Diglossia in Cyprus: Constructing A Questionnaire to Measure Russian-Speaking Immigrants' Attitudes towards Learning Common Greek as L2 and Perceived Level of Exposure and Attitudes towards Cypriot Greek

Ioli Orphanide, Panayiotis Louca, Anna Chatzipanagiotidou & Kostas D. Dinas

Diglossia in Cyprus: Constructing A Questionnaire to Measure Russian-Speaking Immigrants' Attitudes towards Learning Common Greek as L2 and Perceived Level of Exposure and Attitudes towards Cypriot Greek

Ioli Orphanide[1], Panayiotis Louca[1], Anna Chatzipanagiotidou[1] & Kostas D. Dinas[2]

[1]School of Education & Social Sciences, Frederick University, Nicosia, Cyprus, [2]Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, University of Western Macedonia, Florina, Greece

Corresponding Author Email: ioli_orphanides@yahoo.com

Abstract

Cyprus is an island country where diglossia exists, potentially creating certain communicational issues for Cyprus's many immigrants. Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research has shown that attitudes towards L2 and towards SLA significantly affect L2 acquisition. This study describes the design, development, and validation of the Second Language Acquisition in Diglossia Questionnaire (SLA-Dig), which was administered to the largest immigrant minority on the island. Initially the SLA-Dig consisted of 41 Likert type items designed to measure four factors. The SLA-Dig was translated into immigrants' L1 and was originally administered to 105 individuals. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) led to subsequent adaptation. The final version, consisting of 22 questions, was administered to another sample of 182 immigrants. EFA results were in accordance with the original analysis. Reliability analysis resulted in satisfactory Cronbach's α coefficients, consistent with a valid and reliable research tool for conducting research on factors affecting SLA in diglossia situations.

Keywords: Diglossia, Language Attitudes, Non-Standard Variety, Second Language (L2) Learning, Communicative Competence, Instrumental/Integrative Orientation

Introduction

Diglossia is a linguistic phenomenon in which two linguistic varieties belonging to the same language are used in a speech community, each with a different role and under distinct circumstances (Ferguson, 1959). Cyprus is a small island in the Mediterranean Sea where such a

speech community exists: Standard Modern Greek (SMG) is the High Variety and Cypriot Greek is the Low (Arvaniti, 2006; Ioannidou, 2009; Moschonas, 1996; Sciriha, 1996; Tsiplakou, 2009).

At the same time, Cyprus has seen a rise in immigrant influx in recent years (Cyprus Statistical Services, 2013; Papamichael, 2009), mainly due to its integration in the EU. Thus, the need to effectively research the ways diglossia affects learning Greek as a second language (L2) in Cyprus rises. Through investigating the current sociolinguistic situation in Cyprus, as well as through literature review, certain factors that possibly affect L2 learning under a diglossia situation have been located and need to be researched. Since no such tool exists for the Greek Cypriot setting and, in fact for any diglossia setting, the need to construct a valid and consistent tool seems imminent. This article describes the creation procedure of this tool.

Sociolinguistic Status in Cyprus

Two distinct linguistic varieties co-exist in Cyprus: on the one hand, Standard Modern Greek (SMG) functions as the High Variety (HV) and is used in official settings, newspapers, school lessons etc., even though Cypriots do not always realize that the SMG variety used in Cyprus slightly differs from SMG used in mainland Greece (Mackridge, 2012). On the other hand, Cypriot Greek (CG) is the Low Variety (LV), used widely throughout the island between family and friends (Orphanide & Chatzipanagiotidou, 2019; Sciriha, 1996), in markets, between colleagues, outside the school classroom (Sciriha, 1996) or even on occasions spontaneously inside the classroom (Ioannidou, 2009; Ioannidou, 2012). Cypriot Greek is even used sometimes in the courtroom to better convey a message (Georgiou, 2015).

The two linguistic varieties illustrate obvious differences on all levels, i.e., phonological, grammatical, syntax, lexical (Hadjioannou, 2000; Kontosopoulos, 2001; Newton, 1972; Tsakona, 2006), with differences in the phonological level being more obvious (Pavlou & Christodoulou, 2001). Even though Cypriots feel confident when using SMG, the chances of the CG disappearing are very slim (Tsiplakou, 2004). On the contrary, a *koiné* variety seems to be rising, suppressing basilects (Hadjioannou et al. 2011; Karyolaimou, 2000; Mackridge, 2012; Tsiplakou, 2009; Tsiplakou, 2014) and reviving CG's status (Tsiplakou, 2014). What is more, during the past decade CG has been more prominent in the public sphere e.g. in television or radio shows (e.g. Sophocleous, 2019-today), advertising (Georgiou, 2019), satirical blogs (e.g. Sike; Woofis), various themed blogs (e.g. (Aceras Anthropophorum˙ Blog Skepseon), vlogs (e.g. Iconomu, 2014˙ Papavasiliou, n.d.), in literary book translations (cf. I. Hadjipieris' translation of *Le petit prince* in De Saint-Exupery, 1943/2018), comic strips (cf. L. Taxitari's translation of *Asterix aux jeux Olympiques* in Gosciny, 1968/2007) and even on t-shirts and stickers (e.g. Ermina Emmanouel Art, n.d.˙ Romeotees, n.d.), thus legitimizing the public usage of CG and removing it from the strictly private sphere where the LV typically belongs (Tsiplakou & Ioannidou, 2012). Within the complex Cyprus political setting, the issue of diglossia remains a deeply political, emotionally charged, and ethnocentric issue (Ioannidou, 2012; Papapavlou, 2010; Papapavlou & Mavromati, 2015; Yiakoumetti, 2006). Even though Grecophone Cypriots link CG to their identity (Orphanide & Chatzipanagiotidou, 2019; Sciriha, 1996), as is true with most speech communities of non-standard varieties (Trudgill, 2000), there is no intention of standardizing CG and promoting it as the HV (Armosti et al., 2014).

Teaching Greek as a Native Language in Cyprus Policy

Due to various complex political and historic reasons, the official policy of Cyprus's Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports and Youth (MOEC) regarding teaching Greek as a Native Language (GNL) until recently was – beyond very few literary references –to simply ignore the dialect (Eteokleous et al., 2012) and to adopt the curriculum used in the respective Ministry of Greece (Hadjioannou et al., 2011; Papapavlou & Pavlou, 2005). This means that at the center of this policy one can find Greek culture and Christian Orthodox faith (Pavlou & Papapavlou, 2004). However, new curricula were issued in 2010 (MOEC, 2010), having critical literacy at their core, meaning that diglossia could now not only be mentioned in the GNL classroom but also used to increase students' metalinguistic awareness (Tsiplakou et al., 2018). Some voices of distrust were expressed (e.g. Xenis, 2012), turning the matter into a political one; thus, the curricula were very short-lived (Tsiplakou et al., 2018). There is no reference to the diglossia issue in the current curricula (MOEC, 2016; Tsiplakou et al., 2018).

There are currently two main approaches when it comes to the issue of dialect use in the native language classroom (cf. Cheshire et al., 1989; Snell, 2013). *Elimination of nonstandard speech* is the first, which has started to reappear in educational settings (Snell, 2013). This approach considers dialectal forms that children use as "wrong" and gives praise to students who learn the HV (Trudgill, 2000). The second approach, supported by many linguists (Trudgill, 2000) is called *bidialectal education*; two linguistic varieties are used during teaching (Yiakoumetti, 2006), while code-switching is actively encouraged, thus contributing to higher metalinguistic awareness, amongst other things. (Trudgill, 2000). Such an approach entails many benefits for children, since both self-confidence levels and grades rise (cf. studies mentioned in Sophocleous & Wilks, 2010; Trudgill, 2000; Yiakoumetti, 2006).

Greek as a Second Language in Cyprus

The immigrant influx seen in Cyprus during the past 15 years means that there is also an increased interest in learning Greek as a Second Language (GSL), with both public and private options available. The difficulty of memorizing grammar and syntax rules to learn a new language is further enhanced by the fact that one needs to use new knowledge to effectively communicate in real life settings (Barkhuizen, 2004). In a diglossia situation, the student must learn vocabulary, grammar, and syntax for two different, yet similar, linguistic varieties, meaning that the task might become even more tiring and time-consuming (Ferguson, 1971). Research in Cyprus has shown that foreigners living on the island and learning GSL do experience some issues in communication due to the diglossia situation (Orphanide et al., 2020; Pavlou & Christodoulou, 2001), while attitudes towards CG tend to be negative between Greek Pontiacs living in Cyprus (Pavlou & Zoumpalidis, 2008).

It seems reasonable to think that the curriculum for teaching GSL in school settings would follow the same route as the case with GNL, and indeed this was the case until very recently. However, the new curriculum issued in 2020 includes many references to CG, aiming to cultivate multilingual awareness and help students become functional users of both linguistic varieties (Mitsiaki, 2020). Results and reactions from this curriculum remain to be seen.

Second Language Acquisition Theories

The procedure of L2 acquisition and the factors affecting it have been the subject of many theories over the 20th century: from Skinner's (1957) behaviourism to Chomsky's (1965) transformational generative grammar, to Corder's (1967) error analysis and Selinker's (1972) interlanguage. One of the most prevalent theories today is Hymes's (1972) theory of communicative competence; rejecting Chomsky's (1965) ideal speaker, Hymes (1972) focuses on sociocultural factors to interpret language acquisition and usage. The theory of communicative competence combines linguistic theory with communication and culture theory and is based on four pillars: (a) whether something is formally possible (e.g. grammatical), (b) feasible, (c) appropriate and (d) done; it also entails variables such as attitude and motivation (Hymes, 1972). Currently, communicative competence is at the core of both language teaching (cf. Council of Europe, 2008) and language certification (Bachman, 1990; Canale & Swain, 1980; Centre for the Greek Language, 2015).

However, it was in the field of social psychology that large-scaled research on the factors that affect L2 acquisition begun. Gardner (1985) viewed language as more than a neutral linguistic code. Learning a foreign language is different from all other school subjects, since students are exposed to a culture other than their own; this means that variables such as attitude, motivation and orientation towards language learning are entailed in the L2 acquisition process (Gardner, 1985).

Social psychologists went beyond language theory: they created models which affect L2 acquisition to implement their theories. A prevalent variable in these models is attitude, which also includes many sub-variables such as positive or negative attitude towards a specific language (Baker, 1992). Schumann's (1986) acculturation theory also includes the notion of language attitude, focusing on immigrants' L2 acquisition. Research has located two main components of language attitudes in L2 learning: instrumental orientation and integrative orientation (Baker, 1992). Orientation here means the underlying reason for which a person studies a L2 (Ellis, 1994). Instrumental orientation to L2 learning includes vocational reasons, achievement, status, enhancement of personal success or even basic security and survival; on the other hand, an integrative orientation entails the need for affiliation with a more social and interpersonal orientation (Baker, 1992). Attitudes can be measured both quantitatively and qualitatively in various ways such as questionnaires, interviews, matched-guise technique etc. (Garrett et al., 2003). Another factor that can affect L2 outcomes, as seen in Gardner's (1985) socio-educational model is informal language experience, which in its turn is affected by attitudes towards other ethnic groups and attitudes towards L2 learning.

Purpose and Innovation of the Study

This research's purpose is:
- to measure immigrants' attitudes towards Cypriot Greek (CG), their perceived level of exposure to CG, as well as their integrative and instrumental orientation towards learning Greek as a Second Language in Cyprus;
- to find if these variables are related;
- and to find if these variables are affected by specific demographic characteristics such as age, years of residence in Cyprus etc.

This is done by creating a new research tool, the Second Language Acquisition in Diglossia Questionnaire (SLA-Di), to measure the aforementioned factors quantitatively.

Negative attitudes towards L2 have been shown to negatively affect SLA (Baker, 1992; Gardner, 1985). By creating a tool that will scientifically measure these attitudes in the immigrant community of Cyprus, we can contribute to designing a curriculum that will be suitable for these immigrants' needs and minimize negative attitudes towards CG in the immigrant community. This, in its turn, will ultimately help immigrants in Cyprus to better integrate in the local community. And successful immigrant integration means improved economic indexes (DeVoretz & Werner, 2000).

This research can also contribute to understanding this contradiction: on the one hand, immigrants are globally the largest group of people with a vested interest in learning a L2; on the other hand, immigrants' L2 level remains low (AlHammadi, 2016). Even though SLA by immigrants is affected by many factors (cf. AlHammadi, 2016; DeVoretz & Werner, 2000), attitude towards the local non-standard varieties has not been studied under this prism.

Lastly, this new research tool focuses on immigrants' rather than local L2 learners' attitudes towards diglossia which, to the extent of the researchers' knowledge, has not been studied before.

Materials and Methods

The development of the Second Language Acquisition in Diglossia Questionnaire (SLA-Di) was conducted in two phases. Phase I included the development of the original version of the instrument, which was administered to an appropriate sample, with recorded data subsequently analyzed through Exploratory Factor Analysis. Phase II included the adaptation of the original version based on the aforementioned analysis, and the subsequent administration to a different sample, as well as analysis of the recorded data.

Population and Sample

The current study focused on the Russian speaking community of Cyprus, one of the largest immigrant communities (Nestoros, 2017; Noonan, 2014), which has an established presence on the island, including schools, radio stations, magazines and newspapers, shops, and festivals in the Russian language (see Orphanide, 2020). Given this, Russian speaking immigrant adults residing in Cyprus for a period of six or more months that had at least basic knowledge of Greek as L2 (GSL) were defined as the population of this study. These criteria were set so that respondents' willingness to communicate (Gallagher, 2013) and socialize (Oakes, 2013) with the local population would be stronger. Level of GSL was established based on self-report questions. Since a registry of the population was not available, the only option for sampling was convenience sampling, but this still resulted in a highly stratified sample.

For Phase I the sample was obtained from two private GSL institutions, one in each of the largest cities in Cyprus. Snowball sampling (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012) was also adopted by requesting from these participants to invite other Russian speaking immigrants, who are no longer actively attending GSL classes or who have learned GSL through informal training, to participate in the study. The sample comprised of 105 people, mostly women (87%). The age group with the most participants was the 26-39 group (47%), followed by the 40-55 age group (37%), with both 18-25 and 56-70 age group at 8%. The majority of the sample were of high socio-

economic status (81.4%). Years of residency in Cyprus were grouped into three categories (1-4, 5-10 or >11 years), with an equal percentage of 35.4% for the first two and 29.3% for the latter. Some demographic variables were slightly off the acceptable kurtosis or skewness levels of ±2; however, this fact does not affect sample suitability for conducting EFA (Williams et al., 2010).

The sample for Phase II was obtained primarily online, via email and social media. To increase the response rate, potential participants were offered an incentive in the form of a raffle draw for a 50-euro spa coupon, a practice not uncommon in online surveys (Manzo & Burke, 2012). The link leading to the questionnaire was shared online in two ways. Following the snowball sampling technique (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012), the link was sent via email to 85 persons who either belong to or are affiliated with the Russian-speaking community of Cyprus, along with an accompanying explanatory text in Greek, Russian and English asking them to fill out and forward the questionnaire to friends and family. In addition, several posts on the social media platform *Facebook* were made. Russian-speaking immigrants were asked to participate in the study by posting in groups of primarily Russian-speaking immigrants. The total number of members in those groups summed up to around 16.000, although group members might belong to more than one of those groups. The link was made available for a duration of three months, from October 2019 to January 2020. To counterbalance for the disadvantages of online sampling, such as sample bias, technophobia, and lower response rates (Hunter, 2010), sampling was also conducted conventionally for the 56-70 age group through the above-mentioned private GSL institutions and targeted sampling. The total number of participants obtained from both online and conventional sampling was 182. The sample comprised mostly of women (90.4%), which perhaps reflects the makeup of the specific Facebook groups that were used for obtaining the online sample. This fact does not affect sample suitability for EFA (Williams et al., 2010). Almost half of the participants (57.7%) belong in the 26-39 age group, followed by the 40-55 age group (34%) and a vast difference for the 56-70 and 18-25 age group (4.5% and 3.8% respectively). Thus, for inferential statistics, the four categories merged into two, i.e., age group 18-39 and age group >40. A large percentage of participants are of High socio-economic status (75.5%), followed by Medium (14.2%) and Low (10.1%) socio-economic status. As for marital status and spouse's country of descent, 36.1% said their spouse is Cypriot or Greek, 38.1% said their spouse is from a country other than Cyprus/Greece and 25,8% said they are not married. Fourty one percent lived in Cyprus for >11 years, followed by 5-10 years (31.8%) and finally 1-4 years (26.8%). A total of 98 people left their email to participate in the raffle draw for the spa coupon; the data given by these participants was also very low in missing data, indicating that the incentive contributed to better quality and quantity of collected data.

The Second Language Acquisition in Diglossia Questionnaire (SLA-Di)

The questionnaire developed focused on the social factors that affect GSL acquisition in Cyprus. A 5-point Likert scale was used for measuring, following Dörnyei and Csizer's (2012) model questionnaire. Answer 1 corresponded to "I don't agree at all" and answer 5 to "I completely agree". Using both literature review as well as ingenuity (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012), several items were created for each factor; caution was exercised so that survey errors (Gideon, 2012b) and the phenomenon of Total Survey Error (Gideon, 2012a) would be avoided: the items are presented in random order, to avoid possibility of answering similar questions in the same way (Dörnyei & Csizer, 2012· Gardner, 1985); at least seven different items were created for each

factor, so that items which lower the reliability index (*Cronbach's* α) could be removed post hoc (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012· Gardner, 1985). When phrasing the items, all efforts were made to avoid researchers' common errors (Garrett et al., 2003): items phrased clearly and simply, avoiding all use of scientific jargon, which could frighten participants; no suppository or guided or negatively formed items; no bold adjectives used; the questionnaire was completed by participants without any prior discussion with the researchers; what is more, the questionnaire was translated into the population's native language, thus possibly improving data quality (Price et al., 1983 as cited in Garrett et al., 2003).

A total number of 41 items/questions was developed to measure four factors. The first factor was hypothesised to measure Integrative Orientation Towards GSL Acquisition in Cyprus and comprised of 8 items such as "I learn Greek so that I can feel part of the local society" and "If you are raising a family in Cyprus, it's important that you speak Greek well". The second factor was hypothesized to measure Instrumental Orientation Towards GSL Acquisition in Cyprus and included 8 items such as "I could find a better job in Cyprus if I spoke Greek." and "Speaking Greek well can be a professional asset for me in Cyprus.". The third factor was hypothesised to measure Attitude towards Cypriot Greek (CG). This factor comprised of 12 items such as "In Cyprus, CG has lower status compared to SMG", (CG was referred to as "the Cypriot dialect" in the questionnaire and SMG was referred to as "Common Greek"), "Cypriots should only use SMG and not CG", "I expect that my children (or future children) will speak both SMG and CG". Con-trait items did not affect EFA results, as the correlation between items can be seen irrespectively. The fourth factor was hypothesized to measure Perceived Exposure to CG Outside the Classroom. The 13 items comprising this factor were created using the Council of Europe's (2008) *Common European Framework of Language.* These items begun with the stem statement "How often do you hear CG spoken…", which was followed by everyday circumstances in which language use occurs, such as "…when going shopping", "…when discussing everyday issues (such as the weather, family etc.) with Cypriots". The 5-point Likert scale used was slightly modified to fit this factor's items, with 1 corresponding to "Rarely" and 5 corresponding to "Very often" (see Appendix).

The demographic variables included in the research questions were also based on bibliography: research has shown that women more often than men have positive attitudes towards the High Variety (Cheshire, 1991; Trudgill, 2000). Suggestions for educational policy cannot ignore gender differences (Starks & Paltridge, 1996). Age is also a factor that can be researched for its relationship with language attitudes (Ellis, 1994). Years of residence in a foreign country can also affect level of usage of L2 (AlHammadi, 2016), making these two variables important to incorporate in the research questions. Marital status (Maple, 1982 in Schumann, 1986) and family (Borjas (1992 in AlHammadi, 2016; Chiswick et al., 2002) can also affect level of usage of L2. Seeing as this research's target group is adults learning GSL, spouse's country of descent was deemed appropriate to investigate, since family is a factor researched with younger target groups.

Bearing in mind issues of internal validity, reliability and factor dimensionality, the questionnaire was reviewed by experts in the field of social linguistics for readability, cohesion, and appropriateness (Baker, 1992· Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012), so that face validity was assured. Since items were developed in the Greek language, they were subsequently translated by a

professional translator into the target group's native language (Russian) and again reviewed by three more target group native speakers.

To minimize sample mortality, the questionnaire additionally included a short introductory paragraph presenting the purpose of the study, while reassuring participants that no special skills or dexterity was required to answer it; this being one of the main reasons that participants fail to complete online questionnaires (Roos, 2002, as cited in Hunter, 2010). To reduce conformity to researchers' expectations, participants were reassured that there were no correct or wrong answers and that researchers just wanted to know their honest viewpoint (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012· Gardner, 1985; Garrett et al., 2003). The introductory paragraph also included basic information on research study's scope and stressed the importance of participants' answers towards contributing to scientific knowledge about GSL in Cyprus; the main reasons for which participants will take part in a research without personal gain is if they are convinced that it is a serious research, if they can see a noteworthy cause linked to the research's purpose and if they believe that their opinion counts (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012). The questionnaire version used during Phase I also included an annex asking for feedback regarding content, length, and research purpose, following Gideon (2012b). Finally, to ease concerns over anonymity and data protection, a short paragraph about GDPR (European Commision, 2018) was added next to the point where participants could fill out their email address.

The full length of the questionnaire in paper and pencil format during Phase I was less than five pages long, including the Annex. Most researchers agree that any questionnaire over 4-6 pages long and taking more than 30 minutes to be completed will probably be considered too much pressure and remain uncompleted by participants (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012). The full length of the questionnaire in paper and pencil format during Phase II was also less than five pages, including the raffle draw participation and a suggestion to voluntarily take part in a relevant focus group. According to platform www.1ka.si where the electronic form of the questionnaire was uploaded, the predicted total completion time for the SLA-Di was 19m 48s.

The questionnaire was approved by the Research Ethics & Integrity Committee of Frederick University, Cyprus (approval number EI-2019) and participants were informed of their voluntary participation in the questionnaire, their right to withdraw from the questionnaire at any time, as well as of the anonymity of the data.

Procedure

For Phase I of the SLA-Di, 41 five-point Likert type items were developed as explained above. A paper and pencil format of the questionnaire was then administered to a sample of 105 members of the Russian-speaking immigrant community of Cyprus. Data underwent Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). This is a statistical procedure often used in the fields of education and psychology; through EFA a large number of question items is reduced to smaller data sets known as "factors", measuring the same characteristic (Williams et al., 2010). EFA can locate correlations between measurable variables and latent concepts, thus allowing for theory formation or clarification; it also provides construct validity evidence of self-reporting scales (Williams et al., 2010). Internal consistency levels for each factor were calculated using *Cronbach's α*, a measure ranging from 0 to +1. By removing items that were lowering *Cronbach's α* level, only factors with strong (>0.7) *Cronbach's α* measure were included. As a result of the EFA, 19 items/questions were removed, resulting in the final version of the questionnaire with 22 items/questions. This

version was distributed during Phase II mainly online, which resulted in 182 completed questionnaires. Again, EFA was conducted, confirming the results from the first EFA and showing high levels of internal consistency for all factors.
Statistical package SPSS v19.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, USA) was used.

Results
Results from Phase I

Data collected from Phase I was firstly screened and prepared for analysis. Out of the 105 completed questionnaires, four were rejected due to missing data or no GSL knowledge. Missing data from at least one participant was observed at an expected rate (72.4% of the items). This was appropriately addressed using Expectation Maximization technique. This method is commonly used when conducting Exploratory Factor Analysis (Howell, 2008). Furthermore, to ensure data was missing completely at random, Little's MCAR test was performed, confirming that missing data was missing completely at random, $\chi^2(1,148)=1205.420$, $p=.116$.

Next, the suitability of the data and sample size for conducting EFA were explored. The *Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin's* (*KMO*) test for sampling adequacy revealed that sample was adequate for EFA (*KMO* = .658). Likewise, the *Bartlett's Test of Sphericity* (*BTS*) indicated that data were suitable for EFA (p<.001).

EFA was then performed using Principal Components Analysis (PCA). Orthogonal Factor Rotation (Varimax) was conducted, after testing various rotation techniques on the data set (Williams et al., 2010). The number of factors extracted was decided by combining the implementation of the following criteria, as suggested by Williams et al (2010); Tabachnick and Fidell (2007): a) Eigenvalue (>1), b) the cumulative percentage of variance explained by factors– which in social sciences and humanitarian studies can only reach 50-60% (Williams et al., 2010), c) the Monte Carlo Test (O'Connor, 2000), and, d) Cronbach's α measure, which is recommended to be larger than .70 for each extracted factor (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012).

The Monte Carlo test (see Table 1) revealed that seven extracted factors can be measured by the questionnaire. However, an examination of the Scree Plot (Figure 1) showed that only the first three factors should be extracted. According to Eigenvalues (**Error! Reference source not found.**2), the cumulative percent of variance explained by the first six factors was 57.30%. Furthermore, only the first four extracted factors, which had a value of Cronbach's α larger than .70, can remain. Finally, item loadings were examined to ensure that only factors with item loadings larger than .40 would be extracted. The application of the above criteria resulted in the extraction of three factors and 22 out of 41 items becoming interpretable under them.

Out of the four hypothesised factors of the SLA-Di Questionnaire, Attitude Towards CG and Perceived Level of Exposure to CG were formed as expected and only included items designed to measure that specific characteristic, albeit some of the items loaded primarily in other, smaller factors and were thus removed. However, four items that were hypothesized to measure Integrative Orientation and two items hypothesized to measure Instrumental Orientation, primarily loaded on the third factor (primary loadings >.50, see **Error! Reference source not found.**3). After careful examination of these items, it was decided that the third factor was measuring "Extended Integrative Orientation towards Learning GSL". This factor thus measured the extent to which Russian-speaking immigrants in Cyprus learn GSL to gain *a good quality of life*, as indicated by better work prospects and smooth integration into the Cypriot

society. The merge of Integrative Orientation with Instrumental Orientation might seem odd at first; however, it makes sense when considering the characteristics of the populations that formed the basis of the Integrative/Instrumental Orientation approach, namely pupils and students studying L2 as a *foreign* language in their own country. On the contrary, this study's population are *immigrants* learning L2 as a *second* language in a country other than their own. For the immigrant population, learning the local language cannot simply be a matter of achievement, status, or personal success, neither simply a need for affiliation with the L2 culture. Working is of vital importance to the immigrant population since without work their quality of life would be seriously affected (Agudelo-Suárez et al., 2009). What is more, their acquired level of L2 can be a decisive factor for success in the job market (Al Hammadi, 2016). Integrative attitude for the immigrant population cannot simply include a cultural interest in the L2 population: this notion needs to be *extended* to incorporate integration into the local society. What is more, this specific study took place in a diglossic context, which makes L2 learning even more complicated for immigrants (Ferguson, 1971). In sociolinguistic contexts where learners acquire different linguistic varieties, one cannot uncritically apply L2 acquisition theories that rely on the assumption of integrativeness (Coetzee-Van Roy, 2006).

Results from Phase II

To confirm the validity of the research tool and the expected factor formation, an EFA was conducted (Williams et al., 2010) using the data collected from 182 Russian immigrants in Cyprus. The same data screening, preparation procedures and tests as per Phase I, were performed prior to EFA. To confirm the factorial structure of the SLA-Di Questionnaire obtained from the Phase I, factor extraction was fixed to extracting three factors. No factor rotation was deemed necessary to be performed. Item loadings replicated the factor structure obtained from Phase I. All items exhibited high primary loadings on their respective factor (**Error! Reference source not found.**). *Cronbach's α* for all three factors (Extended Integrative Attitude towards GSL, Attitude towards CG and Perceived Level of Exposure to CG) was very satisfactory ($α$=.757, $α$=.806 and $α$=.917, respectively).

Discussion

The need to research the way diglossia affects immigrants learning GSL lead, via literature review, to the location of certain factors that might affect GSL in the longterm. A quantitative questionnaire was constructed with item-questions calculated to measure four factors: Attitude towards Cypriot Greek (CG), Perceived Level of Exposure to CG Outside the Classroom, Instrumental Orientation towards Learning Greek as a Second Language (GSL) and Integrative Orientation towards Learning GSL. After conducting Exploratory Factor Analysis, the first two factors formed as expected, with some items removed to ensure high Cronbach's $α$ measures. However, the last two factors merged, creating a new factor named "Extended Integrative Orientation towards Learning GSL". This can be explained through literature and by considering the different populations of the studies on which the Integrative/Instrumental dichotomy was created. The updated questionnaire was distributed, and new data underwent EFA as well. Results show a valid and solid tool for researching immigrants' language attitudes in a diglossic setting, attitudes towards L2 acquisition and perceived level of exposure to a non-standardized linguistic variety in a diglossic setting.

Research Contribution

Sensitivity to dialect or linguistic varieties is included in the notion of sociolinguistic competence, which in its turn is one of the major components of communicative competence (Bachman, 1990 in Jung, 2005). Language is more than communication: it is a values system, mirrored in the way that people perceive the world around them (AlHammadi, 2016). Language attitudes are important in successfully reaching SLA goals, as shown in SLA models (Dörnyei & Csizér, 2012; Gardner, 1985) and in other work (Baker, 1995) Whereas there are many ways to measure language attitudes, both qualitatively and quantitatively, there are no questionnaires to the writers' knowledge measuring immigrants' attitudes towards the linguistic low variety in a diglossic situation. Some studies investigate English as SL2 learner's attitudes towards American or British English (cf. Jung, 2005; McKenzie, 2008), but no study considers actual immigrants' attitudes. Language attitudes of SL2 learners that view language as a single entity (cf. Kachru, 1985) now come as a surprise (McKenzie, 2008), given the importance of attitudes towards language variation in SL2 (Dörnyei & Skehan 2003) and in constructing sociolinguistic theory (Garrett et al., 2003).

Studies on attitudes around language variation in SL2 learners may be particularly interesting for educators and language planners involved in curriculum design (Friedrich, 2000; McKenzie, 2008). Such studies should also be taken into account with respect to teacher recruitment and the linguistic model used in the L2 classroom (McKenzie, 2008). This will ensure that the students' particular learning needs are covered and that any feelings that arise towards these linguistic varieties are properly addressed (Friedrich, 2000). Students will thus be able to actively engage in choosing their target linguistic variety (Beebe, 1985; Ellis, 1994), which will in turn affect the teaching model as well (Starks & Paltridge, 1996).

Research Limitations

The basic research limitations stem from the lack of access to a data pool set that includes all Russian-speaking immigrants in Cyprus, making sampling impossible in any other way than convenient. The two different ways of distribution (i.e. paper form for the questionnaire during Phase I and mainly online for the final questionnaire) can also be considered as limiting; ideally, both questionnaires would be distributed in the same way and preferably online, since this has been the way of surveys for the past two decades or so and will be the way for the future (Hunter, 2010). However, distributing two very similar questionnaires online to the same population would probably result in reduced number of data the second time around; thus, it was decided to save the online distribution for last, to collect more and higher quality data that would be needed to conduct statistical analyses.

Suggestions for Further Research

The current questionnaire can be used in other diglossic settings, thus encouraging comparison between various sociolinguistic circumstances. It can also be enriched with more factors, albeit this could result in a questionnaire that is too large and tiring.

References

AlHammadi, F. A. (2016). Psycholinguistic determinants of immigrant second language acquisition. *Lingua*, *179*(2016), 24-37. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2016.03.001

Agudelo-Suárez, A., Gil-González, D., Ronda-Pérez, E., Porthé, V., Paramío-Pérez, G., Garcia, A.M., & Garí, A. (2009). Discrimination, work and health in immigrant populations in Spain. *Social Science and Medicine, 68*(10), 1866-1874.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.02.046

Armosti S., Christodoulou K., Katsoyannou, M., & Themistocleous, C. (2014). Addressing writing system issues in dialectal lexicography: the case of Cypriot Greek. In C. Dyck, T. Granadillo, K. Rice & J.E. Rosés Lambrada (Eds.), *Dialogue on dialect standardization* (pp. 23–38). Cambridge Scholars Publishing. https://books.google.com.cy/books?id=gvCmBgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&hl=el#v=o nepage&q&f=false

Arvaniti, A. (2006). Erasure as a means of maintaining diglossia in Cyprus. *San Diego Linguistic Papers, 2,* 25-38. https://escholarship.org/uc/item/4q90b3fm

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing.* Oxford University Press.

Baker, C. (1992). *Attitudes and language*. Multilingual Matters.

Barkhuizen, G. (2004). Social influences on language learning. In A. Davies & C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 552-575). Blackwell Publishing.

Beebe, L. M. (1985). Input: choosing the right stuff. In S.M. Gass & C.G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp.404-414). Newbury House Publishers.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1), 1-47. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1

Centre for the Greek Language. (2015). *Guide to the examination for the certificate of attainment in Greek.* Centre for the Greek Language, Greek Ministry of Education and Religions.http://www.greek-language.gr/certification/sites/greeklanguage.gr.certification/files/guide2012.pdf

Cheshire, J. (Ed.). (1991). *English around the world: sociolinguistic perspectives.* Cambridge University Press.

Cheshire, J., Edwards, V., Munstermann, H., & Weltens, B. (1989). *Dialect and education: some European perspectives.* Multilingual Matters.

Chiswick, B. R., Lee, Y. L., & Miller, P. W. (2002). Family matters: the role of the family in immigrants' destination language acquisition. *Journal of Population Economics, 18*(4), 631-647. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-005-0008-0

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* M.I.T Press.

Roy, C. (2006). Integrativeness: Untenable for world Englishes learners? *World Englishes*, *25*(3/4), 437–450. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2006.00479.x

Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics 5*, 161-169.

Council of Europe. (2008). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment.* https://rm.coe.int/1680459f97

Cyprus Statistical Services (2013). *Demographic report 2013.* (Population Statistics Series II-50). Republic of Cyprus Press.

https://www.mof.gov.cy/mof/cystat/statistics.nsf/All/2B040A717AD10B52C2257F0A0035DA26/$file/DEMOGRAPHIC_REPORT-2013-231214.pdf?OpenElement

De Saint-Exupery, A. (2018). *Le petit prince* [In Cypriot Greek] (I. Hadjipieris, Transl.) Metaicmio. [1st ed.: De Saint-Exupery, A. (1948). *Le petit prince*. Reynal & Hitchcock.]

DeVoretz, D., & Werner, C. (2000). A theory of social forces and immigrant second language acquisition. The Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA). Discussion Paper 110. https://ssrn.com/abstract=224110

Dörnyei, Z., & Csizér, K. (2012). How to design and analyze surveys in SLA research? In A. Mackey & S. Gass (Eds.), *Research methods in second language acquisition: a practical guide* (pp. 74-94). Wiley-Blackwell. https://b9f19ceb-f720-4252-a2be-ccde56c0821f.filesusr.com/ugd/ba734f_d39bf789a07b4d429092f26dabea25b6.pdf?index=true

Dörnyei, Z., & Skehan, P. (2003). Individual differences in L2 learning. In C.J. Doughty & M.H. Long (Eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 589–630). Blackwell.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

Ermina Emmaneouel Art [@ermina3emm] (n.d.). *Home* [Instagram profile]. Instagram. Retrieved January 25, 2022, from https://www.instagram.com/ermina3emm/

Eteokleous, N., Tsolakidis, S., & Loizidou, N. (2012). Pre-service teachers' initial experiences with the first-time developed Greek Cypriot dialect keyboard. In L. Gómez Chova, A. López Martinez & I. Candel Torres (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th international technology, education and development conference*, (pp. 1993-2002). https://www.academia.edu/37808212/Pre_service_teachers_initial_experiences_with_the_first_time_developed_Greek_Cypriot_dialect_keyboard

Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. In P.P. Giglioli (Ed.), *Language and social context* (pp. 232-251). Penguin Books. [1st publication: *Word*, *15* (1959), 325-40].

Ferguson, C. A. (1971). *Language structure and language use: Essays by Charles Ferguson.* (Selected and introduced by A.S. Dil). Stanford University Press.

European Commision. (2018). European Union data protection rules. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/priorities/justice-and-fundamental-rights/data-protection/2018-reform-eu-data-protection-rules_en

Friedrich, P. (2000). English in Brazil: functions and attitudes. *World Englishes, 19,* 215–24. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00170

Gallagher, H. C. (2013). Willingness to communicate and cross-cultural adaptation: L2 communication and acculturative stress as transaction. *Applied Linguistics, 34* (1), 53–73. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ams023

Gardner, R. C. (1985). *Social psychology and second language learning: the role of attitudes and motivation.* Edward Arnold.

Garrett, P., Coupland, N., & Williams, A. (2003). *Investigating language attitudes. Social meanings of dialect, ethnicity and performance.* University of Wales Press.

Georgiou, G. (2015). Language struggle in a diglossic setting: code-switching and power in the court [doctoral dissertation, University of Cyprus]. Gnosis. https://gnosis.library.ucy.ac.cy/handle/7/38979.

Georgiou, G. (2019). *From communicative competence to the utilization of language identities in language class* [conference presentation in Greek]. 3rd International Conference "Literacy and modern society: Identities, texts, institutions", Nicosia, Cyprus.

Gideon, L. (2012a). Introduction. In L. Gideon, (Ed.), *Handbook of survey methodology for the social sciences* (pp.3-6). Springer.

Gideon, L. (2012b). The art of question phrasing. In L. Gideon, (Ed.), *Handbook of survey methodology for the social sciences* (pp. 91-107). Springer.

Gosciny, R. (2007). *Asterix at the Olympic Games* [in Cypriot Greek] (A. Uderzo, Illus.) (L. Taxitari, Transl.). Mamuth Comix EPE. [1st ed.: Gosciny, R. (1968). *Astérix aux jeux Olympiques* (A. Uderzo, Illus.). Hachette.]

Hadjioannou, K. (2000). *Etymological dictionary of the spoken Cypriot dialect. History, interpretation, and phonetics. Including locations' appendix.* [In Greek]. Tamasos Ltd.

Hadjioannou, X., Tsiplakou, S., & with a contribution by Kappler, M. (2011). Language policy and language planning in Cyprus. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 12*(4), 503-569. https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2011.629113

Howell, D.C. (2008) The treatment of missing data. In W. Outhwaite, W. & S. Turner, (Eds.), *Handbook of social science methodology* (pp. 208-224). Sage.

Hunter, L. (2010). Challenging the reported disadvantages of e-questionnaires and addressing methodolological issues of online data collection. *Nurse Researcher*, *20*(1), 11-20. https://doi.org/10.7748/nr2012.09.20.1.11.c9303

Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Penguin Books.

Iconomu, M. (2014). *Maria Iconomu* [YouTube Channel]. YouTube. Retrieved July 28, 2020, from https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCBI_v1LHQBqN6feOlRK0Vng/featured

Ioannidou, E. (2009). Using the 'improper' language in the classroom: the conflict between language use and legitimate varieties in education. Evidence from a Greek Cypriot classroom. *Language and Education, 23*(3)*, 263–278.* https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780802691744

Ioannidou, E. (2012). Exploring linguistic practice of teachers in elementary and secondary education in Cyprus [in Greek]. In Z. Gavriilidou, A. Efthymiou, E. Thomadaki & P. Kambakis-Vougiouklis (Eds.), *Selected papers of the 10th International Conference of Greek Linguistics* (pp. 815-826). Komotini, Greece: Democritus University of Thrace.

https://docplayer.gr/3546387-International-conference-of-greek-linguistics-the-10th-democritus-university-of-thrace.html

Jung, W. (2005). Attitudes of Korean EFL learners towards varieties of English. *English Teaching, 60*(4), 239-260. http://journal.kate.or.kr/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/kate_60_4_11.pdf

Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the Outer Circle. In R. Quirk and H.G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the World* (pp. 11–30). Cambridge University Press.

Karyolaimou, M. (2000). Cypriot Variety: dialect or idiom? In A.F. Christidis (Ed.), *Greek language and its dialects* (pp. 43-48). Greek Ministry of Education, Culture and Religions & Centre for the Greek Language http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/modern_greek/studies/dialects/thema_b_8_3/index.html

Kontosopoulos, N. (2001). *Dialects and idioms of modern Greek* (3rd ed.). Grigori.

Mackridge, P. (2012). Multilingualism and standardization in Greece. In M. Hning, U. Vogl & O. Moliner (Eds.), *Standard languages and multilingualism in European history* (pp. 153-77). John Benjamins Publishing Company

Manzo, A. N., & Burke, J. M. (2012). Increasing response rate in web-based/internet surveys. In L. Gideon (Ed.), *Handbook of survey methodology for the social sciences* (pp. 327-343). Springer.

McKenzie, R. (2008). Social factors and non-native attitudes towards varieties of spoken English: a Japanese case study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *18*(1), 63-88. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2008.00179.x

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sport and Youth of Cyprus (MOEC) (2010). *Modern Greek [Curriculum]* [In Greek]. No longer available online.

Ministry of Education, Culture, Sport and Youth of Cyprus (MOEC) (2016). *Curricula – indexes of learning – indexes of successful learning* [In Greek].
 http://www.moec.gov.cy/analytika_programmata/

Mitsiaki, M. (2020). *Curriculum for Greek as a second language (Pre-elementary, Elementary, Middle and Technical Schools of Cyprus).* [In Greek]. Cyprus Pedagogical Institute. https://www.pi.ac.cy/pi/files/epimorfosi/entaxi/ANALYTIKO_PROGRAMMA_SPOUDON_G2_PDF.pdf

Moschonas, S. (1996). Diglossia in Cyprus. In A.F. Christides (Ed.), *"Strong" – "weak" languages in the European Union: a view of linguistic hegemonism* (pp. 121-128). [In Greek]. Centre for the Greek Language.
 http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/modern_greek/studies/dialects/thema_b_8_4/index.html

Newton, B. (1972). *Cypriot Greek*. Mouton

Nestoros, C. (2017). Natalia Kardash: The truth about the Russian speaking community of Cyprus [In Greek]. *Politis Newspaper* https://politis.com.cy/synenteyxeis/natalia-karntas-i-alitheia-gia-ti-rosofoni-koinotita-tis-kyproy/

Noonan, L. (2014). Russians' Cypriot haven undisturbed by sanctions, tensions. *The Cyprus Mail.* http://cyprus-mail.com/2014/03/28/russians-cypriot-haven-undisturbed-by-sanctions-tensions/

Oakes, L. (2013). Beyond diglossia? Language attitudes and identity in Reunion. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 34*(1), 30-45.
 https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2012.697466

O'Connor, B. P. (2000). SPSS and SAS programs for determining the number of components using parallel analysis and Velicer's MAP test. *Behavior Research Methods, Instrumentation, and Computers, 32*, 396-402. https://people.ok.ubc.ca/brioconn/nfactors/nfactors.html

Orphanide, I. (2020). *Diglossia in Cyprus: attitudes of non-native speakers towards the Cypriot Greek and towards learning Greek as a second/foreign language, contact frequency of non-native speakers with the Cypriot Greek and effect on level of communicative competence.* [Unpublished PhD thesis] [In Greek]. Frederick University of Cyprus.

Orphanide, I., & Chatzipanagiotidou, A. (2019). Language attitudes in Cyprus: constructing a questionnaire, analysing data and issues of validity and liability. In T. Aravositas, V. Kourti-Kazoulli, E. Skourtou, P. Trifonas, (Eds.), *Issues of language, otherness and education* (Chapter 7). Gutenberg.

Orphanide, I., Chatzipanagiotidou, A., & Dinas, K. D. (2020). Do we need to teach the dialect to foreigners? Teachers' views on teaching Greek as a second/foreign language in a diglossia situation. *Multilingual Academic Journal of Education and Social Sciences, 9*(2), 65-85 [In Greek]. DOI: 10.6007/MAJESS/v6-i1/3769

Papamichael, E. (2009). Greek Cypriot teachers and classroom diversity: Intercultural education in Cyprus. In L.J. Saha & A.G. Dworkin (Eds.*), International Handbook of Research on Teachers and Teaching* (pp. 605–617). Springer Science + Business Media.

Papapavlou, A. (2010). Language planning in action: searching for a viable bidialectal program. *Language Problems and Language Planning, 34*(2), 120-140. https://doi.org/10.1075/lplp.34.2.02pap

Papapavlou, A., & Mavromati, A. (2015, May 29). *Assessing Bilingual and Bidialectal Language Programs: Where Do We Go From Here?* [Conference presentation] "Revisiting language, otherness and education", University of the Aegean, Rhodes.

Papapavlou, A., & Pavlou, P. (2005). Literacy and language-in-education policy in bidialectal Settings. *Current issues in Language Planning*, *6*(2), 164-181, https://doi.org/10.1080/14664200508668279

Papavasiliou, V. (n.d.). *Timeline* [Facebook profile]. Facebook. Retrieved January 24, 2020, from https://www.facebook.com/VasilisPapavasiliou1

Pavlou, P., & Christodoulou, N. (2001). Bidilectalism in Cyprus and its impact on the teaching of Greek as a foreign language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 11*(1)*,* 75-91. https://doi.org/10.1111/1473-4192.00005

Pavlou, P., & Papapavlou, A. (2004). Issues of Dialect use in education from the Greek Cypriot perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2), 243–258. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2004.00061.x

Pavlou, P., & Zoumpalidis, D. (2008). Language attitudes among Russians of Greek origin towards the linguistic variety in the Cypriot-Greek speech community. *The 3rd International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, *Nicosia*, *Cyprus*. https://www.ucy.ac.cy/eng/documents/MGDLT-3.pdf

Romeotees [@romeotees] (n.d.). *Home* [Instagram profile]. Instagram. Retrieved January 25, 2022, from https://www.instagram.com/romeotees/

Schumann, J. H. (1986). Research on the acculturation model for second language acquisition. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 7(*5), 379-392. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1986.9994254

Sciriha, L. (1996). *A question of identity: language use in Cyprus*. Intercollege Press.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics 10*, 209-231. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209

Skinner, B. F. (1957). *Verbal behavior.* Copley Publishing Group.

Snell, J. (2013). Dialect, interaction and class positioning at school: from deficit to difference to repertoire. *Language and Education, 27*(2), 110-128. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2012.760584

Sophocleous, M. (Presenter). (2019) *Casa de Mikel* [comedy television show]. Ant1 Cyprus. https://www.ant1.com.cy/webtv/show-page/?show=99821

Sophocleous, A., & Wilks, C. (2010). Standard Modern Greek and Greek-Cypriot dialect in kindergarten classroom interaction: teachers' and learners' language attitudes and language use. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *23*(1), 51-69. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908311003632519

Starks, D., & Paltridge, B. (1996). A note on using sociolinguistics methods to study non-native attitudes towards English. *World Englishes*, *15*(2), 217-224. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1996.tb00107.x

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.

Trudgill, P. (2000). *Sociolinguistics: an introduction to language and society* (4th ed.)*.* Penguin.

Tsakona, V. (2006). The Cypriot dialect [in Greek]. In M. Theodoropoulou & M. Arapopoulou (Eds.), *Modern Greek dialects.* Centre for the Greek Language. http://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/modern_greek/studies/dialects/thema_b_8_1/index.html,

Tsiplakou, S. (2004). Attitudes towards language and linguistic change. Is it a two-way relationship? In G. Catsimali, A. Kalokairinos, E. Anagnostopoulou & I. Kappa (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Greek Linguistics.* Linguistics Lab of University of Rethymno. CD-Rom.

Tsiplakou, S. (2009). Code-switching and code-mixing between related varieties: establishing the blueprint. *International Journal of the Humanities*, *6*(12), 49–65.

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Stavroula-Tsiplakou/publication/292702974_Code-switching_and_code-mixing_between_related_varieties_Establishing_the_blueprint/links/5c4b8da9299bf12be3e40537/Code-switching-and-code-mixing-between-related-varieties-Establishing-the-blueprint.pdf

Tsiplakou, S. (2014). Does convergence generate stability? The case of the Cypriot Greek koiné. In K.H. Kuhl, S. Hoder & K. Braunmuller (Eds.), *Stability and divergence in language contact: factors and mechanisms* (pp.163-177). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Tsiplakou, S., & Ioannidou, E. (2012). Stylizing stylization: the case of Aigia Fuxia. *Multilingua, 31*(2), 277-296. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2012-0013

Tsiplakou, S., Ioannidou, E., & Hadjioannou, X. (2018). Capitalizing on linguistic variation in Greek Cypriot education. *Linguistics and Education 45*(2018), 62-71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2018.03.006

Williams, B., Onsman, A., & Brown, T. (2010). Exploratory factor analysis: a five-step guide for novices. *Journal of Emergency Primary Health Care*, *8*(3), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.33151/ajp.8.3.93

Xenis, G. A. (2012). A constructed effort to elevate the Cypriot Dialect to a language? Linguistic work, ideological background, social consequences [in Greek]. Announcement at the Conference "*I was given my Greek language", May 5th, 2012, Nicosia.* https://antistasi.org/?p=32000

Yiakoumetti, A. (2006). A bidialectal programme for the learning of standard modern Greek in Cyprus. *Applied Linguistics, 27*(2), 295–317. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/aml012