Style Shifting from Cypriot towards Greek Phonology

Maria Christodoulidou

Frederick University Cyprus

pre.mc@frederick.ac.cy

Abstract

This study investigates how different linguistic audiences influence the speech styles of Cypriot Greeks who are bilinguals in Cypriot and Standard Modern Greek. Drawing upon the theoretical framework of language style as audience design (Bell 1984), this paper investigates style shifting of select phonological variables—from Cypriot Greek towards Standard Modern Greek—in the interactions of Cypriots with three types of audiences, composed of respectively: 1. Cypriot addressees and Greek auditors; 2. Greek and Cypriot addressees; and 3. Greek addressees and Cypriot auditors. The variables investigated are (k), (x), (t), (p). Apart from the specific results for each of the variables, this research demonstrates that the subjects under investigation shift their speech to imitate the speech of their addressees, whereas auditors have an inferior effect on style shifting. Specifically, the results of this study show greater style-shifting in conversations with an audience of Greek addressees rather than auditors.

Keywords

style-shift; language style; audience design; linguistic accommodation; diglossia; Cypriot Greek; naturally occurring speech

1. Introduction

In face-to-face interaction “speakers accommodate to each other linguistically by reducing dissimilarities between their speech patterns and by adopting features from each others’ speech” (Trudgill 1992: 76). According to Bell (1998: 240), language style is a challenging aspect of sociolinguistic variation. The basic principle of language style is that an individual speaker varies his/her speech depending on the circumstances. These variants may carry different social meanings (ibid.).

This paper draws upon the theoretical framework of *Audience Design* (Bell 1984) in order to examine how different linguistic audiences influence the speech styles of Cypriot Greeks who are bilingual in Cypriot and Standard Modern Greek. It comprises transcriptions of approximately 7 hours of tape-recorded, naturally occurring conversations between young Cypriot

Greeks¹ and Athenian Greeks² who range from 21–26 years old, which take place during a variety of informal gatherings or events, e.g. dinner, meeting for coffee, etc. The variables investigated in the interactions are (k), (x), (t), (p). The Cypriot consultants were recorded when interacting with three types of audiences, composed of (i) Cypriot addressees and Greek auditors, (ii) Greek and Cypriot addressees, and (iii) Greek addressees and Cypriot auditors. Apart from the specific results for each of the variants, this research demonstrates that the subjects shift their speech to imitate the speech of their addressees, whereas the presence of auditors has a lesser effect on style shifting. Specifically, the research shows greater style-shifting in conversations with an audience of Greeks as addressees than with an audience of Greeks as auditors.

Audience design is a sociolinguistic model outlined by Bell in 1984, which proposes that linguistic style-shifting occurs primarily in response to a speaker's audience. According to this model, speakers adjust their speech primarily towards that of their audience in order to express solidarity or intimacy with them, or away from their audience's speech to express distance. The social factors that affect speech include audience, purpose, topic, mode, channel, and genre (Hymes 1997). Labov (1972: 208) on the other hand suggests that styles can vary along a single dimension, measured by the amount of attention paid to speech. Research on style has found, however, that the speaker's awareness of his/her addressee is stronger than the attention factor (Bell 1984: 149). There are differing views on what constitutes stylistic variation, however. Eckert (2001) defines style as any number of linguistic variables that indicate or mark a social identity either on an individual level or beyond. Others view stylistic variation as sociolinguistic variation demonstrated by a single speaker (Labov 2001; Bell 2001). In other words, a speaker does not change his/her position within the social hierarchy, but rather he/she is presenting a particular version of his/her dynamic social identity at a given moment. Based on this view, it is often claimed that community-level sociolinguistic variables must exist before such variables enter the style-shifting repertoire of a speaker (Bell 1984: 159).

The theory of audience design supposes that style is what an individual speaker does with a language in relation to other people (Bell 2001). The speaker is of primary concern among the interlocutors; the first person's characteristics account for speech differences between speakers (Bell 1984: 159). However speakers vary their style according to their audience. Differences in speaker speech patterns are explained as an effect of audience, which can include third-person consultants (*ibid.*).

¹) In this study these speakers are referred to as Cypriots.

²) In this study these speakers are referred to as Greeks.

The audience design framework distinguishes between several kinds of audience types based on three criteria from the perspective of the speaker: known (whether an addressee is known to be part of a speech context), ratified (the speaker acknowledges the listener's presence in the speech context), or addressed (the listener is directly spoken to). The impact of audience members on a speaker's style-shifting is proportional to the degree to which the speaker recognizes and ratifies them (ibid.: 154). Bell identified the following audience types: addressee (listeners who are known, ratified, and addressed), auditor (listeners who are not directly addressed, but are known and ratified), overhearer (non-ratified listeners of whom the speaker is aware), eavesdropper (non-ratified listeners of whom the speaker is unaware) (ibid.).

The hierarchy of roles and their salience for the speaker demonstrate that each audience member's influence on speech style designed by a speaker is dependent on distance of his or her role in the interaction. Quantitatively, the influence of each role to the speaker increases according to his/her proximity to the speaker: Speaker > Addressee > Auditor > Overhearer. The speaker accounts for more variation, the addressee for less, the auditor for less than the addressee, and so on. The amount of variation is less when we move from first to second and third person (ibid: 160).

Bell (2001: 163) expanded the theory of audience design by adding a notion of "referee design" as a mechanism in parallel with the "audience design" mechanism that gave the theory its name. Referee design is defined as the change in a speaker's style that affiliates the speaker with a particular social group as prompted by the audience. Bell argues that a comprehensive theory of style-shifting must consider the two principal driving forces: audience design and referee design. While a talker is crafting from a stylistic repertoire that incorporates the needs of the audience, a speaker feels the pressure to maintain a level of faithfulness to their social network and larger social affiliations. The collaborative relationship between a talker, the audience, and the social group pressures in the development of style across the course of an interaction is an integral aspect of Bell's theory (ibid.).

The theory of language style as audience design is closely associated with *accommodation theory*, which was developed by Giles within the framework of social psychological research on similarity and attraction. The basic tenet of the theory is that an individual is evaluated more positively when reducing differences between him/her and the addressee. Therefore the process of speech accommodation is actually a speaker's desire for social approval. If we consider accommodation as an act of identity-change, then it contains certain costs for speakers who put in the effort to succeed it. It seems reasonable that accommodation may be initiated by desired rewards (Giles and Powesland 1997: 233).

The process of speech accommodation is an attempt by the speaker to make him/herself acceptable to an addressee. In order to achieve this, the speaker employs speech-repertoire patterns, which include characteristics approved by the addressee, and by doing that, the speaker opts to speak more similarly to his/her addressee. This process is called speech convergence. Apart from the fact that the speaker is considered more similar to the addressee by accommodating his/her style, speech accommodation is also the desire of the speaker to be understood (ibid.: 234). If we reduce “audience” to the three roles of addressee, auditor, and overhearer, and if we interpret accommodation as any style shift responding to these persons, then accommodation theory is a powerful explanation of speech style (Bell 1984: 162).

This study investigates phonological style shifting of the aforementioned phonological variants from the part of Cypriots towards Greeks. Cypriots, as bilinguals in Standard Modern Greek and Cypriot Greek may follow, based on their audience, several strategies, including: (a) the choice to use Standard Modern Greek; (b) the choice to use the Cypriot Greek; and (c) the choice to adopt a mixture of Standard Modern Greek and Cypriot Greek. The focus of this study is to examine the effect of audience on the linguistic choices and especially on the phonological choices of the speakers.

2. Cypriot Greek and Standard Modern Greek

The Cypriot Greek dialect³ has long been described as a geographical continuum consisting of eighteen regional idioms (Contossopoulos 1969: 105) or basilects, commonly referred to as *xorkátika* ‘peasantry’, as opposed to *elliniká* ‘Greek’, the latter being the standard variety spoken in mainland Greece (Newton 1972a: 51). Among these regional geographical varieties, the ‘metropolitan’ idiom (spoken in the plain of Mesarká and the capital, Nicosia) was characterized as ‘town speech’, i.e. as somehow more ‘standard’ or ‘formal’ (Tsiplakou et al. 2006).

According to Newton (1972a), Cypriot varieties include Cypriot town speech and Cypriot village speech. In Davy, Panyiotou and Ioannou (1996), Papapavlou

³ The Cypriot Greek dialect spoken in Cyprus is an indigenous variety of Greek. The term “dialect”, as defined by Chambers and Trudgill, refers to varieties which are grammatically, lexically, and phonologically different from other varieties (1998: 5). A dialect refers to such differences of the local linguistic variety that a speaker of the same language could not understand a speaker of a dialect (Contossopoulos, 1994: 1). The Cypriot Greek dialect is identified as belonging to the Southeastern dialects spoken also in Chios and the Dodecanese (including Kalimnos, Kos, Astipalea, Simi, Karpathos and Rhodes). They are also spoken in Kastellorizo, a small island between Rhodes and Cyprus. Livisi and Halicarnassos, on the mainland are also grouped with the Southeastern dialects (Newton 1972b: 15).

and Pavlou (1998) and Karyolemou and Pavlou (2001), village Cypriot is classified as the basilect and town Cypriot as the acrolect of the low variety (L). Katsoyannou et al. (2006) and Tsiplakou et al. (2006) distinguish four levels of use of Cypriot Greek (CG), ordered from less formal (basilectal) to more formal (acrolectal): (i) peasantry, (ii) correct Cypriot, (iii) polite Cypriot, (iv) “pen-pusher” talk (from a traditional Cypriot way of referring to mainland Greeks), which reflects the spoken standard. These levels constitute a dialectal continuum. In addition, researchers including Karyolemou (1997; 2000), Moschonas (2002: 917), Terkourafi, (2004) and Arvaniti (2002) have supported the creation of a Cypriot koine in urban centres, i.e., a middle variety which varies from the local vernaculars by incorporating important influences from Standard Modern Greek (SMG).

CG and SMG are different across all levels—phonology, morphology, syntax and lexicon—(cf. Ferguson 1959; Levinson, 1983: 93; Pavlou and Christodoulou, 1996). For instance, Cypriot has phonemes that do not exist in SMG (e.g., Cypriot speakers note the palatoalveolar [tʃ] as a trademark of the Cypriot accent, never used in SMG (cf. Tsiplakou 2009). The equivalent, for instance, for Cypriot [tʃe] ‘and’ in SMG is [ce] (Newton 1983; Karyolemou and Pavlou 2001; Arvaniti 2002)). In addition, CG is acquired naturally among Cypriots while SMG is taught as the standard language (cf. Ferguson, 1959: 30) and thus represents the norm by which divergences are measured (Terkourafi 2007). SMG is the formal language and thus the language of education in Cyprus and has established norms for orthography, pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary. CG is not standardized, i.e., there is no unified orthography, written grammar, or lexicon (cf. Ferguson 1959: 29–31).

However, the sociolinguistic situation in Cyprus cannot be described in terms of classic diglossia as introduced by Ferguson (1959) for describing a situation where two languages or language varieties occur together in a community, and each has clearly defined functions.⁴ Thus, referring to diglossia as a straightforward dichotomy between SMG and CG is a simplification of the situation, given Cypriot is not homogeneous (Arvaniti 2002). While the choice of language variety results from negotiation between consultants, there are cases where the setting imposes it. For instance the official language of formal education is SMG. However in the interaction between students and professors in lectures in tertiary education, where the use of SMG is more or less imposed as the sole

⁴ According to Ferguson (1959), one of these varieties, the H (‘high’) variety, is adopted as the standard variety and is used in official situations, such as government broadcasts, religious services, and teaching; and the other, the L (‘low’) variety, is used in informal situations, such as local markets and conversations between friends.

vehicle of academic literacy, the L variety may surface unexpectedly (Tsiplakou 2006). Researchers such as Tsiplakou et al. (2006) and Karyolemou (2006), opt to speak of a post-diglossic stylistic continuum.

3. Data and Methodology

The present study comprises transcriptions of approximately 7 hours of tape-recorded naturally produced conversations between friends during a variety of informal gatherings or occasions, e.g. dinner, meeting for coffee, etc.⁵ The conversations were recorded in the dormitories of a British university where the consultants are students. For the purposes of the current study, 4 native speakers of Cypriot Greek and 2 native speakers of Modern Greek were selected. The consultants, both Greeks and Cypriots range from 21–26 years old and are University students at the graduate or postgraduate level. The Cypriot consultants come from Nicosia and the Greeks come from Athens. All the consultants are friends and they typically met up in the university dormitory rooms. The Cypriot consultants met daily for coffee or dinner, and they met with the Greek consultants at least twice a week. They usually conversed about their families, their boyfriends and girlfriends, their courses, and about absent individuals whom they criticized. Each recording includes 3–4 consultants, whose privacy is protected through the assignment of individual pseudonyms.

Let us now turn to the sociological aspects of the Cypriot consultants:

- Demetra, 21 years old, is a second-year student at the University. In the UK, most of her friends are Greeks and Cypriots. Her boyfriend is Greek.
- Lydia, 23 years old, completed her BA in Cyprus and is currently working on her MA in the UK.
- Elena, 24 years old, completed her first degree at the University of Cyprus. This year she is working on her MA in the UK.
- Theodore, 26 years old, has lived in Athens for seven years. Most of his friends are Greeks. This year he is pursuing his MA in the UK.

And the Greek Consultants:

- Chloe, 22 years old, is a third-year student at the University.
- Jannis, 25 years old, completed his first degree in Athens and this year is working on his MA in England.

⁵ The transcription symbols used in this study—cited in Appendix I—are based on the transcription conventions developed by Jefferson (cf. Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 1974).

The main objective of the present study is to examine the effect of the audience variable on speech style. The purpose is to examine phonological style shifting from the part of Cypriots towards Greeks under the framework of audience design. For the study four phonological variables (k), (x), (t), (p) were selected and investigated in the speech of Cypriots under the influence of three audiences:

1. Cypriots addressees and Greeks auditors,
2. Greeks and Cypriots addressees,
3. Greeks addressees and Cypriots auditors.

In order to examine how the speech style of the Cypriot consultants is affected by the presence of Greeks in the audience, we recorded informal conversations between Cypriots and Greeks. The researcher was present at the conversations and consultants were aware of the recorder but not of the research question. Numerous recordings have been conducted in order to capture the above three audiences accidentally, i.e. without the consultants knowing the aim of research, so as to avoid the “Observer’s Paradox” phenomenon. As can be seen, the importance of Greeks in the interaction is increasing by passing from the first to the second and third audience. In the first audience, Greeks are in the secondary role of auditors, while Cypriots are in the principal role of addressees. In the second audience, the role of Greeks increases to co-addressees with Cypriots. In the third audience, Greeks are the addressees, while Cypriots are only auditors.

All the linguistic variants were transcribed from tapes. Processing the figures involved counting the number of occurrences of the local dialect variants as well as the number of occurrences of the Greek variants. After the demonstration that the linguistic behaviour of the speakers was more or less the same, it was decided to unify the linguistic variables used by speakers. The next step was to compare the number of occurrences of each linguistic variant across the three different audiences. The chi-square test of independence was applied for each variant separately across the three audiences and has shown significant increase in style shifting when moving from the first to the second and third audience.

4. Phonological Variables

In studies of code-switching among related varieties, phonology is often used as the decisive criterion for defining the matrix language of an utterance or a segment of speech, in the face of the difficulties engendered by lexical and morphosyntactic parity or convergence (cf. Alfonzetti 1998). The use of CG

versus SMG phonology appears to be quite a decisive criterion for determining the matrix language and for deciding whether code-switching outside of the Cypriot continuum is taking place (Tsiplakou 2009).

For this study four phonological variables were selected: (k, x, t, p). The Greek and Cypriot variants are illustrated in table 1 that follows:

Table 1. Variables

Greek variants	Cypriot variants
variable (k) -[e, i]	
(k): [c]	(k): [tʃ]
variable (x) -[e, i]	
(x): [ç]	(x): [ʃ]
variable (t)	
(t): [t]	(t): [tʰ]
variable (p)	
(p): [p]	(p): [pʰ]

The velar consonants /k, x/ are fronted in all Greek dialects to [c, ç] before a front vowel or yod, and in the CG [c] is then softened to [tʃ], and [ç] to [ʃ]. Therefore SMG *ce* ‘and’ and *çeri* ‘hand’ are pronounced [tʃe] and [ʃéri] in Cypriot. Cypriot does not follow the stage of depalatalization, so there is no further development beyond [tʃe] and [ʃéri] (Newton 1972b: 126–129). Thus the variable (k), before a front vowel [e, i] may be realized by two variants, (k): [c], which is the Greek variant and (k): [tʃ], which is the Cypriot variant. In many cases—when there is a preceding [n], but also without it—the voiceless palatal affricate [tʃ] is pronounced as the voiced palatal affricate [dʒ] i.e. *ti dʒiran* ‘the lady’ (ibid.: x; Contossopoulos 1994: 22). The variable (x), before a front vowel [e, i] is realized as (x): [ç], which is the Greek pronunciation, and as (x): [ʃ], which is the Cypriot pronunciation. Unvoiced plosives (t, k, p) are pronounced aspirated in the CG ([tʰ], [pʰ], [kʰ]) depending on the following vowel. In this study we examine only (t) and (p).

According to Bell, the phonological variants deployed by the speakers are related to the type of audience, since speakers design their style according to their hearers (1984: 145). The use of each variable (k, x, t, p) is examined first in an audience of Cypriot addressees and Greek auditors, then in an audience of both Greek and Cypriot addressees, and last in an audience of Greek addressees and Cypriot auditors in order to investigate effect of the audience in the phonological choices of the speakers.

Before proceeding to the investigation of the ‘behaviour’ of each phonological variable in the three audiences under study, we first need to show how speakers use these variables in Cypriot-to-Cypriot conversations in the absence

of Greek speakers. In informal, friendly conversations among the Cypriot consultants, the speakers use the Cypriot Greek phonology 80% of the time. The following excerpt is indicative of the extent of use of Cypriot variants. The turns with the Cypriot variants are marked with arrows and the Cypriot variants are indicated in italics.

Extract 1 (Biscuits)

1. T → *£stin Ellaðan ef' i tʃ'e ta:: piskot^haðika::, ennoo tʃ'e ta::£=*
£In Greece one can find the:: biscuits:t, I mean the::£=
2. M → =nne::, nne:: Papaðopulu:: °en oreá tʃ'e tʃ'i::na:: °.
=ye::s, ye::s Papadopoulos⁶ °are ni::ce°.
3. A → etsi lalun, tʃ' i fokoLÁ::tes
they say so, chocoLÁ::tes too.
4. T → tʃ'inta fru[fri tʃ'e ta mpak^ha::nti::s,
what about frou[frou and baca::ndy::s,⁷
5. M [aku i sifititries mu:: £ulles i mpa ekratusen
[listen all my classmates £one was having
6. → piskot^ha fraulas, i alli portok^ha::lli, i alli fokolá::ta.
strawberry biscuits, the other ora::nge, the other chocola::te.

As illustrated in excerpt 1, in informal Cypriot-to-Cypriot conversations the consultants use exclusively the Cypriot variants [ʃ, tʃ, t^h, k^h].

5. Data Analysis of Style Shifting towards the Greek Variants

Style shifting towards the selected Greek phonological variants is going to be examined under the influence of three different audiences. In this section chi-square tests are applied in order to reveal the distribution of each phonological variant across the three audiences.

For the variable (k), the use of the Greek and Cypriot variant across the three audiences is shown in table 2.

⁶) A Greek biscuit company.

⁷) Frou-Frou and Bacandys are Cypriot biscuit companies.

Table 2. Variable (k) -[e, i]

Variable (k) -[e, i]	1) CY addressees & GR auditors	2) GR & CY addressees	3) GR addressees & CY auditors	Total
	No. of usage	No. of usage	No. of usage	No. of usage
GR variant [c]	33	90	225	348
CY variant [tʃ]	180	120	0	300
Total	213	210	225	648
$\chi^2(2) = 328.986, p < 0.0001$				

The results of chi-square test for the use of the Greek variant [c] across the three audiences are as follows: $\chi^2(2) = 328.986, p < 0.0001$. This shows that there is significant difference between the audiences that could not arise by chance.

For the variable (x) the use of the Greek and Cypriot variant across the three audiences is shown in table 3.

Table 3. Variable (x) -[e, i]

Variable (x) -[e, i]	1) CY addressees & GR auditors	2) GR & CY addressees	3) GR addressees & CY auditors	Total
	No. of usage	No. of usage	No. of usage	No. of usage
GR variant [ç]	9	60	90	159
CY variant [ʃ]	69	24	3	96
Total	78	84	93	255
$\chi^2(3) = 135.687, p < 0.0001$				

The results for the distribution of the Greek variant [ç] across the three audiences ($\chi^2(3) = 135.687, p < 0.0001$) show that there is significant difference between the audiences that could not arise by chance.

For the variable (t) the use of the Greek and Cypriot variant across the three audiences is shown in table 4.

Table 4. Variable (t)

Variable (t)	1) CY addressees & GR auditors	2) GR & CY addressees	3) GR addressees & CY auditors	Total
	No. of usage	No. of usage	No. of usage	No. of usage
GR variant [t]	8	14	21	43
CY variant [tʰ]	22	10	0	32
Total	30	24	21	75
$\chi^2(2) = 27.171, p < 0.0001$				

The results for the distribution of the Greek variant [t] across the three audiences ($\chi^2(2) = 27.171$, $p < 0.0001$) show that there is significant difference between the audiences that could not arise by chance.

For the variable (p) the use of the Greek and Cypriot variant across the three audiences is shown in table 5.

Table 5. Variable (p)

Variable (p)	1) CY addressees & GR auditors	2) GR & CY addressees	3) GR addressees & CY auditors	Total
	No. of usage	No. of usage	No. of usage	No. of usage
GR variant [p]	8	10	27	45
CY variant [p ^h]	16	8	0	24
Total	24	18	27	69
$\chi^2(2) = 25.896$, $p < 0.0001$				

The results of a chi-square test for the use of the Greek variant [p] across the three audiences are as follows: $\chi^2(2) = 25.896$, $p < 0.0001$. This shows that there is a significant difference between the audiences that could not arise by chance.

Table 6 represents the distribution usage totals and percentages of each of the Greek variants in the speech of the Cypriot consultants.

Table 6. Style shifting towards four Greek variants across three audiences

Greek Variants	1) CY addressees & GR auditors		2) GR & CY addressees		3) GR addressees & CY auditors	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
c	33/213	15	90/210	43	225/225	100
ç	9/78	12	60/84	71	90/93	97
t	8/30	27	14/24	58	21/21	100
p	8/24	33	10/18	56	27/27	100
Total	58/345	17	165/336	49	363/366	99

As illustrated in Table 6 in the first audience of *Cypriot addressees and Greek auditors*, consultants have used six times the amount of Cypriot variants ($n = 345$) compared to the Greek ones ($n = 58$). In all, speakers shift towards the Greek variants in an average of 17%.

As it is shown consultants switch towards the Greek variants [c, ç] at an average of 15% and 12%, respectively. The relatively low percentages of shift confirm Bell's (1984: 145) theory that "auditors affect style to a lesser but regular degree". Specifically the Greek variant [c] is used 33 times out of 213. The Greek variant [ç], which is the standard variant is used 9/78. Shift towards [t, p] achieved higher percentages, 27% and 33% each. This can be explained by Trudgill's

(1986:19) claim that the modification of a feature is easier when the phoneme already exists in the system. In general shifting towards the Greek variants [c, ç, t, p] is remarkable considering the fact that in a Cypriot-to-Cypriot conversation without the presence of Greeks the Greek variant occurs very few times.

As we move from the first audience to the second (*Greek and Cypriot addressees*), there is very significant increase in the use of the Greek variants. The Greek and the Cypriot variants are used 165 and 171 times respectively, i.e. speakers use the Greek variants in an average of 49 %. This confirms the theory that speakers accommodate primarily to their addressees (Bell 1984). Given that the audience comprises both Greek and Cypriot addressees, the use of both variants is expected. Speakers use the Greek variant [c] on an average of 43 %. The Greek variant [ç] is used at a 60/84 ratio, i.e. speakers converge towards the Greek variant [ç] at an average of 71 %. The Greek variants [t] and [p] were used in an average of 58 % and 56 % respectively.

In the third audience of *Greek addressees and Cypriot auditors* there is an overt preference towards the Greek variants. Speakers use almost exclusively the standard variants (363:366), i.e. speakers shift towards the Greek variants at an average of 99 %. They shift almost perfectly towards Greek, inasmuch as in that case the main role in the audience, that is the addressees, who are known, ratified and addressed are the Greeks. As demonstrated in Table 6, the use of the Greek variant [c] illustrates a case of total shifting; it is used 225/225 (100 %). The Greek variant [ç] was used almost exclusively 90/93, i.e. at an average of 97 %. The Greek variants [p] and [t] are used at an average of 100 %. The results confirm Bell's claims that variables with strong addressee effect show about half the variation as auditor effect (1984: 175).

6. Conclusions

In the present study I investigated the effect of three audiences in the phonological choices of Cypriot Greek speakers. The audiences were composed of the same consultants who were assigned different roles in each case. Given that we were interested in style shifting from Cypriot towards Greek, we recorded Cypriot Greek consultants conversing with three audiences in which the importance of Greeks in the interaction increased by passing from one audience to the next. Therefore in the first audience Greeks played the secondary role of the auditors, while Cypriots played the role of the addressees. In the second audience the role of Greeks increased to co-addressees along with Cypriots. In the third audience Greeks were the addressees, while Cypriots were only auditors.

The chi-square test analysis for each of the variants has shown that there is such a significant shift towards the usage of the Greek variants as we move

from the first to the second and the third audience; a circumstance which could not arise by chance. The results appear to confirm the theory of language style as determined through audience design. Accordingly, it is possible to suggest that the present work may be revealed as generally showing that speakers have the ability to design their style for a range of different addressees, and to a lesser degree for other audience members. As it has been demonstrated, when addressing bilingual audiences, speakers respond primarily to their addressees. Thus, style shift increases when moving from the first to the second and third audience accordingly with the increase of the role of Greeks in the conversation.

Even the presence of Greeks as auditors had a 17 % effect in style shifting. The move from the first to the second audience where the role of Greeks increased to co-addressees affected style shifting at an average of 32 %, whereas the move to the third audience where the Greeks were the participants in the conversation increased style shifting by an average of 50 %.

If we compare the results of the first audience with that of the second, we can see that in the second audience the speakers used the Greek variant [c] almost 3 times as much, the Greek variant [ç] almost 6 times as much, [t] 2 times as much and [p] 1,6 times as much. In the move from the second to third audience [c] was used almost 2,3 times more, [ç] 1,3 times more, [t] 1,7 times more and [p] 1,7 times more. The following is a more detailed layout:

- (1) The Greek variant [c] is used in an average of 15 % in the audience of Cypriot addressees & Greek auditors, while in an audience of both Greek & Cypriot addressees, its use increased to an average of 43 %. This shows that the addressee-designed shift is about 3 times as great as the auditor-designed shift (cf. Bell 1984: 172). Given the context (informal gathering) is the same, the difference in the percentages is attributed to the change of audience. As the role of Greeks in the conversation changed from auditor to addressee, the use of the Greek variant [c] increased. The average of 100 % tallied among an audience of Greek addressees & Cypriot auditors is more than twice as much compared to the average of 43 % tallied for the audience of Greek & Cypriot addressees.
- (2) The Greek variant [ç] was used at an average of 12 % in the audience of Cypriot addressees & Greek auditors and in an average of 71 % in the audience of Greek & Cypriot addressees; i.e. style shifting in the audience of Greek & Cypriot addressees is 6 times as much as in the audience of Cypriot addressees & Greek auditors. In the audience of Greek & Cypriot addressees [ç] was used at an average of 97 %. As it was explained in the case of the variant [c] this is ascribed to the effect of the audience. This confirms that “speakers treat auditors as second class addressees” (Bell,

1984: 174). As it is shown style-shifting towards the Greek variant [ç] was greater compared to that of the Greek variant [c].

- (3) The Greek variant [t] is used at an average of 27 % in the audience of Cypriot addressees & Greek auditors, 58 % in the audience of Greek & Cypriot addressees and 100 % in the audience of Greek addressees & Cypriot auditors.
- (4) The Greek variant [p] was used at an average of 33 % in the audience of Cypriot addressees and Greek auditors, at an average of 56 % in the audience Greek and Cypriot addressees. In the audience of Cypriot addressees and Greek auditors the variant [p] was used at a 100 % rate.

The shifts towards the Greek variants [t, p] seem to be easy for the speakers to make, and it appears that merely the presence of the Greeks as auditors triggered shifting. In general, the results confirm Bell's claims that variables with strong addressee effect show about half the variation as auditor effect (1984: 175).

The results show clearly that the audience affects the speech style of bilingual speakers. On the other hand, our results, which demonstrate a significant move in style shifting towards the Greek variants, rely to a significant extent on the fact that the present study was focused on young educated speakers. Younger generations are more capable than older ones in using SMG. This is largely due to the fact that older generations did not have as many opportunities for education in or contact with SMG. Of course, we must acknowledge the influence of the media, a powerful means for the use and dissemination of a language, as a conduit for SMG, as they were not as rich and pervasive in earlier years as they are today. Further research should be concentrated on how older generations understand and accommodate to SMG.

Acknowledgements

I am most grateful to my colleague Dr. Petroula Mavrikiou, statistician, for her invaluable assistance with the statistical analysis of my results.

Appendix

Transcription Conventions

- [Separate left square brackets, one above the other on two successive lines with utterances by different speakers,
- [indicates a point of overlap onset, whether at the start of an utterance or later.

- = Equal signs ordinarily come in pairs—one at the end of a line and another at the start of a next line. If the two lines connected by the equal signs are by the same speaker, then there was a single, continuous utterance with no break or pause, which was broken up in order to accommodate the placement of overlapping talk. If the lines connected by two equal signs are by different speakers, then the second followed the first with no discernible silence between them.
- . The period indicates a falling or final, intonation contour, not necessarily the end of a sentence.
- ? A question mark indicates rising intonation, not necessarily a question.
- , A comma indicates continuing intonation, not necessarily a clause boundary.
- :: Colons are used to indicate the prolongation or stretching of the sound just preceding them. The more colons the longer the stretching.
- word Underlining is used to indicate stress or emphasis.
- ° ° Two degree signs indicate that the talk between them is markedly softer than the talk around it.
- £word£ Word or Words enclosed by pound sterling signs indicate the word is articulated through a hearably smiling voice.
- An arrow marks significant turns

References

- Alfonzetti, Giovanna. 1998. The conversational dimension in code-switching between language and dialect in Sicily. In Peter Auer (ed.), *Code-switching in conversation*, 180–214. London: Routledge.
- Arvaniti, Amalia. 2002. Διμορφία, διγλωσσία και η εμφάνιση της Κυπριακής Κοινής [Dimorphy, diglossia and the emergence of the Cypriot koiné]. *Recherches en linguistique grecque*, vol. I, 75–78. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Bell, Alan. 1984. Language style as audience design. *Language in Society* 13, 145–204.
- Bell, Alan. 2001. Back in style: Re-working audience design. In Penelope Eckert & John R. Rickford (eds.), *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, 139–169. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chambers, Jack and Peter Trudgill. 1998. *Dialectology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Contossopoulos, Nikolaos. 1969. Συμβολή εις την μελέτην της κυπριακής διαλέκτου [A contribution to the study of the Cypriot dialect]. *Επετηρίς του Κέντρου Επιστημονικών Ερευνών* 3, 87–109.
- Contossopoulos, Nicos. 1994. *Dialekti ke Idiomata tis Neas Ellinikis*. Athens.
- Davy, Jim, Yiannis Ioannou and Anna Panayiotou. 1996. French and English loans in Cypriot diglossia. *Travaux de la maison del' Orient méditerranéen* 25: *Chypre hier et aujourd'hui entre Orient et Occident*, 127–136. Lyon: Maison del'Orient méditerranéen.
- Eckert, Penelope. 2001. *Linguistic variation as social practice*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ferguson, A. Charles. 1959. Diglossia. In Pier Paolo Giglioli (ed.), 1982, *Language and Social Context*, 232–251. London: Penguin Books.
- Giles, Howard and Powesland, Peter. 1997/1975. Accommodation theory. In Nicolas Coupland &

- Adam Jaworski (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: A Reader*, 232–239. Basingstoke: Macmillan (originally published 1975).
- Hymes, Dell. 1997. The scope of sociolinguistics. In Nicolas Coupland & Adam Jaworski (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: A Reader*, 12–22. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Katsoyannou, Marilena, Andreas Papapavlou, Pavlos Pavlou & Stavroula Tsiplakou. 2006. Διδιαλεκτικές κοινότητες και γλωσσικό συνεχές: η περίπτωση της κυπριακής. [Bidialectal communities and the linguistic continuum: the case of Cypriot]. In Mark Janse, Brian Joseph and Angela Ralli (eds.) *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, 156–171. Patras: University of Patras.
- Karyolemou, Marilena. 1997. Accommodation theory and the use of the aorist in the Cypriot variety. In Gaberell Drachman, Angeliki Malikouti-Drachman, Jannis Fykias and Cilia Klidi (eds.), *Greek Linguistics: Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Greek Linguistics* 2, 707–726. Salzburg: W. Neugebauer Verlag GmbH.
- Karyolemou, Marilena. 2000. Le chypriote: dialecte ou idiome. In Anastasios-Phivos Christides (ed.), *La langue grecque et ses dialects*, 111–115. Athens: Greek Republic, Direction of International Relations and Centre for the Greek Language (bilingual edition).
- Karyolemou, Marilena. 2006. Reproduction and innovation of communicative patterns in a former-'diglossic' community. Paper presented at *Trans 16: Innovations and Reproductions in Cultures and Societies, Vienna, 9–11 December 2005*. Available online at: http://www.inst.at/trans/16Nr/01_4/karyolemou6.htm.
- Karyolemou, Marilena and Pavlos Pavlou. 2001. Language attitudes and assessment of salient variables in a bi-dialectal speech community. In Josep Fontana et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the first International Conference on Language Variation in Europe*, 110–120. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.
- Labov, William. 1972. *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Labov, William. 2001. *Principles of linguistic change. Vol. 2. Social factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Levinson, Stephen. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moschonas, Spiros. 2002. Koini glossa kai dialektos: To zitima tis glossikis dimorfias stin Kipro (Common language and dialect: The issue of the linguistic diglossia in Cyprus). *Nea Estia* 151, 1745, 898–928.
- Newton, Brian. 1972a. *Cypriot Greek: its phonology and inflections*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Newton, Brian. 1972b. *The Generative Interpretation of Dialect: A Study of Modern Greek Phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Newton, Brian. 1983. Stylistic levels in Cypriot Greek. *Mediterranean Language Review* 1, 55–63.
- Papapavlou, Andreas and Pavlos Pavlou. 1998. A review of the sociolinguistic aspects of the Greek Cypriot dialect. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 19, 3, 212–220.
- Pavlou, Pavlos and Niki Christodoulou. 1996. Bidialectalism in Cyprus and its effects on teaching Greek as a foreign language. *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics*, 588–599. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50, 696–735.
- Terkourafi, Marina. 2004. The Cypriot koine: a recent development? *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference of Greek Linguistics, Rethymnon, 18–21 September 2003*. Rethymno: Linguistics Lab.
- Terkourafi, Marina. 2007. Perceptions of difference in the Greek sphere: The case of Cyprus. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 8, 60–96.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1986. *Dialects in Contact*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1992. Dialect contact, dialectology and sociolinguistics. In Kingsley Bolton & Helen Kwok (eds.), *Sociolinguistics Today: International Perspectives*, 71–79. London: Routledge.
- Tsiplakou, Stavroula. 2006. Cyprus: language situation. In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Linguistics* (2nd edn.), 337–339. Oxford: Elsevier.

- Tsiplakou, Stavroula, 2009. Code-switching and code mixing between related varieties: Establishing the blueprint. *The International Journal of the Humanities* 6, 49–66.
- Tsiplakou, Stavroula, Andreas Papapavlou, Pavlos Pavlou & Marianna Katsoyannou. 2006. Leveling, koineization and their implications for bidialectism. In Frans Hinskens (ed.), *Language Variation: European Perspectives: Selected papers from the Third International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE 3)*, Amsterdam, June 2005. *Studies in Language Variation* 1, 265–276. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.