Working Papers in

Urban Language & Literacies

_____

Paper **240**

Crossing of a different kind

Ben Rampton (*King's College London*),
Constadina Charalambous (*European University Cyprus*)
& Panayiota Charalambous (*King's College London*)

2018

Crossing of a different kind

Ben Rampton
(King's College London)

Constadina Charalambous
(European University Cyprus)

Panayiota Charalambous
(King's College London)

2018

Abstract

Is crossing is now an outdated concept, losing its distinctiveness in the 'trans-super-poly-metro movement'? To answer this question, this paper moves away from the scenes of vernacular multi-ethnic heteroglossia that have dominated the research on crossing, and turns instead to a setting profoundly affected by violent conflict, where reconciliation initiatives have led to the introduction of the language of the traditional enemy at secondary school. Drawing on two linguistic ethnographies in the same location (funded by King's and Leverhulme), a radically different view of crossing emerges: rather than being closely tied to popular culture, crossing is shaped in the constraints and affordances of secondary education; inter-generational links count as much or more than peer group relations; 'technical redoing' is a more important key for crossing than 'make believe', 'contests' or 'ceremonials' (Goffman 1974); it is the expression of political views that is avoided rather than the use of the other-ethnic language; and the mixed speech variety seen as pointing to the compatibility and integration of notionally distinct groups is rooted in the past rather than the present and future. In this way, the concept of crossing retains and extends its value for the analysis of a distinctive sociolinguistic practice – a practice that is not restricted to the vernacular activity widely documented in the literature, but can also be found in official sites struggling with a legacy of acute conflict and division.

Has the notion of language crossing now passed its sell-by date, absorbed or superseded by what Pennycook (2016) calls the 'trans-super-poly-metro movement' with which it is often associated? So have, for example, the potentially tense inter-ethnic dynamics that were said to give crossing its vitality and edge now dissolved in the fluid convivialities of urban superdiversity? Or conversely, is 'crossing' irrevocably founded in an outdated belief in the essential separateness of languages, at a time when sociolinguists are agreed that named languages are ideological constructions? Answers to questions like these can certainly be found in existing theoretical and empirical work, but for the most part, this paper interrogates crossing's continuing value by turning to empirical territory that is starkly different from the scenes of vernacular activity and popular culture that have dominated the research hitherto. So instead, the paper focuses on young people in the Greek-Cypriot education system learning Turkish, the language of the (former) enemy. As we shall see, this is a situation where the legacy of war makes ongoing interethnic hostility more intense than in the sites described elsewhere in research on crossing. But the concept still illuminates the sociolinguistic processes involved here, and in what follows, we will show how this scene enriches our conceptualisation of crossing, how crossing contributes to our understanding of language education (the wider process in which this language learning is embedded), and how it adds to our understanding of how language features in changing intergroup relations.

The paper begins with an overview of the sociolinguistic research on crossing (drawing heavily on Rampton & Charalambous 2012). Although this has been conducted in many different locales, crossing is overwhelmingly associated with vernacular heteroglossia, frequently emerging in urban and/or mediated spaces influenced by migration and/or globalisation. From this review, five processes and phenomena closely associated with 'vernacular heteroglossic crossing' are identified, and these then form the basis for a comparative investigation of the case of Greek-Cypriots learning Turkish at school, drawing on linguistic ethnographies conducted in 2006 and 2012 (§ 2). Starting outside but gradually moving closer to schools and the classrooms in which crossing occurs, our account begins in §3 with a sketch of the history of conflict in Cyprus and the roles that state and

supra-state actors played in the introduction of Turkish as a curriculum subject in 2003 – official roles without parallel elsewhere in research on crossing. The sections after that describe adolescent interviewees' mixed and sometimes intensely anti-Turkish attitudes, together with their accounts of crossing the border into Turkish-speaking territory with members of their families (§ 4); the significance of the linguistic convergence of Turkish and Greek in Greek-Cypriot dialect (§ 5); the influence of the distinctive institutional affordances of schooling (§ 6); and the ways in which learning Turkish was interactionally framed in class (§ 7). Throughout, cross-references to crossing research elsewhere will bring out the distinctiveness of the Greek-Cypriot case, and after a tabular summary of all this, the paper concludes with answers to the questions identified at the start, reaffirming crossing's analytic value at a time when in many places, social and ethnic divisions seem to be intensifying (§ 8).

1. Previous research on crossing

Language 'crossing' can be defined as reflexive communicative action in which a person performs specially marked speech in a language, dialect or style that can be heard as anomalously 'other'. Crossing is closely related to stylisation, and as pointedly non-habitual speech practices, they both break with ordinary modes of action and interpretation. But crossing entails a stronger sense of social or ethnic boundary transgression and it raises questions of legitimacy and entitlement. So with crossing, when hearers encounter the transgressive disjuncture between the voice a speaker is using and their social or ethnic background, the questions with which they make sense of it go beyond 'why that now?' to 'by what right?' or 'with what license?' (Rampton 2009:152; Auer 2006; Quist and Jørgensen 2007).

Crossing and stylisation are probably as old as speech itself (Hill 1999:544, 2009:Ch.6), but since the 1990s a flurry of studies have described it *inter alia* in the UK, mainland Europe, north and south America, South Africa, Hong Kong, Japan, Australia, New Zealand (see e.g. Rampton (ed) 1999; Auer (ed) 2007; Alim, Ibrahim and Pennycook (eds) 2009; Reyes and Lo (eds) 2009). It is difficult to summarise this work, and general definitions of crossing which declare e.g. that it is ludic or 'expresses identification with the outgroup' are impossible to sustain when it is studied close-up. In any given site, there are likely to be different types of crossing, produced and construed on different kinds of occasion by people with different commitments and positions. Crossing can be mocking, admiring, an end-in-itself or the first step in a longer journey, and it may strengthen boundaries, undermine them, or assert their irrelevance. And of course researchers themselves may have different inclinations, seeming to others either unduly cynical or romantic in their interpretations. That said, at least three related themes recur in this research.

First, crossing is often described in class-stratified societies where people are trying to make sense of the ethnic differences produced by immigration. So in Europe, for example, a substantial number of studies have focused on crossing among youth in multi-ethnic urban working class locations where there have been substantial post-war histories of labour immigration from abroad (e.g. Auer and Dirim 2003, Doran 2004; Hewitt 1986; Jaspers 2005; Lytra 2007; Madsen 2015; Rampton 1995). As well as disrupting the normal relationship between speaker and voice, the crossing practices described here often depart from the forms and decorums of educated national standard languages, and can themselves be seen as a 'low', 'slang', vernacular style counterposed to 'posh', whether 'posh' is mono- or multi-lingual in standard languages (Rampton 2011). Crossing and stylisation are also often closely associated with substantial changes to the traditional local vernaculars in these areas: urban youth vernaculars influenced by Turkish and other minority languages have been described in Germany, Denmark and Sweden (Auer & Dirim 2003; Quist 2008; Kotsinas 1988; Nortier & Svendsen (eds) 2015), while in the UK, Jamaican Creole often plays a leading role reinvigorating non-standard English among young people (Hewitt 1986; Harris 2006).

Second, public discourses and mediated popular culture play a crucial part in the dynamics of crossing, in two ways. On the one hand, crossing and stylisation are often broadly counter-posed to the institutions, policies and official discourses of the nation-state as well as the mainstream press and media, which generally promote the national standard, shape particular images of 2nd language learning, and circulate reductive representations of migrant neighbourhoods and ethnic populations (Hill 1995; Lippi-Green 1997; Chun 2009; Androutsopoulos 2001, 2007; Cutler 1999; Rampton 1995:Ch.3; Reyes & Lo (eds) 2009; Jaspers 2005; Quist & Jørgensen 2009:376-7). On the other hand – directly opposed to educated mainstream standards – mediated musical cultures have had a massive

influence supporting crossing and stylisation (e.g. Auer 2003:85-90; Rampton 1995:Ch.10). Among others in recent years, African-American Vernacular English has gained global currency through Hip Hop (e.g. in Brazil, Greece, Germany, Tanzania, Nigeria, Hong Kong, Japan; Alim, Ibrahim & Pennycook (eds) 2009), and as well as displaying affiliation to a larger transnational community, these appropriations are also sometimes redirected towards local political struggles (Roth-Gordon 2009; Sarkar 2009:153).

Third, interactional analysis reveals that crossing and stylisation typically occur in moments and activities when the ordinary commonsense world is problematised or partially suspended (Rampton 1995). Artful performance – stories, songs, jokes etc – is one type of environment where the special framing of the activity licenses the use of styles and forms that would otherwise seem unaccountable. Games, where there was an agreed relaxation of routine interaction's rules and constraints (Rampton 1995:Chs 6.7, 7.2), are another. Small-scale interpersonal verbal rituals are a third, occurring at the start of an encounter, close to a breach of etiquette etc, involving "lexicalisations whose… purpose is to give praise, blame, thanks, support, affection or show gratitude, disapproval, dislike, sympathy, or greet, say farewell and so forth" (Goffman 1981:20-21). The significance of crossing's occurrence in interactional spaces that are specially marked as unusual and non-routine is twofold. First, it carries the implication that the speaker isn't really claiming unqualified open access to the identity associated with the language they're crossing into. Second, the fact that the intensity and duration of these interruptions to routine activity can vary a great deal, from events that are very conspicuously staged to acts in which there is merely the lightest suggestion that things aren't quite what they seem, helps to explain how over time, routine vernacular practice can gradually come to absorb forms that were once clearly marked as 'other'. Whereas games and artful performance provide rather well-demarcated frames for often quite spectacular crossing and stylisation, interpersonal verbal rituals are more closely woven into everyday activity, and can provide a safer and more ordinary environment in which a speaker can try to slip an other-ethnic form into their speech as if it was a normal part of their own repertoire (Rampton 1995/2018:Ch.5.5, 2009; Hewitt 1986:151).

For analysts, the differentiation of crossing from stylisation is sometimes somewhat uncertain, and depends on local situational contingencies. Over time, there can also come a point where the concept stops being applicable and linguistic forms that were once seen as noticeably 'other' are absorbed into a person's habitual speech, losing their ethnic specificity in the milieu s/he inhabits, instead becoming part of 'how we speak round here' (Rampton 1995:Ch8.5, 2011, 2015; Bakhtin 1981:189-90,199). In cases of this kind, however, the non-applicability of crossing merely testifies to the *specificity* of the notion, not its overall redundancy. Crossing was never proposed as a general perspective in itself, and it refers instead to a rather particular set of practices. At least in our own work, it is just one term in the more overarching framework provided by Interactional Sociolinguistics, which John Gumperz developed in the pursuit of a "closer understanding of how linguistic signs interact with social knowledge in discourse", seeking a "dynamic view of social environments where history, economic forces and interactive processes... combine to create or to eliminate social distinctions" (Gumperz 1982:29; Rampton 2017).

Nevertheless, when the investigative imperatives of Interactional Sociolinguistics are followed and crossing practices are taken as an empirical point of entry into wider analysis, several phenomena and processes repeatedly stand out:

a) an orientation to change in the boundaries differentiating social groups, embedded within ideological controversy;
b) a substantial institutional contribution to crossing practices, interacting with practices on the ground;
c) extensive meta-commentary on language crossing and the articulation of very different political stances through crossing practices;
d) its occurrence within interactional spaces marked as special; and
e) its intimate but often shifting relationship with more habitual forms of vernacular speech.

Or at least, it is this kind of dynamic configuration of historical, political, institutional, interactional and linguistic processes that has emerged in the literature so far. But how much of this transfers into the classrooms where Greek-Cypriots were learning Turkish? If we actually can see these processes in play, how similar or different are they from the descriptions hitherto? And what is to be gained

from introducing 'crossing' and its association with (a) to (e) into a scene where language education theories are more likely to hold sway?

We should now turn to the Cyprus case.

2. Fieldwork and data

The account that follows draws on two projects looking at Turkish language learning in Greek-Cypriot in secondary schools and adult afternoon classes. In the first, fieldwork took place in 2006-07, close to the initial introduction of Turkish classes, while in the second, data was collected almost a decade after Turkish officially started in Greek-Cypriot secondary education.[1] The secondary students in both projects were 16-17 year olds, while the adult learners were aged between 30 and 60 in 2006 and 25 to 70 in 2012. Given the political sensitivity of the processes involved, as well as the relative lack of prior description, both projects were designed as linguistic ethnographies (Rampton, Maybin & Roberts 2014), combining analysis of interviews and classroom discourse with consideration of historical, socio-political and institutional processes. Methodologically, the 2012 study was designed along similar lines to the 2006 project (see C. Charalambous 2009, 2012), aiming to map both the continuities and the shifts observed since 2006 across different educational settings. Initial data analysis involved 18 months of data processing, and produced 20 thematic reports.[2] The two datasets are summarised in Table 1.

In view of our central aim in this paper – to explore whether and how Greek-Cypriots learning Turkish represents a significant exception/expansion to existing models of language crossing – the ensuing account of crossing in Cyprus is theoretically pointed, not comprehensive. Most descriptions of vernacular heteroglossic crossing have focussed on youth, and to sharpen the comparison, we will concentrate on the secondary school data, particularly from 2012-13. But at least two simplifications in the portrait need to be recognised: (i) there were actually many more sites in Cyprus where both adolescent and adult Greek-Cypriots could learn Turkish than those we describe, displaying potentially very different dynamics from those we describe below. These included a Turkish Studies programme at the University of Cyprus, private tuition, and inter-communal centres committed to reconciliation. (ii) Cyprus is itself now actually very multi-ethnic and multi-lingual, even though the historic antagonism between Greek- and Turkish Cypriots can easily suppress recognition of its diversity, as C. Charalambous et al 2016 demonstrate in interactional detail.

With those caveats in place, we can start the description and comparison, starting with a preliminary sketch of the background, adding further information to this when it becomes relevant.

---

[1] The first project was a doctoral study entitled *Learning the Language of 'the Other',* funded by King's College London (C. Charalambous 2009). Fieldwork was conducted between September 2006-January 2007, and was located (a) in a Lyceum in Nicosia, mostly following one Turkish language teacher in two of his classes for the whole of the autumn term; and (b) in an adult institution, following one teacher in one of her classes. Data collection involved classroom observation and recordings, interviews with language learners, teachers, ministry officials etc. and the collection of related documents (textbooks, curricula and other government texts). The second project is entitled *Crossing Languages & Borders: Intercultural Language Education in a Conflict-troubled Context*, and is funded for three years by the Leverhulme Trust. Fieldwork was conducted between September 2012 and May 2013, in (a) three Lyceums (secondary schools) in different districts in Nicosia, following two teachers in six classes, and (b) in two adult institutions, following two teachers in two classes. In between these two projects, from 2010-2012, C. Charalambous and P. Charalambous worked together on projects researching peace education in Greek-Cypriot schools (eg, Zembylas et al. 2014, 2016, P. Charalambous et al. 2015; C. Charalambous et al.2013), so they have been closely focused on the issues of reconciliation in education for a sustained period.

[2] Our analysis was assisted by the qualitative software NVivo 9, and the resulting reports have so far included: ethnographic descriptions of classroom practices and pedagogies for all the classes in focus; interactional analyses of selected episodes; descriptions of the place of Turkish in the wider institutional culture; comparisons of discourses and practices in adolescent and adult classes; discussions of developments in policy, curriculum and the wider social setting over time; a preliminary quantitative analysis of the questionnaire data; and thematic analyses of participants' interview accounts, focusing on: motives and influences in their decisions to learn Turkish, perceptions of classroom practices, sites of encounters with Turkish speakers, perceptions of the Turks, and perceptions of the Cyprus problem.

Table 1: Overview of the dataset

Fieldwork dates & project title:	2006-07: LEARNING THE LANGUAGE OF THE 'OTHER'	2012-13: CROSSING LANGUAGES AND BORDERS
SECONDARY SCHOOLS		
Classes observed and n. of participants	1 teacher (Andreas), 3 classes, 52 students	2 teachers (Savvas, Stella) 6 classes, 101 students
Classroom recordings	13.5 hours	51 hours
Classroom observations	32 hours	78 hours
Interviews	21 students in 8 interviews, 3 teachers	62 students in 21 interviews, 2 teachers
Other	interviews with ministry officials	93 questionnaires
ADULT INSTITUTIONS		
Classes observed and n. of participants	1 teacher (Zina), 1 class, 6 students	2 teachers (Yannis, Stalo), 2 classes, 25 students
Classroom recordings	12 hours	34 hours
Classroom observations	21 hours	68 hours
Interviews	7 students, 1 teacher	15 students, 3 teachers
Other	-----	22 questionnaires

3. Reconciliatory initiatives against a background of division (cf §1.a, §1.b)

In Cyprus, interethnic conflict between the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities began in the early 20th century, when the island's two main religious groups were transformed into ethnonational groups – 'Greeks' and 'Turks'. In 1960, a bi-communal Republic of Cyprus was established, but there was interethnic violence between 1963 and 1967, and approximately 20,000 Turkish-Cypriots moved into ethnically pure enclaves. In 1974, war broke out, following a *coup d'état* backed by Greece and Turkish military intervention, and there were devastating consequences (dead and missing people, loss of property, dislocation). Following the violent relocation of around 196,000 Greek-Cypriots and 34,000 Turkish-Cypriots into, respectively, ethnically homogenized sectors in the south and north of the island (Canefe, 2002), Cyprus has been *de facto* divided, separated by a buffer zone patrolled by military personnel and UN peacekeepers. Since then, there has been little violence, but in the Greek-Cypriot part where our research has been based, hostile images of Turks and Turkish-Cypriots have been perpetuated in the media (Adamides, 2014), in public debate and mainstream education, where '*I don't forget and I struggle*' is still presented as the official view of Turks in many curriculum areas (Christou, 2007, Papadakis, 2005). In 2003, however, this situation was somewhat disrupted. The EU Accession Treaty was in focus, and there was a great deal of emphasis on finding a political settlement of the Cyprus Conflict. During the EU negotiations, the Turkish-Cypriot authorities lifted some of the restrictions of movement across the buffer zone in Nicosia, so that people could cross the dividing line for the first time in nearly 30 years. Very soon after, the (Greek-) Cypriot government announced that among other things (the offer of passports, access to health care and so forth), it would set up voluntary language classes for Greek-

Cypriots who wanted to learn Turkish, both in secondary schools and adult institutes, as well as classes for Turkish-speaking adults who wanted to learn Greek. In the educational documents and in interviews with senior ministry officials, all this fitted into a rhetoric of reconciliation, and the new classes were presented as an emblem of government good will (P. Charalambous et al 2015:6-7), even though on the ground, as we shall see, learning Turkish was usually seen as anomalously 'other' and students choosing Turkish were sometimes called 'traitors'.

As in much of literature on crossing, the orientation to change in group relations and the boundaries differentiating them (§1.a above) was very obvious, but with roots in war and armed violence, the legacy of hostile division was far more intense and institutionalised in Cyprus than in the multi-ethnic urban areas most often described in literature on crossing, where the major sources of differentiation addressed by crossing tend to be the racism and discrimination around migration and class stratification. In these sociolinguistic studies of vernacular heteroglossia, the impetus for affiliative (rather than mocking) language crossing often develops 'bottom-up' from the experience of people with different ethnic backgrounds living together in the same spaces as friends, neighbours or workmates, attending the same schools or workplaces (thereby giving the lie to the racist discourses that seek to divide them). But only 16 of the 62 students that we interviewed in 2012-13 claimed to know Turkish-Cypriots personally (R14.7),[3] and instead, the opportunities for Greek-Cypriots to learn Turkish were directly derived from government policy initiatives that emerged in negotiations between the Greek- and Turkish-Cypriot authorities and the influence of the European Union.

This history showed up in interview discussions, pointing to attitudes and extra-curricular experiences that were also rather different from those described elsewhere in the research on crossing.

4. Stances and positioning: Adolescent learners of Turkish and their out-of-school experiences
   (cf §1.a, §1.c)

In the multilingual urban sociolinguistic literature, the ethnic outgroup affiliation described among young people with close inter-ethnic relationships is often very strong, and there are also accounts of 'wannabees' and '(white) people who think they're black' (e.g. Sweetland 2002; Hewitt 1986; Cutler 1999; Rampton 1995/2018). In places like London, Hamburg and Copenhagen, crossing is also typically associated with youth and 'youth language' (e.g. Nortier & Svendsen (eds) 2015), and it can sometimes function as a source of discomfiture to parents (Rampton 1995/2018:Ch.5.6). As elsewhere, adolescents in Cyprus engaging with the language of the 'other' had a lot to say about the process, and they articulated very mixed political views (cf §1.c). But while there was a good deal of hostility towards Turkish-speakers, the enthusiasm of adolescents who *supported* better group relations seemed less intense than in other studies of crossing, and was rather cautiously expressed (at least in these interviews at school). In addition, and in contrast to the general tendency in other studies of crossing, inter-generational family relationships and sensitivity to the views and experiences of parents and grandparents played a very substantial part in how these young Greek-Cypriots perceived speakers of Turkish.

Among other things in the 2012 interviews, we asked them whether they spoke Turkish outside class and whether they'd like to meet a Turkish speaker, or to know one to be able to practise their Turkish with. Thirteen (out of 62, in 10 out of 21 interviews) said they didn't "want any relations with them", occasionally elaborating with expressions of dislike or hatred ("I don't like them"; "I don't want them"; "I wish they were effaced"). They said they didn't like seeing Turks or Turkish-Cypriots in the streets, didn't want to visit Turkey, and preferred to stay "friends and apart", "the further the better". Such views were regularly linked back to the invasion and the suffering of Greek-Cypriots under the Turks (15 interviews; R15.13). The war in 1974 was described as hugely traumatic, and the Turks were violators who committed great and disproportionate injustice: students felt "bitterness", "hostility", "anger", because the Turks "did so much to us", "inflicted evil over here" – "they are the enemy that uprooted my family".

---

[3] For eight of these students, the encounters had been resulted from their parents' employment, particularly in the construction industry where there were a lot of Turkish-Cypriots who travelled everyday to work (R14.7). Six others were members of the Maronite community, an officially recognised religious minority in Cyprus, who interacted with Turkish speakers on regular visits to Maronite villages in the northern part of the island. For these students, Turkish had more the character of a bilingual community language.

In fact, in more than half of the 2012 interviews, informants talked about there being good *security* reasons for 'knowing the language of the enemy'. Some referred to war in the future, while others said that they'd be able to detect if they were being insulted in the street and swear back. Indeed, even those who were quite interested in reconciliation said that this security rationale was a very good way of warding off their critics:

Extract 1 Interview 2_LAR-U-C2
Maria (female, aged 17), Kostis (m., 17 yrs), Chrysanthi (f, 17) and Sokratis (m, 17) in interview with Panayiota (female, 30s) (2012; translated & edited transcript))

```
Maria:      one day [...] Mrs G. came, a historian ((laughs)) her nation is high
            up there, let's say, ((laughs)) and she tells me "why did you choose
            Turkish?" and she is also my teacher, I was scared, I me::an
Kostis:     ((laughs))
Maria:      eh I tell her "Miss, whether we like it or not Turkish-Cypriots
            are there and we have to learn it too at- and I have an uncle who is
            in the- a military officer and he tells me, to combat the enemy you
            have [to know his culture, everything, you have to know everything"
Sokratis:        [you have to learn the language of the enemy
Chrysanthi: hey what mark did she give you?
Maria: eighteen {out of 20}
Chrysanthi: eh that's ok ((laughs))
```

Other informants, however, spoke of Turkish being useful if ever there was a solution to the Cyprus problem (9 interviews out of 21; R13.14-15): "at some point" one might "necessarily need to know Turkish" and that "you never know when you'll need it"; "it's not a bad thing to learn a language that lives in Cyprus"; "in the future we may need them, to talk wi::th-" "Turkish girls ((*laughs*))" (Marinos & Michalis). More positive views, however, tended to be articulated in relatively general terms, in expressions of inter-communal good will or in criticisms of their own community.[4] Some drew on the distinction between 'Turks' and 'Turkish-Cypriots', shifting the blame to 'Turks': Turkish-Cypriots were "more towards our side", "more familiar with us", "more friendly towards us". To support this, they often drew attention to things that the two groups shared: they had lived together on the island for centuries; they didn't have problems in the past; Turkish-Cypriots also have rights in Cyprus; some of them even (used to) speak Cypriot Greek fluently; and what happened wasn't necessarily their fault, as they were also the victims of Turkish politics. For others (in 12 interviews (R15.30-32)), the distinction between Turks and Turkish-Cypriots was dissolved in a regard for their common humanity ("not every Turk is to blame"; "they are human too"), and instead, the 'big actors' that take political decisions and affect the course of history – the "state", the "military", "politicians", "leaders", "people higher up", "big interests" – were distinguished from "simple people", "folk", "everybody", including women and children, who were innocent victims of "the situations" ("it's not everybody's fault for what happened"; "nobody wants to go to war"). Indeed, in 12 of the interviews, adolescents voiced criticisms of their own community (R15.33-34): "there's no chance that it [the war] is only the Turks' fault", "it was also our fault for what happened", "we also did a lot, it's not only them", "we gave them [Turkish-Cypriots] a hard time". Those expressing views like these described themselves as "more open-minded", "searching things more", "thinking more rationally", and in doing so, they were also critical of one-sided nationalism with which they were "brainwashed" in their families, their communities and their schools: "there is fanaticism on both sides", "Greek-Cypriots sometimes don't think clearly, their brain is fogged".

Turning to the non-school experiences that informed these young people's perceptions of Turkish, it was also clear that inter-generational relationships were a much more significant factor than in other studies of crossing. All but seven of the 62 adolescents we interviewed in 2012-13 had crossed the border on visits to the Turkish-speaking part of the island, usually only once or just a few times, and most of them made these trips with their families. They described day excursions, "going around" "out of curiosity" to "see the place" and "see how it is", visiting major cities (Keryneia & Famagusta), religious monuments (e.g. Monastery of Apostle Andreas) and archaeological and historical sites (St.

---

[4] In contrast, a significant proportion of the adult learners maintained active links with Turkish speakers.

Hilarion castle, Bellapais Abbey) – visiting places that "we had been hearing about since we were babies – Apostle Andreas, Apostle Andreas" (Renos, Interview 1_LAR-U-C). Impressed by the natural beauty but struck by what they saw as a general state of dilapidation, these visits had much more the character of pilgrimage than tourist recreation, and in 17 interviews, informants from refugee families said they visited family homes and occupied villages and towns where their parents or grandparents had lived before 1974:

Extract 2 Interview 6_LAR-R-B3

```
Marina:      we went where my mum's house is, personally my mum and grandma were
             surprised because they ((the Turkish-speakers)) had fixed it and made
             it really nice and they had also kept on all their photos and
             everything
```

Extract 3 Interview 21_NIC-U-C1

```
Christi:eh over there in the occupied areas they have brought many people
             from Turkey, and they are not Turkish-Cypriots, they are Turks, they
             are the bad Turks let's say, it's unacceptable for my father to go to
             his house and to not let him in his house, his parents' house, just to
             enter, not to take anything, just to see it, to see where he used to
             sleep and to leave, nothing, he wouldn't bother them, this thing is
             absurd, to take our property like that [...] and my father doesn't
             want to go again since then, he says this is unacceptable
```

Extract 4 Interview 18_NIC-U-B2

```
Eleana: eh basically my mum is from Kerynia and we went there and the Turks
             came and they created a problem because we went there to see her
             house, and the Turk came and turned and told her "this house is mine",
             and then they were saying something in their language and my mother
             knows some Turkish [...] because in the past she was living together
             with Turkish-Cypriots [...] ok I mean it's not very nice to see your
             house and to hear the other telling you 'you know this house is mine,
             you do not belong here'
```

So Turkish was associated with a history of intense interethnic conflict by these young people, and it was surrounded by a great deal of commentary. Although there were substantial differences in the stances they articulated, there was little evidence of the intense identification with the ethnic other reported elsewhere in research on crossing. Their engagement with the language wasn't usually shaped in any of the everyday interethnic peer-group conviviality that features so prominently in the literature,[5] and in contrast, their perspective on Turkish-speakers was influenced by their sensitivity to the experience of parents and family. In fact, intergenerational relations also sometimes affected adolescents' sense of proximity to the Turkish language itself.

5. **Linguistic convergence: Turkish in Greek-Cypriots' linguistic heritage** (cf §1.e)

The research on multi-ethnic areas often describes a close link between crossing into an other-ethnic language and a local style of speech that is more pervasive and habitual (§1.e). Hewitt, for example, connects white uses of Jamaican Creole to the emergence of a local multi-ethnic vernacular which he describes as a 'community English' that functions as "the primary medium of communication in the adolescent peer group in multi-ethnic areas" (1992:32; Harris 2006; Rampton 2015:38-43). For Greek-Cypriots as well, there could be a close link between Turkish and their local vernacular speech, but there were significant differences. While the urban multi-ethnic vernaculars described elsewhere are generally conceived as relatively recent phenomena, principally associated with youth, the mixing

---

[5] The Maronite students were an exception here – see note 3.

of Greek and Turkish features in habitual speech was deeply rooted in pre-war history [6] and shared with older generations.

A number of interviewees referred to Greek-Cypriot parents or grandparents who knew some Turkish because they had lived with Turkish speakers, either in pre-1922 Anatolia or pre-1974 Cyprus (see Eleana in Extract 4), or just because Turkish "was there":

Extract 5: Interview 16_NIC-U-B2

```
Constadina:  erm basically my grandfather was throwing in some Turkish words,
             although he didn't have any relation with- and I liked it, eh and
             they are like nice, they are heavy ((laughs)) eh and I thought I'd
             take it
YIOTA:       ((laughs)) so how come he knows Turkish?
Constadina:  I have no clue, I have no clue but he knows
```

Beyond the example of older family members who knew some Turkish, four centuries of co-habitation has also meant that the local Cypriot varieties of Greek and Turkish have had a substantial influence on one another, and there is a great deal of shared lexis (Hadjipieris & Kabatas 2015). Informants quite often referred to this lexis when describing the learning of Turkish, saying Turkish was "very close to the Cypriot dialect that we use", we "speak it without realizing it", "it's familiar, it's not the first time we hear it", "often it's things we hear from our parents also".

For Gabriela, who was rather exceptional in the strength of her commitment to learning Turkish as a contribution to reconciliation, this common stock involved much more than just a distant etymological connection:

Extract 6 (Interview 2_LAR-U-C2)

```
Gabriela: we have many common words, why? why is this thing?
          could it be that we have possibly coexisted at some point?
          could it be that one people influenced the other?
          I mean e:rm it's history let's say,
          there are some events that we should not forget let's say,
          these are things that happened
```

Indeed, when new Turkish secondary language curricula and promotional materials were being prepared for 2010, the early drafts also referred to this common lexis, just as words shared between Greek and Italian featured as an educational selling point for Italian. But these were removed from the final publicity text for Turkish, amidst fear of the potential political reaction.[7]

Nevertheless, when interviewees referred to the lexis shared by the Cypriot varieties of Greek and Turkish, they often said that this made learning Turkish easy, along with familiar pronunciation and the readability resulting from the correspondence between grapheme and phoneme (9 interviews). Indeed – and contrary to our own and other Greek-Cypriot adults' perceptions of how hard it is to learn Turkish – the projection of Turkish as an easy language played a substantial part in its promotion as an option at secondary school (see §6).

So the similarities between Turkish and 'Greek Cypriot Dialect' certainly played a significant role in adolescents' willingness to study the language, even among those who were very hostile to

---

[6] Turkish has been spoken in Cyprus for about four centuries and when Cyprus gained independence from British Administration in 1960, both languages were recognized as official languages in the constitution. Indeed, Turkish is still considered to be the second official language of the (Greek-Cypriot) Republic of Cyprus and it is used alongside Greek in official documents, stamps and bank notes (Karyolemou, 2003) (the Republic of Cyprus is officially regarded as functioning unaltered in the government-controlled areas, with its northern part being illegally occupied). But rising nationalism and growing hostility between the two communities in the latter part of the 20th century had a negative impact on Greek-Turkish/Turkish-Greek bilingualism on the island. Language was seen as essential to being 'Greek' or 'Turkish' and to the communities' survival (Karoulla-Vrikki 2004); speaking the language of the other community became not just undesirable but a sign of 'betrayal' (Ozerk, 2001); and Greek-Cypriot education was monolingual, with Turkish never taught in the school curriculum prior to 2003.

[7] When linguistic evidence of shared past was included in another official educational initiative to cultivate peaceful coexistence in 2008-2010, there was intense public debate and strong resistance from school teachers (C. Charalambous et al 2013; Zembylas et al 2016).

Turkish-speakers. But in contrast to the new multi-ethnic local vernaculars reported elsewhere in crossing research, this wasn't widely embraced as a sign of resurgent multi-ethnic (or pan-Cypriot) identity. Instead, this linguistic proximity was valued within the educational logic of studying an easy language that would get them better marks. Indeed more generally, the embedding of the language in the official school curriculum is another major difference between learning Turkish in Cyprus and the crossing described elsewhere in the literature.

6. The institutional contribution: Schooling and its affordances (§1.b)

In most of the literature on crossing, it is clear that the interplay between institutional platforms and local practices is very significant (§1.b). Popular culture and the mass and social media are widely reported as the most public platform for crossing practices, promoting the kind of heterodox language mixing that features in everyday recreation 'on the ground', while educational institutions pursue purist standard language policies. As a result, crossing seems to be part of vernacular culture. In Cyprus, institutional sites also played an important part in the promotion of crossing, but here, it was secondary schooling sponsored by the state that advanced an involvement with Turkish among these young Greek-Cypriots.

This was not easy terrain to navigate. According to teachers we interviewed in 2012, hostility to Turkey and Turkish-Cypriots had 'simmered down' since the first years when Turkish was introduced. Then, there had been damage to classrooms, anti-Turkish slogans and swearwords written on the boards in class, disruptions by students outside, and requests in lessons for the translation into Turkish of nationalist slogans like 'a good Turk is a dead Turk' (R1:28,31-33). Indeed over the course of 7 months' fieldwork in 2012, we ourselves only witnessed a few incidents of hostility from other students. Nevertheless, there was still a strong sense of transgression associated with learning Turkish, and as we have seen, there were expressions of antagonism to Turkish-speakers even among some of the adolescents who were themselves studying the language (§4).

Both in informal interaction and in interviews, there were a number of learners who complained about other students, teachers and the school authorities reacting negatively, and studying Turkish wasn't something they could pursue discretely unnoticed – the people who had chosen Turkish were conspicuous to everyone when they all went off to different language classes twice a week (see Extract 1). Outside school, a number of these learners participated in bi-communal networks, or they had contact with Turkish-Cypriots through their families, and as a result, they were able to access long-standing discourses that opposed ethnocentric and nationalist ideologies and emphasised 'shared Cypriotness' instead. But for the most part, they kept quiet about this in their Turkish classes.

Especially with new media, popular culture opens a plurality of platforms for the promotion of other-ethnic language learning and use, but in education, the hierarchical organisation of schooling made the provision of Turkish somewhat precarious. In 2006, there were 1138 students learning Turkish in 75 classes in the Greek-Cypriot secondary system, while in 2012, there were 873 in 61. But these were taught by just eight teachers, all Greek-Cypriot, and they worked peripatetically. Learning Turkish wasn't compulsory, and to keep their jobs, these teachers had to recruit final and next-to-final year students in sufficient numbers to justify running these classes. To do so, they had to compete for students with six other languages in an open 'options market', and although they certainly also encountered some help and encouragement from senior colleagues, they also faced substantial challenges.

First, there were lapses in government support. Although classes were approved in 2003, Turkish was omitted from the 2004 and 2006 editions of the Ministry booklet advising secondary students on their option choices; in 2007, it was only publicised in an addendum circulated belatedly to schools; and in 2010, even though it was taught as part of the foreign language curriculum, it was left out of the section on 'Foreign Languages' (pp 60-69), and presented separately (pp. 83-85).

In addition, school management could create obstacles:

Extract 7:
Andreas (advisory teacher) in interview with Panayiota

```
YIOTA:      em:::, where could we attribute the fact that in some schools we
            have 4 classes of Turkish and in others 1 or none?
```

```
Andreas:   there are many reasons, first it has to do with the way in which they
           [students] get informed by the career advisors, second, the way the
           school programmer allows things to happen, the collaboration between
           the career advisor and the programmer, the guidelines [given] by the
           school management [R1.5-6]
```

Other staff could also be difficult, as one of the teachers made clear in her account of 'European Languages Day', an important marketing event:

Extract 8:
Stella (Turkish language teacher) in interview with Panayiota

```
YIOTA:    on the Day of Languages do you do anything with Turkish?
Stella:   No and [Savvas] ((a senior TL teacher)) made an issue of the fact
          that many schools tell us, in their own way they tell us not to do
          things, [...] there was an incident this year in one Lyceum in Paphos
          where the teacher wanted to take part and the English teachers
          reacted, the philologists too, "but it does not belong to the European
          Union", but we said "it's languages day" and they made an issue of it,
          and then the inspector called them and also made an issue of behaving
          to the Turkish teacher in this way [R1.19]
```

Nevertheless, there were a number of ways in which learning Turkish was supported by the particular affordances of schooling as an institutional process.

Especially in the last two years of secondary school, students were under a lot of exam pressure if they wanted to get a place in a Greek or Greek-Cypriot university. They had to study foreign languages, and choosing a language option that was easy could both increase your overall GPA and "reduce workload" pressure, allowing you "to have a lighter schedule". Both in curriculum publicity texts and in workshops and guidance for teachers, Turkish was said to be easy: "There are no irregular verbs and no genders. There are no articles and no prepositions. The words read as they are written. The good news is that the grammar is simple. The rules are general and the exceptions are truly minimal" (Ministry of Education and Culture 2013); "the guidelines we give to the teachers during our seminars… are: 'prove to them how easy Turkish is, in order for them to love the subject'" (advisory teacher). We ourselves never used the word 'easy' in any of the interview questions we planned in advance, but easiness was by far the most commonly given reason for studying Turkish (20 interviews; R13.3-6): "from all languages I believe it's the easiest"; "it's more for the marks and for the fact that it's an easy language". There was a strong consensus that it was a good way "to get an A" or "20", "to have a sure mark", and, for very weak students, even "to pass the class". Students often said they'd consulted older students during the language option selection process, and the upshot was that because of its easiness, Turkish was attractive both to high and low achieving students. More than that, it provided a good reason and justification for students who were anti-Turkish:

Extract 9: Interview 4_LAR-R-B3

```
Minas:    am I going to start learning the language of those who conquered me
          and had me beneath {their power} for so long? I don't like this
YIOTA:    but you chose it
Minas:    eh?
YIOTA:    you chose Turkish yourself
Manos:    he took it as a course
Minas:    I took it as a course, for the marks let's say,
          as a foreign language let's say
          "ok let's take it, fuck it[8]" but apparently
          I didn't take it for learning how to speak with the one or the other[9]
Manos:    we already said that, we took it in order to pass {the class}[10],
          it's a language, to learn 2-3 words
```
Looking beyond justifications and motives framed in educational terms, there is also a strong case for saying that the humdrum institutional ordinariness of foreign language learning was itself

---

[8] He used a Turkish word "sikkime" meaning 'fuck it'
[9] Expression meaning with people who you are not related to in any way.
[10] Meaning that they were on the brink of failing and repeating the class

significant in the promotion of Turkish. Although the place of Turkish in the curriculum could certainly be controversial, curricular foreign language learning is an unspectacular but long-term and widely-established activity. There is wide-spread international agreement that learning a foreign language is worthwhile; it is supported by professions with subject specific expertise (language teachers); there are well developed grading educational schemes for measuring progress; and with all the administrative and delivery structures already in place, the government could slot Turkish into the system by adding it as just another language to the list of Foreign Languages options (with 'foreign' also muting its identity as an official national language).

But once Turkish had appeared among the modern language options, this could then be a first cue for students to talk to their parents about whether or not Turkish could play a part in their future, even if this reached only as far as end-of-year exams. If students did select it, then twice a week, they'd find themselves participating in a space where objects and practices linked with Turkish had a routine presence close at hand, and they'd also need to work out how to justify their choice to others. And more than that, small tokens of Turkishness would begin to circulate through the low-key everyday activities of secondary study, travelling back and forwards between school and home in homework bags, figuring in anecdotes of classroom experience, getting mentioned in chat about tests and exams. According to several students, speaking in school-learned Turkish to parents who didn't know the language was the only time they used it outside class, either 'for fun' or to 'teach' them a few things:

> "I can- like I talk to my mum, to my mum let's say, when she tells me something, {I tell her} Turkish words that she can easily learn like 'good morning' 'how are you' 'what's your name'" (Areti Interview 1_LAR-U-C2)

Indeed, there were reports of kids inspiring their parents to start learning Turkish. Katerina, for example, told us that her parents began a year after she chose Turkish at school ("they were listening to me studying a bit and they wanted to know"), and now she uses it to teach her mum: "I was telling her some words so that she understands them, because she is English and she doesn't get it that easy so I had to explain things to her again while she was studying".   And nineteen students said that they had been encouraged to take Turkish by siblings and cousins who were learning or had learnt it themselves, most often as options at school:

Extract 10: Interview 2_LAR-U-C2

```
YIOTA:    erm, do you use it anywhere?
Mariza:   yes, all the time!
YIOTA:    really? where?
Mariza:   with my siblings, my cousins, we are learning foreign languages and we
          are exchanging
Despo:    me with my brother, because he knows, sometimes he sits and we spend
          time together talking and learning it
YIOTA:    ah really?
Despo:    yes, also new words and things like that
```

Bringing Turkish home from school certainly wasn't always welcomed:

> "we read it ((*laughs*)) I go and read my dialogues at home and she listens to me, like I read to my mum, but not to my brother, I can't […] he doesn't want to […] he doesn't allow me to" (Marina Interview 6_LAR-R-B3)

> "my mum simply doesn't like it and she told me not to speak it at home but she is ok with me learning it" (Corina; Interview 11_LAR-R-C4)

> "erm ok because they lived through the war and they had a hard time, there's no chance that they'll want to hear the Turkish language at home, ok" (Froso Interview 19_NIC-U-C1)

> "ok my parents didn't say anything [...] but my brother who is a soldier told me like 'I am there protecting you from the- like from these people and you go and learn Turkish?'" (Mina; Interview 5_LAR-R-B3)

Some parents, though, were said to be much more concerned about their child's achievement than the ideological ramifications of studying Turkish: "how come you didn't choose English which you know already?"; "how are you doing in Turkish? do you find it easy? because I don't see you studying at home" (R14.3). There were also students who told us that they hadn't consulted their parents before deciding to take the Turkish option. But overall, even though it might take limited and fragmentary forms, studying Turkish at school increased the language's currency at home, embedding it in a set of home-school relationships in which parents are conventionally expected to talk to children about their subject choices, and children are supposed to engage in school tasks with the knowledge and approval of their parents. This seemed to happen in families with very different attitudes to the Cyprus problem, and *within* families, it also brought out differences in perspective and/or life-experience between parents and children and sisters and brothers.

These inter-generational and inter-institutional (home/school) dynamics look rather different from those typically associated with recreational participation in youth culture, and even though influence from institutions beyond the interpersonal fits the broader profile of crossing, the Cyprus case stands apart from the rest of the literature. In Cyprus, teachers were crucial agents in Greek-Cypriot adolescents' sustained encounter with Turkish, and to set up the classes, they had to negotiate the organisational structures of school, overcoming obstacles that sometimes looked deliberate. But once established, there were specifically educational incentives to attract students, and Turkish was at least partly normalised as a school subject pursued in the familiar routines of secondary study. These differences from vernacular crossing also extended to the way in which Turkish was presented in class and the interactional framing of the practices that learning it involved.

7. Crossing in another key: Learning Turkish as 'technical redoing' (cf §1.d)

As can be inferred from the description of attitudes to Turkish-speakers and the Cyprus problem, the Turkish lessons at secondary school were filled with students who held very different political views.[11] So how did Turkish-language teachers cope? What did they do to avoid a classroom experience that wasn't traumatically riven by conflict? And at a more theoretical level, even though all the out-of-class evidence points to learning Turkish as a case of crossing, how can the routines of language pedagogy be aligned with the kind of interactional characterisation that it has been given in the heteroglossic literature?

As detailed elsewhere (P. Charalambous et al 2017), we identified three pedagogic strategies. In adult classes, teachers did sometimes introduce scenes of everyday activity with Turkish speakers, but this never happened in the secondary classes – as one teacher complained, "how am I going to practice dialogues in the classroom between sales-men and buyers, when students are not supposed to cross to the other side and buy things from the occupied territories?" (fieldnotes, 2006). There was also one very gifted secondary teacher who managed to 'cosmopolitanise' Turkish, repositioning it in a globalised Europe above and beyond the Cyprus problem (though he never ventured into role-playing interethnic encounters). The most common pedagogic strategy, however, was to de-politicize the learning of Turkish by decontextualising the language, disconnecting it from Turkish people, from Turkish culture and all its political and emotional associations. Instead, they presented the language as a neutral lexico-grammatical code, and they avoided any talk about the Turks or Cypriot politics in the classroom. In fact, there is a long line of teaching that treats language as a formal code, and if a researcher was to focus on only the most observable practices of teaching and learning occurring in class, s/he might simply infer that these were nothing other than very traditional foreign language lessons, wholly unconnected to the often rather spectacular crossing practices described elsewhere in the literature. All of these teachers, however, were aware that they were presenting a very narrow view of Turkish, and said that they were doing this deliberately because of the ideological controversy around the language.[12]

---

[11] In an informal scan of one of the interviews with students from Stella's rural classes, we classified 29 statements as negative, and 25 as positive, while the balance was 9 negative and 15 positive with interviewees from one of her urban groups. With Savvas' students, the number of clearly positive and negative statements were equally balanced in one of the interviews (13 each), and there were 9 negative and 36 positive in another (R15.13).

[12] Andreas (Mr A) was the most striking case, and he generally avoided even mentioning the word 'Turks' in class. He said he always told students that 'the Turkish language is not the Turk, it's a tool', and that 'we are here [only] to talk about the language'. Constadina observed 32 hours of class time and there were two just occasions when he tried to incorporate

As noted in §1, research on crossing often identifies three frames in which routine assumptions about the world are temporarily problematized and partially suspended: artful performance, games and interaction rituals. But these didn't feature with any regularity or prominence in the Turkish classes, which instead consisted of explanations, discussions and exercises focused on grammar and vocabulary. To make sense of this, we can turn to Goffman's work on 'keying', and in doing so, discern a type of 'keying' that hasn't been covered elsewhere in the literature (though see Rampton & Charalambous 2012:493).

When acts are 'keyed', they are framed as special, non-ordinary and not to be treated naively or taken 'straight', and Goffman outlines several very basic types of keying (even though they are certainly not mutually exclusive[13]; Goffman 1974:Ch.3). 'Make believe' is one, and this can be aligned with artful performance: it includes playful mimicry, dramatic scriptings and activity performed to entertain and engross the participants, "done with the knowledge that nothing practical will come of the doing" (1974:48-56). Games and sports are covered by 'contests' – transformations of fighting in which the "the rules… supply restrictions of degree and mode of aggression", and as in drama, there are "engrossing material which observers can get carried away with, materials which generate a realm of being" (1974:56,57). Interaction rituals can be seen as small forms of 'ceremonial' – ceremonials also involve "marriages, funerals and investitures", they "have a consequence that scripted dramas and even contests do not", and rather than pretending to be someone else (as in make-believe), "the performer takes on the task of representing and epitomising himself [sic] in some one of his central social roles – parent, spouse, national and so forth" (1974:58). But Goffman also identifies a fourth type of keying – what he calls 'technical redoings' – and this fits the Turkish language classes rather closely.

Technical redoings include activities like rehearsals, pedagogic demonstrations and 'practicings' in which

> "instructor and student…focus conscious attention on an aspect of the practiced task with which competent performers no longer concern themselves. Thus, when children are being taught to read aloud, word pronunciation can become something that is continuously oriented to, as if the meaning of the words were temporarily of little account. Indeed, the same text can be used as a source of quite different abstractable issues: in the above case, spelling, phrasing, and so forth. Similarly during stage rehearsals, proficiency with lines may come first, movement and timing later. In all of this one sees again that a strip of activity is merely a starting point; all sorts of perspectives and uses can be brought to it, all sorts of motivational relevances" (p.64)

Practicing gives "the neophyte experience in performing under conditions in which (it is felt) no actual engagement with the world is allowed, events having been 'decoupled' from their usual embedment in consequentiality" (p.59). In short, technical redoings are activities which are [i] "performed out of their usual context, [ii] for utilitarian purposes openly different from those of the original performance, [iii] the understanding being that the original outcome of the activity will not occur" (p. 59; numerals added). This matches the Turkish lessons, in which the language was extracted from its socio-cultural context ([i] above) and turned into something you needed to pass exams rather than communicate with ([ii]), thereby accommodating students who never wanted to talk to a Turkish speaker ([iii]). And just as technical redoing also allows "all sorts of perspectives and… motivational relevances", these culturally sterilised lessons could accommodate students who saw Turkish as a potential weapon alongside those who hoped for better inter-ethnic relations in the future.

The literature on heteroglossic vernacular crossing contains a good deal of detailed interaction analysis. It picks out the different ways and sites in which language forms sensed to be other-ethnic

---

culture into his teaching. But in the first, he played Turkishness down by playing the Turkish language version of what was originally a Greek song, and in the second, when he talked about religious and cultural practices, he described them as Muslim rather than Turkish (C. Charalambous 2014). Stella adopted the same culturally sanitised, code-centred strategy in four of the five secondary classes she taught. In the lessons we observed, she avoided teaching about Turkish culture, sidestepped any political discussions triggered by her students, and used terms like 'chaos' and 'mayhem' to describe what could happen when the students were 'not ready' and 'not fit' for anything other than 'matters of the language'.

[13] As Goffman notes, "keyings are themselves… vulnerable to rekeying… [There isn't] any obvious limit…to the number of rekeyings to which a particular strip of activity can be subject" (1974:79-80). So for example, there is often a performance element in interaction ritual, as well as elements of interaction ritual in performance. See Rampton 2009 for further discussion.

are slipped into ongoing activity with varying degrees of ostentation, and it describes the immediate responses these elicit. In sustained linguistic ethnographies, there are also accounts of avoidance – of how people who otherwise cross quite regularly avoid doing so with/in particular kinds of interlocutor or setting (Hewitt 1986:Ch.5; Rampton 1995/2018:Part III). At the same time, between more confident crossers and friends who 'own' the language, there is often explicitly articulated political agreement on e.g. anti-racism and local community (Hewitt 1986:Ch.2; Rampton 1995/2018:Ch.12).

Within the protected space of technical redoing in the secondary Turkish classes, these dynamics were usually reversed. Though levels of interest and engagement varied from pupil to pupil and class to class, everyone had been identified as a learner of Turkish; explanations and illustrations of Turkish were directed to all of them; and orally and/or in writing, they reproduced its linguistic structures more or less as required. Inside these classrooms, it wasn't the use of the other-ethnic language that was risky or transgressive: it was the intimation or expression of political opinion that was marked. There are detailed interactional accounts of students articulating their political views in *sub rosa* snatches of song and 'silly talk' in C. Charalambous 2012, 2013, along with the protest provoked if teachers slipped into a less neutral, more positive account of Turkish-speakers (also Rampton & Charalambous 2016). Alternatively, students might insert derogatory remarks or parodic impersonations in the performance of classroom tasks, drawing comment from the teacher:

Extract 11 (R2.28; C, 09.11.12)
Irodotos and Dimos are not very attentive so the teacher assigns them one example each to do:

```
SAVVAS:      Dimos will do number 5 and Irodotos number 4
Irodotos:    Why do we go backwards, are we Turks?
SAVVAS:      Why is that? Do we have to be Turks to go backwards?
             Haven't you realised that in this country half of us are going
             backwards?
```

Extract 12: (R2.31; C, 01.03.13)
Constantinos and Markos are reading a dialogue, with Constantinos putting on a very heavily stylised accent. (Later in interview, Savvas, the teacher, mentioned this incident when asked about students' responses to Turkish: he saw this behaviour as 'making fun of the language' and he attributed it to 'immaturity'.)

```
Constadinos: ((stylized and in a theatrical manner, making his voice deeper:))
             buyurun beyefendi. Hos geldiniz
SAVVAS:      come on, read well guys
Markos:      why, isn't this good? But this is how the [Turks read
SAVVAS:                                                 [is it so?
Nestoras:    (         ) come on man
```

But on the whole, technical redoing and an understanding that these classes were just about language kept the lessons free of political dispute.

Stepping back, we can generate a broader characterisation of what was happening in these lessons if we compare them with the adult classes that we studied. In the adult classes, a substantial proportion of students said that Turkish classes provided linguistic and cultural resources that could bring them closer to Turkish-Cypriots in a journey that some of them had been travelling for a number of years. Not every adult had a strong personal investment in this, but even if they were learning for work purposes, they anticipated encountering people who spoke Turkish. Likewise, not everyone visited the north, and when they did, some experienced trepidation or disappointment. But adult students linked the language to the people, and saw learning Turkish as a way of strengthening connections severed by conflict in the past. In contrast, for adolescents at secondary school, the *lessons seemed more like a tentative and precarious prelude* to the kind of commitment that Turkish involved for adults. Rather than crossing the threshold, they were, one might say, assembling on the porch, prevaricating in the ante-chamber. Turkish was there on the table, but they hadn't necessarily signed up to go any further. Students who hated the idea of contact with a Turkish-speaker said that they were only doing it because they'd been told that Turkish was an easy subject: for students like this, even a shift from hostility to tolerance could be a step forward. And even with students who were quite positive about the language in interview, the idea of getting closer to Turkish speakers was

regularly hedged with phrases like 'so far but no further', only 'up to there', 'up to that point', 'but that's about it', implying 'that's all', 'don't think there is much more than that':[14]

Extract 13

```
YIOTA:      ((to Phaedra))e::rm with your Turkish-Cypriot friends do you meet on
            this side only o:::r
Phaedra:    yes, I don't want to go over there, I told them, I don't care, if they
            want to come let them come, if they don't – "stay over there, I'll
            never see you again" but I'm not going over there
Yorgos:     ((laughs))
Phaedra:    ((laughs))I don't care
Eleonora:     what a friendship man!
Phaedra:    eh that's enough, let's not overdo it
```

Extract 14 Interview 15_NIC-U-B2

```
Filippos: I don't think it ((learning Turkish)) influenced my views, ok I didn't
          have this impression that every Turk is bad, I had my views from
          before, okay we have learned the language better
YIOTA:    Yorgos?
Nikos:    eh okay, we learned the language better as Filippos says
Filippos: that's about it
Nikos:    we saw how the language is, eh okay!
```

8. Conclusions

At the start of §1, language crossing was defined as reflexive communicative action in which a person performs specially marked speech in a language, dialect or style that can be heard as anomalously 'other', raising questions of legitimacy. This basic definition was then elaborated with points (a) to (e). From all the comparative empirical description in subsequent sections, it looks as though yes, Greek-Cypriots learning Turkish at secondary school certainly counts as crossing, but not in the fashion we are used to seeing in the literature on the topic. It is crossing of a different kind. This is illustrated in Table 2, which takes the five phenomena and processes identified in §1, lists the ways in which these are usually described in the literature, and then sets out the ways in which the Cypriot case is distinctive.[15]

---

[14] "ως τζιαμαί", meaning 'up to there', 'up to that point' or 'but that's about it', or "εντάξει, αλλα 'ντα", translatable as 'but okay', suggesting 'that's all', 'there is no more than that' 'don't think there is much more than that'.
[15] It is worth reemphasising that this table does not claim to be comprehensive account of every kind of crossing that emerged when Greek-Cypriots engaged with Turkish. Crossing took different forms, and some were closer to the accounts elsewhere in the literature.

Table 2: Crossing in Greek-Cypriot secondary schools compared with crossing in the urban sociolinguistic literature

Phenomena & processes associated with crossing, identified both in the sociolinguistic literature on heteroglossia *and* in the Cypriot case study	Crossing among youth in most of the sociolinguistic literature	Crossing into Turkish among young Greek-Cypriots
a) An orientation to changing group relations and shifts in the boundaries differentiating groups, generating considerable political controversy.	Change emerging from the local multi-ethnic co-habitation of young people with locally born or immigrant (grand)parents. Widespread and intense public debate about integration, racism and anti-racism.	A discourse of reconciliation intensified by EU Accession and the partial lifting of restriction of movement across the buffer zone, creating possibilities of contact between Greek and Turkish Cypriots after c.30 years of the territorial segregation following war. Major public and party-political debate for and against closer links. In secondary schools, Turkish lessons are introduced to a curriculum that continues to portray Turks as the traditional enemy. (§3)
b) An interplay between interpersonal practice and larger-scale institutional activity	Local friendship recreation among youth, often in inter-ethnic peer groups, engaging with expressive forms promoted in popular culture (radio, television, new media).	Government introduces the option of Turkish in secondary education, and Turkish language teachers establish the classes. As a school subject, Turkish is partially normalised; there are educational incentives to learn it; and it is more salient at home, often in inter-generational relationships. (§3 & §6)
c) Extensive meta-commentary and expression of different political stances through crossing.	Crossing can be seen negatively as racist mockery or as the expropriation of a valuable other-ethnic resource by wannabees. Alternatively, crossing can be a convivial expression of shared local multi-ethnic community.	Learners of Turkish were often called traitors by others, causing offence to their own ethnic ingroup. Learners justified their attendance at Turkish classes by saying: that they hated Turks; that they only wanted good school grades with an easy language; that it was good for security purposes; that it might be useful if the Cyprus problem was resolved; or that they opposed generalised Turkophobia (and sometimes critiqued hegemonic nationalism at school and in the community) (§4 & §5). Only a minority knew Turkish-speakers personally, and well-disposed students often wanted to go only 'so far but no further' in such cross-ethnic relationships. (§7)
d) Occurrence in 'keyed' interactional sites where routine assumptions are partially suspended	Crossing occurs in artful performance (Goffman's 'make believe'), games ('contests'), interaction rituals ('ceremonials'). Young people also sometimes avoid crossing in the presence of the legitimate 'inheritors' of the language, in order not to give offence or face challenges. Confident crossing in inter-ethnic company is often based in explicitly shared political views about inter-group relations.	Crossing occurs in lessons focused on Turkish lexico-grammar, excluding cultural and political concerns – 'technical redoing'. Everyone who picks the option ventures into Turkish in these technical redoings, and it is references to political stance that are transgressive. (§7)
e) A close link between crossing and everyday vernacular speech	Crossing is closely associated with the emergence of new forms in routine local vernacular speech. This can also be invoked to counter challenges, claiming that the use of (originally) other-ethnic forms is a natural part of one's habitual speech.	400 years of cohabitation has produced substantial linguistic convergence in the Cypriot varieties of Greek and Turkish. This can be controversial, but it underpins promotional claims that Turkish is an easy subject at school, which are in turn used to justify studying the language by/to students hostile to Turks and Turkish-Cypriots. (§5)
Crossing: reflexive communicative action in which a person uses a language, dialect or style that is marked as anomalously other, raising questions of legitimacy and entitlement.		

With this summary in place, we now turn back to the questions identified right at the start.

So, to begin with, is crossing really a distinctive practice, or can it be absorbed as just another instance of lexical proliferation in the post-structuralist 'trans-super-poly-metro movement'?

To respond to this, it is first worth briefly reflecting on the thinking behind this question. It so happens that the first detailed studies of crossing appeared at a time of growing optimism about inter-ethnic relations in Britain, when 'new ethnicities' more at ease with difference seemed to be emerging (Hall 1988; Gilroy 1987; Rampton 1995/2018). In addition, as the literature has argued at some length, changing circumstances can lead to the blurring and weakening of inter-ethnic boundaries, and this can mean that crossing becomes stylisation, which can in turn become (habitual) style (see §1). If these two points are put together, they facilitate the inference: changing conditions have led to the disappearance of crossing, submerging it in stylisation and style. Studies of crossing have also focused quite extensively on recreational exuberance and popular youth culture in the neighbourhoods they investigated, usually dwelling more on conviviality than actual or potential violence (though cp Hewitt 1986:Ch.1). This may also encourage the association of crossing with some of the more romantic/utopian arguments for translanguaging (P. Charalambous et al 2016; Jaspers 2017).

But the case of Greek-Cypriots learning Turkish shows how important it is not to confound the broader cultural ambience in one particular socio-historical locale with the specificity of crossing itself as an empirical practice. In London, ethnicity might be just one identity among others in interpersonal friendships, very much secondary to "taste, life-style, leisure preferences" (Gilroy 2006:40), and in this context, the use of someone else's ethnic language might cease to be potentially transgressive. But in Greek-Cypriot secondary schools, Turks were the traditional enemy. Ethnic difference loomed very large in the learning and use of Turkish, and far from just slipping into their ordinary speech as an index of solidary conviviality, Turkish was marked off from routine vernacular activity by all the paraphernalia of formal language learning.

So 'crossing' isn't just another word for trans-/super-/poly-/metro-lingualism. At the same time, however, it *is* philosophically compatible with this post-structuralist movement in its assumptions about the socio-ideological constructedness of named languages (Blommaert & Rampton 2011), and this contradicts another reason given for dispensing with the concept. This is the view that crossing is fundamentally tied to the autonomy of different languages, building on an ontological commitment to their separability and distinctiveness. This attribution of essentialism to crossing research is actually very hard to sustain. First, this view overlooks the fact that the people being studied themselves often believe (with a vengeance) in the separateness of languages and ethnicities, and after that, it neglects the central focus of this research on how people like these come to question and undermine absolutist beliefs of this kind, in processes that can lead to changes in their ordinary vernacular speech, mingling and fusing linguistic forms that dominant ideologies regard as distinct.[16]

With these arguments for the continuing significance of crossing as a term to describe specific kinds of sociolinguistic practice in place, we can now address two final questions. First, does the Greek-Cypriot case-study really enrich our understanding of crossing, and if so how? And second, so what? What wider significance does this have?

Our study has certainly broadened the account, showing that crossing can occur in situations severely affected by violent conflict as well as in multi-ethnic cities shaped by immigration; that it can be influenced as much – or more – by inter-generational than peer group relations; it can be formally promoted in education systems, not just in popular culture and informal interaction; it may be keyed as a 'technical redoing' rather than as 'make believe', 'contest' or 'ceremonial', with the expression of political views being risky rather than use of other language; and the politically symbolic convergence attested in habitual vernacular speech may lie in the past as much as the present and future. But what of the wider relevance of an expanded account like this?

First and most obviously, it can enrich our understanding of language education. According to Pennycook, educational discussions of translanguaging are founded in "a pedagogical drive to make language classes more accountable to the sociolinguistic worlds that are both part of the wider context in which such classes occur and part of their internal dynamics" (2016:203). This makes a great deal of sense, but as we have seen – and as the notion of crossing reminds us – these sociolinguistic worlds may be riven by division and conflict (see also e.g. Uhlmann 2010, 2011, 2012 on Jewish secondary students learning Arabic in Israel; O'Reilly 1996 and Malcolm 2009 on Irish among Protestants in

---

[16] Theoretically, the suggestion that crossing is based on an essentialist view of language and ethnicity is also contradicted in the earliest work on crossing by the citation of figures like as Bakhtin, Le Page and Pratt, together with its protracted critique of 'ethnic absolutism' (e.g. Bakhtin 1981; Le Page 1980; Pratt 1987; Rampton 1995, 1998).

Northern Ireland; and Karrebaek & Ghanchi (2014) on children and adolescents of Iranian descent learning Farsi in Copenhagen). The boundaries and antagonisms involved in conflictual situations of this kind are never immutable, but talk of the "transformative power" of trans-languaging shouldn't obscure the gradual, fragile, cautious and risky activity involved in the renegotiation of boundaries like these.

Crossing sensitises us to this, and makes us less likely, for example, to criticise the Turkish language teachers we observed for failing to meet the expectations of communicative language teaching theory. Rather than seeing them as narrowly old-fashioned in their focus on the lexico-grammatical code and in their failure to introduce authentic everyday material from the real world of the target language, we can appreciate their teaching as a keyed framing, a technical redoing, that was sensitively adapted to a setting shaped within living memory by violent conflict, where even the idea of talking to a real Turkish-speaker was challenging. We may also wonder whether the conventional metrics of success in a foreign language can grasp the tentative and precarious exposure to Turkish that these classes involved for the students. Foreign language assessment generally only starts to notice and measure progress when someone begins to speak the language a little, or takes an interest in the culture, but metaphorically at least, one could characterise these classes as more 'throat-clearing' than talk itself, more like a long, deep in-breath than an actual speaking turn. Indeed, given the fact that Turkish is listed as a national language by the Republic of Cyprus, one might be tempted at first glance to criticise its insertion into the curriculum as just one option among a number of *foreign* languages. The notion of crossing, however, emphasises both the significance *and* the multivalent fragility of the part that language can play in the renegotiation of group boundaries, and its embedding within linguistic ethnography and interactional sociolinguistics allows us to analyse these processes empirically, demonstrating the substantiality of processes that might otherwise remain invisible.

We can also look beyond education to Peace & Conflict Studies, a field of research and intervention that is centrally concerned with rebuilding relationships after war and violent conflict. There is growing interest here in the low-key peace-building activity of local people, and some of this work refers to communicative strategies like politeness and avoidance, also invoking Goffman (Mac Ginty 2014). The scope for a significant interdisciplinary contribution to this from sociolinguistics is very substantial, and the concept of crossing can play a leading role. Indeed, new forces are emerging in many places that threaten to intensify division, and in Britain for example, young people like those studied in research on crossing in the 1980s are now discursively constructed as potential threats to national security, both in legislation and political discourse (Khan 2017). In conditions like these, crossing's value as an analytic aid to deeper understanding of how local practices can and can't, do and don't, contribute to improving group relations, is surely growing, not diminishing.

References

Adamides, C. 2014. Negative perceptions of foreign actors: An integral part of conflict perpetuating routines. In M. Kontos et al (eds.), *Great power politics in Cyprus: Foreign interventions and domestic perceptions*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 197-222

Alim, S. A. Ibrahim and A. Pennycook (eds) 2009. *Global Linguistic Flows: Hip Hop Cultures, Youth Identities and the Politics of Language*. London: Routledge.

Androutsopoulos, J. 2007. Bilingualism in the mass media and on the internet. In M. Heller (ed) *Bilingualism: A Social Approach*. Basingstoke: Palgrave. 207-232

Androutsopoulos, J. 2001) 'From the Streets to the Screens and Back Again: On the Mediated Diffusion of Ethnolectal Patterns in Contemporary German.', in *Essen: LAUD 2001*. Paper 522. Essen: Linguistic Agency, University of Essen.

Auer, P. 2003. 'Crossing' the language border into Turkish? Uses of Turkish by non-Turks in Germany. In L. Mondada and S. Pekarek-Doehler (eds) *Plurilinguisme – Mehrsprachigkeit – Plurilingualism: Festschrift for Georges Lüdi*. Tübingen: Francke. 73-97.

Auer, P. 2006. Sociolinguistic crossing. In K. Brown (ed) *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. 2ⁿᵈ Edition Volume 11*. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 490-492.

Auer, P. (ed) 2007. *Style and Social Identities*. Berlin: Mouton.

Auer, P. and I. Dirim 2003) 'Socio-Cultural Orientation, Urban Youth Styles and the Spontaneous Acquisition of Turkish by non-Turkish Adolescents in Germany', in J. Androutsopoulos and A. Georgakopoulou (eds.) *Discourse Constructions of Youth Identities,* Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 223-246.

Back, L 1995/2003. X amount of Sat Siri Akal!: Apache Indian, reggae music and intermezzo culture. In R. Harris & B. Rampton (eds) *The Language Ethnicity and Race Reader.* London: Routledge. 328-345

Back, L. 1996. *New Ethnicities and Urban Culture.* London: UCL Press

Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Blommaert, J. & B. Rampton 2011. Language and superdiversity: A position paper. *Diversities* 13/2:1-21. Also at *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies* #70

Canefe, N. 2002. Refugees or Enemies? The Legacy of Population Displacements in Contemporary Turkish Cypriot Society. *South European Society and Politics, 7*(3), 1-28.

Charalambous, C. (2009). *Learning the language of 'The Other': a linguistic ethnography of Turkish-language classes in a Greek-Cypriot school.* Unpublished PhD thesis, King's College, London.

Charalambous, C. 2012. 'Republica de Kubros': transgression and collusion in Greek-Cypriot adolescents' classroom 'silly-talk'. *Linguistics and Education* 23:334-349

Charalambous, C. (2013). The burden of emotions in language teaching: Renegotiating a troubled past in the language classroom. *Language and Intercultural communication Journal* 13(3), 310-220

Charalambous, C. 2014. 'Language learning in a conflict-ridden context: Exploring barriers & possibilities' in V. Lytra (ed.): *When Greek Meets Turk: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on the Relationship Since 1923*. Ashgate, pp. 141–6

Charalambous, C., P. Charalambous and M. Zembylas (2013) "Doing "Leftist Propaganda" or Working Towards Peace? Moving Greek-Cypriot Peace Education Struggles Beyond Local Political Antagonisms." *Journal of Peace Education* 10(1): 67-87.

Charalambous, P., C. Charalambous and M. Zembylas (2014) "Old and New Policies in Dialogue: Greek-Cypriot Teachers' Interpretations of a Peace-Related Initiative through Existing Policy Discourses." *British Educational Research Journal* 40(1): 79-101.

Charalambous, P., C. Charalambous & B. Rampton 2015. De-securitizing Turkish: Teaching the Language of a former Enemy, and Intercultural Language Education *Applied Linguistics* 2015: 1–25 doi:10.1093/applin /amv063 (Earlier draft available as *Working Paper in Urban Language & Literacies* 137)

Charalambous, P., C. Charalambous & M. Zembylas 2016. Troubling translanguaging: Language ideologies, superdiversity and interethnic conflict. In J. Jaspers & L. Madsen (eds) *Sociolinguistic in a Languagised World.* Special issue of *Applied Linguistic Review.* 7/3. Also at *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies* 190.

Charalambous, C., M. Zembylas & P. Charalambous 2015. Superdiversity and discourses of conflict: Interaction in a Greek-Cypriot literacy class. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies* 154 at academia.edu

Christou, M. (2007). The language of patriotism: sacred history and dangerous memories. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 28*(6), 709-722.

Chun, E. 2009. Ideologies of legitimate mockery: Margaret Cho's revoicings of mock Asian. In A. Reyes and A. Lo (eds) 2009. *Beyond Yellow English: Towards a Linguistic Anthropology of Asian Pacific America.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 261-287.

Cutler, A. ((1999) 2003) 'Yorkville Crossing. White Teens, Hip Hop, and African American English', *Journal of Sociolinguistics,* 3(4): 428-442

Depperman, A. 2007. Playing with the voice of the other: Stylised *Kanaksprak* in conversations among German adolescents. In P. Auer (ed) *Style and Social Identities.* Berlin: Mouton. 325-360.

Doran, M. (2004) 'Negotiating Between "Bourge" and "Racaille": Verlan as Youth Identity Practice in Suburban Paris', in A. Pavlenko and A. Blackledge (eds.) *Negotiating Identity in Multilingual Contexts,* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gilroy, P. 1987. *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack.* London: Hutchinson.

Gilroy, P 2006 'Multiculture in times of war: an inaugural lecture given at the London School of Economics'. *Critical Quarterly,* Volume 48, Issue 4, pp 27-45.

Goffman E 1974 *Frame Analysis* Harmondsworth Penguin

Goffman E 1981 *Forms of Talk* Oxford Blackwell

Gumperz, J. (1982) *Discourse Strategies,* Cambridge: CUP

Hadjipieris, I. & O. Kabatas. 2015. *Joint Dictionary of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Dialect.* Nicosia: Lithographica Ltd

Hall, S. (1988) 'New Ethnicities', *ICA Documents, 7*: 27-31.

Harris, R. 2006. *New Ethnicities and Language Use.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Hewitt, R. (1986) *White Talk Black Talk,* Cambridge: CUP

Hewitt, R. 1989. Creole in the classroom: Political grammars and educational vocabularies. In R. Grillo (ed) *Social Anthropology and the Politics of Language.* London: Routledge. 126-44

Hewitt, R. 1992/ 2003. Language, youth and the destabilisation of ethnicity. In R. Harris & B. Rampton (eds) *The Language Ethnicity and Race Reader.* London: Routledge. 188-198

Hill, J. (1995) 'Junk Spanish, Covert Racism, and the (Leaky) Boundary Between Public and Private Spheres', *Pragmatics* 5(2):197-212.

Hill, J. (1999) 'Styling Locally, Styling Globally: What Does it Mean?', *Journal of Sociolinguistics,* 3(4): 542-556.

Hill, J. 2009. *The Everyday Language of White Racism.* Maine, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Jaspers, J. 2005. Linguistic sabotage in a context of monolingualism and standardization. *Language and Communication.* 25/3: 279-298. (see also *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies.*# 28)

Jaspers, J. 2017. The transformative limits of translanguaging. *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies 226.*

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.

Karrebæk, M. & N. Ghandchi 2015. 'Pure' Farsi and political sensitivities: Language and ideologies in Farsi complementary language classrooms in Denmark. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 19/1:62–90.

Karyolemou, M. (2003). 'Keep your language and I will keep mine': politics, language, and the construction of identities in Cyprus. In D. Nelson, & M. Dedaic-Nelson (Eds.), *At War with Words* (pp. 359-384). Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Khan, K 2017. Citizenship, securitisation and suspicion in UK ESOL policy. In Arnaut, K,., M. Karrebæk, M. Spotti & J. Blommaert (eds) *Engaging Superdiversity: Recombining Spaces, Times and Language Practices.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 303-320. Also available as *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies 130* (2014)

Killoran, M. (1998). Nationalism and Embodied Memory in Northern Cyprus. In V. Calotychos (Ed.), *Cyprus and Its People: Nation, Identity and Experience in Unimaginable Community 1955-1997* (pp. 159-170) Westview Press.

Killoran, M. (2000). Time, Space and National Identities in Cyprus. In M. Yashin (Ed.), *From Nationalism To Multiculturalism: Literatures of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey* (pp. 129-146) Middlesex University.

Kizilyürek & Gautier-Kizilyürek, 2004

Kotsinas, U-B. 1988. Immigrant children's Swedish – A new variety? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development.* 9/1-2:129-140.

LePage, R. (1980) 'Projection, Focusing and Diffusion', *York Papers in Linguistics.* 9.

Lippi-Green, R. 1997. *English with an Accent.* London: Routledge.

Lytra, V. 2007. *Play Frames and Social Identities.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mac Ginty, R. 2014. Everyday peace: Bottom-up and local agency in conflict-affected society. *Security Dialogue* 45/6:548-64

Madsen, L. M. 2015. *Fighters, Girls and Other Identities.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Makoni, S. & A. Pennycook 2007 (eds) *Disinventing and Reconstituting Languages.* Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Malcolm, I. 2009. *Towards Inclusion: Protestants and the Irish Language.* Belfast: Blackstaff Press.

Ministry of Education and Culture 2013. *Selection and description of courses for Integrated Lyceum.* Nicosia: Counselling and Career Guidance Service.

Nortier, J. & B. Svendsen (eds) 2015. *Language, Youth and Identity in the 21st Century.* Cambridge: CUP.

O'Reilly, C. 1996. The Irish language - Litmus test for equality? Competing discourse of identity, parity of esteem and the peace process. *Irish Journal of Sociology.* 6: 154-78

Ozerk, K. Z. (2001). Reciprocal Bilingualism as a Challenge and Opportunity: The Case of Cyprus. *International Review of Education, 47*(3-4), 253-265.

Papadakis, Y. (2005). *Echoes from the dead zone: Across the Cyprus divide*. London: IB Tauris.

Pennycook, A. 2016. Mobile times, mobile terms: The trans-super-poly-metro movement. In N. Coupland (eds) *Sociolinguistics: Theoretical Debates.* Cambridge: CUP. 201-216.

Pratt, M. L. (1987) 'Linguistic Utopias', in N. Fabb *et al.* (eds.) *The Linguistics of Writing,* Manchester: Manchester University Press: 48-66.

Quist, P. 2008. Sociolinguistic approaches to multi-ethnolect: Language variety and stylistic practice. *International Journal of Bilingualism.* 12/1&2:43-61.

Quist, P. and N. Jørgensen 2009. Crossing – Negotiating social boundaries. In P. Auer and Li Wei (eds) *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 371-389.

Rampton, B. 1995/2018. *Crossing: language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman (3rd edition London: Routledge).

Rampton, B. 1998. Speech community. In J. Verschueren, J Õstman, J. Blommaert & C. Bulcaen (eds) *Handbook of Pragmatics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Also at: *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies 15* (2000)

Rampton, B. (2006). *Language in late modernity: interaction in an urban school*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Rampton, B. (2009). Interaction ritual and not just artful performance in crossing and stylization. *Language in Society, 38*(02), 149-176.

Rampton, B. 2011. From 'multi-ethnic adolescent heteroglossia' to 'contemporary urban vernaculars'. *Language & Communication.* 31:276-94.

Rampton, B. 2015. Contemporary urban vernaculars. In J. Nortier & B.A. Svendsen (eds) *Language, Youth and Identity in the 21ˢᵗ Century.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 24-44.

Rampton, B. 2017. Interactional Sociolinguistics. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies.* 205.

Rampton, B. & C. Charalambous 2012. Crossing. In M. Martin-Jones, A. Blackledge & A. Creese (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Multilingualism.* London: Routledge. 482-498. (Earlier draft available as *Working Papers in Urban Language & Literacies* 58)

Rampton, B. & C. Charalambous (2015). Breaking Classroom Silences in London & Nicosia. *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies*, Paper 116

Rampton, B., J. Maybin & C. Roberts 2015. Theory and method in linguistic ethnography. In J. Snell, S. Shaw & F. Copland (eds) *Linguistic Ethnography: Interdisciplinary Explorations*. Palgrave Advances Series. 14-50. A version is also available at: *Working Papers in Urban Language and Literacies.* 125 (2014)

Reyes, A. and A. Lo (eds) 2009. *Beyond Yellow English: Towards a Linguistic Anthropology of Asian Pacific America.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roth-Gordon, J. 2009. Conversational sampling, race trafficking and the invocation of the *Gueto* in Brazilian Hip Hop. In S. Alim, A. Ibrahim and A. Pennycook (eds) 2009. *Global Linguistic Flows: Hip Hop Cultures, Youth Identities and the Politics of Language.* London: Routledge 63-78

Sarkar, M. 2009. 'Still reppin por mi gente': The transformative power of language mixing in Quebec Hip Hop. In S. Alim, A. Ibrahim and A. Pennycook (eds) 2009. *Global Linguistic Flows: Hip Hop Cultures, Youth Identities and the Politics of Language.* London: Routledge. 139-158.

Sweetland, J. (2002) 'Unexpectedly authentic use of an ethnically-marked dialect, *Journal of Sociolinguistics,* 6(4): 514-537.

Uhlmann, A. J. (2010) "Arabic Instruction in Jewish Schools and in Universities in Israel: Contradictions, Subversion and the Politics of Pedagogy." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 42: 291-309.

Uhlmann, A. J. (2011) "Policy Implications of Arabic Instruction in Israeli Jewish Schools." *Human Organization* 70(1): 97-105.

Uhlmann, A. J. (2012). Arabs and Arabic grammar instruction in Israeli universities: Alterity, alienation and dislocation. *Middle East Critique*, *21*(1), 101-116

Zembylas, M., C. Charalambous and P. Charalambous (2016) *Peace Education in a Conflict-Affected Society: An Ethnographic Journey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zembylas, M., C. Charalambous, P. Charalambous and P. Kendeou (2011) "Promoting Peaceful Coexistence in Conflict-Ridden Cyprus: Teachers' Difficulties and Emotions Towards a New Policy Initiative." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 27(2): 332-341.