with her sister and her cousins who learned this code through the GCMS. Her childhood linguistic experiences involve social interaction within two different sociolinguistic contexts. In each case, the legitimate language differed. So, she spent the academic year in London where the EL was the code of high social value and acceptance. However, her summer holidays in Cyprus called for the continuous and almost exclusive use of the dialect. Therefore, she had to readjust her views about the code that constituted the channel valued in the Cypriot social milieu. In this

social context, she had experiences that both advanced her linguistic skills and proved the usability of a code undervalued in her main place of residence.

Greek Community School educational experiences

Marianthi's mother attended lessons in a GCS after her parents' encouragement. However, she withdrew at the age of nine. She identifies her negative experiences in the community school as significant in altering her linguistic choice when interacting with her parents. She says that *'most of the teachers were Greeks coming from Greece...and they wanted us to use Modern Greek and they claimed they couldn't understand me... the way I spoke because I used the dialect...and I stopped using it even with my parents because it was like Greek education didn't accept my Greek language...but this was the language that I learned and I used in Cyprus...so I stopped using it...I was angry...but when I was in Cyprus I used it because this was the place it was accepted'*. She exercised her resistance to the LI promoted by the GCS by deactivating her HL skills in the English context. The rejection of her home language, because it was excluded by the Greek school, caused her some confusion. But she continued employing this code during her social interactions in the *safe place* of her parents' homeland. The LI about CD in this context promoted its value and social acceptance.

Linguistic capital fluctuations: adulthood

Spouse's linguistic capital

Marianthi's mother got married to a partner of Sicilian origin after the end of her official schooling. They established their own household and they had two children. Both partners employed their common language, English, for communication. Thus the dominant EL started monopolizing Maria's mother linguistic exchanges, to a greater extent.

Children as HL socialization agents

Marianthi's mother's parents were the carers for her first child because she was working full time. Her parents' retirement and the revitalization of their heritage language occurred almost simultaneously with the birth of her first child. Thus Marianthi's older sister entered the English school as a dominant CD speaker. Her mother complied with her parents' FLP. She also revitalized her HL skills so as to communicate effectively with her daughter. Thus a long period of immigrant language underuse was followed by its reintroduction in the family's daily exchanges. Therefore, Maria's mother linguistic capital underwent an additional alteration responding to the particular circumstances of that period. Nevertheless, it did not remain

static and unchanged. When her first daughter started school, her EL skills were empowered responding to her child's rapid adaptation to the linguistic needs of the EMS. Simultaneously, she gave birth to her second child and decided to take a part time job. So, she had the opportunity to invest more time in her children's socialization. Thus her dominant language, the English code, became an almost exclusive linguistic choice during her interactions with her offspring.

Greek Community School and HL revitalization

Marianthi's mother supports and encourages her children's attendance at the Greek community school. She also actively participates in its operation by holding a position on the parents committee. She pays regular visits to the Greek and Greek Cypriot education offices in London to discuss issues arising from the monthly meetings of the committee regarding the operation of the school and its needs for teachers and educational resources. Furthermore, she regularly socializes with representatives of the Greek and the Greek Cypriot Ministries of Education who visit the community school to express their support for the institution and the effort for HL maintenance invested by the members of the Greek and Greek Cypriot diaspora who live in London. Her involvement in the above activities familiarized her with the SMG variety. This was decisive for the initiation of another change in her linguistic life, the introduction of the SMG as part of her spoken repertoire. Since then, as will be shown below, she has reconsidered her perceptions about the three codes, acknowledging the superiority of the standard variety over the CD. Her regular presence in formal contexts where the former is considered the legitimate code affects her LI and her subsequent actions with reference to her children's learning of SMG.

Discussion

Marianthi's mother's language history refers to an ever transforming linguistic capital responsive both to particular social circumstances and relevant LI that direct which code can offer anticipated social profits. Her linguistic life entails participation in a variety of *counterhegemonic* spaces that challenge the authority of the official language. During her childhood, both her home domain and her summer holiday domain involved linguistic interaction that counteracted the hegemonic forces of the EL and the SMG code respectively. The household she established after her marriage was also a place where the dominant language ideology was questioned when her children were in a young age. Nevertheless, her

current linguistic repertoire may reject the monopoly of the EL, but shows submission to the penetrating power of a different dominant language, the SMG.

6.2.4. Language history: Marianthi

Primary socialization

Marianthi is nine years old. She was born in London. Her primary caretakers were both her parents and her grandparents. So she grew up as a bilingual child. She used mainly the EL with her parents and she used almost exclusively the CD with her grandparents. Marianthi spent many hours with her grandparents in her early years, due to her mother's work commitments. Therefore she was immersed in the *counterhegemonic* space of her grandparents' household. As Marianthi reports '*...I know that I used to speak more Greek when I was younger and before going to the nursery because I spent more time with my grandparents...*'.

EMS

When Marianthi entered the EMS, there was a great alteration in her linguistic capital. Her official schooling commitments imposed the reduction of socialization time with her grandparents. Her exposure to the EL grew bigger and her CD skills suffered a gradual but a significant deterioration over the years till the present.

GCS

Marianthi started attending the weekly lessons in the GCS at the age of five. Her community schooling familiarized her with the SMG. Thus, her linguistic capital was further altered with the introduction of a new code associated with her linguistic heritage. However, she continued using the CD with her grandparents and occasionally with her mother.

Her mother's involvement in the GCS parents' committee

Marianthi's linguistic life changed significantly when her mother became a member of the Greek School's parents' committee and experienced the LI prevalent in this educational setting. Marianthi's mother started using references from the SMG and requesting her parents and also her daughters to follow her linguistic choice. Accordingly, Marianthi is currently involved in a process of linguistic capital modification. Complying with her mother's wish, she has to change her language patterns by employing the SMG during her interactions with her close family members.

Discussion

Marianthi's linguistic capital altered over the years in response to particular circumstances. Her entrance in the EMS resulted in EL dominance at the expense of her CD skills. Moreover her mother's involvement into the operation of the GCS initiated the second significant transformation of her linguistic capital, imposing the use of the SMG during her interactions with significant people in her CD speaking social network in London.

6.3. LI: English, SMG, CD

6.3.1. Marianthi's grandfather

English as a lingua franca

Marianthi's grandfather validates the EL highly and acknowledges its importance both within English society and internationally. He maintains that *'you cannot survive in England without speaking the language...it is the language of the future...wherever you go you can use English and people will understand you'*. He stresses the unquestionable power of the dominant code. He also attributes to it the assets of a *lingua franca* that affords the speaker with linguistic flexibility in a variety of international contexts. Marianthi's grandfather is aware of the communication gaps that occur when a speaker fails to meet the linguistic needs of his social context. His past experiences inform his current perceptions about the authoritative role of the official code in the English society. He recognizes that EL governs most communication within his current place of residence. Thus he accepts and acknowledges its value as the only prestigious code in the host country.

EL: the power of its convertibility to other forms of capital

Marianthi's grandfather draws on dominant LI when expressing his views for the importance of younger children's EL learning. He states accordingly that *'...and you know we managed with the language in a way... ..but for the younger ones the situation is different...they live here and they should learn the language...this is their priority...this does not mean that they should not learn Greek as well...but English is very important, we live in England after all...'*. He clearly emphasizes the value of the younger generation's English linguistic capital. He rationalizes his views by underlining the societal demands imposed by English society. He is aware of the dominant English LI that emphasize the convertibility of the official code to all social, economic and symbolic forms of capital. His aspirations accord with his grandchildren's social development and achievement. Thus he reproduces relevant LI representative of his past

social experiences and his understanding of the English social order. Nevertheless, he does not reject the validity of the heritage code. For him, the *paradox of counterhegemony* is the linguistic scenario that both meets his wishes and affords the speaker social flexibility within different contexts.

The paradox of *counterhegemony*

Marianthi's grandfather does not comply with English monolingualism. Despite the fact that particular social circumstances led to the temporary and partial abandonment of his mother tongue, his current linguistic life involves the revitalization of his HL use. His linguistic behaviour reveals the value he ascribes to his mother tongue. His household constitutes a *counterhegemonic* space wherein the power of the official language is shifted. However, he does not totally reject the use of the EL. But it is the HL, in both forms, that mainly regulates his linguistic exchanges currently. Marianthi's grandfather's linguistic choices reveal the *paradox of counterhegemony*. He rejects HL exclusive use since this could lead to his marginalization. Therefore he prefers to use each channel depending on the prevalent social circumstances and their associated profits in each situation these. His wife's similar ethnolinguistic identity enables him to implement these linguistic choices.

HL: production and reproduction of relevant LI

For Marianthi's grandfather, the preservation of the heritage code is a complex procedure. Marianthi's grandfather is a native CD speaker. He is aware of the differences between the CD and the SMG, and the associated LI and the social stereotypes they promote. Choosing the language to be used during the interview process he stated that *'you do not have to ask which language we are going to use...it will be Greek of course...our language...if I say something that you cannot understand just tell me...I come from a village and I learned the 'kalamaristika' only at school...Toula (his daughter) tells me not to use any more these old words that nobody understands nowadays but I am old and my tongue is used to the 'χορκάτικα' (the chorkatika)... but people don't use it anymore...young people cannot understand it...so I am still learning...Toula teaches me'*. He attributes to the CD the negative loaded label of *'χορκάτικα'*. He also employs the term *'kalamaristika'* referring to the SMG which involves specific social connotations. Marianthi's grandfather is a recipient and at the same time a producer of LI that a) view the CD as the linguistic code used by people who belong to lower social classes and who do not have a solid educational background and b) perceive the SMG as a language which may have the power of the dominant language but fails to inspire solidarity among the members of the Cypriot community when used in informal contexts. Such LI

question the appropriateness of SMG use among native CD speakers and remind us of the dichotomy between status and solidarity as two orthogonal axes of evaluation that regulate social uses of speech (Woolard, 1985). Nevertheless, it was the prestigious form of the HL that dominated Maria's grandfather's linguistic expressions during the interview. He also admits that he behaves similarly when speaking with his daughter and with his grandchildren. A paradoxical phenomenon of *symbolic domination within counterhegemonic spaces* appears.

Symbolic domination within a counterhegemonic space

Marianthi's grandfather's migration to England led to a modification of his LI regarding the code that holds the higher social status. The EL replaced the SMG as the prestigious code in the host society. Nevertheless, the *counterhegemonic* spaces created through the use of the HL promote a new set of LI attributing high value to the use of the heritage code. But the diglossic linguistic heritage makes the language choice within these spaces a complex phenomenon. Accordingly, Marianthi's grandfather refers to 'our language', activating the process of *erasure* and intentionally ignoring the differences between the SMG and the CD (Gal and Irvine, 1995; Irvine and Gal, 2000). The dominant language becomes the 'exterior' (Moschonas, 2004, p. 190), the external force against which the HL has to prove its unity as a condition for its survival. Nevertheless, among the two varieties of the HL, it is the standard form that Marianthi's grandfather employs. The penetrating power of LI about the SMG manages to enact *symbolic domination* even within *counterhegemonic* spaces.

Symbolic domination and the dominant HL ideology

Marianthi's grandfather admits that he speaks in SMG when his grandchildren are present. Such a FLP is heavily informed by his aspirations for the younger generations. Accordingly he states that '*it was different for us and our children when they were young...most of us had not gone to school...the CD was stronger...but now the things have changed...our grandchildren need to know the official language, the language they learn at school...'*. Marianthi's grandfather produces and reproduces LI that give the SMG an unquestionable social value. Such LI are promoted by the Greek Cypriot Mainstream School and the GCS wherein the authoritative role of the SMG is actualized, *saturating the consciousness* (Williams, 1980) of the young learners and their caretakers. Nevertheless, he also admits the alteration of these LI over the years in response to particular sociolinguistic circumstances.

LI responsive to past experiences and future aspirations

Marianthi's grandfather acknowledges that his LI about which code should be learned and used have altered over the years. Accordingly, for him, the CD was valued in the past because few people had access to official schooling. At that time, linguistic market accepted the dialect without hindering speakers' social advancement. But the current sociolinguistic situation entails LI that make social success conditional on the actor's SMG linguistic capital. Therefore, Marianthi's grandfather, drawing on his wish for his grandchildren's future social achievement, complies with the dominant LI and argues for the power of the SMG.

LI about the SMG and the GCS over the years

Notwithstanding, Marianthi's grandfather's current LI regarding the SMG and the GCS as an institution that promotes and legitimates its use, contradict the ones he held during his daughter's community schooling years. He recalls those years by saying '*the teachers in the Greek Community School were coming only from Greece when our children attended lessons there...they could not understand their way of speaking because they knew how to communicate only in the Cypriot dialect...it was hard for them and the teachers refused to show the appropriate understanding...*'. Marianthi's grandfather presents his own justification and empathy for his children's unfavourable position towards the GCS. However, he underlines the need for his grandchildren both to attend lessons at the community school and to learn the linguistic product on offer. Lack of competence in the SMG led to his daughter's withdrawal from the Greek School. However, this same code is the one that he desires his grandchildren to develop.

The paradox, which characterizes his changing LI throughout the years can be rationalized and justified. His actions are defined by his understandings of the social order. In the years when his daughter was a student in the GCS, his main focus was on her achievement in the EMS. Her community schooling had a subordinate role in his educational expectations for his children. Moreover his use of the SMG was limited referring only to interactions with some of the social contacts of the Greek community in London. Nevertheless the linguistic situation both in his home country and his community has altered over the last decades. The number of SMG speaker has multiplied and the official code has penetrated daily interaction between the group members. His wish for his grandchildren's familiarization with this code arises from his interpretation of current linguistic demands. He draws on his representation of the social order to design linguistic practices with the anticipation of specific social profits.

Discussion

Marianthi's grandfather validates highly the EL, the official code in the host country. He identifies this channel as the linguistic medium that can give the speaker linguistic flexibility both in England and internationally. But he does not reject the value of his mother tongue, which dominates his interactions with his partner. His immigrant language is his main linguistic choice when expressing himself orally without further thought and deliberation. Nevertheless, he reproduces LI which place his native language in a subordinate position to the SMG. Despite the fact that he identifies himself as a native CD speaker, he is involved in a process of introducing influences from the SMG to his linguistic repertoire.

However, he justifies this by referring to his future aspirations for his grandchildren. Marianthi's grandfather is aware of the penetrating power of the official code in his home country. Its use is more common among the Greek Cypriots since official education stopped being a luxury and became a product on offer for a variety of social classes. He views the SMG as a linguistic capital that can be converted to other forms of capital. For him, this code meets linguistic needs of modern times since it has the label of the official code, internationally recognized as such. Thus he wishes his grandchildren to learn this form of the HL. His LI respond to his social experiences over the years and to his future aspirations regarding the convertibility of linguistic capital to other forms of social benefits.

6.3.2. Marianthi's grandmother

LI: past experiences, future aspirations and linguistic capital convertibility

Marianthi's grandmother, echoing her husband, identifies the EL as a code of high value in English society. She maintains that the instrumental power of the dominant language intensifies for the younger generations' social development. She says accordingly that *'they need to know good English to survive...if you haven't any previous experience about how life is without knowing the language, you cannot really understand...English is everywhere and you need to know it'*. Marianthi's mother encountered many linguistic difficulties when she first moved to England. Her past experiences inform her current LI. She underlines the need for the younger generation to become skilled users of the official language. She identifies the EL as a valuable linguistic capital giving the speaker social profits within English society. She both produces and reproduces dominant LI.

The paradox of *counterhegemony*-symbolic domination within *counterhegemonic* spaces

Nevertheless, in accordance with her husband's linguistic behaviour, her current linguistic life is CD dominated at the expense of the English code. She is aware of 'the ideology of the standard language' (Milroy, 2007, p. 133) but she continues using the HL with her family members. Her household is a *counterhegemonic space*, wherein the monopoly of the host language is shifted. Marianthi's grandmother's linguistic choices also accord with the phenomenon of the *paradox of counterhegemony*. She revitalized her HL skills but she did not totally abandon the dominant language use. Like her husband, she resists linguistic marginalization by including in her linguistic repertoire a channel that ensures communication with the majority of the population in the host country.

Marianthi's grandmother chose to use a type of CD including many elements of the SMG during the interview. Rationalizing her linguistic choice she claimed that '*we should use our language...I speak the dialect of course and I have been to school for only three years but I am more accustomed to using Greek now...you learn from the TV, the radio...I have changed the way I speak not to my husband or my children but you know with Greeks I meet and I do not know...Tula (her daughter) encourages us to speak like that to the children so as to learn the modern language...when she was young I used only the dialect but now it is different...'*. Marianthi's grandmother started to become extensively familiarized with the SMG when satellite television began broadcasting Greek and Cypriot channels using this language. The media as powerful institutions operate as indicators of which language is the legitimate one. They promote an implicit linguistic hegemony, taking advantage of their influential power over their audiences.

Marianthi's grandmother, similarly to her husband, exercises alternative *counterhegemonic* linguistic practices in two senses: first she persists in using the HL under a dominant English context and secondly she insists on keeping the CD alive, resisting SMG dominance. Nevertheless, bending to her daughters' linguistic wishes, she appears to admit to the power of a *linguistic hegemony* that exists and develops within her *counterhegemonic* household. The superiority of the SMG has *saturated her consciousness* (Williams, 1980) and she appears symbolically dominated (Bourdieu, 1991). However, both her interactions with her husband and with some members of the Greek Cypriot community challenge the power of the two prestigious codes. In these communicative occasions, the LI that emphasize the feelings of solidarity between co speakers over-exceed the power of the dominant LI. Such LI are affect laden inspiring a sense of common experiences and shared background knowledge.

Discussion

Marianthi's grandmother admits the indisputable power of the EL within the host country and both produces and reproduces relevant LI. But she does not comply with English monolingualism. She supports and encourages bilingualism by ensuring that her household operates as a safe space wherein the HL use proliferates. Nevertheless she allies with SMG dominant LI to the extent that she moderates her linguistic behaviour by using influences from the standard form of her HL. Thus, her household turns from a *counterhegemonic space* to a *hegemonic* one which may challenge the monopoly of the EL but remains informed by the social powers which legitimate the SMG.

Discussion on both Marianthi's maternal grandparents' LI

Both Marianthi's grandparents ally with dominant LI that validate the official codes over the dialect. Their language conceptions are informed by the social benefits afforded to the speaker of each code. Moreover, both produce and reproduce multiple LI. This multiplicity involves the creation of LI that attribute to each language a different value depending on the speakers' generational status. So Marianthi's grandparents recognize the value of the SMG for their grandchildren's future social advancement. But they attribute high value to the CD with reference to their personal social expectations. Thus, the LI they produce and reproduce can be contradictory, 'a ubiquitous set of diverse beliefs' (Kroskrity, 2004, p. 498).

6.3.3. Marianthi's mother

Submitting to the dominant language ideology

Marianthi's mother maintains that '*you cannot go on without learning the EL*'. She recalls her early educational experiences in the EMS when her competency in the target language was poor, characterized by many influences from the CD: '*I had to learn English very fast and I felt that I couldn't go on without it*'. She explains that English is her strongest language and her primary or exclusive linguistic choice within specific social contexts, accommodating to her interlocutors' needs: '*I use English at work, with my husband, with most of my friends, some relatives and most of the times with my children...you know for me that I was raised in England and I went to the English school, English is more easy to use*'. Marianthi's mother clearly expresses the power of the dominant language in her daily interactions. This channel gradually acquired the strength of a native language. It is her main linguistic choice and the code she is more confident to use. Her partner's linguistic identity intensifies the authority and the

supremacy of English. Thus, she complies with the dominant LI that ascribe to the EL an unchallenged value within the English society.

HL convertible to a symbolic capital

Marianthi's mother grew up as a bilingual speaker. She was raised up in a household where both the CD and the EL were used. The former language is associated with her early socialization in England but mainly in her parents' home country. It inspires her feelings of emotional attachment with her relatives in Cyprus. Her grandparents hold a prominent position among the relatives who she visited during her summer holidays on the island. As she underlines '*I loved my grandparents very much and I loved Cyprus and the language through them*'. Thus for Marianthi's mother the CD holds a deep sentimental value as a symbol of her special bond with significant figures, 'a symbol of...{her}...intimate relationships' (Tannenbaum, 2005, p. 248). Her LI about the dialect are affect laden, putting emphasis on its convertibility to a symbolic capital of childhood memories with beloved family members.

HL use enacting ties to ethnic identity

Marianthi's mother produces and reproduces HLI that view the language as an index of a particular social identity. She enacts the process of *iconization*, conceiving of the heritage code as an iconic representation of group membership (Gal and Irvine, 1995; Irvine and Gal, 2000). For her, the HL is a 'core value' of her Greek Cypriot heritage (Smolitz, 1999). Therefore, the group members can prove their 'authenticity' by using the legitimate code for their community. Marianthi's mother appears entangled within the 'positioning of authenticity' attributing inherent references to her Greek Cypriot group (Bucholtz, 2003). She produces and reproduces LI deeply rooted in actors' 'saturated' cultural representations since the early years of nation state foundation (Williams, 1980; Kroskrity, 2004). Such conceptions about languages are heavily informed by the nationalistic notion of one language-one culture-one identity. Marianthi's mother, submitting to such powerful discourses, criticises other members of the Greek Cypriot community in London by stating that '*they don't try to use the language and they do not motivate their children to use it... they have turned to English*'.

Symbolic domination within a counterhegemonic space

Marianthi's mother submits to the English dominant LI, acknowledging their penetration and authority, but her linguistic behaviour proposes an alternative to English hegemony. She chose to use the HL during the interview. She employed a high variety of the CD enriched by many elements from the SMG. She is aware of the differences between the two linguistic codes and

says that *'there is a difference...Greek is official, it is the language they learn in the Greek School, I was raised by parents who speak the dialect and I can see the difference. The accent and some words are said differently...but the main thing is to be able to communicate, isn't it?'*. Marianthi's mother produces and reproduces LI that *erase* the disparities between the two varieties. She recognizes the status held by the SMG as an official language. But she does not reject the value of the CD, arguing for its linguistic similarity to the standard variety. Such a practice is commented on by Bourdieu (1991), who maintains that the speaker who has managed to master the legitimate language and experiences the recognition for having done so, accepts language differentiation without the tendency to devalue the low variety.

Nevertheless she puts effort into improving her accent and her vocabulary using influences from the SMG. Thus she submits to the dominant LI that impose the use of the SMG as the legitimate form of expression. She appears *symbolically dominated* and enacts the *paradox of counterhegemony*. She is the recipient and the producer of LI that see the dialect as a subordinate code. While she tends to *erase* the differences between the two linguistic mediums, she 'modernizes' her oral expressions in favour of the standard variety. But for her submission to the dominant LI does not concern only her own linguistic choices. She operates as an agent imposing such cultural conceptions by inviting her parents to participate in this process. She appears as a representative of SMG legitimization with the drive to impose its impact even on her parents' linguistic identity. Her main argument for such requirement concerns her children's familiarization with an official code which will afford them the label of being proficient at a language which is widely recognized and accepted as a valid qualification.

Discussion

Marianthi's mother allies with the English dominant LI as a native English speaker. But she expresses divergent beliefs about the two codes associated with her linguistic heritage. She attributes a deep emotional value to the CD but she complies with the SMG LI that promote the instrumentality of the standard variety. She insists on her children's learning a language which she herself refused to speak at a young age. The alteration of her LI over the years reveals a paradox. Her perceptions about which code should be used, maintained and transmitted to the younger generation, are informed by the prevalent social conditions, her understanding of the demands on each age group and her future aspirations. She views languages as products which offer the speaker particular benefits. Her LI are informed by her past experiences and her future wishes both for herself and for her children. Marianthi's mother supports the *counterhegemonic spaces* of her own and her parents' household.

Nevertheless, at the same time she facilitates the exercise of the dominant LI, bending to their will. Moreover, she puts effort into persuading her parents and her children to act accordingly scrutinising and moderating their linguistic behaviour. Consequently she becomes the founder of a *hegemonic phenomenon* of the standard form of her HL which functions as a *counterhegemonic practice* for the dominant language in the host country.

6.3.4. Marianthi

Submitting to the dominant language ideology

Marianthi lives in a home context where the main vehicle of communication is the EL which she characterizes as 'my language'. She is the recipient of dominant LI produced and legitimated within the EMS. As Bourdieu (1991) maintains 'this institution has the monopoly in the large-scale production of producers /consumers' and consequently in the reproduction of a market where the dominant language is recognized as the only legitimate linguistic capital (p. 57). For her, the EL is the code used for meeting the majority of her linguistic needs. She perceives this code as her mother tongue and its high evaluation is undoubted and solid: '*English is my language...how can you be in England without speaking English...what would you do?...I know English and I can go to school...to speak to my friends...to read...to write...I am so happy I speak this language....my life would be very hard without it*'. Marianthi experiences the social benefits associated with the EL use in the English context. She holds the linguistic capital necessary for moving with flexibility in her social environment.

HL: challenging its value

Marianthi's linguistic repertoire may be English dominated, but she is growing up receiving linguistic stimuli from two additional channels of communication: the SMG and the CD. She participates in the *counterhegemonic* procedure initiated by her grandparents and her mother. She admits using her HL when interacting with her mother, her grandparents and her relatives in Cyprus who are monolingual speakers of the heritage code. However, she maintains that 'it is not important to learn Greek because you do not need it' since '*I can always tell stuff in English to the people who speak Greek to me in England*'. The majority of Marianthi's social networks both in England and in Cyprus consist of bilingual speakers. Her advanced receptive skills provide her with the opportunity to decode the messages articulated by her interlocutors. Therefore, for her, the exclusive use of English linguistic capital can fulfil her communication needs even in Cyprus since the proliferation of this code on the island operates counterproductively for her exclusive use of the HL. This maximizes the instrumental

value of English, creating powerful LI that conceive it as the ultimate linguistic medium for successful social interaction. Marianthi is both the recipient and the producer of dominant LI which construct the EL as the only powerful linguistic medium in the English context and in the majority of her socialization spaces in Cyprus. Such, dominant discourses are implicitly or explicitly conveyed, communicated, spread and transferred by her mainstream schooling, the media and the policy makers in her place of residence and in her grandparents' homeland. Thus Marianthi's LI about the HL undervalue its convertibility to a social capital and challenge its instrumental value.

HL use convertible to a symbolic capital

Marianthi may challenge the value of the HL but she admits to its convertibility to a symbolic capital of recognition and satisfaction by her grandparents and her mother. She states accordingly that *'my grandparents want me to speak Greek....my mother likes it when I speak Greek with her family...and she is impressed...and she is proud of me'*. She also reports her own feelings when successfully employing the heritage code. She says that *'...when I manage to communicate with Greek people, I feel I have achieved something...and I feel pleased and proud....'* So, Marianthi reveals the emotional value she ascribes to the HL. However, she does not clarify which form of the HL. She employs the umbrella term 'Greek'. This may be linked to LI that underline the significance of HL use, irrespectively of the form, as a form of resistance to EL dominance. Thus, Marianthi seems entangled within multiple LI that either promote HL use or disqualify its validity.

LI: ties of SMG to aesthetics

Woolard (1998) argues that LI enact ties to aesthetics. Similarly, Marianthi (addressing the teacher/researcher) reports that *'I do not like to speak Greek with my mother because it is embarrassing the way she speaks...it is the way she says the words...it is the way she pronounces them...and I don't like it...it is not like the way you speak...it is different and I don't like it so much...I prefer your way of pronouncing the words...they way you speak...'*. Marianthi attributes better aesthetic qualities to the language she learns in her community schooling. She expresses her preference for the GCS teacher's style of speaking. She reproduces LI created and promoted by her mother. As she admits *'you know expressions like 'ti kamnes' (how are you? -CD)...she told me the other day to stop using this -n- in the middle of the word*

*because it is the right way of saying the word*¹⁹... my mother always asks me how you (the teacher) say the words to prove them right...'. Marianthi's mother prompts her daughter to become *symbolically dominated*. Marianthi is the recipient of her mother's imposed discourse which values the teachers' 'authentic' utterances over any other HL input. The young student has internalized her main caretaker's suggestions and views. Marianthi seems to submit to the legitimization of the language taught in the GCS. She identifies it as a linguistic medium with carries greater charm and attraction than her mother's accent.

Discussion

Marianthi appears *symbolically dominated* producing and reproducing dominant LI about both the EL and the SMG. For her, the former code holds an uncontested value since it is an effective communicative tool ensuring successful social interaction in different sociolinguistic contexts. She also ascribes superior aesthetic qualities to the standard variety of her HL as prompted by her mother's discourses. Marianthi moves between social contexts which endorse dominant LI. Her linguistic beliefs ally with the *paradox of counterhegemony* since her resistance to dominant English LI involves the parallel use of the HL. Nevertheless, even when using the heritage code she submits to a different set of dominant LI created in favour of the SMG.

6.4. Family Language Policy: Marianthi's family

Below I discuss the FLP employed by Marianthi's family. I will illustrate each participant's language practices with reference to the HL transmission efforts. Each member of the older generation contributes linguistically in forming the FLP. The informative power of their LI is evident throughout their accounts. Nevertheless there is a complex interrelationship between LI, employed FLP and sociohistorical circumstances. The ever changing social life has an impact on imported LI which inform FLP. Therefore FLP is not a static process but is affected by the transformative power of the social world. It is a process receiving influences from perceived social structures mediated by the social actor's LI along with their personal interests and ambitions.

¹⁹ The expression 'how are you?' translates to 'ti kamnis?' when the CD is used and to 'ti kanis?' when the SMG is employed.

6.4.1. FLP: Marianthi's grandfather's linguistic contribution

HL use deterioration

Marianthi's grandfather admits that the English code dominated the FLP implemented when his children were young. Both grandparents tried to advance their EL skills, accepting and prompting their children's linguistic help after their introduction to the official schooling. They learned as *novices* next to their children. Both parents and children were co learners with a common object, their advancement in the English society both linguistically and professionally. However, the HL use was not totally abandoned but largely eliminated and confined. His daughters managed to become familiar with the heritage code both within their home context and within the Cypriot context during their summer holidays. Marianthi's grandfather rationalizes the FLP he employed raising his children, by underscoring the social pressure for rapid linguistic adaptation. He states that '*...back then it wasn't a matter of choosing...it was a need...we had to because we did not have any other option...we were not offered another option...'*

Promoting the bilingualism of younger generations

Marianthi's grandfather admits to greater use of his mother tongue with his grandchildren than with his children. His identification with the role of the grandfather had an impact on his linguistic contribution to the FLP with reference to his grandchildren's HL learning and development. His linguistic choices became HL dominated. He reports that '*I try to speak Greek to them as much as I can...when my grandchildren were younger...I mean before going to the English school, we used only Greek with them... they replied back using both languages...but after they started school their replies are always in English...but we have never stopped using Greek with them...we will not make the same mistake we did with our children...we use mainly Greek with them...some English as well but mainly Greek'*. Marianthi's grandfather expresses regret for submitting to the dominant ideologies that viewed young children's bilingualism as a problem and not as a benefit in the past. He currently encourages his grandchildren's parallel use of both languages. He consciously resists the EL dominance, promoting his grandchildren's bilingual capital.

SMG hegemony

However, Marianthi's grandfather's linguistic contribution to his FLP has experienced a significant alteration in recent years. He has deliberately starting using references from the SMG when addressing his grandchildren. But such a linguistic choice is exclusively informed by

his aspiration for his grandchildren's linguistic future. He considers the standard variety of his HL a valuable linguistic capital, giving the speaker social recognition and advancement. Thus, his use of mother tongue shifts when his grandchildren are present. The SMG occupies the position of the legitimate language. This is the one which his grandchildren are called to acquire so as to ensure their official recognition as competent speakers of a language. The dialect cannot afford the speaker the power of competency proved by authorized documents.

Continuous and consistent use of HL

Marianthi's grandfather's efforts regarding HLM do not comprise a strategic plan of specific linguistic actions. He does not describe specific practices which engage the younger generations in particular communicative instances that demand the exclusive use of the heritage channel. He accepts the use of the EL during his linguistic interactions with his grandchildren. For him, the continuous and consistent use of the HL when addressing his grandchildren is the mediating tool for successful HLM. His past experiences suggest that his children managed to learn the HL under a FLP that involved their limited exposure to relevant linguistic stimuli. Thus he expects his current FLP involving greater HL use to have a beneficial impact on his grandchildren's linguistic capital.

Discussion

Marianthi's grandfather's FLP has undergone alterations over the years because of his aspirations for the younger generation's linguistic development. He conceives of languages as capitals which can be exchanged for desired social benefits. Thus the EL monopolized his linguistic exchanges with his children in the past. In the same sense, the SMG has started dominating his interactions with his grandchildren in current years. But these linguistic decisions are relevant to his LI that mediate social structure and forms of talk (Woolard, 1998; Kroskrity, 2004). His linguistic choices interact with social power and dominant LI imposing specific linguistic identities as valuable. Marianthi's grandfather's linguistic practices may accord with or may contest such dominant discourses depending on his personal interest and future ambitions for the social achievement of significant others.

6.4.2. FLP: Marianthi's grandmother's linguistic contribution

Promoting bilingualism

Marianthi's grandmother, similarly to her husband, reports that her main linguistic practice for HLM refers to the provision of a rich oral linguistic capital for her grandchildren. Echoing her

husband, she admits limited HL use with her children in the past. She expresses her high linguistic expectations from her grandchildren's current rich exposure to the heritage code by saying that *'I use only Greek with them...and you know just this makes a difference for them....hearing the language is the most important for me...my children managed to learn our language by hearing just a percentage of what our grandchildren hear from us....but they answer back in English...'*. However, Marianthi's grandmother does not only accept her grandchildren's dominant language use during their interaction but she also employs the same code when she needs to exchange meanings that demand quick responses. Accordingly, she explains that *'...when there is a lack of time and we need to communicate I use English with them...if we are on our way to school and I have to ask her if she got her scarf I have to use English because I need a quick answer from them...'*

HL capital enrichment through cultural familiarization

Notwithstanding, she maintains that the HL is almost exclusively used when interacting with her grandchildren in her home context. She engages them in activities that provide for both their linguistic development and their familiarization with cultural elements identified with their Greek Cypriot heritage. She describes accordingly that *'...when I am cooking and I have them around I ask for their help and we cook together....I ask them to repeat the names of everything I use...Marianthi is trying but she mixes English and Greek at the same time....but she is trying and I reward her effort even when she uses some English words...'*. Marianthi's grandmother's description reveals her role as a linguistic and a cultural mediator, enriching the younger generation's social experiences with alternative ways of 'doing things' identified with their Greek Cypriot background. The young children are prompted to learn as novices both her way of making food and the heritage linguistic elements. Their grandmother's house constitutes a safe linguistic space allowing the use of more than one linguistic code. Nevertheless, it is the HL that occupies the position of the legitimate language. The phenomenon of *counterhegemony* is actualized and the young children gain experience of occurrences wherein the unquestionable power of the EL is shifted. The dominant language use is both accepted and allowed but it does not meet their grandmother's desires and wishes.

SMG hegemony

Marianthi's grandmother, similarly to her husband and responding to her daughter's request, has also enriched her oral productions with references from the SMG when interacting with her grandchildren. In agreement with her husband, she recognizes the power of the SMG. But, her admission of its authority is provisional, informed by her children's academic and

professional achievement. For her, the standard form is associated with social success within a labour market which officially recognizes and subsequently imposes and defines the linguistic forms which are valued and appreciated. The SMG gives the speaker social benefits that she considers significant for the younger generations but not for her own social life.

Discussion

Marianthi's grandmother puts effort into maintaining the immigrant code. Her contribution to the FLP refers to the continuous and almost exclusive use of the HL when addressing her grandchildren. Her linguistic behaviour bears great similarities with her husband's self reported linguistic practices regarding the younger generation's learning of the heritage channel. Moreover, Marianthi's grandmother reports specific events she initiates so as to engage her granddaughters both with the HL and with their Greek Cypriot cultural background. The EL is always in play. Its use is accepted but not encouraged. Both spouses admit the difficulties of their endeavour within dominant English society. The grandfather underlines that *'...it is very hard to persuade them to use the language but we are doing our best'*. His wife maintains that *'...we have great difficulties but we keep trying...but EL always comes out ahead'*. Despite the drawbacks, both grandparents persist in their attempts to retain the immigrant code. Their contribution to the FLP operates counter to the dominant language hegemony, introducing the young children to alternative ways of being in the English dominant society.

6.4.3. FLP: Marianthi's mother's contribution

Promoting and encouraging bilingualism

Marianthi's mother admits that her household is an English dominant space. The latter results from her husband's linguistic identity. He is of a Sicilian background. The EL is the two spouses' common communicative code. As Marianthi's mother explains *'my husband doesn't speak Greek and we use English when we are talking to each other...'*. But she does not comply with English monolingualism when interacting with her daughter. She reports that *'I am using mainly English when speaking to Marianthi and sometimes Greek, it depends...'*. Marianthi's mother encourages her daughter' bilingualism by using the HL when addressing her. Her husband both approves and encourages her endeavour to maintain the heritage code. He states accordingly that *'Toula (his wife's name) and her parents try a lot...they try for the children and they want to hear them using the language...I like it a lot...I like what they are doing....I wish my mother was more persistent when I was young so as to learn better...like*

Toula and her parents do... Marianthi's father clearly acknowledges her wife's and her parents' difficult enterprise. He approves of their FLP and especially their persistence in using the immigrant code. Despite the fact that his current linguistic identity stems from English monolingualism, he expresses his satisfaction about his children's bilingualism. His appreciation of the latter reinforces Marianthi's mother's motivation to sustain her strenuous task.

Investing in the grandparents' linguistic help

Grandparents constitute a vital HL resource for younger generations (Kenner et al. 2007; Kamo, 1998, Ishizawa, 2004, Ruby, 2012). Marianthi's mother identifies her parents as two significant figures who both provide for the children's HL development and motivate her own efforts for HLM. She recognizes and appreciates their linguistic support by saying that *'...but we use only Greek when my parents are present...my parents help a lot with the language...it would be even harder for me if I hadn't my parents to support me...I am getting motivation from my parents ...'*. Marianthi's mother accepts that her parents are the primary source of her children's HL linguistic capital. Therefore she puts effort into maintaining daily contact with them. This facilitates the young children's regular and consistent contact with the immigrant code.

Promoting interactions with heritage monolingual speakers in London

Marianthi's mother reports her feelings of satisfaction when engaging her children in communicative situations that demand HL use. She says that *'the children use the language with my aunts and uncles when they pay visits ...I have an aunt who speaks only Greek and this helps the children very much...they are forced to use the language each time they meet her and I can see them trying a lot...I really enjoy seeing them trying and managing to communicate with our relatives'*. Marianthi's mother enjoys her daughters' achievement in establishing successful communication with monolingual speakers. She considers such encounters motivating for their HL development. Furthermore, both children gain experience of the convertibility of their HL linguistic capital to a social capital which extends even to monolingual social contacts. Many studies have shown that younger generation's HL interactions with monolingual members of the extended family are conducive to HL use and HLM (Cavalirro, 2005; Pauwels, 2005).

Prompting sociolinguistic experiences in ethnic institutions in London

Marianthi's mother prompts her whole family's participation in the Greek Orthodox Church services on a regular basis. She states that *'we try to go to church every other Sunday...I want the children to know our way of doing things...and you know we meet other Greek Cypriots there...and they hear the language and they try to use it when somebody speaks to them...'*. She identifies the church as a place that provides for her children's HL further development. Moreover, she considers this religious institution as a space where the younger generations can gain familiarization with the religious aspect of their immigrant background. Her aim is to involve them in activities which she identifies as Greek Cypriot and, for her, they mark the *difference* of their background.

Maria's mother attributes a high value to her children's ethnic socialization through their attendance at the church services. She even criticizes members of the Greek and Greek Cypriot community who fail to meet such 'group belonging requirements'. She underlines that *'...they do not come to church to meet other Greek Cypriots... they have turned to English...they just do not care...and you know most of them they are not so close with their parents because if the family members are very close to each other they do all this and they keep both the language and the culture alive...'*. For, Marianthi's mother, both the HLM and the Greek religion constitute the 'core values' of her background (Smolicz, 1999). She considers both of them as 'marks of authenticity' that set the boundaries between 'us' and 'them' and prove the cultural distinctiveness of the group. Furthermore, she believes in an essential link between a strong family relationship and successful HLM. The latter is informed by her own experience since her parents have a prominent role in her life complementing her efforts for HLM.

Investing in regular visits to homeland

Marianthi's mother considers the regular trips to Cyprus beneficial for children's HL capital development. She argues that *'we also visit Cyprus and the children are forced in a way to use the language during our holidays...we stay there for two or three weeks...the children like it very much...I can see that they can speak...that all these years of effort have helped them...that they have learnt things...that they hear and they keep things and when they have to use them they do so... I can hear them using the language when we are in Cyprus...each time they learn more...within two weeks they manage to use the language even more and this makes me very proud...we come back and they are very improved...'*. She reveals her feelings about her children's HL use when acting and interacting within the Cypriot context. The young family

members are immersed into the HL enriching their linguistic capital while converting it to a wide network of social contacts in their parents' homeland.

Submitting the hegemony of official HL varieties

A significant feature of Marianthi's mother's contribution to the FLP is her submission to SMG hegemony. As explained in the previous section, she appears *symbolically dominated* by attributing higher value to the standard variety of her HL than to the CD. Her husband accords with her views about which code should be transmitted to the younger generation. He has abandoned his heritage channel. Marianthi's mother justifies his decision by reporting that '*...he speaks a kind of dialect... he does not want our children to learn the dialect...he wants them to learn the official Italian language*'. Marianthi's father's linguistic identity bears similarities with his wife's. He also considers his heritage channel as a subordinate variety. He is also *symbolically dominated* submitting to dominant ideologies that devalue the dialect while ascribing authority and legitimacy to the standard variety. Thus, both spouses' LI and linguistic behaviour contribute to a FLP where the official form of the HL is highly appreciated at the expense of the dialectic forms.

GCS: homework involvement

Marianthi's mother employs exclusively the heritage code when helping Marianthi with her GCS homework. This holds the following three interrelated implications for her contribution to FLP: a) she attributes great importance to her daughter's community schooling and the linguistic product on offer, b) she has the opportunity to develop both her own and her daughter's SMG linguistic capital²⁰ and c) she can draw on the authority of the written text to prompt her daughter to use the 'correct' linguistic forms. So, the SMG, 'which is identified with correct language, as opposed to the implicitly inferior conversational language, acquires the force of law' (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 49) and creates a SMG *hegemony* within a *counterhegemonic* space. Mother and daughter exercise their resistance to the English dominant language monopoly by submitting to the power of a different dominant channel to that of the host country.

Discussion

Marianthi's mother's contribution to the FLP may not entail her exclusive use of the HL but she puts great effort into creating opportunities for her children's exposure to the heritage code.

²⁰ The textbooks provided to the students by the GCS use exclusively the SMG.

She initiates both interactions with speakers and visits to social contexts that promote HL use and develop further HL capital. However, being entangled within dominant LI she induces SMG learning and use. Her husband approves her effort and admires her systematic endeavour. Both spouses show a conditional encouragement of their children's bilingualism, revealing their preference for the standard variety of their HLs.

6.4.4. FLP: Marianthi's positioning

In the following paragraphs I will analyse Marianthi's responses to her grandparents' and her mother's language practices that contribute to the formation of the FLP with reference to the HLM. How does Marianthi view her caretakers' interventions for HLM? What are the interventions that she considers beneficial for her HL learning and development?

Reflecting on her English dominant linguistic capital

Marianthi rationalizes her HL skills by commenting that *'my mother knows to speak Greek because she used to speak a lot with her parents, but for me it is different because my dad is Italian and he cannot speak Greek...so my parents use English and I use English with them'*. Marianthi is aware of the home linguistic circumstances that would prove fruitful for HL learning and development. She attributes her dominant English skills to her parents' linguistic identities. She reveals that the main channel of communication with her parents is the EL. Nevertheless, she admits that *'I use Greek with my mother sometimes'*. However, she maintains that the use of the HL with her mother is not a systematic pattern of linguistic behaviour but an alternative way of communication *'when {she doesn't} want {her} father to hear what {she is} saying'*.

The Grandparents: primary HL recourse and motivational force for HL use

Marianthi is aware of the fact that her grandparents' endeavour to provide for her HL learning has been happening since her early childhood. She acknowledges that the reduction of the time spent with them when she started school had an impact on her HL skills. She identifies her grandparents as her primary HL resource. Moreover, she admits that their presence operates as a motivational force for her HL use. She admits that *'I use mainly Greek when my grandparents are at home...that means every afternoon...almost every afternoon...my grandparents speak almost always in Greek to me...with my grandparents it is different...they try to make me speak the language...even when they are in Cyprus and they phone me they want me to speak Greek to them'*. Marianthi argues for the efficiency of her grandparents'

contribution to the FLP regarding her HL use. She respects their wish and responds to their inducement by drawing on the heritage code during their linguistic interactions.

SMG interventions

Both Marianthi's grandparents' and her mother's contribution to the FLP include linguistic practices in favour of SMG use. Nevertheless, Marianthi reveals her different responses her caretakers' interventions. So, as previously reported (p. 91-92), she reproduces dominant LI that promote the belief that the SMG carries higher aesthetic qualities than the CD. She draws on her mother's discourse that ascribes the power of the legitimate language to the GCS teacher's form of talk. Therefore, Marianthi devalues her mother's spoken language while attributing high value to that of her teacher. Nevertheless, she resists allying to these LI when she refers to her linguistic encounters with her grandparents. Marianthi describes their different way of prompting the SMG use by saying '*...you know my grandparents don't make a big deal about that...we speak the way we used to but my mother gets crazy sometimes... but I still use it with my grandparents the way it is....*'.

Marianthi explains that her grandparents' main concern is to encourage the HL use regardless of its form. She describes that '*they try to make me to speak Greek...if I say, for example, 'no' they say to me 'not no' but 'ohi' (no-SMG) and they say to me to use more Greek and to repeat the English words using Greek...'*. Her grandparents' do not persist in correcting her CD linguistic productions. Their intervention consists of suggesting SMG words instead of EL ones. Thus, they promote LI that value the SMG over the dominant code. The CD use is not rejected or *misrecognized* as a low value linguistic choice. Therefore, Marianthi perceives the dialect as a vital linguistic capital that sustains the close bond with her grandparents. Her emotional attachment to such significant figures reinforces her resistance to LI that undervalue their form of talk.

HL use with other HL socialization agents within the English context

Overseas visitors from the home country

Pauwels (2005) identifies immigrant's monolingual visitors from their home country as significant providers for HL use and reinforcement. Similarly, Marianthi, echoing her mother, comments that '*...sometimes we have visitors from Cyprus...you know uncles, aunts and other relatives who do not actually speak English...and I have to use Greek with them...'*. Such social experiences motivate her to employ her HL capital since it appears as the only medium convertible to a social capital. Moreover, she gets involved in *counterhegemonic*

communicative instances wherein the dominance of the EL is shifted. Consequently, Marianthi enriches her LI repertoire with social encounters that challenge the authority of the dominant language by attributing high value to the heritage code.

Sociolinguistic experiences in ethnic institutions in London

Attending the Greek Orthodox Church

Marianthi maintains that *'we see many people at the church but I do not get to speak to them much...we just speak for a bit and then we go'*. She admits that even the short linguistic encounters with other members of the community instigate HL use. So, she has the opportunity both to practice her HL oral skills and to gain experience by establishing communication with a variety of speakers. The church context acts as a *counterhegemonic* space wherein the heritage code obtains status and recognition.

GCS

Marianthi identifies the GCS as a setting that supports her HL use. She says that *'I use Greek when I am at the Greek School...well I try to but I do not speak all the time...'*. Her community schooling provides her with rich linguistic stimuli aiming to develop all four skills in the SMG. It is a *counterhegemonic* space wherein a paradox appears since it simultaneously challenges and complies with dominant language ideology. Its operation contests the penetrating power of the EL while ascribing high value to the standard HL variety at the expense of the CD. The dialect seems powerless and its value is questioned. Relevant LI are produced and transmitted to the young learners.

Cypriot context: converting HL capital to other forms of capital

Marianthi admits that her regular visits to Cyprus operate productively for her HL use. Pauwels (2005) underlines the positive effect of such visits on speakers' HL capital. Marianthi reports that *'I always use Greek when I go to Cyprus...not always but I speak mainly Greek when I am in Cyprus because I am with people I enjoy to meet and I want to speak Greek with them...I have family there and some friends...and some people I know speak only Greek, so I have to speak Greek...I cannot just stand and look at them...'*. Marianthi reveals her high motivation to use the heritage code in her grandparents' homeland. There, she has the opportunity to use the immigrant code with a variety of speakers. She can practise her linguistic skills and enrich her linguistic capital. Moreover, she can employ her HL linguistic capital and convert it to a wide network of social contacts. Furthermore, she can transform her HL skills to a symbolic capital of close bonds with special friends and members of her extended family. Nevertheless,

Marianthi's visits to Cyprus do not exclude the use of her dominant language. She explains that '*my cousins and the friends I have in Cyprus can speak English...they learn English at school...so I can speak Greek and English to them...and you can hear people using English at the shops...and everyone understands English, even the older people*'. Marianthi's utterances confirm the spread of the EL in Cyprus and its penetrating power as a *lingua franca*. Despite the fact that the HL does not exclusively inform her linguistic exchanges on the island, she becomes familiarized with a social context wherein the power of her dominant language is shifted.

Discussion

Marianthi describes the sociolinguistic contexts that promote her HL learning and development. She also identifies the actors who both provide for her heritage code enrichment and motivate its use. For her, her grandparents hold a prominent position among her immigrant language co speakers. The LI she creates and promotes for the CD are affect laden, informed by her emotional attachment to them. Thus despite the fact that she reproduces dominant SMG LI, she resists their power when referring to her grandparents CD linguistic capital. Marianthi moves across *counterhegemonic* spaces both in England and in Cyprus. She gains social experiences of converting her HL capital to both a social and a symbolic capital. The latter both develops further her HL skills and motivates her to invest time and effort in HL learning. Moreover, it promotes LI that view the heritage channel as a valuable linguistic tool for not only effective but also socially and emotionally beneficial interaction.

6.5. Greek Community School: perceptions and expectations

The FLP involves both grandparents' and parents' choices of linguistic practices that provide for HL learning. It includes intervention practices that can support the latter. Both the first and the second generations include the GCS as part of their HLM practices. Below, I analyze their perceptions about this institution along with their expectations from its attendance. My aim is to explore the rationale of its incorporation in the FLP despite the fact that both Marianthi's mother in the past and Marianthi currently express negative views about their experiences there. So, what are the participants' views about the role of the GCS? How does this area of their FLP relate to their LI?

6.5.1. Marianthi's grandfather

LI and GCS: contestation versus submission

Marianthi's grandfather perceives the GCS as an educational institution that enables the development of all four HL skills. Commenting on his daughter's current HL skills, he underlines that *'she is very good in speaking and in reading the language but she has great difficulties in writing a text or an official letter in Greek...this happens of course because she refused to go to the Greek school...your parents cannot teach you this...it is the school that offers this kind of knowledge...'*. Marianthi's grandfather supports the operation of the GCS and recognizes the linguistic benefits stemming from its attendance. As previously reported, his LI about the GCS and the linguistic product on offer have changed over the years, informed by his aspirations for the younger generations' future advancement. Nevertheless, Maria's grandfather never stopped appreciating community education. It is the degree his identification with the LI produced and reproduced within the GCS that has altered over the years. So, he contested the power of the GCS's dominant discourses in the past, due to his social experiences and interests at that time. However, for him, the same discourses appear incontestable and therefore he finds his submission to them unavoidable now.

GCS: the past and the present

Marianthi's grandfather encouraged his daughter's participation in the GCS and tried to deter her withdrawal. However, he rationalizes her decision by describing the difficulties that young community language learners encountered in the past. He reports accordingly that *'the children were too tired to go to the Greek school...they didn't enjoy going...Toula (his daughter) was annoyed each time she had to tell her classmates that she had spent her day at the Greek School while the other children had done more exciting stuff...we had great difficulties in persuading her to attend the lessons...there wasn't an option about which days to attend, it was strictly on Saturdays... and the children wanted to see their friends...and the community was very small back then...there were not many students, but all the children were in the same class due to the lack of teachers...'*. Marianthi's grandfather describes the practical problems arising from the community school's day of operation, its timetable, and the lack of both students and trained teachers. He puts emphasis on his daughter's *sense of difference* to her peer group, due to this extra-curricular activity. He also reveals the young student's difficulty in identifying with this position of 'otherness' that involved additional homework and less free time.

Notwithstanding, Marianthi's grandfather now considers the GCS an appealing education setting for young learners. He reports that *'nowadays they organize shows, parties, various events like dinners and dancing which help the children to enjoy their time at the Greek school and they look forward to all these...'*. For him, the 'modern' GCS is different to the old, problematic institution that his daughter rejected years ago. The students have the opportunity to participate in school events that stimulate their interest and excitement. More importantly, the GCS provides for SMG language learning with reference to all four linguistic skills. The latter is, for Marianthi's grandfather, the ultimate aspiration for his grandchildren's linguistic future.

Discussion

Marianthi's grandfather reports his approval of the 'modern' GCS. Such an institution meets his expectations for his granddaughter's HL proficiency since it provides for all four SMG skills. His past experiences, formed when his daughter attended her community schooling, were affected by her feelings of disappointment, frustration and rejection. Nevertheless, the current situation is considerably different. Marianthi's grandfather produces and reproduces LI that validate the code on offer in the GCS. However, this identification is a recent phenomenon. He admits the changeability of his LI about the GCS and the SMG since they are created in the interest of the younger generation's future social advancement and the demands of the linguistic market defined by particular sociohistorical circumstances.

6.5.2. Marianthi's grandmother

GCS: the past, the present and the paradox of her LI changeability within the years

Marianthi's grandmother, echoing her husband, describes her daughter's negative GCS educational experiences in the past *'the teachers spoke very fast and she could not understand them...she almost stopped using our language because of her disappointment and anger...she was confused...she did not know what was happening...why she couldn't understand the Greek teacher...and this made things worse...she already didn't like wasting her Saturdays...she had a very important reason with what happened with the teachers'*. Like her husband, she expresses the view that her daughter's community schooling operated in a counterproductive way for her HL development.

She also, agreeing with her husband, appreciates and approves of the way the GCS operates now. So, she maintains that *'they do all these shows and we go and we watch the children acting and singing...we really enjoy them...it is very different to the old years...'*. Marianthi's

grandmother puts emphasis on the different educational approaches employed by the GCS over the years. For her, the 'modern' GCS meets her expectation since it achieves both HL learning and young students' engagement with enjoyable performances. In addition, it legitimates the code she sees as an essential linguistic capital for the younger generations, affording the speakers with desired social profits. This increases her approval of this educational setting. Marianthi's grandmother submits to the will of dominant SMG LI. However, the same LI led her daughter to abandon her community schooling. Like her husband, the convertibility of her LI over the years reveals a paradox between past and present LI about the GCS and the language it legitimates.

Discussion

Marianthi's grandmother's views about the GCS bear similarities to her husband's perceptions. So, she appreciates highly the role and the learning outcomes of this institution. She compares her current positive evaluation with her negative opinions in the past. Both grandparents seem to engage in a *paradox* when praising this educational setting for offering a linguistic product which was among the reasons that led to the deterioration of their daughter's HL use. Their LI about the GCS and the SMG have changed over the years due to the changeability of sociohistorical circumstances. Their current interpretations contest older representations. Languages, for them, are specific capitals that give the speaker particular social benefits. When a code fails to meet this requirement, it is doomed to gradual abandonment.

6.5.3. Marianthi's mother

GCS past experiences

Marianthi's mother, echoing her parents' views, describes her community schooling experiences in her own words. She reports that *'...I stopped attending lessons at the Greek school when I was nine years old...I did not like it...my parents tried to persuade me to continue but I did not change my decision...and you know back then the teachers were very strict...and I was using the dialect while the teachers wanted us to use the modern language... and the lessons were on Saturday and I preferred to see my friends, to do things with them instead of being at the Greek school...I felt different to my classmates...I did not want to be the child who goes to the Greek school and was not having fun... and it was very difficult for me as a student'*. Marianthi's mother recalls the difficulties she encountered due to her dialect that led to her GCS withdrawal. She also underlines that her community schooling commitments produced a sense of social deprivation and of difference to her peer group. However, she also recounts a dimension that was not reported by her parents. She expresses a challenging view about the

overall educational procedure. Reflecting on her GCS experiences, she reveals its failure to teach Greek effectively. She says that *'the school back then was a religious community school and more emphasis was given to the Christian religion which was good but I think that the lesson must have a structure...it should be about learning the language and how to use it to communicate with others...'*

GCS: present perceptions

Marianthi's mother's current perceptions about the GCS are informed by her role as a member of the GCS Parents Committee. She admits that her views about this educational setting have altered over the years. She rationalizes this by explaining that *'the situation is different now...the school is more organized than it used to be...you know you have to finish the English school and then you have to go to the Greek school...the lessons are not on Saturdays but twice a week after school...there is a system'*. Drawing on her past experiences, she puts emphasis on the convenience of the 'modern' GCS's days and hours of operation. But, more importantly, for her, this institution provides the young learners with the opportunity to learn an official code which is conceived of as a valid linguistic capital. Accordingly, she maintains that *'the children learn the official language...and I want my children to learn and to take their GCSE exams...I want them to become fluent...to be able to communicate using the language...'* Marianthi's mother's LI about the GCS and the SMG are created in the interest of her children's future educational achievement. For her, the standard variety can give her children specific social benefits. The CD may hold an unquestionable power as a symbolic capital of sentimental value but fails to respond to the demands of the current linguistic market encountered by the young learners. Therefore, it is doomed to relegation and restricted use.

Discussion

Marianthi's mother's LI about the GCS are historically diverse and contradictory. The *paradox* revealed in her parents' views reappears in her accounts. She considers the GCS as a valid institution which operates effectively by offering knowledge of a code which she views as superior to her home language. Nevertheless, she rejected her community schooling at a young age because of her disassociation with the official form of her HL. Her past experiences and her present interpretation and understanding of the social world co operate to create her current beliefs and future expectations. Her role of a mother of two children who strives to provide for their future social and professional success informs her current LI. The latter are created in the interest of specific benefits and profits that only SMG proficiency can afford its speaker. Both herself and her parents produce and reproduce a particular *family discourse*

which imposes the moderation of their dialectic linguistic behaviour in favour of the young children's future achievement. They follow a particular FLP that puts emphasis on the creation and provision of rich SMG HL stimuli for the younger generation to learn and to maintain.

6.5.4. *Marianthi*

'...Greek School is important...'/ '...Greek School is boring...'

Marianthi is aware of her caretakers' perceptions about her community schooling. She comments that '*my grandparents always tell me that I should go to the Greek School and they think it is important for me to learn more Greek*'. She also underlines her mother's encouragement for her regular attendance by stating that '*my mother tells me all the time about how important is to go to the Greek school...*'. Marianthi describes her *family discourse* about the importance of the GCS. But, she also reveals her community schooling experiences by saying that '*I do not like Greek school...it is boring...it is only reading and writing ...we do not use computers and the computers make the lesson fun...it is not like the English school, it is different...I do not like the books either...we do not do so many activities...we should do more activities like in the English school*'. Marianthi's culture of learning in the EMS involves the use of technological equipment that is attractive for the young students. Her criticism of her community schooling experiences puts emphasis on the lack of such facilities and the consequent disengagement of the learners. For her, both the educational material and the educational process fail to capture her interest and motivate her as a learner. Marianthi appears entangled within *discourses of conflict* because in order to satisfy the wishes of her family she has to participate in a setting that appears irrelevant to her educational expectations and demands.

Rationalizing the use of English in the GCS

Marianthi rationalizes the fact that the EL dominates her talk with her GCS teacher, by explaining that '*...when I speak with my yiayia (grandmother-SMG/CD) or with my papou (grandfather-SMG/CD) or with my mum I do not worry ...I just say it... but here...I have to think to say it correctly... but with my yiayia and my papou I just say it, I can speak with them... but here I try to be perfect...and this makes me stressed*'. Marianthi reveals her anxiety about producing utterances that meet the GCS's linguistic demands. She admits that both her grandparents and her mother create a *safe* linguistic environment which stimulates her spontaneous talk. However, the GCS fails to inspire her with similar feelings. Thus, the EL seems for her the primary or even the only linguistic choice when interacting with her GCS teachers.

Furthermore, Marianthi provides an alternative rationalization for EL dominance when communicating with her bilingual friends and classmates within the context of the GCS. She explains that *'it feels weird to speak Greek with my classmates...listen to me (she addresses Michella) Michella, ti kaneis? (how are you?-SMG)... you see it feels weird...I cannot open up and speak the way I speak with my yiayia and papou...it is nothing to do with you (the teacher), it feels weird to speak with children I am used to speaking in English with them...'*. Marianthi reveals that she has associated the use of her HL linguistic capital with specific interlocutors both in London and in Cyprus. She admits that she does not feel confident to switch between languages with co speakers with whom she has already established a particular linguistic pattern of communication.

Resisting SMG dominance

Marianthi's mother, as previously said, refers to the authority of Marianthi's Greek teacher to stop her from using the dialect. However, Marianthi regularly exercises her resistance both towards the power of the teacher's native SMG skills and towards the institution of the GCS.

(extract from classroom audio recording, T: teacher, M: Marianthi)

The teacher asks the children to work as a team and to write a short story about two animals.

T: *Poia einai ta dio zoa pou the exe i istoria mas; (Which will be the two animals in our story?)*

M: *It will be about a skouloukoui (worm-CD).*

T: *Ena skouloukoui, ena skouliki kai poio allo zoo? (A worm -CD-, a worm -SMG-, and which other animal?)*

M: *I said skouloukoui, this is the way my grandfather calls it...I want it to be a skouloukoui and not a skouliki...what kind of word is skouliki? It does not sound right! Look I have written skouloukoui already! Can I write it on the board for everyone to see?*

T: *Ela...grapse tin kai meta grapse kai skouliki. (You can come...write it and then write skouliki as well.)*

M: *But our story will have **my** word, won't it?*

T: *You can choose, mporeite na dialeksete alla thelo na kserete kai tis dyo. (You can choose but I want you to know both of them.)*

M: (smiling with satisfaction)

Marianthi clearly defends the form of the HL she has learned from her grandfather. She resists the power of the SMG. She persists in employing a word already part of her linguistic repertoire. It appears that she wants to prove the validity and usability of her linguistic capital. She uses the possessive pronoun 'my' for the word she proposed, to declare her distance from the SMG word recommended by the teacher. For her, such a code lacks the symbolic value attached to her grandparents' home language. The young student proves her close bond with her grandparents and her appreciation of the code they have transmitted to her.

Discussion

Marianthi's perceptions about her community schooling experiences reveal a *conflict of discourses* between her *family discourse* and her sense of disengagement from the GCS's educational procedure. She clearly expresses her discomfort about using her HL linguistic capital within the community classroom. She prefers to employ it with her grandparents acknowledging its guaranteed convertibility to both a social and a symbolic capital. Marianthi *positions herself towards her family discourse produced through the FLP in an incoherent way*. Sometimes she submits to the power of the standard variety and moderates her dialectic utterances. In other instances she challenges its legitimacy and validity by demanding and insisting on using words which are exclusively identified with the CD. She expresses a desire to demonstrate the usability of her own linguistic capital as it has developed through her extensive socialization with dialect speakers throughout the years.

6.6. Summary

All four participants' language histories indicate changeability, variability and ongoing modification of linguistic practices responsive to their cultural representations of the role that each language holds for their particular interests. Their stories illustrate the impact that specific political, social, economic and historical circumstances have on the social actors' dilemmas and decisions about which language should be used, maintained and transmitted to the younger generations. Their linguistic choices respond accordingly to their future expectations regarding the benefits they wish to receive within specific social contexts. Their linguistic practices are repeatedly readjusted, involving a constant negotiation regarding the language in authority. Their LI inform their linguistic behaviour and they also experience transformation and moderation. The SMG and the CD appear to be in an eternal controversy contesting over which one will have the label of the legitimate language within specific

contexts. Nevertheless, for all the members of Marianthi's family it is the EL that gives unquestionable superiority in English society. Their English hegemony resistance practices reveal the *paradox of counterhegemony* since they do not involve EL shift but its parallel use with the heritage code. However, the phenomenon of *symbolic domination* even within *counterhegemonic* spaces persists when the official form of the HL penetrates their interactions at the expense of the vernacular.

Chapter 7. Analysis: Michella's family

7.1. Introduction

Languages travel within the years. They lose their usability in daily life but they also reappear strong and alive under specific circumstances. Michella's family however shows a relevant consistency regarding the use of the HL. The grandmother is a native CD speaker with basic EL abilities. The mother is a fluent SMG language speaker. Nevertheless, it is the CD Michella's mother learnt from her parents. Michella lives within a household where three linguistic systems, the EL, the SMG and the CD, are in parallel use. She has developed a high level of metalinguistic awareness regarding the differences between the two codes associated with her Greek Cypriot background. In this chapter, two women and a young child within three generations share their language histories and their LI. They also reveal their contribution and their response to the FLP. Moreover, they express their views about the GCS, an institution affecting their language practices for HL transmission and further development.

7.2. Language Histories

7.2.1. Language history: Michella's grandmother

Migration rationale and socio-educational background

Michella's grandmother migrated to London at a young age. She was sixteen years old when she left her island in search of a better quality of life in Great Britain. She comes from a big family with low economic status. As she explains '*I have six brothers and sisters...we were very poor...I remember my mother struggling to ensure food for all of us...*'. She had to withdraw from her mainstream education after three years of attendance, to join the labour force in support of her family's income. Thus, her reading and writing SMG skills are at a basic level. Her mother tongue is the CD, the code she used with her family members and her wide social network in Cyprus.

Linguistic environment of the workplace in the host country

Michella's grandmother's first employment was in a local business manufacturing clothes. The linguistic environment of her workplace consisted of many Greek Cypriots and constituted a site of *counterhegemony* where the CD was the legitimate language among the co-speakers. It was a space where 'the laws of price formation which apply to more formal markets are suspended' (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 71). Thus, her poor dominant language proficiency did not appear as an impediment to her professional career. Her bilingual co-workers took the role of

translator in communicative instances demanding the exclusive use of the dominant code. She explains that *'I used the CD with the other women in the factory...if it was something said in English I could not understand, my cousin or the other friends that I had there, translated to me in English, so I did not have any problems with the language...I was very lucky with that...I don't know how I would have survived in a job that required only English...'*. Thus, Michella's grandmother's HL linguistic capital did not undergo a significant alteration when she first relocated to the host society. Myers-Scotton (2006) maintains that the linguistic demands of immigrants' professional environment are decisive for HLM.

Social network of co speakers in London

For Michella's grandmother the CD retained its monopoly in her daily interactions with her friends and family members residing in London. She explains that *'my parents and grandparents came to London some years after...we are a big family...we always speak Greek to each other...it was like that from the beginning, it never changed...this is our language...our friends are Greek Cypriots and we use our language with them'*. Michella's grandmother reveals her membership of various *counterhegemonic* sites from the first years of her immigration. So her mother tongue continued to dominate her linguistic interactions. Moreover, the CD dominance was reinforced when she became a home worker for the business. She shared her home with her grandparents, her parents, and some of her brothers and sisters. In this *counterhegemonic* space the dialect took over completely, controlling and directing every linguistic exchange.

Establishing her household

Michella's grandmother continued using her mother tongue even after establishing her own household. She got married to a member of the same community and gave birth to three children²¹. All her children were raised in a bilingual home environment. She consistently used the CD when addressing them. As she explains *'I used Greek with my children...their father helped them with their English homework....I always insisted on them using their language....I allowed them to use English but the main language in our home was and still is the Greek language'*. Michella's grandmother did not allow the EL to dominate her interaction with her husband and with her children. This decision was also affected by her poor EL proficiency.

²¹ Two of her children reside permanently in London. Her third child moved with his family back to Cyprus some year ago.

Thus, she founded a household where her children could experience the phenomenon of *counterhegemony* since the CD appeared as the legitimate code.

HL use in the current years

Michella's grandmother is in her late sixties nowadays. She continues using the CD, in a form that could be seen as 'town Cypriot' (Arvaniti, 2006a; Newton, 1972b) in her daily interactions. Therefore her utterances are informed by many SMG linguistic elements. She enjoys spending time with her children and her grandchildren. Moreover after her retirement she stays half the period of each year in her home country. Her frequent contacts with speakers who live permanently in Cyprus contribute to the continuous update of her linguistic skills. The dialect is the code she exclusively uses with all the members of her extended social network both in Cyprus and in England. She constitutes a vital HL resource for both her children and grandchildren. She is also the hostess of regular family gatherings during which the CD use proliferates. As she explains '*we gather all together now and then...we are all together laughing, singing and enjoying ourselves...we speak only Greek when we are together....we speak all the same language, grandparents, parents and children....we use only our language...*'

Discussion

Michella's grandmother's HL linguistic capital has remained relatively stable over the years. She has been participating in sites of *counterhegemony* since the early years of her migration to England. She never submitted to the societal pressures for rapid linguistic adaptation. Her resistance was supported and reinforced by both her linguistic professional environment and her extended social network of CD speakers in the host country. Thus she never stopped using her mother tongue and she never developed EL skills. Her marriage to a member of the same community did not disturb her linguistic identity. She socialized her children to use the CD. Their entry to the EMS did not substantially change the linguistic balance within the home domain. Her low English linguistic skills demanded the extensive use of the CD by her children. Michella's grandmother continues to be a vital linguistic resource for both her children and her grandchildren who reside in London. Her presence in their family gatherings commands HL use out of respect for her communicative needs. This relationship also operates as a powerful factor for HL use and HLM across the generations.

7.2.2. Language history: Michella's mother

Michella's mother is in her early thirties. She shares a common Greek Cypriot background with her husband. Both spouses were born in London and received their formal education in the EMS.

Childhood linguistic experiences

As previously said, Michella's mother was raised in a bilingual household. The CD monopolized her interactions with her mother. The FLP allowed the use of both the EL and the dialect with her father. As she explains *'I used only Greek with my mother but with my father I could also say something in English...when he first migrated to London he attended afternoon classes in the EL...it is not that my mother cannot speak or understand English at all...but my father knows more'*. The CD was her main linguistic choice when communicating with her brothers but also with the extended network of relatives residing both in London and in Cyprus. Her regular visits to the island facilitated the empowerment of her CD skills. Her entrance to the EMS introduced the EL to her linguistic repertoire. Nevertheless, her mother's low proficiency in this code prevented the EL from significantly disturbing her household's linguistic ecology. But it gradually dominated her interactions outside the home, when communicating with her English speaking friends or with her bilingual peers.

GCS

Michella's mother attended lessons in the GCS for three years. Her educational experience there introduced her to the SMG. Nevertheless, she resisted complying with the dominant LI promoted by her community schooling. She describes that *'I still remember my school years as a student in the Greek school...my teacher could not understand the dialect...she used this other language which was different to my one...I felt like I knew nothing, any Greek...my parents tried to explain to me but I wouldn't listen'*. Thus, her CD linguistic capital was maintained intact and continued to be the variety of the heritage code that could afford her both with social and symbolic profits. The dialect was her linguistic choice when interacting with her family members and with a wide network of social contacts both in England and in Cyprus, providing her with feeling of emotional security and self fulfilment.

Linguistic environment of the workplace

Michella's mother's entrance in the British labour market initiated the revitalization of her SMG skills. She worked in a travel agency which provided tickets and holiday deals to Cyprus exclusively. She describes the change in her linguistic capital by saying that *'... after getting this*

job in the travel agent's I started using the standard form...next to the office there was a shop selling Greek magazines...I read lots of them to get used to the modern form...I started using it with great fluency...my contact with the customers helped a lot... the language was all around me...I became more fluent while working at the travel agent's...I had to speak Greek so as to maintain my position in the office...my Greek reached a very high level at that period...' Thus, her professional career endowed her with experiences of how her SMG linguistic capital could be converted to an economic capital and to a social capital with a network of customers. Furthermore, she experienced its convertibility to a symbolic capital of emotional fulfilment stemming from her recognition as both a competent HL user and an effective employee. Michella's mother resigned from this post after she got married to focus on her two children's upbringing. She re-entered the labour force after her children reached schooling age.

Establishing her own household

Michella's mother established a bilingual household where the HL was the dominant language. Both varieties of the HL (CD and SMG) were used interchangeably, through code-switching or code-mixing. Her husband's English dominant linguistic identity imposed the extensive but not the exclusive use of the English code during their interactions. Nevertheless, she raised her children as HL dominant speakers. Her parents and the wider network of family members supported her choice and provided for their HL immersion, providing the young children almost exclusively with rich CD linguistic input. But, the children's entrance to the EMS empowered the use of the EL within the home domain. However, the HL was never abandoned or rejected. It maintained its usability, sustained by the wide social network of dominant HL speakers amongst which the prominent position is held by Michella's grandmother.

HL use in the current years

Michella's mother's current linguistic life entails the use of all three languages in her daily social encounters. She uses the dominant language when interacting with her co workers²² and her English monolingual social contacts. She draws on her CD linguistic capital to communicate with her mother and monolingual Greek Cypriot friends and family members. She uses both the above codes with her father and her bilingual associates. Nevertheless, she puts effort into adapting her HL linguistic capital to the SMG variety. Her household remains a safe 'trilingual'space for her children's parallel use of all languages. However, as she explains, the EL is more often used than the HL. She reports that *'I speak English and Greek with my husband, I*

²² She has a part time job in a local superstore.

think we may use more English to be honest...for me English is my first language and it is easier to use English...it is stronger in my mind...'

Discussion

Michella's mother reveals experiences in various social fields where the language in authority differs. She has been moving in linguistic markets that challenge the monopoly of the official language from an early age. For her, the participation in sites of *counterhegemony* appears to be a daily practice and not a rare phenomenon. In such spaces, the exclusive use and the undisputed value of the EL is challenged and even shifted. Her linguistic capital underwent relevant fluctuations over the years but the dominant language never took over completely. Michella's mother's language history celebrates the victory of bilingualism over EL dominance.

7.2.3. Language history: Michella

Michella is nine years old. She was born in London. She receives her formal education in the EMS. She attends lessons in a Greek Community School in north London.

Linguistic capital alteration over the years

Michella entered the EMS as a monolingual CD speaker. Her early socialization experiences were exclusively in the dialect. As her mother maintains '*she could speak only Greek before starting the English school... we used to visit Cyprus and our relatives there could not believe that she couldn't speak any English but only Greek... it was only one week after she started school when she began using the EL at home...'* Michella's official schooling introduced her to a new linguistic code. The influential power of her formal schooling altered her linguistic capital. The distribution of the two languages changed dramatically at the expense of the heritage code. Nevertheless, she never stopped using the HL. Michella started attending lessons in the GCS at the age of five and thus she gained familiarization with a new code, the SMG. Her current linguistic capital involves the co-existence of all three channels of communication. However, her English linguistic abilities overexceed her HL skills.

7.3. LI: English, SMG, CD

7.3.1. Michella's grandmother

Recognizing EL power

Michella's grandmother acknowledges the particularities of her language history and the distinctiveness of her linguistic identity. She expresses her appreciation of the network of people who supported her survival in the English dominant society. She reports that '*'*

managed to survive without learning the language but I had around me people that helped me a lot, I do not know how it would be for me if it wasn't for my family, my husband, my children and now my grandchildren... maybe my life would be easier if I knew more English...knowing the language makes things easier...but nowadays you cannot survive without speaking the language...what would have happened if my children hadn't gone to school to learn the language?' She puts emphasis on the instrumental value of the EL. For her, the official language is a prerequisite for current and future social success. She considers that there is less tolerance of immigrant languages speakers in the modern era. Despite the fact that she identifies as a dominant CD speaker, she views the EL as valid linguistic capital which can give the bearer desired profits and benefits.

Resisting EL hegemony

Michella's grandmother stresses the importance of HL use and maintenance. Her aspirations for the younger generation's linguistic identity reject English monolingualism. Thus she invested effort and time in raising her children bilingually in the past. She also insists on her grandchildren's HL use. She underlines the significance of the domestic space as a site of consistent immigrant language use. She persists in her mother tongue's authority in her home. She accepts the legitimacy of the EL in other social institutions in the host society, but she refuses to allow societal pressures to intrude into her private environment and to impose the dominant language hegemony. She states accordingly that *'I want my children and grandchildren to speak Greek... our home is a Greek home...Greek is our language when we are at home...English is the language of the outside world'*.

LI: discourses of difference

Michella's grandmother uses the terms 'Greek', 'SMG', and 'CD' interchangeably when referring to the HL. Her selection of each appears intentional and serves to produce positions of difference between languages, enacting the process of *fractal recursivity* (Gal and Irvine, 1995; Irvine and Gal, 2000). So, she employs the term 'Greek' when she needs to underline the difference between the EL and the ethnic code. The host language becomes the 'exterior', 'the other' against which the 'interior', the HL, has to fight for its survival and maintenance (Terkourafi, 2007). The heritage code appears unified, homogeneous and powerful, opposed to the host language and its hegemony. However, this code is further dichotomized into the SMG and the CD. The former then appears as the 'exterior', a variety externally imposed by dominant LI that promote its social value over the 'interior', the mother tongue. I shall explain this process further below.

Resisting SMG hegemony

The linguistic landscape in Cyprus complicates further Michella's grandmother's endeavour for HL maintenance. She is aware of the dominant LI that value the SMG over her mother tongue. Her regular visits to her home country immerse her in the social context where such language beliefs proliferate. She is also aware that both the Cypriot mainstream school and the GCS reproduce such views. Therefore, she aspires for the younger generations to learn the SMG for their future social advancement. But she does not allow such discourses to moderate her own linguistic identity. She believes that her oral CD skills have remained unchanged over the years despite the fact that her social encounters in Cyprus enrich and inform her linguistic capital with SMG influences. Her main concern is her children's SMG development but she resists her own submission to the hegemony of the official code. Accordingly, she maintains that *'I use the Cypriot dialect with Michella...I am helping her with her homework sometimes...we read in Modern Greek and we write in Modern Greek but I use the CD when we are speaking...'*.

HL use: mark of ethnic belonging

Michella's grandmother expresses her wish for her grandchildren's HL use, stating that *'I don't want them to use the language the way the foreigners do...it is their language and I want them to use it fluently...we are Greeks and we live in a Greek house...this how it should be, we are Greeks and we should use our language'*. For her, the speaker's form of talk reveals his authentic membership of a group. Michella's grandmother produces and reproduces LI that attribute to the language the power to set categories and to separate 'us' from 'them'. She submits to belief systems that view the heritage code as a mark of distinctiveness. She is entangled within discourses of *iconization* created and promoted within powerful political institutions such as the Greek Cypriot nation state (Gal and Irvine, 1995; Irvine and Gal, 2000). She allies with essentialist notions that endorse the immutability of ethnic behaviour over the years. Her aspirations for the younger generations refer to linguistic identities that are both identifiable as 'other' by non group members and as 'same' by the members. She maintains that *'I have another grandchild from my brother's side...he is so good in Greek....people think he is a student in Greece or in Cyprus...I want my children and grandchildren to be like him...'*. Thus, the effort she invests in the development of her grandchildren's HL linguistic capital aims at them having linguistic identities that are 'unmarked' among group members (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004). She produces discourses emphasise the convertibility of the HL linguistic capital to a symbolic capital of 'authentic' group belonging.

Promoting multilingualism

Michella's grandmother's accounts reveal her belief that all three languages can be developed simultaneously. She is aware that the English social context and the EMS offer abundant opportunities which ensure the rapid acquisition of the EL. She identifies her home domain as the space where the other two codes should have the opportunity to be used. She denies dominant language penetration in her daily interaction with her family members. For her, each language meets different linguistic needs and it is appropriate for use under certain social circumstances. But HL use, in either of its forms, is the medium of communication which gives greater emotional satisfaction. She underlines that *'I am very proud when I hear them speaking the language'*.

Discussion

Michella's grandmother is the recipient and the producer of multiple LI with regard to the three codes. For her, the HL, in both of its forms, holds the value of a symbolic capital inextricably linked with the sense of ethnic belonging. She acknowledges the dominant LI that value both the EL and the SMG over her mother tongue. But, she resists their hegemony by sustaining her dialect. She is aware of the social profits that both the EL and the SMG give their bearers. Therefore she produces relevant LI that emphasize their significance for the younger generations' future social advancement. For her, the value of each code is linked with specific social contexts. Among the latter, her home domain appears as a *counterhegemonic space* where the use of both the SMG and the CD resists English hegemony. The two forms of the heritage code seem unified against the 'exterior' threat of the dominant language which jeopardises the symbolic value of ethnic belonging.

7.3.2. Michella's mother

Submitting to the penetrating power of English

As previously said, Michella's mother identifies the EL as her dominant language. She maintains that *'I have to think before saying something in Greek...it is not my first language'*. The English code is the channel of communication she feels confident using when expressing her feelings and thoughts. Michella's mother considers her gradual linguistic transformation from a CD monolingual speaker to a dominant English speaker as a 'natural' outcome of acting and interacting within English society. She states that *'I did not speak any English before going to school but you know...in school you have to learn the language and then it becomes your own...and you use English every day...and then one day you realize that this is your first language and Greek is the second one...'* She identifies the EMS as significant in changing her

linguistic capital to English dominance. For her, such a process holds the power of a 'common sense' progression within the years. Michella's mother ascribes high value to her dominant code. She is aware of the benefits afforded to its speaker within the English context. Thus, Michella's mother both accepts and submits to the penetrating power of the EL.

The EMS as a significant point of HL linguistic capital alteration

As previously said, Michella's mother identifies her official schooling as the starting point of her deterioration in HL use. She is aware of its powerful impact both on her own and on her children's HL linguistic capital. She describes that *'I felt that the children moved ten steps backwards since their first day at school...the EL is ahead since then...Michella could not speak English before going to school but after the first days of schooling the Greek language started losing its power...soon she started using the language even at home...the teachers told me to stop using Greek and start using only English because she couldn't say anything in English...she used to point at the things she wanted to play with...but I never stopped using Greek with her....I just ignored them'*. Despite the fact that Michella's mother resisted the discourse of the EMS educators that discouraged her children's bilingual upbringing, the EL gradually dominated their linguistic repertoire. She reveals the LI created and produced in the EMS that favour monolingualism over bilingualism. She discloses her resistant linguistic behaviour informed by a different set of LI that promoted HL learning.

HL use enacting ties to ethnic identity

Michella's mother argues for an inextricable link between HL use and ethnic identity. For her, the immigrant code is a powerful symbol of ethnic belonging, a 'core value' (Smolicz, 1999) that ensures the group's distinctiveness. She says accordingly that *'I always say to my children that 'we come from Cyprus and we speak Greek, we are not English'...this is our language and we are Cypriots...'*. Echoing her mother, she ascribes to an essentialist view of ethnic behaviour. For her, language is an index of particular social identities. Moreover, she identifies with LI that conceive languages as boundary markers that separate different nationalities. Michella's mother admits that she socializes her children through such discourses of difference between groups. The HL appears as a vital symbolic capital that marks group members against the 'other', the non-group members.

Submitting to SMG hegemony

Michella's mother identifies the SMG as the appropriate language to be used by both herself and her children. She maintains that '*they speak in the modern way in Cyprus nowadays...I am trying to speak in the same way...and I am trying to teach them the modern language so as when we visit Cyprus or Greece they can speak in this way...I do not want them to express themselves as the grandparents do...not speaking like the village people*'. Michella's mother is the recipient and producer of ideologies which ascribe low social value to the vernacular, which is associated with speakers of little education belonging to the lower levels of social stratification. She regularly visits Cyprus, where her niece and nephews are Michella's age and they attend lessons in the Cypriot Mainstream School. She and her brother are often involved in discussions about their children's linguistic identities. Thus she receives information concerning prominent LI about both the SMG and the CD. Enacting the process of *iconization*, she conceives the CD as an *index* of particular social identities (Gal and Irvine, 1995; Irvine and Gal, 2000). She is trapped within a process of *misrecognition* which classifies speakers according to the linguistic code they use. She is *symbolically dominated* submitting to dominant discourses which validate SMG over the CD and moderating her own linguistic behaviour in favour of the former and at the expense of the latter.

SMG capital convertible to an economic capital and a symbolic capital

Michella's mother's LI about the validity of the SMG are informed by its convertibility to both an economic and a symbolic capital. She maintains that '*the children should learn the modern language... and I want them to pass the GCSE exams successfully ...to use their skill in their future career...'*. The language officially accepted in GCSE exams is the SMG. She underlines that the current linguistic market endorses the prestige of the official language speakers. Such language proficiency appears as a valid capital that can give the speaker professional advancement and subsequent economic benefits. Her past experiences when working in the travel agency along with her future aspirations for her children, inform her present LI, her cultural conceptions about the link between language and society.

CD and its convertibility to a social and to a symbolic capital

Nevertheless, Michella's mother does not totally reject the value of the CD. Her extended network of dialect speakers informs her LI about the convertibility of this code to both social and symbolic profits. She explains that '*...I want my children to experience the joy of understanding the language that their relatives speak...not standing watching them without knowing what they are talking about...'*. For her, a common code is a condition for cohesive

family bonding. It appears as a prerequisite for creating and reinforcing affective relationships with significant others. Her mother holds a prominent position among them. The CD appears as a symbolic capital of close emotional attachment between mother and daughter. Furthermore, the same code converts to a symbolic capital of close bonds between the grandmother and the grandchildren. However, the grandmother's current form of linguistic identity, as a CD speaker whose language has influences from SMG, does not challenge Michella's mother's LI about the value of SMG for her children's future advancement. Thus, the grandmother's HL capital is further validated and legitimized.

Discussion

Michella's mother is the recipient and the producer of dominant LI that validate the official forms of the languages over the CD. She recognizes and accepts the penetrating power of the EL within the British social context. Nevertheless, she resists its hegemony. She puts efforts into maintaining her HL in both of its forms as an essential symbol of her ethnic belonging. Despite the fact that she *misrecognizes* a higher value of the SMG over the CD, she does not disregard the latter. She tries to keep a linguistic balance by using all three codes with her children and the members of her social network. Each language meets different needs depending on her social encounters and the context where they occur. Nevertheless her future aspirations concern her children's SMG learning, the code she identifies with modernity. Her mother appears as a significant figure who contributes greatly by creating the linguistic circumstances where the CD has greater legitimacy. Both women have had social experiences which have provided them with the opportunity to acknowledge that the authority of a language shifts according to the context and the interlocutor. All three systems are in parallel use, constituting her linguistic life a complex phenomenon. Specific language ideologies inform her perceptions about the three languages but none of them undergoes total rejection or abandonment.

7.3.3. Michella

Michella's mother's and Michella's grandmother's LI contribute to the creation of a *family discourse* relating to each code's evaluation and significance. Michella's socialization process both through the use of particular languages and to use specific codes promote such messages either implicitly or explicitly. The young child becomes the producer and the reproducer of beliefs about the three codes co-existing in her linguistic capital.

HL use and its convertibility to social and symbolic profits

Michella is an English native speaker. As such she highly validates the EL and both acknowledges and experiences the social profits afforded by its use. But she does not comply with English monolingualism since her HL linguistic capital provides for an additional set of social benefits. As she states, *'if I couldn't speak Greek, I wouldn't have any friends in Cyprus...I wouldn't be able to speak with my grandmother...I don't know how I would manage without it...'*. Michella's linguistic life consists of social experiences that impose HL use. Her HL linguistic capital is convertible to the symbolic rewards of close ties with significant figures. Among these her grandmother holds a prominent position. The two of them share a very close emotional bond sustained and reinforced by daily encounters. Michella uses the CD when interacting with her grandmother and therefore ascribes great value to this code. Nevertheless, she also refers to another form of symbolic capital afforded by her HL use. She maintains that *'my grandparents are very proud of me when I use Greek and I know my mother feels very proud when she can hear her children speaking Greek and this makes me feel very good because I love my grandparents and my parents'*. Michella is aware of the feelings inspired in both her mother and her grandparents when she uses the immigrant code. She enjoys using her ability to arouse these feelings in significant people. Their emotional responses motivate her to continue investing time and energy in using and developing her HL capital.

Reproducing family discourse

Submitting to dominant SMG LI

Michella reveals her grandmother's explicit discourse that now promotes the value of the SMG over the dialect. With regard to some of the CD expressions she learnt with her grandparents in her early years, she reports that *'...my grandparents would not let me carry on using these words...they also have this look...and I know that it is time to use the other words...'*. Michella explains the power of her grandparents 'look' by describing similar encounters with her mother. She says that *'she does not say something to me but I can understand from the way she looks at me...she has this strange way of widening her eyes...and then I realize my mistake and I change...'*. Both Michella's grandparents and her mother employ particular facial expressions which direct the switch from the vernacular to the standard variety. Michella is socialized to decode such articulated messages despite the fact that no linguistic exchange is involved. But more importantly, she becomes the recipient of LI that promote the value of the SMG over the CD. She complies with the *family discourse* moderating her linguistic expressions

in favour of the standard variety. She appears *symbolically dominated* submitting to dominant LI that *misrecognize* the value of the dialect.

Reproducing dominant SMG LI in the GCS setting

Michella produces and reproduces her *family discourse* regarding the superiority of the SMG over the CD in the educational site of the GCS.

(extract from classroom audio recording, T: teacher, Ma: Marianthi, Mi :Michella)

T: *Τι τίτλο να βάλουμε στην ιστορία που γράψαμε;* (Which title should the story have that we wrote?)

Ma: *Ο καράολος.* (the snail/ CD word)

Mi: *Ο καράολος;* (the snail?) *You shouldn't use this word. It is very old. Old people use these words. They say it differently now, they call it σαλιγκάρι* (SMG word).

Ma: *Σαλιγκάρι;* *What kind of word is this? It's harder than 'καράολος'....*

Michella informs Marianthi about the social connotations carried by her proposed linguistic form. So, Michella operates as an agent of socialization who introduces Marianthi to the LI that *iconize* the CD use by linking it with speakers from the past. Thus, Michella produces, reproduces and promotes the LI articulated by both her mother and her grandmother.

HL use tied to ethnic identity

Michella is the recipient of family discourses that iconize languages with specific social identities. She reproduces such LI by maintaining that *'because if you are Greek...you should be Greek...you should speak your own language so you can be Greek...so you can tell you are Greek...because if you say to somebody 'I am Greek' and you cannot speak Greek you are not Greek, are you?...it's not like being Greek...'*. Echoing her mother and her grandmother, she views HL use as a prerequisite for claiming a Greek identity. She is socialized to identify this as an unquestionable fact, a 'common sense' reality which imposes the rules of 'natural' ethnic categorization. Her family discourse directs and informs her perceptions.

Nevertheless she does not reject the influences she receives from the wider social context in which she acts and interacts. She ascribes to an English identity. But both her family background and her close bonds with her relatives direct the superiority of their immigrant history over her 'Englishness'. She explains that *'I am Greek...I do a lot of English stuff as well...and if somebody asks me if I am English I may say that I am but I am Greek as well...with*

my family we do mostly Greek stuff...it is like doing both of them...but at home we do more Greek things...'. Michella clearly identifies her home context as a site of counterhegemony where the Greek element is prevalent and dominant. Nevertheless the EL is not completely excluded. Her mother's bilingual policy, allowing the use of the two codes during their daily interactions, was explained above. But her mother also consistently underlined her persistence in HL use.

Discussion

Michella operates as both the recipient and the producer of dominant ideologies which favour the SMG over the CD. She has been raised in a family where such discourses are clearly articulated and explicitly imposed. But the CD is not abandoned or rejected. Its use is encouraged, provided it is not informed by too many influences identified with the 'old language'. So Michella is socialized to ascribe value to all three languages co-existent in her life. She switches with flexibility between them. Nevertheless her EL competency over-exceeds her HL ability. But she receives constant support and encouragement to use the immigrant language with her family. She benefits from both social and symbolic profits stemming from the use of all three different codes. Her rich linguistic repertoire allows her to move across different sites of interaction, enhancing her social experiences. She is a linguistically flexible social actor who perceives the languages as tools which are used according to the context and the interlocutor.

7.4. Family Language Policy: Michella's family

7.4.1. FLP: Michella's grandmother's contribution

Michella's grandmother holds precious experience of the linguistic environment that has provided for successful HL use and maintenance since her children's years of primary socialization. Accordingly, she draws on the practices she employed in the past to resist HL shift by the younger generations. Her main concern is to maintain the immigrant code's vitality in her grandchildren's linguistic lives. Therefore she invests time and effort into socialising her grandchildren through the heritage channel and encouraging them to use it. Her contribution to the FLP involves the following linguistic practices:

Continuous and consistent use of HL

Michella's grandmother emphasizes that her main strategy for HL transmission to the younger generation is its proliferation within the home context. She maintains that *'the children can hear us and they learn...they live in a Greek speaking house and they learn...they listen to us,*

they hear the language, this is the way they learn, by having the language all around them'. Her past experience as a mother of three children who were raised bilingually operates as a *tool kit* from which she draws practices that can ensure HL maintenance. For her, bilingualism is not a state that causes confusion to the speaker. She resists dominant LI created and promoted within the EMS that associate bilingual children with low achievement. Her children's social advancement in the English dominant society validates such a standpoint. Therefore, she invests in constant and persistent HL use, aspiring to aid the development of her grandchildren's ethnic linguistic capital.

HL enrichment through family history

Michella's grandmother is the mediating link between the past and the present for her offsprings. She often narrates events from her historical background and provides the younger generations with rich information about their family history. As she explains '*I share so many things with Michella...it's not only about speaking the language...it is this as well but she also knows a lot about me, about my life...I talk to her about the difficulties we had many year ago...my wedding dress, my wedding day... we talk about so many things all the time...she listens to me really carefully...she asks questions when she cannot understand...she knows so many stories about my life...we are very close...*'. Michella's grandmother's historical accounts can be beneficial for Michella in three different ways. Firstly, Michella's HL input is enriched with new expressions and words²³. Secondly, the young child receives information about the sociohistorical circumstances many years ago. Thirdly, she deepens her knowledge about the variety of traditions and rituals closely associated with her Greek Cypriot background. Thus Michella can enhance her cultural capital of customs and practices which she may never have the opportunity to experience but they provide an enlightening perspective of alternative ways of being associated with her Greek Cypriot heritage.

HL enrichment through cultural familiarization

Familiarization with traditional Greek food making

Michella's grandmother does not expend her efforts only on the oral description of the traditions that are associated with her immigrant background. She also tries to actively involve her granddaughter into practices which she considers as *Greek Cypriot*. She states that '*I call Michella each time I prepare food and I want her to learn something new...we prepare the food*

²³ The communication chunks used between the grandmother and the granddaughter on a daily basis may fail to provide such enrichment due to the repetitive use of the same or similar expressions.

together...we speak Greek all the time...we repeat the names of the ingredients...I explain to her each step and she learns...she enjoys that, she always listens paying attention...'. So, Michella becomes the recipient of the funds of knowledge held by her grandmother (Moll et al, 1992). She enriches both her HL linguistic capital and her skills regarding the know how to do particular Greek Cypriot tasks inextricably associated with her heritage.

Familiarization with Greek music

Michella's grandmother considers her grandchildren's familiarization with Greek music a vital element of her contribution to the FLP. She identifies the latter as an important language practice that both develops further the HL linguistic capital and enriches cultural capital. Her household operates as a *counterhegemonic* space where Greek music proliferates. She maintains that *'there is always Greek music on in my house, not only traditional music...modern music as well...the children like modern music...they ask me about the singers, their names and the songs...they like it very much...they learn the lyrics and they sing...and you know the more they can understand the lyrics the more they enjoy listening to our music'*.

SMG socialization

Michella's grandmother explains that she uses her mother tongue with her granddaughter *'I use the CD with Michella'*. Despite the fact that she argues against her linguistic identity moderation in favour of the SMG, she encourages her granddaughter's SMG use. She puts effort into enriching Michella's HL linguistic capital with SMG influences. She explains that *'I will say to her 'apidi' {CD, pear} but she already knows that it is 'achladi' {SMG, pear} in Modern Greek.... we repeat all these again and again... I explain to her the differences and I call her to tell me a Cypriot word in Greek...she knows both...I want her to know both'*. Michella's grandmother insists on the parallel use of the two codes provided their differences are emphasized so the younger child becomes aware of their particularities. She operates as an invaluable *facilitator* who moves between the two channels of communications explaining and analysing their disparities.

Moreover, Michella's grandmother invests time and effort into familiarizing Michella with the written form of the SMG. As previously said, she helps the young student with her GCS homework. The code used in the official textbooks is the standard form of the HL. Furthermore, the same code appears in the books that she reads to her granddaughter. She explains that *'I read stories to her...I read stories to all of my grandchildren...I call them to sit next to me and I read them stories...books that I buy from Cyprus'*. Michella's reading sessions

with her grandmother provide for both her SMG linguistic capital development and her awareness about the language in power in the written form. Consequently, Michella becomes the recipient of implicit and explicit messages relevant to LI that challenge the authority of CD in the written text. However, she also experiences the power of the CD in her exchanges with her grandmother. The young child is immersed into multiple LI that associate the use of a code with specific interlocutors and particular contexts of interaction.

Discussion

Michella's grandmother contribution to the FLP is decisive for HL maintenance. Her endeavours consist of a variety of *language practices* which are both strategic-planned after deliberation on her past experiences- and systematic. She is both a valuable HL source and the mediating link with traditions, customs, rituals and the family history. She appears as a well equipped *language manager* who links the present with the past. She negotiates language differences and constitutes an explanatory human force who mediates difficulties and linguistic discrepancies. She promotes SMG use but she does not reject the CD. Her language practices endorse compartmentalization; each form meets different linguistic and social needs. So, each code's legitimation relates to specific social circumstances. The power of the codes is not static but is always shifting. Her ultimate objective is HLM in both its forms. Her motivational power derives from her LI that promote an unquestionable equivalence between heritage code use and ethnic belonging. She aspires to her grandchildren's identification with such a discourse. For her, HL use and maintenance appears both as a duty and as a prerequisite for claiming a Greek Cypriot background.

7.4.2. FLP: Michella's mother's contribution

Investing in the grandparents' linguistic support

Michella's mother underlines the grandparents' significant role in younger generations' HL socialization. She maintains that '*I know other grandparents who use the EL with their grandchildren...I say to these people 'speak to the children in Greek, use your own language, English is not your language, Greek is'....I strongly believe that the grandparents should always speak to the children in Greek...the children have to listen to the language to learn it... and grandparents are the native speakers... their English is not as good as mine because they didn't go to an English school...these are the people who can help us with the language..'*. For her, the grandparents are a valuable HL source whose native HL linguistic capital can provide successful HL learning and maintenance. Therefore she encourages their contribution to the FLP while appreciating the support they provide for HLM.

Michaella's mother admits that her parents provide additional assistance in situations that call for direct intervention from a competent speaker. She explains that *'my father is very helpful when we do not know a word in Greek...his English is very good and he can translate words and expressions from English to Greek...he helps the children in an effective way...but he helps me with my Greek as well...when I want to say something in Greek and I do not know the right way, I ask my father for help and he explains to me everything I need...when I read with the children and I find a word I do not know, I even call my parents to ask them about the right pronunciation and its meaning'*. So, Michella's grandparents appear to be 'language experts' and their role becomes even more vital. They are their daughter's *linguistic backup*, the helpers she will seek to answer her questions and to solve linguistic problems. Thus Michella's mother highlights the necessity of their involvement and the significance of their contribution to the FLP.

Continuous and consistent use of HL

Michella's mother, echoing her own mother, argues that an effective language practice for HLM is the widespread use of the heritage code in the home context. She says that *'I know people my age who are parents as well but they do not use the Greek language at home and they are expecting the grandparents to transmit the language...but how are they expecting this to happen when children and grandparents meet once a week? The children need to get to know the language...they have to hear the language at home...they should have the language around them every day... how are they supposed to learn a language they do not hear at all?...My children hear the language from me, my husband and their grandparents every day and still we are struggling..'*. Michella's mother puts emphasis on the need for systematic effort for the younger generation's HL socialization. She argues for the provision of a rich linguistic input in family activities. The FLP entails linguistic support by all the members of the first and the second generation. Nevertheless, she also reports the difficulties she encounters by explaining that *'it is easier to express myself in English...but I try, we try all together...I use Greek as much as I can...it is very difficult you know... I have to think before saying something in Greek ...I have to remind myself all the time 'speak Greek to the children'...'*. However, she is determined to provide the best for her children's HL learning.

Exchanging views on effective language practices

Michella's mother exchanges views and ideas about potentially effective language practices that support her children's bilingualism with her older brother who lives in Cyprus. They share a common goal and they encounter similar linguistic concerns and anxieties. She explains that *'...his three children attend lessons in the Cypriot mainstream school...the children have become fluent Greek speakers but their parents use English with them, they want to maintain the EL...it's a similar situation to ours...we phone each other saying 'try this or that'...but you know at the end of the day we have agreed that the most important thing is to use the language all the time with the children...but he does not have the help I get from my parents..'*. Michella's mother repeatedly emphasizes the highly appreciated and effective linguistic assistance she receives from her parents. She benefits from a significant provision that her brother lacks. The brother and the sister empathize with each other's endeavours and exchange views on successful ways of maintaining their children's bilingualism. These discussions inform the FLPs that each family enacts.

Promoting bilingualism

Michella's mother tries to keep a linguistic balance by allowing the use of the school language along with the HL. She explains that *'I started using both languages with my children since they started school...I say to them that 'we say like that in English but we call it this way in Greek'...I ask the children to use Greek, I always say to them 'you said it in English, let me hear you saying the same in Greek and they are try to say it...and if they have any difficulties I will help them...we are trying all the time...it's like an everyday struggle...over and over again'*. Michella's mother describes the bilingual FLP she employs with her children. She underlines the difficulty of such an endeavour but she does not resign from this hard task. She shows determination and persistence.

The bilingual FLP also entails listening to songs in both languages. She reports that *'they like Greek music, they know a lot of Greek singers...I make sure they listen to English and Greek songs...when I drive them to school every day I put music on, we listen to English songs but we have the Greek songs as well, the children listen to both...'*. Furthermore, she provides for satellite television programs in both languages. She maintains that *'they have their favourite English programmes...but they love watching some Greek programmes as well...it is something like a bit of both...I wanted to have a satellite television for them, for us so as to listen to our language, to listen and to learn...'*. Michella's mother's accounts reveal a bilingual FLP according to which both codes are supported through various means.

Promoting interactions with other HL speakers in London

Michella's mother encourages her children's linguistic interaction with other HL speakers who visit her home. She explains that *'when we have visitors who speak the language I always ask them to use the Greek language when they speak to Michella...I say to them 'she speaks Greek, use Greek with her, don't use English, she can understand you...'*. Michella's mother seems to exploit every opportunity for HL use. She is aware that the monolingual English society does not provide many opportunities for extensive and exclusive heritage code use. Thus, when particular occasions allow this, she requests the monopoly of the code which does not flourish in the wider social context.

Promoting sociolinguistic experiences in ethnic institutions in London

Michella's mother's provision for her children's HL use opportunities also extends outside her household. The whole family regularly attends the local Greek Orthodox Church services where the immigrant language use proliferates. She says that *'we try to go to church every other Sunday...and there you see people and you use the language, the children are always next to me... they hear the priest saying the words...they hear people using Greek...we use only Greek there...I ask the children to do the same...'*. The church appears as a *counterhegemonic* space where the legitimate code is the HL. The immigrant channel operates as a capital convertible to social profits. The co-ethnics use their language establishing and extending their social network.

Investing in regular visits to Cyprus and to Greece

Michella's mother promotes her family's regular visits to Greece and Cyprus as a beneficial language practice for HLM. Such social contexts require HL use in natural communicative instances. The family members gain linguistic experiences from a variety of speakers. They also further develop their HL capital. Michella's mother describes *'... we visit once per year either Greece or Cyprus...last summer we went to Rhodes...we learnt new words and we used the language a lot...at the restaurants, at the shops, every place we went...we use only the Greek language and we make great progress each time...you cannot learn without visiting Greece or Cyprus...England cannot offer you this kind of opportunity to use and to experience the language...'*. Their journeys appear to have a multidimensional impact on their linguistic lives. As Michella's mother describes *'...not only the children but myself as well...we come back and we speak more fluently each time ...'*. So, such trips prove linguistically beneficial for both the mother and the children. Michella's mother presents herself as a 'language novice' who learns

along with her children. The latter aids her HL development, which will support her FLP for HLM.

Investing in supportive educational material

Michella's mother invests time and money in buying a variety of books and educational materials in the local bookstores when visiting Greece or Cyprus. She reports that *'we bought a laptop for the children last time...it's an excellent tool for them to learn the right spelling of the words...it has pictures and you have to press the buttons to write the word...the children loved it...and we buy lots of books each time'*. These books are read during the school year until their next visit. They exchange roles as reader and audience. Both mother and children are active participants in the reading process. She explains that *'I read these books with my children...I ask them questions about the meaning of the text and the expressions...I want them to understand every word...I explain to them using English when they have difficulties with some words...I also call my parents for extra help if I am not sure about the pronunciation or the meaning...we also use dictionaries if we cannot understand some words...then I ask the children to read the story for me...'*. A variety of supportive linguistic practices are employed when the mother and the children read together. The significant figures of the grandparents are always addressed to provide their help as 'language experts'. The FLP involves the young learners' familiarization with possible ways of overcoming linguistic difficulties arising when they read.

SMG socialization

As previously said, Michella's mother validates the SMG highly and identifies it as the code she wishes her children to learn. Her LI inform her language practices and thus she puts effort into moderating the young children's dialect utterances. She describes that *'...like the word 'kamari'{CD, room}... I tell her she should use the word 'domatio'{SMG, room}...she asks me 'why do you say 'domatio' instead of 'kamari' and I explain to her that if we go to Cyprus and we say 'kamari' they may not understand what we are talking about because it is a very old word...a word that only the grandparents use but it is not used nowadays'*. Michella's mother promotes and even imposes dominant LI that iconize the use of CD with speakers holding particular social identities. Nevertheless, she does not disregard the vernacular since it is the main linguistic means of communication with the grandmother. However she explicitly expresses her wish for her children's SMG learning by saying that *'...I want my children to speak the way my brother's children do...I want them to be like that...they may stay in Cyprus and I know it is different for us who live here...but I do my best as to achieve that...and you*

know my brothers' children speak Modern Greek...you cannot understand if they are from Greece or from Cyprus...their accent is perfect...this is what I want from my children'.

Discussion

Michella's mother's accounts reveal her determination for HLM. Her LI inform her language practices. Her endeavour is demanding and strenuous but her persistence overcomes the difficulties and the possible drawbacks. She identifies as a 'language learner' who invests time and effort in enriching her HL capital along with her children. Her household is a multilingual context where all the codes are in use. Nevertheless, the official varieties hold a prominent position. The FLP shows the impact of her cultural conceptions based on her past experiences and her future aspirations for her children.

7.4.3. FLP: Michella's positioning

HL use in the home domain

Michella admits that she lives in a bilingual household by saying that *'I use English and Greek with my parents and my brother...I think we may use more English'*. Her home is a *counterhegemonic* context where all three codes (SMG, CD, English) are in daily use. She describes her bilingual encounters with her brother by reporting that *'we use either English or Greek ...or sometimes English and Greek together...but I can ask him something in Greek and he may reply in English or I may say something in Greek and he may use English..'* However, her mother imposes a different form of linguistic exchange that does not allow her the flexibility of choice. She explains that *'I use English and Greek with my mother but if she says something in Greek I will speak Greek because if I say it in English she will tell me 'what do we have to do?' and I know that I have to use Greek'*. Michella develops her linguistic identity by submitting to the rules of a FLP that promotes bilingualism. She is socialized to decode her mother's linguistic messages and to switch between languages accordingly. She identifies her mother as a linguistic facilitator who provides vital assistance when she encounters difficulties. She describes that *'if I do not know a word I will ask my mother in English and she will explain to me... and I will learn something new'*.

HL use with the grandparents

Michella identifies her grandparents as a significant HL resource. For her, the use of the heritage code with her grandmother appears as a necessity and not a choice. She explains that *'when I am with my grandmother...she doesn't really know English so I cannot use English with her...'*. Therefore the HL monopolizes their encounters. The grandmother provides

substantially for her granddaughter's HL capital development. But, Michella also provides linguistic help to her grandmother. She describes that *'when we are in the bus together I have to ask the driver about the place we want to go...and I will say it to her in Greek because most of the time she does not really understand what other people say to her in English...'*. The young child takes the role of her grandmother's translator in English monolingual social encounters. Michella experiences the benefits stemming from her bilingual identity. Her linguistic capital gives her linguistic flexibility and access to the social profits of managing successful communication with a variety of speakers.

Michella also draws on her HL capital when interacting with her grandfather. Nevertheless, his bilingual linguistic identity supports her heritage code development in a different way. She explains that *'I speak Greek with my grandfather but I can also use some English...if there is a word I don't know...I will say it in English and he will tell me the Greek one...so I learn new words...but my grandmother cannot help me so much with that'*. For Michella, her grandfather is a significant linguistic facilitator providing the 'linguistic bridge' between the two languages. Thus, the benefit she receives can be two fold. So, she both enriches her HL capital and improves her linguistic deficiencies. The grandfather's bilingualism inspires a sense of linguistic safety when difficulties arise.

SMG linguistic socialization

As previously reported, both Michella's mother's and Michella's grandmother's contribution to the FLP involve the endorsement of SMG. Michella complies with her family discourse and she reproduces LI that ascribe greater social value to the standard variety than the CD. Furthermore, she puts effort into moderating her dialect influences. As she reports *'my mother says to me not to use the old words, not to say 'oi'{CD, no} but 'ohi'{SMG, no}...and when I use these words she says to me 'excuse me?'...and then I think and I say it in the right way'*. For Michella, the standard form holds the power of 'the right way'. She appears entangled within LI that give the SMG the authority to impose linguistic 'correctness'. Her accounts and her linguistic behaviour identify with Kroskrity's (2004) concept of 'practical consciousness'. Michella complies with dominant LI without contesting their legitimation. She rationalizes her linguistic choices by drawing on her family discourse as it is created and promoted by both her mother's and her grandmother's LI.

HL use outside the home domain

Michella admits that her social life consists of many experiences of *counterhegemonic* linguistic encounters and spaces. She reports that *'I use Greek...my cousins who live in England...they know Greek, they are like me...my auntie, my uncle, my grandmother's sisters and brothers...in the Greek school...when we go to church and we meet relatives'*. She draws on her HL capital to communicate with a variety of speakers in her extended family. So, for her, the immigrant code is a linguistic tool of great usability in many sites within the English society. Her bilingual ability allows her to move with flexibility between social contexts and to communicate successfully either by employing exclusively one code or by using her overall linguistic capital.

HL use outside the English context

Michella's social experiences of HL use extend outside the England. She identifies her regular visits to Cyprus as rich opportunities of ethnic code use and further development. She describes that *'we have lots of relatives in Cyprus...I see them every summer when we go for our summer holidays...my uncle and my aunties from my father's side and my cousins...they do not actually speak English so I have to use only Greek with them'*. So Michella enriches her social encounters repertoire with interactions within a social context where the EL ceases to be the legitimate code. Moreover, she realizes that EL's power varies in different countries. Furthermore, she becomes aware of the validity of her HL capital by experiencing its convertibility both to a social network of co- speakers and a symbolic capital of building close bonds with family members and friends. Therefore, her motivation for investing time and effort to advance her heritage code skills grows bigger. This arises from her wish to avoid communication disparities such as this one: *'when I was in Cyprus the last half term...we went to my cousin's house and they asked me something about my mother in Greek and I didn't know what to say and I was thinking what they were talking about...and I wanted to ask my cousins in English but they couldn't understand...and I thought that I should have learnt a few more words because if you talk to someone and they ask you something like that you should already know what they say...and I should have known that...and I had to wait for my mum to come to explain to me...and it was a little bit embarrassing you know....'*

Discussion

Michella's social network consists of various interlocutors who impose and/or encourage the HL use. She experiences the convertibility of her HL capital to social and symbolic profits both in England and in Cyprus. This affects her cultural conceptions about the languages in her

linguistic repertoire. Particularly important to her is the symbolic value of emotional attachment with family members that the HL use gives.

Linguistic difficulties, learning new words, asking for the help of other family members, searching for the meaning of words, developing the skills of switching between languages and fostering bilingual ability are part of her daily experiences. She is socialized to see such endeavours as part of her FLP, her daily routine of managing her languages. Michella finds her linguistic life entertaining and comments that *'...but if my mother can't help me, she will call my grandparents or her brother in Cyprus and they will tell her...everyone is asking somebody in our family...it is funny isn't it?'*. She is surrounded by significant figures who are involved in the same process. She is aware that learning a language requires constant support by others. Despite the complexities she shows willingness and determination to continue such a demanding linguistic journey. She responds positively towards the FLP, ascribing to the messages explicitly and implicitly articulated by her *family discourse*.

7.5. Greek Community School: perceptions and expectations

7.5.1. Michella's grandmother

GCS as a site of 'modern' language teaching

Michella's grandmother identifies the GCS as an educational institution that provides for students' 'modern' language learning. She produces and reproduces LI that view the CD as an old-fashioned code that fails to meet the linguistic requirements of the modern era. As previously said, she considers the SMG a linguistic capital that can afford her grandchildren with future social benefits. She says accordingly that *'it's good for them to go to the Greek School... I want her to learn the official language.... I am here to support her but I am not a teacher and I speak the dialect not the modern code'*. She views her own role as complementary to the educational objectives of the community schooling. She identifies as an actor who will support and encourage her granddaughter's learning but she believes that her linguistic knowledge deprives Michella from access to the socially prestigious code.

GCS and SMG further development

Michella's grandmother acknowledges Michella's advanced HL capital. Nevertheless, she expresses her wish for further HL enrichment and development. As previously said, her LI make her aspire to her grandchildren's fluency. For her, the GCS meets her expectations expressed as *'...I want them to learn the language at a higher level... they need to learn more...'*. Motivated by this future aspiration for the younger generations, she is actively

involved in Michaela's GCS homework commitments. Her behaviour implicitly reveals her LI about this educational setting and the linguistic product on offer. She illustrates the linguistic help she provided by saying that *'I helped her the other day that she was to write a story which she heard from her grandparents...it is not that she does not know many stories about our life...I have told her everything about our past...but she needed help...and I told her my ideas about what she could write and she found it very helpful...we read and we write together'*. Michaela's mother describes the two generations' collective effort. She conceives of this task as a common duty that makes both of them partners in a joint enterprise with the ultimate goals of HL learning, use and maintenance.

Discussion

Michaela's grandmother is aware that the community school is an educational setting where the legitimate code is the official language of her place of origin. As such, she highly validates its objectives since they accord with her LI created in the interest of her grandchildren's future social achievement. For her, the SMG affords the speaker with aspired social benefits. Therefore, she invests time and effort in supporting her granddaughter's learning to prompt her SMG capital development.

7.5.2. Michaela's mother

GCS: the paradox of her LI changeability within the years

Michaela's mother, as previously said, shares similar views to her mother on her children's SMG learning and put effort into developing this. She highly validates the educational setting of the GCS since she identifies with the LI that promote the dominance of the official language. Nevertheless, Michaela's mother rejected her community schooling at a young age. She explains that *'I can still remember my teacher in the Greek school...she could not understand the dialect and she did not allow us to use the words from the dialect...I did not attend lessons for more than three years...I did not like the teacher...she was very strict and unreasonable...I decided to stop it...I announced it to my parents and they could not persuade me to change my decision...'*. Her accounts disclose the changeability of her perceptions over the years. Moreover, they reveal the paradox that arises, since the LI that enact strong ties between the SMG and the GCS caused her to reject her community schooling in the past.

GCS: SMG convertibility to an economic and to a symbolic capital

Michella's mother conceives of the SMG as a code that can give the speaker particular social, economic and symbolic benefits. Her past experiences at work, reinforce such a belief. For her, the official award of a GCSE in SMG can afford the holder with greater professional flexibility in the modern labour market. She believes that the GCS attendance is inextricably associated with successful results in the official exams. She argues that *'I want them to be successful in their GCSE exams...they can take the exams...I did not have the maturity to think about all this when I was their age so as to keep going to the Greek School'*. For her, the GCS complements her endeavour to support her children's SMG linguistic capital by offering systematic knowledge about the skills tested in the official exams. She says accordingly that *'you learn things at home...but how are you going to learn to write, to learn the grammar, the more complicated part of the language?...you cannot learn these things in your family...your family teaches you the oral form of the language....but there are other things that you need to learn about the language and the Greek School teaches this missing part..'*

Discussion

Michella's mother's views about the GCS are relevant to her LI about the superiority of the SMG over the CD. Such cultural conceptions are informed by her past experiences and they are created in the interest of her children's future educational and professional attainment. Her LI have undergone alterations within the years. Her new social representations contrast with her old conceptions about languages, revealing a paradox.

7.5.3. Michella

Discourses of conflict

Michaella is aware of her parents' and grandparents' perceptions about the GCS. She reports that *'my grandparents and parents say that I have to come to the Greek school because it is good for me, that I can learn more...'*. However she reveals that *'...because for most of the things..I just get told about them at home from my grandmother...and it is a little bit boring to do it again and again...sometimes I just do not want to learn it again'*. Similarly to Marianthi, she is entangled within *discourses of conflict* since her wish to access a symbolic capital by earning the appreciation of family members contrast with her feelings about the community school. Nevertheless, her justification differs from Marianthi's. For Michella, the learning procedure fails to interest her since it does not meet her advanced linguistic needs. However, she admits that *'...but there are other times that it is quite interesting to find new words and things that I do not know... ..but I only like coming to the Greek School when... when I am*

actually talking to someone and I remember that word that I have learned at school...'. So, Michella produces an additional set of *discourses of conflict* that reveal her incoherent perceptions about the GCS. The communication disparities she has experienced in the past with her relatives who live in Cyprus²⁴ inform these views. She appears entrapped between multiple and contrasting views indicative of her complex linguistic life.

Reproducing family discourses about GCS

Michella draws on her mother's utterances to refer to her future profits from attending the GCS. She reports that *'it is boring but when you are old enough you think that it was good I went to the Greek School...my mother always says that it doesn't have to be now..'*. Michella is the recipient of a family discourse that promotes community schooling by putting emphasis on the future benefits afforded to competent HL speakers. She also echoes both her mother's and her grandmother's beliefs when she maintains that *'if I finish school I may use Greek to find a job...or I may find somebody I like and if he is Greek I will be able to communicate with him in our language...or if I meet friends who are Greek I will be able to talk to them in my own language...and I will be able to speak to my children in Greek and they can learn two languages and be ahead of others who speak only one language...but I have to learn more to do all this stuff and the Greek School can help me...my family helps me a lot but you need the proper education, don't you?'*. Michella reproduces the *family discourse* within which she is socialized. She allies with the FLP and reproduces the LI articulated implicitly and explicitly by her caretakers.

Discussion

Michella produces multiple and contrasting discourses about her GCS experiences. She is raised in a family where particular LI are diffused and articulated through the applied FLP. Her own views and justifications reproduce such a *family discourse* revealing its coherence amongst the three family members.

7.6. Summary

Michella, her mother and her grandmother have successfully maintained both the forms of the heritage code over the years. All three participants acknowledge the penetrating power of the EL but they resist its hegemony by enacting counterhegemonic practices of HL use. Their anticipated profits from using the immigrant code reinforce their efforts for its maintenance

²⁴ The incident is described in section 'HL use outside the English context' (p. 137).

and create LI that highlight its convertibility to other forms of capital. Their common perceptions about languages create a family discourse that each member in each generation reproduces. But, similarly to Marianthi's family, Michella's family appears symbolically dominated when its members submit to the power of the SMG and moderate their spoken CD.

Chapter 8. Analysis: Alex's family

8.1. Introduction

In the following paragraphs I will analyze the data collected from Alex's family. Three generations share their language histories and they reveal their LI and the applied FLP with reference to HLM. Alex's maternal grandfather moved to London at a very young age. His maternal grandmother was a native CD speaker when she immigrated. His parents learnt the CD during the years of their primary socialization. Both were born in London and received their education in the EMS. Alex's family holds a very low HL capital. The participants reproduce dominant LI that validate the EL over their mother tongue and the SMG over the CD. The identification of the CD as a linguistic code of low social value results in complex intergenerational linguistic situations. Their language histories reveal complexity, HL fluctuation over the years, linguistic dilemmas and submission to dominant LI but also involvement in *counterhegemonic* linguistic activities with significant others.

8.2. Language Histories

8.2.1. Language history: Alex's maternal grandfather

Migration history

Alex's maternal grandfather immigrated to London at the age of four. His parents owned a small family restaurant in Cyprus where the majority of the customers were English soldiers who resided in the area during the years of the British colonization. The unsettled political situation in the island led the family to abandon their country so as to establish a similar business in London. This business was passed on to their son.

Linguistic capital fluctuation over the years

Childhood linguistic experiences

Alex's maternal grandfather was a bilingual speaker when he relocated to London. His linguistic capital included both the CD and the EL. He explains that '*I knew English before moving to this country...my parents used English since the years we were in Cyprus because of the restaurant they ran*'. However, the host language gradually dominated the linguistic interactions between parents and son. The parents' wish for rapid social and linguistic adaptation informed such a linguistic choice. The EL use grew greater when the son entered the EMS. As he explains, '*in my years speaking a language other than English was a problem*

for the teachers in the English school'. Nevertheless, the dominant language was not exclusively used. The CD was also used in the family interactions but the two codes were in asymmetrical distribution at the expense of the heritage channel. He never attended lessons at a GCS since his parents' professional commitments did not allow them the luxury of time to seek opportunities for HL education.

Spouse's linguistic identity

Alex's grandfather, after completing his official schooling, started working in the family business where he met the wife he married at the age of twenty three. She was a monolingual CD speaker who strived to learn the dominant language to accelerate her social and linguistic integration in the host society. Moreover, her CD capital was a distinct variety that was unintelligible for him, because she came from a different village. Therefore the two spouses established an English monolingual pattern of communication at the expense of their dialect identities. Their daughter grew up in a household where the family members' linguistic interactions were almost exclusively in the EL. The latter has been Alex's grandfather's linguistic choice when communicating with his daughter since the early years of her socialization.

Current HL use

Alex's grandfather's CD capital only includes oral skills. The EL dominates his linguistic interactions in the English context. He explains that '*...but after all these years in London...it comes easier to use English...my mind thinks English...I have to think before saying something in Cypriot...I cannot even think when was the last time I used Cypriot...maybe in the summer when I visited Cyprus...but now we are in London and I do everything using English...so the other language is not used...I even speak English with my wife and my children...we are used to it now and it does not change'*. So, Alex's grandfather admits the dearth of HL use in his current life due to habitual linguistic behaviours which resist change to avoid communication disparities and failures.

Discussion

Alex's maternal grandfather received his primary socialization in a household where the EL had a prominent but not an exclusive role. Nevertheless his *counterhegemonic* experiences refer mainly to his childhood period. The EL gradually dominated the majority of his interactions to the point of its exclusive use throughout the years. Therefore, for him, the HL use appears as a demanding mental endeavour that prevents unprompted expressions of thoughts and feelings.

He has an English monolingual pattern of communication with some rare exceptions of CD use when he visits his homeland.

8.2.2. Language history: Alex's maternal grandmother

Migration rationale

Alex's maternal grandmother immigrated to London at the age of twenty. She comes from a village located away from Cypriot urban centres. Her parents owned a small farm producing products sold in the local market. She withdrew from the CMS at a young age to participate in the local labour force and to support the low family income. She left Cyprus at her brother's invitation. He had already been in London for one year. He sponsored her ticket and he ensured a paid job for her at a restaurant where she met her future husband.

Linguistic capital: alterations over the years

The urge for social integration

Alex's grandmother entered the host society as a monolingual CD speaker with no previous EL familiarization. Therefore she encountered many linguistic difficulties in the first years of her relocation. However, she managed to learn the dominant language even though she only developed her oral skills. She reports that '*I had difficulties at the beginning... my priority was to learn the language...because you have to find a job and you must understand what people say to you...what do you do?...you learn the language and you use it...it helps you to survive, to go on with your life*'. Alex's grandmother's linguistic capital suffered a great alteration from the early years of her immigration. She strived to learn the code that could afford her with social flexibility in the host society. So the EL gradually penetrated her daily linguistic interactions.

Spouse's linguistic identity

For Alex's grandmother, the EL power over her linguistic capital grew further when she married her husband. She viewed his dominant English identity as an opportunity for her EL skills development. Along with the disparities between the two spouses' dialects, this led to the establishment of an English monolingual pattern of communication. Nevertheless, Alex's grandmother continued drawing on the CD capital in the months that her mother stayed in London to look after her granddaughter, Alex's mother. During that time, the household altered to a *counterhegemonic* space where the EL power was shifted in favour of the CD. The grandmother and the granddaughter used exclusively the immigrant code since the former was a monolingual dialect speaker.

Current HL use

Alex's grandmother has abandoned her HL. Her exclusive linguistic choice is the English language. This is the code she employs during her social interactions both within the English context and during her rare visits to Cyprus. Reflecting on the process of her linguistic capital alteration from a monolingual CD speaker to a dominant EL speaker she comments that '*...then it becomes something normal, you do not feel different using it*'. Similarly to her husband, she admits the influential power of a habitual linguistic behaviour which acquires the strength of a 'normal' way of acting over the years.

Discussion

Alex's grandmother's linguistic capital has endured a remarkable change since the early years of her immigration. She has transformed from a CD monolingual speaker to an English monolingual one. Her *counterhegemonic* experiences refer to the first years of her relocation to England. Alex's grandmother failed to resist EL power in favour of her integration to the host society. She invested in a linguistic capital which could afford her with desired social benefits. So, her heritage code was doomed to abandonment.

8.2.3. Language history: Alex's mother

Alex' mother is thirty two years old. She is a housewife and has focused on raising her four children. She was born in England and she received her education in the EMS.

Childhood linguistic experiences

The vital role of her CD monolingual grandmother

As previously said, Alex's maternal grandparents established an English monolingual pattern of communication with their daughter. Nevertheless, Alex's mother grew up as a bilingual learner since her main caretaker, for some months every year, was her CD monolingual grandmother. She also spent her summer holidays with her grandmother in Cyprus. Alex's mother describes her close bond with her grandmother by saying that '*I was very close with my grandmother...she knew things about me that not even my mother knew...we shared secrets...and you know her language became my language...our language*'. So, for her, the CD became a vital linguistic capital for communication with such a significant figure. Moreover, it held a symbolic value of close emotional attachment with a beloved person. Alex's mother could also experience the convertibility of her HL capital to both a social capital of network of

co-speakers and a symbolic capital of building friendships during her summer holidays in Cyprus.

However, the grandmother grew older and she stopped visiting London when Alex's mother reached the age of fifteen. Her contact with her grandmother decreased to the period of her summer holidays in Cyprus. However, they had a regular communication through telephone. But, Alex's mother HL capital started altering in favour of the dominant language. The latter became her exclusive linguistic choice when her grandmother passed away. The death of her main and most significant interlocutor marked the ending of eighteen years of regular bilingual activity.

Current HL use

Alex's mother is currently an English monolingual speaker. The EL monopolizes her linguistic interactions both in London and during her summer holidays in Cyprus.

Discussion

Alex's mother experienced the *counterhegemonic* phenomenon when she was in a younger age. She drew on her CD capital and exchanged it to both a social and a symbolic capital before the age of eighteen. Nevertheless, her linguistic capital suffered an immense change after that time altering from bilingual to strictly monolingual. Her HL use ceased when her main interlocutor passed away.

8.2.4. Language history: Alex's father

Alex's father is thirty three years old and he owns a store with printing facilities. During the second year of the present research project he became the president of the parents' committee of the Greek school where all his four children attend the weekly lessons. He was born and educated in England.

Childhood linguistic experiences

Alex's father grew up as a bilingual learner. He received his primary socialization in a *counterhegemonic* household wherein both the CD and the EL were used. He describes that: '*I learned the language by using it with my parents...I was better in understanding than in speaking you know...my parents used Greek {i.e. CD} or English but I used English*'. Alex's father explains the form of his bilingual encounters with his parents. The EL dominated his speaking but he had receptive skills in both codes. Nevertheless, his parents' long working hours prohibited his extensive exposure to their heritage *human capital* (Coleman, 1988). Alex's

father grew up under the powerful linguistic influence of English speaking childminders at the expense of the further development of his HL skills.

EMS

Similarly to Marianthi's mother, Alex's father's entrance into the EMS was a decisive point for the gradual alteration of the family's linguistic balance at the expense of the CD. He describes that *'I was better at speaking Greek before going to school... I remember my mother saying I had problems with the language when I was in the nursery...but when you are a child you learn the language really fast...the school...the friends you make, help you a lot...my parents wanted me to be a good student...to be good with English...education for them was above all...they were proud of my English...when I was in the nursery the teacher told them I have to learn English well because it would be very hard for me to manage...'*. Alex's father rationalizes his parents' support for his extensive EL use by drawing on the dominant LI promoted by the EMS, which viewed bilingualism as an obstacle to students' progress. Their submission to such discourses interrelated with their wish for their son's educational achievement. Alex's father admits the linguistic impact of his peer group on his EL skills. So the EL capital grew stronger at the expense of his HL capital. His attendance in a GCS for four years failed to reverse the gradual deterioration of CD use.

Adult linguistic experiences

Alex's father lost one of his primary CD co-speakers at the age of nineteen when his father passed away. Furthermore, his mother returned to her homeland some years after his marriage. The mother and the son have been keeping frequent telephone contact. Nevertheless, their close relationship has been affected by the changeability of their linguistic identities over the years. As Alex's father explains *'...I speak with my mother on the phone once a week or once every ten days...she uses mainly Greek and some English...but her Greek has become better now that she lives in Cyprus but for me it has become the opposite...I am struggling to understand her most of the time...and her English is worse than ever you know...I think she has forgotten everything..'*. Both family members experience the penetrating power of their social context's widely spoken code over their linguistic capital. Alex's father's opportunities for HL use were further eliminated when he got married and established an almost English monolingual household. According to Alex, his parents only use the CD when they want to keep their conversation secret from their children. The HL abandonment led to his emotional detachment from his mother whom he only meets once a year during his summer holidays in Cyprus.

Discussion

Alex's father was raised in a *counterhegemonic* household. Nevertheless, he abandoned his HL when he lost opportunities of daily contact with both of his main CD interlocutors. For him, the ethnic linguistic capital stopped converting to a social and a symbolic capital. Moreover his network of social contacts stopped providing opportunities for HL use. The English language conquered his linguistic identity at the expense of the CD.

Discussion on both Alex's parents' language histories

Alex's parents' language histories bear the following similarities: both spouses a) share *counterhegemonic* experiences resisting the dominant LI that promoted English monolingualism, b) share experiences of the HL's convertibility to both a social capital of a network of co-speakers and a symbolic capital of emotional attachment to these speakers and c) gradually relinquished their HL capital when they lost their main interlocutors and subsequently the social and symbolic profits associated with its use with them.

Nevertheless, both Alex's parents' language histories are distinct in their uniqueness. So, Alex's father suffered a gradual disempowerment of his CD capital, while his wife's switch to English monolingualism was rapid and complete. Their parents ascribed to different patterns of CD use. Alex's paternal grandparents continued using both languages throughout the years they had a close bond with their son. But Alex's maternal grandparents employed an English monolingual pattern of communication. However, the presence of the grandmother altered the home language balance in favour of the CD. Each spouse was involved in *counterhegemonic* linguistic practices instigated by different significant others. So, for Alex's father his main HL providers were his parents but for Alex's mother her main HL source was her grandmother. Moreover, each spouse developed his/her CD capital to a different level associated with their caretakers' *human capital* along with the invested time and effort for its transmission to the younger generations (Coleman, 1988).

8.2.5. Language history: Alex

Alex is nine years old. His home domain is a site where the EL appears to hold an unquestionable powerful position. He says accordingly that '*...but you know we do not speak Greek in my family...I do not speak Greek with my family...we speak only English*'. Alex is an English monolingual speaker. He uses the EL to express his thoughts and his feelings. This is the linguistic medium that facilitates the articulation and the negotiation of the messages

exchanged with the members of his social network. His educational experiences in the EMS empower his EL capital and immerse him within explicit and implicit discourses that value the official language over other linguistic means. So, his private and public reality is structured, guided and experienced through the use of the EL and dominant EL ideologies.

8.3. LI: English, SMG, CD

8.3.1. Alex's maternal grandfather

EL use: a distinctive mark of prestige among immigrant group members

As previously said, Alex's grandfather is a native EL speaker. So he uses the dominant code to interpret and negotiate his social reality. But this channel has also achieved transnational recognition as a *lingua franca*. Thus it affords its speakers with social flexibility within different contexts internationally. For Alex's grandfather, the EL is his linguistic choice even when interacting with his Greek Cypriot social network both in London and in Cyprus. He reports accordingly that '*I use English with my Cypriot friends*'. Furthermore he comments that '*...most of the times they are impressed because I do not have this accent that most of them have*'. Alex's grandfather carries a 'distinctive mark' which is 'socially recognized as distinguished' and awards him with his ethnic interlocutors' admiration (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 62). So, his linguistic capital gains him honour and prestige among his Greek Cypriot friends. His low HL skills do not deprive him of immigrant group socialization. Therefore, the EL is a powerful code that monopolizes his social interactions. Alex's grandfather allies with the dominant English LI and benefits from both the symbolic and social profits that his EL use affords him.

EL use: 'being Greek doesn't have to do with the language'

Alex's grandfather identifies Cyprus as a place of great emotional value. For him, this island is an integral part of his family history and his immigrant past. So, he comments that '*I am a Greek Cypriot, I feel proud of it...for me being Greek doesn't have to do with the language...it is about how you feel inside your heart...and my heart belongs to Cyprus...it's a love that comes from your history...your roots and it is always there*'. Alex grandfather claims the detachability of his ethnic identification from the heritage code. For him, as already said, HL use is not a condition of the Greek Cypriot group membership. His sense of immigrant group belonging stems from a deep attachment to a space that links his current life with his distant past.

Promoting a provisional bilingualism for the younger generations

Alex's grandfather underlines that: *'I cannot imagine my children and my grandchildren speaking better Greek than English...what will happen with their future in England?...It is good to know Greek but what you need to survive is English'*. So, he submits to powerful LI that view the EL competence as a prerequisite for social advancement and future social mobility in the English society. Nevertheless, he does not reject bilingualism. However, his relevant LI promote a provisional form of bilingual ability defined along two axes. Firstly, he considers HL learning beneficial only if it complements an English dominant linguistic capital. Secondly, he encourages such a complementarity when the SMG is the second code. For Alex's grandfather, the CD, his own second language, is intentionally excluded from his aspirations for the younger generations' bilingual ability. He reproduces LI that place the dialect in a subordinate position to the standard variety. Reflecting on the complexity of his linguistic heritage, he comments that *'the whole thing is very complicated...you want your children to learn the language of the place you come from, but which is this language?...my parents, my mother in law and my wife speak this 'chorkatitzi'²⁵ which even in Cyprus is the language for the people who have not gone to school'*. For him, the vernacular iconizes particular identities which do not accord with his wishes for the social positioning of his younger family members.

Discussion

Alex's grandfather produces and reproduces dominant LI that validate the standard varieties over the CD. However, he clearly identifies the EL as the code of the highest status and prestige, stemming from its convertibility to other forms of capital within the English linguistic market. His multiple LI are created in the interest of his own social experiences and of his future aspirations for the younger members of his family.

8.3.2. Alex's maternal grandmother

LI: EL the key to success in England

Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) argue that LI guide the use of certain linguistic resources over others. Alex's grandmother switched to EL use at the expense of her home code. Such a linguistic behaviour is informed by her cultural conceptions about languages. She views languages as commodities that afford the speakers with particular benefits. For her, the preservation of a code is relevant to its associated profits. Thus, she abandoned her HL when

²⁵ Alex' grandfather uses the term 'chorkatitzi' and not 'chorkatika' used by Marianthi's grandparents and Michella's grandparents. Such a heavy accented term indicates the low variety of the CD he has learned from his parents.

she migrated to London since, as she reports, *'you understand that your language has no value in another country so you stop using it...I realized that my language was useless'*. Alex's grandmother produces and reproduces dominant LI that validate the EL over her immigrant code. For her, the former holds incontestable status and authority in the English society. Her LI interrelate with her past experiences as an immigrant of low EL proficiency. She explains that *'English is the language you need when you live in England and learning English has been my priority, for me and my children...my husband knew the language since he was a child and he cannot understand how hard it is when you are struggling to communicate...everything else is left behind...speaking good English is the key to success and progress in England, isn't it?'* For her, the dominant code is a valid capital that provides the bearer with social rewards. She considers it the prerequisite for achievement within the context of the demanding English linguistic market.

EL use: *'...you learn to be a Cypriot without using the language...'*

Alex's grandmother, similarly to her husband, argues for the detachability of her ethnic identity from the CD use. She states accordingly that *'it is not about how much you use the language...deep inside I love Cyprus...people criticize you but they have not gone through the difficulties I have and they cannot understand...'*. For her, the sense of Greek Cypriot group belonging is not defined by the level of HL use but of a deep emotional bond to the place of origin. Her language history reveals the social circumstances that led to her abandonment of the heritage code. Despite arguing for the malleability of the linguistic aspect of her immigrant origin, she claims an immutable affective impact of her bond to her homeland.

Allying with dominant LI about SMG

Alex's grandmother is the recipient and producer of LI that enact the process of *iconization* (Gal and Irvine, 1995; Irvine and Gal, 2000). So, for her, both the SMG and the CD index particular social identities. She perceives the SMG as representative of speakers who respond effectively to the linguistic demands of the modern social world. But she *iconizes* CD with social identities of low recognition and status. She reports accordingly that *'...it is not nice to speak the dialect, is it?...it reminds you of something old, old-fashioned...after all the Greek language is the one the children should learn...this is the one that will help them later in life...the dialect is the language that old people use, the young people are modern and they should use the modern language'*. Alex's grandmother produces and reproduces social stereotypes and dominant discourses which afford the official language the prestige of the legitimate language. Although she is not a SMG user she recognizes its symbolic power since

she was raised and educated within a social context 'in which this definition of the legitimate and the illegitimate language is established and imposed' (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 44). She submits to the power of the 'dominant language ideology' (Milroy, 2007).

Discussion

Individuals' LI are both informed by dominant ideologies along with their subjective social experiences. Bourdieu (1991) argues for the extensive power of the former over the latter. Alex's grandmother submits to the penetrating power of dominant English and SMG LI. She conceives of languages as commodities to be exchanged for specific social profits. So, she switched to English monolingualism to access economic and social profits in the English society. Moreover, she aspires to SMG linguistic identities for the younger generations in the interest of their future social advancement. She expresses a *practical consciousness* of the LI she receives and produces since she tends to reproduce dominant LI as unchallenged and highly naturalized (Kroskrity, 2004). Her views about the changeability of the linguistic aspect of her Greek Cypriot identity facilitate her submission to such dominant discourses.

Discussion on both Alex's grandparents' LI

Both Alex's maternal grandparents recognize and submit to the symbolic power of the EL and the SMG. They validate languages with reference to their convertibility to social benefits. Therefore, their LI place codes in a hierarchical order. For them, the EL holds the prominent position. It is the channel that affords the speaker with social flexibility and mobility. The SMG holds a subordinate role but accords with their aspirations for the younger generation's future linguistic identities. The CD is doomed to 'silence' and abandonment since it fails to secure any social, economic or symbolic advantages. Both spouses seem entangled within dominant LI that impose the legitimacy and authority of the standard forms over the vernacular. Their past *counterhegemonic* experiences of CD use and their associated profits have faded over the years under the penetrating power of the dominant LI. Their current views appear dominated in the interest of their grandchildren's future social advancement. Moreover, both spouses claim an ethnic identity that is detached from HL use. Thus, for them, the form of the code to be maintained does not affect group membership either for themselves or their children and grandchildren.

8.3.3. Alex's mother

EL use and the younger generations

Alex's mother, echoing her parents, submits to the dominant English LI. She sees this code as a linguistic product of great social value within the English context. Therefore, she argues for her children's EL capital development. She states that *'...it is important for them to learn English, we live in England after all...'*. Her LI are affected by the dominant English discourses along with her desire for her children's future social achievement.

EL use and double ethnic identification

Alex's mother, similarly to her parents, identifies her Greek Cypriot group belonging with a great emotional attachment to Cyprus. Nevertheless, for her, such a deep bond is inspired by her close relationship with her grandmother. She states accordingly that *'a part of myself is British...I think that being a Greek Cypriot is in a way rooted in my heart, something that my grandmother put inside me when I was young and this does not have to do only with the language...it is a deep love inside you that you cannot describe or explain'*. Alex's mother underlines her hybrid sense of identity where both her Cypriot background and the British social and cultural context create communication links. The former has a powerful affective impact. The second carries the significance of her place of birth along with the context of her primary and secondary socialization. Both of them interrelate to produce a hybrid identity as a British Cypriot.

CD LI: changeability within the years

Alex's mother admits that her CD LI have changed throughout the years since the loss of her grandmother, who was the chief agent of her heritage code socialization. She says accordingly that *'when I was young and my grandmother was alive it was different, I loved this language because it was my grandmother's language...I did not care if it was called 'chorkatika'...it was the language that we shared...after her death there was no point in using it...and now I do not want my children to learn or to speak a language that is not official...things have changed now...the dialect is the language that our grandparents and our parents use...and you want the best for your children...you want them to learn a language that will help them in their future'*. Alex's mother submits to the power of the SMG. Her cultural conceptions about the CD have undergone alteration. Her social role as a mother of four children who wishes for their future achievement informs her current perceptions about the vernacular. Baker (1992) argues for the effect of an actor's age and his/her key experiences on his/her language cultural representations about languages. So, Alex' mother seems to have renegotiated her beliefs

about the CD and the SMG with reference to her interpretations of the current demands of the linguistic market. She views the SMG as a capital that can convert to beneficial assets for her children. Her current beliefs are guided by the dominant LI which validate the official language over the dialect. She produces and reproduces prevalent discourses that identify the vernacular with particular social identities. Even though the CD held a heavy symbolic power for her, she withdrew from efforts to maintain it in favour of the code imposed as legitimate.

Discussion

Alex's mother is entangled within dominant LI that promote the standard varieties at the expense of the CD. She is *symbolically dominated* since she submits to such discourses while producing and reproducing their messages. For her, languages are products to be exchanged for other forms of social benefits within the current linguistic market. Therefore, she promotes the channels that endorse social recognition stemming from their status as official languages.

8.3.4. Alex's father

LI: EL and younger generation's future advancement

Alex's father, echoing his parents in law and his wife, argues for the EL's uncontested power within the English society. For him, dominant language proficiency is a prerequisite for his children's educational achievement and future social development. He underlines that: *'I want him (Alex) to be good in English, I am very worried about his future...to be honest I am mostly concerned about my children's success in the English school because this is what they need for their future...Greek has a secondary role'*. He views the EL as a capital of greater value than the HL. He produces and reproduces dominant discourses that impose the superiority of the official code over the heritage language. He submits to the authority of the EMS on the base that it links educational achievement with future professional development. Therefore, the linguistic product on demand and on offer within the setting of EMS acquires the force of a 'common sense' requirement for social achievement.

EL use enacting ties to Greek Cypriot ethnic identity

Alex's father states that *'I am a Greek Cypriot...this is my background and Cyprus is the place I come from...and you know in London nothing changes if you know the (H) language...even people who speak Greek or the dialect, use English...they use the safe way'*. He argues for the detachability between his ethnicity and the heritage code. For him, the English context does not demand the immigrant group members to prove their 'authenticity' through HL

competence. Therefore, he can experience group membership by employing his English linguistic identity.

Submitting to dominant LI about SMG

Alex's father, similarly to his wife, produces and reproduces dominant LI that validate the SMG over the CD. He acknowledges and (*mis*)recognizes the authority of the standard variety. He reports that '*it is not the Modern Greek the language we know...it is the dialect...and I want my children to learn the official language...I do not speak Greek to my children because it is the dialect that I have learned from my parents...and even if I could use it fluently...both me and my wife wouldn't use it because we want our children to learn the official language...*'. He bends to the prevailing linguistic force of the SMG. For him, this code is the capital he seeks to complement his children's linguistic repertoire since its symbolic and material profit is safeguarded in the current linguistic market. Therefore, his 'anticipation of possible profit naturally takes the form of an anticipated *censorship*, of a self-censorship which determines not only...the choice of language...but also what it will be possible or not possible to say' (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 77).

Discussion

Alex's father, similarly to his wife, appears *symbolically dominated* submitting to two different sets of dominant LI. His cultural conceptions about languages are informed by their convertibility to desired social benefits along with his aspirations for his children's future social achievement.

Discussion on both Alex's parents'LI

Both spouses share common experiences of the dominant LI articulated and transmitted through the educational system, the media and their interactions within the English dominant society. Such discourses promote the belief that EL is a code of higher social value than the HL. They are tied to the English political and economic interests and their creation is associated with the foundation of the English nation state. So, the distinctive official language is endorsed as the only linguistic capital that can afford the bearer access to economic, social and symbolic profits within the English context. Thus, the social actors experience the constraints set by the wider social order in which they are entangled. Nevertheless, they are neither mere, passive pawns of structural conditions nor exclusively led by the guidelines promoted. They have an active role in constructing social reality by exercising their agency through their interpretation

of social phenomena. These are constantly informed by their particular social positioning within the wider social context.

So, Alex's parents submit to EL dominant discourses but they also produce LI that support HLM. Nevertheless, their views reveal their submission to a new set of dominant discourses with reference to the SMG. Similarly to Alex's maternal grandparents they place languages in a hierarchical order defined by each code's convertibility to desired social profits. So, the EL holds the unchallenged power of a 'common sense' linguistic competency associated with successful social integration in the English context. Their role as parents who wish to invest in their children's future social identities interrelates with their current LI about the SMG. They believe that the official code of their place of origin affords the bearer with greater social, economic and symbolic benefits than the CD. Thus they promote the former at the expense of the latter. They even choose to *censor* themselves to avoid their children's familiarization with a code of low social value. Both spouses are recipients and producers of dominant discourses that validate the standard varieties over the CD.

8.3.5. Alex

LI: submitting to English monolingualism

As previously said, Alex is growing up in a household where the family members have established communication through the exclusive use of the EL. This code is highly validated by both his parents and his grandparents. So he is immersed in relevant LI transmitted implicitly or explicitly through his interactions with them. Moreover, Alex is the recipient of dominant discourses promoted or even imposed by the influential institution of the EMS, which also facilitates the hegemony of the EL. Similarly, he is exposed to the LI promoted by the English television programmes and other forms of media such as films, videos, advertisements and internet use. All the latter endorse the monopoly of the EL. Additionally, he is subjected to similar prevalent discourses produced and reproduced during his socialization with his monolingual peer group. Thus, Alex is entangled within multiple LI that endow EL with uncontested authority over his social life. Thus his LI support his mother tongue's superiority and indispensable daily use. Accordingly he states that '*...I do not have to learn Greek because I do not need it...everyone speaks English to me...'*

LI: HL

(The following extract is part of the audio recorded lessons in the GCS, T: teacher, A: Alex, M: Marianthi, Mi: Michella)

T: *Ήταν εύκολο το homework;* (Was the homework easy?)

M: Όι (no, CD).

Mi: Όχι (No, SMG) –addressing to Marianthi- *You should say ‘όχι’ not ‘όι’.*

T: *Alex, do you understand what we are talking about?*

A: *I did not understand what you said but I know that Michella said ‘no’ while Marianthi didn’t pronounce the word properly...*

T: *Is there any difference between the two words?*

A: *Yes, there is...Marianthi forgot to pronounce the middle letter...*

Alex’s response indicates his lack of familiarity with the HL. He is unaware of the two forms associated with his Greek Cypriot origin. Accordingly he sees the SMG word as correct. His community schooling reinforces such cultural conceptions. For him, the CD is not the ‘proper’ linguistic form. He *misrecognizes* its authority and legitimation. Thus he appears *symbolically dominated* and he reproduces the dominant SMG LI. His lack of HL socialization experiences affects his linguistic understanding.

Language use and Ethnic identity

Despite the fact that both Alex’s grandparents and his parents argue for the detachability between HL use and their sense of ethnic identity, Alex presents his own understanding of this. He comments that *‘I am English and just a little bit Greek, but my parents are English and Greek...my ‘yiayia’ (grandmother) and my ‘papou’ (grandfather) are Greek and English’.* He explains the latter statement by saying that *‘it is because my grandparents know more Greek than my parents...but I cannot understand and I cannot speak Greek...’.* For him, the degree of ethnic belonging is defined by the level of heritage language proficiency. Even though his grandparents use exclusively the EL when addressing him, he affords them HL competency since he believes that *‘all the grandparents know Greek but when they are with people who do not know Greek they use English...’.* Alex justifies his British identity by stating that *‘I am English because I was born in England, I go to the English school, all my friends are English and I am more used to do English stuff’.* He also rationalizes his Greek Cypriot identity by saying that *‘I am Greek because my parents and my grandparents are Greek and because I come to the Greek School...I go to Cyprus and all these festivals with my father...I go to church sometimes’.* Alex claims a hybrid identity involving both his Greek Cypriot background and his English way

of being. He partially reproduces his *family discourse* created and promoted by his caretakers, explaining his own interpretation of social reality.

Discussion

Alex produces and reproduces dominant EL and SMG LI. His socialization experiences empower EL supremacy. An exception to his English monolingual spaces of interaction is the GCS. However, the latter educational institution creates and promotes a new set of dominant LI about the SMG. Alex performs a *practical consciousness* of prevalent LI producing and reproducing relevant discourses (Kroskrity, 2004). His lack of HL socialization deprives him of familiarization with both forms of the heritage code. Therefore, he is entangled within prevailing messages that endorse official languages with ultimate control and authority. But Alex partially reproduces the *family discourse* created by his parents and his grandparents regarding the lack of links between ethnic belonging and heritage language use.

8.4. Family Language Policy: Alex's family

8.4.1. Alex's grandfather's contribution to FLP

Discrepancy between LI and linguistic practices

Alex's grandfather's LI partially promote his grandchildren's bilingualism. Nevertheless, his beliefs are not translated into practices. He employs an English monolingual pattern of communication with the younger generations. But this linguistic behaviour does not only stem from his lack of SMG competency but also from his perceptions regarding parental responsibilities. Thus he relinquishes his own contribution to a relevant FLP. He states that '*it is their parents' responsibility to help them learn the language...we tried to do our best for our daughter...she went to the Greek School and she learned some of the modern language...she should speak to the children in Greek...'*

8.4.2. Alex's grandmother's contribution to FLP

Discrepancy between LI and linguistic practices

Alex's grandmother allies with her husband's views. She also validates SMG over the CD and considers HLM to be the parents' duty. Her linguistic behaviour is similar to her husband's since she uses only English with her grandchildren. However, she attributes her poor contribution to FLP to the lack of regular socialization with her family. So, she comments that '*...we are old and we did all we could...my daughter and her husband should do more and help the children with the language...after all we do not see them very often'*

Discussion on both Alex's grandparents contribution to FLP

Both Alex's maternal grandparents disclaim their contribution to a FLP that promotes HL learning and maintenance. Although, their LI endorse SMG, they lack this code and do not consider it their responsibility to help the younger generation's heritage language socialization. Their views and their linguistic behaviour deprive of the HL experiences that both Marianthi and Michella share with their grandparents.

8.4.3. Alex's parents' contribution to FLP

Ethnic socialization experiences

Both Alex's parents admit the exclusive use of the EL with their children. Moreover, they both aspire for their children's SMG linguistic capital development. Therefore they employ a FLP that may not involve HL use among the family members, but encourages and promotes the younger generation's heritage language socialization experiences. They hire a private Greek tutor to support Alex's SMG linguistic capital. So they exchange their high family income to their child's HL capital development. They also support his regular attendance in the GCS. Furthermore, they attend various Greek Cypriot festivals in London. Additionally, they pay frequent visits to Cyprus. Thus their young children gain social experiences associated with their Greek Cypriot background.

Discussion

Alex's parents may deprive their children of receiving their socialization in a *counterhegemonic* household but they promote their immersion in other spaces where the Greek Cypriot community socializes. Their contribution to the FLP involves linguistic practices that promote their children's SMG learning. Their beliefs and their evaluation about languages interrelate with their linguistic behaviour and their efforts for HLM. Their HL management practices may appear less linguistically focused than the other two families but they encourage their children's familiarization with ethnic spaces.

8.4.4. FLP: Alex's positioning

The EL monopolizes Alex's linguistic interactions with his family members. Therefore, such encounters cannot provide for his HL learning or development. Nevertheless, his parents describe their FLP and their efforts for his heritage language socialization in other ethnic spaces. But how does Alex respond to such experiences? What is the language used when he is involved in such Greek Cypriot social encounters? How does he manage to meet the linguistic requirements of social situations expected to demand HL communicative abilities?

Visits to Cyprus

Alex linguistic experiences in Cyprus fail to provide for his immersion in the HL. He reports that *'...everyone speaks English in Cyprus...in the restaurants...in the shops...my friends...my neighbours...one time I remember that we went somewhere and they could not speak English, can you believe that?'*. The proliferation of EL use on the island deprives him of the opportunity to experience the convertibility of his HL to other forms of capital. His mother tongue is the only medium he converts into a social capital of a network of friends and a symbolic capital of close bonds with them. It is a powerful and ubiquitous communication channel penetrating his everyday activity on the island. As he describes *'I play with other children in Cyprus...they live across the road...they live in England too...they go to Cyprus every summer...we speak English...we meet every summer...they are like my summer friends...'*. So, Alex lacks not only opportunities to use the HL but also the motivational force which could inspire him to invest in learning it.

Social encounters with his paternal grandmother

Alex's paternal grandmother has lived permanently in Cyprus in recent decades. The grandmother and the grandchildren meet once a year. As Alex explains *'I may see my grandmother once in three weeks when we are in Cyprus...she speaks Greek to me and I cannot understand her...my father translates in English so as to understand her'*. The young child is emotionally detached from his grandmother. The lack of a shared communication code prohibits a bond between them.

Greek Cypriot festivals in London

Alex and his family attend various Greek Cypriot festivals in London. Nevertheless, even in these spaces, the dominant channel in use is the EL. As he describes *'I meet other Greek Cypriots in these festivals or so that I go with my father and they all speak English...they are like me.....but I speak English with my friends and my father speaks English with the people we see there....'*.

Discussion

Alex's participation in the spaces where the Greek Cypriot community socializes and the FLP promotes, fail to endorse HL learning and development. So, for him the use of the EL is unquestionably associated with the majority of his social life. Thus, it has attained the powerful position of a *common sense* linguistic act. It operates as the medium that meets the 'normal' expectations, 'a consensus ...to accept their language norms and usage as standard' (Wiley, 2000, p.113). This is the outcome of the hegemonic force of the EL 'deeply saturating

the consciousness' to the point of perceiving it as the only linguistic choice in all the social fields where the person interacts (Williams, 1980, p.8).

8.5. Greek Community School: perceptions and expectations

8.5.1. Alex's grandfather

Changeability of LI over the years

Alex's grandfather encouraged his daughter's attendance at the GCS. Nevertheless, he recalls her negative educational experiences by saying that '*I remember my daughter coming back for the Greek School upset just because a teacher had made fun of a word she had used which did not exist...*'. So, he accepted her decision to withdraw from the school. However, he currently expresses his wish for his grandchildren's regular attendance. His LI afford SMG superiority over the CD. The GCS is a counterhegemonic space where the SMG is the legitimate code. Thus, it accords with his aspirations for his grandchildren's future linguistic identities. Therefore he validates its role and the linguistic product on offer. His perceptions have changed over the years, responding to his interpretations of the social reality and the new demands of the linguistic markets.

8.5.2. Alex's grandmother

Changeability of LI over the years

Alex's grandmother complies with her husband's views. She also views positively her grandchildren's attendance in the GCS. Her cultural conceptions about languages reveal the high value she ascribes to the linguistic product on offer there. Thus, the LI created and promoted within it accord with her aspiration about her descendants future linguistic identities. However, her perceptions, similarly to her husband, have altered over the years. Her current social representations support an educational setting that failed to meet her daughter's linguistic needs in the past.

Discussion on both Alex's maternal grandparents' GCS perceptions and expectations

Both Alex's maternal grandparents support the GCS setting. They identify it with an institution where the SMG is the legitimate language. As such it offers a linguistic product which is highly valued. Both of them appear symbolically dominated, acknowledging superiority of the SMG over the CD. The target language in the community school accords with their aspiration for the younger generations to learn a language beneficial for future advancement. Their language

evaluations about the two forms of the HL comply with the LI created and promoted within this educational setting.

Furthermore, both Alex's grandparents show their recognition of the GCS by consistently attending all the events organized by this institution. They join the audience of the students' parents and grandparents to praise their grandchildren's participation in school plays. Moreover, they also participate in the annual 'dinner and dance' held by the Greek School Parents Committee, including traditional Greek and Cypriot dance performances by the children. Even though they underline the limited time they spend with their grandchildren, their behaviour reveals their positive evaluation of the GCS. Despite the fact that they admit the lack of a strong bond with their daughter and their grandchildren, they express both verbally and in practical terms their approval of the education the children receive in such a setting.

8.5.3. Alex's mother

GCS: past experiences

Alex's mother describes her educational experiences in the GCS by saying that *'I quit Greek School when I was ten years old...I did not like it...I thought it was a waste of time... ..I just hated going there and not learning anything more than the things I already knew from my grandmother...I felt like it was a waste of time...all my Saturday mornings I had to go to the Greek School'*. So, Alex's mother questions the value of her community schooling. She challenges its educational efficiency regarding her HL skills development. She expresses her disappointment about the unequal profits she received in comparison to the time she invested in attending lessons there. All the above informed her decision to terminate her participation.

GCS: present perceptions

Despite the fact that Alex's mother recalls unpleasant memories from the years of her community schooling, she supports and promotes her children's HL education. She justifies the alteration of her views over the years by underlining the value of the linguistic product offered in the GCS. As she claims *'I do not want my children to learn or to speak a language that is not official...things have changed now...the dialect is the language that our grandparents and our parents use...and you want the best for your children...you want them to learn a language that will help them in their future'*. For her, the GCS is identified with an institution where the SMG is the legitimate code. Driven by her LI, she views this code as the linguistic medium for her

children's access to future social rewards. Therefore, she highly validates and supports the operation of the institution that offers such a linguistic product.

8.5.4. Alex's father

GCS: past experiences

Alex's father recalls his community schooling by reporting that *'I went to the Greek school but I did not like it...the teachers were different...more strict and ...it was on Saturdays...you know how the children are expecting the weekend to do fun things...and I had to go to the Greek School...so I stopped it...my parents did not like it but I could not find any difference in my life by going to the Greek School...I knew the language from my parents'*. So, similarly to his wife, he challenges the teaching practices and the efficiency of learning. He also comments on his sense of difference to the members of his peer group. For him, the GCS attendance was an extra educational commitment without any further academic benefits regarding HL development. Therefore, he withdrew at a young age.

GCS: present perceptions

Alex's father encourages his children's participation in the weekly lessons in the GCS. He rationalizes his standpoint by saying that *'it is not the Modern Greek the things we know...it is the dialect...and I want my children to learn the official language...I want them to take the GCSE exams in modern Greek and I cannot help them'*. For him, his children's community schooling is an investment for their future competency in SMG. He considers this code a linguistic capital that can afford the speaker the symbolic and material profits associated with an official language. His perceptions are further informed by his involvement in GCS administration. His position as the president of the parents' committee requires regular contact with the Greek and the Cypriot educational offices in London. Socializing with the educational counsellors, attending educational conferences and meetings and socializing his with administrators from Greece and Cyprus introduce him to a number of social contexts where the SMG is the legitimate language. Such social experiences increase the value he attributes to this code.

Discussion on both Alex's parents' GCS perceptions and expectations

For both Alex's parents, the personal sacrifices they underwent to attend the weekly lessons in the GCS were not converted to the expected educational profits. Therefore they both terminated their community schooling experiences at a young age. Their past experiences and their current views about this institution reveal a paradox. They both ascribe high value to the

educational setting and the code that they rejected when they were young. Their social role as parents of four children who wish to provide for their offsprings' future social advancement inform their present perceptions and evaluations. For them, the younger generation should acquire the code which is 'recognized as legitimate competence, as authority exerting an effect of (mis)recognition' (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 185). They believe that their children's linguistic capital will convert to 'profits of distinction' as official language speakers (ibid, p. 185). Thus, both Alex's parents are involved in a process of re-evaluation of the GCS on a new basis as defined by the perceived price of the product on offer, the SMG.

8.5.5. Alex

'...I do not like Greek school...'

Alex questions and challenges the institution of the GCS by saying that '*I do not like Greek School...it is like your mum and dad have to force you to come to the Greek School..*'. He is aware that his attendance meets his parents' wishes. Nevertheless, he underlines that the latter contradicts his own will and desires. Alex draws on a number of powerful arguments to justify his disapproval of his community schooling. His views are informed by his current linguistic life and his experiences as a student in two different educational institutions, both the EMS and the GCS. So, he comments on his overloaded weekly programme by reporting that '*I also learn Spanish and German in the English School...I have an English tutor on Wednesday and a Greek tutor on Friday...and I have also to come to the Greek School...but why?*'.

For Alex, the HL is an additional foreign language he has to learn since it does not have any practical usability in his daily life. Furthermore, he contrasts his foreign language learning experiences in the English school to the ones he has in the GCS by reporting that '*Greek school is two hours...we just do half an hour with the other languages...learning the other languages at the English school is more fun...we do games...we use computers...in the Greek school everything is old...the books are old...it is only reading and writing...*'. So, Alex criticizes the traditional learning approach in the GCS which appears parochial, uninteresting and disengaging. His negative views are further empowered by the fact that such an institution operates outside the EMS and therefore its status is vulnerable to scepticism *per se*.

Additionally, Alex feels that his community schooling gives him an undesirable mark of difference from the members of his peer group. He states that '*everyone goes to the English School but not everyone goes to other schools like Greek School...but why...why do I have to*

learn this language?...everyone can understand English'. This dissimilarity to his classmates is associated with the personal sacrifice of investing two hours of his afterschool time twice a week in a dissatisfying experience of language learning. Alex feels trapped within an institution where the linguistic product on offer is irrelevant to his needs. His social experiences both in England and in Cyprus have proved the power of his mother tongue as a *lingua franca* that enables communication with speakers of different ethnicities from all around the world.

Discussion

Alex challenges the institution of the GCS and its learning approach. Despite his parents' and his grandparents' encouragement, he refuses to identify as a learner of a language without practical value in his daily life. He resents his sense of difference to his friends who are not involved in similar endeavours. He is aware of the power his mother tongue holds since it is the only linguistic code which ensures successful communication in a variety of contexts both in England and in Cyprus. Therefore he fails to recognize the value of putting extra effort into learning a language which cannot provide him with any additional assets or access to desired social resources. The use of the EL meets all his communication needs without drawbacks or linguistic insecurity. Consequently, HL learning seems a strenuous procedure, an extra duty which he does not desire to undertake.

8.6. Summary

Alex has been raised in a family where the EL prevails. Both his parents and his maternal grandparents have submitted to the power of the dominant language at the expense of the heritage code. They have abandoned the CD over the years. Specific sociohistorical circumstances affected this phenomenon. Alex's grandparents and parents validate the SMG over the CD. But only his parents initiate practices that encourage his learning of the official form of his HL. His grandparents do not contribute to his HL learning in practical terms but they show their approval of his efforts by specific actions. Alex's social experiences with other members of the Greek Cypriot community both in London and in Cyprus reinforce his LI about the unquestionable validity of his mother tongue, the EL. Despite his low HL proficiency, he argues for a hybrid identity involving both his Cypriot background and his English way of being. He partially reproduces his *family discourse* that promotes the detachability between language use and ethnic belonging.

Chapter 9. Analysis –Comparison of the three families

9.1. Introduction

In this chapter I will provide a comparative analysis of the collected data. The research questions lead the formation the categories under discussion. My aim is to reveal the commonalities and the differences in the participants' language histories. Each member in each family carries unique linguistic experiences and perceptions about languages. These inform each participant's contribution and response to the FLP. Moreover each family appears as a unique dynamic system of interrelationships between its members.

9.2. 1st generation

The members of the first generation who participate in the present study are Alex' maternal grandparents, Michella's maternal grandmother and Marianthi's maternal grandparents. The first four categories ('age of immigration', 'linguistic environment', 'ethnic social network' and 'spouse's linguistic identity') that I shall discuss appear as the most significant self reported factors that caused the alterations of their linguistic capital throughout the years. These interrelate with the last two categories ('FLP with reference to their children' and 'FLP with reference to their grandchildren') in the sense that these form the participants' past experiences which affect both their cultural representations about languages and their contribution to the FLP.

9.2.1. Age of immigration

In the literature the age of immigration is identified as an important component affecting successful HLM (Kipp et al., 1995). People who experience immigration during the years of their primary socialization are exposed to the penetrating power of the host language while holding an underdeveloped HL capital. This may have a detrimental impact on the latter in favour of the dominant code. Alex's grandfather is the only participant who migrated to London at a very young age. He was four years old when his family moved to England. Michella's grandmother relocated at the age of sixteen. Alex's grandmother and Marianthi's grandparents shared the same experience around the age of twenty. Thus, among the five, Alex's grandfather received part of his primary socialization in the host society. Thus, even though he holds a basic CD capital, he failed to develop it further due to his early social engagement within the English context. All the other members of the first generation immigrated to London bearing a rich CD linguistic capital. Its preservation seemed to be

affected by their cultural conceptions about its value as a capital convertible to social profits, particularly in the workplace.

9.2.2. Linguistic environment of the workplace

Myers-Scotton (2006), summarizing the central factors affecting HLM, identifies the workplace as a space that causes HL use deterioration. In my study, both Marianthi's grandparents and Alex's grandmother reveal their anxiety about rapid linguistic adaptation to an English dominant work context in the first years of their relocation. They identify this as a decisive factor leading to the gradual deterioration of their HL use. They justify their linguistic behaviour by drawing on their need to invest in a linguistic capital that could convert to a desired social and economic capital in their new place of residence. Therefore, they admit that EL interfered even with their interaction with heritage code speakers. However, Michella's grandmother's case challenges the view that maintains a powerful and incontestable association between advancement in the host society and proficiency in the host language. Her powerful CD linguistic identity escaped alteration due to the support of a bilingual professional environment. Contrary to all the other first generation participants, Alex's grandfather avoided dilemmas since his linguistic knowledge met the demands of the English labour market.

9.2.3. Greek Cypriot social network

The beneficial impact of the immigrant group social network on HLM is extensively reported in the literature (Myers-Scotton, 2006; Kipp et al., 1995; Giles et al., 1977). The actor's socialization with co speakers can be advantageous for his/her HL capital development. Moreover, the bearer's HL capital can facilitate the extension of his/her social capital of group contacts and provide for his/her symbolic profits of close emotional bonds with significant others. So, all the participants connect HL learning and preservation with regular socialization with co speakers both in London and in Cyprus. Marianthi's grandparents admit the beneficial impact of their regular visits to Cyprus on the development of both their own and the younger generations' HL capital. Similarly, Marianthi's grandfather argues that the small size of his community in the past accelerated EL dominance. Alex's grandparents attribute their daughter's high CD skills to her socialization with her grandmother. Michella's grandmother views both her family members' relocation to London and the wide network of co speakers in her workplace, as significant factors that supported her strong heritage linguistic identity and her close bond with her parents and her siblings. Similarly to Marianthi's grandparents, she believes that her family's regular trips to Cyprus update their existent HL capital.

Nevertheless, Alex's grandfather's accounts challenge the interrelationship between HLM and immigrant group social network. He admits that his regular interactions with his Greek Cypriot acquaintances are English dominated. For him, the EL use in such communicative instances does not appear an obstacle for converting his linguistic capital to a social capital. On the contrary, such a linguistic act affords him a symbolic capital, a distinctive mark (Bourdieu, 1991) which inspires recognition and admiration from his friends of Greek Cypriot origin. But for Michella's grandmother it is the HL use that operates as an identity marker that affords the speaker with his/her recognition as an 'authentic' group member.

9.2.4. Spouse's linguistic identity

Brown (2008) connects the spouses' common immigrant linguistic identity with successful HLM. This is evident in the cases of Marianthi's and Michella's grandparents. Both spouses shared the same immigrant code and therefore they could choose to preserve it through interpersonal communication. The common linguistic background again proved essential for Marianthi's grandparents' decision to revitalize their HL use in later life. Nevertheless, Alex's grandparents' language histories reveal a complex dimension involved in the cases of spouses whose homeland is a diglossic society. Each partner spoke a different dialect used in his/ her own village of origin. Therefore the communication disparities they encountered, along with the wife's wish for rapid linguistic adaptation to the host society, reinforced dominant language use between the two partners. So, the claim that the spouses' common immigrant linguistic identity is challenged when immigrants' linguistic background involves local dialects that differ to the point of incomprehensibility.

9.2.5. FLP with reference to their children

The families founded by the first generation immigrants applied unique FLP informed by the interrelationship between their past linguistic experiences, their cultural conceptions about languages and their future aspirations for their children. So, Marianthi's grandparents admit the partial abandonment of their mother tongue when their children were young. Their FLP involved the parallel use of the two codes, EL and CD, but in uneven distribution. They both submitted to dominant LI that promoted the belief that the EL is the only code giving the speaker social benefits within the English context. Their children's entrance to the EMS empowered such dominant discourses at the expense of the CD use. Nevertheless, they never shifted from the use of the latter channel. Their regular visits to their homeland provided their children with opportunities to experience the convertibility of their home language to both a social capital of friends and a symbolic capital of close relationships with their relatives residing

permanently on the island. Furthermore, they encouraged their children's participation in the GCS. So, they invested in linguistic practices to provide for their children's heritage linguistic identity. Both Marianthi's grandparents admit greater HL use with their daughter in recent years. Their accounts reveal the alteration of the FLP throughout their lifetime.

Michella's grandparents' FLP, with reference to their children, refers to the extensive use of the CD. This appeared as a necessity due to the grandmother's almost monolingual identity. Similarly to Marianthi's grandparents, they travelled often to their homeland with their children investing both in their bonding with their relatives who resided in Cyprus and the parallel reinforcement of their bilingual skills. Additionally, they held positive attitudes towards the GCS and encouraged their daughter's regular attendance. Their FLP appears consistent throughout the years emphasizing the importance of maintaining the heritage code. They perform a similar linguistic behaviour in the current years by expressing their demand and persistence for HL use within their home context. However, a new code has entered their linguistic exchanges resulting from their submission to a new set of LI that promote the standard variety domination. The SMG informs greatly their current linguistic repertoire. So, the current FLP may continue to endorse HL use but the form of the heritage code has altered by embracing SMG influences.

Alex' grandparents established an English dominant household, due to the grandmother's symbolic domination by the host language and the communication disparities caused by the spouses' different dialects. The official language became their exclusive medium of communication when addressing their daughter. Nevertheless, they supported and encouraged her GCS attendance. Additionally, they viewed positively their daughter's CD use with monolingual dialect-speaking grandmother. However, they never put effort into employing their HL capital to provide for their child's further heritage language development. Their FLP reveals consistency throughout the years since they continue to employ exclusively the EL when interacting with their daughter.

Each couple's FLP appears unique in its particularities. Both Michella's grandmother's and Alex's grandparents' reports reveal the relative stability of the chosen form of interaction with their children since they were young. But, Marianthi's grandparents' FLP seems to have undergone great changes. The power of the EL has shifted placing the HL in the position of the dominant linguistic choice when interacting with their daughter. Similarly to Michella's mother, they also have updated their linguistic identities with many SMG influences which

they use when their grandchildren are present. However, a common element of all three couples' specific actions for HLM refers to their support and approval of their children's GCS attendance. Even Alex's grandparents, who used English monolingual language practices with their daughter, enacted a form of HLM management by encouraging their daughter's community schooling.

9.2.6. Family language policy with reference to their grandchildren

A new linguistic element that interferes with the first generation participants' contribution to and/or perceptions about the FLP, with reference to their grandchildren, is the SMG. Despite the fact that they were not concerned about the transmission of the official form of their HL when their children were of school age, their current views and their linguistic behaviour are considerably different. All of them now acknowledge the penetrating power of the standard variety. They are recipients of dominant LI articulated explicitly or implicitly through the Cypriot media, the established policies on their island and the institution of the GCS in London. Their regular socialization with other Greek Cypriots provides them with the opportunity to update their views about the demands of the new linguistic market. All the participants attribute a higher value to SMG than the CD. They are recipients and producers of powerful LI that favour the standard variety over their mother tongue. All of them appear *symbolically dominated* (Bourdieu, 1991).

Although the linguistic dilemma regarding which code has to be maintained and transmitted to the younger generation was not an issue in their children's bilingual development, it is a vital consideration in their present role as grandparents. So Alex's grandparents may admit they do not participate in their grandchildren's HL familiarization but they want them to have bilingual identities. Nevertheless, their support for bilingualism is concerned the younger generation's proficiency in two official codes, the EL and the SMG. Therefore, they approve of their grandchildren's attendance at the GCS, supporting its role as an institution where the SMG is the legitimate code.

Marianthi's grandparents' submission to the dominant SMG LI involves the moderation of their linguistic behaviour when interacting with their granddaughter. Their linguistic contribution to the FLP involves the consistent use of the standard variety with their descendant. So, Marianthi's grandparents, contrary to Alex's grandparents, are actively involved in their granddaughter's familiarization with the channel they highly validate. Moreover, similarly to Alex's grandparents, they encourage the young child's participation in the GCS.

But Michella's grandmother, despite her alliance with the dominant SMG LI, uses both varieties of the HL with her granddaughter. Her linguistic contribution to the FLP involves conscious and consistent language practices to provide for Michella's HL capital development. Her efforts are informed by powerful LI that view the heritage code use as a proof of authentic belonging to the Greek and the Greek Cypriot community. Michella and her grandmother have built a very close relationship since they meet daily and they spend a substantial time with each other. But Alex's grandparents only meet with their grandson every other weekend. Marianthi's grandparents also interact with their grandchildren almost daily but their exchanges include the use of the EL. Therefore, Michella is the only one among the three children who receives such an extensive ethnic linguistic input from the grandparents.

9.3. 2nd generation

The members of the second generation who participate in the present study are Marianthi's mother, Michella's mother and Alex's parents.

9.3.1. HL use fluctuation within the years

All four second generation participants admit the deterioration of their CD skills from a young age. In agreement with the literature, their English official schooling appears as the most significant factor causing the gradual decline of the immigrant code (Fishman, 1991; Fillmore, 1991, 2003; Kipp et al., 1995). Nevertheless, Michella's mother may admit the dominance of the EL in her linguistic repertoire but she never abandoned the CD as a result of her mother's linguistic identity. However, similarly to the other parents, she currently submits to dominant LI about the SMG. Thus her linguistic behaviour has altered at the expense of her dialect skills. Marianthi's mother may hold a poorer SMG capital but she also appears *symbolically dominated* by the standard variety. Meanwhile, although Alex's parents agree with dominant discourses about the SMG, they continue using exclusively the EL.

9.3.2. Family language policy

Marianthi's mother's, Michella's mother's and Alex's parents' contribution to the FLP is affected by their HL capital, their cultural representations about languages and their future aspirations for their children's linguistic identities. So, Alex's parents have founded a monolingual household and they deny using their HL with their children. They justify their decision by re producing dominant LI which devalue their CD capital. They submit to the will of prevalent discourses that promote the SMG as the variety that affords the speaker social recognition and advancement. Therefore, they disclaim any language practices that could

familiarize their children with the dialect. Nevertheless, they employ two different intervention strategies in favour of the form of the HL they wish to maintain. So, they both encourage their children's attendance to the GCS and exchange their economic capital for SMG private tutoring for Alex. Their contribution to the FLP is heavily informed by their desire to invest in their children's future SMG linguistic identities.

Marianthi's mother, similarly to Alex's parents, produces and reproduces LI that validate the SMG over the CD. Nevertheless, her heritage linguistic capital allows her to respond to such dominant discourses differently to Alex's parents. She continues using the heritage code with her children although consciously moderating her oral expressions by employing influences from the SMG. Her household appears to be a complex *counterhegemonic* space. The bilingual pattern of communication between the family members reveals their resistance to the EL monopoly. But the SMG use indicates their submission to a new set of dominant LI. Despite the paradox revealed, Marianthi's mother manages both to create a bilingual socialization context for her children and to promote the form of the HL she aspires to maintain. Similarly to Alex's parents, she also encourages her children's GCS attendance. Furthermore, both Marianthi's mother and Alex's father implicitly state the high value they ascribe to their offsprings' community schooling by actively participating in its operation.

Michella's mother's contribution to the FLP involves the extensive use of the HL. She shares similar views with Alex's parents and Marianthi's mother regarding which code should be learned and maintained by the younger generation. She also submits to SMG superiority. But she appears more persistent and systematic than the other second-generation participants in encouraging or even demanding her children's HL use. She exploits her heritage human capital (Coleman, 1998) -both her linguistic capital and the time invested in transmitting it-for her children's immersion in a *counterhegemonic* household. But, similarly to Marianthi's mother, her home space may resist EL monopoly but submits to SMG domination. Moreover, she also describes the wide range of intervention strategies she employs to develop further her children's HL skills. For her, the GCS is among the sites that promote SMG learning for the younger generation and therefore she endorses its operation. Michella's mother justifies her wish for HL use and maintenance by drawing on LI that promote an inextricable link between heritage code use and group membership. Similarly to her mother, she perceives language use as a marker of authentic group belonging.

9.3.3. GCS and HL learning: the paradox

All four second generation participants encourage their children's attendance in the GCS. However, all of them report their own negative community schooling experiences resulting in their withdrawal at a young age. Their dialect identities were challenged and ridiculed within this setting in the past. The variety of the HL promoted as legitimate in the GCS was unfamiliar to them. Therefore they terminated their attendance in a setting that offered a linguistic product that failed to meet their communication needs with their Greek Cypriot social contacts. Nevertheless, they currently support its operation and validate highly the linguistic product on offer. The GCS meets their linguistic expectations with reference to the form of bilingual identities they wish their children to develop. Their LI have undergone alteration over the years. Their role as parents who wish to provide for their children's future social advancement informs their cultural conceptions about languages. Their perceptions reveal a *paradox* since the code that led to the rejection of their community schooling when they were young, constitutes their chief rationalization for their children's attendance at the present time. The paradox arising is shows the multiplicity of the LI and their changeability over the years in response to the bearer's present and future interests.

9.3.4. Partnership between grandparents and parents

In the literature, grandparents are identified as a vital HL resource that provides for successful HLM (Kenner et al. 2007; Kamo, 1998; Ishizawa, 2004; Ruby, 2012). Both Marianthi's mother and Michella's mother admit the substantial linguistic help they receive from their parents regarding the younger generations' HL learning, enrichment and advancement. For both of them, the members of the first generation operate as a powerful motivational force that reinforces their effective response to the demands of their linguistic endeavour. But Alex's parents lack such linguistic help since they rarely meet with their parents. Thus Alex, contrary to Marianthi and Michella, lacks experiences of HL use with his grandparents. Furthermore, contrary to Marianthi and Michella, he appears oblivious to such a distinctive form of intergenerational relationship and emotional attachment.

9.4. 3rd generation

The members of the third generation who participate in the present study are Marianthi, Michella and Alex.

9.4.1. LI and HL use: a complex interrelationship

All three third generation participants are recipients of implicit and explicit messages that define the value of each of the varieties in their linguistic repertoire. Such linguistic ideologies are produced, articulated, negotiated, reproduced and contested during their socialization process in various sites of interaction both in the dominant society and in their ancestors' home country. The three young participants perceive their EL skills as a *common sense* necessity since it is the official language of their own place of origin. It is also the only linguistic medium accepted as a prerequisite for their further educational development in the EMS. Nevertheless, all three share social experiences of *counterhegemonic* processes and spaces. However, each one of them has a unique linguistic life offering varying opportunities of HL use. The regularity of the heritage code use informs their perceptions about its value and usability in their daily life. Moreover, this bears an impact on their motivation to invest time and effort in developing further their relevant linguistic skills.

So, Alex's HL use refers only to his encounters with his GCS teacher and his Greek private tutor. Thus, he challenges the value and the usability of a channel that fails to meet the demands of his daily linguistic interactions. Thus he expresses a lack of motivation to advance his basic HL skills. Marianthi uses the heritage code more regularly than Alex. She reports a wide network of co speakers both in London and in Cyprus. She interacts bilingually both with her mother and her grandparents. She employs a similar pattern of linguistic interactions when she visits Cyprus and within the setting of the GCS. But her receptive skills over-exceed her productive abilities. She moves across *counterhegemonic* sites that challenge the monopoly of her dominant language. But she is also aware of the powerful position of the EL as a *lingua franca* that provides for her successful communication in most of the spaces where she acts and interacts. Therefore, she emphasizes that her motivation to learn the HL is founded upon her need to fulfil her mother's and her grandparents' wishes. Her emotional attachment to such significant figures inspires the desire to advance her HL skills. So, Marianthi agrees with Alex on the low usability of the HL in her daily life. But she admits that, for her, such an endeavour is stimulated by affective reasons concerning her strong bond with both her mother and her grandparents. Thus, for her, the HL holds the value of a symbolic capital highly appreciated by significant others. So, contrary to Alex, she can admit to a valid aspect of heritage code use.

Michella's linguistic life differs both from Alex's and from Marianthi's. For her, the HL use is a daily practice of necessity due to her beloved grandmother's monolingual identity. Moreover, she receives her socialization according to a FLP that disapproves the exclusive use of the EL.

Therefore her HL skills are the most advanced of all three children. Michella is the only child that experiences to such an extent the convertibility of her heritage linguistic capital to both a social capital of a wide network of co speakers and a symbolic capital of close bonds with significant figures both in England and in Cyprus. This fosters her motivation to invest more time and effort in advancing further her heritage linguistic skills. Moreover, her social experiences within *counterhegemonic* spaces are the richest among the three children. Thus, Michella values the heritage code both in practical and in symbolic terms.

9.4.2. LI: SMG and CD

Michella is the only young participant who holds background knowledge about the differences between the two varieties of the HL along with the social connotations linked to their speakers' social identities. She is the recipient of relevant LI which she reproduces within the space of the GCS. Marianthi is also the recipient of such LI but she is not involved in their reproduction. For both Michella and Marianthi, the use of the modern variety is a vital element of their FLP founded by the contribution of both their mothers and their grandparents. But Michella's discourses reveal her deep immersion in both the HL and the LI that affect the use of each variety. Alex is unaware of such discourses since he lacks such a familiarization with the HL. For him, the latter is identified with the standard form he learns from both his GCS teacher and his Greek private tutor.

9.4.3. HL use, LI and GCS experiences

All three young participants in the present study express challenging views regarding teaching and learning in the Greek Community School. Their perceptions are informed by their 'culture of learning' as it is nurtured within the EMS. So, all of them express their disapproval of the lack of technological equipment for learning. They express their feeling of boredom and disappointment due to the traditional way of teaching focused on reading and writing. However, all three regularly attend the weekly lessons. They admit their parents' intervention for ensuring the consistency of their participation. Nevertheless, their perceptions about such an educational setting are further informed by the value they attribute to the linguistic product on offer. But, as previously said, this value interrelates with the usability of the heritage code in their social encounters. Thus, a complex interrelationship arises that informs the young children's GCS evaluation.

So, both Marianthi and Alex further rationalize their challenging views towards their community schooling, by commenting on the low usability of the linguistic product on offer.

Despite the fact that Michella agrees with her classmates regarding the disengaging learning procedure in the GCS, she admits her learning benefits from its attendance. Therefore she recognizes its value as an institution within which she has the opportunity to advance her linguistic skills. But Michella is the only child that uses the HL in such a consistent and regular mode. Therefore, she has the opportunity to experience the practicality of the knowledge she receives. Furthermore, the communication disparities she has encountered with her relatives in Cyprus operate as an extra motive for her wish to develop further her HL skills so as to maintain her extensive social capital both in London and in Cyprus.

9.4.4. Family discourse and group belonging

All three young participants in the present study are the recipients of messages articulated by their parents and their grandparents, both explicitly through their utterances and implicitly through their social performances under specific circumstances. Such messages affect the young children's understanding of how their HL is associated with their Greek Cypriot background. Both their grandparents and their parents constitute the role models that the young children use to create their own Greek Cypriot identities.

Accordingly, Alex identifies with a hybrid identity that includes both his English and his Greek Cypriot background. He views the speaker's HL skills as decisive on directing the degree of identification with a group. Despite the fact that his own proficiency in the heritage language is low, he does not dismiss his Greek Cypriot origin. Both his parents and grandparents consciously exclude the heritage code from their linguistic repertoire. So, Alex's family role models implicitly promote the belief that heritage language use does not condition ethnic identification. Alex experiences his Greek Cypriot group membership by attending lesson in the GCS, by spending his holidays in Cyprus, by eating traditional Greek food and by attending the Greek Festivals in London with his father. These affect his interpretation of the impact of his Greek Cypriot origin on his sense of ethnic belonging. So, Alex partially reproduces an implicit *family discourse* that argues for the detachability between heritage code use and ethnic membership.

Marianthi is the only child who comes from a mixed marriage. She admits that all three ethnicities constitute part of her identity. Marianthi, similarly to Alex, does not report any discussions with her primary caretakers about the meaning of her Greek Cypriot identity. Her perceptions and understanding accrue from being actively involved in her mother's and her grandparents' way of being. Despite the fact that all of them are active HL speakers, Marianthi

does not consider the HL proficiency as a prerequisite of ethnic membership. She also identifies with her father's Sicilian background without having any knowledge of the Sicilian dialect. Marianthi views her ethnicity as actualized by her engagement in cultural activities prompted by both her mother and her grandparents. Accordingly, she reports that her Greek Cypriot identity is enacted by her attendance in the GCS and the Greek Orthodox Church services, her opportunities to eat Greek traditional food and her regular visits to Cyprus. Marianthi positions herself towards her *family discourse* which is performed implicitly through her grandparents' and her mother's social behaviour. Although all of them accept the importance of HL learning for deeper ethnic identity negotiation and involvement, Marianthi's perceptions reveal a sophisticated personal interpretation of her role as a third generation member in an inter-ethnic family.

For Michella, ethnic membership appears to have an uncontested link with heritage language learning and use. She questions the 'authenticity' of an ethnic identification that does not entail heritage language use. Her perceptions agree with her mother's and her grandmother's beliefs. Contrary to Marianthi's and Alex's descriptions, all three generation in her family engage in linguistic interactions that put emphasis on the expected cultural behaviour so that claims for ethnicity can receive recognition. So Michella, unlike the other two young participants, does not inform her perceptions about her ethnic identity by interpreting only the implicit messages from her parents and her grandparents. Michella's mother and grandmother explicitly clarify to her, the responsibilities and duties they expect of an authentic Greek Cypriot community member. The young child receives, produces and reproduces a particular *family discourse* that defines the meaning of her ethnicity in practical terms concerning the ways of living and acting within society. Michella, like Alex and Marianthi, identifies her community schooling, her trips to Greece and Cyprus and her participation in the Greek Orthodox Church services as indicative of her Greek Cypriot background. But for her, unlike the other two children, the HL operates as a powerful ethnic identity marker which ensures ethnic authenticity and legitimacy.

9.5. Summary

In this chapter, I revealed the commonalities and the differences between the three families who participated in my study. Each member of each generation has a unique language history. Each generation's HL use interrelates with specific social, historical, economic and political dimensions, creating language ideologies that are either in accordance with dominant discourses, thus hindering LM, or resisting these discourses, thus reinforcing LM. Each three-

generation family has a unique form of interrelationships among its members, constructing family language policies responsive to its members' perceptions about languages. All the above interrelate in a complex way to produce distinct *family language histories*. In the next chapter, I will explain the meaning of this concept which emerged from the analysis of the data.

Chapter 10. Conclusion

10.1. Family Language Histories

In this thesis three children who attend lessons at a Greek Community School, their parents and their grandparents revealed their perceptions about the languages co-existent in their daily lives. I employed a case study methodology to appreciate the uniqueness and the complexity of each family's and each family member's linguistic life. Two qualitative research tools were used for the data collection: semi-structured interviews and the researcher's notes. I followed the journey of the participants' languages over the years. I explored the factors which informed their linguistic choices with reference to their heritage code abandonment but also its revival and further reinforcement. I revealed the hidden linguistic histories initiated before the years of the first generation's relocation to the English society. I described the three families' FLP over the years, the moderations and the alterations it underwent responding to specific social forces and driven by the participants' goals, motives and aspirations. I allowed participants' voices to uncover their beliefs and perceptions about languages and their informative power in their linguistic lives.

This study reveals the multidimensionality of the participants' linguistic choices. Particular social and political circumstances have an effect on their linguistic decisions. The actors appear entangled within multiple LI that value the EL over the heritage code. But their diglossic background makes their effort for HLM a complex phenomenon. A tension arises because of the co-existence of two different varieties which both operate subordinately within the dominant English society, but each carry a political, historical and ideological 'load' that makes their inclusion in the participants' linguistic repertoire a complex field of conflicts and contradictions.

The three families' linguistic lives can be located within a space where three languages operate, meeting the communication needs of different contexts and interlocutors. The dominant language of the host society carries the power and legitimacy of the main linguistic vehicle of interaction. The private sphere constitutes a space wherein all three languages, English, Standard Modern Greek (SMG) and Cypriot dialect (CD) compete for a hierarchical position. The past and its sentimental linguistic bonds as a valued symbolic capital is involved in a struggle with the current demands of a linguistic market where primarily English and secondarily SMG is the desired 'capital', since these give the speaker recognition, economic mobility and social flexibility. For Michella's family, the CD continues to hold a respected

position in their linguistic repertoire. But both Marianthi's family and Alex's family comply with the unquestionable power of the dominant codes. The GCS promotes this behaviour since it is a space that reinforces and actualizes the legitimacy of the SMG code while relegating the CD to a subordinate.

The concept of the family language history emerges for the analysis of the data and interrelates all the above dimensions involved in the younger generation's HL maintenance or shift. This concept is a tool to analyse and explain the outcome of language maintenance or shift for children in three-generation families. It involves firstly examining, with regard to the grandparents, the language ideologies arising in particular socio-political contexts that affect their views about the linguistic capital of their different languages. These views inform the family language policies that they pursue with their children, resulting in language maintenance or shift. The same analysis is then applied to the parent generation, but at this point the interaction of the language ideologies held by grandparents and parents needs to be taken into account when identifying how the family language policy is constructed. In all contexts, language ideologies are viewed as dynamic, responding to changes in socio-political context both in the family's country of origin and in the host country. Participants, including children, are seen as having agency in constructing their views and their uses of different languages, including the potential for creating counter-hegemonic spaces for language maintenance within the home, as well as being affected by power relationships in the wider society.

The present study contributes to the field of LM and LS by exploring the phenomena through the theoretical framework of LI, an area of interest that has not received sufficient attention in the literature. It reveals the informative power that LI can have over the abandonment or the preservation of a HL. It describes the phenomenon of counterhegemony as the members of each family experience it over the years. This phenomenon refers to an alternative linguistic life that does not reject the use of neither the dominant language nor the heritage language. It promotes the parallel use of the two codes that can be in complementary distribution meeting different communication needs and endorsing the speakers with different social, economic and symbolic profits.

This research study contributes to the existing theory by extending Bourdieu's theory of capital to interpret the participants' compliance with or resistance to the hegemony of the EL. The analysis of the collected data reveals the interrelationship between the family members'

perceptions about the convertibility of a linguistic capital to social, economic and/or symbolic profits with their heritage language use and maintenance. This study also contributes to the existing theory by describing the phenomenon of counterhegemony, an alternative to linguistic hegemony. The analysis of the collective data reveals the complexity of this phenomenon with reference to the linguistic behaviour of immigrants of a diglossic background. This regards the penetrating power that the official language of the home country can have over immigrants' counterhegemonic linguistic behaviour. Such a form of counterhegemony may challenge the monopoly of the dominant language in the host country but endorses the dominant language in the place of origin with the power to affect social actor's linguistic behaviour to the degree of the total abandonment of the low variety of the heritage code.

10.2. Implications of this study

The findings of my study are relevant for researchers focusing on the role of the immigrant family in the area of LM and LS. This study also addresses researchers who are working in the field of FLP regarding the preservation or the abandonment of a heritage code. My detailed description of my cases can provide them with the opportunity to detect similarities with their own studies and thus judge the 'transferability' of my findings to other contexts. My study adds to the existing literature by offering findings stemming from the analysis of case of three-generation families with a diglossic background, which reveal how their perceptions about their languages interrelate with their family language policies in favour or at the expense of HL maintenance.

10.2.1. Educational implications

This study can be of great interest for educators, parents and policy makers involved in the community schooling of the younger generation of immigrant communities. The findings suggest that the young community learners of a diglossic background are entangled within multiple LI that may devalue the form of the HL that they have learned from their parents and/or their grandparents. The needs of these children call for educators and policy makers who appreciate their distinct linguistic identities and respect their linguistic capital. But inflexible curricula that demand their linguistic adaptation to the official form of their heritage code may discourage the young learners and their families from maintaining any form of the HL. Thus, a new approach of community schooling which uses the young learners' acquired capital as a basis from which to build towards the learning of a standard variety can resolve the tension arising in these linguistic situations.

This study also addresses educators in mainstream schools who discourage immigrant families' bilingualism by prompting the exclusive use of the dominant language. But this can deprive immigrant communities from using a language which may be of low social value in the host society but can have a great symbolic value for the speakers. This study suggests that mainstream school educators should acknowledge the young students' ethnic background, allowing their bilingual identities to develop further, thus helping to create social actors who appreciate linguistic difference and respect multilingualism as an advantageous way of being in today's global society.

References

- Alba, R.; Logan, J.; Lutz, A. and Brian, S. (1992). Only English by the Third Generation? Loss and Preservation of the Mother Tongue among the Grandchildren of Contemporary Immigrants. *Demography*, 39 (3), 467-484.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Arvaniti, A. (2006). Linguistic practices in Cyprus and the emergence of Cypriot Standard Greek. *San Diego Linguistic Papers* (2), 1-24.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundation of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Bauman, Z. (2004). *Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bayley, R.; Schecter, S. R. and Torres- Ayala, B. (1996). Strategies for Bilingual Maintenance: Case Studies of Mexican-Origin Families in Texas. *Linguistics and Education*, 8, 389-408.
- BERA: British Educational Research Association (2011). *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*. British Educational Research Association.
- Blackledge, A. and Creese, A. (2010). *Multilingualism: A Critical Perspective*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Blackledge, A. and Creese, A. (2008). Contesting 'Language' as 'Heritage': Negotiation of Identities in Late Modernity. *Applied Linguistics*, 29 (4), 533-554.
- Blackledge, A. (2004). Constructions of Identity in Political Discourse in Multilingual Britain. In A. Pavlenko, & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts* (pp. 68-92). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Blommaert, J. (1999). The debate is open. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 1-38). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Blommaert, J., Creve, L. and Willaert, E. (2005). On Being Declared Illiterate: Language Ideological Disqualification of Dutch Classes for Immigrants in Belgium. *Language and Communication*, 25.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. USA: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In J. Richardson, *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood.
- Brown, A. (2008). Language Shift or Maintenance? An Examination of Language Usage Across Four Generations of Self- reported by University Age Students in Belarus. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 29 (1), 1-15.

- Bucholtz, M. and Hall, K. (2004). Language and Identity. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Companion in Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 369-387). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bucholtz, M. (2003). Sociolinguistic nostalgia and the authentication of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7 (3), 398-416.
- Caldas, S. J. (2012). Language Policy in the family. In B. Spolsky, *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy* (pp. 351-373). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Caldas, S. J. (2006). *Raising bilingual-biliterate children in Monolingual Cultures*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Canagarajah, S. A. (2008). Language shift and the family: Questions from the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12 (2), 143-176.
- Chao-Jung, W. (2006). Look Who's Talking: Language Choices and Culture of Learning in UK Chinese Classrooms. *Language and Education*, 20 (1), 62-75.
- Cho, G. and Krashen, S. (2000). The Role of Voluntary Factors in Heritage Language Development: How speakers can develop the Heritage Language on their own. *ITL: Review of Applied Linguistics*, 127-128, 127-140.
- Clyne, M. (1985). *Multilingual Australia*. Melbourne: River Seine Publications.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 94, 95-120.
- Conteh, J. (2005). Going round in circles: developing the methodology. In J. Conteh, E. Gregory, C. Kearney, & A. Mor-Sommerfield (Eds.), *On Writing Educational Ethnographies: the Art of Collusion* (pp. 95-106). Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Coulmas, F. (1998). *With forked tongues: What are national language good for?* Singapore: Karoma Publishers Inc.
- Creese, A.; Bhatt, A.; Bhojani, N. and Martin, P. (2006). Multicultural, Heritage and Learner Identities in Complementary Schools. *Language and Education*, 20 (1), 23-43.
- Crow, G.; Wiles, R.; Heath, S. and Charles, V. (2006). Research ethics and data quality: the implications of informed consent. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 9 (2), 83-95.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2009). Invisible and visible language planning: ideological factors in the family language policy of Chinese immigrant families in Quebec. *Language Policy*, 8, 351-375.
- D' Andreade, R. G. (1984). Cultural meaning systems. In R. A. Shweder, & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Cultural Theory: Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 88-119). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Davy, J.; Ioannou, Y. and Panayotou, A. (1996). French and English loans in Cypriot diglossia. *Work of the Orient House Mediterranean* , 25, 127-135.
- De Houwer, A. (1999). Environmental factors in early bilingual development: the role of parental beliefs and attitudes. In G. Extra, & L. Verhoeven, *Bilingualism and Migration* (pp. 75-95). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- de Klerk, V. (2001). Case Study: The Cross-Marriage Language Dilemma: His language or hers? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* , 4 (3), 197-216.
- Diamond, J. (1996). The roots of radicalism. *The New York Review of Books* , 14, 4-6.
- Dopke, S. (1997). Community Languages in Family Day Care. *Proceedings of the 2nd National Family Day Care Conference*, (pp. 1-12). Adelaide.
- Dorian, N. C. (1998). Western language ideologies and small language prospects. In L. A. Grenoble, & L. J. Whaley (Eds.), *Endangered Languages* (pp. 3-21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Doucet, J. (1991). First generation of Serbo-Croatian speakers in Queensland: Language maintenance and shift. In S. Romaine (Ed.), *Language in Australia* (pp. 270-284). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Eastman, C. (1984). Language, ethnic identity and change. In J. Edwards (Ed.), *Linguistic Minorities, Policies and Pluralism* (pp. 259-276). London: Academic.
- Edstrom, A. (2010). Tracing Language, Culture, and Identity Through Three Generations: The experience of a Spanish-Italian family in the United States. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* , 18 (1), 81-97.
- Edward, V. and Newcombe, L. P. (2005). When School is Not Enough: New Initiatives in Intergenerational Language Transmission in Wales. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* , 8 (4), 298-312.
- Edwards, J. (1995). *Multilingualism*. London: Penguin.
- Emerson, R. M.; Fretz, R. I. and Shaw, L. (2001). Participant Observation and Fieldnotes. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of Ethnography* (pp. 352-368).
- Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Fellin, L. (2002). Language ideologies, language socialization and language revival in an Italian Alpine community. *Proceeding of the 10th Annual Symposium About Language and Society* (pp. 46-57). Austin: Texas Linguistic Forum .
- Ferguson, C. (1959). Diglossia. *Word* , 15, 325-340.

- Ferguson, C. (2003). Diglossia. In C. B. Tucker, *Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings* (pp. 345-358). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Fillmore, L. W. (2003). External Pressures on Families. (R. Campbell, & D. Christian, Eds.) *Heritage Language Journal* , 1 (1), 9-12.
- Fillmore, L. W. (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly* , 6, 323-346.
- Fine, G. A. and Sandstrom, K. (1993). Ideology in action: A pragmatic approach to a contested concept. *Sociological Theory* , 11 (1), 21-38.
- Finocchiaro, C. (1995). Intergenerational language maintenance of minority groups in Australia in 1990's: An Italian case study. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* , 16 (1-2), 41-54.
- Fishman, J. A. (1980). Bilingualism and Biculturalism as individual and as societal phenomena. *Journal of Multilingual and Mutlicultural Development* , 1, 3-15.
- Fishman, J. A. (1967). Bilingualism with and without diglossia; diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues* , 23 (2), 29-38.
- Fishman, J. A. (1989). *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J. A. (1997). Language and Ethnicity: The View from Within. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (pp. 327-343). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fishman, J. A. (Ed.). (1966). *Language Loyalty in the United States: the maintenance and perpetuation of non-Englsih mother tongues by American ethnic and religious groups*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, J. A. (2004). Language Maintenance, Language Shift, and reversing. In T. K. Bhatia, & W. C. Ritchie (Eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism* (pp. 406-436). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Theoretical Languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J. A. (1972). *The Sociology of language*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Fishman, J. A. (1965). Who speaks what language, to whom and when? *La Linguistique* , 2, 67-88.
- Fishman, J. A. (2001). Why is it so hard to save a threatened language? In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Can Threatened Languages be Saved?* (pp. 1-22). Clevedon: Mulilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J. A.; Nahirny, V.; Hoffman, J.; Hayden, R. (1966). *Language Loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton.

- Floka, N. (2006). *Greek-Cypriot grandparents and their interaction with their grandchildren regarding the maintenance of the Greek language and culture*. London: Unpublished Report Study, Goldsmiths College, University of London.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry* , 12 (2), 219-245.
- Freebody, P. (2004). *Qualitative Research in Education: Interaction and Practice*. London: Sage Publications.
- Gal, S. and Irvine, J. T. (1995). The Boundaries of Languages and Disciplines: How Ideologies Construct Difference. *Social Research* , 62 (4), 967-1001.
- Gal, S. (2005). Language Ideologies Compared: Metaphors of Public/Private. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* , 15 (1), 23-37.
- Gal, S. (1998). Multiplicity and contention among language ideologies: A commentary. In K. W. B. Schieffelin, *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 3-47). New York : Oxford University Press.
- Garcia, O. (Ed.). (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Garcia, P. (2005). Case Study: Parental Language Attitudes and Practices to Socialize Children in a Diglossic Society. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* , 8 (4), 328-344.
- Gardner-Chloros, P.; McEntee-Atalianis, L. and Finnis, K. (2005). Language Attitudes and Use in a Transplanted Setting: Greek Cypriots in London. *International Journal of Multilingualism* , 2 (1), 52-80.
- Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Towards an interpretive theory of culture. In C. Geertz (Ed.), *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays* (pp. 3-30). New York: Basis Books.
- Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Gibbons, J.; Ramirez, E. (2004). *Maintaining a Minority Language: A Case Study of Hispanic Teenagers*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Giddens, A. (1987). *Social Theory and Modern Sociology*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Giles, H. and Johnson, P. (1987). Ethnolinguistic Identity theory: A social psychological approach to language maintenance. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* , 68, 69-99.
- Giles, H. and Johnson, P. (1981). The role of language in ethnic relations. In C. Turner, & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup behaviour* (pp. 199-243). Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.

- Giles, H; Bourhis, R. Y.; Taylor D. M. (1977). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (Ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp. 307-348). London: Academic Press.
- Glassner, B. and Loughlin, J. (1987). *Drugs in Adolescent Worlds: Burnouts to Straights*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Gonzalez, R. D. (2003). Language Ideologies. (R. Campbell, & D. Christian, Eds.) *Heritage Language Journal*, 1 (1), 23-25.
- Goutsos, D. and Karyolemou, M. (2004). Introduction. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (168), 1-17.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. New York: International.
- Gregory, E.; Long, S. and Volk, D. (2004). *Many Pathways to Literacy: Young Children Learning With Siblings, Grandparents, Peers and Communities*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Guardado, M. (2002). Loss and Maintenance of First Language Skills: Case Studies of Hispanic Families in Vancouver. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58 (3), 341-363.
- Guba, E. G. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (p. 105-117). California: Sage Publications.
- Hammersley, M. and Gomm, R. (2000). Introduction. In R. Gomm, M. Hammersley, & P. Foster (Eds.), *Case Study Method: Key issues, key texts* (pp. 1-16). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Hammersley, M. and Traianou, A. (2012). *Ethics in Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Hammersley, M. (2006). Ethnography: problems and prospects. *Ethnography and Education*, 17 (1), 1-18.
- Haugen, E. (2003). Dialect, Language, Nation. In C. B. Tucker, *Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings* (pp. 411-422). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Heath, S. B. (1989). Language Ideology. In *International Encyclopedia of Communications* (Vol. 2, pp. 393-395). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hill, J. H. and Mannheim, B. (1992). Language and World View. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 21, 381-406.
- Holmes, J.; Roberts, M.; Verivaki, M.; Aipolo, A. (1993). Language Maintenance and shift in three New Zealand speech communities. *Applied Linguistics*, 14 (1), 1-24.
- Howard, P. (2003). *Heritage: Management, Interpretation, Identity*. London: Continuum.

- Ioannidou, E. and Sophocleous, A. (2010). 'Now, is this how we are going to say it?' Comparing teachers' language practices in primary and secondary state education in Cyprus. *Linguistics and Education* , 21, 298-313.
- Ioannidou, E. (2007). Using the improper language as a marker of ethnic identity in a Greek Cypriot Classroom. In A. N. Papapavlou and P. Pavlou (Eds.), *Sociolinguistic and pedagogical dimensions of dialects in education* (pp. 165-192). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Irvine, J. T. and Gal, S. (2000). Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics and Identities* (pp. 35-84). Santa Fe, New Mexico, School of American Research.
- Irvine, J. T. (1989). When Talk Isn't Cheap: Language and Political Economy. *American Ethnologist* , 16 (2), 248-267.
- Ishizawa, H. (2004). Minority Language use among grandchildren in multigenerational households. *Sociological Perspectives* , 47 (4), 465-483.
- Jeon, M. (2008). Korean Heritage Language Maintenance and Language Ideology. *Heritage Language Journal* , 6 (2), 54-71.
- Johnson, P.; Giles, H. and Bourhis, R. (1983). The viability of ethnolinguistic vitality: a reply. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* , 4, 255-269.
- Joseph, J. E. (2004). *Language and Identity: National, Ethnic, Religious*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Kamo, Y. (1998). Asian Grandparents. In E. M. Szinovacz (Ed.), *Handbook of Grandparenthood* (pp. 97-112). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Kanazawa, H. and Loveday, L. (1988). The Japanese immigrant community in Brazil: language contact and shift. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* , 9 (5), 423-435.
- Karoulla-Vrikki, D. (2004). Language and Ethnicity in Cyprus under the British: a linkage of heightened salience. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* (168), 19-36.
- Karyolemou, M. and Pavlou, P. (2001). Language attitudes and assessment of salient variables in a bi-dialectal speech community. *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Language Variation in Europe*, (pp. 110-120). Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- Karyolemou, M. (2002). When language policies change without changing: The University of Cyprus. *Language Policy* , 1, 213-236.
- Kenner, C.; Ruby, M.; Gregory, E.; Jessel, J.; Arju, T. (2007). Intergenerational learning between children and grandparents in East London. *Journal of Early Childhood Research* , 5 (3), 219-243.
- Kibrik, A. E. (1991). The problem of endangered languages in USSR. In R. H. Robins, & E. M. Uhlenbeck (Eds.), *Endangered Languages* (pp. 257-273). Oxford: Berg Publishers.

- King, K. A. and Fogle, L. (2006). Bilingual Parenting as Good Parenting: Parents' Perspectives on Family Language Policy for Additive Bilingualism. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* , 9 (6), 695-710.
- King, K. A. (2000). Language Ideologies and Heritage Language Education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* , 3 (3), 167-184.
- King, K. A.; Fogle, L. and Logan-Terry, A. (2008). Family Language Policy. *Language and Linguistics Compass* , 2 (5), 907-922.
- Kipp, S.; Clyne, M.; Pauwels, A. (1995). *Immigration and Australia's Language Resources*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Kondo, K. (1998). Social-Psychological Factors Affecting Language Maintenance: Interviews with Shin Nisei University Students in Hawai. *Linguistics and Education* , 9, 369-408.
- Kontosopoulos, N. (2001). *Διάλεκτοι και Ιδιώματα της Νέας Ελληνικής(Dialects and Vernaculars of Modern Greek)*. Athens: Grigori Publications.
- Kopeliovich, S. (2010). Family language policy: From a case study of a Russian-Hebrew bilingual family towards a theoretical framework. *Diaspora, Indigenous and Minority Education* , 4 (3), 162-178.
- Kostoulas-Makrakis, N. (1995). *Language Maintenance or shift?: a study of Greek background students in Sweden*. Stockholm: Institute on International Education, Stockholm University.
- Kroskrity, P. (2004). Language Ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp. 496-517). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Labov, W. (1972b). *Languauge in the Inner City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W. (1972a). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lambert, W.; Hodgson, R.; Gardner, R. and Fillenbaum, S. (1960). Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* , 60, 44-51.
- Lincoln, Y. S. and Guba, E. G. (2000). The Only Generalization is: There is no Generalization. In R. Gomm, M. Hammersley, & P. Foster (Eds.), *Case Study Method: Key issues, key texts* (pp. 27-44). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2003). Clusters of Research Areas. (R. Campbell, & D. Christian, Eds.) *Heritage Language Journal* , 1 (1), 3-6.
- Lopez, D. E. (1996). Language: diversity and assimilation. In R. Waldinger, & M. Bozorgmehr (Eds.), *Ethnic Los Angeles* (pp. 139-163). New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Lytra, V. (2012). Discursive constructions of language and identity: parents' competing perspectives in London Turkish complementary schools. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* , 33 (1), 85-100.

- Makoni, S. and Pennycook, A. (2007). Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages. In S. Makoni, & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages* (pp. 1-41). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Martin, P.; Bhatt, A.; Bhojani, N. and Creese, A. (2006). Managing Bilingual Interaction in a Gujarati Complementary School in Leicester. *Language and Education* , 20 (1), 5-22.
- May, S. (2003). Rearticulating the Case for Minority Language Rights. *Current Issues in Language Planning* , 4 (2), 95-125.
- Mehmedbegovic, D. (2011). *A study in attitudes to languages in England and Wales: Who needs the languages of immigrants?*. Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- McEntee-Atalianis, L. J. and Pouloukas, S. (2001). Issues of Identity and Power in a Greek Cypriot Community. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* , 22 (1), 19-38.
- Miller, J. and Glassner, B. (2004). The 'inside' and the 'outside': Finding realities in interviews. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice* (pp. 125-139). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Milroy, J. and Milroy, L. (1999). *Authority in Language: Investigating Standard English*. London: Routledge.
- Milroy, J. (2001). Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* , 5 (4), 530-555.
- Milroy, J. (2007). The ideology of standard language. In C. Llamas, L. Mullany, & P. Stockwell (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to sociolinguistics* (pp. 133-139). London: Routledge.
- Mitchel, J. C. (1984). Case studies. In R. F. Ellen (Ed.), *Ethnographic Research: A guide to general conduct* (pp. 237-241). Orlando, FL: Academic Press, Inc.
- Moschonas, S. (2004). Relativism in language ideology: on Greece's latest language issues. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* , 22 (2), 173-206.
- Moschonas, S. (1996). Η γλωσσική διμορφία στην Κύπρο. 'ισχυρές' - 'ασθενείς' γλώσσες στην Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση Όψεις του γλωσσικού ηγεμονισμού ('powerfull' - 'powerless' languages in the European Union: Sides of the linguistic hegemony (pp. 121-128). Thessaloniki, Greece: Greek Language Centre.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple Voices*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Newton, B. (1972b). *Cypriot Greek: Its Phonology and Inflections*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Newton, B. (1972a). *The generative interpretation of Dialect: A Study of Modern Greek Phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Obied, M. V. (2009). How do siblings shape the language environment in bilingual families? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* , 12 (6), 705-720.

- Pakir, A. (2003). Language and Education: Singapore. In J. Bourne, & E. Reid (Eds.), *World yearbook of education: Language Education* (pp. 267-279). London, UK: Kogan Page Publisher.
- Palys, T. (1997). *Research decisions: Quantitative and qualitative perspectives (2nd ed.)*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Panayiotou, A. (1996). *Ιδεολογική σύγχυση και απότοκα γλωσσικά ιδεολογήματα στη σύγχρονη Κύπρο (Ideological confusion and derived language perceptions in Cyprus today)*. Paper Presented at the Symposium on Language and Identity, Intercollege, Nicosia.
- Papadakis, Y. (1998). Greek Cypriot narratives of history and collective identity: nationalism as a contested process. *American Ethnologist* , 25 (2), 149-165.
- Papadakis, Y. (2003). Linguistic varieties and social practices in Cyprus. In D. G.-M. (ed.), *Self and 'other': Conceptualizations, identities and practices in Cyprus* (pp. 535-564). Athens: Gutenberg.
- Papadakis, Y. (2000). *On linguistic bea(u)tification and embarrassment: Linguistic boundaries in Cyprus*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Cyprus.
- Papapavlou, A. and Pavlou, P. (2005). Literacy and language-in-education policy in bidialectal settings. *Current Issues in Language Planning* , 6 (2), 164-181.
- Papapavlou, A. and Pavlou, P. (2001). The interplay of language use and language maintenance and the cultural identity of Greek Cypriots in the UK. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* , 11 (1), 92-113.
- Papapavlou, A. N. and Pavlou, P. (1998). A Review of the Socolinguistic Aspect of the Greek Cypriot Dialect. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Developemtn* , 19 (3), 212-220.
- Papapavlou, A. N. (1997). Attitudes towards the Greek Cypriot dialect: Sociocultural implications. *Proceedings of the 10th International Symposium on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics* (pp. 173-193). Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Papapavlou, A. N. (1998). Attitudes towards the Greek Cypriot Dialect: Sociocultural Implications. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* , 134, 15-28.
- Papapavlou, A. N. (1989). English loanwords in the Greek Cypriot dialect: Sociocultural interpretations. *The Cyprus Review* , 1 (1), 93-109.
- Papapavlou, A. N. (2004). Verbal fluency of bidialectal speakers of Standard Modern Greek and the role of language-in-education practices in Cyprus. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* , 168, 91-100.
- Pauwels, A. (2005). Maintaining the Community Language in Australia: Challenges and Roles for Families. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* , 8 (2&3), 124-131.

- Pavlenko A. and Blackledge, A. (2004). Introduction: New Theoretical Approaches to the Study of Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts. In A. Pavlenko A. and Blackledge, *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts* (pp. 1-33). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Philippou, S. (2007). On the Borders of Europe: Citizenship Education and Identity in Cyprus. *Journal of Social Science Education* , 6 (1), 68-79.
- Portes, A. and Rumbaut, R. (2001). *Legacies: The Story of Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley: University California Press.
- Ralli, A. (2006). Syntactic and morphosyntactic phenomena of Modern Greek dialects: the state of the art. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* , 7 (1), 121-159.
- Robertson, L. H. (2006). Learning to Read 'Properly' by Moving Between Parallel Literacy Classes. *Language and Education* , 20 (1), 44-61.
- Rumsey, A. (1990). Wording, meaning and linguistic ideology. *American Anthropologist* , 92 (2), 346-361.
- Schechter, S. R., & Bayley, R. (1997). Language socialization Practices and Cultural Identity: Case Studies of Mexican-Descent Families in California and Texas. *TESOL Quarterly* , 513-41.
- Schiffman, H. (1996). *Linguistic Culture and language policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Schwartz, M. (2010). Family language policy: Core issues of an emerging field. In L. Wei (Ed.), *Applied Linguistics Review 1* (pp. 171-192). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Schüpbach, D. (2009). Language Transmission Revisited: Family Type, Linguistic Environment and Language Attitudes. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* , 12 (1), 15-30.
- Sciriha, L. (1995). The interplay of language and identity in Cyprus. *The Cyprus Review* , 7 (1), 7-34.
- Seidlhofer, B. (2003). *Controversies in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shin, S. J. (2003). The Role of Parents' Knowledge about Bilingualism in the Transmission of Heritage Languages. (R. Campbell, & D. Christian, Eds.) *Heritage Language Journal* , 1 (1), 17-19.
- Shohamy, E. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York: Routledge.
- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In P. R. Clyne, W. F. Hanks, & C. L. Hafbauer (Eds.), *The elements: A parasection on linguistic units and levels* (pp. 193-247). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

- Smith, L. M. (1978). An Evolving Logic of Participant Observation, Educational Ethnography, and Other Case Studies. *Review of Research in Education*, 6, 316-377.
- Smolicz, J. J. (1983b). Modification and maintenance: language among school children of Italian background in South Australia. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 4 (5), 313-337.
- Smolicz, J. J. (1999). Who is an Australian? Identity, Core values and the resilience of Culture. In M. Secombe, J.J. Smolicz on *Educational and Culture* (pp. 11-50). Melbourne: James Nickolas Publishers.
- Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spyrou, S. (2001). Those on the other side: ethnic identity and imagination in Greek-Cypriot children's lives. In H. S. (ed), *Children and anthropology: perspectives for the 21st century* (pp. 167-185). London: Bergin and Garvey.
- Stake, R. E. (1994). Case Studies. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 236-247). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Stake, R. E. (1978). The case study Method in Social Inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 7 (2), 5-8.
- Stake, R. E. (2000). The case study method in social inquiry. In R. Gomm, M. Hammersley, & P. Foster (Eds.), *Case Study Method: Key issues, key texts* (pp. 20-26). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Stavans, A. (2012). Language Policy and literacy practices in the family: the case of Ethiopian parental narrative input. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33 (1), 13-33.
- Suarez, D. (2002). The Paradox of Linguistic Hegemony and the Maintenance of Spanish as a Heritage Language in the United States. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 23 (6), 512-530.
- Tabouret-Keller, A. (1997). Language and Identity. In F. Coulmas, *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (pp. 315-326). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Tabouret-Keller, A. (1968). Sociological factors of language maintenance and language shift: A methodological approach based on European and African examples. In J. A. Fishman, C. Ferguson, & J. Das Gupta, *Language Problems of Developing Nations* (pp. 107-118). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Tannenbaum, M. (2012). Family language policy as a form of coping or defence mechanism. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33 (1), 57-66.
- Tannenbaum, M. (2003). The Multifaceted Aspects of Language Maintenance: A New Measure for its Assessment in Immigrant Families. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 6 (5), 374-393.

- Tannenbaum, M. (2005). Viewing family relations through a linguistic lens: symbolic aspects of language maintenance in immigrant families. *The Journal of Family Communication* , 5 (3), 229-252.
- Taylor, C. (1999). To Follow a Rule ... In R. Shusterman (Ed.), *Bourdieu: A Critical Reader* (pp. 29-44). Oxford, London: Blackwell.
- Taylor, S. (2002). *Ethnographic Research: A Reader*. London: Sage Publications.
- Terkourafi, M. (2007). Perceptions of difference in the Greek sphere: The case of Cyprus. *Journal of Greek Linguistic* , 8, 60-96.
- Themistocleous, C. (2005). Diglossia in Cyprus: Investigation in the domain of the internet. In E. Vilar Beltman (ed), *CamLing: Proceedings in the 3rd Cambridge Postgraduate Conference in Language Research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (2001). Individualism-collectivism and personality. *Journal of Personality* , 69, 907-924.
- Tsiplakou, S. (2003). *Στάσεις απέναντι στη γλώσσα και τη γλωσσική αλλαγή: μία αμφίδρομη σχέση; (Attitudes towards language and language change: a two-way relationship?)*. Retrieved 1 30, 2011, from <http://www.philology.uoc.gr/conferences/6thICGL/>
- Tzitzilis, C. (2000). Νεοελληνικές διάλεκτοι και νεοελληνική διαλεκτολογία.(Modern Greek dialects and modern Greek dialectology). In A. F. Christidis, *Η Ελληνική Γλώσσα και οι διάλεκτοί της(The Greek Language and its dialects)* (pp. 15-22). Athens: Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs, Centre for the Greek Language.
- Veltman, C. (1983). *Language Shift in the United States*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Veltman, C. (1991). Theory and method in the study of language shift. In J. R. Dow (Ed.), *Language and Ethnicity: Focus schrift in honour of Joshua, A. Fishman* (pp. 145-167). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wei, L. (2006). Complementary Schools, Past, Present and Future. *Language and Education* , 20 (1), 76-83.
- Wiley, T. G. (2001). On defining heritage languages and their speakers. In J. K. Peyton, D. A. Ranard, & S. McGinnis (Eds.), *Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource* (pp. 29-36). Washington, DC: Centre for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems.
- Williams, R. (1980). *Culture and Materialism: Selected Essays*. London: Verso.
- Woolard, K. A. (1998). Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard, & P. V. Kroskrity, *Language Ideologies* (pp. 3-47). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Woolard, K. A. (1985). Language variation and cultural hegemony: towards an integration of sociolinguistic theory. *American Ethnologist* , 12 (4), 738-748.

Woolard, K.A and Schieffelin, B. (1994). Language Ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* , 23, 55-82.

Yiakoumetti, A; Evans, M and Esch, E. (2006). Language Awareness in a Bidialectal Setting: The Oral Performance and Language Attitudes of Urban and Rural Students in Cyprus. *Language Awareness* , 14 (4), 254-260.

Yin, R. K. (1984). *Case Study Research: Design and methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publishing Ltd.

Zainal, Z. (2007). Case study as a research method. *Jurnal Kemanusiaan* , 9, 1-6.

Appendix 1

CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

PART I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

ARTICLE 1

The State of Cyprus is an independent and sovereign Republic with a presidential regime, the President being Greek and the VicePresident being Turk elected by the Greek and the Turkish Communities of Cyprus respectively as hereinafter in this Constitution provided.

ARTICLE 2

For the purposes of this Constitution:

1) the Greek Community comprises all citizens of the Republic who are of Greek origin and whose mother tongue is Greek or who share the Greek cultural traditions or who are members of the Greek Orthodox Church;

(2) the Turkish Community comprises all citizens of the Republic who are of Turkish origin and whose mother tongue is Turkish or who share the Turkish cultural traditions or who are Moslems;

(3) citizens of the Republic who do not come within the provisions of paragraph (1) or (2) of this Article shall, within three months of the date of the coming into operation of this Constitution, opt to belong to either the Greek or the Turkish Community as individuals, but, if they belong to a religious group, shall so opt as a religious group and upon such option they shall be deemed to be members of such Community:

Provided that any citizen of the Republic who belongs to such a religious group may choose not to abide by the option of such group and by a written and signed declaration submitted within one month of the date of such option to the appropriate officer of the Republic and to the Presidents of the Greek and the Turkish Communal Chambers opt to belong to the Community other than that to which such group shall be deemed to belong:

Provided further that if an option of such religious group is not accepted on the ground that its members are below the requisite number any member of such group may within one month of the date of the refusal of acceptance of such option opt in the aforesaid manner as an individual to which Community he would like to belong.

For the purposes of this paragraph a "religious group" means a group of persons ordinarily resident in Cyprus professing the same religion and either belonging to the same rite or being subject to the same jurisdiction thereof the number of whom, on the date of the coming into operation of this Constitution, exceeds one thousand out of which at least five hundred become on such date citizens of the Republic;

(4) a person who becomes a citizen of the Republic at any time after three months of the date of the coming into operation of this Constitution shall exercise the option provided in paragraph (3) of this Article within three months of the date of his so becoming a citizen;

(5) a Greek or a Turkish citizen of the Republic who comes within the provisions of paragraph (1) or (2) of this Article may cease to belong to the Community of which he is a member and belong to the other Community upon

(a) a written and signed declaration by such citizen to the effect that he desires such change, submitted to the appropriate officer of the Republic and to the Presidents of the Greek and the Turkish Communal Chambers;

(b) the approval of the Communal Chamber of such other Community;

(6) any individual or any religious group deemed to belong to either the Greek or the Turkish Community under the provisions of paragraph (3) of this Article may cease to belong to such Community and be deemed to belong to the other Community upon

(a) a written and signed declaration by such individual or religious group to the effect that such change is desired, submitted to the appropriate officer of the Republic and to the Presidents of the Greek and the Turkish Communal Chambers;

(b) the approval of the Communal Chamber of such other Community;

(7) (a) a married woman shall belong to the Community to which her husband belongs.

(b) a male or female child under the age of twentyone who is not married shall belong to the Community to which his or her father belongs, or, if the father is unknown and he or she has not been adopted, to the Community to which his or her mother belongs.

ARTICLE 3

1. The official languages of the Republic are Greek and Turkish.

2. Legislative, executive and administrative acts and documents shall be drawn up in both official languages and shall, where under the express provisions of this Constitution promulgation is required, be promulgated by publication in the official Gazette of the Republic in both official languages.

3. Administrative or other official documents addressed to a Greek or a Turk shall be drawn up in the Greek or the Turkish language respectively.

4. Judicial proceedings shall be conducted or made and judgments shall be drawn up in the Greek language if the parties are Greek, in the Turkish language if the parties are Turkish, and in both the Greek and the Turkish languages if the parties are Greek and Turkish. The official language or languages to be used for such purposes in all other cases shall be specified by the Rules of Court made by the High Court under Article 163.

5. Any text in the official Gazette of the Republic shall be published in both official languages in the same issue.

6. (1) Any difference between the Greek and the Turkish texts of any legislative, executive or administrative act or document published in the official Gazette of the Republic, shall be resolved by a competent court.

(2) The prevailing text of any law or decision of a Communal Chamber published in the official Gazette of the Republic shall be that of the language of the Communal Chamber concerned.

(3) Where any difference arises between the Greek and the Turkish texts of an executive or administrative act or document which, though not published in the official Gazette of the Republic, has otherwise been published, a statement by the Minister or any other authority concerned as to which text should prevail or which should be the correct text shall be final and conclusive.

(4) A competent court may grant such remedies as it may deem just in any case of a difference in the texts as aforesaid.

7. The two official languages shall be used on coins, currency notes and stamps.

8. Every person shall have the right to address himself to the authorities of the Republic in either of the official languages.

ARTICLE 4

1. The Republic shall have its own flag of neutral design and colour, chosen jointly by the President and the Vice President of the Republic.

2. The authorities of the Republic and any public corporation or public utility body created by or under the laws of the Republic shall fly the flag of the Republic and they shall have the right to fly on holidays together with the flag of the Republic both the Greek and the Turkish flags at the same time.

3. The Communal authorities and institutions shall have the right to fly on holidays together with the flag of the Republic either the Greek or the Turkish flag at the same time.

4. Any citizen of the Republic or any body, corporate or unincorporate other than public, whose members are citizens of the Republic, shall have the right to fly on their premises the flag of the Republic or the Greek or the Turkish flag without any restriction.

APPENDIX 2

Sample of Interview transcription

Transcription of the interview with Michella's mother

01/03/2008

(R: researcher, M: Michella's mother)

R = How is it going with the homework for the Greek community school?

M = We have mainly problems because of the dialect. I speak the Cypriot dialect; this is the language I have learnt from my parents. Some words are expressed in a different way but they are not accepted by the Modern Greek context. I have to explain to the children that this word is called like that using the dialect but the official word to name it is that one... But it needs a lot of hard work. The English language is stronger than the Greek one. It is always ahead. I felt that the children did ten steps backwards when they started lessons in the English mainstream school. The Greek language started losing its power on them from their first day in the English school. We have also problems with some words constructed by elements taken from both languages...the phenomenon of 'Greeklish'.

Both of my children could speak only Greek until they entered the English school. Michella was registered in the English school in the age of four. She could only speak Greek at that time.... Only Greek, nothing else.

R= Did she? And who are the people she used to communicate with?

M = With me, her father, her brother, her grandparents and..... when we had visitors of Greek-Cypriot origin I always asked them to use the Greek language when addressing to her 'she speaks Greek, don't speak to her in English'. I acted like that for both of my children. When they were young I used to teach them the numbers, the colours using only the Greek language. We used to sing Greek songs... When they entered the English school I used both languages 'we say it like that in English but we call it in this way in Greek'. However she could only speak Greek before entering the English school. She was expressing her wishes 'Mum, a glass of water' using only the Greek language. It was only one week after she had started the English school when she began using the English language at home.

R= Which were your reactions when she started using the English language?

M = Mmm....I accepted it... in a way but we never stopped using the Greek language. I always say to them 'we should speak more Greek in home, not only English'. There are times that we use a lot of English. Sometimes I, myself, may use more English than Greek but as soon as I realize it I try to switch to Greek. English for me is my first language, even if we do not want to accept this fact sometimes, and it is easier to express myself in English. But I try, we try all together. When we are on holidays in Cyprus, we learn new words, not only the children but me as well. We use only the Greek language and we make great progress each time. We come back and we speak the Greek language more fluently than we used to.

R= How often do you visit Cyprus?

M = We visit either Greece or Cyprus once a year. Last summer we went to Rhodes, we learnt new words and we used the language a lot. We stayed there approximately three weeks but sometimes our holidays may be even longer.

R = Do you have any relatives back in Cyprus?

M = My brother is living in Cyprus. He was born in England and two years ago he and his wife decided to go to Cyprus and live there. They have three children who attend lessons to the Greek mainstream school. The children speak Greek very fluently at this point but their parents speak them in English so as to maintain the English language. It is a situation similar to ours but they live in another country. The children play all together each time our two families meet and they use both languages so as to communicate, English and Greek together. We have also some other relatives who live in Cyprus but we mainly see my brother and his family.

R = Who are the people that the children use the Greek language with when they are in England?

M = They use the Greek language in home and with their grandparents. However, when there is a word that they do not know in Greek they use its English version. I do the same. When I do not know how to express something in Greek I use English. The children may start a sentence in Greek but they use also English words to complete it. My father is more helpful with this situation because his English is very good and he manages to understand the children. He explains to them the way each expression can be said in Greek. My mother does not speak much English; she cannot teach them the Greek equivalent to an English expression, she helps them only with the very simple expressions. My father helps them to progress in a more effective way.

We have also some relatives of Greek-Cypriot origin who the children meet occasionally. They use both Greek and English when they talk to the children but to be honest English is the dominant language when the children communicate with their cousins.

The children like very much the Greek music. They listen to Greek music. They can name you Greek singers. They also like dancing traditional Greek dances. They enjoy it very much.

We also go to church but not so often. It is a place that you can find many Greeks gathered, talking to each other using Greek. But we do not go to church very often. We are always there during Easter week and I am trying to explain to them the meaning of the whole service. I mean that during Easter services I explain to them why the church is decorated in a specific way during Great Friday, why the priest follows a particular way of actions with reference to the Christ and his passions.

I am mainly persistent in teaching them the wishes we exchange during Easter day and the meaning of them. I want them to know and other wishes we exchange when somebody is leaving for a journey or comes back from a journey. They have to know them and use them

when we travel to Greece or Cyprus, to be able to answer back when somebody asks or says something to them. These are the things I am trying to work with.

And I always say to them....I will say it in English, I say to them 'I am proud to be Greek, I am proud to be Cypriot, I am proud where I come from'...and I want the same for my children. This is what I am saying to them. I like our food, our music and I think my children like all these too. They like Greek dances. They learn traditional Greek dances in the Greek school but we also learn traditional Greek dances at home. Her cousin visits her at home and they listen to Greek music and they dance at the same time. Sometimes we dance together at home; I teach them Greek dances that I know. You know... we do all these kind of stuff.

Both my children entered the English school without being able to speak or understand English. My son was half two when he was first registered in the nursery. He was speaking only Greek until this point. I remember that we visited Cyprus when he was three years old and our relatives there could not believe that he did not speak English but only Greek.

R = How do you manage to persuade the child to switch in Greek when she speaks English to you?

M = I accept the fact that she is speaking in English but I always say to her... to them that ...I remind them to use Greek. I ask them to say the same expression in Greek. When they do not express themselves properly I explain to them the right way of expressing it in Greek. As I told you before we have many problems with the Cypriot dialect. She says many words which come from the dialect and I am trying to persuade her to say them in modern Greek...like the word 'kamari' and I say to her 'domatio' and she asks 'Why you say 'domatio' instead of 'kamari'....and I explain to her that if we go to Cyprus and she uses the word 'kamari' they may not understand because it is a very old word...a word that only the grandparents use but it does not happen the same now days. They speak in a modern way now in Cyprus. I am trying to teach them the modern language so as when we visit Cyprus or Greece to be able to speak in the modern way not in the way the grandparents express themselves...not speaking like the village people. I really try very hard for this. There is also the problem with the 'Greeklish'. The Greek-Cypriots have made a lot of words combining Greek and English at the same time. The children know some of them and they use them. I try to explain to them that these are words that only the Greek-Cypriots who live in England use; the right way of saying it is that one.... I always remind them 'Greek is your language; you have to know it, to use it'. They have cousins who do not speak Greek. I find this fact embarrassing. I say to their parents that they have to be ashamed of themselves. We have an opportunity to learn, to know a second language and it is sad not to be able to communicate with others...with our people. I do not knowI always say to my children 'we come from Cyprus and we speak Greek, we are not English'...this is the language of our home land and we are Cypriots. I cannot understand these families, I do not know, I say to them 'I am proud to be Greek',....I do not know about the others...we are trying about this and we are trying hard.

When the children communicate with their grandmother they use Greek. Sometimes, of course they use some English words but only when they do not know the Greek equivalent.

The same happens to me. I may not know something in Greek but I ask my father to help me, I ask him to explain it to me.

R = Which language do you use at home?

M = I speak English and Greek at the same time with my husband. I think that we may use....more English to be honest...orhalf English half Greek...when the whole family is around the dinner table we use both languages....English and Greek at the same time....but I always remind to the children to speak Greek, I constantly say to them 'you have to be able to speak Greek otherwise in what way are you going to communicate with the people in Cyprus, your cousins who leave there?'. I think that it is going well until this time, they speak Greek, they use the language.

I know other grandparents who use the English language when they speak to their grandchildren. I say to these people 'Speak to the children in Greek, use your own language' I say to them to do so, I believe so... 'your first language is not English, it is Greek'. I believe that the grandfather and the grandmother should always speak in Greek to the children. There are people in my age, they are parents also, who do not use the Greek language at all at home...and they are expecting the grandparents to teach to their children the Greek language. How are they expecting the grandparents to teach the children the language if they meet each other once a week? The children will not get to know the language. I say to them that they have to use the language at home; the children have to listen to the language. How are they going to learn the language if they do not hear it at all? My children hear the language from me and my husband, their grandparents...they listen to Greek music also, Greek songs. We listen to Greek songs at home, we also hear English songs but not only English. When we are in the car we listen to English music but we listen to Greek songs also.

About the traditions too.....these days that are close to Easter. I explain to them our customs, what kind of food we use to eat according to our tradition. We go to the grandmother's home and we prepare all together the traditional foods, the children are there with me, with their grandmother, they watch...they learn our customs....our traditions...

I attended lessons in the Greek community school only for three years. When I finished the school I got a job to a travel agent, a Cypriot one. My Greek was not very good the first period but after two months I made a great progress. My husband comes from a family that does not use English at all. He attended the Greek school properly but his Greek is not as good as mine. He has learnt the language with many elements of the dialect. His grammar also is not good. Imagine that I always correct him, even though I did not attend lessons to the Greek school for more than three years. It was very stupid of me. Now I realize my mistake but it is too late. I did not want to go on with the Greek school. I did not like the teacher, to be honest. She was very strict and I decided to stop the Greek school. I announced it to my father but he could not persuade me to change my decision.... But I knew since then that I wanted my children to learn Greek.

Since the time I got married and stopped working to the travel agent I have the feeling that my Greek is as good as it used to be, that I used to be more fluent ...more capable of using the

language. The job in the travel agent at that point of time helped me a lot, because I could hear the language all around me and I was forced to use it all the time, I had to speak Greek otherwise I could not stay in the job. But my level in Greek language was very high during that period of time.

It is like when we go to Greece or to Cyprus and we come back more fluent, knowing more words, being able to use the language easier than before. But all these are things that you are going to experience only if you visit the country and stay for a period of time there using constantly the Greek language. You cannot learn these without travelling, without visiting Greece or Cyprus....England cannot offer you this kind of opportunities ...to use and experience the language.

I remember that when I used to work to the travel agent, I had many difficulties in understanding written forms of the Greek language. Next to the travel agent's there was a shop from which I used to buy Greek magazines...you know for young ladies...I was one at that point of time...and while I could read every word, all the texts....I could not understand the meaning...I could not understand what it was about. However after the first two months that my Greek was rapidly improved I managed to understand every written text. The language was all over around me and I could understand any form of it.

R = Which language did you use in your family context?

M = I used only Greek with my mother....I used only Greek with my father but with my father...I could also say something in Englishmy mother understands also English but my father's English is better, much more better.. You know my father, when he first came in England attended lessons in afternoon English classes. He knows to read, to write, to speak...he has, of course, a different accent to the native speakers but he is very good. My father helps me when I have difficulties with Greek expressions I do not know. I say to him the English version and he explains to me the Greek equivalent...I cannot do this with my mother...it is not that she does not speak or understand English at all....but my father has more knowledge on the English language, on the correct forms of the English language.

I think that Michaela is so fluent in Greek because she loves Cyprus, she loves her culture and all these happen because she can hear and she can watch parts of it within our home.

Each time we go to Cyprus I say to my children 'I have come home' for me it is my home, for me my home, my place is Cyprus. I do not know the reasons why other Greek-Cypriots do not feel the same...I do not know.....I cannot say...We live in England...we were born in England but our roots come from Cyprus, and Cyprus and Cypriots are this thing, they live like that, they cook this food.....

When I was young we did not visit Cyprus very often but I always have had a love inside me for Cyprus. I feel a deep love when I go to the villages where my father and my mother were born...it is important to know that these are your roots...that everything started in these villages. It is good to know that your father comes from this place and your mother comes from that village.

Last time we visited Cyprus I went to my grandmother's home. Both my grandparents are dead now and the house is abandoned...but when I went there all my memories came back...my grandmother cooking traditional food and me standing next to her...the animals around the house, the donkey, the goats, the horse...here we had the horse, here we had the goats....things that I remember and I describe and I explain to my children ...my history ...their history...what we used to do many years ago in these places. These are my memories and I share them with my children, to teach them....to make them understand....to get to know their roots

R = What do you think about the Greek school? What are your expectations?

M = You know ... you learn things at home...but how are you going to learn to write, to learn the grammar of the language? You cannot learn these at home with your family. Your family teaches you the culture and provides you with the verbal input of the language but there are more to be taught and the Greek school teaches the rest, the missing part of the language that the family cannot give you. How can I explain that to you....for me...for my beliefs....for the way I am thinking.....Greek language is like swimming. When I was very young I had an accident in a swimming pool. Since then I am afraid of the swimming pools and of the sea. I can step in a swimming pool or in the sea only if I know that the water is shallow. I am trying to persuade the children to attend swimming lessons by reminding them that each time we go on holidays they enjoy themselves in the swimming pool but I am standing outside. Why is that? Because when I was young, in their age I did not learn to swim, I had this accident and since then I lost the feeling of joy when being to a swimming pool or by the sea. I promised to myself once that I will do anything I can so as to teach my children swimming and the Greek language. I want them to be better than me, to enjoy swimming like all people do and to speak the Greek language fluently. I want them to be successful in their GCSE exams because I did not have the maturity many years ago to go on with my studies in the community school. I think that one day they will thank me for all these and I hope that they will do the same with their children. I say to them so all the time.

I say to them that we are lucky to have one language in our home which we can learn easily while other people have to go to school to learn French or Spanish. My son learns also French and German at school... I explain to him that soon he will have his GCSE in four languages, this is important for his future career. But you know....I say to them all the time about this and thatevery day....for themfor their future.

R= What do you think about the Greek-Cypriots in your age whose children do not have any connection to the Greek language and culture?

M = Mmmmm.....I have a cousin, she is in my age...she was also born and educated in England. She understands Greek but she always uses English when she speaks. She is not....she isthe way I say it.... 'she is Greek only by name' (English). Only their name is Greek...the rest of them. ..of themselves is English. They do not speak Greek in their home, they have not kept any of the Greek customs and traditions. Let me give you an example; last Easter we visited some friends of Greek-Cypriot origin, we entered their house and their greetings were English not Greek...and it was Easter. Why? Why do you do this? You are not Greek? You know our

traditions, we say 'Christos anesti' and 'alithos anesti', this is what we...the Cypriots say on Easter day...but they did not. They may cook Cypriot dishes but that is the point everything ends, it stops there.

The strange thing is that many of these people sent their children to the Greek school and they are expecting their children to learn Greek only by attending a two hours lesson twice a week. For example, this cousin of mine does not speak Greek, it is not that she cannot speak, she does not want to do so, she is embarrassed because of her accent, her accent is very English. Her child goes to the Greek school but he only listens to the Greek language from his grandparents. It is difficult for him to learn to speak. How will it happen?.....And, of course, there are grandparents who use the English language when they are with their grandchildren...my opinion is that the grandparents should use their first language with the grandchildren not the second one which they do not know very well...for me English is my first language and it is easier for me to use English but I try, I try hard and I use Greek as much as I can. I entered the English school and I could speak both Greek and English...I was the younger child of the family.....and English language is stronger than the Greek one in my mind but I try to use Greekgrandparents should use their first language with their grandchildren. My visits in Cyprus or in Greece empower my competence in the Greek language and I really enjoy it each time.....new words, more fluency...

When we are reading together a book written in Greek...let's say the texts in the book that they use in the Greek school...I always ask them questions about the meaning of the text, of the words....the other day we were trying to learn the Greek words we use so as to say the time....I was explaining to them using English.....we say it like that in English...we use these Greek words to say the same thing. Sometimes I even call my parents for help, when we are talking about something I am not sure about the proper either pronunciation or meaning. We have also many difficulties with the spelling of the Greek words. It is a very hard task for the children and for me also. And to be honest, the books you are using are not very helpful for the children; they do not explain properly what exactly the children are asked to do. However the most important thing isI believe that if the children do not use the Greek language at home, if they do not hear the language at home, if they do not have the opportunity to speak with other people using the Greek language, they will not learn. The whole procedure is hard, it is difficult.....I have to think before saying something in Greek...it is not my first language.....I have to remind all the time to myself 'speak Greek to the children'...and I also ask from the children to use Greek....you said it in English, let me hear it now in Greek...and they are going to say and I am going to help them if they have any difficulties...we are struggling all the time...and again and again.

We use dictionaries when we are studying together.....I explain to them that this is the word the Greek-Cypriots use in England for example 'baso' but the proper word is 'leoforio' because the first one is a Greekish version. I want them to know that the Greeks in England use the word 'stamps' so as to name stamps but we cannot use it in Greece or in Cyprus.

I am trying hard... I am determined to go on like that though. I want my children to learn the Greek language, to be able to use it...to be able to prove but also to support their

background...they are Greek-Cypriots and I remind it to them every day...every second....it is hard and very demanding though...it is a procedure that demands strength and persistency but we will go on trying and trying.....

APPENDIX 3

Sample of reflection notes

2/11/08
I. Studying Martin Hammerley talking about the researcher's personal and cultural assumptions, I thought I could include my initial assumptions about the parents for the last of the language. Gradually, I realize the difficulty.
"Home country for me is the country my parents live and my parents live in Britain. What for bothering teaching Greek?"
Am I an "outsider"?

17/03/12
Upgrade
Differences
Everything went fine.
Two points made!
i) sociocultural aspects
ii) methodological perspective
I should refer in detail about my access to participants' houses. How did I build rapport? in detail the progress of my report
Let's progress to Mithal's family a short discussion at the end comparing the two families grandmother.
• low education - withdrew in a young age
• 16 in London but extended network of CD speakers.

she did not press her to adopt the English language
• counteragency but she survived with the help of her husband and her children!
• in her is idealized that professional advancement accelerates language shift since economic profits highly evaluated but she did not encounter such an issue.
• identify strongly with CD for herself since she managed to survive without shifting - her experiences allow her to be indulged in a position of a competent speaker, posing successfully against dominant discourses.
It is not the fact that she is not aware of them but she has managed to set boundaries regarding her linguistic life. Adhering to the power of English and its complementary use but contradicts its monopoly.
she place also
her professional occupation

• husband as children helped her
• her husband at school
• helping children
• dependant learners
• persistent and consistent about CD use
Nevertheless aware of the social constraints
• extended social network in Cyprus and in England
• regular visits to Cyprus
• linguistic update
• more intense G.C.S
her