



*Working Papers in*

# Urban Language & Literacies

---

Paper **283**

## **Language education & 'conflicted heritage': Implications for teaching & learning**

Constadina Charalambous (*European University Cyprus*)

2021

This is a draft of Charalambous, C. (2019). Language education and 'Conflicted heritage': Implications for teaching and learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 103(4), 874-891.

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/modl.12593>.

Please cite the published paper

# Language education and ‘conflicted heritage’: Implications for teaching and learning

Constadina Charalambous

European University Cyprus, Department of Education Sciences,  
E-mail: [Co.charalambous@euc.ac.cy](mailto:Co.charalambous@euc.ac.cy)

This article revisits discussions of the relationship between language and heritage, bringing into the picture processes and experiences of (in)security and conflict. It draws largely on critical heritage studies literature, as well as on literature that deals with managing heritage in post-conflict situations, and uses insights and concepts from this literature to inform current debates in modern language education and heritage language education in particular. Using the notion of conflicted heritage, it focuses on a particular type of language class, Turkish classes in Greek-Cypriot educational settings, where the target language has been part of a long history of conflict. The discussion of these classes reveals the role that language education can potentially play in wider social and political processes of managing a conflicted heritage as a society attempts to move beyond a conflict-troubled past. Finally, the article points to the implications for language education when a language is associated with a conflicted heritage and discourses of (in)security.

*Keywords:* heritage; heritage language education; conflict; conflicted heritage; (in)security; critical heritage studies

This article<sup>1</sup> revisits discussions on modern language education (MLE) and heritage language education (HLE) and problematizes the ways in which the notion of heritage has been so far conceptualized. Drawing largely on literature from critical heritage studies (CHS), it speaks to current theorizations of the relation between language and heritage, and uses CHS insights to analyze a case study in a conflict-affected context. Using the notion of conflicted heritage, the article highlights types of language education that have not been adequately discussed and that do not fit the usual labels of foreign or heritage language, adding to current discussions of language and heritage the experience of conflict and (in)security (Bigo, 2016).

*Heritage* is a term that features often in discussions of language education in relation to the legacy of a past, usually within community attempts to claim and connect with a shared ethnolinguistic or religious background.<sup>2</sup> It is often used alongside or instead of terms such as *community language*, *mother tongue*, and many others<sup>3</sup> (Cummins, 2005; Van Deusen-Scholl, 2003; see Kagan & Dillon, 2008, for the increasing uptake of the term in academic discussions). However, not much has been said either about how conflict complicates the relationship between language and heritage, or about the role of HLE in efforts to reconfigure a relationship troubled by animosity and violence.

In the example presented in this article, the Turkish language is an official language of the Republic of Cyprus (alongside Greek), but for Greek Cypriots, it is unavoidably linked with a history of violent conflict, collective narratives of trauma, and trajectories of dislocation. Since the 1974 war, Cyprus remains de facto divided into Turkish-speaking northern and Greek-speaking southern parts, and therefore, the Turkish language is often seen as the ‘language of the enemy.’ Nevertheless, Turkish is also a language with more than 400 years of presence on the island alongside Greek and other languages. This long history of language contact has left its

traces on the local Greek variety spoken today by Greek Cypriots, and it is even more visible in older generations that have lived before the separation alongside Turkish Cypriots.

The ambivalent positioning of the Turkish language is reflected in the following quote, in which Papadakis (2005), a well-known Greek-Cypriot anthropologist, reflects on his own Turkish language-learning experience:

Learning Turkish was an exploration deep into the subconscious of the Greek language. An exploration of denial and suppression. There were so many things I knew and did not know at the same time; so many words we used whose origins were found in Turkish; so many words that were dear and intimated but were also regarded as barbaric and vulgar. Not just swear words, or words for sweets and food, but words expressing intimate feelings too. (p. 43)

So when a long-divided society is trying to move beyond its conflict-troubled past and to reunite, terms like *enemies* and *friends* or *us* and *them* start to blur, as discourses of conflict coexist with emerging discourses of reconciliation. Similarly, a language may carry the ‘mark of otherness’ but at the same time be part of a shared history and a shared heritage. This is not unique to situations of conflict and reconciliation. In fact, it is particularly evident in western societies post-9/11, with the increasing representation of migrant communities (and their languages) as a ‘security threat’ that requires special measures—what international relations literature calls *securitization* (e.g., Emmers, 2013).

Using the metaphor of a mobius strip, Bigo and McCluskey (2018) argued for “the consubstantiality of security and insecurity” (p. 126), and, thus, suggest the terms *(in)security* and *(in)securitization* to highlight that what is considered security for some might be insecurity for others, depending on the point of view. Their notion of (in)security also has significance for language policy and language education (Charalambous et al., 2018; Rampton & Charalambous, 2019), as national security is increasingly being evoked in relation to heritage languages, often blurring the boundaries between heritage and foreign (Zakharia & Bishop, 2013). However, there is not much discussion of the implications on teaching and learning when a language carries the stigma of conflict, involves deeply felt contestations over identity or controversial identities, and is associated with feelings of threat, suspicion, and trauma. With (in)security becoming increasingly a part of everyday practices that demand our analytic attention, it is necessary to bring these issues to the foreground.

In what follows, I draw largely on CHS and on literature around the role of heritage in postconflict processes and the (re)negotiation of a collective past and future, in order to enrich HLE discussions and to consider types of language education that are difficult to understand within the mainstream language education paradigms. Using insights from CHS, I analyze examples from Cyprus arguing that the concept of conflicted heritage enables us to foreground processes of (in)securitization, with important pedagogical implications. It also allows us to see language education as part of wider social and political processes, including attempts to move beyond a conflict-troubled past.

## **Heritage language in education**

The term *heritage* has been widely used in language education literature, mostly to refer to

community or minority languages; however, this is often done without much discussion of the notion of heritage or of the issue of conflict and (in)security. The following themes seem to have dominated the discussions of HLE:

1. *Defining the heritage speaker and the criteria for distinguishing heritage language from a foreign language.* There are usually three main sets of criteria that are debated in relation to the definition of the heritage speaker: (a) criteria based on learners' proficiency—many definitions mention at least some familiarity with the language, but there is an increasing number of learners who don't have such a familiarity due to language shift, for example, (b) criteria based on learners' ethnic origin regardless of linguistic proficiency, (c) criteria based on learners' self-identification or positioning by policy makers or censuses, among others, which are usually influenced by the general sociopolitical context (Bale, 2010; Cummins, 2005; García, 2005; He & Xiao, 2008; Potowski, 2010; Valdés, 2014; Wiley, 2005). For example, Van Deusen-Scholl (1998) distinguishes *heritage learners*, who have had some exposure to the heritage language, from learners with heritage motivation (*heritage seekers*), people who aspire to connect to a broader community and cultural or religious identity through language learning.
2. *Critiques of romanticized and reified representations of heritage languages.* Some of the HLE literature has been criticized for being part of a rather romantic celebratory discourse that represents languages (within efforts of revitalization for example) as “objects of wonder and appreciation” (Moore, 2006, p. 297), not taking into account the realities of living in multilingual and multicultural environments (Harris, 1997; 2006; see also Bale, 2010). Similarly, Blackledge and Creese (2008) as well as Garcia (2005, 2014) criticized the notion of heritage language for solidifying language practices, representing languages as ‘museum objects’ with clear-cut boundaries, and for essentializing the relations between languages and communities (see also García, Zakharia, & Otcu, 2012; Wiley et al., 2014). In contrast, research in heritage classrooms shows that students tend to resist the ‘boundaries’ between languages and identities, and on the ground, they use and mix different linguistic features in a more resourceful and creative way, adopting different identity positionings, resisting or subverting school ideologies and language policies (see for example, Blackledge & Creese, 2008, for Birmingham; Das, 2008, for Canada; Okubo, 2010, for Japan; Zakharia, 2016, for New York).
3. *Heritage language education as a political discourse.* In the U.S. context, and in particular within the No Child Left Behind Act (2002), HLE has been criticized as a political discourse for constructing other-than-English languages spoken in the United States as something that belongs to the past, and for being used to silence policies and discourses around bilingual education. Within this context, García (2005) argued that “the term heritage languages in the United States signals a losing of ground for language minorities that was gained during the civil rights era” (p. 602; see also Cummins, 2005; García et al., 2012). Ricento (2005) also points to a shift from a language-as-a-right discourse to a neoliberal language-as-a-resource discourse, which sees HLE as a tool (resource) for serving national or economic interests. Such discourses are also evident in EU documents advancing multilingualism for economic and personal development (e.g., Common European Framework of Reference for Languages).
4. *National security as a significant issue for HLE (since 9/11).* McGinnis (2005) points out that in the U.S. context, heritage language classes are increasingly being represented as a

‘silver bullet’ against security threats; while Khan (in Charalambous et al., 2018) describes how, under the increasing (in)securitization of British Muslim communities, Arabic language classes are seen both as a threat and as a ‘weapon’ (see also Zakharia & Bishop, 2013).

However, despite recent interest on the impact of (in)securitization, there is no in-depth discussion on how conflict and (in)security change the way heritage is usually understood. Similarly, the process of negotiating a conflicted heritage through language learning remains unexplored. To deal with these issues, it is worth turning to heritage literature beyond language education.

## **Heritage and the negotiation of a conflict-troubled past**

### *Rethinking Heritage Through Critical Heritage Studies*

In contrast to more traditional literature on heritage that centers around issues of preservation of monuments or nonmaterial artifacts—such as songs and endangered languages—CHS see heritage primarily as a set of social, cultural, and political practices that relate both to choice of what counts as heritage (and the motives behind this selection), and to its consumption or reception (what people do with it) (Smith, 2012; Waterton & Smith, 2010).

According to Tunbridge & Ashworth (1996), if we name as *past* the things or events that happened, and *history* the different attempts to describe them, then heritage emerges as a contemporary product shaped by history but serving specific purposes in the present and future:

History is what a historian regards as worth recording and heritage is what contemporary society chooses to inherit and to pass on. The distinction is only that in heritage current and future uses are paramount, the resources more varied, including much that historians would regard as ahistorical, and the interpretation is more obviously and eternally the product that is consumed. (p. 6)

Similarly, Graham (2002), highlighted that heritage is more about meaning than material artifacts:

It is [meaning] that give[s] value, either cultural or financial, to [artefacts] and explain[s] why they have been selected from the infinity of the past (...). Heritage does not engage directly with the study of the past. Instead, it is concerned with the ways in which very selective material artefacts, mythologies, memories and traditions become resources for the present (...). It follows too that the meanings and functions of memory and tradition are defined in the present. (p. 1,004)

This view allows for an exploration of the cultural economic, political, and emotional functions of heritage and at the same time of the power relations and identity politics involved:

Heritage is also a knowledge, a cultural product and a political resource and thus possesses a crucial socio-political function. Thus, heritage is accompanied by a complex and often

conflicting array of identifications and potential conflicts, not least when heritage places and objects are involved in issues of legitimisation of power structures. (Graham, 2002, p. 1,006)

But how can all of this feed back into HLE discussions? First of all, CHS allows us to shift the emphasis from the criteria of who is a heritage speaker to investigating what is seen by different actors as linguistic heritage, how it is practiced and how it functions in a community. In general, the politics behind choosing the term heritage to refer to a language and the discursive context within which it is used becomes an important issue for investigation. Similarly, choosing to learn a certain language as an act of ethnic or religious or political identity becomes an important addition in discussions on heritage language motivation. Indeed, although a lot has been said on language motivation in relation to language teaching and achievement, as Van Deusen-Scholl (2003) remarks, there is much less discussion on the sociopolitical and ideological context and the personal drives that lead learners to construct a particular identity through heritage language.

Approaching heritage through the lenses of CHS also enables us to overcome much criticized reified views of language as heritage. Instead, our analytic attention shifts to “the value and meaning one gives in specific uses or denials” of semiotic resources (Constantinou & Hatay, 2010, p. 1,602). At the same time, seeing heritage as a contemporary product serving economic, social, and political interests in the present and future also helps us go beyond critiques of the notion of heritage as portraying languages as objects of a past that is now disassociated from speakers’ everyday lives. Instead, it lets us approach the individuals or communities involved as “active producers of it, heritage makers as much as consumers” and to account for “the intangible practices, traditions and stories that surround it, the multiple ways individuals and communities relate and give meaning to it” (Constantinou & Hatay, 2010, p. 1,602).

Finally, CHS bring contestation at the heart of the discussion. Specifically, for contexts affected by conflict, it allows us to connect and compare language education to a broader range of social and political practices and strategies of managing a conflicted heritage. Indeed, there is a large body of literature focusing on heritage in relation to contestation and conflict, together with a proliferation of terms for signifying it. *Unwanted*, *undesirable*, *contested*, *dissonant*, and *conflicted* are some of the terms used, but for the purposes of this article, I will use *conflicted heritage* in order to foreground the connection with a conflict-troubled past, and its potential political function in postconflict negotiations.

### *Managing a Conflicted Heritage*

Literature on heritage in relation to conflict-management processes usually looks at:

1. Conflict around heritage, involving, for example, claims of ownership<sup>4</sup>, contestation over different representations, and debates on authenticity (e.g., Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996);
2. Ways of dealing with ‘unwanted’ or ‘dissonant’ heritage, looking, for example, at how nation–states deal with heritage that is not part of official identity narratives or heritage that is associated with a nonglorified past (Macdonald, 2006; Šešić & Mijatović, 2014);
3. Approaches to managing and negotiating heritage in postconflict or peace-building and reconciliation processes (Giblin, 2014; Waterton & Smith, 2010).

Beyond academia, many international bodies (e.g. UNESCO, Council of Europe), as well as local nongovernmental organizations, see heritage playing an important role in restoring a society after conflict, and they support the promotion of shared heritage, pointing to a common past or emblematically recognizing the existence of diversity (Giblin, 2014). In contrast, there is also a critical view of attempts to use heritage as a healing mechanism for overcoming a traumatic past. According to Giblin (2014), critiques usually target the particular ways in which heritage is exploited by stakeholders (i.e., claims that it is not used properly) or question the perspective that heritage can heal, replacing it with examples of how heritage can hurt. But, rather than attempting to resolve such a debate, what is important for the purposes of the present article is that heritage tends to be viewed by stakeholders at different levels (internationally, nationally, locally) as an important dimension of handling a conflict-troubled past, and it is considered a part of postconflict processes, regardless of the actual outcomes (whether for healing, intensifying conflict, or handling an unwanted past). Moreover, by comparing examples from different conflict-affected contexts, it emerges that there are distinctive ways with which heritage is managed in such situations.

One widespread strategy seems to be *museumification*. This is the building of memorials (e.g., genocide memorials) to preserve or intensify a conflict narrative (e.g., the Holocaust Museum in Jerusalem), or to admit and acknowledge war traumas, in order to help the two sides move past the conflict. At the same time, memorials can also be part of a process of selecting and restoring (or creating) a preconflict past or precolonial past that is hoped to provide the foundations of a peaceful future (e.g., memorials in Uganda, Rwanda—see Giblin, 2014). In polar contrast, *erasure* seeks to obscure any heritage that is not in line with the official identity narratives (see, e.g., Constantinou & Hatay, 2010, on Cyprus; Šešić & Mijatović, 2014, on the Balkans).

Another type of strategy, in between museumification and erasure, is *disassociation*, which involves attempts to disentangle ‘unwanted’ heritage from current identity processes. Macdonald (2006), for example, described the dilemmas of how to deal with the legacy of a Nazi heritage in postwar Nuremberg, and analyzed the different ways in which city authorities dealt with buildings constructed and used by Nazis, pointing to the ideological implications of different strategies. Trying to avoid museumification but also erasure, local authorities in Nuremberg resorted to two strategies of disassociation. The first one was *trivialisation*, which involved “using the buildings for banal ordinary purposes, rather than for anything ceremonial or grand, and leaving them unkempt. [This] constituted a refusal to allow them to become any kind of glorious heritage or desirable materialisation of identity” (Macdonald, 2006, p. 19). The second strategy was *recontextualization*. This entailed turning the buildings into a “Documentation Centre,” which would require visitors to engage in “a different kind of viewing relationship, (...) serious cognitive work and an ability to self-distance from that which was displayed; unlike museum-ification which risked invoking (...) ‘wonder’, an immediate emotive response of awe” (Macdonald, 2006, p. 22).

Last, *commodification* involves preserving, restoring, or creating conflicted heritage for economic purposes, such as tourism, which can be seen in combination with other strategies in different contexts (Šešić & Mijatović, 2014; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996). Of course, in addition to the official strategies, there are also the meanings given by different people on the ground as heritage is experienced and practiced by all the different actors involved (cf. Constantinou & Hatay, 2010).

These strategies are also relevant for HLE. Indeed, issues such as museumification and memorialization (e.g., Moore, 2006) as well as commodification (Heller, 2010) have been raised in HLE discussions, and there is a very substantial body of work on the ideological construction of language itself (e.g., Jaffe, 2009). In what follows, after giving some more background about the context and the research that this article draws on, I will use the notion of conflicted heritage to look at Turkish language teaching in Greek-Cypriot education. The analysis reveals the similarities with the strategies for managing heritage in post-conflict situations and illustrates how the insights offered in the second section can be used to account for conflict and (in)security in language education.

### **Turkish language as part of a conflicted heritage**

The Turkish language has had a historic presence in Cyprus for around 4 centuries, and this is reflected, *inter alia*, in its influences on the local Greek variety and the lexicon shared by the Cypriot varieties of Greek and Turkish (Hadjipieris & Kapatas, 2015). However, with the rising nationalism in the mid-20th century, the growing hostility between the two communities unavoidably had a negative impact on the development of Greek–Turkish or Turkish–Greek bilingualism. Language was seen as essential to being Greek or Turkish and to communities’ survival (Karoulla–Vrikki, 2004), and by the mid-20th century, speaking the language of the ‘enemy’ became not only undesirable, but a sign of ‘betrayal’ (Kızılyürek & Gautier–Kızılyürek, 2004; Ozerk, 2001).

When Cyprus was given independence from British administration in 1960, both languages were recognized as official languages in the constitution, and they were used in parallel in all state bodies, organizations, and documents, as well as in road signs, stamps, coins, notes, and so on (Karyole mou, 2003). However, the culmination of the nationalist discourses undermined the sovereignty of the new state. In 1963, there was an outbreak of violence resulting in Turkish Cypriots’ moving to ethnic enclaves; in July 1974, a pro-Greek coup overthrew the legal president; and a week later, Turkish troops occupied the northern third of the island. During the war, Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots were forced to relocate to the southern and northern parts of the island respectively, and Cyprus has been since *de facto* divided.

With a suspension of all communication until 2003, the physical and cultural division of the island was also reinforced by intensive projects of postwar nation building on both sides. Although there has been no recent violence, the (in)securitization of Turks was institutionalised in Greek-Cypriot society, and is well documented in the media, public discussion, and education (Adamides, 2015; Christou, 2007; Makriyianni & Psaltis, 2007; Papadakis, 2008). Nevertheless, Turkish is still considered an official language of the Cyprus Republic<sup>5</sup>, and in the government-controlled areas (the Greek-speaking southern part), it is always used alongside Greek in official documents, stamps, notes, and so on.<sup>6</sup> Education, however, has continued to be monolingual, and until 2003, Turkish was never taught in Greek-Cypriot school curricula.

In 2003, the Republic of Cyprus made Turkish available to Greek-Cypriot students as a foreign language option at secondary school<sup>7</sup> and free to adults wishing to learn it in public further education institutes. But, with the absence of an agreed political settlement between the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities, attending Turkish classes could be perceived as highly transgressive for Greek Cypriots. Indeed, as shown elsewhere (Charalambous, 2013; Charalambous, Charalambous, & Rampton, 2017), these classes could not always follow

mainstream foreign language pedagogies designed for situations of peace and stability, and they often involved accusations of betrayal, while for some students, ‘national security’ was a reason for enrollment. Nevertheless, learning Turkish was also experienced by some learners as an attempt to reconnect with a shared preconflict past and a common Cypriot heritage and identity.

It is these classes that I analyze in the rest of the article, showing how the notion of conflicted heritage and the conceptualizations of heritage discussed earlier can allow us to approach the contestations involved in this type of language classes that do not fit mainstream descriptions and labels in language education literature.

## **Methodology**

The data in this article come from two linguistic ethnographies (Rampton, Maybin, & Roberts, 2015; Rampton, 2007) looking at Turkish language learning in Greek-Cypriot secondary schools and adult afternoon classes. The fieldwork of the first study took place between September 2006–January 2007, and was located in (a) a Lyceum in Nicosia, mostly following one Turkish language teacher for the whole of the autumn term, and (b) an adult institution, where Greek-Cypriot adults learned Turkish and Turkish Cypriots learned Greek.

The second study methodologically mirrored the first one, and was conducted in 2012, almost a decade after Turkish officially started in Greek-Cypriot secondary education. The fieldwork was conducted between September 2012–May 2013, in (a) three Lyceums in different districts in Nicosia, following two teachers in six classes, and (b) two adult institutions, following two teachers in two classes (see Table 1)<sup>8</sup>. The secondary students in both projects were 16–17 year-olds, and the adult learners were aged between 25–70.

The analysis of both data sets was assisted by the qualitative software NVivo 9 (Weitzman, 2000), and it combined thematic analysis of interviews, analysis of policy documents and curricula, and close analysis of classroom discourse in relation to the historical, sociopolitical and institutional dynamics, mapping continuities and shifts both in different periods of time as well as in different educational settings. Previous publications have mostly focused on teachers’ struggles in teaching a language associated with a conflict-troubled past (e.g., Charalambous, 2012, 2013; Charalambous et al., 2017).

In what follows, I will present some examples that show how Turkish was represented and handled as conflicted heritage in both secondary education and adult institutions, pointing to the tensions around it at the levels of policy, teaching, and learning, and the parallels with the cases described earlier.

Table 1

Collected Data		
Type	2006–2007	2012–2013
Secondary Schools		
Classroom Recordings	13.5 hrs	51 hrs
Classroom Observations	32 hrs	78 hrs
Interviews	21 students, 3 teachers, 6 ministry officials	62 students, 2 teachers
Adult Institutions		
Classroom Recordings	12 hrs	34 hrs
Classroom Observations	21 hrs	6 hrs
Interviews	7 students, 1 teacher	15 students, 3 teachers

### **Analysis: Handling a conflicted heritage in language education**

#### *Struggles and tensions at the policy level*

Turkish language learning for Greek Cypriots was announced by the Republic of Cyprus within a wider package of political measures for support to the Turkish Cypriot community (usually referred to as ‘Trust Building Measures’), in the midst of accession negotiations to the European Union, just a week after the Turkish-Cypriot authorities decided the partial lifting of the restriction of movement across the buffer zone after almost 30 years. As the two sides were at the time involved in intense political negotiations<sup>9</sup>, the setting up of Turkish language classes appeared from the start as a political move in conflictual interethnic politics aiming at reconciliation. However, the ways in which the Turkish language was represented in official documents changed throughout the years in between the two research projects; the next section outlines the different strategies used for creating associations or disassociations between Turkish and Cypriot heritage.

*Turkish language learning for healing and reconciliation:* When Turkish was initially introduced (2003), it was presented in official documents and interviews with ministry officials as having a rather emblematic function, signalling rapprochement and will for reconciliation, and it was expected to help the two communities overcome their traumatic past (Charalambous, 2013;

Rampton & Charalambous, 2012). As explained elsewhere, the institutionalization of the Turkish language signified its recognition and legitimization, a status it never had before in Greek-Cypriot formal education (Charalambous, 2012; 2014). In fact, it is within this function of emblematic recognition that we can better understand why the introduction of Turkish language classes for Greek Cypriots (the beneficiaries of free classes) was a measure of support to *Turkish* Cypriots (compare, for example, to the offering of Arabic in Jewish schools in collaboration with the military and intelligence services (Mendel, 2013; Uhlmann, 2010)).

It is worth pointing out here that similar moves were also observed around the same period in Greek-Cypriot society in relation to handling and preserving Ottoman cultural heritage monuments. As Constantinou and Hatay (2010) described:

Especially with Greek-Cypriot entry into the EU, Greek-Cypriot identity has been progressively redefined as a national Cypriot one, in which the essential identity of the island is Greek, but in which the majority identity can also show tolerance for other cultures, including the internal Turkish Other, by patronizing its cultural heritage in areas under its control (e.g. the reconstruction of Ottoman hamams, mosques, tekkes, etc.). (p. 1,614)

In the case of the Turkish language, rather than ‘patronizing,’ its inclusion in the foreign language curriculum seemed to serve a symbolic enactment of a reconciliatory discourse. This was emphasized in the curriculum of Turkish sent to secondary schools via a circular in 2005,<sup>10</sup> which clearly located Turkish language learning as part of postconflict political negotiations. The following excerpt is from the opening paragraph of the curriculum:

*Excerpt 1*

The Turkish Curriculum 2005/2007

Turkish as a course is one of the new languages that have been incorporated as an optional course in the Integrated Lyceum (Eniaio Lykeio). The teaching of Turkish was introduced in the Integrated Lyceum in the context of the political decision of the government to announce measures for the support of Turkish-Cypriots and measures that would bring the two communities closer, with the aim of making feasible the coexistence of the two communities, in the context of a comprehensive solution of the Cyprus problem. The Turkish language is an official language of the Republic of Cyprus, something which renders the language a valuable cognitive tool for every student. (p.1)

Furthermore, in 2008 (and until 2010), the Greek-Cypriot Ministry of Education set ‘peaceful coexistence’ between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots as a primary educational objective for all schools, encouraging pedagogical activities that promote the commonalities of the two communities. Within this policy, the common vocabulary between Greek and Turkish (and specifically between the local varieties spoken on the island) was offered as one of the examples of common Cypriot heritage that teachers could draw on to promote this objective, as shown in the following excerpt from a circular dated August 28 sent to all schools<sup>11</sup>:

## *Excerpt 2*

### Peaceful Coexistence Educational Objective

[Teachers should] provide opportunities for better acquaintance with the history, tradition and culture of Cyprus, in which all communities (Greek Cypriots, Turkish Cypriots, Maronites, Armenians and Latins) had their own participation and contribution (common struggles and sacrifices, common linguistic elements, customs, traditions, achievements in art, literature, music, theater, etc.).

...

#### Suggested Activities:

▫ ...

▫ Assumption of specialized work by High School students taught the Turkish language on the comparison of the two languages, their interplay, etc.

However, this initiative sparked intense reactions and public debates. Ethnographic research at schools at the time revealed strong resistance from teachers (see Zembylas Charalambous, & Charalambous, 2016), and in 2010 it was withdrawn. Similarly, within this new political climate, the new curriculum of Turkish (2010), adopted a different approach for representing the Turkish language and its relation to Greek Cypriots.

*Turkish language learning as part of European multilingualism:* Instead of seeing Turkish as part of common Cypriot heritage, a part of a preconflict past (cf. Giblin, 2014), the 2010 curriculum foregrounded a representation of Turkish as a language of Europe. Right from the start, a note next to its title pointed the affinity of the curriculum to EU policies: “Based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Language: learning, teaching, assessment. Council for Cultural Co-operation, Committee on Education, Department of Contemporary Languages, Strasbourg.” Furthermore, Turkish Europeanness was explicitly constructed by referring to Turkish as an official language of an EU member state (Cyprus Republic), as well as the language of a state that negotiates access to the EU (Turkey).

In general, the value and necessity of learning foreign languages within diverse and multilingual Europe was from the start emphasised as a means for cultivating intercultural understanding, and served as the main discursive framework for contextualizing and justifying Turkish language learning in the Greek-Cypriot context. This is also evident in a subsequent section entitled “The promotion of multilingualism and the teaching of Turkish,” which emphasises that “the teaching of foreign languages is the most important tool that state education can employ for the promotion of multiculturalism and intercultural communication” (p. 4).

The next excerpts, following three pages on EU multilingualism and intercultural ideals, are a characteristic example of the line of argument that the curriculum put forward.

## *Excerpt 3*

### The Turkish Curriculum 2010

It is not possible to promote intercultural dialogue at the level of the people of the E.U. *without first promoting it within our own homeland* [emphasis added] ... We believe that it is

not possible to *promote a culture of peaceful coexistence, mutual respect and collaboration between Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots* [emphasis added] without using the formative power of the teaching of the language, which can function as a catalyst in such cases.

As indicated in these excerpts, in the new curriculum, the Turkish language was repositioned in a larger wider context (Europe), which includes the national but can escape narrow local indexicalities (e.g., Cypriotness) and representations of common linguistic heritage. As a matter of fact, according a ministry official involved in the revision of curricula, the curriculum committee was asked to remove all references to common vocabularies that existed in previous drafts, to avoid potential reactions, as illustrated in Excerpt 4.

*Excerpt 4*

Interview with Ministry Official, 2013

**Researcher:** did you remove it in the end or not?

**Official:** that was an order! It wasn't a suggestion! it was like "they should be deleted!"

**Researcher:** so . . . there is no mention of common elements?

**Official:** that's right, they have removed the whole of it

**Researcher:** impressive

**Official:** extremely impressive, I was angry . . . and I really wonder why he {Senior Ministry Official} did it, because he is a person who is very ehmm progressive, this particular man, and in fact he is one of the people who believe that Turkish should be compulsory, and he had the courage to assert his views, and he did this in many ways . . . I don't know how he saw this, or whether there were other interventions, from people higher up

It is only towards the closing paragraphs of the introduction (and just before moving to the technical part of the curriculum) that the 'special' status of the Turkish language within Cyprus history ("the realities of our homeland") is finally mentioned:

*Excerpt 5*

Therefore, Turkish does not constitute a foreign language, within the realities of our homeland and neither should be treated through the same lens compared to the other languages taught in schools. We suggest the promotion of the compulsory teaching of Turkish and Greek in the schools of both communities as a measure for building support which will bring the two communities closer, in the context of the ongoing talks in search for a comprehensive solution of the Cyprus problem (p. 5)

The conclusion of the introduction puts forward a representation of Turkish as part of a Cypriot heritage that has a political and healing function, and can contribute towards reconciliation. However, the textual position of this representation at the very end of the introduction undermines its currency—compared, for example, to the previous curriculum where it was stated right at the beginning (see Excerpt 1)—while the suggestion is rather rhetorical and refers to an indefinite future.

*Turkish language learning as individual resource:* The reconciliatory discourse was further undermined in a subsequent document (2013) that included information for all languages offered at secondary schools as options for students. In the section on Turkish, we can observe another discursive shift, from the general ideal of EU interculturalism to the more instrumental individual “professional and social development.” The following excerpt is the opening paragraph:

*Excerpt 6*

Selection and Description of Courses in Integrated Lyceum, Ministry of Education & Culture, 2013

Turkish Language

The ability of a person to survive in an international and globalized environment and to meet the challenges of everyday life (social and professional), while surmounting the cultural barriers that impeded communication, is directly associated with the learning of foreign languages and cultures.

The knowledge of foreign languages is a necessary precondition for the free movement of people and ideas between the countries of the European Union. In our time, which is characterised by rapid social change, the learning of foreign languages does not only consist of a learning objective, but of a way of life. The choice of foreign languages (...) is the *first important step in [students'] professional and social development.* (emphasis added)

In this excerpt, language learning is primarily presented as a personal instrument for meeting the challenges of globalized world. The European Union is still mentioned but not so much in relation to intercultural communication or respect to difference, as to highlight the necessity of knowing foreign languages for enjoying the free movement of people and ideas that the EU offers. This necessity provides the main context for constructing a representation of Turkish as useful beyond the local context.

The reconciliatory function of the Turkish language classes is still acknowledged, but is mentioned very briefly, mostly as historical information, the initial reason that the classes were set up a decade ago. This reference is prefaced and followed by references to students' future where the needs of job market features prominently as the “basic criterion” for selecting the language:

*Excerpt 7*

*The choice {of a foreign language} must be done with seriousness and with a basic criterion the resources it offers for being successful in the job market.* (emphasis added)

Turkish learning offers this possibility.

*The teaching of Turkish was introduced in Integrated Lyceum [secondary schools] in 2003, being part of the Government's decision to announce support measures for Turkish Cypriots as well as measures that would bring the two communities of Cyprus closer [emphasis added], in order to make it feasible for the two communities to coexist within the context of a comprehensive solution of the Cyprus problem.*

Article 3 of the Constitution of the Republic of Cyprus declares that “the official languages of the Republic are Greek and Turkish.” For this reason, the Turkish language is used on our

passports and euro coins.

In a future solution of the Cyprus problem, the two languages will continue to be official languages of the state and the governing structures; *this makes the learning of the Turkish necessary for the staffing of the various jobs both in the public and private sectors.* (p. 72-emphasis added)

Although the status of Turkish as official language of the Republic is acknowledged, the emphasis lays on the potential usefulness of Turkish knowledge, rather than emblematic support and solidarity. Similarly, the future of a unified Cyprus is still envisioned as a possibility, but instead of foregrounding ‘getting to know each other,’ the document stresses a potential need for bilingual personnel in the private and public sector. The absence of references to common homeland or shared history and linguistic heritage is also noteworthy. Whereas the equivalent section on the Italian Language stresses the common vocabulary with the local Cypriot dialect, for Turkish this is silenced, and what is emphasised, instead, is ‘easiness’:

#### *Excerpt 8*

A few words about the Turkish language

The language is agglutinative, which means that the words take suffixes without changing themselves. 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. (p. 72)

Hence, the language is constructed as useful for Greek-Cypriot students monocommunitally, within the school economy and the need for good grades. Similar strategies were observed in relation to handling Turkish in the classroom.

#### *Strategies for teaching Turkish*

The representation of Turkish in the classroom, and especially in formal secondary education, appeared particularly challenging. In particular, the enactment of the reconciliatory discourse in Turkish language teaching appeared highly problematic, as it was confronted on the ground with the hegemonic educational discourses of otherness, giving rise to resistance, and loud accusations of betrayal (Charalambous, 2013). As a result, the most widespread strategy for dealing with Turkish was disassociation.

According to Charalambous et al. (2017), in order to cope with the legacy of the conflict past, the majority of the teachers in both projects, despite their very different profiles, and the curriculum that called for a communicative approach, consistently tried to ‘clear’ Turkish from its cultural and historical associations, teaching it as a ‘neutral’ linguistic code. Restricting teaching into the ‘scientific’ aspects of the language (grammar, syntax, etc.), teachers could reinstate their epistemic authority (Charalambous, 2013) and exclude the possibility of any discussion of politics, escaping the risk of negative reactions.

Following the new 2010 curriculum, *cosmopolitanization* was another strategy, observed only during the second project by a teacher who was very competent and always tried to embrace

youth culture. This strategy included an attempt to reposition Turkish within a cosmopolitan ambiance, and was accompanied by emphasis on European discourses and the value of multilingualism within European markets. *Localization*, in contrast, involved presenting and teaching the Turkish language as a local community language, relevant to students' lives, and in connection with the island's troubled past (references to history, to Turkish Cypriots, to the use of Turkish in the northern part of Cyprus, etc.). This strategy was followed by teachers who had an explicit pro-reconciliation stance. Still, it was not done without the risk of contestations, and it was only observed in adult classes and in a rather unique secondary school class, with a small number of students who all had pro-reconciliatory affiliations (for extended discussion and examples, including a discussion of teachers' and learners' profiles, see Charalambous et al., 2017). It is also worth noting here, that the same teachers could employ different strategies in different classes.

Regardless of the different attempts to find a legitimate representation for the Turkish language in Greek-Cypriot society, its place and social and political meaning in formal education remains rather precarious. It remains a part of the foreign language curricula, despite the repetitive acknowledgements that Turkish is not a foreign language, and even though teachers and students certainly did not see it as such. At the same time, it cannot be called and taught as a second language, as albeit being spoken on the island, it is not part of students' everyday life due to the de facto separation of the island. Whereas it might be difficult to find a label for Turkish within the language education literature, the contestations around it resemble contestations reported in heritage literature in relation to 'dark' or 'unwanted'/'undesired' heritage (e.g., Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996; Macdonald, 2006), and what I call here conflicted heritage.

#### *Comparing strategies around Turkish to strategies on handling a conflicted heritage.*

The different strategies for handling Turkish both in policy documents and in the classroom, when seen next to other heritage management strategies, emerge as part of broader struggles to handle a conflicted heritage (both material and intangible), in line with political negotiations for settling the protracted conflict. As mentioned earlier, Constantinou and Hatay (2010) described efforts in Cyprus to preserve Turkish or Ottoman heritage (mosques, hamams, etc.) both as an emblematic act of solidarity to Turkish Cypriots and as an attempt to construct and present a multicultural image of Cypriot past, in line with EU discourses on diversity and cosmopolitanization. The same processes were also identified in relation to Turkish language classes: Their initial introduction was presented as an emblematic act of goodwill and recognition, and this was framed later under the general EU discourses of multilingualism and intercultural communication.

Similarly, some of the ways of handling the Turkish language resemble heritage discourses and practices outside the Cypriot context. For example, the commodification of conflicted heritage, that is, turning 'problematic' heritage into economic resource can be seen in discourses seeking to instrumentalize Turkish for professional and economic development in the quest of an acceptable representation. Moreover, disassociation—that is, divesting heritage from its historical and ideological associations, evident in later policy documents as well as in teaching practices—together with recontextualization has been reported in other conflict-troubled contexts in relation to material troubled heritage (e.g., the handling of Nazi buildings in Nuremberg).

The memorialization of common heritage from a preconflict past that has been reported in

attempts to use heritage for healing and reconciliation (see Giblin, 2014) can be also seen in the initial setting up of the classes as well as in calls (between 2008–2010) to teachers to focus on the similarities between Turkish and the local Greek-Cypriot variety. This shared heritage has, in fact, been memorialized in a recently published dictionary (Hadjipieris & Kapatas, 2015), and there were plenty of references to it in learners' personal accounts and narratives (see next section).

When seen, therefore, as part of a conflicted heritage, the tensions between the different representations can be understood as part of postconflict struggles, as attempts to create particular historical narratives or memories of the past as well as political visions for the future. At the same time, though, the struggles for finding an acceptable representation of the Turkish language have a serious impact on language teaching and learning. Policy makers, teachers, and learners had to cope with accusations of national betrayal, security concerns, and personal and collective trauma.

### *Representations of Turkish in Learners' Accounts*

Moving beyond issues of policy and pedagogy, in order to understand the experience of learning a language that is part of a conflicted heritage, it becomes necessary to escape from the individual as our unit of analysis and pay attention to the role of collective narratives and memories. In the case of Turkish, family histories, narratives of conflict, dislocation, and the ongoing political processes affected learners' relation to the language inside and outside the classroom, despite learners' individual profiles. Of course, economic or professional reasons could be part of some learners' choice to learn Turkish—for example, learners mentioned “finding a job,” “getting a promotion,” that “Turkish might be useful,” that “it is after all an official language of the State.” But for several participants, Turkish was a way of showing active support to Turkish-Cypriot compatriots (“it's fair,” “it shows respect”) and reconnecting with historical roots (cf. heritage seekers, Van Deusen-Scholl, 2003); while for another group (mainly younger participants), the reason could be to “understand the enemy.”<sup>12</sup>

In addition, disregarding the rationale behind the initial decision to enroll, learners' commitment to these classes would mostly be perceived as running against hegemonic historical narratives. It could create highly controversial and contested identities with which learners had to deal with (almost all learners reported facing some kind of reaction, e.g., being accused as traitors, Turcophiles, etc.) and not identities that learners aspire to or identities that empower them with social, cultural capital, and so on, as normally discussed within the notion of investment, for example (cf. Darvin & Norton, 2015; Norton, 2000). So in all cases, Turkish language learning involved multiple negotiations at the personal or interpersonal levels as learners sought acceptable justifications for choosing to learn Turkish and ways to position themselves and their choice within the main circulating discourses in Greek-Cypriot society, and even within their families.

Athina, for example, in the following excerpt, tries to mitigate her mother's disagreement with learning Turkish by showing an understanding towards the reasons behind it (a missing brother), and at the same time distancing herself from her mother's stance (“it's ok,” line 5), presenting it as something she can joke with (11).

*Excerpt 9*

Interview with Secondary School Students, 2006

- 1 **Athina:** My mum doesn't want... she doesn't want me to learn Turkish  
2 **C.C.:** So what does she say now that you are learning?  
3 **Athina:** Well...let's say she doesn't want...  
4 because she had also a brother who is a missing person...so she  
doesn't like it  
5 but...it's ok  
6 **C.C.:** Did she react when you said I want to learn Turkish or-  
7 **Athina:** No she didn't react I mean to start going on about it  
8 but she doesn't like it for example when I learn new words  
9 she doesn't like it if I go and say them to her because she  
doesn't like them {the Turkish people}  
10 and let's say if I tell her... (.)  
11 sometimes I'm teasing her and I say to her "I'm gonna marry a  
Turkish guy"  
12 then she starts telling me off. *((she laughs))*

In contrast, there were also a number of students who saw Turkish as a (re)discovery of a Cypriot linguistic heritage, which for the younger learners was often surprising:

*Excerpt 10*

Interview with Secondary School Students, 2013

- Elena:** Whenever I go to my grandparents in {Cypriot Village} let's say most of the words that my grandfather tells me are Turkish  
**Ioanna:** [Yes  
**Demetra.:** [My grandmother too!  
**Ioanna:** My grandmother is from Paphos and whenever I go there, there are so many words that are similar to Turkish!  
**Elena:** And we had no idea!  
**Ioanna:** Yeah we didn't know!

*Excerpt 11*

Interview with Adult Learner, 2013

- Researcher:** So what made you learn the language? How did you see it?  
**Stathis:** I wasn't thinking "it's Turkish," I was thinking that it was my grandmother's language and I knew that my grandmother's language was different from the language I was hearing around me. I can't say that this was what triggered me in the first place, above all I think was the fact that I have an interest for Turkish-Cypriots as a community, as my compatriots, e::rm I am bothered by the division of Cyprus, it's something I never managed to overcome, I think it's a shame that we are a divided island

For the adult participants, born before the 1974 war, the association of the Turkish language with a conflicted heritage was more direct. Some of them had lived with Turkish Cypriots before the separation, but many lived through the violent conflict, were displaced, or had experienced family loss. In fact, for some of them, learning Turkish seemed to be firmly grounded in their life

experiences (family, childhood, youth, etc.) and trajectories, and in interviews they talked about an ongoing life project of personal exploration and transformation in which learning Turkish was a part, allowing them to reconnect with a disrupted heritage. This process often involved reworking learned orthodoxies, critically reflecting on old certainties, and rethinking the relations with the other side and imagining ways towards a more peaceful future. Some of the most reflective learners described this in terms of healing and a conscious revolution.

Stelios and Fofi (two adult participants), for example, described their Turkish learning as part of a larger project for healing the traumas caused by the war and the management of the experience by the Greek-Cypriot society and the state. They both reported traumas at the personal or individual level (e.g., in Stelios's case, the loss of his father during intercommunal troubles in 1964 and the hatred induced by his family thereafter), but at the same time they also talked about collective healing and exploring the other side as part of their collective heritage:

### *Excerpt 12*

Interview with Adult Learner, 2013

**Stelios:** After the war, weirdly enough there was a movement to... (...) bring closer the Turkish-Cypriots and they started having news in Turkish and other shows in the Turkish language and I remember that in my house and in relatives' houses they usually started swearing upon hearing Turkish. That is let's say the language of the enemy "they did so many things to us" etc. And I had the feeling that I have to speak this language. Eh. This feeling as a child it traumatised me. You can't go through all these things and stay intact. If you are a bit sensitive it is impossible. I have spent all my adult life trying to restore these traumas, to...come to terms with them, to handle them

We see, therefore, that Turkish language learning was described by participants as interwoven with an attempt to (re)define themselves in relation to a collective self and 'other,' and (re)position their place in history and future. Turkish language learning involved for learners a renegotiation of historical and family narratives, revisiting a troubled past and sometimes revisiting traumatic aspects of a collective self. But at the same time, it also involved the possibility of a bicomunal bilingual future, together with envisioning—and in a sense enacting—a different political configuration of a bilingual state (e.g., a federal state).

## **Discussion and conclusions**

This article revisited discussions on language education and heritage, introducing concepts and approaches from CHS that shift the focus from what is heritage to how heritage is managed and practiced, and on how it functions socially and politically. Studies on heritage management, in particular, reveal the role of heritage in reconfiguring or sustaining a conflict-troubled past, and in struggles for collective repositioning in the past, present, and future. The importance of heritage in identity politics and in creating a common sense of belonging is also evident in the emphasis put on heritage by different stakeholders, including the European Union. In fact, 2018 was named *European Year of Cultural Heritage* in an attempt to "encourage more people to discover and engage with Europe's cultural heritage, and to reinforce a sense of belonging to a common European space. The slogan for the year was: "Our heritage: where the past meets the

future.”<sup>13</sup>

The approach offered by the CHS literature examined here enables us to understand the EU emphasis on heritage at a time of political and economic turmoil, and provides tools for analyzing the ways in which heritage is used and practiced by different stakeholders, and the impact they might have. In the case of language, CHS literature encourages a reconceptualization of language as heritage in a way that is sensitive to its different social, political, and economic functions. Additionally, it allows us to examine language alongside other forms of heritage and broader social and political attempts to manage it. More specifically, the notion of conflicted heritage keeps in sight the relationship to a past that involves trauma and conflict and highlights the role of language in postconflict struggles and (in)securitization processes. At the same time, it also adds language in the CHS agenda, where it has not featured prominently.

The relevance of CHS literature to language education becomes clearer in the case discussed here. This case presented a distinctive type of language education that is difficult to understand within the mainstream paradigms of HLE or foreign language education.<sup>14</sup> Instead, it relates to processes observed in contexts where the target language is associated with discourses of threat and (in)security that are deeply rooted in history and society. Understanding heritage as economic, cultural, and political practice and focusing our attention on the ways it is exploited within a conflict-affected society can help us understand the struggles and contestations around the Turkish language, as different actors imbued it with different meanings and ideological significance. Turkish language learning, similarly to other types of heritage, involved intense contestations over the meaning of Turkish, the orientations towards it and over the ways in which it should be taught and handled. Moreover, there were contestations in relation to whether learning Turkish could hurt or whether it could contribute to collective healing. Seeing Turkish as part of a conflicted heritage allows us to understand these deep tensions that are unavoidable as a conflict-affected society tries to deal with the legacy of the past and build the foundations for a peaceful future.

The notion of conflicted heritage invites us also to discuss other language classes in conditions of (in)security and conflict, and this has important implications both for language policy as well as for pedagogy. First, teaching a language that is part of a conflicted heritage presents a challenge to communicative teaching and intercultural language education theories. When a language is part of a conflicted heritage and is affected by (in)securitization discourses, talking and teaching about issues of culture or imagining and practicing dialogues with native speakers can be a very sensitive issue. Hence, following the usual language teaching guidelines can become particularly problematic or even spark intense reaction in the classroom. Instead, traditional grammar exercises may appear as a strategic attempt by teachers to lower the risk for resistance and enable a first symbolic contact with the language that can later on lead to more substantial communication (see Rampton, Charalambous, & Charalambous, 2019, on *technical redoing*; Charalambous et al., 2017; Charalambous et al., 2018). Beyond the example discussed here, similar processes were observed in Karrebæk & Ghandchi's (2015) research on learning Farsi as a heritage language in Copenhagen amidst fears of surveillance by the Iranian state. Their detailed account reveals an attempt by teachers and parents to limit the social meanings of the language, trying to keep it neutral from Iranian politics, and therefore restricting teaching in the 'safe' activities of grammar and vocabulary. Likewise, Arabic language learning in Hebrew schools and universities in Israel was also affected by powerful (in)securitization discourses, and there, disassociation (what Uhlmann, 2010, calls Latinization) emerged again as the most widespread strategy for handling the ideological and emotional baggage of the language

(Uhlmann, 2010).

Second, the types of textbooks and materials used to teach the language, and the associated narratives and identities they convey can also be a site of trouble and contestation (e.g., in the case discussed here, they had to be approved by the Ministry of External Affairs). Similar issues have also been observed in teaching Arabic in London with teachers hesitating to use ‘authentic’ textbooks (Ros i Sole & Charalambous, 2012).

Third, both teachers and policy makers may need to deal with competing collective representations and may need to employ different strategies for representing the language and its relation to the conflict. In the Turkish language classes, this was evident in the gradual toning down of the reconciliatory discourse and the increasing emphasis on language as a resource, in an attempt to disassociate the language from the conflict, to limit the negative associations for learners (e.g., traitors), and to increase enrollment. Similarly, Khan points to implications for Arabic as a heritage language in London, and in particular for students’ motivation as, “just at the time when [British] intelligence and the military want their linguistic abilities more than ever, Muslims are being portrayed as a ‘suspect community,’ subjected to high levels of surveillance, scrutiny and distrust” (Charalambous et al., 2018, p. 643; Khan, 2016). Zakharia and Bishop (2013) also described very similar processes in relation to Arabic bilingual education in New York, which has been limited by policy makers from heritage to foreign language education serving a ‘security agenda,’ with negative implications for the future of these schools and the learners.

In general, the sociopolitical and ideological context and the personal drives of learners appear extremely important in this type of class, as they tend to be associated with contested identities, contrary to the types of identities usually assumed in HLE. Consequently, teachers need to navigate this precarious and polyphonic terrain with students’ positionings ranging from learning the language to be prepared for war to peace activists or people aspiring to connect with a disrupted heritage.

Approaching language education as part of a conflicted heritage, therefore raises a need to rethink and reconceptualize a number of concepts involved in language teaching and learning, and similarly adapt language teachers’ training and assessment. Concepts, for example, such as investment, motivation, history, culture, and intercultural dialogue (e.g., Charalambous et al., 2018; Karrebæk & Ghandchi, 2015) may become very different from current theoretical discussions of heritage or foreign language education, as politics, ideologies, and (in)security become deeply interwoven with the language learning process. Moreover, whilst theories on intercultural pedagogy and intercultural dialogue prove to be insufficient, we may need to turn our attention to different types of pedagogies for teacher education, such as pedagogies in relation to ‘troubled’ or ‘difficult’ knowledge.

Developed in South Africa, the concept of troubled knowledge brings to the foreground the “affective impact of a traumatized past—such as the profound feelings of loss, shame, resentment, or defeat—in the future development of a postconflict society” (Zembylas, 2017, p. 663). It also highlights the need for pedagogical strategies that can deal with learners’ emotional challenges involved in this process as teachers and students will have “to tolerate the loss of certainty in the very effort to know” (Farley, 2009, as cited in Zembylas, 2017, p. 662). Such a pedagogy, Zembylas (2017) argued, “requires the development of a new vocabulary by teachers and students for describing the affective legacies of difficult knowledge.”

Conflicted heritage might be a start for developing such a vocabulary in language education and language teacher training, which can help us understand the political role of language

education in dealing with the legacy of a conflict-troubled past and conditions of (in)security.

-----

## Acknowledgements

This article has been revised extensively based on feedback from Ben Rampton, who read it multiple times. It was initially presented as part of a conference panel on Language & Securitization (2016) and it has since been enriched by comments from Jan Blommaert, Rob Moore, Martha Karrebæk, and Ofelia Garcia. I am indebted to all of them, as well as to the journal Editor and the anonymous reviewers for their very constructive criticism and feedback.

## Notes

1. This paper draws largely on ideas developed collectively in project meetings and discussions with Ben Rampton and Panayiota Charalambous, through our collaboration in the project “Crossing Languages & Borders” (Leverhulme, 2012-2015, RPG-2012-477).
2. Cummins (2005), Garcia (2005), and others prefer to refer to it as heritage language *in* education in an attempt to avoid some of the problems discussed in this section.
3. According to Bale (2010), “a formidable list of terms often positioned as synonymous with heritage: aboriginal, ancestral, autochthonous, (ex-)colonial, community, critical, diasporic, endoglossic, ethnic, foreign, geopolitical, home, immigrant, indigenous, language other than English, local, migrant, minority, mother tongue, refugee, regional, and strategic” (p. 43).
4. According to Tunbridge & Ashworth (1996), the different meanings that can be given to the term *heritage* create problems especially in regards to what heritage is, how it functions in the society, and how it is exploited for political or socioeconomic purposes, “buying and selling of the past” (p. 3). Problems also emerge in relation to the distortion of heritage/history for promoting specific interests.
5. The Republic of Cyprus is officially regarded to be functioning unaltered in the government-controlled areas, with its northern part being illegally occupied.
6. On the northern side of the island, the Greek-Cypriot presence was eradicated in, for example, the replacement of any Greek names of villages and streets for Turkish ones, thereby constructing the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus as always existing independently from Greek Cypriots (Killoran, 2000).
7. Students in the last two years of secondary school could choose to study two foreign languages from the following list: English, French, Italian, Spanish, German, Turkish, Russian.
8. The first project was my doctoral study, “Learning the Language of the ‘Other’: A Linguistic Ethnography of Turkish-language classes in a Greek-Cypriot School,” funded by the School of Social Sciences & Public Policy (King’s College London, 2009). The second project was entitled “Crossing Languages & Borders: Intercultural language education in a conflict-troubled context” (2012-2015, funded by Leverhulme). The project was conducted in collaboration with Professor Ben Rampton, and Dr. Panayiota Charalambous who worked full-time on the project as a Research Associate.
9. Negotiations culminated with a public referendum over a solution plan known as the Annan Plan (named after the UN Secretary at the time). The solution was accepted by the majority of Turkish Cypriots but rejected by the Greek Cypriots.
10. A draft of the curriculum was circulating since 2005, and it was officially published in 2007.
11. The whole document (in Greek) can be found here:  
<http://www.schools.ac.cy/dde/circular/data/Doc7387.pdf>

12. A small survey conducted in 2012 revealed this to be the case for around 25% of the younger participants.
13. [https://ec.europa.eu/info/events/innovation-and-cultural-heritage-2018-mar-20\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/info/events/innovation-and-cultural-heritage-2018-mar-20_en) \_
14. Of course, what is seen as foreign or heritage is always contingent, and using one label over the other serves different political purposes and constructs different representations of ‘us’ and ‘others’. In the case under consideration here, adding Turkish as an option in the foreign language curricula enforced representations of otherness on the one hand, but on the other hand, it allowed Turkish to be introduced within existing educational structures (Charalambous et al., 2017).

## References

- Adamides, C. (2015). A comfortable and routine conflict. In J. Ker–Lindsay (Ed.), *Resolving Cyprus: New approaches to conflict resolution* (pp. 5–15). London: IB Tauris.
- Bale, J. (2010). International comparative perspectives on heritage language education policy research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 42–65.
- Bigo, D. (2016). International political sociology: Rethinking the international through dynamics of power. In T. Basaran, D. Bigo, E.–P. Guittet, & R. B. J. Walker (Eds.), *International political sociology: Transversal lines* (pp. 24–48). London: Routledge.
- Bigo, D., & McCluskey, E. (2018). What is a PARIS approach to (in) securitization? Political anthropological research for international sociology. In A. Gheciu & W. C. Wohlforth (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of international security* (pp.116–132). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (2008). Contesting ‘language’ as ‘heritage’: Negotiation of identities in late modernity. *Applied Linguistics*, 29, 533–554.
- 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: Negotiating a troubled past in ‘other’-language learning classrooms. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 13, 310–329.
- Charalambous, C. (2014). ‘Whether you see them as friends or enemies you need to know their language’: Turkish-language learning in a Greek Cypriot school. In V. Lytra (Ed.) *When Greeks and Turks meet: Interdisciplinary perspectives on the relationship since 1923* (pp. 141–162). London: Ashgate
- Charalambous, C., Charalambous, P., Khan, K., & Rampton, B. (2018). Security and language policy. In J. W. Tollefson & M. Pérez–Milans (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of language policy and planning*. (pp. 632–652). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Charalambous, P., Charalambous, C., & Rampton, B. (2017). De-securitizing Turkish: Teaching the language of a former enemy, and intercultural language education. *Applied Linguistics*, 38, 800–823.
- Christou, M. (2007). The language of patriotism: Sacred history and dangerous memories. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 28, 709–722.
- Constantinou, C. M., & Hatay, M. (2010). Cyprus, ethnic conflict and conflicted heritage. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33, 1600–1619.
- Cummins, J. (2005). A proposal for action: Strategies for recognizing heritage language competence as a learning resource within the mainstream classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 585–592.

- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2015). Identity and a model of investment in applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 35, 36–56.
- Das, S. (2008). The talk of Tamils in multilingual Montreal: A study of intersecting language ideologies in nationalist Quebec. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 8, 230–247.
- Emmers, R. (2013). Securitization. In A. Collins (Ed.), *Contemporary security studies* (3rd ed., pp. 131–143). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- García, O. (2005). Positioning heritage languages in the United States. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 601–605.
- García, O. (2014). Introduction. In T. Wiley, J. Peyton, D. Christian, S. Moore, & N. Liu (Eds.), *Handbook of heritage, community, and native American languages in the United States: Research, policy, and educational practice* (pp. 87–89). New York: Routledge.
- García, O., Zakharia, Z., & Otcu, B. (Eds.). (2012). *Bilingual community education and multilingualism: Beyond heritage languages in a global city*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Giblin, J. D. (2014). Post–conflict heritage: Symbolic healing and cultural renewal. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 20, 500–518.
- Graham, B. (2002). Heritage as knowledge: Capital or culture? *Urban Studies*, 39, 1003–1017.
- Hadjipieris, I., & Kapatras, O. (2015). *Kino Lexiko tis Ellinokypriakis kai Tourkokypriakis Dialektou* [Common dictionary of the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot dialect]. Nicosia, Cyprus
- Harris, R. (1997). Romantic bilingualism: Time for a change. In C. Leung & C. Cable (Eds.), *English as an additional language: Changing perspectives* (pp. 14–27). Watford: NALDIC.
- Harris, R. (2006). *New ethnicities and language use*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- He, A. W. and Xiao, Y. (Eds.). (2008). *Chinese as a heritage language: Fostering rooted world citizenry*. Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press.
- Heller, M. (2010). The commodification of language. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 39, 101–114.
- Jaffe, A. (2009). The production and reproduction of language ideologies in practice. In N. Coupland & A. Jaworski (Eds.), *The new sociolinguistics reader*. (390–404). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kagan, O., & Dillon, K. (2008). Issues in heritage language learning in the United States. In N. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 1242–1255). Boston: Springer.
- 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. S., & Ghandchi, N. (2015). ‘Pure’Farsi and political sensitivities: Language and ideologies in Farsi complementary language classrooms in Denmark. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 19, 62–90.
- Karyolemou, M. (2003). “Keep your language and I will keep mine”: Politics, language, and the construction of identities in Cyprus. In M. N. Dedaić & D. N. Nelson (Eds.), *At war with words* (pp. 359–384). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Khan, K. (2016). Citizenship, securitization and suspicion in UK ESOL policy. In K. Arnaut, M. S. Karrebæk, M. Spotti, & J. Blommaert (Eds.), *Engaging superdiversity: Recombining spaces, times and language practices*. (pp. 303–320). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Killoran, M. (2000). Time, space and national identities in Cyprus. In M. Yaşın (Ed.), *Step-Mothertongue: From nationalism to multiculturalism: Literatures of Cyprus, Greece and*

- Turkey* (pp. 129–146). Middlesex: Middlesex University Press.
- Kızılyürek, N., & Gautier–Kızılyürek, S. (2004). The politics of identity in the Turkish Cypriot community and the language question. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 168, 37–54.
- Macdonald, S. (2006). Undesirable heritage: Fascist material culture and historical consciousness in Nuremberg. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 12, 9–28.
- Makriyianni, C., & Psaltis, C. (2007). The teaching of history and reconciliation. *Cyprus Review*, 19, 43.
- McGinnis, S. (2005). More than a silver bullet: The role of Chinese as a heritage language in the United States. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 592–594.
- Mendel, Y. (2013). A sentiment-free Arabic: On the creation of the Israeli accelerated Arabic language studies programme. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 49, 383–401.
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2005/7). *Programma Spoudwn Xenwn Glosswn [Foreign Language Curricula]*. Nicosia, Cyprus: MOEC, Pedagogical Institute
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2010). *Programma Spoudwn Xenwn Glosswn [Foreign Language Curricula]*. Nicosia, Cyprus: MOEC, Pedagogical Institute
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2013). *Epilogi kai Perigrafi Mathimatwn sto Eniaio Lykeio [Selection and Description of Courses in the Integrated Lyceum]*. Nicosia, Cyprus: MOEC, Pedagogical Institute
- Moore, R. E. (2006). Disappearing, Inc.: Glimpsing the sublime in the politics of access to endangered languages. *Language & Communication*, 26, 296–315.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, P.L. 107-110, 20 U.S.C. § 6319 (2002).
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow: Longman.
- Okubo, Y. (2010). Heritage: Owned or assigned? The cultural politics of teaching heritage language in Osaka, Japan. *Critical Asian Studies*, 42, 111–138.
- Ozerk, K. (2001). Reciprocal bilingualism as a challenge and opportunity: The case of Cyprus. *International Review of Education*, 47, 253–265.
- Papadakis, Y. (2005). *Echoes from the dead zone: Across the Cyprus divide*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Papadakis, Y. (2008). Narrative, memory and history education in divided Cyprus: A comparison of schoolbooks on the “History of Cyprus.” *History & Memory*, 20, 128–148.
- Potowski, K. (Ed). 2010. *Language diversity in the USA*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rampton, B. (2007). Neo-hymesian linguistic ethnography in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11, 584–607.
- Rampton, B., & Charalambous, C. (2012). Crossing. In M. Martin–Jones, A. Blackledge, & A. Creese (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of multilingualism* (pp. 482–498). London: Routledge.
- Rampton, B., & Charalambous, C. (2019). Sociolinguistics and everyday (in)securitisation. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, XX, x–xx.
- Rampton, B., Charalambous, C. & Charalambous, P. (2019). Crossing of a different kind. *Language in Society*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1017/S0047404519000460
- Rampton, B., Maybin, J., & Roberts, C. (2015). Theory and method in linguistic ethnography. In J. Snell, S. Shaw, & F. Copland (Eds.), *Linguistic ethnography* (pp. 14–50). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Ricento, T. (2005). Problems with the ‘language-as-resource’ discourse in the promotion of heritage languages in the USA. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9, 348–368.
- Ros i Sole, C. & Charalambous, C. (2012, August). *Silencing emotions in the language classroom*. Paper presented at the 19<sup>th</sup> Sociolinguistic Symposium, Berlin, Germany.
- Šešić, M. D., & Mijatović, L. R. (2014). Balkan dissonant heritage narratives (and their attractiveness) for tourism. *American Journal of Tourism Management*, 3, 10–19.
- Smith, L. (2012). A critical heritage studies? [Editorial]. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 18, 533–540.
- Tunbridge, J. E., & Ashworth, G. J. (1996). *Dissonant heritage: The management of the past as a resource in conflict*. Chichester: Wiley.
- 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.
- Valdés, G. (2014). Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. In T. G. Wiley, J. T. Peyton, D. Christian, S. C. Moore, & N. Liu (Eds.), *Handbook of heritage, community, and native American languages in the United States* (pp. 41–49). New York: Routledge.
- Van Deusen-Scholl, N. (1998). Heritage language instruction: Issues and challenges. *AILA Newsletter*, 1, 12–14.
- Van Deusen-Scholl, N. (2003). Toward a definition of heritage language: Sociopolitical and pedagogical considerations. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 2, 211–230.
- Waterton, E., & Smith, L. (2010). The recognition and misrecognition of community heritage. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 16, 4–15.
- Weitzman, E. (2000). Software and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*, 2nd ed. (pp. 803–820). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Wiley, T. G. (2005). The reemergence of heritage and community language policy in the US national spotlight. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 594–601.
- Wiley, T., Peyton, J., Christian, D., Moore, S., & Liu, N. (Eds.). (2014). *Handbook of heritage, community, and native American languages in the United States: Research, policy, and educational practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Zakharia, Z. (2016). Language, conflict, and migration: Situating Arabic bilingual community education in the United States. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 2016, 139–160.
- Zakharia, Z., & Bishop, L. M. (2013). Towards positive peace through bilingual community education: Language efforts of Arabic-speaking communities in New York. In O. García, Z. Zakharia, & B. Otcu (Eds.), *Bilingual community education and multilingualism: Beyond heritage languages in a global city* (pp. 169–189). New York: Multilingual Matters.
- Zembylas, M. (2017). Teacher resistance to engage with ‘alternative’ perspectives of difficult histories: The limits and prospects of affective disruption. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 38, 659–675.
- Zembylas, M., Charalambous, C., & Charalambous, P. (2016). *Peace education in a conflict-affected society: An ethnographic journey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.