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Abstract

This dissertation aims to study the potential role that education systems in post-conflict societies play in the reinforcement/containment of ethnic antagonism and, by extension, the sustenance/transformation of ethnic conflicts. Using primary and secondary data from Cyprus and Northern Ireland, research has focused on two specific mechanisms linking education and conflict: the cultural hypothesis and the suggested conflict-enhancing stimuli of nationalist historical narratives in schools, and the social differentiation hypothesis and the suggested conflict-enhancing impact of ethnic segregation in educational structures. Findings show that in the case of Northern Ireland, a common, pluralistic official historical narrative for both communities can reduce inter-group enmities by competing with vernacular, partisan stories that are likely to accentuate historical grievances while, in the case of Cyprus, the two contrasting, nationalistic, historical narratives taught in schools have an opposite effect by reinforcing the gap between the two communities’ narratives of victimisation. Findings across both cases as to the second hypothesis suggest that cross-community contact in schools can reduce the conflict by bringing about positive attitudes and behaviours towards the ‘other’ and, by extension, by improving the rules of ethnic interaction. Despite inconclusive results on the effect of both mechanisms in altering the content of identities, a crucial structural source of conflict, findings generally add validity to the two hypotheses.
Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1. The Research question and its goals

This dissertation aims to understand the processes that exacerbate/undermine ethnic conflict and, in particular, the role that educational systems potentially have within such processes. My initial view is that since ethnic conflicts emerge due to an existing or perceived discriminating ethnic divide, examining the role that education arguably plays in the construction of ethnic identities and the perception of the ‘other’ would be crucial in identifying key conflict dynamics. In accordance with Brubaker et al.’s definition, ethnic conflict is understood here as conflict where violence (structural/direct) is perpetrated across ethnic lines, in which at least one party is not a state (or a representative of a state) and in which ‘the putative ethnic difference is coded as having been integral rather than incidental to the violence, that is, in which the violence is coded as having been meaningfully oriented in some way to the different ethnicity of the target’ (1998:428). On the other hand, ‘education systems’ refer to the institutionalised education provided by the state (Thyne 2006:734). By attempting to examine the existence of two specific causal mechanisms: the ‘cultural hypothesis’ and the ‘social differentiation hypothesis’ through a case study design consisting of two post-conflict societies: Cyprus and Northern Ireland, the relationship between educational systems and the containment/reinforcement of ethnic antagonism as negative/positive indicators of ethnic conflicts will be assessed. Ethnic antagonism has been defined and is understood here as ‘politics shaped on the basis that everything is a zero-sum competition between exclusive rival visions’ (Morrow, 2004).

1.2. Connections to Theoretical and Policy-Making fields

At the same time as the nature of armed conflicts, especially after the end of the Cold war, has shifted from inter-state to intra-state conflicts (Grasa 2010; Harbem and Wallenstein 2010) with 90 to 95 percent of their totality belonging in the latter category (Grasa 2010:65), both peace and security studies researchers have stressed the extensive number of armed conflicts in which the division between opponents is defined to a large extent by their ethnic difference (Dennis Smith 2001 in Davies 2004:74). Although a large number of conflicts are now simultaneously entangled in webs of identity, politics and resources (Rothman et al. 2001:289) pointing to their multi-causality, various studies have stressed the extent to which territorial and resource-based grievances are now often superseded by ethno-political and
identitarian factors (Grasa 2010:65). An increased interest on civil wars from political scientists as well as peace and security studies researchers has thus emerged for theoretically and empirically examining not only possible causes and triggers of conflict but also potential conflict preventors and peace-builders. Upon these shifts in conflict dynamics from external to internal, examining where does education fit among the various conflict and conflict resolution theories has thus gained even more relevance (Sobhi Tawil 2001 in Davies 2004:7).

Given its highly cross-disciplinary nature, inquiry on educational issues of current concern is seen as an important ‘policy-oriented research’, that is, research that is best ‘defined in terms of its instrumental function rather than by the topics of study’ (Nisbet in Keeves 1988:139). In contrast to other explanations often identified behind ethnic conflicts, education provided by the state is, therefore, a policy-relevant variable (Dixon 2009:715). This means that it could be directly manipulated by governmental institutions and policy makers, arguably, to a much larger extent than other putative explanatory factors such as regime types or geographical conditions. As Jeffrey Dixon has put it ‘this [education] is something that all but the most destitute governments can alter through national policies’ (1999:715).

The findings of this research inquiry would thus be relevant for education policy choices and, simultaneously, for peacebuilding activities and measures. A consensus has emerged that, in order to be successful, a peace process must transform the structural sources of conflict – power imbalances and group-level inequalities; cultural sources: identity formations and intercultural misunderstandings and differences – (Darby and Mac Ginty, 2003) all variables on which education, arguably, has an effect. Although education is still seen as rather peripheral among the conditions contributing to ethnic conflict and, for that reason, it only represents a small fraction of humanitarian aid requests or actual aid donations in conflict-affected countries (EFA Global Monitoring Report 2011), additional empirical evidence on the relationship between the two could convince on the need for further – both quantitatively and qualitatively – investment in education in these contexts.

1.3. Structure of the dissertation

This dissertation consists of five chapters. In the following chapter, I will review the existing literature on the relationship between education and conflict while linking this research inquiry with existing theoretical frameworks. In chapter 3, I will outline and justify the
research strategy and data collection methods that this dissertation will employ. In chapter 4, I will present the findings from the data analysis for the two cases while situating them alongside relevant theories. In chapter 5, I will comparatively summarise the main findings of this research inquiry, while commenting on its limitations and outlining some indications for further research.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

As pointed out by various scholars the link between education and ethnic conflict remains a grossly under-analysed area (Davies 2004:7; Sommers 2002). Yet, there exists a considerable number of conflicting views and findings on the specific link between education and ethnic conflict with scholars pointing both to the conflict-moderating and conflict-enhancing stimuli of education. This chapter will firstly look at how existing literature deals with the complex and multidirectional relationship between education and conflict [...] by analysing where does education fit among the various causal mechanisms that might link the two, either in pre-conflict, conflict-ridden, or post-conflict societies. It will then proceed with analysing the two specific causal mechanisms that this dissertation will attempt to test.

2.1. Education and conflict in pre-conflict and conflict-ridden societies: a multidirectional relationship

The traditional assumption in the wider literature concerning education and conflict points to a negative relationship between levels of education and the risk of conflict. This view has been supported by both qualitative (Dupuy 2008) and quantitative evidence (Thyne 2006; Dixon 2009; Coenders et al. 2003) in a number of cross-national studies. The mechanisms on which the relationship is grounded are various. In particular and despite variations across different cultural and historical contexts, numerous studies have found a correlation between levels of tolerance and levels of education (Nunn et al. 1978; Weil 1985). Marcel Coenders and Peer Scheepers (2003) for example, attribute the negative link between education, ethnocentrism and out-group prejudice on socialisation theory and its central thesis alluding to the pacifying effects of the values, norms and modes of behavior which are cognitively transmitted by the educational systems. Furthermore, Clayton Thyne’s findings (2006) point to the stability effects, disincentives for violence, and the lowering of grievances that normally result from educational investment.

Yet, going against this common assumption, a plethora of scholars have come to support the view that schools, under certain conditions, might contribute more to conflict and violence than they do to peace (Davies 2004; Lange and Dawson 2008). Indeed, although traditionally not seen as a causal factor in itself, education has often been pointed out for its role in reinforcing the antecedents to conflict (Davies 2004:41).
2.1.1. Education and Resource-based Conflicts

As regards for example to resource-based conflicts where real or perceived economic divisions often overlapping with ethnic group boundaries incite violence, education, a highly valuable resource in itself (Bush and Saltarelli 2000:9), can be an important source of group tensions when provided unevenly. This link, which is supported by modernization theories of ethnicity that stress the unequal distribution of the benefits of modernity as causes of ethnic violence, (Robert Melson and Howard Wolpe 1970 in Horowitz 1985:101) has been identified by a plethora of scholars in various pre-conflict and conflict-ridden societies. Rwanda prior to the genocide (McLean Hilker 2011) and South Africa under apartheid with their biased ‘ethnic quota’ school systems, (Sarah Graham-Brown 1991 in Davies 2004:44) provide two real-world examples.

Similarly, refuting the dominant research finding associating educational attainment with increasing tolerance towards ethnic out-groups (Coenders et al. 2003:315), Mathew Lange and Andrew Dawson (2008), drawing on Samuel Huntington (1968), support the view that educated individuals who see their aspirations for social mobility and success unfulfilled due to real or perceived feelings of ethnic discrimination, are more likely to act violently towards the out-group. The view of the disparity between the aspirations and achievements of the educated as a major cause of civil war has the same theoretical underpinnings with Ted Gurr’s (1970) notion of relative deprivation that is, the discrepancy between what people think they deserve, and what they actually believe they can get. This causal link between schooling and ethnic violence often referred to as the Frustration-Aggression mechanism has also been pointed out by Pierre Bourdieu (1984:143-44), who has noted the centrality of educational institutions in creating those violence-prone individuals and their aspirations.

2.1.2. Education and Identity-based conflicts

While all previous mechanisms linking education with conflict have more to do with educational attainment and delivery systems, the type and content of education provided has also extensively been identified as an important contributor to ethnic tensions (Bush and Saltarelli 2000; Davies 2004). This is especially the case in identity-based conflicts where issues of identity such as aspirations for equal status with other ethnic groups, the need for a secure identity (Davies 2004:212) and fears of ethnic annihilation (Hugh Miall 1992 in Rothman et al. 2001:290) often combined with disputes over resources, are seen as central to
the grievances sparking off the conflict. According to Stathis Kalyvas identity labels related
to religion or ethnicity are not neutral but typically imply a theory of causation as to the
emergence of civil wars and their violence (2003:481). Similarly, for Pierre Bourdieu (1994),
identities constitute an ‘internalized structural impetus’ with a direct bearing on social
practices (in De Cillia 1999).

The mechanism sustaining the relationship between education and identity-based
contlict is related to the essential role often attributed to education in the process of ‘national
socialisation’ (De Cillia et al. 1999:153) and nation-building through the (re)-construction of
national identity and consciousness (Guibernau 1996:69; Michiyo Kiwako Okuma-Nyström
in Zajda et al.:2009; Gallagher 2005; Tawil 2004; Vom Hau 2009). Schools have been
traditionally seen as constituting society’s main socialisation agents (Davies 2004; Guibernau
1996) and as fulfilling an essential collective function: assuring ‘a sufficiently common body
of ideas and feelings among citizens without which any society is impossible’ (Émile
Durkheim 1922 in Guibernau 1996:25). In this process of the coalescence of national
loyalties and boundary construction, the role of history teaching and of historical memory
has been extensively discussed. (Smith 2005; Michiyo Kiwako Okuma-Nyström in Zajda et
al.:2009). National histories are often seen as written and perpetuated from the point of view
of ‘national self-determination’ (Canefe 2002:387) and it is, therefore, through their
dissemination in schools that conceptualizations of identity are transmitted (Vural and
Özuyanık 2008. As Falk Pingel has put it, history does not only describe the group but it also
constructs it, it ‘invents’ it (in Kizilyürek 2002). Similarly, for Homi Bhabha (1990), history
education is an important site for the implantation of the ‘official narrative’, the means
through which the nation is created. Given that ethnic conflict, in accordance with Roger
Brubaker’s and David Laitin’s definition, refers to a conflict in which ‘the putative ethnic
difference is coded as having been integral rather than incidental to the violence’ (1998:428),
both identity, one of the basic building blocks of ethnicity (Nagel 1994:152), and the
concrete institutions by which it is produced, reproduced and spread (De Cillia et al.
1999:155) are often seen as integral parts of the causal explanation.

Yet, although there seems to be a general acceptance in the literature that identity and
a popular awareness of ethnic categories is a necessary condition – as well as a result
(Rothman et al. 2001:296) – of ethnic conflict (Fearon and Laitin 2000; Davies 2004;
Horowitz 1985), as pointed out by James Fearon and David Laitin, no positive theory linking
processes of ethnic identity construction as independent variables to the occurrence of ethnic
violence as a dependent variable still exist (2000:846), which often makes education and its key role in the forging of national identities seem irrelevant to the explanation.

This ambiguity as to the intervening role of education in the reinforcement – or dismantling – of identity-based conflicts is also closely related to the traditional debate in the literature between primordialists and constructivists regarding the existence of social categories. The primordialist thesis holds that ethnic identities are socially or genetically fixed (Fearon and Laitin 2000:857) and can be viewed as a form of extended kinship based on primordial objects such as descent and indigenousness (Horowitz 1985:57), their ascriptive character pointing, therefore, to the limited role school education has to play beyond their social reproduction and maintenance (Okuma-Nyström in Zadja et al. 2009:38). On the other hand, the literature on constructivism argues that ethnicity is socially constructed by three different possible agents: structural forces such as social and economic processes (Anderson 1991), discursive formations (De Cillia et al. 1999:155), or individuals (Fearon and Laitin 2000) and stresses its symbolic, less rational dimension concerned with feelings and emotions (Guibernau 1996; Anthony Smith 1989 in Pecora 2001; Anderson 1991). School education could be seen as an agent of identity construction not only due to the discourse, symbolic and cultural systems that it disseminates but also as a social force in itself. According to Pierre Bourdieu (1994), ‘through […] educational structures and social rituals, the state moulds mental structures and imposes common principles of vision and division […]. And it thereby contributes to the constructions of what is commonly designated as national identity’ (in De Cillia et al. 1999:156).

The uncertainty as to whether the formation of ethnic identities constitutes a necessary condition for ethnic violence is also associated to the question of whether identity construction and the dissemination of a common ‘vision’ necessarily involves ‘division’. According to Montserrat Guibernau and the constructivist-type proposition, among the defining criteria of national identity we find not only similarity and a sense of complicity among in-group members but also some kind of differentiation from others (1996). In a similar vein, Donald Horowitz highlights the powerful role of contrast in the growth of group identity (1985:82). Although studies have demonstrated that cultural differences as such do not necessarily imply violence (John McGarry and Brendan O’Leary 1995 in Fearon and Laitin 2000:846) numerous scholars as for example Bruce Kapferer and Gérard Prunier support the view that ethnic publics are constituted by ethnic discourses that predispose them to violence against ethnic ‘others’ (in Fearon and Laitin 2000:846). In line with the constructivist-type proposition that the social construction of group identity necessarily
entails differentiation and the implied potential for an antagonistic relationship with the ‘other’ (Fearon and Laitin 2000:851), structural and discursive formations of ethnicity could thus be seen as a potential motive for conflict. It is in this possible antecedent of identity-based conflicts that the deliberate and unintentional (Davies 2004:23) conflict-enhancing stimuli of education could fit.

Furthermore, the debate between constructivists and primordialists simultaneously puts into question the potential transformational peace-building impact of education. If in contrast to the constructivists’ belief that identity is ‘malleable’ (Smith 2005:183, Peter Weinreich 1989 in McGlynn et al. 2004) and inter-group hostility is not an eternal condition, one takes into account the primordialists’ claim that ethnic violence results from antagonisms that are essential, enduring properties of ethnic groups (Fearon and Laitin 2000:849) then, arguably, educational systems have little role to play in transforming inter-group enmities and transcending conflict. Although Keneth Bush and Diana Saltarelli point out the potential constructive peace-building role of education in its contribution towards altering the rules of ethnic interaction rather than in altering the content of group identities (2000), the constructivist thesis seems to suggest that the two might be interrelated and the latter a precondition for the former.

2.2. Education and conflict in post-conflict societies: a multi-directional relationship

As in pre-conflict and conflict-ridden societies, the dual conflict-enhancing and conflict-moderating potential impact of education is also to be found in post-conflict, societies. As various studies have pointed out, in divided, post-crisis societies, education can either reproduce or undermine the structural/latent symptoms of conflict that linger after violence has ended (Bush and Saltarelli 2000; Tawil 2004). In order to examine how educational arenas can either have a multiplier effect on conflict or interrupt processes towards more violence and reinforce reconciliation, Lynn Davies has proposed complexity theory as a theoretical framework (2004). One of the main features of the theory is the study of ‘complex adaptive systems’ (CAS) to which according to Davies educational systems as ‘sets of strange attractors coming together to enable adaptation to new turbulences in society’ (2004:28) belong. Among the central features that characterise educational systems as CAS, the two which are most relevant to this research project are the ‘power of information’ as this comes through the curriculum and textbooks and school’s ‘connectivity’ (Davies 2004) both
with other social arenas – e.g. the home, the community – but also, ideally, through the ‘encounter’ in educational arenas, between different social categories such as ethnic groups.

2.3. Summary and Gaps in the Literature

In sum, research conducted so far has contributed to the understanding of the different possible mechanisms through which education can either prevent/exacerbate conflict or a posteriori transform/reproduce it. Yet, gaps in both theoretical and empirical research remain. As pointed out by various scholars, the link between education and ethnic conflict remains a grossly under-analysed area, most often lacking a theoretical framework to underpin it (Davies 2004, Sommers 2002). Empirically, the scarcity of related empirical evidence presents a serious drawback in gauging the exact impact of education in pre-crisis, crisis and especially post-crisis situations. As explained in the literature, this is due to a series of factors. First of all, the complexity of assigning causality (Hayes et al. 2007:464) when the relationship between educational systems and the perpetuation/transformation of conflict not only does not rely on a simple cause-effect or stimulus-response (Davies 2004:185) but also when multiple societal variables come into play. Secondly, the difficulty of measuring the long-term, more affective and qualitative effects of educational policies on students (Davies 2004:163); Thirdly, due to the endogenous element involved given that educational policies adopted are more often than not both the result of, and a trigger of conflict (Bush and Saltarelli 2000).

More research therefore needs to be carried out on the specific societal impact of education at each of the different phases of conflict in order to better understand how nation-states can anticipate, minimise/maximise and manage its potential detrimental/beneficial effects. By looking at two potential, highly interrelated causal mechanisms that might link education and protracted ethnic conflict in post-crisis situations, the role of educational systems either as deformers or transformers/ peace-builders will be examined (See Figure 1).

Figure 1: Factors Exacerbating or Restraining Conflict at Different Phases (Miall 2003:7).
2.4. Causal Mechanisms and Theoretical Frameworks

The Cultural Hypothesis

The first causal mechanism potentially connecting education with ethnic conflict in post-conflict societies to be examined is closely linked to the Cultural Hypothesis. The underlying mechanism of the Cultural Hypothesis sees ethnic animosities and grievances – rather than for example rationalist calculations and greed – which are socially constructed as the main cause of ethnic conflict and views different values, narratives, discourses and symbols passed on in school as the main causal mechanism connecting the two variables (Smith 2005:93; Brubaker and Laitin 1998). Depending on the form and content of these teachings, the effect of education on ethnic conflict can thus be either positive or negative. Based on this hypothesis, the binary nature of history teaching as it relates either to conflict or to conflict resolution is questioned. Specifically, the hypothesis of whether history teaching and, in particular, official historical narratives reinforce/undermine ethnic conflict through the strengthening/containment of ethnic antagonisms is examined through the following two interrelated mechanisms sustaining the link between the two:

- The deployment and of nationalist/ pluralistic historical narratives and the ensuing construction of opposing/common norms and identities

The Social differentiation Hypothesis

The second causal mechanism to be examined is linked to the Social differentiation Hypothesis. While the previous mechanism emphasises the cultural/historical grounding of ethnic antagonism (Brubaker and Laitin 1998:442) as it is constructed through history education and memory, the social differentiation hypothesis (Smith 2005:93) underlines its social psychological underpinnings and relational aspects on which education equally has an effect. The underlying mechanism of the social differentiation hypothesis views educational structures and, in particular, segregation/integration along ethnic lines in school as a main cause of ethnic division/ cooperation. The central tenets of the hypothesis are premised on Gordon Allport’s (1954) Contact Theory according to which, contact between members of different ethnic groups, especially when institutionally sanctioned, results in the erosion of mutual ignorance and suspicion, of group differences and therefore in more tolerant and positive attitudes (Hewstone et al. 2006:115; Smith 2005:93). The second hypothesis that will be examined is thus whether contact in the school environment is likely to undermine the
conflict by fostering sentiments of reconciliation among ethnic groups. Positive indicators of these sentiments are positive feelings/attitudes towards the out-group, and a less sectarian identification (Hewstone et al. 2006:115).

Figure 2: The Conflict Triangle (Miall 2003).
Chapter 3: Research Methodology

This chapter will briefly outline and justify the research strategy and data collection methods that this dissertation will employ to examine the two hypotheses. It should be noted that given the diverse focal point of the two hypotheses to be examined and differences as far as the accessibility to primary data in the two cases is concerned, data collection tools vary across both the two cases and the two causal mechanisms.

3.1. Research Strategy and Design

In order to examine the two causal mechanisms, and in general the relationship between educational systems and the containment/reinforcement of ethnic antagonism as negative/positive indicators of ethnic conflicts, a case study strategy will be used. Given the high contextual heterogeneity that characterizes the phenomena we often lump together as ethnic conflicts, and the resulting plea of various scholars for a more disaggregated analysis of these (Brubaker and Laitin. 1998), this is arguably an appropriate research method for gaining further insights into the exact causal pathways that can lead to these occurrences. As Brubaker et al. point out, case studies can provide ‘rich material on micro-social processes at low levels of aggregation that macro theories miss’ (1998:97).

3.1.1. Case Selection

A case-study design with educational systems as the units of analysis will thus be used. For the case of Cyprus, apart from a personal motivation, my in-depth local knowledge and understanding of the cultural foundations of its society which would facilitate the collection and interpretation of primary data also account for this selection. Selection of the two cases: Cyprus and Northern Ireland seems suitable for various reasons. As regards the dependent variable, a series of commonalities characterises the two cases. In particular, although the bi-communal physical violence has subsidized in both contexts, there continues to be division and political dispute on the basis of ethnic and religious differences (Bekerman et al. 2009:2) which is why both conflicts are often referred to as ‘protracted’. Furthermore, patterns of identity, social segregation, and psycho-cultural aspects such as feelings of prejudice and suspicion which are all involved in the two mechanisms that will be examined (Hayes et al. 2007; Hewstone et al. 2006), are among the factors sustaining the two conflicts. Scholars have warned that findings related to conflict resolution are often culturally specific and not always culturally transferable (Paul Lederach 2005 in Davies 2004:185). Yet, as the causes
and dynamics of ethnic conflict are likely to affect the origins, trajectories, and outcomes of peace processes (Byrne 2001), these causal commonalities are important as findings regarding the peacebuilding role of education can be transferable not only across the two cases but also in similar conflict-ridden contexts. On the other hand, variations across the two countries in the educational aspects this dissertation will focus on and their effects will generate more robust evidence on the validity of the two hypotheses. Given the relevant educational reforms to the two mechanisms adopted in Northern Ireland such as the implementation of a common history curriculum and the creation of integrated schools in contrast to the dismal changes observed in Cyprus, comparison between the two educational systems can offer important insights into the exact impact of specific educational policies.

3.2. Data Collection Methods

**Cultural Hypothesis**

In order to test the first hypothesis across both cases this dissertation will draw both from secondary literature that has already examined the role of school history in the reinforcement/erosion of ethnic antagonism but also from selected documents on history education curricula containing relevant mission or value statements regarding the role of history teaching in society (IIEP 2006) that have been published online by the two countries’ national education departments and their associated affiliations. Ambiguity remains as regards the classification of these latter documents either as primary or secondary sources. Yet, given Finnegan’s suggestion that the role of the documentary source can be ‘relative’ and ‘depend on the purpose of the researcher’ (in Sapsford and Jupp 2006:145) and given my understanding of these particular documents as direct, up to date indicators of a government’s objectives and, subsequently, actions regarding history teaching – despite the possibility of certain intended omissions – (Mangen 1999), they will be interpreted as rather primary sources.

Although for the case of Northern Ireland the availability of data on textbook content and the cultural hypothesis in general was much more limited (Hayes et al. 2007:463) for the case of Cyprus, primary evidence from history textbooks used in secondary education that have already been extensively analysed in the secondary literature will be used. Relevant evidence from both the textbooks and documents on history education curricula will be chosen upon qualitative content analysis that ‘aims to reveal underlying assumptions that
cannot be measured quantitatively’ (Pingel 2010). In line with the cultural hypothesis’s main premises, relevant evidence will be selected according to two sensitivity criteria related to ethnicity: 1) the proportion of facts and views/interpretations and the existence of multi-perspective versus mono-causal historical narratives and 2) the extent of differentiation with the ‘other’ and the existence of exclusive versus inclusive definitions of national identities (International Institute for Educational Planning 2006, Pingel 2010:68).

Social Differentiation Hypothesis

In order to examine the second causal mechanism this dissertation will firstly draw from empirical data provided in the secondary literature. For the case of Northern Ireland, the availability of an extensive number of empirical data on ‘contact work’ (Hayes et al. 2007:463) and the costly levels of accessibility to required primary data account for this choice. On the other hand, the paucity of empirical evidence on the social differentiation hypothesis for the case of Cyprus, and the lower costs of accessibility to primary data account for my choice of proceeding to examine the hypothesis with a set of questionnaires.

Questionnaires

Going a step further beyond the insights that can be obtained from the relevant academic literature, the additional collection and analysis of primary data will enable the provision of more accurate and reliable answers to the research questions. A questionnaire which is defined by Ronald Wolf as a ‘self-report instrument used for gathering information about variables of interest to an investigator’ (in Keeves 1988:478) was thus conducted. Given the complexity of measuring and evaluating the exact impact of specific educational policies especially with regards to specific social phenomena (Hughes 2007) – in this case ethnic antagonism – primary evidence on the views and attitudes of a number of students can arguably shed more light on educational policies’ exact nature and effect and the relationship between these two.

The use of the questionnaires has two main objectives. Firstly, to gain an insight into current Cypriot students’ identifications as well as attitudes and behaviors towards the other community and to examine any correlation of these with levels of contact between the two communities either in school or in any other institutional context. And, secondly, to gain further primary insights into history teaching in Cyprus by analysing the views – both
descriptive and prescriptive – of students on the way history is currently taught. For the latter, for which the aim is rather ‘descriptive’ (Rosier in Keeves 1988:107), an open-ended question asking for the student’s view on the purpose of history teaching and two closed-ended questions: one asking to evaluate the type of current history teaching; and the other their views as to the emergence of the conflict by selecting from a predetermined set of responses were employed. For the former, for which the purpose is rather ‘explanatory’, that is ‘to examine relationships between various factors’ and to explain differences in terms of these explanatory factors (Rosier in Keeves 1988:107), a set of closed-ended questions containing a series of sentences and adjectives which allowed inferences to be made about the attitude and opinions of the students were used.

It has to be noted that due to time constraints both for adequately selecting a representative sample of schools as well as for processing the results, a very small sample (14 respondents), has been used, and thus caution should be applied when interpreting the findings. Respondents were randomly chosen and consisted of current secondary students, equally from both communities, permanently residing in Cyprus. The fact that this age cohort has not directly experienced either extensive inter-communal violence or intercomunal coexistence and has been externally informed as regards to the conflict by social institutions could, arguably, provide crucial insights on the effect of education.
This chapter presents an analysis on the validity of the two mechanisms in the two cases: Northern Ireland and Cyprus. To do this, after a brief introduction on relevant aspects of the two countries’ education systems, the nature and impact of the two hypotheses’ specific educational areas of interest will be examined.

**4.1. The Case of Northern Ireland**

The Education System

A segregated education system along denominational lines whereby schools were run by their respective confessional communities: Catholics and Protestants was established in Northern Ireland since its foundation in 1921 (Smith 2005; Hayes *et al.* 2007). An extensive number of scholars have stressed the underlying role of the overt or latent differences in the separate school systems and the resultant development of different mind-sets behind the emergence of the conflict (Smith 2005; Hayes *et al.* 2007). Today, although differentiation between maintained/Catholic schools and controlled/Protestant-dominated schools persists, positive reforms have also been adopted. The first integrated school was institutionalised in 1981 following with the *de facto* introduction of a common curriculum with the 1989 Education Reform Order (Hayes *et al.* 2007; Fischer 2011). Yet, according to a 2007 report of the Department of Education of Northern Ireland, only 6% of the total school population belongs to the integrated educational sector, with 92% of Protestant children attending a state school and 91% of Catholic ones attending a voluntary school (DENI 2007). Based on the two hypotheses, the following section will examine whether the existing educational system can function as a potential transformer of the conflict.

**4.1.1. The Cultural Hypothesis**

Nationalist or Pluralistic Historical Narratives?

The institutionalization of a common curriculum has meant the development of a single official historical narrative in Northern Ireland. Yet, beyond this, the inclusion of multiple perspectives within the common official historical narrative seems the prevailing assumption (Barton *et al.* 2007). Indicatively, the ‘Understanding of different perspectives and
interpretations’ as well as the development of an ‘ability to challenge stereotypical biased or distorted viewpoints with appropriately sensitive, informed, and balanced responses’ figure, respectively, among the statutory requirements and aimed learning outcomes for history in the first three years of secondary education in Northern Ireland (NIC 2007). Translation of these objectives into actions can be seen through the inclusion of the cross-curricular theme ‘Education for Mutual Understanding’ (Smith 2005) in the history curriculum, with the aim of investigating ‘how history has been selectively interpreted to create stereotypical perceptions and to justify views and actions’ (NIC 2007).

While evidence from the Department of Education Inspectorate seems to suggest that these objectives are generally met (DENI 2004), a potential drawback as regards the content of the curriculum and the ‘symmetrical’ approach to teaching history stands out. Specifically, although a ‘balanced’ study of ‘Irish, British, European and global contexts’ is set out as a learning objective, the study of Northern Ireland’s post-1960 period and of the contentious ‘Troubles’ – a likely historical identification of Catholics – remains an elective course for students past age 14, which is why the history curriculum is often seen as a legitimation of Protestants’ cultural and historical background (Barton et al. 2005:110).

The impact of a common historical narrative
In order to examine the validity of the cultural hypothesis, the congruence between the objectives of the common curriculum and their actual impact on students will be assessed. The assumption is that exposure to pluralistic historical narratives and the ensuing construction of more inclusive common norms and identities are likely to undermine ethnic antagonism and the conflict. The validity of the hypothesis can be tested by measuring the effect of exposure to the required common history narratives on the countering of sectarian identifications but also on the countering of vernacular, partisan historical narratives which are likely to perpetuate the conflict by justifying contemporary attitudes and policy positions (Barton et al. 2005, Walker 1996) and, by sustaining out-group prejudices (Conway 2006).

As regards the first, empirical evidence suggests that sectarian community identifications are often deepened rather than countered as students appear to draw selectively from the formal curriculum the partisan historical narratives of their own political/religious communities (Barton et al. 2005; Conway 2006). Given the theoretical connection between history and identity formation (Gallagher 1989 in Barton et al. 2005) and the fact that for 50% of students the most common basis with history is related to Protestant/Unionist or Catholic/Nationalist heritage (Barton et al. 2003), exposure to a
common narrative might still arouse differing identifications among students. Indeed, open-ended interviews with students who had completed each of the first three years of the secondary history curriculum showed that age thirteen to fourteen – Key Stage 3 – the time when the study of national history is compulsory, coincided with a narrowing of students’ identifications, with the level of students adhering to their religious/national identity rising from 21 percent to 35 percent (Barton et al. 2003).

These variances on the effect of a common narrative seem closely related to the second potential positive indicator of the containment of the conflict: the countering of vernacular, community narratives. As the views extracted from interviews with twenty six teachers from both controlled and maintained schools in Mid Ulster Northern Ireland show, when measuring the effect of history lessons on conflict reduction indicators, intervening variables and external influences such as emotive forces, personal experiences as well as pressure from parents and peers must also be taken into account (Conway 2006; Barton et al. 2003). Indicatively, an empirical study conducted under the aegis of the Northern Ireland Community Relations Council has found that the primary influences on young people’s perceptions of the past are parents (52%), school (47%) and relatives (25%) (Ulf Hansson and McCaffery 2010:69). Although interviews on the views of students from both communities has shown that students seem to consider school and the common curriculum as the most important influence on their understanding of national history (Barton et al. 2003), lack of insights into the ‘other’s’ perspective, and the difficulty of challenging the in-group’s vernacular narratives have also been evidenced (Barton et al. 2009:34). These observations seem to reify Mikhail Bakhtin’s (1982) theory according to which the competing influences of school and community narratives are both internalised to a lesser or larger extent by students, through a process he terms as ‘internally persuasive dialogues’ (in Barton et al. 2009).

4.1.2. The Social Differentiation Hypothesis

The institutionalization of contact in schools in Northern Ireland, as well as variations in the independent variable due to the persistence of both integrated and segregated schools, arguably, allows a more complete examination of the social differentiation hypothesis. The validity of the hypothesis can be tested by measuring the effect of attendance at an integrated school, and by extension of cross-community contact, on a series of positive indicators of conflict resolution.
Given that social identity plays an important role in both maintaining and undermining the conflict (Cairns 1980 in McGlynn et al. 2004), with strong sectarian identifications often pointed out as important deformers of conflict resolution (Hewstone et al. 2006) examination of the effect of integrated education on these is essential. Yet, related empirical data provided in the secondary literature seems inconclusive. Analysis of data collected from surveys conducted on a pooled sample of the adult population of Northern Ireland between 1998 to 2006, has shown that attendance at integrated schools has positive long-term benefits in promoting a less sectarian identity as both Catholics and Protestants who had attended either mixed or integrated schools were more likely to adopt a more neutral stance in relation to their identity preferences (Hayes et al. 2007). Yet, research by Claire McGlynn et al. (2001) not only found the limited impact of integrated education on the sectarian identifications of 63% of former students of integrated schools but also that in a minority of cases these had been strengthened. As a Catholic principal of a primary integrated school stated: ‘We recognize differences and encourage children to celebrate these differences. Everything should be out in the open’ (Bekerman et al. 2009).

Furthermore, given the criticality of the relational aspects of conflict (Lederach 1997), the relationship between a set of attitudinal and behavioural factors that have a direct bearing on inter-group relations, and integrated education, has to be examined. In particular, as to attitudes towards the out-group, empirical data provided in the secondary literature demonstrate positive correlations between inter-group levels of contact among both Catholic and Protestants and out-group trust, out-group forgiveness, and a willingness towards cross-community mixing (Hewstone et al. 2006; Mc Glynn et al. 2004). Yet, beyond this, more importantly, positive attitudinal changes seem to be translated into more positive behaviour towards the ‘other’. Empirical studies comparing students from integrated and nonintegrated schools have found that the former are more likely to have social contact and friendships with members of the ‘other’ community (Maurice Stringer et al. 2000; Carol McClenahan 1996 in Hayes et al. 2007; Hayes et al. 2009). Indicatively, research with a sample of past students of integrated schools showed that the number of mixed friendships held by the students rose from 41% prior to attending to integrated schools, to 67% afterwards (McGlynn et al. 2004:154). Yet, again, a series of intervening variables between integrated education and its potential positive effects on the containment of the conflict have been identified. As respondents from sample surveys with exposure to sectarian violence reported, personal experience of sectarian violence stands out as the most important (Hewstone et al. 2006).
4.2. The case of Cyprus

The Education System

The Cyprus educational system has been segregated in structure along ethnic lines long before the sparking of the conflict and the physical separation of the two communities. Since British rule, public education has been controlled by two separate communal chambers: the Greek and the Turkish, each dependent on its respective ‘mother-country’ for educational policies, orientation and textbooks provision (Philippou and Klerides 2010:223). A plethora of scholars have thus pointed out the instrumental role played by education, as an underlying cause, in the emergence of the conflict (Makriyianni and Psaltis 2007; Vural and Özuyanık 2008; Pollis 1973; Canefe 2002). Today, although, given the frozen conflict, educational segregation persists, some efforts incited by the Council of Europe and the UN for peacebuilding reforms in education are made (COE 2004). In its main objectives for the academic term 2010-2011, the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Cyprus has set the ‘cultivation of a culture of peaceful coexistence, of mutual respect and cooperation’ between the two communities as a goal and a means of transcending the conflict (MOEC, 2010). Based on the two hypotheses, the following section will examine whether the existing educational system continues to function as an exacerbating factor of the conflict or as a potential transformer.

4.2.1. The Cultural Hypothesis

Nationalist or Pluralistic Historical Narratives?

In terms of the proportion of facts and views/interpretations current history teaching in Cyprus and the official history textbooks employed by the two communities are generally characterised by limited pluralistic representations and narratives and strong ethnocentric elements (Hadjiyianni 2006; Beyidoğlu Önen and Jetha-Dağseven 2010; Psaltis et al. 2011). The apparent subsumption of the history of the two communities in official historical narratives within the history of Greece and Turkey, reveals a strong ethnocentric focus (Papadakis 2008; Beyidoğlu Önen and Jetha-Dağseven 2010). Although contentious events seem to be equally represented in both communitie’s textbooks, this is mostly done through opposing lenses (Hadjiyianni 2006). Content analysis of history textbooks employed by both communities has identified a series of discursive apparatuses through which these ‘monolithic’ and ‘nationalistic’ (Makriyianni and Psaltis 2007) narratives are evidenced.
In particular, blame-shifting, biased narratives and omissions have been identified in both communities’ history textbooks. This is especially the case as regards to contentious events such as the initiation of the conflict and the period of direct inter-ethnic violence in the 1960s (Irkad 2002) where the blame for the sufferings of each community and the burden of responsibility is often solely projected onto the other community and its respective motherland (Hadjiyianni 2006:46, 61; Koullapis 2002). The following testimony, cited by a Greek-Cypriot secondary history textbook is illustrative: ‘In this chaos, a Greek policeman was seriously injured, and two Turkish-Cypriots were killed (…). The Turkish leadership proceeded in applying one-sided decisions and actions, and used as a pretense the bloodshed of December 1963’ (MOEC 2003:37-38 in Hadjiyianni 2006:68).

Furthermore, a discourse of ‘victimisation’ is apparent in both communities’ textbooks (Hadjiyianni 2006). This is often transmitted by means of one-sided depictions of losses and sufferings but also the appeal to emotions through the use of emotionally loaded descriptions, personal testimonies, pictorial illustrations and numerical representations of the in-group’s victims. (Hadjiyianni 2006; Beyidoğlu Önen and Jetha-Dağseven 2010; Papadakis 2008; Koullapis 2002). The following personal testimony cited in a Turkish-Cypriot secondary history textbook with reference to the violent inter-ethnic events that occurred in 1967 and their effects on the in-group is also exemplary: ‘The Greek-Cypriots attacked a teacher’s house with a rocket launcher; they also dug the roof and dropped a bomb into the house. After the destruction of the house, the Greek-Cypriots entered the house and committed homicide’ (Serter and Fikretoğlu 2002:161 in Vural and Özuyanık 2008:148).

If internalized, this promotion of a highly selective ‘collective memory’, often referred to as the ‘chosen trauma syndrome’ is likely to reinforce ethnic antagonism and perpetuate the conflict (Weldon 2009; Zembylas and Bekerman 2008; Miall 2004). The dissemination of feelings of apprehension and rage against the ‘other’ (Hadjiyianni 2006), the instrumentalisation of the past for the legitimation of the two sides’ conflictual political aims of the present and the future (Yashin 2002), as well the hindrance of any constructive communication between the two groups as a result of their inability to ‘cross their memories’ (Koullapis 2002), are among the various mechanisms sustaining the link between the two.

Inclusive or Exclusive definitions of National Identities?

The establishment of sectarian, nationalistic historical narratives by the two communities in itself demonises the ‘other’ and contributes in the formation of conflicting national identities (Beyidoğlu Önen and Jetha-Dağseven 2010:16; Barton et al. 2003). Yet,
content analysis of history textbooks revealed an additional number of discursive apparatuses which foment differentiation from the ‘other’.

In particular, the ‘identification stance’ or ‘primordialist model’ and the resulting promotion of sectarian identities along ethnic lines that ignore any common territorial or civic elements (Vural and Özuyanık 2008) has been identified in both communities’ textbooks (Papadakis 2008). In the Greek-Cypriot textbooks, for example, the Cypriot category is mostly represented as an exclusionary category often referring solely to the ‘Greeks’ of Cyprus and exemplifying the ‘politics of denial’ of the ‘other’ (Papadakis 2008; Hadjiyianni 2006; Kizilyürek 2002:434). Similarly, despite a short paradigm shift of ‘post-nationalist transformation’ (Vural and Özuyanık 2008) following the reforms of history textbooks in 2003, current Turkish-Cypriot history textbooks which are in use since 2009 seem to have returned to the same model of identification and emphasis on ethnic purity. As the current history textbook used in grade 9 puts it: ‘there is not one nation but two different nations in Cyprus: [these are] Turks and Greeks (Kıbrıs Tarihi 2009:90 in Beyidoğlu Önên and Jetha-Dağseven 2010:42).

Furthermore, perceptions of the ‘other’ based on mistrust and fear (Vural and Özuyanık 2008) are disseminated through the construction of ‘binary oppositions’. In the case of the Turkish-Cypriot textbooks, official historical narratives differentiate between the two communities by alluding to an ‘authoritative majority’ and an ‘oppressed minority’ (Hadjiyianni 2006). In a similar vein, in the case of the Greek-Cypriot textbooks, a binary opposition separating the majority/the sufferers from the minority/the conquerors is also often implied (Hadjiyianni 2006).

As it is evidenced discursive constructions of identity in the two communities’ history textbooks are based not only on ‘strategies of assimilation’ but also of ‘dissimilation’ which although promotes solidarity among the in-group it simultaneously foments distanciation from the out-group (De Cillia et al. 1999:161). Given that the Cyprus conflict is rooted in the politics of identity, this ‘perpetuation and justification strategy’ (De Cillia et al. 1999:160) is likely to reinforce the conflict and legitimate the status quo by insinuating that no possibility of coexistence ‘under the umbrella of a common political entity’ seems to exist (Vural and Özuyanık 2008).

The impact of contrasting historical narratives

Evidence from the questionnaires seems to confirm the ethnocentric character of current history teaching in Cyprus. To the question of whether current history teaching in
Cyprus is pluralistic only 5 out of 14 students responded affirmatively, with one respondent specifying that this is the case only in Turkish Cypriot schools. Interestingly when asked for their view on the purpose of history teaching at school, the majority of students included a strong nationalist dimension in their responses, reflecting, arguably, the dominant history teaching methods and focus they find at school. Statements such as ‘to learn about our civilisation and culture’, ‘to appreciate our country’s traditions’ or ‘to know what happened in our country’ are exemplary.

In order to test the validity of the cultural hypothesis, the extent to which contrasting interpretations of historical narratives and opposing sectarian identities have been internalised by students has to be assessed. As regards to the latter, adherence to the communal identity, a broader identity that embraces both communities in the conflict, by 9 out of 14 respondents despite the apparent promotion of essentialised identities to be found in official historical narratives, arguably points to the contingent role of education in the construction of identities. In fact, a recent survey among Turkish-Cypriots has showed that fluctuations in identity descriptions that often come to transcend ethno-cultural boundaries are strongly influenced by socialization processes as well as political-ideological stands (Vural and Rustemli 2006 in Vural and Özuyanik 2008). As regards to the former, the contrasting views of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots students that echo their respective community’s narratives as to the emergence of the conflict seem to exemplify the great gap that exists between the two communities’ ‘official historical narratives of victimisation’ (Psaltis et al. 2011). Although additional external influences such as vernacular stories and parental attitudes arguably had a role in the internalisation of these views, the detrimental, divisive role of education is equally evidenced.

4.2.2. The Social Differentiation Hypothesis

The limited social interaction between members of two communities in Cyprus and the almost total absence of inter-group contact in the school environment can give crucial insights into the validity of the social differentiation hypothesis. To test this causal mechanism potentially linking education and conflict, the observable indicators derived from the students’ responses to the questionnaires will be used. Based on these observable indicators, students’ feelings and attitudes towards the out-group, as well as their ‘direction’ (positive/negative) and ‘intensity’ (Anderson in Keeves 1988:421) and the type of students’ social identification (sectarian/unitary) will be inferred and examined as to their relation with
levels of contact with the out-group. To do this and analyse my data, some descriptive statistics using Excel’s spreadsheet have been drawn.

In general, 78.6 percent of the students did not have any contact with the out-group at school. Yet, 92.9 percent of the respondents described their attitude towards the out-group as ‘friendly’ with, indicatively, only one student without out-group exposure having described their attitude as ‘indifferent’. In a similar vein, responding to a question which required students to state their feelings towards the other community on a scale resembling a thermometer ranking from 0 to 100 degrees, all 14 students ranked their feelings between 50 and 100 degrees. Yet, indicatively, the two lowest scores (50 degrees) were found on students with no out-group contact and the two highest ones (100 degrees) among students who had experienced inter-group mixing in some institutional context, the one in school and the other in bi-communal meetings/events. Thirdly, as regards to the third variable of interest: the type of social identification, given the fact that 71 percent of the students seems to adhere to the unitary Cypriot identity, arguably shows that there are no significant differences between those with and those without exposure to the out-group. Indeed, 50 percent of the students who expressed attachment to their respective community’s social identity had experienced some sort of inter-group mixing while the other 50 percent had not.
Chapter 5: Conclusion

5.1. Insights and implications

Through evidence from two post-conflict societies, this dissertation has attempted to shed more light into two specific causal mechanisms that potentially link education and ethnic conflicts. Similarities across the two cases as regards to the nature of conflict and variations on the educational areas of interest were intended to give further insights into educational practices’ exact nature and likely effect on the conflict. For the case of Northern Ireland and the cultural hypothesis, findings from empirical studies seem to suggest the ‘double bind’ (Gregory Bateson 1972 in Bekerman et al. 2009) effect of the common curriculum, with the common official historical narratives both reinforcing and undermining sectarian identities, and ‘competing’ in different levels with partisan vernacular stories that perpetuate contradictions. For the case of Cyprus, as evidence from the questionnaires showed, despite a lack of congruency between students’ ‘unitarian’ perceptions of identities and the strong ethno-nationalist elements to be found in the two communities’ separate official narratives at school, partisan historical narratives and grievances are internalised by the students, reflecting the detrimental effect of education in promoting and reinforcing them. As to the social differentiation hypothesis, across both cases, despite inconclusive results on the actual effect of inter-ethnic mixing at school on the students’ awareness of denominational/religious identities, findings show contact inducing positive attitudinal and behavioural changes towards the out-group and confirm the hypothesis. What this suggests is that whereas for the case of Northern Ireland educational practices were able to bring about positive changes as regards to the conflict, for the case of Cyprus considerable work still needs to be done for the education system to work as a conflict transformer rather than deformer.

The theoretical and policy implications of the findings of this research inquiry are arguably interconnected. Despite the theoretical ambiguity in the literature as to the most likely causes of ethnic conflict and antagonism, the positive changes induced by education on the three dimensions of conflict – contradictions, attitudes/memories, behaviour/relationships (Miall 2003) – seems, arguably, to reify the constructivist-type proposition suggesting that inter-group hostility is not an eternal condition and can be tackled through specific social mechanisms. The creation of reconciliation commissions in conflict-ridden and post-conflict societies for adopting educational policies such as textbooks and curriculum reforms to eliminate content-related bias, as well as the institutionalization of more cross-community
programs in schools could minimise everyday societal conflict-enhancing stimuli and maximize conflict-reducing mechanisms.

5.2. Limitations and Indications for Further Research

This research inquiry contained a number of methodological limitations. First of all, the generalisability of the questionnaires’ findings is problematic as the very small sample that has been used is arguably not representative of the whole population of Cyprus. Furthermore, for the findings across the two hypotheses to be more valid – especially as to the social differentiation hypothesis – inferences on the students’ attitudes which were derived from the students’ responses should have been complemented by inferences made from overt observations (Anderson in Keeves 1988). Arguably, statements on attitudes and actual behaviour towards the out-group might in reality differ, affecting the exact relationship between the two variables examined. Moreover, for a more valid assessment of the actual impact of education, a series of control variables such as parental and peer influence as well as the students’ political-ideological stands which are likely to intervene in the formation of identities, the views regarding the conflict as well as the attitudes towards the ‘other’, could have been developed through specific questions.

On the other hand, as to the cultural hypothesis, it must be said that due to space restrictions, the focus of historical narratives’ content analysis fails to provide a holistic picture of official history textbooks used by the two communities in Cyprus and possibly glosses over other negative but also more positive elements as to the ‘other’ contained in these. In any case, it should be noted that analysis of the content of textbooks, curricula and narratives in both cases should not be equated with the investigation of the totality of the mechanisms in the ‘everyday educational praxis’ that produce hostile attitudes towards the ‘other’ (Makriyiani et al. 2007:56). Various empirical studies have pointed out the additional critical role played by teaching practices and the ‘hidden curriculum’ (Smith 2005) which this research inquiry fails to assess.

For a more complete assessment of the actual effect of specific educational practices on the containment of interethnic enmity and conflict and clearer policy prescriptions, further research involving ethnographic studies of the school environment could be conducted. Longitudinal studies prior to and after specific educational reforms, as well as interviews with both students and teachers could contribute to this. Given the sometimes contradictory and inconclusive findings, and educational practices’ differing effects from students to
students, these last could shed important light to the questions raised in both cases studied. Firstly, about the degree to which, and the conditions under which, pluralistic or nationalist narratives resonate with the students and, secondly, the extent to which the induced more positive attitudes towards the ‘other’ translate into more positive behaviours and, by extension, actions than can succeed in altering the negative rules of ethnic interaction.
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Appendices

Appendix A: Questionnaire

Place of residence
1) What town/area do you live in?

Type of schooling
2) What type of school are you attending? -> Identify differences among students that attended State/Private schools…

☐ State school
☐ Private school

Quantity of contact
3) Do you have contact with members of the other community (Greek/Turkish Cypriots) in any of the following conditions?

- At school
  Yes ☐ No ☐
- In bi-communal meetings/events outside school
  Yes ☐ No ☐
- Other (Please Specify):

Quality of contact
4) How would you describe your attitude when meeting with members of the other community?

☐ Friendly
☐ Indifferent
☐ Hostile

Attitudes towards out-group
5) How do you feel towards Greek/Turkish Cypriots in general?

0° 10° 20° 30° 40° 50° 60° 70° 80° 90° 100°

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Very cold or Negative

Very hot or positive
Turko-centrism /Helleno-centrism and Community Identification
6) Which of the following do you consider to be your ethnic/cultural origin?

☐ Cypriot
☐ Greek
☐ Turkish

History teaching – Opinion
7) What do you think is the purpose of history teaching at school?

Current history teaching – Pluralistic
8) Do you think that current history teaching you receive at school is pluralistic (= offering a diversity of topics and points of view)?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Opinions regarding the emergence of the conflict
9) Which of the following do you think that best explains the emergence of the Cyprus problem?

☐ In 1974 Turkey invaded to achieve partition of the island
☐ In 1974 Turkey emerged to protect the Turkish Cypriots
☐ The application of NATO plots on Cypriot issues
☐ The rise of rival Greek and Turkish ethno-nationalisms which led to intercommunal violence and hostility between the two communities
## Appendix B: Data from Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question #</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very cold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very hot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Complete answers are given on Table 2
| 8          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8a         |   |   |   |   |   | 1 | 5 | 35.7% |   |    |    |    |    |    |
| 8b         | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 57.1% |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 9          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9a         | 1 | 1 |   |   | 5 | 35.7% |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 9b         | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 35.7% |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 9c         | 1 |   |   |   | 5 | 7.1% |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| 9d         | 1 |   |   |   | 2 | 14.3% |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |

Table 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person #</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>They try to teach history in an objective way but they indirectly increase the nationalism (εθνικισμός) through the description of the facts. It must be more factual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I think the purpose of history teaching is to learn more about our civilization and culture therefore we can have our point of view and say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>For people to understand past events and the social implications they may have caused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The purpose of history teaching can be described as understanding and learning the past, culture and problems of people who are living on same island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>History helps you learn about the past events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>History helps you understand the origins of modern political and social problems as well as let you learn how and why people behaved in the past as they did and makes you appreciate that they were motivated in complex and in consistent ways just like us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>To have an idea about the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Manipulation but what I heard is that they have been changed the ones in Turkish part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Learning about the historical facts in our country and the rest of the world, enriching knowledge about our culture and society in earlier years-To comprehend better the current affairs and how decisions made are based on the historical development of a place.--To pass the school exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>In my opinion the purpose of teaching history at school is to learn about who we are to understand our culture and find out the reasons which contribute to be as it is, to have awareness of the political situation of our country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>To learn the history of our own country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>In general I believe history teaching purpose is for us the students to know what happened in our country and culture years ago so that we can understand why and how we end up live the way we do. However in our school history lessons are very different as we get knowledge only for history of 1st and 2nd world war and nothing about our country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>In theory history is taught in schools to teach young people what their place of origin has been through in order to help them appreciate their country’s traditions but it can also be said that a biased view that promotes propaganda is also placed in history lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>We must know our history but not exaggerated it to much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2