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ABSTRACT

The main aim of this thesis was to empirically examine whether increased contact between people from both communities can lead either to the reduction or escalation of ethnic conflict and towards a new laissez-faire for their co-existence under the same state mechanism. To achieve this objective a number of secondary objectives were also addressed:

1. Investigation of the causes and the factors which have led to ethnic conflict in Cyprus.

2. Identifications of the reasons behind the sustained ethnic conflict in Cyprus through the years.

3. Examine whether through the course of an intensive (albeit quiet) conflict in Cyprus, each of the two communities has evolved an ethos of conflict which shapes and manifests the group’s social, behavioural and cognitive frameworks, something that in turn serves as the epistemic basis of the conflict.

4. Provision of an empirical framework that would allow the application of the contact hypothesis theory to examine ethnic conflict in Cyprus.

A unique characteristic of this thesis is the fact that it is the first study that has been ever conducted which investigates the attitudes and perceptions of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots before and after the opening on the cross points in 2003. This has also led to another significant contribution since it has allowed the adoption of contact hypothesis as the theoretical basis of the thesis for the examination of ethnic conflict on the island. The extensive and in-depth review of the literature has not uncovered any scholarly work which has followed a similar theoretical or methodological approach.

The analysis that has been conducted for the purposes of this thesis has led to the formulation of a proposal for a “Conflict Management and Peace Education” program that has as its ultimate aim the reduction of conflict between the two communities through the gradual reduction of mistrust and assisting at the same time to overcome negative stereotypes and prejudice.

It is hoped that this thesis has contributed to the understanding of the attitudinal and perceptual interethnic conflict dynamics. It is well understood that there is no magic recipe for resolving the conflict on the island. It is also recognised that several theses, research projects, articles and peace plans have been devised. However, it is strongly believed that if people at all levels (academicians, researchers, politicians, professionals, workers) are pragmatic and at the same time tend to rationalise the conflict consistently, then it can be expected that soon fertile ground will be available for planting the seeds for peace on the island - the island that the author of this thesis has never seen united and the peace that she has been dreaming of since her birth.
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1.1 Introduction and background of the research

"Arax...[my father said in a glum and pondering tone]... the Cyprus problem is a Gordian knot which is made up of different knots of different nature. I am afraid the only way to untie the knot is most probably using Alexander the Great's sword ".

These were the words of my father, when five years ago I had a first discussion with him about my intention to study for a Ph.D in the area of ethnic conflict in Cyprus. Despite the negativity and pessimism that are clearly diffused out of the above comment, the intention of my father was not meant to discourage me from pursuing a study on this topic. Rather, it was a tragic, honest and frank acknowledgment of the de facto situation on the island from someone that has lived due to his occupation the Cyprus problem in great detail on a day to day basis for the last 30 years. The hesitance and fear that have resulted after the first discussion I had, were soon succeeded by a desire and determination to examine the deep causes of ethnic conflict in Cyprus and to ascertain the rationale that impels a father to admit to his own child that the cause for a reunified and peaceful island is futile.

The island of Cyprus, in the northeastern corner of the Mediterranean, lies approximately 40 miles from the coast of Asia Minor, one hundred miles from the coast of Syria and the Levant, and approximately seven hundred miles from mainland Greece. According to the 2001 census, its population is about 800,000, having still a very similar ethnic split as it did at the start of its period of independence in 1960. The population of the island consists of 80% Greek Cypriots, 18% Turkish Cypriots (about 11.5% now following mass emigration - they have been supplanted by settlers who do not count as Turkish Cypriots) and 2% smaller ethnic and religious minorities including Armenians, Maronites and Latins.

Ethnic conflict is probably the most important source of conflict in the numerous
hotbeds of tension throughout the world (Kaufmann 1996; Horowitz 1985). A review of the various studies on conflict and partition reveals that ethnic conflict stems from a dislike or hatred that members of one group systematically feel towards another ethnic group. The prolonged continuation of such conflicts can create deep-rooted conflictual patterns and behaviours which complicate and obstruct conflict resolution.

Ethnic conflicts, especially those involving ethnic minorities and majorities, tend to be intractable. The parties involved in these types of conflict very often block the satisfaction of the other’s basic and fundamental human needs. According to Yagcioglou, (1998) minorities tend to believe that their identity is not recognised, that they are given fewer opportunities for development, and that their ethnic identity and existence is under threat. On the other hand, majorities usually perceive minorities as a threat to their security, especially if there are close links or cooperation with and influence from enemy countries.

The above argument is substantiated fully by considering the Cyprus conflict where the intense political, ethnic and ideological pressures, which are exerted on the people of the two main ethnic groups (Greek and Turkish), generated a fanatical and hostile climate. As a result this situation has led to a status quo where conflict resolution is almost impossible and one (or either) or both sides have no willingness to work towards reconciliation (Pollis, 1973; Volkan, 1979; Ryan, 1984; Kitromilides 1997).
1.1.1 Purpose and objectives of the study

A unique characteristic of this thesis is the fact that it is the first that has been ever conducted which investigates the attitudes and perceptions of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots before and after the opening on the cross points in 2003. This has also led to another significant contribution since it has allowed the adoption of contact hypothesis as the theoretical basis of the thesis for the examination of the extent to which the application of the 'contact hypothesis' can lead to a reduction of intercommunal tensions between Turkish and Greek Cypriots on the island of Cyprus. The extensive and in-depth review of the literature has not uncovered any scholarly work which has followed a similar theoretical or methodological paradigm. Furthermore, the study has developed and adopted a novel empirical approach for the application of contact hypothesis in intercommunal conflict situations using cross sectional primary data collected and collated through detailed questionnaires; this approach constitutes a major innovation in the use and application of contact hypothesis since in the literature it is mainly applied to observable groups.

This research aims to provide a thorough and in-depth investigation of ethnic conflict on the island of Cyprus through its modern history. Particular emphasis is given to the identification of the impact of the de facto partition on the population (Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots) and the empirical examination of the factors which prohibit rebuilding intercommunal relationships and the rapprochement of the two communities under the same state mechanisms.

It is the aim of this proposed investigation to identify, and review the problems which have led to ethnic conflict and partition of Cyprus in the post-1950 period and to
empirically evaluate and assess the impact of the prolonged ethnic conflict on the attitudes, values and opinions of the whole population (Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots). The vast amount of literature that is relevant to the theme of the proposed research will be utilised so as to extract the most appropriate conceptual and methodological components which will serve better the analytical purposes of the research.

It is the aim of this research to provide a rigorous empirical testing of the contact hypothesis theory in the context of the Cyprus conflict so as to serve the policy recommendations and conclusions regarding the potentials for rebuilding and re-enhancing inter-communal relationships on the island.

To enable the attainment of the above aims and objectives great emphasis will be given to the survey of attitudinal and perceptual data. It is expected that the quantitative analysis of these data will allow the analysis and mapping of the perceptions of people from the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities on a longitudinal basis by utilising a cohort design approach.

This innovative approach of integrating historical examination with current trends identified through empirical means (which surprisingly does not exist in the literature) will effectively confirm or reject the hypothesis whether the two ethnic groups can live together under the same state mechanisms and will also lead to a number of policy recommendations.
Chapter One: Introduction and research methodology

To summarise, the proposed research will provide a holistic theoretical and empirical framework for the examination of ethnic conflict in Cyprus in relation to the contact hypothesis theory and, further, it will seek to identify in this context the values, opinions and attitudes of people from both communities towards reconciliation/conflict resolution.

1.1.2 Limitations and delimitations of the study

Any research project that aims to examine the underlying dynamics and process of ethnic conflict between two communities has to deal with a number of problems which stem from the nature of the investigation itself. These problems are related to the usually complicated historical facts and accounts that describe the conflict, the difficulty in obtaining data from the population about the subject—especially if the researcher belongs to one of the two groups, the need for the researcher to remain independent and objective throughout the research process, access to the population of interest as well as the evolving and rapidly changing nature of ethnic conflict.

The above mentioned problems have imposed certain restrictions and limitations to the researcher. It was therefore necessary to deal with these problems so as to eliminate and/or minimise their impact on the quality of both the process and content of this thesis. For this reason, during the development of the methodology of this research (see section 1.2) special attention and consideration were given in formulating research design and procedures that would enable the successful handling of the problems.
1.1.3 Organisation of the thesis

The thesis is organised in seven chapters.

1. In Chapter One, the background of the study is presented. The objective of this chapter is to set the scene for this thesis and present the research methodology that has been followed so as to provide a background and a detailed description of the methodology to facilitate future studies. The research design procedures and the survey instrument developed for this study, together with the statistical techniques employed are discussed, and the rationale behind their utilisation for the purposes of this research are justified and explained.

2. In Chapter Two, the theories of nation, nationalism, ethnicity and ethnic conflict are reviewed. The rationale behind the review of these theories was mainly due to the need to provide a primer that would assist at a later stage in the understanding of the research questions posed in this thesis.

3. Chapter Three discusses the history of Cyprus from ancient times until the present in order to provide a clear, precise and focused review of the multifaceted history of the island. It also provides a historical review of the domestic setting of ethnic conflict in Cyprus and at a next step its causes and consequences are explained. To enable the attainment of this objective, the domestic as well as external factors behind the escalation of ethnic conflict on the island are identified and analysed. In doing so, emphasis is put on the geographical, historical, social, cultural, institutional and political roots of the conflict. By examining the history of Cyprus through the centuries, various and important factors that have influenced the development of the
island's history came to the surface. Particular attention and emphasis were given to
the identification of the sources of conflict as they have evolved through time. The
researcher has paid particular attention and emphasis to include events and
developments which had a direct bearing on the inter communal conflict on the
island.

4. Chapter Four focuses on discussing the contact hypothesis theory. The objective of
this chapter is to provide the basis for linking the theory of ethnic conflict with the
contact hypothesis theory in order to develop the appropriate theoretical
underpinning on which the empirical examination of ethnic conflict in the context of
Cyprus will be based.

5. In Chapter Five the research objectives of this thesis are tested empirically. In
particular descriptive statistics (analysis of frequencies and crosstabulations),
correspondence analysis and multivariate logit analysis are utilised in order to enable
the extraction of conclusions and recommendations based on empirical evidence.

6. Chapter Six provides an extrapolation of the empirical findings as have resulted
from the current thesis to grass roots level activities via the proposal of a peace
education program aiming the reduction of conflict between the two communities
through the gradual reduction of mistrust negative stereotypes and prejudice.

7. The conclusions of the study are presented in the final chapter (Chapter Seven). The
objective of this chapter is to restate the basic premise of the thesis, to summarise the
findings of the empirical study and describe how these have answered the main
research question, to reiterate the overall contribution of the thesis to the broader field of inter-ethnic conflict resolution, and suggest future directions of studies. References and appendices are attached at the end of the thesis.

The structure of the thesis can be summarised in the figure below.

**Figure 1.1: Structure of the thesis**
1.2 Research methodology

The first issue, which any research has to address at the beginning, is the methodology and methods appropriate to the studied problems. The methodology and methods should give the possibility of answering the main research questions and finding information which will add to previous findings, confirm or contradict them. The literature review that will be presented in chapters 2 to 5 will allow some disputable and important points in the investigation on the causes and effects of ethnic conflict in Cyprus to be noted, and raise questions which still have great potential discussion in the literature.

It is necessary to highlight the main ideas and points which form the basis from which the present study originates and was designed from.

More specifically, the research methodology section attempts to specify and develop a methodological approach for the investigation and analysis of the genesis, development and maintenance of ethnic conflict in Cyprus.

This chapter has the structure outlined below:

- The hypotheses which reflect the research problems are formulated
- The research design to test the hypotheses are delineated
- The formulation of the questionnaire for data collection which includes the development procedure, and the statements and rating scales adopted are depicted
- The results of pilot studies are reported
- The sampling plan is proposed
- The techniques for data analysis are described, and
- A summary of this section is provided at the end.
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The purpose of this section is twofold. It serves to provide:

i. a background of the methodology and research procedures and

ii. a sufficiently detailed description of the methodology to facilitate future studies.

1.2.1 Research questions and hypotheses of the study

According to Nachmias and Nachmias (1992, p. 51) a research problem "is an intellectual stimulus calling for an answer in the form of scientific inquiry". Kerlinger (1973) noted that the adequate statement of the research problem is one of the most important parts of research. The main aim of this thesis, as stated in section 1.1.1, is to formulate a theoretical and empirical framework which will allow the investigation of the following question:

How can the increased contact between people from both communities lead either to the reduction or escalation of ethnic conflict between the two communities on the island?

The problem as stated above is an interrogative sentence/statement that asks what relation exists between three variables: ethnic contact, the two communities (Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot), and the extent of conduct between them. The answer to the research question is exactly what is being sought in this research.

To assess and to confirm the correctness and soundness of the research problem, it was examined against three criteria as stated by Kerlinger (1973). The first criterion stated was that the research problem should express a relation between two or more variables. The research problem of this thesis satisfies this criterion since it aims to investigate the causal relationship between ethnic conflict and contact between the Greek and Turkish
Cypriot communities on the island. The second criterion was also satisfied, since it entailed the specification of the problem in question form. The final criterion demands the specification of the research problem in a way so as to imply possibilities of empirical testing. As was already mentioned in section 1.1.4, the research framework of this thesis will utilise various types of empirical testing, something that satisfies the last criterion.

The specification of the research problem has also formed the basis for the extraction of a number of research aims and objectives that demand special consideration:

1. To investigate the causes and the factors which have led to ethnic conflict in Cyprus.

2. To identify the reasons behind the sustained ethnic conflict in Cyprus through the years.

3. To examine whether through the course of an intensive (albeit quiet) conflict in Cyprus, each of the two communities has evolved an ethos of conflict which shapes and manifests the group's social, behavioural and cognitive frameworks, something that in turn serves as the epistemic basis of the conflict.

4. To provide a theoretical framework that would allow the application of the contact hypothesis theory to examine ethnic conflict in Cyprus and at the same time identify conflict resolution strategies.

5. To empirically examine whether increased contact between people from both communities can lead either to the reduction or escalation of ethnic conflict and towards a new laissez-faire for their coexistence under the same state mechanism.
1.2.2 Setting of the study

Two sets of longitudinal data were collected from both communities on the island. The first survey was conducted four months before the opening of the cross points in the cease fire line while the second six months after.

At this point a clarification has to be made regarding the process that the research design of this thesis has followed. Initially, the intention of the thesis was to distribute a survey to both, the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities in order to identify, analyse and compare the perceptions and attitudes of people from both communities towards each other. However, and while the research was in progress, an unexpected and extraordinary event of exceptional importance happened in late April 2003 that has changed significantly the context and setting within which this thesis was implemented. The opening of the crossing points in the cease fire line that has separated Cyprus since 1974 has offered new avenues that this research could not leave unexplored. This decision is also supported by the notion that research, as an ever-evolving process which takes place within a dynamic, complicated, unpredictable and continuously changing social, political and economic environment, has to be adapted to the current realities so as to offer valid, reliable and objective findings. Having this notion as a guiding principle, a decision was made to examine under a quasi-panel design the attitudes and perceptions of people from both communities towards each other and whether these have changed as a result of the contact that was allowed with the opening of the crossing points.
1.2.3 Conceptual development of the thesis

The conceptual development of the thesis is discussed in detail until 1974. From 1974 till the present the developments are summarised in the form of a table. This is based on the rationale that ethnic conflict between the two communities was generated, evolved and reached its peak in 1974.

From that point onwards in Cyprus there was a de facto partition and the two communities have not had any direct contact.

For this reason there was no need to engage into a detailed discussion of the peace talks from 1974 onwards.

1.2.4 Developmental framework of research methodology

According to de Vaus (2002), social researchers usually try to answer two fundamental questions: What is going on? and Why?. Indeed, it is central to social research to try and answer both questions.

Research is defined as the systematic, controlled and critical investigation of propositions about the presumed relationship between different phenomena. Research without theory is simply collecting data about events. On the other hand, theory without research is empty speculation. It is widely accepted that theory and research must be connected to each other. Theory guides research, and research informs theory, tests or demonstrates the validity of theory (Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992; Johns and Lee-Ross, 1998; Finn, 2000).
According to Kerlinger a theory "is a set of interrelated constructs (concepts), definitions, and propositions that present a systematic view of phenomena by specifying relations among variables, with the purpose of explaining and predicting phenomena" (1973, p. 9). Finn et al. (2000) argued that research needs theory as a framework for analysis and interpretation, and theory needs research to constantly review/modify/challenge theoretical details. Tzeng and Jackson (1991) argued that a major function of scientific theory is to simplify complex phenomena and reduce the chaos of the real world to manageable and understandable pieces of information so that regularities among events are detectable and practical operations possible.

Following the above canons of social research and at the same time taking into consideration the main research problem of this thesis, as defined in section 1.2.1, it can be suggested that this thesis aims to investigate whether increased contact between people from both communities on the island can lead either to the reduction or escalation of ethnic conflict.

The review of the literature (Chapters 2 to 5) has demonstrated that the research into the causes and effects of ethnic conflict in Cyprus has been approached from a great many different perspectives, a factor that inevitably has led to confusion and lack of theoretical and methodological consensus. Furthermore, although most studies have applied valid research methods and recommendations, the absence of studies that utilise the contact hypothesis theory was evident in the process of reviewing the relevant literature.
Undoubtedly, in order to research the relationship between increased contact and ethnic conflict in Cyprus, there is a need to establish an integrated theory. Since a review of the literature appears to indicate that such a theory (in the context of Cyprus) at present is either non-existent or has not been deduced, the research problems of this thesis can not be addressed and investigated on an established theoretical/methodological basis.

The formulation and development of a thesis must begin with the research having a set purpose and, therefore, with an understanding of the nature of the investigative processes. For the purposes of this thesis, particular emphasis is given to the link between theory and research. In light of this and in order to attain the aims and objectives of the thesis, it is decided to utilise the deductive approach for theory testing.

In a deductive approach, the starting point is an abstract, logical relationship among concepts and then there is a subsequent move towards concrete empirical evidence (see figure 1.2) (Miller 2003, p.51). According to Hussey and Hussey (1997, p.52) deduction is the dominant research approach in the natural sciences, where “laws provide the basis of explanation, permit the anticipation of phenomena, predict their occurrence and therefore allow them to be controlled”.
Figure 1.2: The Process of Deductive Theorising

Robson (1993, p.19) lists five sequential stages through which deductive research should progress:

1. Deducing a hypothesis (a testable proposition about the relationship between two or more events or concepts) from the theory

2. Expressing the hypothesis in operational terms (that is, one indicating exactly how the variables are to be measured), which propose a relationship between two specific variables

Source: Neuman, W.L., 2003, p. 51
3. Testing the operational hypothesis (this will involve an experiment or some other form of empirical inquiry)

4. Examining the specific outcome of the inquiry (it will either tend to confirm the theory or indicate the need for its modification)

5. If necessary, modifying the theory in light of the findings.

There are several important characteristics of the deductive approach that need to be taken into consideration when a research strategy is being developed.

First, there is the search to explain causal relationships between variables. For this particular research, the causal relationship to be explained involves the amount of contact between people from the two communities and the level of ethnic conflict. Consequently, a hypothesis is developed (see section 1.2.1, p.10) which states that increased contact between people from the two communities will decrease the level of ethnic conflict. At this point a recommendation of pivotal importance should be mentioned and it concerns the need to use a highly structured methodology to facilitate replication (Gill and Johnson, 1997).

Another characteristic that underlies the deductive approach is the pursuit of the principle of scientific rigour. A fundamental prerequisite for this to be achieved is for the researcher to be independent of what is being observed. For the purposes of this research this issue was resolved since the questionnaire both in the Greek populated South and Turkish populated North were distributed by professional marketing research firms. In addition, the fact that the questionnaire was pilot tested with both Turkish and Greek Cypriot research subjects has ensured that the element of subjectivity in the
choice of questions and the way they were phrased was removed to the greatest possible extent.

A third characteristic of deduction is that concepts need to be operationalised in a way that enables facts to be measured quantitatively. To address this issue, the principle of reductionism was adopted (Saunders et al, 2003, p.87). This holds that problems as a whole are better understood if they are reduced to the simplest possible elements. Through this approach, a series of questions was developed that could capture precisely the attitudes and perceptions of Greek and Turkish Cypriots on several issues and dimensions.

The final characteristic of the deductive approach that had to be considered was generalisation. In order to be able to generalise about regularities in human social behaviour it is necessary to select samples of sufficient numerical size. For the purposes of this research, the determination of the sample size was an issue of primary concern and a detailed discussion of the decisions and rationale concerning the sampling procedure is provided in section 1.2.5.

1.2.4.1 Methodological design and research procedures

Miller (1991) noted that empirical research in social science proceeds in a variety of settings and contexts. The choice of a design setting for any research project is generally a vital concern of the researcher, who seeks to determine the validity of a hypothesis and how best to discover evidence to either accept or reject it. Therefore, a question that has
to be asked at this stage is what design will best ascertain associations or causal paths among the variables under study?

According to Trochim (2001) the research design provides the glue that holds the research project together. In his words, “a design is used to structure the research, to show how all of the major parts of the research project – the samples or groups, measures, treatments or programs, and methods of assignment – work together to address the central research questions” (Trochim 2001, p.171). De Vaus (2002, p.31) in line with Stouffer (1950) indicated that the term “research design” should not be used in a broad sense to include the issues of problem formulation, operationalisation, sampling and the selection of data collection techniques but rather the use of the term must be much narrower to refer to the structure of the data rather than the particular data. The central point of good research design is that it provides a context in which relatively unambiguous statements can be drawn. The aim is to move our conclusions about causal processes from the realm of the plausible and possible to the convincing and compelling.

For the purposes of this thesis, the research design is the blueprint for fulfilling the objectives and answering the research questions that have been put forward. In other words, it is a master plan specifying the methods and procedures for collecting and analysing the needed information. In addition, it must ensure that the information collected is appropriate for solving the problem.
1.2.4.2 The experimental design of the thesis

Trochim (2001, p. 191) argued that experimental designs are often touted as the most rigorous of all research designs, or as the gold standard against which all other designs are judged. If an experimental design is implemented well the experiment is probably the strongest design with respect to internal validity.

According to Neuman (2003) an awareness of the time dimension helps the researcher to read or conduct research because different research questions or issues incorporate time in different ways. Some studies give a snapshot of a single, fixed time point and allow you to analyse it in detail (cross-sectional research). Other studies of moving picture that lets you follow events, people, or social relations over periods of time (longitudinal research).

For the purpose of this particular research a longitudinal approach is adopted since the objectives and aims of the study require the examination of attitudes/perceptions of people at more than one time. This particular research design is usually more complex and costly than cross-sectional research. However, it is more powerful, “especially when researchers seek answers to questions about social change” (Miller, 2003, p. 31).

There are three types of longitudinal research: time series, panel and cohort. The time series is a longitudinal study in which the same type of information is collected on a group of people or other units across multiple time periods. Researchers can observe stability or change in the features of the units. The panel study is a powerful type of longitudinal research. It is more difficult to conduct than time-series research. In a panel study, the researcher observes exactly the same people, group or organisation
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across time periods. The panel study is formidable to conduct and very costly. Tracking people over time is often difficult because some people are impossible to be located again. Nevertheless, the results of a well-designed panel study are very valuable.

Finally, cohort analysis is similar to the panel study, but rather than observing the exact same people, a category of people who share a similar life experience in a specific time period is studied. Cohort analysis is “explicitly macroanalytic”, which means researchers examine the category as a whole for important features (Ryder, 1992 p.230). The focus is on the cohort, or category, not on specific individuals. Commonly used cohorts include all people born in the same year, all people hired at the same time, all people who share a particular life experience. Unlike panel studies, researchers do not have to locate the exact same people for cohort studies. They only need to identify those who experience a common life event.

For the purpose of this thesis the most suitable type is the Cohort analysis, since two samples of people are surveyed at two different points in time. This quasi-panel design (as described by de Vaus 2002, p. 38) involves two different sub-sets of respondents that are surveyed at two different times. Thus, for this research two sets of respondents (one consisting of Greek Cypriots and one consisting of Turkish Cypriots) will be surveyed at two different points in time in relation to their perceptions and attitudes toward each other, having as an ultimate aim to identify whether contact between the two communities can lead to the reduction of hostility, hatred and ethnic conflict. The particular design that is adopted avoids the need to monitor the original respondents for subsequent re-surveying.
At this point certain limitations that are attributed to this approach have to be mentioned. This will allow the researcher to be cautious in applying and implementing the technique and at the same time careful and vigilant in interpreting the results of the study.

According to de Vaus (2002, p.35) this design presents problems that demand particular attention and care when drawing causal inferences. It also has the additional problem of being unable to fully match the samples at Time 1 and Time 2. Thus, differences observed between Time 1 and Time 2 might be due to sampling error-differences between the samples, or due to other factors that intrude during the interim. These could affect causal inferences, and along with other difficulties that include the accurate matching of respondents in each sub-set, have the potential to affect the measurement of change.

For the reason stated above, this thesis will utilise the appropriate empirical techniques that will verify the validity and reliability of the research findings and outcomes.

1.2.5 The sampling plan

For the purposes of this research, a set of principles and procedures was followed so as to ensure the collection of data from an accurate sample, something that at a later stage would allow the generalisation from the sample to the wider population. As de Vaus (2002) has noted, a fundamental goal of research is to be able to generalise – that is, to say something reliably about a wider population on the basis of the findings in a particular study.
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Trochim (2003, p.41) suggested that sampling is the process of selecting units (such as people and organisations) from a population of interest so that by studying the sample you can fairly generalise your results to the population from which the units were chosen.

There are two key questions which have to be addressed in any sample survey:

1. How should the sample be obtained?
2. How large should the sample be?

To carry out a study, one must bear in mind what size the sample should be, whether the size is statistically justified and, lastly, what method of sampling is to be used. Consideration should also be given to the time and cost of the survey, whether it is on a small scale or large scale.

The answers to the issues and questions that were raised above should be based on a consideration of the sampling theory, the nature of the population, the purpose of the research and the resources available to complete the survey.

The first question can be broken down still further into a range of sub-questions. Firstly, who or what should be sampled? This should be determined by the definition of the sampling units, which in turn delimits the eligibility criteria. Secondly, when should the sampling take place? Some consideration should be given to the time of year, the time of day and the duration of the sampling process. It is also useful to have some prior
knowledge of the phenomenon to be sampled. Thirdly, where should the survey be administered?

For the purposes of this particular study the survey was administered in the South and North of the island, using a cluster random sampling procedure which is discussed below.

Finally, how should the participants be selected? A full answer to this question is more complicated and depends upon the definition, and hence the nature of the population. There are basically two generic types of sampling:

- Probability or representative sampling
- Non probability or judgmental sampling.

In a probability sample every item in the sampling frame has an equal chance of being included in the sample. In other words, a probability sample is a technique which ensures a random sample which by implication is likely to be free of potential bias. Furthermore, probability samples allow the precision of the results to be quantified and the level of confidence associated with them to be stated. Precision means how accurate the results are, and refers to the degree of error in the sample estimates. Confidence is the degree to which the researcher can feel confident that a sample estimate approximates to the value in the population. However, the availability of an accurate sampling frame is a prerequisite for this type of sampling. Where a sampling frame does
not exist, this kind of sampling is not usually possible and non-probability sampling is used.

There are several different types of non-probability sampling but all have one thing in common – not all elements have an equal chance of being selected. Such samples are not random and the degree of sampling error cannot be determined.

Probability sampling is theoretically the preferred technique for reasons associated with precision and confidence outlined previously. Another reason for preferring this style of sampling is that many of the statistical and data analysis procedures detailed later (see section 1.2.8, p.50) make the assumption that the data was obtained by this method. Moreover, the aforementioned relationship between sample size and sampling error is only practically applicable to probability samples.

Probability sampling is most commonly associated with survey-based research where the researcher needs to make inferences from the sample about a population to answer the research question(s) or to meet the objectives. The process of probability sampling that has been followed for the purposes of this thesis was divided into three stages:

1. Identify a suitable sampling frame based on the research questions and objectives.

2. Decide on a suitable sample size.

3. Select the most appropriate sampling technique and select the sample.
Each of these stages will be considered in relation to the nature and theme of the current investigation.

1.2.5.1 Identifying a suitable sampling frame

The sampling frame for any probability sample is a complete list of all the cases in the population from which the sample will be drawn. The completeness of the sampling frame is very important. An incomplete or inaccurate list means that some cases will have been excluded and so it will be impossible for every case in the population to have a chance of selection. As a direct consequence the sample may not be representative of the total population.

For the purposes of this thesis, this issue was handled by the two market research bureau that have carried out the survey in the South and North of the island. Both bureau have their own lists and sample selection procedures and systems that can guarantee current and accurate survey samples.

1.2.5.2 Deciding on a suitable sample size

Considerations about populations from data collected using any probability sample are based on probability (Saunders et al, 2003, p.155). The larger the sample size the lower the likely error in generalising about the population (de Vaus, 2002; Trochim, 2003). It can be therefore suggested that probability sampling is a compromise between the accuracy of findings and the amount of time and money a researcher invests in collecting, checking and analysing the data. The decision regarding the choice of sample size for this thesis was governed by the following criteria:
- The confidence that needed to be present in the survey data – that is, the level of certainty that the characteristics of the data collected will represent the characteristics of the total population;

- The margin of error that can be tolerated – that is the accuracy that is required so as to allow estimation to be made from the survey sample.

- The types of analyses that are going to be utilised – in particular the number of categories into which the data will be subdivided (e.g. sex, class, age and nationality), as many statistical techniques have a minimum threshold of data cases for each cell.

- The size of the total population from which the sample is being drawn.

Given the above criteria, it can be suggested that the final sample size is almost always a matter of judgment as well as of calculation. As de Vaus (2002, p.83) has put it, desired accuracy is not the only factor in working out the sample size: cost, time and access to respondents are also key factors. Thus, it can be claimed the final sample size is a compromise between cost, accuracy and ensuring sufficient numbers for meaningful sub-group analysis.

This thesis due to the nature of the theme that is being examined as well as due to the particularities that surround the two communities that comprise the survey population, has presented difficulties regarding the decision about a suitable sample size. More specifically, it was impossible for the researcher to conduct the survey on her own in the North of the island since the subject of the survey is very sensitive and it was highly unlikely that people would have answered questions of that nature to someone coming from “the other side”. In addition, the first survey was conducted well before the
opening of the cross points and at that time access to and from the North was strictly restricted. Another issue that imposed problems and thus prohibited the distribution of questionnaires and collection of data by the researcher was the need to have sampling elements coming from various geographical locations from both the South and North of the island. Due to the above restrictions, a decision was made to hire professional research agencies to carry out the field surveys. This decision was deemed as appropriate since it was the only thing that could ensure that the survey would be implemented in a valid and reliable framework.

However, one restricting/limiting factor was related to the associated costs of this decision. Due to the length of the questionnaire, the cost per completed questionnaire that was charged by the research agencies was CY £4.50 for the South and CY £6 for the North. For the second survey a discount was obtained and the charges were CY £4.00 for the South and CY £5.50 for the North. Having no alternative, a decision was made to limit the sample size to 250 respondents per cohort. This decision in financial terms is translated into a total cost of CY £5,000.

Table 1.1: *A note on cost*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Sample</td>
<td>N=500</td>
<td>250* CY £4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sample</td>
<td>N=500</td>
<td>250* CY £4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>CY £2,125</td>
<td>CY £2,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total aggregate cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>CY £ 5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the fact that the decision to limit the sample size had a subsequent effect on the sampling error and the ability to generalise the findings of the survey to the wider
population, the decision was made, taking into consideration the costs that would have been incurred if a larger sample was selected, the access by the researcher to the populations under study as well as the fact that it was preferable to have a sample of 250 respondents collected within a valid and reliable survey procedure rather than a larger sample characterised by problems of unreliability and subjectivness. As Neuman (2003, p.231) argued, “a large sample without random sampling or with poor sampling frame is less representative than a smaller one with random sampling and an excellent sampling frame”.

The following table indicates the statistical error that is associated with the selected survey samples as this was calculated in relation to the population over 18 both in the South and North.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.2: Margins of error of survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample size (N)</th>
<th>Confidence interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South (confidence level 95%)</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North (confidence level 95%)</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (confidence level 95%)</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North (confidence level 95%)</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Researchers normally work to a 95% level of certainty (confidence level) (De Vaus, 2002; Saunders et al, 2002; Neuman, 2003). This means that if the sample of this survey was selected 100 times, at least 95 of these samples would be certain to represent the
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characteristics of the population. The margin of error (confidence interval) describes the precision of the researcher’s estimates of the population. Table 1.2 provides the sampling errors associated with the sample sizes selected for the purpose of this thesis and at the same time presents the “ideal” research samples that provide a sampling error that is the most commonly used in research. As can be seen from the table, the sample that was selected provides a 6.2 % plus or minus confidence interval. This means that if 45% of the survey sample are in a certain category then the estimate for the total population within the same category will be 6.2 plus or minus the confidence interval - somewhere between 38.8 and 51.2 for a 95% confidence interval. On the other hand, to limit the confidence interval to a level of 3.5% this would have required a sample size of 782 for the South and 779 for the North. Considering the financial restrictions such a decision was very difficult to materialise.

1.2.5.3 Selecting the most appropriate sampling technique and the sample

Following the determination of the sample size the next decision that had to be initiated was the selection of the most appropriate sampling technique so as to ensure that a representative sample would have been obtained.

Five main techniques were considered:

- Simple random
- Systematic
- Stratified random
- Cluster, and
- Multistage
According to Saunders et al (2002), the choice of probability sampling depends on the research questions and objectives. The structure of the sampling frame, the size of the sample that is needed, the geographical areas to be covered, the cost as well as the particularities that characterize a research project determine the choice of the technique. Table 1.3 summarises the impact of each of the above mentioned variables.

After a careful review and examination of the relevant criteria, factors and particularities surrounding this thesis, a decision was made to utilise cluster sampling.

Cluster sampling is a technique where the population is divided into discrete groups prior to sampling (Henry, 1990). The groups are termed clusters and they can be based on any naturally occurring grouping.

For cluster sampling, the sampling frame is the complete list of clusters rather than a complete list of individual cases within the population. At the next step few clusters are selected using simple random sampling. Data are then collected from every case within the selected clusters.

The market research agencies that have carried out the survey process have an established process as well as experience for carrying out surveys based on the cluster sampling technique. These have ensured a valid and reliable data collection process something that adds to the external validity of the survey data1.

---

1 External validity refers to the approximate truth of conclusions that involve generalisations. In more simple terms, external validity is the degree to which the conclusions in the study would hold for other persons in other places and at other times.
Table 1.3: Impact of various factors on choice of probability sampling techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample technique</th>
<th>Sampling frame required</th>
<th>Size of sample needed</th>
<th>Geographical area to which suited</th>
<th>Relative cost</th>
<th>Easy to explain to support workers?</th>
<th>Advantages compared with simple random</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple random</td>
<td>Accurate and easily accessible</td>
<td>Better with over few hundred</td>
<td>Concentrated if face-to-face contact required, otherwise does not matter</td>
<td>High if large sample size or sampling frame not computerised</td>
<td>Relatively difficult to explain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>Accurate, easily accessible and not containing periodic patterns. Actual list not always needed</td>
<td>Suitable for all sizes</td>
<td>Concentrated if face-to-face contact required, otherwise does not matter</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Relatively easy to explain</td>
<td>Normally no difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratified random</td>
<td>Accurate, easily accessible, divisible into relevant strata. See comments for simple random and systematic as appropriate</td>
<td>See comments for simple random and systematic as appropriate</td>
<td>Concentrated if face-to-face contact required, otherwise does not matter</td>
<td>Low, provided that lists of relevant strata available</td>
<td>Relatively difficult to explain. Once strata decided see comments for simple random and systematic as appropriate</td>
<td>Better comparison across strata. Differential response rates may necessitate re-weighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster</td>
<td>Accurate, easily accessible, relates to relevant clusters not individual population members</td>
<td>As large as practicable</td>
<td>Dispersed if face-to-face contact required and geographically based clusters used</td>
<td>Low, provided that lists of relevant clusters available</td>
<td>Relatively difficult to explain until clusters selected</td>
<td>Quick but reduced precision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-stage</td>
<td>Initial stages: geographical. Final stage: needed only for geographical areas selected. See comments for simple random and systematic as appropriate</td>
<td>Initial stages: as large as practicable. Final stage. See comments for simple random and systematic as appropriate</td>
<td>Dispersed if face-to-face contact required, otherwise no need to use this technique</td>
<td>Low as sampling frame population required only for final stage</td>
<td>Initial stages: relatively difficult to explain. Final stage: see comments for simple random and systemic as appropriate</td>
<td>Difficult to adjust for differential response rates. Substantial errors possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Neumam, 2000
1.2.6 Questionnaire design and development

The questionnaire items for the survey instrument used in this study were developed from three principal sources using the aforementioned procedure and is summarised in the Figure below.

**Figure 1.3: Generation of questionnaire items**

A questionnaire is a set of questions designed to generate the data necessary for accomplishing a research project’s objectives (Saunders et al, 2002; Neuman, 2003). Simply stated, it can be thought as a channel for collecting data from respondents.

According to Finn et al. (2000) any questionnaire needs to be well laid out and presented. However, questionnaire design is frequently overlooked as an important aspect of the development of research instruments and as a potential source of independent effects on survey estimates (Sanchez, 1992). The quality of questionnaire design is generally recognised as an important factor for research instruments (Dilman, 1978).
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The procedures used to develop the questionnaire largely followed the guidelines recommended by Nunnally (1978), Nachmias and Nachmias (1992) and Neuman (2003). In the following sections the methodological decisions taken and procedures that were followed during the design and development of the questionnaire are discussed and explained in detail.

1.2.6.1 The pilot study

According to de Vaus (2002) prior to the administration of the final questionnaire, each question and the questionnaire as a whole must be evaluated rigorously. Lancaster et. al (2004, p.307) emphasized the importance of the pilot study by noting that “a well-conducted pilot study, giving a clear list of aims and objectives within a formal framework, will encourage methodological rigour, ensure that the work is scientifically valid and publishable”. A pilot study involves administering the questionnaire to a limited number of potential respondents and other individuals capable of pointing at design flaws (Jobber, 1998).

To improve face and content validity, a panel of experts from the fields of political and social sciences research reviewed the questionnaire. The utilisation of expert opinions for the construction of a questionnaire enhances the content validity of the index (Crano and Brewer, 1986; Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992; de Vaus, 2002). This approach, also known as the Delphi Method, is a set of procedures for eliciting and refining the opinions of a panel of experts on an issue and it relies on the informed opinions of specialists.
These experts were asked to review the questionnaire and indicate whether each question should be kept, omitted or revised. If revisions were necessary, they were asked to indicate their suggestions. They were also asked to make comments regarding the particular wording of each question. All input from the panel of experts was incorporated into the instrument.

The questionnaires were e-mailed to the pilot study sample. Also, a covering letter was enclosed with each questionnaire (see Appendix 1). This letter endorsed the study, explained it and asked for the cooperation of the experts. The pilot survey was distributed on 1st December 2002 and the last day for collecting completed surveys was set on 20th December 2002.

It should be recognised that the results of the pilot study have led to substantial changes to the content and structure of the questionnaire. However, this was expected considering the absence of an established, valid and reliable research instrument aiming at the evaluation and analysis of cross cultural attitudes and perceptions of people from both communities. Therefore, the processes of pre-testing, piloting and modifying/adjusting the questionnaire index were inevitable.

From the comments received, it was decided to include an introductory note at the beginning of the questionnaire explaining its scope and purpose.

It was also decided to avoid the use of graphic devices (initially they were used to increase the attractiveness and friendliness of the questionnaire) since one of the respondents correctly indicated that “no illustrations, suggestive image or else should appear on the questionnaire, eventually causing emotions or other reactions”.

Another suggestion was to replace dichotomous response questions (Yes/No) with rating scales. Emphatically, one respondent indicated that the inclusion of more response alternatives “will allow [the researcher] to have a broader view of the problem”. On the basis of this suggestion the response formats of questions BQ3, BQ6 BQ7, BQ11, BQ12, CQ2, CQ3, CQ4, CQ6, DQ2, EQ1, EQ3, EQ6 were modified.

In addition, some of the respondents were concerned about the restrictions imposed on the respondents due to the use of closed type questions that enabled the collection of quantitative information. Despite the fact that the rationale behind these concerns was fully understood and appreciated, it was decided to maintain a closed response format throughout the questionnaire since the inclusion of open type questions would have complicated further the process of collecting the questionnaires, taking at the same time into consideration the relatively large sample and the overall length of the questionnaire. As a remedy, it was decided to extend the number of response options per question through the identification of possible alternatives through the utilisation of the pilot study. Also the “Other, Please specify” option was utilised so as to provide the respondents the opportunity to add another variable that was not available in the list of alternative responses.

Most of the respondents have pointed out mistakes in relation to the wording and/or structure of some questions. As a result, careful review of the questionnaire has led to the rewording and/or restructuring of questions AQ11, BQ12, CQ6 and EQ2.
1.2.6.2 Contents of the questionnaire

The key to minimise the disadvantage of the survey questionnaire lies in the construction of the questionnaire itself. According to Nachmias and Nachmias "a poorly developed questionnaire contains the seeds of its own destruction" (1992, p.239).

The questionnaire that was developed for the purposes of this thesis was intended to be straightforward and simple in order to increase the response rate, since it is obvious that the foundation of all questionnaires is the question.

The questions employed for the present survey were concerned with the attitudes and opinions of the respondents on a subject relevant to their day to day life. Therefore, the questions included in the survey instrument fell into the category of questions about subjective experiences. According to Singleton et al. (1988, p.272 cited by Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992) subjective experience involves the respondents’ beliefs, attitudes, perceptions and opinions.

Considerable attention was given to develop clear, unambiguous and useful questions. A fundamental precondition to achieve this objective was the wording of the questions. At all times, an attempt was made to make the questionnaire as user friendly as possible.

In order to avoid problems that result from improper wording of questions, the language that was used was simple and jargon and technical terms were avoided. Particular attention was also given to avoiding double-barreled, leading and negative questions. By doing this, it was ensured that respondents were able to give answers without having the feeling that they were giving a wrong answer or a disapproved-of response.
1.2.6.3 Structure and format of the questions.

The next issue that was examined was the response format of the questions. According to Kinnear and Taylor (1997) the concern at this point is focused on the degree of structure that is imposed on the person’s responses. There are two types of question structures that can be distinguished: open-ended questions and close-ended questions. For the questionnaire used in this study close-ended questions were used. For this method the respondents were offered a set of answers and were asked to tick the one that most closely represented their views. The rationale behind the selection of close-ended questions to be used was that they were easy to answer, they required no writing from the respondent, and the analysis was straightforward. As observed by Nachmias and Nachmias (1992, p.244) close-ended questions tend to be answered more readily than open ended ones.

The decision as to the design of the questions was aided by the typology of Lazarsfeld (1944, p.38-60 cited by Nachmias and Nachmias p.243). Based on this the following considerations were taken into account:

a. The objective of the questionnaire.

The objective of the questionnaire was straightforward in that respondents were asked to express their opinions/perceptions and attitudes in relation to the ethnic conflict between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities on the island.

b. The respondents level of information about the topic of the question.

Respondents were asked to express their attitudes and perceptions in relation to issues related with the ethnic conflict on the island in the past, present and future. The level of information of the respondents was very high since the questions in essence captured their life experiences.
1.2.6.4 Rating scale, answering procedures and order of questions.

Particular attention was given to the selection of scale for the current questionnaire since, as suggested by Kinnear and Taylor (1997, p.245), in measuring attitudes one must be sensitive to the scale level assumptions imposed on data analysis. The majority of the literature suggests that attitudes and perceptions are typically measured at the interval or ordinal level. For the purposes of this study a five-point interval scale was used.

A Likert scale, according to Zikmund (1996, p.348), "is a measure of attitudes designed to allow respondents to rate how strongly they agree or disagree with carefully constructed statements". The Likert scale is one of the most widely used attitude-scaling techniques in research (Churchill, 1996). According to Komorita (1963) in a Likert scale the respondent is presented with a set of attitude statements on a scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". The "questions" are thus in the form of statements that seem either definitely favourable or definitely unfavourable toward the matter under consideration. Responses to each statement are given integral weights and an individual’s score on the scale consists of the sum of these weighted item scores. Hence the Likert procedure is frequently referred to as a method of summated ratings.

In the current study, a multiple choice format was employed. For each item, the respondents were asked to pick one of five alternatives that indicated the extent to which they agreed with the position espoused in the item.

The response categories (also termed as ‘quantifiers’ by Nachmias and Nachmias 1992, p.247) set for this study have followed similar five-point scales but with different verbal labels. These were as follows:
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1. Very friendly
2. Friendly
3. Neither
4. Unfriendly
5. Very Unfriendly

1. Definitely
2. Probably
3. Might or might not
4. Probably not
5. Definitely not

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree

Several factors, both methodological and conceptual, suggested the suitability of the Likert scale for the purposes of this study. First, the scales providing interval data enable the application of more advanced statistical techniques (Schertzer and Kerman, 1985). Furthermore, as Aaker et al. (1998) have suggested, in behavioural and attitudinal research projects, interval scales are considered to be the best measurements.
An additional reason for the adoption of the Likert scale was the sensitivity of the scale. Zikmund (1996) suggested that in the cases where the attitudes and opinions of a set of respondents are surveyed, concerning a proposed change of a construct or system, the sensitivity of the scale plays a pivotal role in measuring correctly the opinions of the research sample. Sensitivity refers to “an instrument’s ability to accurately measure variability in stimuli or responses” (Zikmund, 1996, p.338). In more simple terms the sensitivity of an attitude scale is the extent to which it is capable of discriminating between respondents with different attitudes. The use of dichotomous response categories such as “agree” or “disagree” does not reflect precisely the subtle attitude changes. Therefore, the use of a sensitive measure with numerous categories offered more choices for respondents to express their attitudes and simultaneously has increased the sensitivity of the scale.

The widespread use of rating scales in social research has generated considerable debate over the optimal number of scale points to use (Bending, 1954; Komorita, 1963; Jacoby and Matell, 1971; Matell and Jacoby, 1972; Cox, 1980; Garland, 1998).

A study by Garland (1998) provided some evidence that social desirability bias, arising from respondents’ desires to please the interviewer or appear helpful or not be seen to give what they perceive to be a socially unacceptable answer, can be minimised by eliminating the mid-point from Likert scales.

Cox (1980) made four important findings. First, he argued that scales with two or three response alternatives are generally inadequate in that they are incapable of transmitting much information and they tend to frustrate and stifle respondents. Second, the marginal
returns from using more than nine response alternatives are minimal and efforts for improving the measurement instrument should be directed toward more productive areas. Third, an odd rather than an even number of response alternatives is preferable under circumstances in which the respondent can legitimately adopt a neutral position. Finally, even a few response alternatives may be too many for the respondent if comprehensible instructions and labelling of response alternatives are not included so as to enable the respondent to conceptualise and respond.

The above comments of Cox are felt to be of primary importance for this research. Cox suggested that the magic number seven plus or minus two appears to be a reasonable range for the optimal number of response alternatives and he further pointed out that five alternatives seems appropriate for subject-centred scales (as is the scale adopted for the purposes of questionnaire of the current thesis).

Bending (1954) and Jacoby and Matell (1971) investigated how the reliability and validity of a survey is affected by the number of alternatives of a Likert-type scale. The results of their studies suggested that both reliability and validity are independent of the number of scale points used for Likert-type items. Their findings are important for this thesis, since they provide a relative assurance that the adoption of a 5-point Likert scale for the final questionnaire will not have any effect on the reliability and validity of the survey. As Churchill and Peter (1984) noted, shorter and simpler items are generally clearer and easier to respond to reliably.

\[\text{Subject-centred scales are composites of a number of items which have been selected to position respondents along a continuum representing a single attribute.}\]
One study by Devlin, Dong and Brown (1993) showed that 5-point Likert scale appears to capture more information than the 4-point scale. However there is still no study that has demonstrated whether a 5-point scale is superior to a 7-point scale. Since the most widely applied is the 5-point scale, and considering that the character of the scale is subject-centred, it was decided to adopt a 5-point Likert scale.

In addition to the 5-point scale, the option of 'no opinion' was also included in the questionnaire to avoid forced answer bias. Several studies have demonstrated the need for the inclusion of this option. A study by Hughes (1969, cited in Smith 1995) found that bias was introduced when forced choice scales where compared with unforced ones. Also Tsan (1999) noted that the forced choice scale offers potential for misinterpretation of responses and the provision of the “no opinion” option appears advisable.

A particularity of the scaling procedure that was employed in this study was the decision to offer verbal tags between the two extreme anchors of the scale so as to assist the respondents to avoid any misinterpretation or confusion that might have resulted from the scale.

In addition to the Likert scales that were adopted for the purposes of this thesis, several nominal questions were used, where, for some of them, multiple response options were allowed. The inclusion of such questions was necessary so as to offer to the respondents the possibility of expressing to the utmost extent their views, attitudes and perceptions through a closed type structured questionnaire.
1.2.6.5 Translation.

The questionnaire was translated into two languages besides English (Greek and Turkish) so as to assist and motivate the respondents to answer and return the questionnaires. The translation was made by professional translators who were fluent in both the original and target language. Furthermore the method of back-translation was employed for all the translations (Brislin, Lonner and Thorndike, 1973), and the "translation equivalence" of the research instrument was tested in order to ensure that "verbal items and instructions could be used cross-culturally" (Berry et al., 1993).

1.2.6.6 Avoiding pitfalls in the questionnaire construction.

It is widely accepted by many researchers that the process of question writing is a very complex process (de Vaus, 1991; Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992; Finn et al., 2000). This was taken seriously into consideration to avoid some typical pitfalls.

These were:

a. Wording.

Special consideration was given to avoiding technical terms or jargon. Therefore, question items were worded in such a way so that the respondent could understand the questions and so that they had the same meaning for each respondent.

b. Type of questions.

Attention was given to avoiding the inclusion in the questionnaire of leading or complex questions.

There are a number of characteristics which contributed positively to the questionnaire's overall credibility, reliability and validity. These were the short
questions used which facilitated the completion of the questionnaire in a short time, the fairly limited number of questions included in the questionnaire and finally the opportune topic of the research. Indicative of this fact was that a significant number of respondents expressed their interest in obtaining the empirical results of the survey upon its completion.

c. Instructions.

Despite the simplicity that characterised the questionnaire, instructions were included in order to assist the respondents to answer the questions without any ambiguities which could act negatively towards the completion of the questionnaire and, eventually, could result in a decrease of the response rate.

d. Anonymity.

An anonymous study is one in which nobody (not even the researcher) can identify who provided data. Considering the nature of research, the sensitivity of the topic under investigation as well as the fact that the respondents were asked to report on life experiences, attitudes and perceptions, it was decided to adopt a completely anonymous survey procedure.

e. Graphical design, presentation and reproduction of the questionnaire.

An effort was made to make the Questionnaire as physically presentable as possible. Attention was paid to spacing, to the construction of the questions, and to the readability and continuity of items.

All the questionnaires were reproduced by a high quality laser printer with the maximum possible print resolution (1200 x 1200 dpi\textsuperscript{3}) on quality paper (90g/m\textsuperscript{2}). The researcher

\textsuperscript{3} 'dpi' stands for dots per inch and is a measure of print quality.
felt that a high return rate depended in part on the potential respondent’s reaction to the questionnaires. The more favourable the reaction, the better the response. As circumstances would have it, the questionnaire was too garish in design, quality and overall appearance to be easily overlooked or ignored by the potential respondents who were self-administering the survey.

1.2.7 Administration of the questionnaires

The questionnaire design, sampling and administration are three interlinked and interdependent issues. The administration of the questionnaire plays a significant role in the designation of the quality of the sample, the determination of the type of questions to be asked, and the design and layout of the questionnaire. Furthermore, the response rate of a particular survey is a result of the combined effects of the research theme, the nature of the sample, the length of the questionnaire and the care taken in implementing a particular survey.

There are three alternative methods of administering the questionnaires. These are face-to-face interviews, telephone questionnaires and mail surveys.

The following table (Table 1.4) adapted from Dilman (1978) provides a summary of the advantages and disadvantages of the various methods of administering questionnaires.

For the purposes of this thesis the face-to-face method was adopted.
**Table 1.4: Advantages and disadvantages of questionnaire administration methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Face to face</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Rates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General samples</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialised samples</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Representative samples</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance of refusal bias</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over who completes the questionnaire</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining access to the selected person</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locating the selected person</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effects on questionnaire design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to handle:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long questionnaires</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex questions</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boring questions</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item non-response</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter questions</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question sequence control</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of answers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise social desirability responses</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to avoid distortion due to:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer characteristics</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer’s opinions</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of other people</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows opportunities to consult</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids subversion</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementing the survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of finding suitable staff</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dilman (1978)

1.2.7.1 Advantages of the face-to-face interview method advocating its use for this study

Traditionally, the face-to-face interview has been considered the most reliable method of data collection, especially when attitudinal behaviour is of concern. Unfortunately, it is also the most expensive. The advantages that have advocated the use of this method are listed and discussed below.

**Better explanations.** In a face-to-face interview, respondents have more time to consider their answers and the interviewer can gain a deeper understanding of the
validity of a response. Sometimes interviewers need to show advertisements, logos, headlines or samples and this is plainly suited to personal situations.

**Depth.** It is easier to maintain the interest of respondents for a longer period of time in face to face interviews. Being face-to-face with respondents gives the interviewer more control and refusals to answer questions are less likely than over the telephone. Concern about confidentiality can be more readily satisfied than with an 'anonymous' person at the end of a phone.

**Greater accuracy.** In a face to face interview respondents can look up information and products can be examined. If the interview is at a business, files of information can be referred to, or phone calls made to colleagues to confirm a point. The interviewer may be able to make a visual check to ensure that the answers are correct.

**1.2.7.2 Disadvantages of face-to-face Interview Method.**

**Organisation.** Face-to-face interviews are difficult to organise. If the interviews are country-wide, a national field force is required. The subject may be complex and demand a personal briefing which is expensive to arrange when interviewers are scattered geographically.

Monitoring and controlling face-to-face interviews is more difficult than with telephone interviews. Face-to-face interviews need to have a supervisor in attendance for part of the time and check-backs, by visit or post, must be organised. For the most part, however, the interviewer is working in isolation and the quality of the work has a considerable dependency on the conscientiousness of the individual.
Cost. The cost of face-to-face interviews is considerably more than the cost of carrying out telephone interviews.

Time. Face to face interviews are time consuming because of the travel time between respondents.

1.2.8 Techniques and software used for the thesis

As has been discussed earlier in this chapter, this thesis aims to examine a number of research questions and problems (see section 1.2.1 p.10). To achieve this task, a range of different techniques and analytical frameworks will be considered and employed. In the following sections a brief introduction into the properties of each technique will be provided.

To ensure the coherency and readability of this thesis, it was decided to explain the techniques prior to their application.

1.2.8.1 Perceptual mapping and correspondence analysis

Perceptual mapping is a procedure where the perceived relative image of a set of objects is determined.

Every object has both perceived and objective dimensions. Two objects may have the same physical characteristics (objective dimensions) but be viewed differently because different individuals use various evaluative criteria for an object (perceived dimension).
Thus, it can be said that two very important differences exist between objective and perceptual dimensions:

a. Individual differences: The dimensions perceived by individuals may not be compatible with the objective dimensions which are assumed by the researcher.

b. Interdependence: There is always a level of interaction between the perceived and objective dimensions and often evaluation may not be independent.

While conducting a perceptual mapping study, the aim of the researcher is to understand the perceived dimensions and then relate them to objective dimensions wherever possible. However, it has to be noted that the interpretation of the dimensions is seen more as an art than a science and the researcher must make every effort not to permit his/her personal perceptions to affect the dimensionality of the perceived dimensions.

Perceptual mapping is considered to be appropriate when used for the attainment of the following objectives:

a. As an exploratory technique to identify unrecognised behavioural dimensions

b. As a means of obtaining comparative evaluations of objects when specific bases of comparison are unknown or undefined (Hair et al, 1998).
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For the development of a valid and precise perceptual mapping study able to provide reliable results, the researcher must make conceptual as well as practical considerations.

A perceptual mapping study must be developed based on three key decisional elements:

a. A selection of the objects that are going to be analysed.

b. A decision whether similarities or preferences are to be analysed, and

c. A decision whether the study is going to be conducted on an individual or group level.

During the process of selecting the objects that are going to be analysed particular attention has to be given to select only objects that are relevant to the research questions of the study. In the case where inappropriate and irrelevant objects are selected, the resulting perceptual maps will be of questionable validity and reliability since the researcher is forcing the technique not only to extract the perceptual dimensions that distinguish among comparable objects but also to extract dimensions that distinguish among non-comparable objects as well.

The choice concerning the level of analysis (group or individual) is totally based on the research aims and objectives. For the purposes of this thesis the objective behind the utilisation of correspondence analysis is to understand the impact of the de facto partition in Cyprus on the population and to empirically examine the factors which prohibit rapprochement of the two communities under the same state mechanisms.

Correspondence analysis is a controversial technique. On the one hand, its proponents see it as an all-purpose data-analytic tool and often interpret its results in a rather loose manner that is difficult to pin down and justify. On the other hand, its adversaries favour
a more familiar model-based approach with known properties, but sacrifice in the process the versatility of correspondence analysis and its easy handling of large high-dimensional data sets. This controversy has to a certain extent been resolved in the case of simple correspondence analysis, that is, the analysis of a two-way contingency table, where both styles of approach are applicable. (Greenacre, 1990)

In its most basic form correspondence analysis examines the relationships between categories of nominal interval data in a contingency table. The analysis uses a basic statistical concept, the chi-square, to standardise the frequency values forming by this way the basis for associations. In a correspondence analysis framework the chi-square is a standardised measure of actual cell frequencies compared to expected cell frequencies. The chi-square values are converted to similarity values which subsequently provide a standardised measure of association. With these association measures correspondence analysis creates a metric distance measure and orthogonal dimensions upon which the categories can be placed to best account for the strength of association represented by the chi-square distances.

Correspondence analysis differs from other multivariate interdependence techniques in its ability to accommodate both nonmetric data and nonlinear relationships. The analysis offers a unique type of perceptual mapping in which categories are represented in the multidimensional space, and the dimensional reduction that it performs is similar in many respects with multidimensional scaling and factor analysis.

Generally speaking correspondence analysis can address either of two basic objectives:

1. Association among row or column categories: Correspondence analysis can be used to examine the association among the categories of just a row or column.
2. Association between row and column categories: In this case the objective is to portray the association between categories of the rows and columns.

The determination of the specific objectives of the analysis is of particular importance because decisions are based on which type of objective is chosen. Furthermore correspondence analysis provides a multivariate representation of interdependence nonmetric data not possible with other methods.

The only requirement of correspondence analysis is a cross-tabulation of nonnegative entries. The rows and columns do not have predefined meanings but are actual representations of the responses of one or more categorical variables.

By utilising the data which are provided by the cross-tabulation table, the frequencies of any row-column combination of categories are related to other combinations based on marginal frequencies. This procedure yields a conditional expectation in the form of a chi-square value. The chi-square test is used to determine whether the rows and columns are independent of one another or, stated differently, whether there is a statistically significant dependence between rows and columns.

After obtaining the chi-square values, they are standardised and converted to a distance metric which define lower-dimensional solutions. These “factors” simultaneously relate the rows and columns in a single joint plot. The final result is a representation of categories of rows and columns in a single plot.

To assess the overall fit, the number and importance of each dimension has to be identified. The maximum number of dimensions that can be estimated is one less than the smaller number of rows and columns.
Eigenvalues are derived for each dimension and indicate the relative contribution of each dimension in explaining the variance of the categories. Often in the literature the term singular values is used instead of eigenvalues. The singular value is the square root of the eigenvalue and is related with one of the most useful tools of matrix algebra, the singular value decomposition.

The decision concerning the number of dimensions is based on the overall level of explained variance desired and the incremental explanation gained by adding another dimension.

A rule of thumb suggested by Hair et al (1998) is that dimensions with eigenvalues greater than 0.2 must be included in the analysis. Furthermore, a representation of three or less dimensions is suggested so as to facilitate interpretation.

The first step in the interpretation of correspondence analysis is to establish whether there is a significant dependency between the rows and columns.

To do this the chi-square statistic has to be calculated by using the following formula:

\[ \chi^2 = \text{Inertia} \times \sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{j=1}^{c} f_{ij} \]

Furthermore Bendixen (1996) suggested as a rule of thumb that when the square root of the inertia (interpreted as correlation coefficient between rows and columns) exceeds 0.2, this is an indicator of a significant dependency.

The next step in the process of interpreting the results is to determine the appropriate number of dimensions of the solution. As was suggested earlier, the maximum number of dimensions that can be extracted is equal to the minimum of the number of columns minus 1, and the number of rows minus 1.

To illustrate, if there is a table with 5 columns x 6 rows and the data was randomly selected, then the average axis should account for \( \frac{100}{(5-1)} = 25\% \) of the inertia in terms
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of columns and 16.6% (100/(6-1)=16.6%) in terms of rows. Thus any axis that contributes more than the maximum of these two percentages should be regarded as significant and included in the solution.

The type of comparisons has to be determined. In most instances, the comparison between rows and columns is made since correspondence analysis provides a joint display of row and column categories in the same dimensionality, something that allows the simultaneous examination of the row and column categories.

As with every statistical technique, correspondence analysis has its disadvantages. These disadvantages have to be carefully considered in relation to the research objectives of the study.

The first disadvantage of correspondence analysis is that the technique is descriptive and is completely inappropriate for hypothesis testing. Secondly, the technique has no method to assist the determination of the appropriate number of dimensions and this is left to the judge or the researcher. The final disadvantage is that the technique is to a certain extent sensitive to outliers, in terms of either rows or columns.

Several computer programs can be used to carry out correspondence analysis like SPSS, Statistica, BMDPS and SAS.

In a typical output of correspondence analysis using statistical programs, a number of terms appear. These are outlined below in a tabular form with the objective of familiarising the reader with the terms and enabling him/her to understand in a better way the output of correspondence analysis.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mass</th>
<th>The mass column contains the row and column totals for the table of relative frequencies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>The Quality column contains information about the quality of representation of the respective row or column point in the coordinate system defined by the respective number of dimensions as chosen by the researcher. By analogy to factor analysis the quality of a point is similar in its interpretation to the communality for a variable in factor analysis. A low quality means that the current number of dimensions does not well represent the respective row or column.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inertia</td>
<td>The term inertia is a measure of the extent to which the profile points are spread around the centroid, and it is calculated by means of the formula $\Lambda^2 = \sum_i r_i d_i^2$ where $d_i$ is the point $i$'s chi-square distance from the centroid and $r_i$ is the point $i$'s mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Inertia</td>
<td>The quality of a point represents the proportion of the contribution of that point to the overall inertia that can be accounted for by the chosen number of dimensions. However, it does not indicate whether or not, and to what extent, the respective point does in fact contribute to the overall inertia. The relative inertia represents the proportion of the total inertia accounted for by the respective point, and is independent of the number of dimensions chosen by the researcher. It has to be noted that in many instances solutions may represent a point very well (high quality) but at the same time may not contribute much to the overall inertia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative Inertia for each dimension</td>
<td>This is the relative contribution of the respective row or column point to the inertia “accounted for” by the respective dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosine²</td>
<td>Cosine² is the quality or squared correlations of each point by dimension. The sum of the cosine values across the dimensions is equal to the quality value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular values</td>
<td>Singular values are computed by the so-called generalised singular value decomposition of the table of relative frequencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalues</td>
<td>Eigenvalues are the squared singular values and sum up to the total inertia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A final point that should be noted concerns the statistical significance of correspondence analysis. Because the method was developed based on a philosophical orientation that emphasises the development of models that fit the data, there are no statistical significance tests that are customarily applied to the results of a correspondence analysis.

It should be stressed once more that the primary purpose of the technique is to produce a simplified (low dimensional) representation of the information contained in a large frequency table.
1.2.8.2 Probit and Logit analysis

Qualitative response models allow the consideration of regression models in which the dependent or response variable itself can be dichotomous in nature taking two values: if the answer is positive, it takes a value of one, otherwise it takes a value of zero. A set of related questions derive considering the dichotomous nature of the dependant variable. How are models which involve dichotomous response variables estimated? Are there special estimation and/or inference problems associated with such models? There are four commonly used approaches available which can be used to test models with dichotomous response variables:

a. The Linear Probability Model (LPM)

b. The Logit Model
c. The Probit Model
d. The Tobit Model

Both Logit and Probit models have two common features, which are reported in Aldrich and Nelson (1984, p.26):

1. Although $X_i, P_i = E(Y = \frac{1}{X})$ increases, it never steps outside the 0-1 interval.

2. The relationship between $P_i$ and $X_i$ is non-linear, that is, one which approaches zero at slower and slower rates as $X_i$ gets small and approaches one at slower and slower rates as $X_i$ gets very large.

These features determine a model with a sigmoid (or S-shaped) curve which resembles the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of a random variable. The CDF’s which are employed to represent the 0-1 response models are the logistic which gives rise to the
Logit model and the normal which gives rise to the Probit model. Both Logit and Probit regression are used for analysing the relationship between one or more independent (predictor) variables with a categorical dependent (criterion) variable.

1.2.8.3 Software packages used

To enable the analysis of the survey data and the attainment of the research aims and objectives, the researcher devoted considerable time to familiarising herself with a number of software packages. These packages are the following:

i. SPSS v. 13
ii. STATISTICA V. 6
iii. Microsoft Excel
iv. Corel Draw v. 12

Although the time spent to get familiar with and competent in the use of the above packages was substantial, it was considered necessary for the proper development of the analytical framework of this thesis without the restrictions that are usually imposed on research projects by the lack of knowledge of software packages and their computational/analytical power.

1.3 Conclusion

The objective of this chapter was to lay the foundation for this study. It provided the objectives and the background information of the study; introduced, explained and justified the research problems and the research questions. Also, the methodology of the thesis and structure were described, the research design was discussed, as well as the sampling plan, the data collection methods and procedures and the empirical frameworks employed. The following chapter will provide a detailed and comprehensive review of the theories of nation, nationalism, ethnicity and ethnic conflict so as to lay the foundations for the development of a strong theoretical basis for this thesis.
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2.1 Introduction

Terms like "ethnicity" and "ethnic conflict" have become quite common in the English language and they keep cropping up in the press, in television news, in political programmes and in casual conversations.

The same can be claimed for the terms "nation" and "nationalism", that their meaning frequently seems ambiguous and vague. We cannot understand "nation" and "nationalism" simply as an ideology or form of politics but both terms must be treated as cultural phenomena. The central difficulty in the study of nations and nationalism has been the problem of finding a consensus between the various and contradicting key concepts and definitions of the terms (Eriken, 1993, p.1).

There has been a parallel development in the social sciences. In the 1980s and 1990s an explosion in the growth of scholarly publications and large-scale contradictory works on ethnicity and nationalism has been witnessed, particularly in the field of political science, history, sociology and social anthropology.

In the following pages a review of the theoretical dimensions of the various literature on nation, nationalism and ethnicity will be provided as well as a discussion of the theoretical foundations and basis of ethnic conflict, its generating causes, the various types and the key factors that lead to this phenomenon.
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2.2 What is a nation: Origins and definition of the term.

The word “nation” derives from the Latin word “Nationem” and when first coined, clearly conveyed the idea of common blood ties. It derives from the past participle of the verb “nasci” meaning “to be born” and hence the Latin noun “nationem” connoting breed or race.

(Hutchinson and Smith, 1994, p.38).

The Italian scholar Zernatto (Kellas, 1994, p.22) traced the early stages of the terminological history of the term. The idea of a nation is to be found as far back as the ancient world, where Greeks, Jews and Armenians who were conscious of their communities retained their homeland albeit under alien rule for many years.

In Rome the word nation was reserved for groups of foreigners coming from the same geographical region, whose status, because they were foreigners, was below that of the Roman citizens. However, in early 16th century England, the word nation in its conciliar meaning of an elite was applied to the population of the country and made synonymous with the word people. According to Shafer (1982, p.13) “a nation whose past is not linked with the present is a creature which neither has a way nor a future”.

Belonging to a nation means having a common heritage, sacrifice and devotion, and a heroic past of great men and glory. These are the principles on which the concept of nation rests. The desire of nations to be together is the only real criterion that must always be taken into account. Nations are essential because their existence guarantees liberty, which would be lost if the world had only one law and only one master. As Hutchinson and Smith (1994, p.18) stated “nations serve the common cause of
civilisation, each holds one note in the concert of humanity which in the long run, is the highest ideal to which we can aspire”.

A nation is primarily a community of people. Thus it is not a racial or tribal unity but a historically constituted stable community of people. A common language, specific territory, economic life and cultural cohesion are the basic characteristics of a nation. The significance of the nation is usually anchored in the perceived superiority of the cultural values, customs and religion of its members who are united by common historical memories, myths, symbols and traditions. Furthermore, nations are territorially bound units of population, where they must have their own homeland reciprocal legal rights and duties under a common legal system.

Hence to belong to a nation person should have:

- A historic territory or homeland
- Common myths and historical memories
- A common mass culture
- A common legal rights and duties
- A common economy and territorial mobility.

2.2.1 External and internal functions of nations

The external functions of nations are territorial, economic and political. Nations first define a definite social space in which members must live, work and demarcate a historical territory that locates a community in time and space. Additionally, the internal functions of a nation are achieved through a compulsory standardised public mass education system, which includes nationalistic ideals, cultural authenticity and unity. Also, nations provide social bonds between individuals by providing shared values, symbols (by the use of symbols we mean flag, national anthem, uniform, ceremonies and coinage) and traditions. Emphatically, Snyder (cited in Hutchinson and
Smith 1994, p.18) noted that a "man is not enslaved, nor is his race, nor his language nor his religion, nor the course of the rivers, nor the direction of the mountain range. A great aggregation of men, with a healthy spirit and warmth of heart creates a moral conscious which is called NATION".

2.3 What is nationalism

"Ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for your country".

(Shafer 1982, p. 32 quoting President John F. Kennedy)

Nationalism as an ideology and movement exerted a strong influence in the American and French revolutions. The field of nationalism is vast and ramified; it includes the growth of nations and the nation-state as well as ethnic identity and community.

Many historians agree that nationalism became prevalent in the latter half of the 18th century. Nationalism as an ideology was stressed during the American War of Independence in 1776, and the French Revolution in 1792. This early ideological phase was permitted by neo-classicism, the conscious return to letters, politics and art (Hutchinson and Smith, 1994, p.5).

Nationalism is both an ideology and a form of behaviour (Kellas, 1994, p.3). The ideology of nationalism builds on people's awareness of a nation, to give a set of attitudes and a programme of action. These may be cultural, economic or political. The political aspect of nationalism is seen most clearly in the demand for national self-determination.
2.3.1 Goals of nationalism

The following six points represent the goals of an individual classified or referred to as being a “nationalist”.

- **Autonomy**
  Thomas (2004, p.1) states that Autonomy is derived from the Greek words auto, meaning self, and nomos meaning law or rule. It is the desire for independence or freedom from all external constraints. Furthermore Bunnis and James (1999, p.1) assert that an autonomous person is one who has the power of self-possession, and the ability to act as he/she decides, independent of the will of others and of other external and internal factors.

- **Self-determination**
  Parker (2000, p.1) defines self-determination as an individual or collective right to freely determine political status and freely pursue economic, social and cultural development. It is also referred to as the right held by people to self-rule in an identifiable territory, a distinct culture and a will and capability to regain self-governance.

- **Identity**
  Chibber, (2000, p.1) affirms that identity is defined by heritage. Identity is one’s language, people and customs that one recognises to be his/her own. Moreover, identity is the individual characteristics by which a person or things are recognised (Collins Dictionary, 2004).

- **Authenticity**
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The quality of being authentic, genuine and valid. The psychological functioning and personality, applied to the conscious feelings, perceptions and thoughts that one expresses and communicates honestly and genuinely (Barn Dictionary, 2002).

Fraternity
A group of people sharing common interests, business or pleasure, a company, brotherhood, a society an association for a specific religious purpose (Barn Dictionary, 2002). Additionally Fraternity can refer to a group of men bonded together by their ritual that contains the founding principles, ideals and aspirations of the groups (www.angelo.edu., 2004, p.2).

In many ways national symbols, customs and ceremonies are the most potent and durable aspects of nationalism.

2.3.2 The three phases of nationalism.

The following figure shows in a succinct but at the same time self-explanatory manner the phases that the term “nationalism” has been through until acquiring its current conceptual and contextual meaning.
2.3.3 Types of Nationalism.

There are three types of Nationalism:

- **Social nationalism**
  This type of nationalism is based on a shared national culture, but not on common descent.

- **Ethnic nationalism**
  Nationalism of ethnic groups who define their nation in exclusive terms, based on common descent.

- **Official nationalism**
  Nationalism of the state, encompassing all those legally entitled to be citizens, irrespective of their ethnicity, national identity or culture.
2.3.4 **Forms of nationalism.**

The eight forms of nationalism are:

- **Pre-nationalism**
  Nationalism, for many writers is a modern political phenomenon, introduced in the 18th century. However national consciousness is traced back to ancient times.

- **Classical European nationalism**
  It has been observed that nationalism arose in the heart of Europe in the 18th century and then spread throughout the world. Classical nationalism was divided into Western and Eastern nationalism. Western nationalism was based on social nationalism, whereas Eastern nationalism was focused on the nation as a community of common descent, language and religion (Kellas, 1991, p.73).

- **Unification movement**
  The German and Italian unification in the 19th century was achieved through war and conquest. This type of nationalism is called risorgimento (Italian word which means rebirth), and it combines the aim of national unification with liberal ideals of democracy and freedom (Kellas, 1991, p.74).

- **National secession movement**
  In some cases it can be observed that the nationalist spirit leads to the break-up of existing states instead of joining them together.

- **Integral nationalism**
  Integral nationalism is an extreme national feeling and ideology, which clearly resembles the totalitarian and Nazi forms of government.
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Reform Nationalism
This form of nationalism was evidenced in the 20th century in Japan and Turkey, where re-birth or "Risorgimento" was sought but within the existing state, and the nationalists were the ruling class. The aim was economic modernisation, national identity and independence from foreign control.

Colonial nationalism
In the European colonial empires nationalism developed among the European settlers, which led to the independence of the colonies from the mother countries.

Anti-Colonial nationalism
Anti-Colonial movements were born within the British Empire and spread throughout Europe. Therefore, unification and "Risorgimento" nationalism was found in these peoples. Thus nation building, irredentism and secession were found in these new states.

2.3.5 Theories of nationalism.
Smith (1986) focuses on ethnicity as the precursor of nationalism. He emphasises the continuity between ethnic identities and loyalties on the one hand and nationhood and nationalism on the other. Smith claims that nationalism is more concerned with statehood or some form of self-government than ethnicism, which is less clearly political. Nationalism does more effectively what pre-modern ethnicists tried to do, that is, keep out foreigners and diffuse to their kinsmen the traditions and myths of their ancestors, using the modern mass education system.

On the other hand the work by Anderson (1991) is another recent major contribution to the exploration of the psychological appeal of nationalism. He takes a historical, rather
than timeless, universalist approach so that nationalism is seen to emerge at a specific period in European history. Anderson explains how people imagine themselves part of a nation and build up a set of necessary conditions for the emergence of nationalism. He believes that the nation represents the continuity from one generation to the other. Furthermore, he stresses the character of nationalism, not as a political ideology self consciously followed, but as a cultural system with religious character. He suggests that religion not always replaces nationalism but sometimes goes hand-in-hand with it. It has been seen that churches have reinforced nationalism in countries like Armenia, Cyprus, Greece, Poland, Italy and Ireland and to a certain extent they dictate national policies.

Gellner’s theory of nationalism (1983) stresses the economic and industrial forces of society. For Gellner, (cited in Kellas 1983, p.1) “nationalism has been considered essential to the establishment of a modern industrial society. It gives legitimacy to the state and inspires its citizens to feel an emotional attachment towards it.” He connects industrialisation and economic factors to the rise of nationalism during the 18th and 19th centuries. At the basis of his theory is the insistence that an industrial society depends upon a common culture. This probably depends on sharing a language and certainly upon sharing an extended cultural code.

Concluding, Gellner’s theory claims that “nationalism is perceived as a purely modern phenomenon detached from ‘folk’ or the past. Nationalism for Gellner is the vehicle for forging efficient and cohesive societies” (Wicker, 1997, p.166).

Kedourie (1994) defines nationalism as a very modern phenomenon of the 18th century and asserts that nationalism precedes the nation. However, for Hobsbawn (cited from
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Hutchinson and Smith, (1994) nations do not make states and nationalism but the other way round; for him, nation is a very recent newcomer in human history.

Karl Marx and his co-thinkers claimed that, "nationalism is a bourgeois doctrine arising out of the bourgeoisie’s desire to control economic markets" (Shafer, 1982 p.35). In Marx's view nationalism is an expression of bourgeois interest. The bourgeoisie conveniently assumed that the nation consisted only of capitalists and, therefore, the country was "theirs".

It is worth mentioning some of the major differences between nationalism and Marxism: nationalism primarily places emphasis on culture while Marxism traces economic roots. Secondly Marxists locate their enemy in capitalism without considering nationality, while for nationalists the enemy are those who corrupt and oppress the purity of the nation.

Lastly Durkheim defines nationalism as "human groups that are united by a community of civilisation without being united by a political bond" (Guibernau cited in Wicker 1997, p.85). Durkheim supported that nationalism and religion are connected with each other because having the same rituals and symbols means that people think and act the same way.

2.4 Defining ethnicity

The term “ethnicity” derives from the Greek word “ethnos”, which means heathen or pagan (Guibernau and Rex, 1993). It was used in this sense in English from the mid 14th century until mid 19th century. After the late 19th century it gradually began to refer to racial characteristics.
Ethnicity grew in Eastern Europe where dynastic powers were born and became powerful. However the term ethnicity became increasingly crucial in the social sciences in the 1960s, a period marked by the consolidation of the process of decolonisation and the creation of new states.

For Wicker (1997, p.85), “Ethnicity is a group of people with a shared cultural identity, religious and spoken language”. Therefore, the characteristics of ethnicity are shaped by religion and language because these two factors are important elements to distinguish and define ethnicity. Religion provided the mythical core in the particularisation of each local ethnicity and a universalising bridge in its networking with wider ethnic circles. Furthermore, ethnicity has a common and shared culture whereby a group of people share the basics of life, language, customs, rituals and common education system. In these past few years ethnicity constitutes a core mechanism where people understand their past and present history.

2.5 Review of the literature on theories of ethnic conflict.

This section will present and discuss some of the basic concepts and relationships of ethnic conflict. Its purpose is to identify, define and refine certain notions, the use of which is essential for the study of ethnic conflict both on the domestic (internal) and external (international) level.

An understanding of the causes, options and effects of the interaction between ethnic politics and the international environment is essential for a fruitful study of ethnic conflict. Although ethnic conflict is primarily a domestic phenomenon, it is affected by the conditions of the world within which states and entities live and act.
2.5.1 Defining ethnic groups

An ethnic group is a type of cultural collectivity that emphasises the role of myths, descent and historical memories. Ethnic groups can be defined by:

- Collective proper name
- Myth of common ancestry
- Shared historical memory
- Common culture
- Specific homeland.

Figure 2.2: Definitional elements of ethnic conflict

An ethnic group is a cultural unit whose members conceive of themselves as different in language, descent, history, tradition and religious beliefs. In other words it is taken to be a group of people who define themselves as distinct from other groups because of cultural differences. Likewise, Ryan (1995, p.4) defines culture as “a set of concepts in terms of which a given population thinks and acts”. Cultural differences arise from a number of factors but the most important are language, religion, historical experience, geographical isolation, race and kinship.

Nevertheless, a distinctive culture seems to be the most important component of an ethnic identity. As Stavenhagen (cited in Ryan 1995, p.4) has noted “When I speak of
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culture I mean the broad spectrum of human activities, symbols, values and artefacts that identify a human group and distinguish it from others. Ethnic groups then, may be thought of as collectivities that identify themselves or are identified by others precisely in such cultural terms”.

Ethnic groups are those who share the same sense of ancestral past and their ancestral identification (language, kinship, religion, history and culture). These elements are the nucleus for the creation of the ethnic groups because these elements bind and allow the ethnic spirit and continuation from generation to generation. Furthermore, they help to keep cohesion within the group and they can be distinguished from other ethnic groups.

2.5.2 Definition of Conflict

The word “conflict” is derived from the Latin word “confligere” meaning to strike together (Joseph, 1985, p.5). Conflict, as a social phenomenon appears when two interacting parties are pursuing incompatible goals. The phenomenon of conflict manifests itself when different parties formulate incompatible objectives and steps are taken towards their achievement. Coser (cited in Joseph, 1997, p.4), in his classical definition, defines conflict as a “struggle over values and claims to scarce resources in which the aim of the opponents are to neutralise, injure or eliminate their rivals”.

Furthermore, historically radical differences of religion, ideology, culture or institutions have tended to induce conflict. However, this depends on the government whether the above inconsistencies of social ideologies will lead or develop into conflict. These policies are likely to be influenced by the social tension that exists in the state. The tension in the state may increase or decrease depending whether the groups are in close contact or not.
Conflict can transform into two phases. It can take violent or non-violent forms. An exchange of words is a form of non-violent conflict and an exchange of bullets is a form of violent conflict (Joseph, 1997, p.4).

2.5.3 Types of conflict

Conflict can take place among different sorts of entities. These can lead into the following types of conflict: domestic (internal), external (international) conflict, physical, political, ideological and legal conflict.

- Domestic conflict
  Domestic conflict refers to confrontation between parties within a single state. Such parties are groups identifiable with reference to certain characteristics such as geographical region, socio-economic status, ideology, race, religion, language and culture.

- External conflict
  External conflict refers to confrontation between parties across borders. The parties involved in external conflict can be foreign groups, states or subgroups from different states.

- Physical conflict
  Two or more entities try to occupy the same space, each seeking to annihilate, disarm, dominate or capture the other.

- Political conflict
  A group tries to impose its policy on others and to achieve policies against the resistance of others.
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- **Ideological conflict**
  Systems of thought or value struggle with each other.

- **Legal conflict**
  Where controversies over claims or demands are adjusted.

**Figure 2.3: Types of conflict**

After defining the various types of conflict, it is considered prudent, for the purposes of this thesis, to elaborate and discuss further the definitional as well as the conceptual elements of domestic (internal) conflict.

Domestic ethnic conflict can be defined as the situation where two or more segments of a population, which are constituent elements of the same state but with different ethnic identification, are pursuing incompatible or mutually exclusive political goals or national aspirations. Domestic ethnic conflict takes place mainly within a state, but its causes and consequences may extend far beyond geographical boundaries. As the world is becoming more ethnic and less geographic, it means that ethnicity is playing a major role both at the domestic and the international level.
Although domestic ethnic conflict can be seen as a primarily domestic phenomenon, it affects and is affected by the conditions of the world within which states live, act and interact. The societal sources refer to an amalgam of elements of the domestic society. Such elements are culture, history, traditions, norms, social institutions, the degree of national unity, the level of education, the economic system and the mass media.

Weak state structures are the starting point for many analyses of domestic conflict. Some states are born weak, they lack political legitimacy, political borders and institutions. Domestic ethnic conflict is likely to occur if oppression and violence are employed by the state or political transition is under way. Furthermore, the prospects for violence are greater if groups (whether they are based on political, ideological, religious or ethnic affinities) have ambitious objectives, a strong sense of identity and confrontational strategies. Also, the possibility is further magnified if groups are strong and determined, action is feasible, and competition, anxiety and fears of being dominated preponderate.

2.5.4 Definition of ethnic conflict

The post 1945 world was dominated by the ideological battle between Western liberalism and Soviet style Marxism. Both have tended to be dismissive of ethnic sentiments and group rights seemed to be at odds with the idea of individual human rights. These ideological prejudices have brought nationalism and ethnicity to the epicentre of conflict. Furthermore, western social science in the post-war decades expressed the view that ethnic conflict would disappear as nations modernised and minority groups were assimilated. Industrialisation would lead to increased communication and urbanisation would take place. This in turn would lead to acculturation which would be transferred through these ethnic groups to the nation-state, and intercommunal problems will seize to exist.
However, this was not the case. Ethnic revival in Western countries, the Third World and the ex-Soviet bloc countries has lead to bitter ethnic conflict between two or more ethnic groups, as for example in the cases of Karabagh (between Armenians and Azeri) and Abkhazia (between Abkhazians and Georgians).

Ethnic conflict is often used loosely to describe a wide range of interstate or intrastate conflicts that may not in fact be ethnic in character. Ethnic conflict is a dispute about important economic, political, social, cultural, religious or territorial issues between two or more ethnic communities (Joseph, 1997, p.5). Many ethnic conflicts start within the state (domestic) but soon outside powers (external) become involved either for restoring peace or gaining strategic influence.

For ethnic conflict to occur two or more ethnic groups must reside in close proximity. Additionally, national, regional and international authorities must be too weak to keep groups from having disputes or fighting.

Before reviewing the literature on ethnic conflict in Cyprus, a review of the major and important theoretical contributors in the field of ethnic conflict should be discussed and analysed. Despite the fact that in the last years ethnic conflict has become a hot issue in the political science sphere, unfortunately in the extant literature there is still at large a lack of theoretical and conceptual consensus regarding the definition of the term which has still not been clearly defined and explained. Rather, there is a mixture of thoughts regarding the exact and proper definition of the term since each author defines ethnic conflict in a different perspective and finds roots in several factors. This broadens the theory of ethnic conflict and at the same time makes it more difficult to reach a single common definition of the term.
The review of the literature that was carried out for the purposes of this research has clearly demonstrated the absence of a common theoretical and terminological consensus regarding the definition of ethnic conflict. However, several references and theoretical approximations were found on conflict management, conflict resolution, types and forms of conflict. This finding led the researcher to a preliminary conclusion that few scholars in the political science field have touched in detail upon one of the most serious and sensitive issues of this century, which is ethnic conflict, and at the same time few have tried to provide a theoretically succinct and thorough definition of the term. Undoubtedly, the starting point for the analysis of the underlying sources and causes of ethnic conflict must be a strong theoretical and conceptual clarification of the actual meaning of the term. In the absence of this, a review of the various studies on ethnic conflict will be carried out in an attempt to clarify and elucidate the theoretical and conceptual foundations/properties of the term.

2.6 Review of studies on ethnic conflict

Ethnic conflict is a form of ethnic violence and after World War II, especially in the last two decades, ethnic conflict has become widespread in ethnically divided societies. Horowitz, one of the leading figures in the field of political science argued that “ethnic groups are based on shared cultures, histories and traditions. In turn, it is assumed, groups with firmly fixed boundaries enter into conflict with each other” (2000, p.73). When ethnic conflict arises the boundaries of the country are reconstructed. Horowitz further argued that (2000, p.99), ethnic conflict is a by-product of modernisation. It has been observed that ethnic conflict is the outcome of those countries that have passed through a phase of Transformation or Modernisation.

Ethnic conflict can be related to modernisation in the following three ways:
1. When a country or a state passes through a sudden change from traditionalism to modernisation.
2. Ethnic conflict is an impediment to modernisation.
3. Ethnic conflict is regarded as a product of the modernisation process.

**Figure 2.4: Evolution of ethnic conflict**

On the other hand, Deutsch (cited from Horowitz, 2000, p.99) asserted that ethnic conflict is connected with social mobilisation. Social mobilisation was conceived as an “overall process of change which happens to substantial parts of the population in countries which are moving from traditional to modern ways of life” (Deutsch cited from Horowitz, 2000, p.99). It involves the substitution of new patterns of behaviour for old, and involvement of mass politics, the change of occupation from rural to urban, especially from agricultural to non-agricultural.

Social mobilisation fosters ethnic competition, especially in the competitive modern sector. Horowitz (2000, p.101) states that “peoples aspirations and expectations change as they are mobilised into the modernising economy and polity. They come to want and demand more (goods, recognition and power). Men enter into conflict not because they are different but because they are essentially the same. It is the making of men more
alike in the sense of possessing the same wants that modernisation tends to promote conflict”.

Also the benefits of modernity are not equally spread among ethnic groups. This uneven distribution of economic and educational opportunities in the modern sector provides a source of group tension. Horowitz states that (2000, p.101) because some groups gain a headstart in the competition for the rewards of the modern world, the social classes that emerge tend to overlap and reinforce ethnic group boundaries, thereby making ethnic group confrontation more intense”.

Horowitz (2000) provided another theoretical aspect towards the investigation of ethnic conflict by claiming that ethnic groups who had a history of colonial rule are more susceptible and inclined to ethnic conflict. His rationale is based on the fact that ethnic groups through colonial rule obtained modernisation, and economic and educational development. Therefore, under these socio-political and economic contexts ethnic groups use colonial rule to alter their social/political/economic conditions while at the same time the foreign rule uses the indigenous ethnic groups as cheap labour resources in order to achieve their goals. When colonial rule is swept away from a country, in most instances the ethnic groups are confronted with an internal imbalance and competition in order to govern the country (according to ethnic interests and aspirations) something that inevitably leads to ethnic conflict between the two groups (e.g. in Malaysia the Chinese were encouraged to enter into mining and trade, the Indians to tap rubber, the Ceylonese to run the railroad).

Ethnic conflict also is observed when a country is on the verge of independence. At this point, certain questions surface regarding the post-independence rule of the country, the balance of power and the exploitation of the natural resources. This inevitably leads to uncertainties and obstacles to the process of transfer of power. Times of power
transition are periods of ethnic tension. For this reason there are many examples from the past where many ethnic communities/groups preferred to live under colonial rule and felt more secure with colonial rule rather than live in an independent state or country (e.g. Cyprus, Nigeria, Pakistan, India and Indonesia).

However, Horowitz (2000) through his analysis has found that the generation and establishment of **elite classes** in a society had as a direct consequence the formation of reverse dynamics and conflicting interests with the other ethnic groups, leading by this way to ethnic conflict. He further argued that ethnic violence flares up in urban areas when armies become divided due to ethnic tension which inevitably ends in a coup or killings between ethnic groups. As a result in a given country a division of two separate ethnic groups is formed which create **rivalry** and **antagonism**. In this context, societies are more inclined to ethnic conflict (e.g. Rwanda, Nigeria, Congo, Uganda, Zimbabwe).

In addition to the above perspective, Horowitz holds that **economic interests** may contribute to the escalation of ethnic conflict between ethnic groups.

The **materialist theory** (Horwitz, 2000) stresses the **competition between different classes**. This competition is generated when employers use the cheap labour of ethnic group A to undercut the price paid for the labour of ethnic group B. Therefore, highly paid labourers from ethnic group A are threatened by the introduction of new and at the same time cheap labour in the market. This creates a **labour market split** leading to class **antagonism** which transforms to **ethnic antagonism**.

The whole picture gets more complicated when “trading minorities come into the conflict arena with the business men” (Horwitz, 2000, p.107). Conflict arises because trade minorities immigrate in the country and they introduce new goods, low prices, cheap material and labour and new techniques which in turn create competition between the dominating indigenous ethnic groups. (e.g. Chinese in South East Asia, Fiji-Haiti,
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Indonesia-Chinese community) Horowitz claimed that through observation analysis it could be asserted that two ethnic groups living in the same place cause ethnic conflict because they believe that Group A is superior to Group B and vice-versa. Both groups fear that they will lose their ethnic identity through their domination by the other. This phenomenon is usually evident in countries with cultural pluralism (i.e. more than one culture). Ethnic conflict is a direct consequence of this fear, and is generated when one group tries to dominate the other in order to achieve their cultural and ethnic goals. Group B resists since they believe that their values, beliefs and internal social structure will be lost and dominated by Group A.

Horowitz (2000) also supported that ethnically based political parties lead to ethnic conflict. In some countries (India, Cyprus, Kosovo, Serbia and Croatia) ethnic parties emerge due to anti-colonial rule. These political movements divide the population along ethnic lines long before independence. In these situations ethnic conflict becomes unavoidable because ethnic party groups are identified with the cause of protecting the interests of their ethnic group only, and likewise they are characterised by extreme ethnicism. These extreme ethnic feelings in the country create intra-ethnic conflict and ruin the ethnic equilibrium that exists in the country or state.

The final point that is raised by Horowitz is military contribution. The military are a significant symbol of ethnic domination and at the same time can plan a variety of roles in ethnic conflict. The use of military force may help control ethnic rioting, but if the army favours one group over another then its intention may exacerbate the violence (Cyprus, Lebanon, Iraq (Sunni versus Shi’is). If there is a secessionist movement, an ethnically divided army may help and make protracted warfare possible, by that time civil war starts and the army is divided into several units. Civil war is the most
powerful form of internal violence, and this is the most extreme action that reflects divisions that exists in a given society.

The following diagram provides in a diagrammatic way the process where several factors interact towards the generation of ethnic conflict.

*Figure 2.5: The generation of ethnic conflict*
2.6.1 *Divisions as a result of ethnic conflict*

The occurrence of ethnic conflict in a country can lead to the amalgamation, incorporation or division of ethnic groups. This section provides a brief summary of these scenarios.

Horowitz (2000) argued that in certain countries two different groups *amalgamate* (two or more groups unite) to form a new group.

\[ \text{Group A} \rightarrow \text{Group C} \]

A second scenario is the situation where there are two ethnic groups (A+B), whereas Group A is stronger than Group B. In this case, group A absorbs into it group B and *incorporation* takes place.

\[ \text{Group A} + \text{Group B} \rightarrow \text{Group A} \]

Another scenario according to Horowitz (2000) is the *division* that can take place within an ethnic group. According to this scenario, Group A is a single ethnic group but within the group there are differences in beliefs, attitudes and thinking, therefore there are problems for this group to maintain a single cultural and social character. As a result the ethnic groups of this character and nature are divided into two or more ethnic groups.

\[ \text{Group A} \rightarrow \text{Group B} \rightarrow \text{Group C} \]
The final scenario is the situation where there is a single Group A and from this group various other groups are being produced. This is known as *proliferation* (one group or more produce an additional group from within its ranks.) (Horowitz, 2000).

2.6.2 *Dimensions of ethnic conflict*

According to Horwitz (2000) the different dimensions of ethnic conflict are:

A. Backward groups in backward regions  
B. Advanced groups in backward regions  
C. Advanced groups in advanced regions  
D. Backward groups in advanced regions

Backward groups in backward regions (see figure 2.6) desire prolonged colonial rule or a separate independence or a special arrangement to protect them after independence. These people fear competition with their neighbours within the boundaries of a single political arena. Furthermore, backward groups in backward regions tend to demand representation in politics and public service. However, the educated elites stand to gain from the creation of new opportunities in a smaller, albeit poorer state. Advanced segments of backward groups do not resist but generally lead the movement. Additionally, backward groups in backward regions receive a dramatically smaller share of government positions and, instead, civil servants are imported from more advanced regions to theirs.
In economic terms, regions with a surfeit of human resources export them to regions with a deficit the same is for investment. In Telengana\(^1\) cheap but fertile land was purchased by ambitious coastal Andhra farmers. Telengana farmers thus resented the more efficient, productive coastal farmers who migrated there, even though their activity presumably raised the value of Telengana land.

Figure 2.6: **Backward groups in backward regions**

1. Telengana is a region in Andhra Pradesh in Central India.
The above figure demonstrates that backward groups are early seceders, but advanced groups are late seceders. Also, backward groups often seek colonial protection and postponement of independence or a special arrangement, whereas advanced groups are supporters of anti-colonial movements.

Furthermore, backward groups seek proportionality in government employment, advanced groups seek only assurance of non-discrimination. Backward groups attempt secession as soon as their competitive fears seem confirmed. Advanced groups in backward regions have a much higher threshold of tolerance for political events, inimical to their interests than backward regions.

Advanced groups in backward regions secede only as a last resort. Many advanced groups in backward regions, even when severely frustrated, do not reach the point of choosing separatism (The Lozi in Zambia are such group). The Lozi homeland,
Barotseland was administered separately by the British. As independence was agreed, Barotseland, would have a special status within Zambia. This arrangement was soon abrogated by the Zambian government which treated Barotseland as just another province, restricting the powers of the Lozi monarch and abolishing the Barotse legislature. However, despite the pressure, secession has had no real support from educated Lozi elites and despite provocation, important elements of the Lozi community still prefer a unified Zambia.

**Figure 2.8: Advanced groups in advanced regions**

Advanced regions usually generate more income and contribute more revenue to the treasury of the undivided state than they receive (The Basque and Catalan regions in Spain are an example of this).

The Basque and Catalan areas are industrialized regions with per capita incomes far above the national average. Such groups are likely to export surplus capital and population outside the region. Their prosperity generates investment that does not respect regional boundaries.

The prosperity of advanced groups in advanced regions typically depends not merely on the contributions of migrants located in other regions but on a web of interregional economic relations that may include dependence on other regions for materials and markets, sometimes specially protected markets.
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**Figure 2.9: Backward groups in advanced regions**

1. Backward groups in advanced regions
2. Backward groups are numerically predominant
3. Industrial backward groups are afraid of a threat of domination, competition
4. Discrimination by the advanced groups

Backward groups in advanced regions are quite likely to be separatists, but they are rarely in a numerically predominant position in such a region. Economically, advanced regions tend to be the home of advanced ethnic groups who have benefited from the economic institutions that bring prosperity to the region. However, opportunities of this kind are sometimes taken up by migrants to an area as in Sind province of Pakistan, the prosperous urban centres of which are controlled by Urdu speaking migrants from North India, rather than Sindhis. When this occurs the indigenous population becomes a backward group in an advanced region. Backward groups in advanced regions are fearful of competing with advanced groups and keenly sensitive to threats of domination. Their fears are magnified by the large number of advanced group members in their midst. A backward group in an advanced region such as the Lunda must also cope with the advanced group within its own regional borders.

As noted earlier, backward groups in backward regions typically attempt secession despite economic cost. For backward groups in advanced regions secession appears to promise economic benefits. The region typically contributes more to the income of the undivided state than it receives.
2.6.3 Methods of conflict

Conflict may be carried out by two methods: coercion and persuasion.

Coercion usually involves violence and physical conflict, where each party seeks to destroy or dominate the other to control or occupy their territory. Persuasion does not involve violence. Each party tries to isolate the other, and change its policy, ideology or claims. Furthermore, persuasion may be used as a means to conduct propaganda by utilising symbols to influence the minds of the enemy’s armed forces, government and civilian population.

2.6.4 Resolution of ethnic conflict

An important theme in the wide sphere of ethnic conflict theory is ethnic conflict resolution. Horowitz (2000) and Lijphart (1977) argued that when there is majority rule and a minority in a country, in order to prevent ethnic conflict, there should be:

- A grand coalition of all ethnic groups
- Mutual veto powers in decision making
- Ethnic proportionality in the allocation of certain opportunities and offices
- Ethnic autonomy, often expressed in federalism

Lijphard argued for a stable democracy in a state where there is a majority and minority existence. He noted that Switzerland, Belgium, Austria and the Netherlands have attained democracy, stability and cooperation between the leaders of the different groups which transcends the segmental and sub-cultural cleavage.

Nordlinger (1972) provided a different conceptual approach towards ethnic conflict resolution by devising a set of “ethnic regulations” (cited in Horowitz, 2000, p.570) which are the following:
Nordlinger (1972) supported that if in the short term the situation in a given country is complex, problematic or unresolved, then it is impossible for groups to live together in a heterogeneous state. In such a situation, he argued that it is better for the groups to live apart in more than one heterogeneous state. Separating the antagonists through partition is an option, especially in situations where in a state there is more than one ethnic group, something that inevitably provokes separatism. Furthermore, Horowitz (2000, p.589) states that if in the short run the constraints on policy innovation are many, if grand settlements need readjustment, perhaps it is a mistake to seek accommodation among the antagonists. Separating the antagonists (partition) is an option increasingly recommended for consideration where groups are territorially concentrated. It is rare to observe two separate ethnic groups living harmoniously and functioning under the same state mechanism. Sometimes the ethnic group leaders believe that through independence the antagonism and internal problems of the groups will stop. However in certain countries independence accelerates and specifies the ethnic antagonism and creates ethnic conflict.

The most important policies in dealing with ethnic conflict are subsumed into two categories: *distributive and structural* (Horowitz, 2000, p.598)
Distributive policies aim to change the ethnic balance of economic opportunities and rewards while structural policies aim to change the political framework in which ethnic conflict takes place. Distributive policies are employed by those governments who concentrate investment disproportionately in geographic areas where members of one or another group are located in rural development areas and land colonisation (e.g. rural development in Malaysia and land colonisation in Sri Lanka). On the other hand, the main structural techniques involve the reshaping of territorial or electoral arrangement which is federalism and regional autonomy.

Federalism is divided into two paths: homogeneous state and heterogeneous state.

If groups are territorially separate and sub-ethnic divisions are prominent, then a homogeneous state is formed. Furthermore, if a group is territorially intermixed and the conflict is reduced at the centre a heterogeneous state can be created. The Malaysian federal system illustrates several purposes that may be fulfilled by carving out states with varying degrees of heterogeneity. Nigeria showed that federalism can generate political compartments in which ethnically and sub-ethnically differentiated parties can flourish.

Moreover, state governments provide opportunities for the development of inter-ethnic elite relations that sometimes soften ethnic hostility among politicians (e.g. in Malaysia land is subject to the state. Chinese businessmen who need land for development have to get the state approval). Heterogeneous states embracing territorially separate groups, each occupying a portion of the state, have some tendency of fusion. Therefore to reduce ethnic conflict, groups have to be intermixed or their territorial boundaries must have some long-standing binding force as in the case of Malaysia.
Regional autonomy or federal arrangements are sometimes viewed as undue concessions to separatist sentiments. Regional autonomy allows the central government to retain ultimate control over the powers of regional governments (e.g. Sudan, Sri Lanka, and Spain) without losing the cooperation of the beneficiary groups.

It is suggested by Horowitz (2000, p.264) that regional autonomy should be made available not only to separatist regions but to all regions (e.g. Sri Lankan development councils were to be operative throughout the country and Spanish regional government has been offered to all regions on a referendum basis). By universalising regional autonomy, it is possible to dispel ethnic opposition to special concessions. Also, fixed presidential elections may make it possible to offer regional autonomy or federalism.

2.6.5 Underlying causes of internal conflict

Brown (1997, p.4) states that some places and some situations are more liable to violence than others. Hence he has presented four sets of factors that cause internal conflict in a state.

- Structural factors
- Political factors
- Economic factors
- Cultural factors

Structural Factors
The three main structural factors are as follows:
- Weak states
- Intra - state security
- Ethnic geography
As can be seen diagrammatically from the above figure some states are born weak. Many of these states were freed from colonial rule (Cyprus, Southern Asia and Africa) and also many states look for political legitimacy and political institutions capable of controlling the territory placed under their nominal supervision.

In addition to the above, other states have been weakened by internal problems such as endemic corruption and inability to promote economic development. Therefore, when, state structure weakens, violent conflict often follows because ethnic groups prepare military action in order to defend and protect themselves.

Finally, the third factor is concerned with ethnic geography (more precisely when ethnic minorities exist in a state). States with ethnic minorities are more prone to conflict than others. Some states are ethnically homogeneous and therefore face few problems (e.g. Sweden and China; Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic have few minorities). In some states with ethnic minorities, ethnic groups are intermingled, in others minorities tend to live in separate provinces or regions of the country. However, if secessionist demands develop in countries with intermingled populations, ethnic groups will seek to
establish control over specific tracts of territory by direct attacks to civilians, intense guerilla warfare, ethnic cleansing and genocide.

**Figure 2.11: Political factors for ethnic conflict**

Brown (1997, p.8) has identified four political factors that may cause or generate internal conflict. Firstly, the possibility for conflict in a country depends on the stability and fairness that the political internal system holds. Close authoritarian systems are likely to generate considerable resentment over time, especially if the interests of some ethnic groups are served while those of others are trampled upon. Also resentment occurs when ethnic groups are not represented evenly and equally in the government, in the court, military, police and political parties. Furthermore, if the state uses violence or oppression, or the state is under transition then political conflict takes place.

Another reason is the ethnic nationalism that can prevail in a country if the state activates/encourages ethnic distinction rather than the idea that everyone who lives in a country is entitled to the same rights and privileges (instances of strong ethnic nationalism are to be found in parts of the Balkans, East Central Europe and former Soviet Union.).
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Thirdly, the expectation for violence is high if groups are based on political, ideological, religious or ethnic affinities with other states. Internal conflict can take place if groups fear competition or domination and feel that, actions are feasible and success is possible.

**Figure 2.12: Economic factors for ethnic conflict**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most countries experience economic problems of one kind or another and these problems can contribute to intra-state tension. In some industrialised countries problems may emerge if the country’s economy is expanding (e.g. former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and parts of Africa) or if a transition is taking place from centrally planned economies to market based systems. Most of the time this has a direct consequence on the creation of economic problems (high unemployment, rampant inflation and resource competition).

Furthermore, discriminatory economic systems, (unequal economy opportunities, unequal access to resources such as land and capital and unequal standard of living), whether they discriminate on a class basis or on an ethnic basis, can generate feelings of resentment and levels of frustration that can lead to violence. Also economic development and modernisation in a state can create instability and internal conflict. Introduction of new technologies and industrialisation can bring profound social changes.
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Figure 2.13: Cultural factors for ethnic conflict

Cultural discrimination against minorities includes inequality of educational opportunities, legal and political constraints on teaching their language and restraints on religious freedom. These policies have been adopted in the Soviet Union between the 1930's to 1940's during the Stalin dictatorship.

Furthermore, group history and perceptions include legitimate grievances against others for a crime that was committed in the past at some point. Some ancient hatred which has passed down into their history is taught by word of mouth from generation to generation. These actions can easily generate and provoke ethnic conflict if two ethnic groups live in close proximity and the slightest action can be seen as a justification for the past historical action.

2.7 Ethnic conflict in Cyprus: A critical review of the literature

In the previous section an in-depth and thorough analysis was carried out in order to explain and define the theory of ethnic conflict. Despite the fact that it is a complex and difficult task to clearly define the term “ethnic conflict”, several leading scholars from the field of political science have gradually developed the theoretical foundation from which other researchers have devised studies on ethnic conflict. In this section, a review
of the literature on ethnic conflict in Cyprus will be presented, discussed and analysed. In this context, the perspectives of the various schools of thought regarding the solution of conflict in Cyprus will be presented.

The dynamic and complicated nature of ethnic conflict in Cyprus through the years has hindered the processes by which scholars have tried to understand and evaluate the complex nature and underlying interrelationships of ethnic conflict in Cyprus. Usually, new waves of developments occur which affect the scholarly direction of the study of the conflict. Conversely, having two distinct and culturally separate groups makes even more difficult the task of the intermediaries to find an ideal and balanced solution that would satisfy both ethnic communities.

Through the review of the literature, it has been observed that as the years pass scholars have less extreme views regarding the solution of the ethnic conflict in Cyprus. Recent scholars who have written on the ethnic conflict in Cyprus are more elastic and less extreme in their proposals regarding the solution of the problem. In this section an in-depth discussion and analysis of the literature of ethnic conflict in Cyprus will be carried out through the review of studies by Greek Cypriots, Turkish Cypriots and foreign scholars. To facilitate this process, a typology was developed. This typology involved the classification of the extant literature into schools of thought based on the proposed solution to the Cyprus conflict as devised by each scholar. This resulted into the following groups:

- Group A: A unitary or Integrated State
- Group B: A unitary State without foreign interference
- Group C: Partition as a solution to ethnic conflict
Group D: A solution through bi-zonal, bi-communal federation

Group E: Non-coexistence due to ethnic differences

2.7.1 Group A: Unitary or integrated state

Polyviou (1975, p.119) supported the view that a solution to the ethnic conflict in Cyprus could be achieved if the policy of integration was adopted, where Greek and Turkish Cypriots could live together, work and develop a positive sense of citizenship under one strong unitary state. He argued that ethnic conflict in Cyprus could not be solved in any other way (e.g. Federalism) which in more specific terms implies the division of “a small and economically homogeneous island into two geographical zones with separate administrations and hardly any opportunity for association between the two main communities”.

Stavrinides (1975), although sharing the same opinion as Polyviou for the solution of the conflict, noted an important factor that has to be taken seriously into consideration. This factor relates to the fact that the generating cause of conflict between the two ethnic communities was their extreme nationalism in identifying with their motherland (Greece and Turkey). Behind all the protests, violence and killings the nationalistic emotions of both communities were hidden, which eventually did not allow the communities to develop a Cypriot consciousness. Consequently, he pointed out that Greek and Turkish Cypriots can live together if they both try and abandon their extreme nationalistic feelings. If this is achieved, both ethnic communities can build and develop an integrated state where both can live and coexist.
Karouzis (1976) has investigated ethnic conflict in Cyprus through the perspective of a geographer. Before providing his own conclusions regarding the solution of ethnic conflict in Cyprus, he presented and discussed in detail the various other solutions proposed up to that date. As already stated in section 2.6, almost all countries do not have complete ethnological homogeneity and almost everywhere there are minorities. Karouzis has examined the Turkish Cypriot minority comparatively on a global perspective and he came to the conclusion that "no minority has been given so many privileges and so many facilities as has been the case with the Turkish-Cypriot community. On the other hand, no other minority has caused so much harm, destruction and tragedy in any other country as the Turkish Cypriots in Cyprus" (1976, p. 85). His basic assumption was that in order to maintain the territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus, the two ethnic communities should live under one unitary state, and should cooperate and live harmoniously. He asserted emphatically that "given the distribution of population settlement and ownership between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, it is shown beyond any doubt that in Cyprus there is no geographical or any other territorial basis for any solution other than that of a unitary and indivisible state" (1976, p. 83).

Additionally, Kitromilides (1976) noted that the only feasible and adaptable solution is the creation of an integrated state by redressing the structural sources of conflict. If such motivation prevails, then conflict will be much easier to control. Most importantly, the strong nationalist emotion has to fade away in order to create a more balanced and democratic integrated state. This kind of ideology can nurture ethnic coexistence and cultural, social and political identities between the two ethnic groups.
A similar argument was presented by Clerides (1989) who described and pointed out in detail the whole process that has led to ethnic conflict in Cyprus between the two communities. Clerides, following a compassionate approach, recognised that President Makarios made crucial and tragic mistakes regarding the handling of ethnic tension between the two communities in Cyprus. Additionally, he recognised and pointed out that it was due to his nationalist spirit and pride that President Makarios made these mistakes and missed several opportunities to solve the ethnic conflict in Cyprus. As a consequence, the escalation of conflict led to the coup d'état and the Turkish invasion of 1974. Clerides (1989), who has left an imprint since the 1970’s as a negotiator, active leader of a political party and then president of the Republic and leader of the Greek Cypriot community, claimed that a settlement where both communities lived in a unitary state would be viable.

Sharma and Epaminontas (1997) took the above argument further by indicating that the only attainable and durable solution was to unite the island and have Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots live side by side under one government. They supported that any other solution (e.g. federalism, bi-zonal, bi-communal federalism and partition) would create complicated internal problems between the communities.

2.7.2. **Group B: Unitary state without foreign intervention**

The second school of thought that will be analysed and reviewed presents a slightly different approach to a peaceful solution to the conflict. This group of scholars also supported a unitary state, but they shared the belief that foreign powers (Greece, Turkey, Britain, USA and NATO) should not intervene in the internal matters of the island and allow the two ethnic community leaders to find a solution for their citizens.
One of the leading figures and contributors to the study of the Cyprus conflict was Patrick (1973). Being an expert in geography, he tried to touch on and analyse one of the most difficult problems of his time. He spent some time on the island where he came into direct contact with people from both communities in order to grasp the real underlying problem of the conflict.

Unfortunately, because of ill health, he terminated his wide, interesting and insightful research just before the start of the Turkish invasion in 1974. Therefore we do not have a complete picture of what he believed regarding the solution of the ethnic conflict in Cyprus. However, a thorough reading of his work clearly demonstrates that he identified the factors that generated the tension between the two ethnic communities and on that basis he concluded that both communities can live peacefully if they are kept out of external pressure and leave aside their extreme and strong nationalistic emotions.

Kadritzke and Wagner (1976) argued that the major and most important factor that generated the antagonism between the two ethnic communities was the extreme and strong passion that both communities shared for their respective motherlands. They further concluded that the outside pressure that was constantly exerted on the two communities resulted in a bloody invasion in 1974. Both scholars maintained that if external powers did not intervene and exert pressure on their respective communities for their own personal interests, then the island would not have been led into the current situation. Kadritzke and Wagner strongly believed that the ethnic conflict could have been prevented if it was left in the hands of the leaders of the two communities.

The study by Kitromilides and Couloumbris (1976) supported the above arguments and it further indicated that international powers had a big share in the generation of the
conflict, which led to the post-war situation in Cyprus. They argued that if exogenous factors had been left outside, then ethnic conflict could have been regulated in the context of democratic coexistence and elimination of violence. But as a consequence of foreign intervention and influence, Cyprus has never been given the chance to resolve its ethnic and political problems on its own. A similar argument was presented by Coufoudakis (1976) who pointed out that a viable solution is possible if external powers allow the two ethnic communities to solve their differences between them. Xydis, Kitromilides and Attalides (1977) expanded on the arguments of Coufadakis by the suggesting that the policy of partition has been supported and actively promoted by NATO and later by United States as the ideal solution in order to satisfy their political objectives. They argued that if external powers did not intervene, then both ethnic communities would continue living together because the nucleus for Cypriot consciousness was firmly established. In their study the conviction was widespread that both communities could find a solution if the external powers withdrew and put aside their goals with respect to Cyprus.

Evdokas (1978) analysed ethnic conflict in Cyprus by following a psychological perspective. He proposed that a harmonious symbiosis of the two communities was possible. He further supported that in order for this symbiosis to be actualized, foreign influences must be removed and the two communities must be left alone to freely express their wishes. He furthered his argument by stating that “a viable solution to the Cyprus problem must provide a territorially integral and sovereign Cyprus with a return of the population to its previous natural composition” (Evdokas, 1978, p.38). It must also envisage the removal of all foreign troops the cessation of foreign intervention, and equal rights for all.
The work of Sanders (1997) clearly points out that Greece and Turkey had a major share in the internal conflict, because each had an interest in their respective community on the island. The United States interfered in the conflict from 1960-1974 as an effective guarantor, stopping Turkey from invading in 1964 and again in 1967. Sanders justifiably wondered “where were the guarantor powers in 1974?” (1997, p. 78). Sanders further argued that Britain did not take direct action as a guarantor power because its real aim was to lead the island to a form of partition. All these have been seen as a dark background of a Greek, British and American conspiracy whose agreed aim was to overthrow President Makarios and introduce a form of partition in Cyprus. Sanders’ basic assumption was that Turkey, through an aggressive invasion, disturbed the internal balance that existed on the island between the two communities. Hence, both Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, in the absence of foreign intervention and influence, can take the step forward and resolve their internal conflict without allowing external interference.

In a similar fashion, Vanezis (1997) in his study described and explained that Cyprus could not be a federal state like the USA and Switzerland because the latter are larger than the tiny island of Cyprus, while at the same time the question of size has important economic ramifications. He also argued that the economic and demographic realities on the island demonstrate that a federal solution in Cyprus would not be viable. Although the Turkish invasion made the two respective sectors almost equal in area, this does not apply to the population. The northern part is deficient in population and this makes it economically unviable. Therefore, federation cannot be adopted as a solution in Cyprus. Splitting and decentralising a former unitary entity is impossible. The Turks call this type of solution a federation but in fact what they mean is partition.
Hence goodwill between both communities is required in order to achieve a lasting and stable solution. Greece and Turkey should try and allow the two communities to settle their internal affairs by themselves.

2.7.3 **Group C: Partition as a solution of ethnic conflict**

Having investigated and analysed the second school of thought, we will turn our discussion into the review, analysis and discussion of Group C whose scholars share the belief that the ethnic conflict in Cyprus can be solved only through the partition of the island into two separate states.

The studies by Volkan (1979), and Volkan and Itzkowitz (1995) indicated strongly that as far as the Turks were concerned, the return to the old status of Cyprus is impossible and any settlement would have to include separate sectors for Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots. Above all, these studies suggested that the two communities had a superficial relationship between them and saw each other as mirror images. Furthermore, Volkan (1979, p.31) stated clearly that “Turkish troops are a must in the Northern part and unification of both communities is impossible”. Both studies shared the view that forcing both sides to live together should not be seen as a solution because this will lead to bloodshed. Both sides still have their reservations about each other and a sense of insecurity.

The study by Blay (1987) goes even further and claims that because the two communities have been living apart in Cyprus since the 1974 invasion, it is very difficult after a long period of time to bring both ethnic communities back and make them live under the same state mechanism. Therefore, self-determination through
partition for the Turkish Cypriots is suggested as an ideal solution where they will have their own political rights and cultural life.

2.7.4 Group D: Solution through bi-zonal, bi-communal federation

In this school of thought, scholars argue for a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation as a solution to ethnic conflict in Cyprus.

Denktash (1974), the figure who proclaimed North Cyprus as an independent state and until recently (2005) was the leader of the Turkish Cypriot community, expresses his opinion by stating first that Turkish Cypriots under the 1959 Zurich-London agreement were not treated fairly. He stresses that the Cyprus conflict can be solved by the establishment of a bi-communal independent republic of Cyprus, with the external interference of the motherlands (Turkey and Greece). In his view the two motherlands must play a major role in the settlement of the conflict.

The study by Birgen (1977) supported the above argument and noted further that the two ethnic communities have to be equal in determining the affairs and future of the island. Bi-communality, as conceptualized and proposed by Birgen, finds its expression and fulfillment in two ethnically homogeneous zones, where each community masters its own zone under a joint federation.

Sophocleous (1976) and Pollis (1976) argue that the division or segregation of both communities started when Cyprus was under British colonial rule. Therefore, as the division was a de facto situation since colonial times, the creation of two administrations within the framework of a unitary, independent and sovereign federal state can resolve the conflict that has existed on the island since the 1960s. According to Sophocleous (1976) and Pollis (1976) such a solution would enable the two communities to be
brought together again and establish bridges of communication, coexistence and cooperation between them. This, in turn, would enable the establishment of a strong central government and allow the control of both communities.

Catranides (1999) suggested that an ideal solution for both communities is to build a common federal homeland where they will respect each other's autonomy and cherish their cultural diversity. He further noted that a condition for a lasting settlement of the Cyprus problem is for the Greek Cypriots to accept the desire of the Turkish Cypriots to have their own cultural space in Cyprus and simultaneously for the Turkish Cypriots to accept the Greek Cypriot's eagerness to place the whole island within the wider space of the EU and agree to work in good will towards the attainment of this objective.

2.7.5 Group E: Non-Coexistence due to ethnic differences

The last group of studies support the non-coexistence of the communities under one state mechanism due to the ethnic conflict that exists between them.

Salih (1968, 1978) proposed that ethnic conflict in Cyprus is a "one way road". He argued that after so many years of ethnic conflict between the two communities, it is very hard for both communities to coexist under a single state mechanism ruled by the majority who are the Greek Cypriots. He further argued that by living in separate areas the Greek and Turkish Cypriots can develop their human and other resources according to their respective values. Additionally, he suggested that the two communities should develop self-government, be co-equal under federal law, and keep their Cypriot identity and pride. A similar view is shared by Joseph (1985) who argued that the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots remain separate and distinct ethnic groups divided along linguistic, religious, cultural and political lines. Therefore, taking into consideration the above factors, coexistence is very difficult.
2.8 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a review of the theoretical dimensions of the various literature on nation, nationalism and ethnicity. The terms that are used interchangeably in this thesis (nation, nationalism, ethnicity and ethnic conflict) were reviewed so as to enable a better understanding of the research questions posed in this thesis. Furthermore, various studies on ethnic conflict were discussed in order to provide an insight into how ethnic conflict has evolved.

The following chapter provides a comprehensive review of the history of Cyprus in order to provide a clear, precise and focused review of the multifaceted history of Cyprus. It also offers an in depth and thorough analysis of ethnic conflict in Cyprus and attempts to explain its causes and consequences in the pre and post independence era.
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Chapter Three: Kingdoms, empires, ethnic conflict and violence – A Review of Cyprus history

3.1 Introduction

This chapter does not have as an objective to offer a detailed historical analysis but rather to present the specific phases of the historical period when Ottoman Turks seized the island from the Venetians in 1570-71 up until the Turkish invasion (arrival peace operation) on the island in 1974, targeting in illustrating those incidents, ideas and decisions that contributed significantly to the escalation of inter-communal conflicts. Using above the word invasion (while someone might use the noun arrival or peace operation) to describe the specific involvement of Turkey on the island during the summer of 1974 reveals for an objective reader the author’s background as someone who was born and lived on the Greek Cypriot community. Hence, the researcher is inevitably linked to one of the two groups in that conflict unable to completely avoid the restrictions that this can create. For this reason the researcher has paid particular attention and emphasis to avoid consciously or deliberately speaking in an unfair manner towards one of the two ethnicities/communities while at the same time remaining objective in reviewing and discussing historical facts and evidences.

The history of Cyprus is synonymous with the history of the clash of successive civilisations, imperial and colonial power struggles, and post-war superpower domination in the Eastern Mediterranean. Cyprus, as a result of its geographical position, has had an adventurous history. The autochthonous population of Cyprus has in all these centuries adapted to conquests and occupations and has also been courteous and tolerant of the predominant powers of the epoch. The small size of the island has not allowed Cyprus to have an independent existence, therefore it has always been a vessel of those who held command of the surrounding sea. The position that she holds
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on the frontier between the oriental powers of Asia and the empires of the Mediterranean has for 3,000 years made her a pawn in the contest between East and West. The occupation of the island by so many different conquerors including Mycenaean, Phoenicians, Romans, Arabs, Byzantines, Lusignans, Venetians lead to the continuous exploitation of its natural resources and the successive damages on its infrastructure as a result of the frequent conflicts (in the form of invasions and wars) has hindered the social, political and economic development of the island, with serious consequences for the welfare of its inhabitants.

The arrival of what later came to be referred to as the Turkish community on the island dates from the Ottoman conquest of Cyprus from the Venetians in 1571. Successive settlements by Ottoman invasion armies as well as systematic Islamisation of indigenous Greek and Latin Christian populations, created the “Turkish Cypriot” community.

The Turks were originally perceived by the local population as liberators. They abolished serfdom and restored the Greek Orthodox Archbishopric. The local population was integrated in the Ottoman millet system, which divided those included in the vast Ottoman Empire into millets (nations) according to religious affiliation. The native Cypriots, as members of a millet, were accepted as constituting semiautonomous unit in charge of its own churches, schools, cemeteries, and clerical discipline. Thus the local population initially enjoyed more freedom than before, and organised themselves around their own religious units (Volkan, 1989) being now in a position to express themselves culturally more openly. The Church sustained the authority that it had as an official institution during the Byzantine Empire and became a very important parameter of both daily and official activities of the Greek Cypriots. Thus, the Greeks developed a conception of their own nationhood – in contrast to that of Turkish soldiers, officials and
settlers in their midst— in terms of language, social institutions and values, customs and traditions. This differentiation signals the origin of an independent course for the two populations.

The Greek rebellion of 1821 in the mainland and in the Aegean islands, but not in Cyprus, began a century of bitter struggle between Greeks and Turks for the disentangling of the two cultures, religions and peoples which at that time were intermingled not only on the European mainland and the Mediterranean islands but also on the Asian mainland, where there were substantial Greek populations at Smyrna (now Izmir) and elsewhere. On Cyprus, which had not risen, the immediate Turkish reaction to the rebellion was to execute the Archbishop and his three Episcopal brethren and some 500 prominent Greeks (Hale, 2000).

3.2 British rule (1878-1960)

In 1878, when Great Britain decided to occupy some place in the eastern Mediterranean as a strategic post from which she could more easily defend Turkey and the route to India from Russian aggression, Turkey, retaining nominal sovereignty, gave the island over to British administration as an assembly base for the rapid deployment force which Britain was supposed to have at the ready (Lee, 1931; Hale, 2000). Although there never in fact was such a force and Cyprus was not used for any military purpose until the Suez invasion of 1956, the idea that possession of the island was closely related to Turkey's strategic safety was firmly implanted in the Turkish mind.
In 1914 when Turkey joined forces with the Central powers, Great Britain annulled the lease-hold convention of 1878 and annexed Cyprus as a Colony (Oberling, 1982; Patrick, 1989).

When the British came to the island they found the majority of the population who regarded themselves as Greeks and Christians, and thus different from the minority of about 25 per cent who were Turkish Moslems. This group, expressed by the voice of church welcomed the new administrators and made clear from the very beginning their desire for unity with the “motherland” Greece. Greek Cypriots hoped that this could become possible under the British rule.

The Greek Orthodox Church maintained its authority and influence throughout the British period, and every parish or village priest, and every lay preacher, became a transmitter of the nationalist message. The political history of Cyprus during the British period is a record of continual activity on the part of the Greek leadership to promote the cause of enosis.

From the very beginning the Turkish Cypriots, or at least the more sophisticated among them, strongly opposed the idea of enosis. Having lost in 1878 their special privileges, they were now anxious that Cyprus might be incorporated into the Greek State, whose official ideology was implicitly anti-Turkish. A series of disturbances between Greek and Turkish groups in 1912, in which five people died and 134 were wounded, could not but have increased the fears of Turkish Cypriots that as a minority in a Greek state they would be unable to protect themselves. The Greeks, to their discredit, never made any effort to approach the Turks, to understand their fears and reassure them accordingly.
Indeed they consistently ignored the wishes and views of the Turkish community, and element, the vestige of a period they would like to forget (Stavrinides, 1975).

In October 1931, against a backdrop of economic crisis and general world recession, a British proposal to raise taxes ignited the flames of revolt in Cyprus. A series of riots throughout the island by crowds of Greek Cypriots crying for Enosis resulted in several deaths and the burning down of the British Government House in Nicosia. After the riots the British imposed further harsh measures to quell nationalist mobilisation in the colony (Akgün et. al., 2005).

For Turkish Cypriots the 1931 crisis had been a revelation of the Greek Cypriots' continued devotion to union with Greece; it guaranteed the Turks' alignment with the colonial power even though their own political expression was as much denied to them as was the Greek (Hale, 2000). Apart from this, the suppressive measures were also applied to them. It is possible that these measures accentuated the feelings of nationalism for both populations, amplifying their desires to enhance and formalise their links and relationship with their respective motherlands while simultaneously hindering British from fulfilling their goal.

Although there was growing opposition to British rule, colonial administration had brought some benefits to the island. Money had gone into modernisation projects. The economy, stagnant under the Ottomans, had improved, and trade increased. Financial reforms eventually broke the hold money lenders had over many small farmers. An honest and efficient civil service was put in place. New schools were built for the education of Cypriot children. Where only one hospital had existed during the Ottoman era, several were built by the British. Locusts were eradicated, and after World War II
malaria was eliminated. A new system of roads brought formerly isolated villages into easy reach of the island's main cities and towns. A reforestation program to cover the colony's denuded hills and mountains was implemented. Still, however, there was much poverty, industry was almost nonexistent, most manufacturing goods were imported from Britain, and Cypriots did not govern themselves.

In World War II, Cypriots, Turks and Greeks alike, supported the Allied cause. More than 30,000 participated in the war efforts. In reward, the British rule became more lenient. Some of the restrictions were lifted and permission was granted to form political parties. In 1943, municipal elections were again held, the first time since the crackdown of 1931.

The 1930's and 1940's saw the steady development of working-class consciousness in Cyprus. The trade union movement was legalised in 1936. For the first time there were in Cyprus well-led and effective popular organisations which were not informed with the enosist ideal. In 1941 Communist Party AKEL was founded and fought for better wages and working conditions. This is a very significant moment for the contemporary Cyprus history, because for the first time there was an observable and alternative political power (to the church), which after a while will have ability, on crucial phases to raise a different political voice. Because of Western wartime alliances with the Soviet Union, the communist label in 1941 was not the anathema that it later became; nevertheless, some Orthodox clerics and middle-class merchants were alarmed at the appearance of the new party. It has to be noted here that AKEL and its trade union was attracting to its ranks not only Greek Cypriot members but also some Turkish Cypriots expressing the need for common struggles against unjust political practices from the British government (Stavrinides, 1975).
However, most of the Turkish Cypriot workers and farmers were members of Turkish trade unions, which organised into a single Federation in 1943. Turkish Cypriots at the time also felt they had to oppose the ideology of the Soviet Union, which was seen as a main threat against Turkey, during the Cold war.

At the end of World War II, the British government announced its intention to call for a consultative assembly to discuss the constitutional future of Cyprus. While the Church refused to contemplate any plan that excluded enosis, AKEL was willing to participate in discussions for arrangement for a period of self-government while the island remained under British rule. At the time, Greece was governed by a fiercely anti-communist government, which made enosis a less attractive option to AKEL’s supporters (Stavrinides, 1975, p. 32). AKEL was also aware that support for enosis would eliminate their chances of being able to reach out to the Turkish Cypriots on ideological grounds. The appeal of communism among Turkish Cypriots was considerably less although some were members of left-wing trade unions.

In 1948, the British made a proposal for limited ‘home rule.’ The Greek Cypriot reactions were mixed. AKEL rejected it on grounds that it did not satisfy their demand for self-government. The right wing accepted it at first but later rejected it on the instruction of the Church. As the idea of enosis gained in popularity, and the Church of Cyprus consolidated its control of the Greek Cypriots, AKEL felt obliged to shift its position in 1949 and rally behind the nationalist demand for ‘enosis and only enosis’. This shift of the left wing in accepting the nationalist thesis on an issue of such extreme strategic importance, failed to induce, at this crucial phase, a political alternative to the sections of the population controlled or influenced by it. Therefore it provided the "genuine" enosis supporters with an upgraded capacity of public pull.
In January 1950, the Church organised a plebiscite among the Greek Cypriots (by getting them to sign their names openly in churches), which showed that a majority of 95.7 per cent of the Greek Cypriot adult population was in favour of enosis. The assumptions made of this however are controversial thinking that for someone to make a statement against Enosis he/she had to expect to confront being accused of ethnical betrayal. The frame of this choice was not the type we can call nowadays democratic. However, Enosis supporters did not seem to belong to a homogenous group either. There was a great difference between supporting Enosis in general (in many cases meaning the identification of Greek Cypriots as Greeks, sharing common cultural elements) and planning to defend this prospect by military means. The British, however, refused to contemplate any change in the island’s status. Soon after the plebiscite, newly elected Archbishop Makarios III took command of the enosis campaign as the Ethnarch of the Greek Cypriot people. At this time, Greece was still reluctant to champion the Greek Cypriot cause. Weakened by four years of civil war, Athens was in no position to risk a conflict with Great Britain, its former protector and NATO ally. The year 1950 can be considered as the ending of one chapter of Cypriot history and the beginning of a new one. The Cyprus question, an intra-Cypriot, intra-state affair, was transformed into an international dispute, bringing into the scene Greece and Turkey. Simply, the problem was not internal anymore.

3.3 The internationalisation of the Cyprus question and Turkey’s involvement

Makarios embarked on an international campaign with the aim of increasing the pressure on Britain to concede to Greek Cypriot demands for ‘self-determination’ (in fact meaning enosis).
Makarios eventually managed to mobilise public opinion in Greece, where pro-enosis mass rallies were organised. The Greek Government soon had no choice but to commit itself to promote enosis. Categorical statements by the British Minister of State for the Colonies, Henry Hopkinson, on 28 July 1954 to the effect that independence for Cyprus could never be contemplated infuriated both Greece and the Greek Cypriots and prompted Greece to take a more proactive approach.

On 16 August 1954, Greece launched its first appeal to the UN, demanding the ‘application, under the auspices of the UN, of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples in case of the population of the island of Cyprus’. However, after a brief discussion in the General Assembly, the question was shelved.

Although the word enosis had been deliberately avoided in the appeal in order to preempt British claims that Greece was trying to annex the island, no-one was left in any doubt that the recognition of the right to self-determination for Cyprus, with its Greek Cypriot majority, inevitably would result in enosis. Britain, whilst being aware that it held the island against the will of the majority of its inhabitants, was anxious to avoid framing the problem as one of self-determination. Instead, Britain based its position in the UN mainly on strategic and legalistic arguments, denying the UN any jurisdiction on the issue and it. Britain also stressed the necessity of keeping Cyprus in order to be able to fulfill its strategic obligations towards the Middle East and NATO.
London also tried to counterbalance the Greek claims by emphasising the ‘legitimate interest’ of Ankara in Cyprus that derived from its geographical proximity and the existence of a Turkish community on the island. Still, Ankara had hitherto been reluctant to act on concerns voiced by the Turkish Cypriots that the island risked falling into the hands of Greece. However, as the Cyprus issue had entered the UN agenda, as a result of Greek and Greek-Cypriot efforts, once the Cyprus issue had entered the agenda of the General Assembly, Turkey announced that in the event of a British withdrawal from the island the Treaty of Lausanne would become invalid, and that in that case the island should be ‘returned’ to Turkey as the successor to the Ottoman Empire.

Getting Turkey’s involvement in the Cyprus issue had been vital for Britain in order to justify the preservation of its colonial rule, and indeed of its NATO obligations and British ‘interests’ in the region (e.g. protecting the Suez Canal). Although the British failed to gain support for their position that Cyprus was an internal affair, they managed to prevent the UN from taking any substantial decisions on the Cyprus issue. Moreover, the attempt to internationalise the issue had introduced Turkey and Greece as two additional parties in the conflict.

The Greek Cypriots were determined to keep up international pressure with the help of Greece, who continued to raise the matter in the UN throughout the rest of the 1950s, and to increase pressure on the colonial power from within the colony too.

3.4 Establishment of EOKA and intercommunal troubles

Following the rejection of the British constitutional proposals, the Greek Cypriots leadership decided to use armed force as the only remaining outlet for the accomplishment of their aim. In the autumn of 1954 the Greek prime minister, Field Marshal Papagos, and Archbishop Makarios both gave the go-ahead to Grivas who, in
hiding in Cyprus, had called his underground organisation EOKA (Ethniki Organosis Kyprion Agoniston, National Organisation of Freedom Fighters) and adopted the nom de guerre of “Dighenis”, to launch a campaign of sabotage. Archbishop Makarios gave the order to start the armed struggle in 1955 as a means to force the British government to proceed. On 1 April 1955 the blast of dynamite and the chatter of machine guns ended the colonial peace in Cyprus.

The majority of the leaders of the Enosis movement belonged to the right wing party and were engaged in a strong nationalistic propaganda supporting the cause of Enosis by targeting the young students. The links between the nationalists and the students were the teachers and clergy who contributed to a great extent to the Enosis cause. The teachers cultivated and inspired the youth through patriotic songs, lectures and historical retroaction. Youths of all ages enrolled in EOKA, having a strong passion towards Enosis and complete dedication to the realisation of its aim. It is worth mentioning that following General Grivas’s orders neither left wing supporters nor Turkish Cypriots were welcomed to EOKA but were also expected not to join forces with the colonial power.

EOKA was declared an illegal organisation and the British issued the so-called emergency measures. The measures included detention camps and the closure of some schools due to illegal activities of the students (such as the raising of the Greek flag). British diplomacy did however succeed in securing the collaboration of the Turkish Cypriot community. As Grivas Dighenis went ahead with his campaign, accompanying EOKA acts of violence (and frequently terrorism) against the British and their Greek Cypriot collaborators with civil disobedience by sections of the community (especially school children), economic boycott of British goods and services, and acts of ruthless
coercion against those Greek Cypriots especially the communists in AKEL and the trade unions who did not wish to cooperate, the British fell back more and more for support on the Turkish community. They used the Turkish Cypriots to build up the police and the special constabulary and to form a mobile reserve. This policy of the British was well planned in order to create and maintain their “divide and rule policy” between the two communities. In the meantime the British government was worried that conflict between the two communities as well as within the Greek Cypriot community was getting out of control and was becoming more and more violent.

The British government invited the Greek and Turkish governments to participate in a tri-partite conference which was going to be held in London to discuss the political situation of Cyprus. The conference held at Lancaster House in London on 29 August 1955, was attended by Turkish, Greek and British government representatives (Zorlu, Stephanopoulos and Macmillan). At the conference Harold Macmillan, then Foreign Secretary, proposed that the problem of self-determination (by now the code-word for Enosis) be left to one side and that Cyprus should receive self-government by stages at the end of which the Governor would control only foreign affairs, defence and public security. The Turks would have a share of ministerial portfolios and Assembly seats proportionate to their share of the population and there would be a tripartite (British-Greek-Turkish) committee that would supervise the arrangements both for transferring power and for guaranteeing minority rights. The initiative was a failure: Greece would not accept anything which disregarded the issue of self-determination; Turkey would not accept anything that did not explicitly renounce it. Macmillan later admitted [in his memoir, Tides of Fortune] “that it could not be denied that the conference had perhaps increased rather than lowered tension”. (Hale, 2000). It is also worth mentioning that
the conference provided the opportunity to the British to re-awaken the interests of Turkey in Cyprus in respect of the 1923 Lausanne Treaty. It is probably for this reason that Nicos Kranidiotis, who attended the conference as an unofficial observer, confessed many years later that “the tri-partite conference was the beginning of all the troubles of Cyprus” (Toffallis 2002, p.140).

Following the tri-partite conference, protracted negotiations took place between the island’s new governor Field-Marshal Sir John Harding who arrived in Cyprus on 3 October 1955. The newly appointed Governor bore with him a painstakingly crafted formula, explaining that whereas self-determination was not on at the moment for strategic reasons and “on account of the consequences on the relations between NATO powers in the Eastern Mediterranean” the situation might change if self-government showed itself in practice to be “capable of safeguarding the interests of all sections of the community”. A constitutional commissioner from Britain was to recommend how this might be done. After agonised debates in the Ethnarchy Council, Archbishop Makarios for the first time agreed to negotiate but on three conditions: the Governor’s reserve powers were not to include internal security; the Turkish minority’s rights were to be confined to religion and education; and there was to be an immediate general amnesty. Grivas Dighenis, anxious to sabotage any negotiations at all, ended any chances of agreement by a series of massive explosions in Nicosia as the Colonial Secretary arrived. As the negotiations ended without a constructive outcome, the situation in Cyprus became tense. British troops reinforced the curfews which became systematic in towns and villages. In addition, national celebrations and anniversaries (such as 28 October and 25 March) were prohibited.
EOKA fighters increased their military measures against the British authority. As the armed struggle was continuing, on 21 November 1955 talks between Makarios and Harding resumed regarding the solution of the Cyprus problem. Harding proposed to Makarios a new British plan which theoretically recognised the right of self-determination of the people of Cyprus. However, the offer was refused by the Greek Cypriot community leaders. As a result, Harding proclaimed on 26 November 1955 a state of emergency and decreed regulations, envisaging the death penalty for those found carrying or using guns, bombs or explosives.

The above measures intensified EOKA’s military actions which became more acute and violent. Harding and Makarios resumed their talks on 9 January 1956 until 29 February 1956. Harding handed a document to Archbishop Makarios which comprised the latest British plan for the solution of the Cyprus problem, but no agreement was reached. The failure to find a political solution to the Cyprus problem through negotiations led Harding to the decision to exile Archbishop Makarios to the Seychelles Island in the Indian Ocean. His arrest took place on 9 March 1956 at Nicosia airport. Following the exile of the Archbishop, the British troops undertook an intensive campaign to exterminate EOKA. Nevertheless, the organisation proved that it was strong since the British were unable to restrain them. The British decision to exile the Archbishop proved to be one of the most unsuccessful measures as it made the EOKA fighters resume more dynamically and violently their military fight against British rule. The realisation of their mistake led to the decision to repatriate Makarios. Makarios and his co-exiles arrived in Athens on 17 April 1957.
Returning to Cyprus, and while armed struggle was decisively continuing, Makarios stated in an interview on 24 of July 1957 that he was ready to discuss plans for the independence of the island which would exclude unification with Greece. On 22 October Harding resigned as governor and Sir Hugh Foot was appointed. Foot’s approach towards the resolution of the Cyprus problem was different from Harding’s. He tried to implement a different strategy for negotiations. He strongly believed in dialogue and spoke to many leading Cypriots. He also visited many villages and coffee shops and spoke to ordinary people. After his direct intermingling with the people, he constructed a set of to end the state of emergency.

The Turkish government and the Turkish Cypriot community were not satisfied with the appointment of Sir Hugh Foot, because he was following a milder internal policy which they thought would benefit the Greek Cypriots. In 1957, Dr. Kutchuk (a physician who represented the Turkish Cypriot community) was alarmed by the ongoing Greek Cypriot’s campaign and armed struggle for Enosis and feared the consequences of such a development on the Turkish Cypriot community. Hence the Turkish Cypriots opposed any solution which would lead to union of Cyprus with Greece. Dr. Kutchuk published a pamphlet entitled ‘The Cyprus question, a permanent solution’, where he suggested a horizontal partitioning of the island from the town of Polis Chrisochou to Famagusta. The Greek Cypriots rejected his suggestion as a basis for a solution. Furthermore, Sir Hugh Foot went forward and presented his plan to the Turkish and Greek governments in the hope of a solution to the Cyprus problem. However, the Turkish government rejected the British proposal and remained firm in their decision because they believed the plan indirectly granted self-determination to the Greek Cypriots and would undermine the rights of the Turkish Cypriots.
3.5 The generation and evolution of ethnic antagonism and intercommunal strife in Cyprus

On the occasion of the disagreement of the two communities with Foot’s plan, a bitter conflict started to escalate between the Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. The social gap that existed between the two communities began to widen, leading inevitably to polarisation.

The insistence of the Greek Cypriots on self-determination led to extreme and violent actions which created social turmoil and instability in the island. Their demand for union alarmed the Turkish Cypriots who demanded from the Turkish government political measures to protect their community. The decision taken by the Turkish Cypriot community to reject the set of proposals presented by Sir Hugh Foot was received with unease and worry by the Greek Cypriot leaders. The basis of their concerns was that they feared that another obstacle to their struggle for unification with Greece was imposed by the stand of the Turkish Cypriots. This led to an offensive stance by EOKA towards the Turkish Cypriot community by considering them as a new front that they had to fight. Thus, EOKA members started planning violent acts against the Turkish Cypriot community. In January 1957, for instance, a Turkish Cypriot auxiliary was killed and three wounded by a bomb when guarding a power station; a Turkish Cypriot crowd smashed a number of Greek shops. Ten days later there was similar trouble in Famagusta. On 27 and 28 January 1958, there were two days of serious rioting by thousands of Turkish Cypriots in Nicosia leading to pitched battles with British forces at the end of which seven Turks were dead. These events were a clear sign of a rapid rise of hostility and violence between the two communities. As a result,
the anxiety, insecurity and fear of the Turkish Cypriot community was intensified. The ethnic antagonism between the two communities gradually started to expand.

On that ground, Turkish Cypriot nationalists decided to organise an underground organisation, modeled on EOKA, which had as its main objective the protection of the Turkish Cypriot community and the partition of the island. The organization became known as Kibris Turk Mukavemet Teskilati, in short TMT. By integrating in its operation anti-communist and pro-partition aims TMT fought to achieve two basic strategic objectives: The total control of the Turkish Cypriots and the creation of conflict between the two communities in order to prove the impossibility of peaceful coexistence and to support the demand for territorial partition.

The summer of 1958 signaled the eruption of intercomunal violence on the island. A bomb exploded outside the Turkish Press Office in Nicosia on the night of 7 June 1958. This incident marked the beginning of the most acute phase of ethnic tension on the island. Furthermore, on 3 July 1958 disturbances in Omorphita (a Nicosia suburb) forced some Greek Cypriot families to move out of their houses. Also, most Greek Cypriot dwellings in Lefka and some in Paphos were burned down. Ethnic passion reached its climax on 12 July 1958 when eight Greek Cypriots were massacred by extreme Turkish Cypriot nationalists during a clash near the village of Guenyeli. During the three months that followed of racial violence, 107 people lost their lives, 56 Greek Cypriots and 51 Turkish Cypriots.

The internal political situation in Cyprus was out of control. The communal strife was becoming more and more violent and innocent people from both communities were
losing their lives. For the first time the British colonial government was unable to control the activities of EOKA and TMT and enforce their termination. Towards the end of the summer of 1958, Macmillan made an appeal for the termination of the violence. His plea was supported by Archbishop Makarios who was now seriously thinking of compromising by accepted independence as a tactical expedient, in order to secure advantageous provisions for the Greek-Cypriots, with a secret hope that this would possibly later lead to enosis.

3.6 Cyprus as an independent state from 1960

The Greek government and Makarios feared that the island was in serious danger of being partitioned. Makarios realised that his political ambition to achieve Enosis with Greece had become unrealistic and unachievable, mainly because of the strong opposition of Turkey. Furthermore, the Turkish government was willing and prepared to drop its claim for partition and favour independence. The proposals were communicated to Makarios and Kutchuk who agreed to have high level talks in Zurich in early February 1959.

On 11, February 1959 a declaration was initialed by Greece and Turkey, confirming that Cyprus would become an independent state, with a Greek Cypriot president and a Turkish Cypriot vice-president. The first presidential elections were held on 13 December 1959. Archbishop Makarios was elected President of the independent Republic of Cyprus and Dr. Kutchuk was elected Vice-President. The Patriotic Front won 30 seats and the Communist party five. The elections for the 15 seats allocated to the Turkish Cypriots took place on 7 August 1959 and the majority of the votes were won by the National Party. Additionally, a cabinet had to be formed, composed of
seven Greek Cypriot and three Turkish Cypriot members. Also a 70:30 ratio had to be maintained in the Parliament and in all the positions in the civil service.

On 19 February 1959 the London-Zurich agreement was finalised and initialised at Lancaster House. The settlement had two main parts:

- A draft constitution for Cyprus and three treaties.
- British rule in the island would end not later than one year after 19 February 1959.

The Treaty of Alliance was signed between Greece, Turkey and the Republic of Cyprus. They agreed to co-operate in matters of defence. A tripartite military headquarters was to be established in Cyprus and to be commanded in yearly rotation by an officer of each of the three states. Contingents of 950 Greek soldiers and 650 Turkish soldiers were to be stationed in Cyprus under the command of the tripartite headquarters. The Treaty of Guarantee did not allow Enosis and Taksim. Greece, Turkey and Britain were co-guarantors of the independence, territorial integrity and security of the newly born Republic and agreed not to initiate any activity which could lead to Enosis or Taksim.

The republic came into being on 16 August 1960, and Archbishop Makarios stated the following: “We are all going to construct a happy society of Good.... Long live free and independent Cyprus” (Toffallis 2002, p.164). A similar rally was held in the Turkish Cypriot part of Nicosia which was addressed by Dr. Kutchuk who said that “Although the Greek Cypriots control the steering wheel of the state vehicle, the Turkish Cypriots are in charge of the brakes” (Toffallis 2002, p.164). The Union Jack was lowered and the Cyprus flag was raised portraying the map of Cyprus in yellow with two green olive branches at the bottom of the map on a white background, “Sadly the flag and the emblem which symbolised peace and co-existence among the two communities remained only a symbol of that aspiration” (Toffallis 2002, p.181).
3.5.1 Institutional Structure of the Republic of Cyprus

When the independent Republic of Cyprus was formed, both communities hoped that the internal conflict between the Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots would come to an end. However, the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot leaders were from the start in constant disagreement over constitutional matters. The main reason for this disagreement was that each ethnic community leader had to protect and safeguard his people and their interests.

The Constitution included several provisions for ensuring the fair participation of the estimated 80% of the population that was Greek Cypriots and 18% that was Turkish Cypriot. The principles that were agreed upon and inserted in the Constitution could not be implemented because the leaders of both communities were not yet free from their primary targets and could not put aside their strong and extreme nationalism towards their motherlands.

Naturally, it was very difficult to change their beliefs and perspective or their attitudes from one day to the next. However, the Constitution was not designed to help overcome this tremendous gap and ideological conflict that existed for centuries in the minds and souls of the people from both communities. Over and above everything was their ethnic identity and they were blinded by this idea and thought (Clerides, 1989).

The Constitution, as it was designed, had loopholes, but the two communities were not ready to compromise and come to a mutually acceptable solution. The most serious point was that the provisions of the Constitution had ironically promoted a separatist tendency rather than promoting a climate for re-uniting the divided ethnic communities.

The first serious complications that arose at the initial stages following the adoption of the Constitution were the following:
The separate majority issue

The Constitution provided that any law imposing taxation, any law relating to municipalities and the electoral law required the separate majorities of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot members of the House of Representatives.

Thus the Republic was unable to introduce an income tax law when the Turkish Cypriot members used their right of separate majority against the tax bill, not because they disagreed with its provisions or because it was discriminatory against their community, but simply as a weapon to force the government to yield to Turkish Cypriot demands on other issues some of which did not even concern taxation.

The army

President Makarios favoured complete integration of the two ethnic communities at all levels of the army. However Vice-President Kutchuk preferred separate units. As a result President Makarios established the National Guard that consisted only of Greek Cypriots.

70:30 ratios for representation issues

Under the Constitution the civil service had to be composed of 70% Greek Cypriots and 30% Turkish Cypriots. The insistence on the 70 to 30 ratio in participation in the civil service had to be applied at all levels for the civil service to work and administer the country better. Thus, if a Turkish Cypriot civil servant possessed all the qualifications to be promoted to a vacancy in a higher post, his/her promotion could be denied because the Greek Cypriot community had 70% representation in all grades and also the political power to exclude or preclude Turkish Cypriots from taking high-ranking positions in the government.
The communal education issue

The concept of political and constitutional communal segregation reached its full climax in the field of education. The Constitution by its nature left the educational matters of each community in the hands of elected communal chambers responsible for the education of their members. The government funded education but had no say in the education of the Cypriot citizens.

The separate municipalities issues

The Constitution of the Republic provided that separate municipalities were to be created in the five main towns of the Republic. This was a long-term demand of Turkish Cypriotes (cantons). The difficulty in finding a way to define the geographical boundaries of separate Greek Cypriot and separate Turkish Cypriot municipal areas based on strict communal criteria was due to the fact that never in the history of Cyprus had the two communities dreamt of living in separate areas or quarters. The five towns of the island were not large enough to justify the running of more than one municipal service and at the same time it was economically unviable and financially detrimental. However, Turkish Cypriot leadership insisted on the creation of separate municipalities, despite the fact that it was widely acknowledged that it was far from easy to bring about the geographical division of the main towns into communal municipal areas.

Proposals were made for unified municipalities with full safeguards for the interests of the Turkish Cypriot townsmen and financial support. The Turkish Cypriot leadership simply rejected these proposals without any justification (Clerides, 1989).
3.5.2 Outcome of the constitutional deadlock

President Makarios and Vice-President Kutchuk did not resolve their disagreements regarding the constitutional provisions mentioned above. Unfortunately, the Constitution of the Republic was framed and constructed in such a way that it was impossible to resolve the conflict that existed between the two communities (Clerides, 1989; Stavrinides, 1999).

The nature of the Constitution encouraged ethnic division rather than co-operation and symbiosis in all spheres. Unnecessarily, there was a heavy cloud of antagonism and tension over the island. President Makarios was not happy about the way the provisions were imposed on each community and he did not have the flexibility to make any changes. He wanted to reduce the status of the Turkish Cypriots to a minority level and therefore most of the senior positions in the public sector, education and army were given to Greek Cypriots. The two Cypriot communities were forced by the Constitution to co-operate artificially to create a state when there was no national unity and support for one another. This is a must for the formation of a lasting and stable community and a representative united and acceptable government (Clerides, 1989; Salih, 1978; Polyviou, 1975). When internal stability and proper communication could not be maintained the Republic could not properly function especially when the two leaders were not in a position to make some concessions in order to establish peace and social stability in the everyday lives of the two communities.

To govern an island which had a past history of continuous turmoil was not easy, especially when the two ethnic communities differed in cultural, religious, social and
political backgrounds. Therefore, the approach to the constitutional problems should have been more flexible and democratic (Stavrinides 1975; Salih, 1978; Salem, 1992).

The political leaders, President Makarios and Vice-President Kutchuk, admitted that they were too amateur in the dynamics of social politics and they were unable to form a government that represented satisfactorily both communities (Clerides, 1989). The major mistakes in charting the Constitution of the Republic were that the two ethnic community leaders were not able to participate in the process or to provide some ideas. Consequently, the Constitution at its birth was not an expression of the free will of the people but an imposed one. The Greek Cypriot side committed three cardinal mistakes regarding the provisions of the Constitution. The first mistake by the Greek Cypriot side was the refusal to apply the 70:30 ratio and to increase the subsidies to the communal chamber. President Makarios was not happy to have Turkish Cypriots working in the public sector; therefore, he tried with every possible means to raise a barrier to every possible solution to this problem. He insisted that the Greek Cypriots were more educated than the Turkish Cypriots and the positions required highly educated people.

If, for example, President Makarios had accepted the 70:30 ratio, the income tax law could have been voted by the Turkish Cypriot members of the House and probably unnecessary crises would have been avoided. The Constitution rendered it impossible for both communities to co-exist harmoniously as they were entrenched in their positions and unwilling to seek compromises over their legal differences within the government structure. Furthermore, President Makarios refused to sign a protocol containing agreement regarding the financing of the communal chambers. President Makarios was so firm in his beliefs that he was neither ready to listen nor to accept a compromise regarding the constitutional provisions. The final spark that led the
Turkish-Cypriot community and their leaders to seek Turkey’s protection was President Makarios’ insistence on constitutional amendments that he put forward.

President Makarios made his move for constitutional amendments on 17 July 1963 when he felt independent from the Karamanlis regime. President Makarios also completely ignored the newly elected George Papandreou government and proposed a 13-point amendment of the Constitution to Sir Arthur Clark (British High Commissioner). The proposed constitutional amendment was presented to Vice-President Kutchuk on 29 December 1963. Unfortunately, when President Makarios acted he was governed by his strong emotional bonds with Greece and did not stop to consider that the Greek Cypriots were not the only people of Cyprus. President Makarios should have acted in the interest of both communities. He was not only President of the Greek Cypriots but of all the people residing in the Republic of Cyprus.

The Turkish-Cypriot leader disagreed and rejected the 13-point amendment and, together with Mr. Denktash, drew up a ‘Turkish Plan’ on 14 September 1964. The plan included a series of moves which would aim at a separate Turkish Cypriot state. At the same time the Greek Cypriots were also charting their own policy and drawing up a plan known as “The Akritas Plan”. The plan declared that “our unalterable objective is to free the people of Cyprus from the Treaty of Guarantee and Alliance and exercise self-determination.

3.6 Inter-ethnic Conflict and Violence in the post 1960 era

---

1 In July 1963 Karamanlis government lost the national parliamentary elections to George Papandreou.
The causes of the Cyprus conflict can be viewed in terms of the interaction between the behavioural environment of the communities and their goals. The review of the literature (Richard, 1989) has demonstrated that the two communities on the island have had opposing and contradicting perspectives for a range of issues leading inevitably into confrontation and conflict. Furthermore, due to the unpredictable nature of their predispositions towards each other, their reactions to specific situations in the social context of Cyprus were highly unpredictable, something that could easily generate tension and conflict (Richard, 1989).

Firstly, a glance at the relevant literature demonstrates that although both communities were living side by side for several hundred years, they were not integrated. Furthermore, both communities had different sources of information (newspapers, radio, television, films). Additionally, the Cypriot communities speak different languages, belong to different religions (Christian/Islam), and have different traditions and culture as well as social behaviours and values. Both communities maintained different geopolitical goals (union and partition for the Greek and Turkish communities respectively). Attempts to implement these goals have resulted in the creation of tension between the communities. To ensure the attainment of their goals, both communities were prepared and willing to use political violence, economic, legal and political coercion. The arena of conflict which existed in Cyprus had disrupted the sensitive political, ethnic and geo-strategic equilibrium that existed between the two communities forcing the two motherlands to intervene and get engaged politically and economically in the escalating conflict.
In the early stages of the conflict (after 1960) confrontation was on the surface, primarily between the two Cypriot communities. The conflict then spread to include the Greek and Turkish nations as a whole. Subsequently, the intercommunal and international aspects of the dispute were overshadowed by intracommunal and intra-national conflict.

3.7.1 A review of inter-ethnic conflict escalation after the Independence.

An independent state was created, but the Greek Cypriots were not satisfied with an independent Republic, so they carried on with their goal for Enosis with Greece. The aspiration for enosis was maintained by the persistent activity of the Greek Cypriot Orthodox Church. The theocratic character of Greek Cypriot society may help to explain Church’s advocacy for enosis. Unfortunately, educational, political and cultural elements created a notion accepted by the majority of Greek Cypriots that enosis was the only way to preserve their way of life. Instead of promoting the stability and viability of the newly founded state, Makarios pursued a pro-enosis strategy which justifiably created defensive reactions from the Turkish-Cypriot community.

In order to achieve their goal the Greek Cypriot political and religious leaders suggested altering the constitutional status of the Republic through various legal and political actions. On the other hand the Turkish Cypriots wanted the full implementation of the 1960 Constitution and Treaties. There was major disagreement between the two ethnic communities on the implementation of the 1960 Constitution. Therefore, the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot approaches and political behaviour led repeatedly to constitutional deadlocks.
It is evident that both communities regarded the newly established Republic as "second best" arrangement (Patrick, 1989). Indeed, the Greek Cypriots considered the Zurich-London agreement as an imposed solution, while the Turkish Cypriots clearly preferred partition and unity with Turkey.

The Greek Cypriot community failed to convince the Turkish Cypriot political leadership to alter the constitutional status of the Republic something that indirectly would have helped them attain their political goal of Enosis. The period from 21 December 1963 to 10 August 1964 was the most violent phase of the Cypriot conflict. During these violent years it is estimated that 191 Turkish Cypriots were killed and 41 missing or presumed dead.

The first incident of intercommunal strife occurred on the 21 December 1963. On 23 December the Nicosia streets were transformed into battle fields. Telephones were cut off, road blocks were erected around the main Turkish Cypriot villages and quarters. Due to the intercommunal violence the relations of the two communities reached the point of collapse. Many Turkish Cypriot employees were turned out by their Greek Cypriot employers, some others left on their own initiative. Many others were afraid and did not want to put their lives and their families into danger. Major fighting occurred in the areas of Nicosia, Larnaca, Mathiati, Ayios Vasilios and the Kyrenia Pass. During Christmas time the Greek Cypriot forces because of their superiority in numbers, were on the verge of completely overrunning the Turkish Cypriot quarter of Nicosia. The events of 1963 created a point of reference for one of the most notorious figures of the Cyprus conflict, Nikos Georiades, known as "Sampson". Sampson who had actively participated in the 1955-59 EOKA struggle, participated actively in the intercommunal strife. As part of this involvement, he led Greek Cypriot parastatals to
Omorfita, a suburb of Nicosia inhabited by 5,000 Turkish Cypriots. The material
damage wreaked by Sampson's parastatals in Omorfita is described in the UN Secretary
General's report No. S/5950 to the Security Council, which states that 50 houses were
totally destroyed and 240 partially destroyed. As for the human losses, 500 Turkish
Cypriots were captured and taken to Kykkos School in Nicosia, where they were held
with 150 other Turkish Cypriots from the village of Kumsal. On Christmas day, 150 of
the 700 or so captives were selected and dragged away, and the sound of shooting
followed. As for the 150 captives, the Greek Cypriot authorities told their families for
many years that they should regard them as missing. Only Turkey's threat to invade
Cyprus made President Makarios accept a ceasefire on 25 December. In Larnaca,
shooting started on 23 December and continued sporadically until British troops began
to patrol a cease-fire line on 28 December 1963.

During the month of February 1964 violence between the two communities escalated.
Major fighting incidents occurred in the Paphos district at Ayios Sozomenos and in
Limassol. The Paphos district was the centre of conflict during 4 February 1964.
Clashes occurred at Khoulou and Ktima where two Turkish-Cypriots and two Greek-
Cypriots were shot dead. Tension was rising in the Paphos district which remained the
hot spot of conflict. On 14 February it culminated in major street fighting at Ktima. Five
Turkish Cypriots and one Greek Cypriot were killed in the incident. During the same
period frequent shooting incidents occurred between neighbouring Greek Cypriot and
Turkish Cypriot villages in the central region of Paphos district.

On the 6 of February 1964 Turkish-Cypriots from Ayios Sozomenos ambushed a party
of Greek Cypriots from the neighbouring village of Potamia and killed two of them.
Furthermore, on 9 and 10 February 1964 there was sporadic fighting in Limassol and serious fighting in the nearby villages of Asomatos and Episkopi. A ceasefire was negotiated on 13 February 1964.

After long talks and negotiations, the UN Security Council agreed on 4 March 1964 to authorise a UN Peace-Keeping Force and a political mediator for Cyprus. UNFICYP was assigned to prevent any serious intercommunal clashes and to restore and maintain law and order in the island. During 15 and 16 February 1964 shooting broke out at Ayios Theodoros village where two Greek Cypriots were killed.

On 7 March 1964 both communities agreed to an exchange of hostages. After the exchange, the Turkish Cypriots claimed that 176 Turkish Cypriot hostages were not handed back and presumed dead. This incident increased intercommunal enmity. Within 24 hours after the exchange of hostages a number of shooting incidents occurred in widely separate locations throughout Cyprus and major fighting was underway at Ktima and Malia. Fighting at Ktima began on 7 March when Turkish Cypriots took as hostages 100 Greek Cypriots who were shopping in the municipal market. The Turkish Cypriots justified their action by stating that this incident was carried out because out of the 225 Turkish Cypriot hostages only 49 were handed back. In the same period fighting broke out at Malia. A large Greek Cypriot army from Limassol entered the village and attacked the Turkish Cypriot quarter. During the fighting five Turkish Cypriots were killed.

Furthermore, on 19 March 1964 Greek Cypriot forces launched an attack on the Turkish Cypriot mixed village of Khazafani. The village was situated at a very important
strategic position on the shore of Morphou Bay. Seven Turkish Cypriots and one Greek Cypriot were shot dead. On 25 April 1964 the Greek Cypriots began an offensive against Turkish Cypriot positions near the Kyrenia Pass, where six Turkish Cypriots and one Greek Cypriot were killed. Intercommunal strife continued and on 11 May 1964 a car carrying three Greek army officers and a Greek Cypriot policeman entered the Turkish Cypriot walled city of Famagusta. Turkish Cypriot policemen signalled the car to stop as it approached an exit gate. The occupants of the car fired at the Turkish Cypriot policemen and their fire was returned. Both the Greek officers and the Greek Cypriot policeman were killed. After this incident the intercommunal animosity flared up and Greek Cypriot extremist groups wanted to take revenge. Between of 11 to 13 May 1964 around 32 to 35 Turkish Cypriots were abducted and executed. Unfortunately, UNFICYP forces could not maintain a ceasefire and stability between the two communities. Faced with these events and developments, Turkey decided to fan the flames and prepare its intervention.

On 14 of June 1964 General Grivas returned to Cyprus from Greece. Grivas used the popularity he gained in the EOKA era to coerce Cyprus president Archbishop Makarios III and the Greek government into allowing him to return to Cyprus, and eventually into allowing him to become Supreme Military Commander of Cyprus. Grivas created a Greek Cypriot army of 5,000 troops under his command. His attack in August 1964 against TMT forces in the Kokkina enclave resulted in the collapse of negotiations between the Americans, Greeks and Turks to solve the Cyprus issue on the basis of the Acheson plan, in attacks by the Turkish Air Force in the Tylliria area and in the resignation of the first commander of the Cypriot National Guard, Georgios
Karayiannis. During the same period Dean Acheson2 arrived in Cyprus to put forward a reasonable plan in order to neutralise the existing situation in Cyprus. He proposed that a military base comprising almost the entire Karpas peninsula of Cyprus be ceded to Turkey on a fifty-year lease and the remaining island be united with Greece. The plan was studied by Greece and Turkey. Consideration of the plan was interrupted by the Tyliria fighting in August 1964 which was the second most serious intercommunal clash after December 1963.

During August 1964 the Cyprus government was informed that the Turkish Cypriots were smuggling guns from Turkey through the beaches of Kokkina, a Turkish Cypriot enclave on the North West shores of Cyprus. On 6 August 1964 the National Guard under the command of General Grivas attacked Turkish Cypriot villages near Kokkina to stop the smuggling of arms. After this incident, a counter attack was planed by Turkey. On 8 August 1964 Turkish jets attacked the National Guard positions in the Tyliria region. President Makarios stated that if the Turkish air attacks were not terminated, he would order an attack on every Turkish Cypriot village and quarter in Cyprus.

Between December 1963 and August 1964, the most violent phase of the clashes, 191 Turkish Cypriots and 133 Greek Cypriots were killed (55 of them were killed in Tyliria, in the north-west of Cyprus). An additional 209 Turkish Cypriots and 41 Greek Cypriots went missing. The events of this period also led to the uprooting and displacement of an estimated 25,000 Turkish Cypriots and a few hundred Greek Cypriots. Turkish from 96

---

2 Dean Acheson is best remembered as President Harry Truman's powerful secretary of state, the American father of NATO, and a major architect of U.S. foreign policy in the decade following the Second World War. Acheson also played a major role in politics and foreign affairs after his tenure in the Truman administration, as an important Democratic Party activist and theorist during the Eisenhower presidency and as a valued adviser during the Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon administrations.
villages, fearing attacks by the Greek Cypriot paramilitaries, sought refuge in guarded enclaves (Patrick, 1976, p.69).

Such enclaves were formed all over the island, encompassing three per cent of the island’s territory. Official Greek Cypriot statements claimed that those enclaves became the means to prepare the ground for eventual partition. This was denied by the Turkish Cypriot leaders. They claimed that the formation of these enclaves was the result of the objective fear of their people and their effort to survive political and cultural extinction.

As a result, the separation of the two communities became a clear fact. The Turkish Cypriot members of the government and the House of Representatives, who had already left their posts, set up a “General Committee” headed by Vice-President Kucuk as a provisional administrative body of the Turkish Cypriot community (Spring, 1964), (Akgün et.al. 2005).

The juxtaposition of the events from December 1963 onwards, points out that “the conflict between Greek and Turkish Cypriots must be understood in terms of the relationship between two independent systems of formal institutions which claimed to express the national identity, will and interest of the two communities. Indeed, most of the actual fighting was carried out by regular armies belonging to the two national states of Cyprus, the ‘official’ and the ‘unofficial’ (Stavrinides, 1975, p57).

The orchestrated war of propaganda between the two communities created dehumanised views and images whereas Turkey’s national propaganda claimed that Turkish Cypriots could not live in safety under the governance of the Greek Cypriots, while the Greek
Cypriot propaganda countered that by claiming that the intercommunal strife was the result of the evil Turkish leadership.

The immature political thought of the Greek Cypriot community -having as prominent figures Makarios, Grivas, Yeorkandjis, Papadopoulos and Clerides- committed strategic mistakes which fuelled the Turkish Cypriot propaganda. The publication of the Akritas plan by a Greek Cypriot pro-Grivas newspaper (Patris, 21 of April 1966) was characterized as a godsend for the Turkish propaganda (Stavrinides, 1975). According to this plan, the Greek Cypriot political strategy to achieve enosis was in four stages:

1. Amend the “negative” parts of the 1960 constitution;
2. Abrogate the treaties of Guarantee and alliance which forbade enosis and justified the armed intervention of Britain and Turkey to restore the 1960 constitution.
3. Gain international support for the Greek-Cypriot community’s right to self-determination
4. Legitimise enosis by means of plebiscite based on the right of self determination.

Perhaps the most worrying element of this plan was the recognition and endorsement by the Greek Cypriot leadership of the probability of using armed struggle to overcome Turkish Cypriot opposition to the pursuit of the political goals outlined in the Akritas plan.

3.7.2 Arrival of General Grivas in Cyprus and the establishment of EOKA B’ underground movement

In the summer of 1964 General Grivas returned to the island. He came back for the second time aiming at Enosis with Greece. During November 1964 rumours were heard that there were plans underway to overthrow President Makarios and to proclaim Enosis.
President Makarios took his precautions and placed the National Guard under the control of the Cyprus Minister of Defence.

President Makario’s relations with General Grivas at that stage were not friendly at all. General Grivas never accepted the independence of Cyprus, and whoever believed in and agreed with this cause was his enemy. The ideological clash between Makarios and Grivas was on the means and not on the substance of achieving Enosis (Clerides, 1989, Pantelis, 1984). President Makarios was against using violence; instead he believed that through dialogue and talks peace and stability could be achieved. However General Grivas did not share this view and from that day onwards both leaders’ roads separated.

Grivas did not recognise the independence of the Republic of Cyprus and its President. Therefore, Grivas declared that he would not take orders from the Government of Cyprus, but only from Athens. When Grivas was preparing his second underground group, in Greece the military were preparing for a coup d’ état. Therefore on 21 April 1967 a group of Greek colonels, using the prevailing political situation of internal instability in Greece, as an excuse, assumed power in a bloodless military coup. Since then 21 April 1967 is considered by the Greeks as a date of national shame and humiliation. The military person behind the coup was Giorgos Papadopoulos. President Makarios invited Papadopoulos to Cyprus with the intention of cultivating good and friendly relations. Papadopoulos’ plan was to strengthen the defence of the island and the cause of Enosis.

In April 1969 an anti-leftist organisation was formed in Cyprus called EOKA B’. Its members were extreme Enosis believers and EOKA A’ dissidents. The political goal of
EOKA B' was to replace the Makarios government and establish a more militant pro-
enosis regime. They distributed leaflets threatening to cleanse the government of
"traitors". "Traitors" were those who fostered a Cypriot rather than Greek national
identity and those who worked for maintaining independence rather than Enosis. They
carried out a number of assassinations and armed attacks that shook the Greek Cypriot
community. The chief of the police was shot and seriously wounded and a chief
inspector of the police was murdered. Furthermore, the director of the government
Public Information Office was shot and wounded, the house of the Minister of Justice
was bombed. In October bombing targets included the home of the General Secretary of
AKEL (Communist) party and the Presidential Palace. During the month of December
1969 EOKA B' members stole 2300 sticks of dynamite from a mining company and in
January 1970 masked and armed EOKA B' members stole weapons and ammunition
from two armouries of the National Guard in Limassol. Additionally on 8 March 1970
President Makarios narrowly escaped an assassination attempt when his helicopter was
shot down. President Makarios subsequently stated that investigations indicated that
Mr. Polycarpos Yiorgadjis the Minister of Interior of the Republic of Cyprus was
implicated in the 8 March plot (Clerides, 1989; Drousiodou, 1994). A week later on 15
March 1970 Yiorgadjis was murdered in circumstances that have yet to be clarified.

3.7 Intracommunal conflict and the 1974 invasion

The early years of 1973 saw a new escalation of violence within the Greek Cypriot
community. Attacks were carried out by EOKA B' in their "holy" cause to unite Cyprus
with Greece. On 27 January 1973 General George Grivas, alias Dighenis died in his
hide-out in Limassol and Makarios declared an amnesty for all the proponents of Grivas
who had been sentenced to imprisonment. The amnesty proposed was rejected by EOKA B’ members and as a result Makarios declared EOKA B’ an illegal organisation.

Glafcos Clerides, who was a very close advisor to the President, warned Makarios that a coup was being planned against him. However President Makarios believed exactly the opposite. As correctly presumed by Clerides, on the 15 July 1974, at 8:30 in the morning, gun shots were heard in the capital. The Presidential Palace had been bombarded and partially burned. The target of the junta was President Makarios himself. He managed to escape and sought refuge in his birthplace in Paphos. Meanwhile Nicos Sampson was sworn in as President by the National Guard (Oberling, p. 159). The following day the junta announced that Makarios was dead. Nevertheless, President Makarios, from a radio station in Paphos, addressed the Cypriot people: “Greek Cypriot people, the voice which you hear is known to you. You know who is speaking to you. I am Makarios. I am he you elected to be your leader. I am with you a co-fighter and standard bearer in the common struggle. The coup of the junta has failed. I was the target and since I am alive the junta in Cyprus shall not pass” (Clerides, 1990, p. 338). By the following afternoon Makarios had put himself under UN protection and been rescued in a British helicopter and flown to a British sovereign base. On 17 July he was in London for talks with British leaders. (Oberling, p. 159, 161) The main perpetrators of the coup in Cyprus were Colonel Demetrios Ioannidis (from Greece) as well as Generals Barianos and Galatsanos. The implementation of the coup plan was assigned in Cyprus to Michael Yiorgitsis, Kondilis and Pavlos Papadakis.

The intracommunal conflict between the Greek Cypriots and the coup d'etat gave the green light to the Turkish government and Turkish Cypriot leaders to implement their
long awaited “Attila Plan”, which had as its basis the partition of the island. The coup literally was an open invitation to the Turks to invade the island, in order to restore the constitutional order and to support and defend their people. The intervention occurred early in the morning of 20 July 1974 when the Greek Cypriots awakened by the sound of Turkish aircraft and Turkish paratroopers who landed on the Mesaoria plain between Nicosia and the Kyrenia range. The air attacks and the troops landing from the sea near Kyrenia secured a corridor between Nicosia and Kyrenia within three days. The fighting was brutal and the Turkish troops secured the northern part of the island. The Greek Cypriot losses were around 6,000 dead and 1,500 missing.

The Turkish invasion divided the island into two, and Ecevit, the Turkish Prime Minister, declared a ceasefire. There was an inevitable sequel of social turmoil and a new series of tragic events. EOKA B’ members were very angry and disappointed, particularly with the United States for not stopping Turkey from intervening. In retaliation, they killed the American Ambassador in Nicosia.

When the situation became less acute, negotiations were undertaken in an effort to find a solution to the “Cyprus problem”. In January 1977 Denktash met with Makarios after 14 years and they signed the four-point Makarios-Denktash agreement which raised hopes for a new start. However, Makarios died of a heart attack in the summer of 1977. In January 1978 Sypros Kyprianou became the new President of the Republic of Cyprus. Today, more than thirty years after the invasion 37% of the territory of the Republic continues to be under the occupation of the Turkish forces and the displaced people still remain “refugees” in their own land.
3.7.1 *A Review of the elements that eroded the coexistence of both communities*

The Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots were (and still are) divided along linguistic, ethnic, cultural and religious lines. Despite four centuries of co-existence and considerable physical intermingling, the two communities remained separate and distinct ethnic groups. The following are the major reasons to which the inability of both communities to live and co-exist under the same state mechanism can be attributed.

**Ethnic origin:** Greeks and Turks belong to the Caucasian race but are from different ethnic backgrounds. The Greek Cypriots identify themselves with the Hellenic past and the Turkish Cypriots consider themselves as direct descendants of the Ottoman Turks.

**Religion:** The Greek Orthodox Church maintained a dominant position among the Greek Cypriots in order to preserve their religious, ethnic, cultural and political identity. For the Greek Cypriots the Church became a symbol of political and ethnic unity. Most of their political, social, cultural and intellectual life was associated with religious institutions. The overwhelming majority of the Turkish Cypriots belong to the Sunni branch of the Muslim religion. Both organised religions support the national policies of Greece and Turkey respectively.

**Language:** The first settlers of Cyprus spoke the Archaia-Dorian Greek dialect, which then merged with the Hellenic that is the present dialect of the island. The Turkish Cypriots speak Turkish.

**Culture:** The national and cultural bonds of the two Cypriot ethnic groups with their motherlands were further strengthened through the celebration of common national
holidays and the use of common symbols. The two communities were greatly influenced by the folklore, customs and institutions of their respective motherlands. This developed Hellenism and Turkish Kemalism on the island.

**Allegiance:** A review of the past social behaviour by the Greek-Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots clearly demonstrates that people from both communities have had more loyalty to their motherlands than to their homeland Cyprus (Salih, 1978). The spirit and feeling of Cypriot identity was weak to non-existent, a factor that contributed to the turn of the Greek and Turkish Cypriots to their respective motherlands in search of a sense of identity and belonging. Even after independence, the Republic of Cyprus did not have a national anthem and the anthems of Greece and Turkey were played instead.

A further preliminary conclusion that can be extracted at this stage is that the newly established Cyprus government had done nothing to develop Cypriotism. It is believed that if the spirit of Cypriotism and ethnic identity was inspired and encouraged among Cypriots from both communities then Cyprus would have had domestic peace and a national identity and sense of belonging (Salih, 1978).

**Education:** The two communities had separate schools which were largely controlled by their respective religious institutions. The teachers were Orthodox and Muslim priests. Their school curriculum, either primary or secondary, was based on the Greek or Turkish counterparts. Both curricula placed heavy emphasis on religion, national heritage, ethnic consciousness and the long history of Greek-Turkish rivalry, suspicion, mistrust and animosity. Each community honoured the national holidays, played the national anthem and used the flag of its mother country.
There was a traditional difference between Greek and Turkish education. The Greek Cypriot educational system prepared the children for the trades and professions. On the other hand, the Turkish Cypriots gave priority to algebra, the natural sciences and the Turkish language.

**Traditions:** Some practices were common but both communities had their own traditions, and the two communities did not intermingle.

**Literature:** Each community was influenced by books with an extreme nationalistic content. These were imported from Greece and Turkey and were also widely used in the schools.

**Unity:** There was no effort among the Cypriots to live under one united state. There was also physical separation of the Greeks and Turks in some towns and villages. In 1960 Cyprus had 619 villages out of which 393 were Greek, 120 were Turkish and 106 were mixed (Salih, 1978).

**Equality:** Citizens from the two communities were unwilling to recognise each other’s equality as Cypriot citizens. The Greek-Cypriots viewed the Turkish Cypriots as intruders and the Turkish Cypriots viewed the Greek-Cypriots as selfish.

**Patriotism:** The feeling of love towards Cyprus as one’s birthplace as well as the spirit of Cypriotism was absent (Salih, 1978). The absence of the spirit of patriotism has contributed to the widening the gap between the two communities. It could be said that patriotism could have bridged the differences between the two communities and covered
some of the distance that existed between them in terms of national identity, and attitudes.

It is evident that the major mistake committed by both communities during that specific period of time was that they were never given the opportunity to develop a Cypriot consciousness and local culture (Richard, 1989) and both of them permitted two different and independent countries to have a significant role concerning internal matters, Greece and Turkey.

3.8 Conclusion

The review of the history of Cyprus has provided the basis for the appreciation and understanding of the main forces that have shaped the social, political and economic realities on the island through the centuries. Although each foreign rule was over a lengthy period of time, its termination was abrupt, and this left the citizens of Cyprus feeling insecure about their social and economic security. Greek Cypriots looked upon Greece as their anchor and only hope for stability and security.

As has been clearly demonstrated, ethnic conflict between the two communities surfaced during 1957 and escalated during 1958-59. Following the independence and the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus, the ethnic conflict on the island intensified.

“As long as we maintain that all others have sinned and that we are blameless, it will be difficult to stop sinning” (Clerides, 1990, p.330). Between the beginning of 1964 to the end of 1970 was a period during which the Cyprus problem could have been solved. The first possible solution was Enosis which could be achieved if in return some territory was ceded to Turkey; the second solution that was possible was to reach
agreement on an improved Constitution regarding the reduction of the participation of the Turkish Cypriots in the Executive, the Legislative, the civil service and the police, and the abolition of the separate majorities. In return the Greek Cypriots would give autonomy to the Turkish Cypriots in local government.

If during the period 1968-1970 the government and opposition had made a realistic evaluation of what constituted a feasible solution, the situation in Cyprus today would have been different. Cyprus would have had a much improved constitution compared to that of 1960 and the Republic would have escaped the 1974 double catastrophe of the coup, invasion and occupation which violated international law, human rights and human dignity.

As a result the institutional framework of the Republic of Cyprus reflected a divided past and the antagonism of the two ethnic groups. The presence of a deep ethnic fragmentation and a parallel political segregation of the two communities had a catastrophic impact on the newly born Republic (Clerides, 1990). Political separation along ethnic lines prevented the two communities from participating and interacting in a common political arena. Both communities looked at each other as ethno-political enemies. The deep-rooted mistrust and antagonism between the two communities prevented any healthy cooperation in order to create a united democratic state. The Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots had separate and distinct communities with their own values. Furthermore, both communities had antagonistic, ideological, religious and cultural values. The heroes of one community were the villains of the other. Unfortunately, there was no effort by the two communities to assimilate each other and form a coherent state (Clerides, 1990).
They could not reach any consensus because their values were based on two different philosophical systems. The Greek Cypriots wanted Enosis whereas the Turkish Cypriots were opposed to this idea. There was no common ground on which to base a satisfactory solution. However, in the whole history of the Cyprus problem, the Greek Cypriot leader President Makarios committed his biggest mistake by rejecting the Turkish Cypriot side's 1970 proposal for a solution. The Turkish Cypriots wanted to be granted local government rights but President Makarios was not prepared to view the Turkish Cypriots as equal citizens of the Republic. Therefore, the sword of division was granted to the Turkish Cypriots by President Makarios who blindly sought to create a Greek state. As Clerides (1990, p.18) correctly pointed out “If the errors of the past have taught us a lesson, however costly it might have been, then there might still be hope for a solution of the Cyprus problem”.

The following chapter focuses on discussing in detail the origins and central premises of contact hypothesis, contact theory and intergroup contact. The objective of this chapter is to provide the basis for linking the theory of ethnic conflict with the contact hypothesis theory in order to develop the appropriate theoretical foundation on which the empirical examination of ethnic conflict in the context of Cyprus will be based.

As was explained in the introductory chapter it is beyond the scope of this thesis to discuss the intercommunal talks and peace efforts after 1974. On the basis of this rationale Appendix 2 provides a chronology of the intercommunal talks from 1968 to 2004.
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4.1 Introduction

In the previous chapters emphasis and focus were placed firstly on devising the methodological framework and design of the current thesis, and secondly on discussing the conceptual and terminological background of ethnic conflict and nationalism and reviewing the history of Cyprus from ancient times until present (chapters 2 and 3).

It is strongly believed that the conceptual as well as the methodological approach that has been formulated is a necessary prerequisite for understanding the historic as well as the epistemological evolution of ethnic conflict in Cyprus. The aim of this chapter is to build the theoretical framework that would allow the application of empirical methods for the examination of the current nature and status of ethnic conflict in the divided island of Cyprus. To enable the attainment of this objective the contact hypothesis will be adopted as the conceptual paradigm that will guide the quantification of ethnic conflict between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities on the island.

The chapter will begin by discussing the two major research traditions of intergroup relations: the social identity theory and the contact hypothesis. This will be followed by an examination of the conceptual foundations of the contact hypothesis. At a next step, the discussion will concentrate on the categorisation process and the three models of intergroup contact. The chapter will then provide a detailed review of the major limitations of research on the contact hypothesis. As a last step, the utilisation of contact hypothesis as an approach for the study of ethnic conflict will be examined.
4.2 Two major research traditions to improve intergroup relations

From both theoretical and empirical points of view, the field of social psychology has contributed two major research traditions regarding the sources of intergroup tension and how to reduce it: The social identity perspective and the contact hypothesis (Brewer and Gaertner, 2001). According to Weitzman (2005) an understanding of identity issues in conflict interaction is deemed instrumental in understanding how to improve intergroup relations. This section is devoted to the discussion of social identity theory, which provides an explanation of how prejudice comes into being, and then focuses on the contact hypothesis which offers a model for prejudice reduction.

4.2.1 Social Identity Theory

Social identity is an important factor affecting intergroup contact. In countries which experience prolonged ethno-political conflict intergroup contact may be inhibited through social norms. These norms may be the result of social exclusion or even violent means and as such could proscribe meeting or being friendly with outgroup members. It logically follows that the more a person identifies with the ingroup the more inclined he or she will be to follow the group's norms by avoiding contact with outgroup members. The social identity of an individual can be positive or negative depending on the subjective status of one's group in relation to other groups in the social environment. However, since individuals seek for a positive identity they tend to ascribe a positively valued distinctiveness to their own group in comparison to other relevant groups. Thus, as Brewer and Gaertner (2001) noted, individuals organise their understanding of the

\footnote{According to Tajfel and Turner (1986, p.15) a group is defined as "a collection of individuals who perceive themselves to be members of the same social category, share some emotional involvement in this common definition of themselves, and achieve some degree of social consensus about the evaluation of their group and of their membership in it".}
social world on the basis of categorical distinctions which then result in an ingroup-outgroup classification that carries with it affective and emotional significance.

According to Brewer and Miller (1984) the social identity theory holds that an individual’s personal identity is highly differentiated and based in part on membership in significant social categories, along with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership. Brewer and Miller (1996) further suggested that the basic premise of social identity theorists was that ingroup-outgroup distinctions arise from social categorisation processes. Accentuation of category differences combined with a need for positive distinctiveness (intergroup social comparison) results in ingroup favouritism. The important point is that ingroup classification proceeds rather than derives from interpersonal processes. Social identity increasingly comes into play and affects the type of social interaction as behaviour moves along the interpersonal-intergroup continuum from “acting in terms of self” to “acting in terms of group”, i.e. relating to others as an individual in terms of interpersonal relationships or as a group member in terms of intergroup relationships. As Volkan notes “individuals are not usually preoccupied with their large-group identity until it is threatened” (1997, p.25).

Intergroup behaviour and social identity are activated when people believe that their own individual actions are unlikely to resolve problems stemming from their social situation. Social identity tends to lead to the formation of ingroups and outgroups with a bias in favour of the ingroup over the outgroup. As Wilder (1986, p.314) notes, we are socialised from a young age by our cultures and nations to believe that “solidarity with ingroups, varying from families to nations, is an honourable value”. Quattrone (1986) and Weitzman (2005) noted that in its most extreme form, social identity tends to result in the glorification of one’s ingroup while vilifying the outgroup.
Brewer and Miller (1984, p.282) emphasised that “the need for social identity creates a kind of social competition in which individuals are motivated to define the situation and the characteristics of other participants in terms that are associated with positive ingroup status and to avoid comparisons on characteristics that are unfavourable or irrelevant to ingroup identity. This in turn promotes intergroup differentiation as members of each group strive to establish various forms of positively valued group distinctiveness. This competitive process not only creates a depersonalised view of outgroup members but also leads to relatively homogeneous, undifferentiated perceptions of one another on the part of ingroup member”. Furthermore, according to Brown (1984, p.608) social identity theory “assumes that individuals are motivated to achieve a positive self image and that such may be enhanced by a positive evaluation of one’s own group. Since evaluations of the ingroup are assumed to be mainly achieved by comparison with other groups, it follows that there is a general tendency for people to see positive differences between the ingroup and relevant outgroups on various dimensions. Given the emphasis in the theory on the importance of establishing intergroup differences, any similarities between groups are likely to be important in instigating the search for distinctiveness”. In general, therefore social identity theory predicts that similarity, whether of attitudes or status should have repulsive effects on relations between groups”

It is important to note that social identity theory incorporates both perceptual and motivational components. The perception of group differences alone is not sufficient to account for pervasive biases in ingroup-outgroup evaluations. Motivational factors associated with the drive for social comparison and positive self-identity must be invoked in order to explain the selective nature of intergroup comparisons and the prevalence of ingroup favouritism. Thus, based on the assumption that the positive
value attached to category membership is derived through comparison with other relevant groups, the notion of social comparison serves as the critical link between social categorisation and social identity.

Social identity theory (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel and Turner, 1986) has broadened the perspective by including intra individual mechanisms to explain intergroup relations. Originally, the social identity theory assumed that social identity will bolster self-esteem, in the sense that a perceived (a positive distinctiveness) in relation to other groups should support the self-esteem of an individual (Bratt, 2002). More specifically, it was suggested that successful intergroup bias creates or protects relatively high in-group status, thereby providing a positive social identity for in-group members and satisfying their need for positive self-esteem. Hogg and Abrams (1990) derived two corollaries from this self-esteem hypothesis: (1) successful intergroup bias enhances self-esteem and (2) depressed or threatened self-esteem motivates intergroup bias. An exhaustive narrative review (Rubin and Hewstone, 1998) and meta-analysis (Aberson et al., 2000) of over 50 experiments revealed that the majority of evidence supports corollary 1, but there is little evidence for corollary 2. Before discounting the self-esteem hypothesis, however, it is important to consider some of the controversy surrounding the manner in which it has been tested. However, research has not supported the view that social identity is derived from a search for positive self-esteem. Other motives may be just as important, such as having a meaningful interpretation of the world, power and control, and self evaluation (Hogg and Abrahams, 1990).
4.2.2 Contact Hypothesis

Hewstone et al (1994) contended that one of the most well tried interventions to improve intergroup relations is known generally as the “contact hypothesis”. Indeed, one of the most durable ideas in the sociology of racial and ethnic relations is the contact hypothesis. In its simplest form, this hypothesis states that contact, particularly close and sustained contact, with members of different cultural groups promotes positive tolerant attitudes. By contrast, the absence of such contact is believed to foster stereotyping prejudice towards these groups (Allport, 1954; Williams, 1964). According to Stephan and Brigham (1985) the contact hypothesis has always been at the heart of the study of intergroup relations. To provide a solid basis for the discussion that follows in this chapter, two statements of this hypothesis made almost 25 years apart are provided below.

"Prejudice may be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the pursuit of common goals. The effect is greatly enhanced if this contact is sanctioned by institutional support (i.e. by law, custom, or local atmosphere) and provided it is of a sort that leads to the perception of common interest and common humanity between members of the two groups” (G.W. Allport, 1954, p.281)

"Attitude change favourable to a disliked group will result from equal status contact with stereotype-disconfirming persons from that group, provided that the contact is cooperative and of such a nature as to reveal the individual characteristics by social norms favouring equality and equalitarian association among the participating groups” (Cook, 1978, p.97-98)

For at least four decades, social scientists have debated the value of the contact hypothesis for the study of racial and ethnic relations (Powers and Ellison, 1995). The contact hypothesis holds that contact, particularly close and sustained contact, with members of different racial and ethnic groups promotes positive, tolerant attitudes toward those groups. Proponents of the contact hypothesis maintain that interracial contact provides direct information –frequently accurate and favourable information –
on the values, lifestyle and experiences of other groups. This positive firsthand information may be generalised into a positive perception of the groups as a whole, thus permitting individuals to counter unfavourable racial and ethnic stereotypes. In the absence of such first hand information, however, individuals may be unable to counter unfavourable impressions and stereotypes of other racial and cultural groups. In addition, individuals may be influenced by slanted media images of other leaders and other indirect (and often inaccurate) sources of information about these groups (Ellison and Powers, 1994).

Scholars have also presented more conditional versions of the contact hypothesis, suggesting that contact may promote positive racial and ethnic attitudes only under ideal conditions—for instance, when the contact involves persons of equal status, when it takes place under cooperative conditions, and when it enjoys the active support of powerful authorities (Allport, 1954; Desforgee et al., 1991).

4.3 Conceptual foundations of the contact hypothesis

This section is devoted to the discussion of the conceptual foundations of the contact hypothesis. It is strongly believed that an in-depth understanding of the theoretical elements of the concept will greatly facilitate the process of comprehending the complicated nature of the term.

The contact hypothesis is a product of 1950’s America with deep roots in modern liberalism. However, it can be best understood in the context of recent social science theory about prejudice and discrimination. For over five decades, since it was first introduced and developed by Williams (1947) and Allport (1954) it has provided the
basis for a plethora of research studies while at the same time it has exerted a significant influence on political debate and policy development across the US and Europe. According to Connolly and Maginn (1999) its popularity can be best understood by considering its simplicity and its underlying political ideology. However, a review of the relevant literature indicates clearly that it is not the simplicity of the hypothesis that has ensured its popularity within academic and political circles so much as its underlying ideological premises (Brown and Turner, 1981; Jackman and Crane, 1986; Troya 1987, 1993). In essence, it is a hypothesis that appears to restrict the nature and causes of racism and ethnic divisions to individual ignorance and misunderstanding. The more that individuals can meet and thus learn about members of other ethnic groups, the more that their existing prejudices and stereotypes will be undermined (Connolly, P. and Maginn, P. 1999).

During the last twenty years contact between different ethnic groups is increasing because of mass migration, communication, the growth of global tourism and the global economy. Contact theory has been among the theories offering insight into these trends. The contact theory rests upon the definition of prejudice which is commonly defined as an unfair negative attitude towards a social group or a member of that group (Dovidio and Gaertner, 1999). Allport (1954, p.7) defines prejudice as an aversive or hostile attitude towards a person who belongs to a group, simply because he/she belongs to that group, and is therefore presumed to have the objectionable qualities ascribed to the group.

Furthermore, Allport (1954, p.9) defines ethnic prejudice as an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalisation. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed
towards a group as a whole or towards an individual because he is a member of that group.

Allport (1954, p.15) has divided prejudice into five major sectors/branches:

**Figure 4.1: Five major sectors of prejudice**

- **Extermination**: Programs, massacres and the Hibernian programme of genocide mark the ultimate degree of violent expression of prejudice.
- **Discrimination**: The prejudiced person makes detrimental discrimination of an active sort. He/She undertakes to exclude all members of the group in question from certain types of employment, political rights, educational or recreational opportunities hospitals or from some other social privileges.
- **Antilocution**: Most people who have prejudices talk about them with like minded friends, occasionally with strangers they may express their antagonism freely.
- **Physical attack**: Under conditions of heightened emotion prejudice may lead to acts of violence or semi-violence.
- **Avoidance**: If the prejudice is more intense it leads the individual to avoid members of disliked groups even perhaps at the cost of considerable inconvenience.

**Source: Allport, 1954**

Allport’s (1954) contact hypothesis begins by rejecting the seemingly truism that familiarity breeds contempt. Rather, Allport argues that contact and interaction between members of differently identified groups are critical to recognising similarities and to accurate knowledge of “the other”, hence to trust and tolerance.

The theory of contact hypothesis is a broad generalisation about the effects of intergroup contact on prejudiced opinions and discriminatory behaviour. The whole idea behind the theory is to create contact between two or more antagonistic ethnic groups and undermine negative stereotypes and reduce prejudice. Stereotypes, are overgeneralizations about a group or its members that are factually incorrect and inordinately rigid and usually take the form of a set of beliefs that accompany the
negative feelings associated with prejudice (Dovidio and Gaertner, 1999). Thus, the more one gets to know personally individual members of a minority group, the less likely one is to be prejudiced against that minority group (Ray, 1983). More specifically, contact hypothesis (also referred to as "interaction hypothesis") states that prejudice between two or more groups is reduced by regular association under favourable circumstances. This reduction of prejudice occurs despite one group being dominant at the outset. This reduced prejudice or intolerance is reflected behaviourally in subsequent interaction. Thus, as Ford (1986, p.256) postulated "the contact hypothesis is a special case of general attitude change hypothesis, which considers how experiences change attitudes and how the latter changes alter subsequent behaviour".

4.3.1 Facilitating conditions for contact hypothesis

The classic version of contact hypothesis asserts that contact must have acquaintance potential\(^2\) and should occur under certain facilitating conditions of which Allport (1954) highlights the four most important factors:

- **Participants should be of equal status**: contact should be marked by equal status, such that people in the contact situation are treated equally and have equal access to rewards (Brislin and Liu, 2004). According to Forbes (1997, p.116) if two individuals interact in stereotype roles of superiority and subordination, their interaction will likely reinforce rather than break down their stereotype of superiority and inferiority. They will follow the script and know each other only as actors. This is the basic idea behind the various stipulations of equality of status as a condition for positive effects of contact.

\(^2\) Acquaintance potential refers to the opportunity provided by the situation for the participants to get to know and understand one another (Cook, 1962).
- **Participants should not be in competition with one another.** Efforts to attain common goals should involve cooperative effort with minimisation of competition between individuals in the contact situation.

- **They should work independently to achieve common goals.** Such goals are desired by all involved parties and demand the efforts of all for their attainment.

- **The participants’ contact should be supported by local authorities or institutions.** The effectiveness of interracial contact is greatly increased if the contact is sanctioned by institutional support. The support may come from the law, a custom, a spokesman for the community or any authority, which is accepted by the increasing group. In many cases, institutional support comes simply from a social atmosphere or a general public agreement (Amir 1969, p.334).

In addition, Allport has also provided a taxonomy of other relevant factors which over 50 years later is just as striking and useful as it was then.
Figure 4.2: Facilitating conditions for contact

Kinds of contact

Quantitative aspects of contact:
(a) Frequency
(b) Duration
(c) Number of persons involved
(d) Variety

Status aspects of contact:
(a) Minority member has inferior status
(b) Minority member has equal status
(c) Minority member has superior status
(d) Not only may the individuals encountered vary thus in status, but the group as a whole may have relatively high status (e.g., Jews) or relatively low status (e.g., Negroes)

Role aspects of contact:
(a) Is the relationship one of competitive or cooperative activity?
(b) Is there a superordinate role relation involved; e.g., master-servant, employer-employee, teacher-pupil?

Social atmosphere surrounding the contact:
(a) Is segregation prevalent, or is egalitarianism expected?
(b) Is the contact voluntary or involuntary?
(c) Is the contact 'real' or 'artificial'?
(d) Is the contact perceived in terms of intergroup relations or not perceived as such?
(e) Is the contact regarded as 'typical' or as 'exceptional'?
(f) Is the contact regarded as important and intimate, or as trivial and transient?

Personality of the individual experiencing the contact:
(a) Is his initial prejudice level high, low, medium?
(b) Is his prejudice of a surface, conforming type, or is it deeply rooted in his character structure?
(c) Has he basic security in his own life, or is he fearful and suspicious?
(d) What is the previous experience with the group in question, and what is the strength of his present stereotypes?
(e) What are his age and general education level?
(f) Many other personality factors may influence the effect of contact.

Areas of contact:
(a) Casual
(b) Residential
(c) Occupational
(d) Recreational
(e) Religious
(f) Civic and fraternal
(g) Political
(h) Goodwill intergroup activities

(Allport, 1954, p. 262-263)
At this point the condition of “acquaintance potential” should be given greater consideration. Cook (1962) defined the term as the opportunity provided by the situation for the participants to get to know and understand another. According to Pettigrew “the contact situation must provide the participants with the opportunity to become friends” (1998 p.76) which in simple words implies that contact that leads cross-group friendship is most likely to have positive effects. Acquaintance potential, as Brewer and Brown (1994) have claimed, may be important for several reasons. Firstly, opportunities to learn informally more about each other and to become potential friends, provide the chance for participants to acquire more information about one another and to get to know one another as individuals. Cook (1978, 1985) argued that social contact situations must promote interaction of a sort that will reveal enough detail about members of the disliked group to encourage seeing them as individuals rather than as persons with stereotyped group characteristics. By allowing such individualising information to surface, negative stereotypes about outgroups may potentially be corrected. Secondly, and perhaps most importantly, acquaintances formed within a contact situation may lead to the formation of friendships that transcend the contact situation. As Kadushin and Livert (2002) claimed rather than treat acquaintance formation as a requisite condition of social contact situation, we consider the formation of friendship a key consequence of contact. Cross-group friendship can materially aid in the creation of conditions for peace.

In addition to the four conditions suggested by Allport for the success of the contact hypothesis, researchers have since suggested a number of other conditions required for social contact to achieve its desired effects (Kadushin and Livert, 2002).
Dixon et al. (2005) noted that enormous resources have been expended in elaborating taxonomies of conditions for “good contact” and explaining their relationship to prejudice reduction. Some of the prescriptions recommended in the contact literature include the following:

- Contact should be regular and frequent.
- Contact should involve a balanced ratio of in group and out group members.
- Contact should have genuine “acquaintance potential”.
- Contact should occur across a variety of social settings and situations.
- Contact should be free from competition.
- Contact should be evaluated as “important” to the participants involved.
- Contact should occur between individuals who share equality and status.
- Contact should involve interaction with a counter-stereotypical member of another group.
- Contact should be organised around cooperation toward the achievement of a superordinate goal.
- Contact should be normatively and institutionally sanctioned.
- Contact should be free from anxiety or other negative emotions.

As a result some have argued that the growing list of conditions may render the contact hypothesis untestable. As Pettigrew (1998) noted the creation of situations that embody all of the proposed conditions would require considerable effort.

According to Hewston and Brown (1986, p.6) and Brewer and Miller (1996, p. 109) the most comprehensive reviews of the contact literature are those of Amir (1969). Amir
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focused his reviews on a number of specific dimensions of the contact situation and systemised the available evidence on the following:

- The principle of equal status
- Contact with high-status representatives of a minority group
- Institutional support
- Personality factors

The crux of Amir’s (1969) painstaking assessment can be seen in his summary of some of the favourable conditions that tend to reduce prejudice and some unfavorable conditions that tend to strengthen prejudice (see figures 5.3 and 5.4) (Hewstone and Brown, 1986 p. 7).

Figure 4.3: Factors that reduce prejudice

1. Equal status contact between members of various ethnic groups
2. Contact is between members of a majority and higher status members of a minority group
3. When an authority and/or the social climate are in favour of and promote the intergroup contact
4. Contact is of an intimate rather than of a casual nature
5. When the ethnic intergroup contact is pleasant or rewarding
6. When members of both groups in the particular contact situation interact in functional important activities or develop common goals or superordinate goals that are higher ranking in importance that the individual goals of each of the group

Favourable conditions that reduce prejudice
Figure 4.4: Factors that strengthen prejudice

1. When the contact situation produces competition between the groups
2. When the contact is unpleasant, involuntary, tension laden
3. Prestige or status of one group is lowered as a result of the contact situation
4. Members of a group or the group as a whole are in a state of frustration
5. When the groups in contact have moral or ethnic standards which are objectionable to each
6. In the case of contact between majority and minority groups the members of the minority group are of lower status or are lower in any relevant characteristics than the members of the majority group.

Unfavourable conditions that strengthen prejudice

The characteristics of the contact situation to which Pettigrew attaches most importance are based on Allport’s (1954) work. Thus, the interacting individuals should be of equal status and be co-operative and interdependent with one another in the pursuit of common goals. They should also enjoy the positive support of authorities, laws or customs (Pettigrew, 1971 p.275).

Pettigrew (1971) has also argued that Allport’s four conditions reduce prejudice because they maximise the probability that shared values and beliefs will be demonstrated and perceived and will therefore provide the basis for interpersonal attraction between in-group and out-group members.
Chapter Four: Contact hypothesis as an approach for the study of ethnic conflict

Pettigrew (1998) has also added a fifth key condition in order for contact between members of different social groups to yield positive effects. This is the potential for the members of the different groups to become friends. In a way, as Tendayi Viki et al. (2006 p. 286) noted, Allport’s original four conditions are a prerequisite for this last condition. If contact takes place between members of an equal status group who do not have common goals and do not cooperate, it is unlikely for these people to form friendships (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2005). However, Connolly (2000, p.175) has referred to the preoccupation with how the presence or absence of the four key preconditions proposed for ‘successful’ contact to take place can be effectively identified and measured: “in this case, the general utility of intergroup contact for challenging broader racial and ethnic divisions is simply taken for granted and the question is simply one of how best can that contact be operationalised”.

Tendayi Viki et. al. (2006) claimed that Allport’s key conditions may not be absolutely necessary for contact to render beneficial effects. This claim is also supported by the work of Pettigrew and Tropp (2005) who conducted a meta-analysis of the contact literature including 516 studies and demonstrated that those samples with optimal contact conditions yielded significantly greater reduction of prejudice than those without optimal conditions. However, it should be noted that the results have also shown that while Allport’s conditions produce the most improvements in intergroup relations, contact still reduces prejudice, even in the absence of these conditions.

Pettigrew (1986) likened such conditions to a laundry list, and in his more recent publications (1997, 1998) he has distinguished between necessary and facilitating conditions for positive contact. His argument is not merely that the field requires greater
conceptual parsimony and coherence but also that the proliferation of optimal conditions is in danger of rendering the contact hypothesis inapplicable to real world situations, a point that brings us to the limitations of the optimal contact strategy.

In situations where contact has taken place under the conditions outlined above, individuals did tend to report more favourable evaluations of the individual out-group members they had come to know. The rationale that Cook (1978) has developed is based on the theory of interpersonal attraction: “contact between members of different groups allows individuals to discover that they have, after all, many similar values and attitudes” (Hewstone and Brown, 1986 p.5). This discovery will lead to mutual understanding and liking and will eventually – given time, repeated experiences of contact and the above favourable conditions-neutralise the negative relationship that formerly existed between the two groups.

Amir (1969) has conceded that the conditions as stated by Allport may rarely prevail in practice, but when they do, intergroup contact has usually been found to erode prejudiced attitudes and stereotypes. Moreover, Dixon and Durheim (2003, p.1) claim that the contact hypothesis should stipulate under the right conditions between members of different groups so that it reduces the negative intergroup attitudes and stereotypes. Contact should be intimate, cooperative and oriented towards the achievement of a shared goal. Also it should occur between equal status participants who are interacting in an environment where integration is institutionally sanctioned. Where such conditions apply, the effectiveness of contact is reducing prejudice.
Finally, Brewer and Miller (1996) and Brewer and Brown (1998) suggested that the conditions necessary for intergroup contact to be successful in reducing prejudice and enhancing tolerance, can be viewed as an application of dissonance theory. This is the situation where individuals with negative attitudes toward specific groups find themselves in situations in which they engage in a positive social interactions with members of those groups, and this their behaviour is inconsistent with and thus their attitudes. This dissonance, it is theorised, may result in a change of attitude to justify the new behaviour, if the situation is structured so as to satisfy the five conditions for intergroup contact to be successful.

4.3.2 Variables affecting intergroup contact

A scan of the relevant literature reveals several different factors which are believed to influence intergroup contact or the relationship between intergroup contact and attitude change. These variables range from socio demographic characteristics such as social class and age, to opportunities for contact and attitudes, social identity and intergroup anxiety.

4.3.2.1 Socio demographic variables: age and social class

Age might be related to contact in the sense that as age increases the likelihood of having experienced contact with outgroup members also increases. Furthermore, the impact of other variables such as opportunity for contact, outgroup attitudes, and ingroup identification may have established itself only in later years while young people might be more subjected to their parents and environment's influence without further possibilities to influence these.

Social class and education are also variables associated with intergroup contact (Cairns, Gallagher and Dunn, 1993; Whyte, 1990)
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4.3.2.2 Opportunity for contact

Opportunity for contact is a main factor which affects intergroup contact. In countries experiencing ethno political conflict, opportunities for contact may be limited through legislation (e.g. South Africa during apartheid) or through segregation (e.g. Northern Ireland and Israel) or through de facto partition (Cyprus). According to Niens et al (2003) opportunity for contact may be one determining factor for intergroup contact to occur at all.

4.3.2.3 Attitudes towards contact and intergroup attitudes

Amir (1976) has emphasised that attitudes towards intergroup contact are an important factor in the analyses, as negative attitudes towards intergroup contact may reduce actual and, hence, be associated with negative outgroup attitudes. Following Amir’s point, outgroup attitudes as well as group identification are further variables believed to be related to intergroup contact. On the one hand, negative outgroup attitudes might prevent people from taking up opportunities for contact. On the other hand, individuals holding negative attitudes and experiencing situations of intergroup contact may interpret the contact situation more negatively.

4.3.2.4 Social Identity

Social identity (as was already discussed in section 5.2.1) is another important factor affecting intergroup contact. In countries which experience prolonged ethno political conflict intergroup contact may be inhibited through social norms. These norms may be the result of social exclusion or even violent means and as such could proscribe meeting or being friendly with outgroup members. It logically follows that the more a person identifies with the ingroup the more inclined he or she will be to follow the group norms by avoiding contact with outgroup members.
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4.3.2.5 Intergroup anxiety

The theory of intergroup anxiety (Stephan and Stephan, 1985) suggests that anxiety interferes with the ability of an individual to absorb new information something that has as a direct consequence the hindering of the assimilation of information process about positive characteristics of negatively stereotyped outgroup members. On this basis it is believed that a reduction in anxiety will lead to less prejudiced perceptions of outgroups. Intergroup interaction is proposed as a way to reduce intergroup anxiety.

For the purpose of the current thesis the variables which were explained above are of critical importance since they have to be addressed in the context of examining ethnic conflict in Cyprus. For this reason particular attention and care was given, while preparing the survey questionnaire of this thesis, to cover conceptually and theoretically all the dimensions related to these variables.

4.4 Categorisation process: three models of intergroup contact

According to Miller (2002) in the literature three influential theoretical organisations of the process underlying intergroup contact are those of Brewer and Miller (1984), Hewstone and Brown (1986) and Gaertner and Dovidio (2000). Each of the models starts from the same understanding of the basic intergroup schema, but each suggests a different path/way to reducing intergroup conflict. Many scholars (Brewer, 2000; Brewer and Gaertner, 2001; Hewstone, 1996; Hewstone et.al. 2002; Hewstone et.al. 2006) argued that the main three intergroup approaches should be seen as complementary and reciprocal and not competing and exclusive. They further suggested that this integrative approach is a response to the fact that each model can be effective under particular contact conditions, but it also has weaknesses and limitations.
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particularly with respect to generalisation and to finding an intervention that works for both majority and minority groups”.

In this section the three main categorisation approaches to contact are reviewed, considering for each the structural representation of the contact situation that is recommended and the psychological processes that are thought to promote reduced bias in the contact setting (Brewer and Gaertner, 2001). The two primary criteria which are utilised for evaluating the models are whether contact experiences can be generalised from the target-group member(s) encountered in the contact setting to the out-group in general and whether each model can work in the real world.

Table 5.1 provides a synoptic view of the basic properties of the categorisations models and their limitations.

**Table 4.1: Categorization models of contact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORISATION MODEL</th>
<th>EMPHASIS OF CONTACT</th>
<th>LIMITATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decategorised Contact</td>
<td>Emphasis is given to interpersonal interactions and to improving interpersonal relationships. Breaks down group membership and downplays national identity. Members can discover commonalities, disconfirm group stereotypes, and see the outgroup as more heterogeneous.</td>
<td>May not generalise to the rest of the outgroup. Ignores core conflict issues. Minority group members could be deprived of their identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recategorised Contact</td>
<td>Emphasis is given to building a new group identity by creating one agreed upon overarching identity.</td>
<td>Impractical and difficult to find one agreed upon overarching identity. Shares many of the same limitations as the decategorised model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorised Contact</td>
<td>Emphasis is on intergroup relations. Keep group identity salient. Encounter is seen as meeting of two national identities and addresses the political conflict.</td>
<td>Risks reinforcing existing group stereotypes and differences, and may create more intergroup tension and anxiety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategorisation Contact</td>
<td>Emphasis is on combining recategorised and categorised models. Members are viewed as having a dual identity. Group identity is not ignored, and a superordinate, common ingroup identity is also developed.</td>
<td>Difficult to achieve. As in recategorised model, the challenge is to find an agreed upon overarching identity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.1 The interpersonal-intergroup controversy

The polarities of interpersonal and intergroup behaviour have their origin in the work of Tajfel (1978). He suggested that interpersonal and intergroup behaviour could be distinguished by three criteria:

a. The presence or absence of at least two clearly identifiable social categories (e.g. black & white)

b. Low or high inter-subject variability of behaviour or attitude within each group

c. Low or high intra-subject variability in relation to other group members

Therefore, intergroup behaviour occurs whenever individuals belonging to one group interact, collectively or individually, with another group or its members in terms of their group identification (Brewer and Miller, 1986 p.14). Interpersonal behaviour by contrast is where the interaction is determined by the individual characteristics and personal relationships between participants. A shift from interpersonal to intergroup behaviour is a transition from personal to social identity. Personal identity refers to self-definition in terms of personal or idiosyncratic characteristics, while social identity denotes definitions according to category membership.

Intergroup behaviour is more uniform both within the group and towards out-groups because individuals develop their attitudes and actions on the basis of those common group attributes. Therefore, it is not simply a matter of numbers of people that distinguishes the two kinds of behaviour. Both interpersonal and intergroup behaviour are the actions of individuals, but in one case they are the actions of individuals _qua_ individuals, while in the other they are actions of individuals _qua_ group members. The
effect of intergroup behaviour is not interpersonal relations but intergroup relations of status, power, and material interdependence.

Two theoretical approaches, both rooted in social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1979), (see section 5.2.1) have derived competing predictions regarding the type of contact setting which should be most beneficial for reducing prejudice and ameliorating intergroup relations. Both positions, the interpersonal (Brewer and Miller, 1984) and the intergroup (Hewstone and Brown, 1986) attribute a crucial role to category salience, but they diverge sharply over the “recommended dose” (Paolini et.al, 2004). Brewer and Miller’s model argues that in order to achieve harmonious intergroup relations

“group membership needs to be made less salient, the contact situation must be designed to eliminate or overcome the features that promote category salience. In effect, the situation must reduce information processing that is category-based and must promote, instead attention to personal or individual information that is not correlated with category membership” (1988, p.320).

According to Paolini et.al. (2004) the interpersonal model suffers from a major social cognitive weakness. As Rothbart and John (1985, p.92) put it “with individuating information about a categorised individual, perceivers should release the individual from the attributes of the category and, in so doing, render the stereotype immune from the attributes of the specific group member”. Hence, the very conditions that promote personalisation impede generalisation by weakening the cognitive link between the specific group member and his or her social category. In contrast to the interpersonal approach, the intergroup model of Hewstone and Brown (1986) argues that to ensure generalisation, “in-group members who have contact with out-group members must, at some level, continue to be aware of the contact partner as a member of the out-group and not simply a positive individual” (Van Oudenhoven, Groenewoud and Hewstone, 1996, p.658).
As Paolini et al. (2004) noted, unfortunately, by making contact “intergroup”, especially when the salience of group memberships is very high, the interaction with group members may become characterised by anxiety, discomfort, and fear. These mental states would ultimately encourage individuals to avoid intergroup encounters and to react defensively and in an extreme manner towards members of rival groups (Islam and Hewstone, 1993).

All in all it can be suggested that neither the interpersonal nor the intergroup approach alone offers an unequivocal solution to stereotyped responding and discrimination: interpersonal encounter would be pleasant, but would be likely to fail to generalise; whereas, intergroup encounters would generalise, but would be likely to generate anxiety.

4.4.1.1 Decategorisation: The personalisation model

The “decategorisation model” (Brewer and Miller, 1984) calls for contact between individuals of two opposing groups, hence encouraging individuals to “switch off” their social identity and so to distance themselves from the in group in order to promote personalised contact between in group and out group members.

This approach seeks to eliminate categorisation via two mutual and reciprocal cognitive processes; “differentiation” (distinctions are made between outgroup) and “personalisation” (outgroup members are seen in terms of their uniqueness and in relation to the self). Decategorisation seeks to reduce bias by moving (former) ingroup members away from the self and towards outgroup members, removing in this way in group favouritism as a source of bias (Brewer 1999; Hewstone et.al. 2002).
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According to Brewer "this perspective on the contact situation suggests that intergroup interactions should be structured so as to reduce the salience of category distinctions and to promote opportunities to get to know outgroup members as individuals. Attending to personal characteristics of group members not only provides the opportunity to disconfirm category stereotypes, but it also breaks down the monolithic perception of the outgroup as a homogeneous unit" (1986, p. 293). In other words "it is a bottom-up road of encoding information where in personalised interaction the key comparison process involved in noting the important attributes of another person is not made with respect to the groups to which that other and one self respectively belong" (Miller 2002, p.391). Thus, attributes of that other are noted primarily in terms of a self other comparison process.

Experimental studies (Bettencourt et.al., 1992) have shown that within contact situations an interpersonal focus is more effective at reducing bias than a task focus and that these effects can generalise to other members of the out group not involved directly in contact (Hewstone et.al., 2002, p.589). The more likely long–term positive effects of decategorised contact are that categories are seen as less useful and hence used less often, and the largely atypical out group members encountered increase the perceived variability of the out group as a whole (Bettencourt et.al., 1992).
Figure 4.5: The Decategorisation Model

(A) Category-Based Model

(B) Differentiated Model

(C) Personalized Model

In category-based responding, the outgroup is seen as relatively undifferentiated, tightly bounded, and different from the ingroup, the dogmatism (as represented by the large circle) is seen as relatively prototypical of the ingroup, being positioned near the center of the circle. Panel B reflects differentiated perceptions of ingroup and outgroup members. Differences among group members are noted. Thus, some group members are depicted as being outside the group boundary. When group boundaries are depicted as larger circles, perceptions of group boundaries are more prototypical and permeable (broken group boundary lines).

In personalized interaction (Panel C), group membership is relatively undifferentiated, tightly bounded, and different from the self. This is seen as very similar to the self. Thus, in personalized interaction, some outgroup members are seen as being as similar to the self as are ingroup members. Others are seen as being dissimilar to both self and the ingroup prototype.
4.4.1.2 Mutual intergroup differentiation model

An alternative model of intergroup contact was proposed by Hewstone and Brown (1986). The mutual intergroup differentiation model was inspired on the one hand by Tajfel’s (1978) social identity theory and, on the other hand, by Brown and Turner’s (1981) analysis of interpersonal and intergroup behaviour. The model is based on the idea that the need for positive social identity should be capitalised upon in the intergroup contact situation. As Brewer (1996, p.294) noted “when intergroup contact experiences are cooperative and pleasant, the effects are more likely to generalise to attitudes toward the outgroup as a whole when contact is experienced as an intergroup interaction rather than an interpersonal one”.

According to social identity theory individuals define themselves to a large extent in terms of their social group memberships and tend to seek a positive social identity. This is achieved by comparing their own group with other groups to establish a positively valued distinctiveness between two groups. Tajfel (1978) claimed that motivational as well as cognitive factors underlie intergroup differentiation, suggesting in this way that positive comparisons (intergroup differences seen to favour ingroup) provide a satisfactory social identity, while negative comparisons (differences which favour the outgroup) convey an unsatisfactory identity.

Brown and Turner (1981) extended further the distinction between interpersonal and intergroup behaviour by arguing that intergroup contact works, if and when it does, because it changes the nature and structure of intergroup relationship and not because it permits and encourages interpersonal friendships between members of different groups.
What follows from the above discussion is that the effects of positive contact at an interpersonal level are thought not to generalise to the rest of the outgroup because an individual outgroup person is likely to be sub-typed as somehow different from the rest of the group in question. It can be therefore suggested that interventions or tactics to improve intergroup attitudes and behaviour must be intergroup rather than interpersonal in nature (Miller, 2002).

As Hewstone and Brown (1986) argued, the essence of their intergroup approach to contact lies in the varying importance that members of different groups ascribe to dimensions of intergroup comparison, as conceived in social identity theory. Following Brewer (1979) and Hewstone and Brown (1986), intergroup differentiation will be maximised where the intergroup position is superior, but minimised when the ingroup’s position is inferior. The fact that attenuation of group differences occurs on some dimensions does not imply any reduction of accentuation on other dimensions. As put forward by Hewstone and Brown “the implications of this argument are that research might usefully concentrate on establishing mutual intergroup differentiation, rather than swimming against the tide and attempting to deprive individuals of their valued group identities” (1986, p. 36). This is in line with Tajfel who suggested that “it may be useful to see in each intergroup situation whether and how it might be possible for each group to achieve, preserve, or defend its vital interests…. In such a way that the self respect of other groups is not adversely affected at the same time” (1981, p. 343)

Miller (2002) argued that the group member must be salient during intergroup contact for positive effects to generalise to other members of an outgroup. This may lead, however to threatened group identities and subsequently to intergroup bias. As a result,
Hewstone and Brown (1986, p.35) advocated that in cooperative settings, for instance, labels must be divided in ways that provides a sense of successful task accomplishment to each of the independent groups in the setting, allowing each to experience success (a) at the group level and (b) to the same degree. Under such conditions of mutual recognition of superiorities and inferiorities would characterise this mutual intergroup differentiation and would be reflected in group stereotypes. Likely, each group would view itself positively and hold positive stereotypes of outgroups, consistent with those group’s auto stereotypes allowing in this way each group to be seen as it wishes to be seen and desired differences to be highlighted.

In sum, “generalisation of positive intergroup contact occurs when contact occurs with outgroups members who are perceived as representative of that particular outgroup. These may include contact with several outgroup members or with a single person who is perceived as a typical member of his or her group. Thus, implicit here is that the group identities of those interacting must be salient and that each of the interacting persons must be perceived by the other as a typical member of his or her respective social category” (Miller 2002, p.392).

Hewstone and Brown (1986) recognise that there are problems and dangers associated with their model of mutual intergroup differentiation. A first problem may result by encouraging a positive view of the ingroup which may, as a direct result stoke the fires of ethnocentrism. Another concern is related to the danger of subtle outgroup discrimination, in that ingroups may try to appropriate the most valued task-relevant or status-stressing dimensions for their own groups. Finally, the discussion and
presentation of differences must be carried out with great care to avoid the perception that one group is inferior to another.

According to Brewer and Miller (1996, p.125) the intergroup differentiation model produces something of a dilemma:

“on the one hand, if the contact provides positive experiences that disconfirm negative stereotypes about the outgroup, there is reason to expect that attitudes towards the group as a whole will become more positive. On the other hand, such contact also reinforces perceptions that the two groups are distinctly different and thus perpetuates ingroup – outgroup categorisation”.

Under this rationale it can be asserted that the effectiveness of the differentiated social identity strategy depends on the presence of a strong common goal that creates positive interdependence between the groups and overrides other forms of social competition.

Finally, according to Brewer (1999) and Hewstone et.al. (2002) the fundamental limitation of both decategorisation and recategorisation models is that they threaten to deprive individuals of valued social identities in smaller, less inclusive groups simply “by eradicating or replacing original categorisations, neither model is likely to meet the needs of assimilation and differentiation, or of cognitive simplicity and uncertainty reduction” (Brewer 2001; Hogg and Abrams, 1993 cited in Hewstone et.al. 2003). On the basis of the above limitations it can be asserted that decategorisation and recategorisation are temporally unstable solutions to the problem of inter group discrimination (Brewer and Gaertner, 2001).
4.4.2 Recategorisation: The Common Ingroup Identity Model

An alternative model for intergroup contact is the Common Ingroup Identity Model (Gaertner and Dovidio, 2000). The model is based on the premise that bias toward outgroup member is most difficult to overcome when ingroup-outgroup distinctions are highly salient (Brewer, 1996). In more simple words, “bias toward outgroup members is reduced by changing a person’s perceptions of an intergroup context from one that involves members of different groups to one that involves members of a single common or superordinate group” (Miller 2002, p.393).

This model proposes an opposite solution to the reduction of category salience than that represented by the decategorisation model. Instead of focusing attention on individuating information in the contact situation the “common ingroup identity model” suggests structuring the contact situation so as to focus attention on superordinate
category identification that encompasses both the ingroup and outgroup in a single social group representation.

According to the common ingroup identity model the reason behind the effectiveness of superordinate goals in reducing intergroup hostility is that they minimise attention to category differences by creating a new inclusive group identity. With such a superordinate recategorisation the evaluations of former outgroup members improve as they are more likely to think of themselves as “one unit” rather than two separate groups. Original ingroup-outgroup distinctions become less salient when both groups are included in a new ingroup that encompasses previously separated groups. At the same time cognitions and motivations involved in the expression of intergroup conflict and bias change to those of a more inclusively accepting nature. Since the positive attitudes that are associated with the ingroup are extended to the “new” members (who were formally outgroup members). As Brewer (1996, p.294) “when this form of recategorisation is successful, ingroup loyalties and concern for collective welfare are transferred from the original subgroups to the new social category as a whole”. Gaertner et. al. (1993) focused on “recategorisation in broader social categories” and the establishment of a common in group identity for social groups in intergroup conflict, again a process that requires a silent social identity to be “switched off”.

According to Gaertner and Dovidio (2000) and Hewstone et.al. (2002) the common in group identity model of recategorisation seeks to alter which categorisations are used and to replace subordinate (us and them) with superordinate (we) categorisation. There is extensive experimental support for this particular model which claims that bias is reduced primarily by improving attitudes towards former out group members, owing to
their recategorisation from out group to in group. Under such conditions inter group relations are likely to improve over time, rather than immediately as positively biases associated with a new super ordinate group membership encourage more self-disclosing interaction with former out group members, something which ultimately leads to more differentiated impressions of them (Dovidio et.al., 1997; Gaertner and Dovidio, 2000; Hewstone et.al., 2002).

The common ingroup identity model specifies that the relationship between several antecedents (different types of intergroup interdependence and cognitive, perceptual, linguistic, affective and environmental factors) and consequences (cognitive, affective and behavioural) are mediated by four levels of categorisation; an interpersonal level (“separate individuals, decategorisation”), intergroup level (“two groups, categorisation”), superordinate group level (“one group, recategorisation”) and dual identity level (“two subgroups in one group, recategorisation) (Eller and Abrams, 2006, p.93).

A number of scholars (Hewstone et.al. 2002; Brewer 2000; Hornsey and Hogg 1999) pointed out two major limitations to the common group identity model of recategorisation: “First a common group identity may only be short-lived or unrealistic in the face of powerful ethnic and racial categorisation… Second, for the group with a history of antagonism, and for minorities who are likely to resist assimilation into a superordinate category… the prospect of superordinate group identity may constitute a threat, which actually increases bias.” (Hewstone et.al. 2002, p.590).
4.4.3 Three types of generalisation of contact effects

According to Bratt (2002) social identity theory indicates that stable attitude generalisation based on pleasant contact with individual outgroup members might be difficult to obtain. At the same time he argues that a lengthy tradition of intergroup research based on the contact hypothesis provides evidence for the assumption that such attitude generalisation from experience with individuals to attitudes towards groups is possible and often takes place.

Hewstone and Brown (1986) in summarising the issue of generalisation argued that “as long as individuals are interacting as individuals, rather than as group members, there is no basis either for expecting any attitude change to be generalised throughout the group or for one person to extrapolate the positive attitudes towards one individual to other outgroup member” (p.19). All that can be expected, if the contact remains on an interpersonal basis, is that a few personal relationships will change but the intergroup situation will remain unaltered.
In a recent study, Hamburger and McKenna (2006) noted that one of the greatest challenges to the contact hypothesis is the issue of whether or not the results of a positive contact with a member of the outgroup will be generalised further. They further argued that group saliency during the interaction appears to be of a critical importance for the success generalisation of positive effects. However, a scan of the relevant literature indicates that there is much debate among researchers as to what level that salience should be. Hewstone and Brown (1986) argued that if the individual is perceived only as an individual rather than also as a representative member of his or her group, then any attitude change will remain target-specific. On this basis they have suggested that for a positive contact to have a sufficient impact at the group level, individual participants need to be seen as representatives of their groups so that the (out)group identity is highly salient. In contrast to Hewstone and Brown (1986), Brewer and Miller (1984) among others have suggested that in order for a contact to succeed group saliency should be low.

Miller (2002) argued that the meaning of “generalisation of benefit” is more complex than it may appear on first thought. Indeed, the problem of generalisation is one that has dogged research in this area (Amir, 1969; Hewstone and Brown, 1986). Allport (1954, p.276) emphatically noted that “people may come to take for granted the particular situation in which the contact occurs but fail completely to generalise this experience. Such generalisation is pivotal if intergroup contact is to have broad and lasting consequences. A first issue as extracted from the literature relates to the fact that attitude change is often limited to the specific situation which produced it. A possible explanation for this lack of generalisability beyond specific situations has to do with the
different kinds of social and institutional support for desegregation in the different settings (Hewstone and Brown 1986, p.17).

A second issue relates to how far the positive attitudes promoted by the contact experience will generalise to include other members of the outgroup not actually present in the contact situation. According to Cook contact experiences to generalise over contact experiences require attitude change which results “from cooperative interracial contact only when such contact is accompanied by supplementary influence that promotes the process of generalisation from favourable contact with individuals to positive attitudes toward the group (from which the individual comes)” (1978, p.103).

Pettigrew (1998) discusses the issue of generalisation by defining three distinct levels of generalisation:

- **Generalisation Across Situations** - Do the changes generalise across situations?

- **Generalisation from the outgroup individual to the outgroup** - Do the changes generalise from the specific outgroup members with whom there is contact to the outgroup?

- **Generalisation from the immediate outgroup to other outgroups** - Do the changes toward the outgroup generalise to other outgroups not involved in the contact?

According to Miller (2002 p.388) “the levels appear to differ with respect to the ease or likelihood of generalisation, with the first being most likely and the third least. And with respect to the second level, one must consider whether “other persons” refers to the actor’s contact with other new individuals who are members of the social category, or
instead, whether the actor is responding to the social category label. Note that if the second level refers to responses to the social category label, one is asking whether beliefs about the attributes of the social category have been altered. Thus, it asks whether the contact experience affects group stereotypes, by contrast with beliefs about a particular outgroup individual, or subset of individual outgroup category members.

In an alternative approach in studying the meaning of “generalisation” Brewer and Miller (1988) discuss the generalisation of:

a) Category based responding.

b) Differentiating perceptions and

c) Personalisation.

A careful comparison of Brewer and Miller’s typology in contrast with Pettigrew’s analysis which considers generalisation of a single (positive) response to one of three levels of abstraction, Brewer and Miller (1988, p.338) distinguish three types of generalisation.

A. The generalisation of category-based responding results in further consolidation of stereotypes about the outgroup. It also solidifies self-serving positive stereotypes about the outgroup.

B. Generalisation of decategorised responding - the generalisation of differentiated perceptions of outgroup members – results in increased perception of subgroups and subtypes and thus, less outgroup homogeneity.

C. Finally, with the generalisation of personalisation, interactions with new members of the outgroup are open to more intimate levels of communication. In this conceptualisation, the organisation is primarily focused at Pettigrew’s
second level, although it can in principle be extended to his other level as well.

Several studies found specific attitude change without a corresponding generalisation effect. Students who studied cooperatively with students of other races increased the number of their cross-racial friendships by becoming friends with those specific interaction partners, but they did not change their racial attitudes in general (Weigel et al. 1975). As Hewstone and Brown (1986) noted in their comprehensive review of generalisation effects, the ‘consensus from a number of studies seems to be rather pessimistic’ (p.17), and the ‘failure to generalise positive attitudes to outgroup members in general is a critical weakness in traditional contact theory (p.18). A word of caution, however, with regard to the above was given by Desforges et.al. (1997) who referred to studies which detected changes in both specific attitudes and in attitudes toward the group as a whole (Deutch and Collins, 1951, Wilder, 1984; Desforges et. al. 1991; Hewstone and Brown, 1986).

Desforges et. al. (1997 p.185) noted that the “literature suggested that one crucial difference between studies that found generalisation and those did not is the absence of what Cook (1978) called a ‘supplementary influence’ that promotes the process of generalisation from favourable contact with individuals to positive attitudes toward the group”. Another crucial element of generalisation as suggested by Pettigrew might be “ensuring that in some way the participants in the contact encounters see each other as representatives of their groups and not merely as ‘exceptions to the rule’ (Pettigrew 1979 sited in Hewstone and Brown 1986, p.18).
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Rothbart and John (1985) and Desforges et al. (1997) argued that one possible outcome of representativeness is that other participants come to regard the person as an individual and not as someone who represents the larger social category. This individuating outcome facilitates the specific attitude change part of the contact hypothesis, but it also might impair the generalisation part because the individual’s actions are not seen as representing how other group members behave.

4.4.4 The combined approach: Pettigrew reformulated contact theory

The debate about the respective merits of the three models has become the primary concern of psychological research on contact. By theorising the development of intergroup relations over time, Pettigrew (1998) has attempted a valuable rapprochement of the main theories in the field. In particular, Pettigrew (1998) has suggested that the models can be reconciled if one treats intergroup contact as an evolving process on the basis of a three stage model in which an optimal contact experience is developed gradually. Brewer and Miller’s (1984) decategorisation would come first, to ensure liking between the contact partners. Although the interaction initially may be characterised by anxiety, the effects of decategorisation should reduce this negative effect. If successful, Hewstone and Brown’s (1986) salience of categorisation would come next, to reduce prejudice via generalisation. Finally, the third step, aimed at maximising the reduction in prejudice, would – in Pettigrew’s view - involve a recategorisation process, whereby partners of rival groups replace distinct identities with common in-group identity or, better still, adopt a ‘dual identity’ of both subordinate and superordinate group identities (Gaertner and Dovidio, 2000).
It should be noted that in Pettigrew’s longitudinal model, subjective factors, such as the participants’ perception of the contact situation and prior experiences are considered; greater attention is given to essential processes such as the role of cross-group friendship; categorisation processes are addressed and may come into play at different points in time during the contact; individual differences and societies influence contact outcomes; and the importance of all these factors may vary depending on the stage of the intergroup contact (see figure 5.8). Weitzman (2005) suggested that the most unique feature of this re-formulation is that of the time dimension. While Allport’s conditions are viewed as essential, other factors found in various research studies play a role in prejudice reduction that are defined as facilitating. In this way “the theory is kept from being overwhelmed and diminished by a long list of necessary factors for the contact to succeed” (Weitzman, 2005, p.36). Another major contribution of Pettigrew’s reformulated contact theory is the suggestion that different categorisation strategies can be used at various points in time. Paolini et.al. (2004) supported that the most innovative element of Pettigrew’s conceptualisation lies in the special role that, within his three stage process, he attributes to cross-group friendship. Close interaction with an out group member, self-disclosure, extensive and repeated contact in a variety of social contexts, and other friendship-developing mechanisms are believe to provide the ideal ground for the three stages to unfold. Hence, according to the direct cross-group friendship hypothesis, in order to achieve generalisation, “the contact situation must provide the participants with the opportunity to become friends” (Pettigrew, 1998, p.76).
4.5 **Major limitations of research on the contact hypothesis**

Although the research evaluating the contact hypothesis has been fruitful, there are still large gaps with regards to the knowledge of how individuals alter their attitudes towards members of other groups. An understanding of the limitations in research on the contact hypothesis will help in understanding what future role would be most appropriate and productive for researching contact hypothesis within the context of ethnic conflict in Cyprus.

Ellison and Powers (1994, 1995) have identified a number of critical limitations of the extant contact hypothesis literature. The first limitation is related with the research setting under which the studies took place. More specifically, most empirical investigations over the years have been conducted in specific institutional contexts (e.g. interracial housing projects, desegregated schools, the military etc), carefully delimited settings or in laboratories. The argument to be posed against this specific research
context relates to the notion that most interracial contact does not occur in these specialised, highly monitored settings. It can be therefore suggested that while these studies have contributed to the understanding of intergroup relations, until recently they have left open the question of whether interracial contact results in positive racial attitudes on the general population. Ellison and Powers (1994, p.386) have argued that the uneven performance of the contact hypothesis in institutional and experimental contexts has led researchers to emphasise various qualifications and contingencies present in Allport’s (1954) early formulation of the contact hypothesis. Thus, scholars in the field have asserted that interracial contact may promote positive racial attitudes only under ideal conditions, for instance when the contact occurs between persons of equal status, under cooperative and non-competitive conditions, and with the encouragement of the authorities (Stephan, 1987; Desforgee et al. 1991)\(^3\). This major limitation has led researchers as far as to recommend abandoning research in this tradition in favour of an approach that focuses more squarely on racial differentials in power and status.

The second limitation of the contact hypothesis is that it has focused primarily on white racial attitudes, giving little attention to the views of the African American. According to Powers and Ellison (1995, p.206) “because many African Americans are forced to encounter whites frequently in public settings, due to the demographic imbalance between blacks and whites, and because such contact often takes place under competitive and even hostile circumstances, it appears that causal interracial contact is not necessarily associated with positive racial attitudes among African Americans.” On the basis of these mounting evidence that the contact hypothesis works differently for

\(^3\) For a detailed discussion of the facilitating conditions for the success of contact hypothesis see section 4.3.1
black than for whites, Ellison and Powers (1994, 1995), have suggested that additional research on the implications of interracial contact concerning racial attitudes is needed.

The third limitation is related to the important question on the causal assumptions of the contact hypothesis that have been raised in the literature (Jackman and Crane, 1986). As argued by Ellison and Powers (1995) researchers have suggested that the positive association between contact and positive attitudes reported in cross-sectional studies may reflect primarily a selection effect: initially tolerant attitudes may lead individuals to engage in, or even seek out, interracial contacts, while less tolerant persons eschew such contacts. If this interpretation is accurate, then research for the contact hypothesis for the past four decades has been fundamentally misguided and further inquiry on the consequences of interracial contact holds little promise for social scientists or policymakers (Ellison and Powers, 1995, p.206). The urgency of this phenomenon has been underlined by Sigelman and Welch (1993, p.793) who concluded their study by postulating that “our findings pinpoint the issue of causal order as a live one, the resolution of which should be a priority focus in future research”.

The fact that most studies in this area are now quite dated forms the fourth limitation of the contact hypothesis literature. Although the contact hypothesis was the focus of numerous investigations during the 1950s and 1960s interest in this perspective has waned considerably in recent years. The reason for this as explained by Ellison and Powers (1994, p.386) is the significant improvement of the racial climate in the United States. As a direct consequence of this development there is relatively little research on the role of interracial contact in shaping recent or current racial attitudes.
Another limitation of the contact hypothesis as was identified by Hewstone and Brown (1986) and Pettigrew (1998) is that often contact is not generalised from one member of the outgroup to the outgroup as a whole. As Hewstone and Cairms (2000) noted on a more practical note, it is often difficult to bring about intergroup contact on a large scale in a real life context.

Finally, one of the most serious criticisms of research on the contact hypothesis is the contention that selection bias operates to promote interaction between groups who are already unprejudiced towards one another (Ellison and Powers, 1993, p.207). This ascertainment is of particular importance for the purposes of this thesis since it supports the methodological decision to avoid using multivariate regression models for modelling the relationship between contact and attitudes. Most statistical models of the relationship between contact and attitudes assume that contact is an independent (exogenous) variable influencing attitudes. This implies that net of observed covariates, contact and attitudes are statistically independent and, it may be the case that initially tolerant attitudes lead persons to engage in or even seek out interracial contact (Ellison and Powers, 1995, p.207). This argument by itself lends support to the statistical modelling approach adopted for the purpose of this thesis, that is, to use perceptual mapping as the method to capture and analyse the complicated interrelationship and dynamics between contact and attitudes of groups. Furthermore, instead of employing multivariate regression analysis it was considered prudent and methodologically correct to quantify the perceptions/attitudes of Greek and Turkish Cypriots in the form of a set of conditional probabilities. To reiterate, these conditional probabilities will ultimately provide a ranking order for the determination of the probability for living once again with a Greek/Turkish Cypriot under the same state mechanism (see chapter 5 section
5.4). As concluded by Ellison and Powers (1995) the estimated effect of contact and other key variables in regression models of racial attitudes will be inconsistent as a result of a selection bias that sorts people nonrandomly into situations of contact with members of other racial and ethnic groups.

Research on the contact hypothesis has been dogged by questions of causal ordering and selectively (see Jackman and Crane, 1986; Sigelman and Welch, 1993). As Ellison and Powers (1994, p.396) have elaborated further “while contact theorists view contact as an independent variable influencing attitudes, some critics have argued that initially tolerant attitudes lead persons to engage in, or even to instigate, interracial contact. If accurate, this criticism implies that observed attitude differences between persons who have experienced contact and those who have not are due to a predisposition toward racial tolerance, rather than to the actual experience of interracial contact”.

Such critiques of the contact hypothesis, both in terms of its underlying theoretical framework and its broader political and social implications, are well made and persuasive. These criticisms have led writers such as Jackman and Crane (1986) to recommend that the contact hypothesis should be rejected and replaced with a clear focus on power relations and broader structures. The review of the relevant literature demonstrates what appears to have happened in recent years where an academic gulf seems to have emerged between writers who emphasise the way in which racism and ethnic relations are inscribed in broader social processes and institutions and those who continue to research the contact hypothesis. (Conolly, P. and Maginn, P. 1999). However, a full scale dismissal of the contact hypothesis is a little premature. (Dixon, J.A and Durheim, K. 2003 and Pettigrew, F.T. and Tropp, L.R. 2004)
4.5.1 Measurement and methodological issues

In the theoretical domain of intergroup contact three dominant methodological approaches to the study of intergroup contact can be identified (Stephan and Brigham, 1985). The first approach utilised laboratory experiments by examining variables such as the effects of cooperation and competition, the outcome of intergroup contact, the competence of group members, and the similarity of members of the groups. On the basis of the studies of Blanchord and Cook (1969, 1978, 1984) it can be asserted that laboratory studies indicated that intergroup cooperation could positively affect intergroup relations and that relations tended to improve most when intergroup contact led to successful outcomes. The second approach for the study of intergroup contact was based on the exploration of the effects of various factors in structured field studies. These studies supported the view that cooperation is important in contact situations and had as their prototype the study by Sherif and Sherif (1969). Several of these studies also indicated the importance of status in the contact situation and of the role of authority figures in influencing the contact (Stephan and Brigham, 1989, p.3). The third approach was based on the examination of the effects of contact in desegregated schools. The majority of these empirical studies suggested that intergroup contact in desegregated schools does not have positive effects on intergroup relations.

According to Connolly (2000, p.173) methodologically, there has been a focus on both the nature of the samples used and the ability of the research to adequately control for, and thus appropriately measure the effects of, the four conditions associated with the contact hypothesis. Many scholars have repeatedly suggested that those who engage in contact from a relatively self selecting sample are more likely to have positive attitudes to other racial and ethnic groups in the first instance (Robinson and Preston, 1976).
Another methodological debate that has stemmed from the contact hypothesis literature is concerned with the ability of experimental tests to adequately control for, and thus measure, the impact of the four conditions for contact proposed by the contact hypothesis. Ford (1986) based on an extensive review of the research literature, interestingly noted that the condition of 'equal status' has rarely been adequately defined and measured but has been simply assumed by the fact that respondents lived in close proximity, shared similar roles or were in the case of the research carried out by Sigelman and Welch (1993).

A shortcoming, as pointed out by Connolly and Maginn (1999) and Connolly (2000) is related to the type of 'test/retest' methodology used to detect participants' attitudinal change before and after their involvement in contact. As put by Connolly (2000, p.175)

"at its most basic level, in limiting its focus to the immediate post-contact effects, it is unable to take into consideration the longer-term impact of the broader social environment on the attitudes and behaviour of participants. Moreover, the measures used to test participants' levels of prejudice are also crude and do not allow for a consideration of the contradictory and context-specific nature of racial and ethnic prejudice".

For measuring intergroup contact two main approaches can be utilised: the quantity of contact and the quality of contact.

The quantity of contact refers to the frequency with which an individual meets members of the outgroup and it can be measured by asking how frequently a person meets with members with the other community. It should be noted, however, that an issue that is not addressed through the measurement of contact is how positive or negative an individual perceives the contact to be. This issue is targeted when measuring quality of contact. According to Niens et.al. (2005) in terms of quality of contact there are two basic dimensions where quality of contact may refer. Firstly, positive versus negative
experiences of contact may affect the outcome of intergroup contact. Second casual versus intimate contact may also affect the outcome of the contact experience. It is therefore evident that it is important to measure the individual perception of the contact situation.

According to Bratt (2002) Brewer and Brown (1998) and Pettigrew (1998) the optimistic claims about the merits of contact hypothesis which have been rejected in empirical studies is a result of a dubious interpretation of the contact hypothesis. Indeed, both experimental studies and field research have in general supported the more limited claim actually made by the contact hypothesis. In addition several studies of superficial measurements of contact (e.g. the distance to the closest neighbour who is a member of the outgroup) have found that contact was associated with less prejudice (Kirchler and Zani, 1995).

Bratt (2002) has reached a conclusion which in methodological terms is of exceptional importance for the purposes of this thesis. More specifically, he noted that if data are purely correlational (the studies have no longitudinal design), it remains uncertain whether measured attitudes are a consequence of contact experienced or rather a cause of contact. Therefore, the methodological decision that was made for the purposes of this thesis to utilise a cohort design is supported from the extant literature.

The juxtaposition of the various criticisms and shortcomings of contact hypothesis was not meant to lead into a rejection of the contact theory as a solid theoretical basis for the examination of ethnic conflict between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities on the island. On the contrary, it has helped the most in deriving a more rigorous methodological framework, which at the same time addresses various shortcomings and
criticisms. In line with Connolly (2000) it is strongly believed that what is required is a methodological paradigm that addresses three specific concerns.

a) The methodological approach needs to be better able to deal with the complex dialectical relationships between the nature of the intergroup contact itself and the broader social economic and political contexts within which the participants are located.

b) It should be sensitive to the contingent, contradictory and context-specific nature of racism and ethnic prejudice and thus able to identify and chart their developments.

c) It needs to be able to offer insights into why particular forms of contact seem to be more successful than others.

The above methodological concerns are interdependent. Taken together, the points raised above represent a more fundamental and important concern which is directly related to the current research approaches to the contact hypothesis. As has been mentioned earlier in this chapter a number of preconditions have been identified in relation to the nature of intergroup contact and attempts have been made to measure the effects on attitudinal change. In addition, various social psychological perspectives, especially social identity theory, have been utilised to try explain these effects. However, as Connolly argued, these theories remain generalised and are rather speculative. As Connolly and Maginn (1999, p.50) emphasised “explanations as to why particular respondents have experienced attitudinal change are not derived from a careful examination of their own experiences and perspectives but are simply ‘read off’ from the presence of particular conditions existing within the contact. Given the
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context-specific nature of racism and ethnic prejudice and their contingent and contradictory form, the production of such ungrounded assumptions is highly questionable”.

4.6 Contact hypothesis and ethnic conflict

The persistence of ethnic conflict through time and across nations continues despite an ever-increasing rate of migration and globalisation, unprecedented advances in communication and contact technology, and a growing global acceptance of liberalism-warrants an adequate analysis of the how and the why of the occurrence of the phenomenon of ethnic conflict.

In Chapter 2, the theoretical and conceptual properties of ethnic conflict were reviewed and discussed. In this section the relationship between the contact hypothesis and ethnic conflict will be examined. More specifically, the discussion will be focused on examining how the conceptual and methodological properties of the contact hypothesis can be utilised for the study of ethnic conflict.

As was already discussed in Chapter 2, ethnic conflict has complex causes and diverse effects, ranging from petty slights to murderous violence. The term is often used loosely, to describe a wide range of interstate or intrastate conflict that sometimes is not ethnic in character. For ethnic conflict to occur a systematic prerequisite is needed where two or more ethnic groups must reside in close proximity. Additionally, national, regional and international authorities must be too weak to keep groups from having disputes or fighting. These factors may lead or cause ethnic conflict.
Forbes (2004, p. 79) argues that contact may have an effect on the conflict variables (prejudice, discrimination, hostility, etc.) “because of its effect on cultural differences, rather than on stereotyping, and it may be a cause of antagonistic relationships more often than a cure for them, because, given cultural differences between groups, contact sets up conflicts of interest regarding how exactly the groups are to converge on a common culture or common norms in their dealings with others”. Forbes (1997, 2004) has also provided some further insights into the causes of ethnic conflict by focusing on the two correlations commonly found in situations of ethnic contact and conflict:

1. The negative correlation that supports the “contact hypothesis”. Under this situation, the more personal contact, the less conflict (prejudice, discrimination, hostility).

2. The positive correlation, which is suggested by many historical and sociological studies of contact situations, and postulates that more contact brings along more conflict.

4.6.1 Contact hypothesis in the context of ethnic conflict in Cyprus

Intergroup contact between the two communities on the island of Cyprus violates most of the facilitating conditions which are required for the contact theory to be successful (see section 4.3.1). This conclusion stems from the review of historical facts since the de facto partition of the island after the events of 1974 and up until the opening of the crossing points in April 2002. During that period when the two communities were not interacting, it was almost always the case that there were significant status differences. Moreover, contact of people from the two communities was most of the times not voluntary. In addition, people from the two communities diverged on common goals, while interactions between them were not always cooperative but sometimes conflictual.
(see for example the “Women Walk Home⁴” demonstrations in 1986 and Solomou and Isaac killings in August 1996⁵).

The negative attitudes of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots toward each other attest to the existence of a strong ingroup-outgroup schema in keeping with social identity theory. Although members of both groups had had little or no prior interpersonal contact with each other since 1974, they tended to deny each other’s humanity, with Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots tending to perceive each other as inferior, violent, hostile, evil, terrorist soldiers and settlers.

According to Weitzman (2005) in situations where there is a long history of intergroup strife, each group tends to evolve a conflict ethos that develops as an important part of its social identity. Oren et al. (2004, p.134), have further asserted that this ethos of conflict comprises several themes of societal beliefs including a dehumanised image of the opponent which, interestingly, consists of mirror images of each of the rival groups. As Weitzman stated “this ethos serves a dual function: it supplies meaning to the stressful conditions under which the groups live, enabling them to adjust to them; yet at the same time it also helps fuel the continuation of the conflict” (2005, p. 92).

---

⁴ Greek Cypriot women repeatedly made attempts to return to their homes and properties and were stopped, many arrested by the de facto Turkish Cypriot police. On March 20 and July 24, 1989, several thousand Greek-Cypriot women attempted to return to their homes and properties. Witnesses said women were dragged kicking and screaming into Turkish-Cypriot custody. Some had their hair pulled, received bruises or were cut by barbed wire. Six Greek Cypriot women were sexually assaulted and beaten by Turkish-Cypriot prison guards and police after being arrested. The Greek women, organized by a committee called Women Walk Home, ended both protests after about three hours. Many were among 200,000 Greek Cypriots who left their homes in the north after the coup d’etat and the subsequent Turkish invasion of Cyprus.

⁵ In August 1996, Greek Cypriot refugees demonstrated with a symbolic march towards their properties against the continuing Turkish military presence in Northern Cyprus and the occupation of their homes and properties. The refugees’ demand was the complete withdrawal of Turkish troops, and their return to their former properties. Starting peacefully at first, the civilian demonstration got noisier and more threatening as the demonstration neared the Green Line. The toll of the anti-occupation rally was two Greek Cypriots dead and 41 injured, 36 Greek Cypriot civilians, three police officers and two police officers serving with one of the two British bases on the island.
In the long history of ethnic conflict in Cyprus, several attempts have been made to organize intergroup contact activities. A review and assessment of these activities through the years indicates that they are characterised by serious limitations. These limitations inevitably have caused a serious deviation from the conditions recommended for effective contact.

A first limitation is related to the lack of continuity which characterises these activities. A second limitation is the lack of institutional support and legitimisation by authorities of both communities. Third, these activities are not specifically designed according to defined goals and some conceptual or theoretical orientation. On the other hand, the activities conducted so far in Cyprus have enabled two of the conditions recommended for effective contact by focusing on contents that stress the similarities between the participants and by enabling interaction on an equal-status basis.

A closer look at the nature, contents and context under which these activities took place demonstrates a series of major problems and shortcomings which are listed and explained below:

1. **Absence of a clear definition of goals that could provide a sound basis for planning the contact situations**

   In most cases, contact situations were stated as general, long range and utopian declarations instead of short term, operational and attainable aims. In addition, the expectations concerning the goals of the contact organisers and of the participants from the two groups do not always coincide. As a result unrealistic hopes have repeatedly led to disappointment and frustration.
2. The absence of a clear a priori definition of goals

The fact that organizers of these integroup activities lack a clear definition of goals raises problems regarding the choice of programs to be included in contact situations. The predominant disposition that ‘the more, the better’ has led to a situation where contact organisers have attempted to include a wide variety of cognitive, emotional and behavioural contents, which in turn, have created contacts that include a large quantity of material, but of a highly superficial level. Such inputs have resulted in limited and not very meaningful outputs.

3. Organisation and implementation of one-shot events

The integroup contact theory postulates that attitudes and relations are products of a long and continuous development. Unfortunately, the review of contact situations that have taken place in Cyprus indicates that there is an absence of systematic and long term planning for instilling stable attitudes and relations.

4. Preparation and evaluation of contact participants

As Ben-Ari and Amir (1986) suggested the initial attitude of the participants and their expectations play a central role in determining the outcome of contact. In most contact situations which took place contact participants were neither prepared nor evaluated at an early stage and as a result the probability of obtaining positive results was greatly reduced.

5. Insufficient attention for establishing optimal contact conditions

In many contact situations insufficient attention was given for establishing optimal contact conditions and as a result unfavourable conditions prevailed. This was due to reference by participants, from both ethnic communities, to
political and national conflict issues which as a result created tension among the participants and gives rise to attacks and accusations on the one hand, and defensive reactions on the other.

4.7 Conclusion

The review given here of the key methodological and theoretical debates that currently guide research on the contact hypothesis has served to provide an extensive review of the various conceptual and methodological frameworks in approaching and studying contact hypothesis, while at the same time presenting the shortcomings and various criticisms that surround this particular research field. Overall, it can be asserted that the work that has been reviewed has led to the development of a rather self-referential field where the core assumptions and beliefs that underpin the contact hypothesis are simply taken for granted and remain unchallenged (Connolly, 2000).

Indeed in attempting to theorise its influence and effects, it is clear that these cannot be fully understood without a proper appreciation of the broader social contexts within which participants are located and the various factors that help to construct and sustain racial and ethnic divisions.

The review of the extant literature has also extracted important theoretical implications concerning the contact hypothesis. These implications will be taken seriously into consideration in the next chapter of this thesis at the stage where the theory of contact hypothesis will be applied in the context of ethnic conflict in Cyprus. The first implication is that quality of contact can be useful in predicting not just attitudes or prejudice, but also intentions to behave in a particular manner towards other groups. A
second implication is that good quality of contact can have positive effects on intergroup relations, even in situations where all the conditions outlined by Allport (1954) and Pettigrew (1998) are not met. The third implication relates to the fact that quality, rather than quantity of contact strongly affects the nature of future intergroup relations. Hence, the mere amount of contact may not be useful in improving intergroup relations.

In retrospect, then, the “contact hypothesis” has come a long way since it was discussed by Allport (1954). Experimental and field research indicates that its effectiveness as a method of reducing intergroup prejudice depends on a complex interaction of the structure and quality of the contact experience, and the frequency and extensiveness of contact relationship. None the less, in the long run co-operative contact does seem to be the key to improving intergroup relationship and changing the social psychological processes that underlie prejudice and discrimination.

The next chapter tests empirically the research objectives of this thesis. To achieve this, descriptive statistics as well as multivariate statistical models are utilised in order to enable the extraction of conclusions and recommendations based on empirical evidence.
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"Statistics should not be used the way a drunk uses a lamppost, that is, for support rather than for illumination." - Andrew Lang

5.1 Introduction

In Chapter 1, the methods for examining the research questions and testing the derived hypotheses of this thesis have been discussed. In this chapter, the research findings derived from the application of these analytical methods are presented.

This chapter reports the results of statistical techniques applied in analysing the research results of surveys distributed in the South (Greek Cypriots) and North (Turkish Cypriots) of the island. Data from these questionnaires were used in organising the results of the study as follows: (a) demographic data; (b) analytical techniques; (c) hypotheses testing; and (d) summary.

The structure of this chapter is arranged in the following sequence:

1. The profile of the respondents is first reported.
2. The respondents' perceptions and attitudes towards each other as well as towards the past and current political, economic and social conditions on the island are presented and analysed through the means of correspondence analysis.
3. Next a hypothesis test is conducted so as to determine the conditional probabilities of providing a ranking order for the determination of the probability of living once again with Greek/Turkish Cypriots peacefully under the same state mechanism.
4. Finally, a summary concludes this chapter.
The purpose of this chapter is to generate the information that will answer the research problems and provide insights into the prospects and conclusions provided in the next chapters (see Chapter Six and Seven).

5.2 Descriptive Analysis of the Data

The objective of descriptive statistics is to provide summary measures of the data contained in all elements of the sample.

5.2.1 Analysis of demographic characteristics of the respondents

This section aims to provide a profile of the respondents who have participated in the survey.

Figure 5.1: Nationality of respondents
The sample for this survey consists of four sets of respondents. Due to time as well as resource restrictions it was decided to limit the sample to a level appropriate for statistical analysis (see Chapter 1 for a detailed explanation of the rationale behind the selection of the survey sample).

Figure 5.1 presents the breakdown of the sample in terms of their nationality. It is evident that the sample of both surveys in the North consisted of Turkish Cypriots (90.0% first survey / 95.6% second survey) and Turks (10% / 4.4%). It can therefore be suggested that the sample for the North is more homogeneous since it consists only of Turks when compared with the sample from the South where it is a slightly heterogeneous due to the presence of minorities in the sample. More specifically, the sample from the South presents a percentage of Greek Cypriots (89.5% / 91.6%), Greeks (5.7% / 3.6%) and minorities (2.2% / 4.4%).

What is characteristic in figure 5.2 is that in both cases what is higher in the first survey 82.4% tertiary-6.8% secondary and 53.1% secondary-23.2% tertiary has changed in the second survey to 40.2% secondary-38.8% tertiary and 37.5% tertiary-10.4% secondary.
In figure 5.2 in all cases of both surveys the percentage of skilled worker respondents is the smallest (0.0% / 3.3% and 1.8% / 3.9% respectively). In both surveys carried out in the South, the percentage of salaried respondents is higher (39.5% / 48.6%) while in the North self-employed respondents are higher (29.5% / 43.3%).
In figure 5.3 the pattern is that in both surveys the percentage of the male respondents in the North is significantly higher than the female respondents (63.2% (m) / 36.8% (f), 66.8% (m) / 33.2% (f) respectively). While in the South the percentages are more balanced (53.7% (m) / 46.3% (f), 47.1% (m) / 52.9% (f)). This demonstrates that the male population is significantly higher than the female population in the North because of the presence of 30,000-35,000 Turkish troops (UN Security Council-5- press release SC/6460, 3846th meeting (pm) 23 December 1997).
In figure 5.4 the distribution of the respondents in both surveys in the North and South demonstrates a balanced trend. The percentages, as depicted in figure 5.4, resemble closely the official statistics of both communities.

This is of particular importance for the purposes of this thesis since the age variable will be used extensively in employing statistical tools such as crosstabulations, correspondence analysis and logit analysis.
Figure 5.5 clearly indicates that the majority of the respondents in both surveys come from the private sector. The high percentage (28.2%) of respondents in the first survey in the North could be due to the presence of the Turkish occupation troops.

It should be noted that the occupation army and their dependents, who number approximately 30,000-35,000 in the North, are considered neither private nor public sector. They are considered as others.
Figure 5.6 shows that in both surveys in the South and North the majority of the respondents come from urban areas. The statistics provided here closely resemble the official statistics from both communities.
In figure 5.7 in both surveys the majority were not displaced. The displaced respondents are fewer, however the percentage difference between displaced to non-displaced respondents is greater in the South (23.6% / 45.8% respectively) than in the North (20.0% / 10.8%).
In figure 5.8 the results in both surveys, regarding the North, demonstrate a reasonably good consistent trend. Respondents in the political spectrum in the North follow the order: Left, Others, Right, Nationalist, Centre and Liberal. While in the South this cannot be said. Both cross sections (for the North) where Leftist respondents are high reflect the present political inclinations. It should be noted that the current Turkish Cypriot leader Mr. Mehmet Ali Talat is a leftist.
5.2.2 Analysis of cross tabulations

Figure 5.9: Intercommunal relations between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots prior to: 1955

In figure 5.9, the first cross section for the South, the respondents with “neither” answer lead the table (32.4%) followed by “friendly” (27.1%), and “unfriendly” (5.3%). This distribution is compatible with the age distribution of the survey in the South (see figure 5.4), where the majority of the respondents belong to 18-24, 25-34, 35-44 the age groups: (55.2% / 29.6% / 4.8%). These were groups of respondents who were not born or did not witness the period where ethnic conflict was heightened on the island.

In the second survey for the South, an increase is observed among the respondents answering “very friendly” (from 15.4% to 20.0%) and “friendly” (27.1% to 54.1%), and a decrease in “neither” (from 32.4% to 2.3%). The decrease is normal due to the reduction of prejudice, after the opening of the crossing points.

As for the first cross section for the North, in addition to consideration of the age group the opinion of the Turkish settlers in the survey should be taken into consideration as
well. Regarding the second survey for the North, a high unfriendly (32.8%), very unfriendly (11.4%) response in the second cross section clearly demonstrates the experience of the respondents according to age group. Highly unfriendly and very unfriendly respondents (24.3% and 17.1%) respectively are from the age groups 45-54 and over 54 who experienced the period of heightened ethnic conflict on the island.

**Figure 5.10: Intercommunal relations between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots prior to 1960**

In analysing the data in figure 5.10, it is necessary to take into account the distribution of the age groups and to a lesser extent the existence of the Turkish settlers in the North. In the first cross section for the South, the respondents with “neither” answer lead the table (35.5%), followed by “unfriendly” (27.9%), “friendly” (24.6%), “very friendly” (6.6%) and “very unfriendly” (5.5%). The reason why the “neither” respondents are higher in the first cross section in the South, is due to the higher percentage of the age
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groups: 18-24 (55.2%) and 24-34 (29.6%) respectively. This can be explained by the fact that they have not lived through the 1955-59 intercommunal incidents.

In the second cross section for the South the trend demonstrates an increase in the “friendly” response (39.1%) and decrease in the “neither” (28.7%), “unfriendly” (23.0%) and “very unfriendly” (23%).

As for the North, in the first cross section the respondents with a “friendly” answer are higher (37.3%) followed by “unfriendly” (13.1%). In the second cross section regarding the North, an increase is observed in the “unfriendly” from 31.1% to 39.1% and in the “very unfriendly” from 9.6% to 23.6%. This is primarily due to the age groups and to a lesser extent the presence of the settlers. Another explanation is that the intercommunal relations of the age groups 35-44 and 45-54 and over 54 in the North were affected by the traumatic intercommunal incidents that took place between 1955-1959.

**Figure 5.11: Intercommunal relations between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots prior to 1964**

How would you describe inter-communal relations between Greek and Turkish Cypriots prior to 1964?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How you describe</th>
<th>Very friendly</th>
<th>Friendly</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Unfriendly</th>
<th>Very unfriendly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>51.80%</td>
<td>33.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish (2nd cross section)</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>43.90%</td>
<td>51.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish (1st cross section)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>56.50%</td>
<td>25.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek (2nd cross section)</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13.40%</td>
<td>49.20%</td>
<td>23.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek (1st cross section)</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>59.20%</td>
<td>18.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The data in figure 5.11 are of the most striking and revealing result of the two surveys carried out in the North and South. The results show that relations between the communities during the first four years of the Republic were marked by a lack of trust and as a result, "friendly" relations between the two communities were at their lowest ebb.

In the South the respondents who described the relations between the communities as "very friendly" and "friendly" totalled 9.8% (2.2%+7.6%) in the first survey and 3.3% (1.1%+2.2%) for the second, while in the North the figures for the same survey stand 16.3% (2.9%+13.4%) and 2.9% (0.8%+2.1) respectively.

On the other hand, the total of the respondents who described the relations between the communities as "unfriendly" and "very friendly" was for the South 77.7% (59.2%+18.5% for the 1st cross section) and 81.9% (49.2%+25.4% for the 2nd cross section). While for the North 81.9% (56.5%+25.4% for the 1st cross section) and 95.8% (43.9%+51.9% for the 2nd cross section).

What is worth mentioning is that in both surveys, in the second cross section, the total percentage of respondents with "unfriendly" and "very unfriendly" was high in the North, almost reaching 100%(95.8%). From the ordinary observer's point of view, one would have expected that during the first four years of the Republic relations between the two communities would have got better; however, both empirically (through this survey) as well as historically this was not the case.
Figure 5.12: Intercommunal relations between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots prior to 1974

Figure 5.12 is more revealing in a diachronic sense. That is as time passes and no settlement is reached and there is no reconciliation, despite the fact that intercommunal talks between Mr. Rauf Denktash and House Representative Glafkos Clerides were going on since 1967, the “unfriendly” and “very unfriendly” trend is on the rise; in fact “very unfriendly” relations leads in both surveys. The results of figure 5.12 are totally in line with the results of figure 5.11.
Figure 5.13: Business relations between Greek and Turkish Cypriots

The results of both surveys are the natural outcome of the existing situation when the surveys were carried out.

In the second survey, the “Yes” responses on both sides show an increase, compared to the first survey. For the South it is 1.3% (9.6% / 8.3%) and for the North 20.0% (35.5% / 15.5%). The big increase (20%) for the North is normal because the majority of consumer goods in the South are less expensive and of better quality than in the North.
In figure 5.14, in both surveys for the South, the responses to the “probably yes probably no” question top the bar chart. Another important result is that in the 2nd cross section for the South there is an increase in the respondents favouring business relations. For the North in both surveys the respondents preferred establishing business relations with the South. In the second cross section for the North, the increase in the respondents who gave a “definitely not” answer (12.3% increased to 23.8%) is due to the Turkish settlers.
In figure 5.15, in the first cross section for the South, the responses to the questions are reasonably well distributed. Also, in the second survey, the high percentage of “probably not” (51.9%) responses for the South is normal. In this case English could be the medium of communication. In the second cross section for the North, the responses “definitely” (40.3%) and “definitely not” (41.1%), is due to the age groups as well as the Turkish settlers. The high percentage (40.3%) of “definitely” is due to the level of education in general, and knowledge of the English language in particular among the Turkish settlers which is very low.
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Figure 5.16: Evaluation of the role of the Greek Orthodox Church

In figure 5.16, the high percentage of responses in the first cross section (38.6% and 46.2%) and (50.6% and 42.4%) in the 2nd for the North to the questions “it had an active role in the development and escalation of ethnic strife” and “it had an active role in the development of the nationalist movement” is the natural outcome of the historic developments between the Greeks and Turks since 1821: The Greek War of Independence and Archbishop Makarios as the leader of the ENOSIS movement.

However, the high percentage of responses, (30.1% and 37.2%) first and second cross sections respectively for the South to the question “it had a neutral role” has a political dimension in that “Cyprus problem” was the result of the “Cold War” antagonism between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, and not a Church “instigated” issue.
Figure 5.17: Have you had any relatives killed as a result of intercommunal clashes during the 1960-74 period?

The answers of the respondents in figure 5.17 helps in clarifying and understanding the answers of the respondents to other questions of both surveys. A high percentage of respondents had a relative killed as a result of intercommunal clashes during 1960-74 periods the (47.5%, and 59.0%) for both the first and second cross sections in the North. The “pain” of these respondents is reflected in their response to the questions related to ethnic issues.
In both surveys for the South, the percentage of “Probably Yes Probably Not” responses to the question is almost the same (34.8%) for the first and second cross sections respectively, and it is also the highest. On the other hand, there is an important decrease between the first and second cross sections as regards the “Definitely” and “Definitely Not” (25.8% to 6.6%) answers respectively.

The high percentage of “Probably Not” responses (34.9%) to the question in the 2nd survey (2nd cross section) for the South and the very low “Definitely not” percentage (4.2%) should be considered normal as by that time, the two communities already had direct contact as account of the partial opening of the crossing points.

As for the North, in the 1st cross section the percentage of responses to the questions are fairly reasonably distributed. The relatively high percentage of “Definitely Not” (28.2%) responses is due to the non-religious character of the struggle.
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Regarding the second cross section for the North, in the bar chart the percentages in the responses to the first and last questions top the chart; 41.9% for “Definitely” and 30.8% for “Definitely not”. This is due to the age groups and the Turkish settlers.

**Figure 5.19: Nationalistic feelings/inclination of both as a factor for the tension between the two communities**

In figure 5.19 the majority of the respondents in both surveys in the South and North clearly indicate with their response that "nationalistic feelings" were strong enough to be accounted as a factor in the tension between the two communities.

The high percentage of respondents who gave a “Definitely” answer for both surveys in the North (62.5% and 79.4% respectively) is due to the strong nationalism of the Turkish Cypriots.
In figure 5.20 the data clearly indicate that intercommunal differences first appeared in the period 1955-1959. The Turkish Cypriots stress this more in both cross sections (47% and 58.5% respectively). This period is when both sides first formed organised armed groups (EOKA A’ and TMT). Despite the fact that EOKA aimed at the liberation of Cyprus from Great Britain, the aim and cause of the organization imposed a threat over the Turkish-Cypriot community on the island. As a result in 1958 TMT was formed for the protection of the Turkish Cypriot Community. Inevitably, the conflicting interests of both communities in particular and the respective motherlands in general, have escalated the conflict to a more dangerous level, that of armed inter-group conflict.
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Figure 5.21: Did the cold war antagonism aggravate the conflict between the two communities?

To the respondents of both surveys in the North, it is clear that the "cold war antagonism" was a factor that aggravated the conflict between the two communities. The percentage of respondents who gave a "Definitely" answer in the first and second survey in the North is 43.6% and 75.5% respectively. In particular, the high percentage of responses in the second survey in the North suggests that if both communities were left alone, they would have no major differences between them.

As for the respondents in the South there is "indecisiveness". This is reflected in the high percentage of "Probably Yes Probably Not" (40.6%) responses. In the second survey for the South, there is a small increase in the percentage of "Definitely" question responses (from 13.9% to 19.0%).
"Indecisiveness" is also clearly reflected in the high percentage of "I do not know/no answer" (38%) responses.

Figure 5.22: Do you believe that the movement for Enosis (Union) and Taksim (Partition) were the reasons for ethnic strife?

In figure 5.22, for the North, the inclination is evidently positive. In both surveys the high percentage of "Definitely" responses in the first and second cross sections (87.6% and 95.2% respectively) indicates this. Furthermore, higher percentages in the second cross section compared to the first, further support the above argument.

This is also true for the South, especially in the second survey. In the second cross section, the total percentage "Definitely and Probably" 86.3% (42.2% + 44.1%) responses correspond to the incremental pattern that has emerged from the analysis of the data for the North.
Figure 5.23: Do you believe that prior to 1974 both communities were treated equally on economic issues?

The results of both surveys in figure 5.23 regarding the North reflect the grievances (diachronic) of the Turkish Cypriots who claimed that they were not treated equally on economic issues.

The respondents in the South as well, with their answers, agree though to a lesser extent that the communities were not treated equally on economic issues. In the first cross section the percentage “Probably Not” answers is 27.8% and in the second it is 40.0%. The high percentage of respondents in the second cross section for the South who answered “Probably Yes/ Probably Not” 37.1% is also worth noting.
**Figure 5.24: Do you believe that prior to 1974 both communities were treated equally on social issues?**

The bar chart in figure 5.24, with the first and second cross sections for the North, demonstrates that a high percentage of the Turkish Cypriot respondents consider that the communities were not treated equally on social issues. In the first and second cross sections the “Definitely Not” response was 47.8% and 67.1% respectively.

A similar pattern also emerges from the analysis of the respondents in the South, though the percentage is evidently lower.
Figure 5.25: Do you believe that prior to 1974 both communities were treated equally on religious issues?

When one speaks about religion in Cyprus, he/she is basically speaking about Christianity (Greek Orthodox) and Islam (Turks). Religion like education is a communal affair and handled as such. This is reflected in the 1960 Constitution as well. Therefore, in figure 5.25, in the first and second cross sections for the North the high percentage of “Definitely Not” responses (35.4% and 57.4% respectively), has nationalistic tones. In the second cross section the higher percentage (57.4%) is due to the settlers. The percentage of respondent who gave “Definitely” replies in both cross sections is almost the same (25.7%, 25.5% respectively). As for the South, there was a high percentage of respondents who answered “Probably, Probably Yes/ Probably Not and Probably Not” in both surveys (67.7% and 84.7% respectively). This demonstrates that for the Greek Cypriots religion was not a decisive factor in intercommunal relations.
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Figure 5.26: Which are the factors that have led to intercommunal strife? First priority

From the bar chart in figure 5.26 it is very clear that in both surveys, for the North and South, the first priorities are the “Strategic interests of the motherlands, Turkey and Greece”, as well as the “British government policy towards both communities” that led to the intercommunal strife.

In such cases one usually expects that culture, language, economic and religious factors would have played a major role in any inter-communal strife, which, as is demonstrated through the current analysis, it is not the case in Cyprus.
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Figure 5.27: Which are the factors that have led to intercommunal strife? Second priority

As in the first priority (Figure 5.26), in the second priority (Figure 5.27) too, the strategic interests of the motherlands as well as British policy towards the communities are considered as the factors that have led to intercommunal strife (second cross section).

In the first cross section of the Second Priority East-West antagonism and economic considerations in addition to British government policy, have been indicated as important factors.

The same trend is valid for the second cross section for the South, though there is a decrease in percentage compared to the first cross section (27.0% to 13.7%) among the respondents that consider economic factors as leading to intercommunal strife.
The majority of the respondents in the North, favoured one way or the other "federation" be it bizonal or non-bizonal. The figure in the first cross section was 71.1% (47.7% + 23.4%) and in the second 81.3% (38.6% +42.7%).

This is an expected result for the North, because the Turkish Cypriot community always opted for a federation. In a federal set-up the Turkish Cypriots will not be considered a minority, which is their main concern.
Figure 5.29: Did the division of the island in 1974, in your opinion, solve the Cyprus problem between the two communities?

From the bar chart in figure 5.29 more than 75% of the respondents in the South, in both surveys, believe that the 1974 division did not solve the Cyprus problem. The exact percentages are 75.9% and 81.5% respectively. The same line of thinking is in the majority though to an extent lesser percentage in the North (67.1% and 69.8% respectively).

The percentage of respondents of the Turkish Cypriot sample who gave a “Definitely” answer (15.8% and 13.9%) is due to the presence of Taksim supporters, settlers and extremist groups.
In figure 5.30, in the first and second cross sections, the percentage of respondents who replied “Definitely” is 56.1% and 74.4% respectively. This percentage is higher (74.4%) in the second survey after the partial opening of the crossing points. The settlers and extreme nationalists account (10%) of the respondents who answered “Definitely Not”.

The same trend is to be found in the South as well, but to a lesser extent. Also, there is a kind of skepticism among the respondents in the South. Their response is concentrated more on questions with “Probably” as an answer.
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Figure 5.31: Do you believe that reconciliation between the two communities will ever be possible?

More than 60% of the respondents in both surveys in the North believe that reconciliation between the two communities is possible (60.8%) in the first cross section and 65.5% in the second cross section. The responses “Definitely Not” in the North, with percentages 10.4% and 15.9% in the first and second cross sections respectively, are due to the settlers and extreme nationalists.

In the South the majority of the respondents believe that reconciliation is possible though they are not as definite as in the North. However, in the second cross section the percentage of Greeks who believe reconciliation is possible increases after the partial opening of the crossings. Those who answered “Definitely” increased from 7.1% to 16.2% and those answered “Probably” went up from 35.7% to 42.8%. There was also a significant decrease in the number of people who replied “Probably Not” (from 19.2% to 9.5%) and in the respondents who said “Definitely Not” (from 16.5% to 4.1%). On the basis of the results above is evident that both sides favour reconciliation.
Figure 5.32: In the future do you expect any progress for the solution of the Cyprus problem?

The bar chart in figure 5.32 clearly indicates the expectations of the respondents of both sides, which, by a great majority are hoping for progress for the solution of the Cyprus problem.

The higher percentage of respondents in the South opting for "Yes" in the second cross section compared to the first cross section is due to the revived "hope" generated by the partial opening of the crossings between the sides.
Figure 5.33: Would you feel comfortable living once again peacefully with the Greek/Turkish Cypriots?

In figure 5.33 the majority of the Greek Cypriot respondents have doubts whether they would feel comfortable or not living with the Turkish Cypriots. This results from the sum of the percentages of the "spectrum" of “Probably, Probably Yes/No and Probably No” respondents which is 69.0% (19.2% + 25.3% + 24.5%). In the second cross section the figure is even higher 76.6% (23.4% + 24.8% + 28.4%). The drop in the percentage of the respondents who said “Definitely Not” 10.8% (22.7% / 11.9%) is due to the opening of the crossings. The small increase in the percentage of respondents who said “Definitely” 3.2% (11.5% / 8.3%) is also due to the opening of the crossings.

As for the North, the percentage of respondents with a “Definitely” stance is 39.1% and the second highest percentage of respondents are those who answered “Definitely Not” (25.2%). Regarding the second cross section there is a drop in the percentages though very small, varying between 1.6% and 4.4%, for the first four response options and a 10% increase in the “Definitely Not” response option. Normally one would have
expected a decrease in the “Definitely Not” answer when the crossings opened. The increase here is attributed to the age groups as well as the "security issue".

**Figure 5.34: What are your fears concerning living together with Turkish Cypriots under the same regime/government mechanism?**

In both surveys for the respondents in the North the fear of the majority is security. The figure is 56.8% in the first cross section and 66.8% in the second.

The second "fear" as far as the respondents in the North is concerned with economic segregation (20.6%).

Regarding the South, in the first cross section the "fears" are almost evenly distributed.

However, in the second cross section, that is after the partial opening of the crossings, the main concern is "security" (42.3%) and then comes "crime" (11.8%). The high percentage of "no opinion" for the second cross section is due to the confusion that has resulted in the respondents attitudes and views as a result of a significant change (opening of the cross points)
The bar chart in figure 5.35 demonstrates clearly that both sides favoured European Union membership, for different reasons each. The Turkish Cypriots favoured the E.U. due to the hopes for economic development in the poverty stricken area of Northern Cyprus. The Greek Cypriots on the other hand favoured joining the E.U. as a way guaranteeing security and boosting the chances for a solution through a European Union mediation.
Figure 5.36: In your opinion how would you like Cyprus to join the EU?

In this survey, the respondents in the South are clearly against an arrangement that will give the chance to the Turkish Cypriots to become European Union members without a settlement of the Cyprus problem.

The total percentage of the respondents in the South who wanted the Turkish Cypriots to join the European Union "after" a settlement of the Cyprus problem is for the first cross section 65.7% (14.0% + 40.3% + 11.4%) and if to this the percentage respondents who said "never" are added (17.4%), then the total percentage stands at 83.1% (65.7% + 17.4%). This total percentage is almost the same for the second cross section as well 81.9% (5.5% + 40.0% + 36.4%) and when the "never" response (2.9%) is added to it, then the figure comes to 84.8% (81.9% + 2.9%).

As for the North, a high percentage of respondents (50.0%) answered the “Turkish Cypriots should enter the European Union after the solution of the Cyprus problem".
Clearly, this is the key issue for the North. With the solution of the Cyprus problem the status of the Turkish Cypriots will gain legitimacy. On the other hand, without a settlement they fear that they will become a minority.

**Figure 5.37: Personally which one of the following would you prefer as a solution of the Cyprus problem?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefer living together with the TC/GC in two Component states</th>
<th>Prefer living separately from the TC/GC in a different component state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish (2nd cross section)</td>
<td>59.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish (1st cross section)</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek (2nd cross section)</td>
<td>31.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek (1st cross section)</td>
<td>51.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Figure 5.37, the percentage of respondents for both response options in the first cross section for the South is almost equal (51.0% and 49.0%). The percentage changes in the second cross section where respondents from the South are in “favour of living together in two component states” (68.7%).

As for the North, the percentage of respondents in favour of living together is 65.0%. The drop in the percentage of respondents who were in favour of “living together”, (40.5%), and the increase in the percentage of respondents who preferred to “live separately” (59.5%) can be attributed to the “threat” that the Turkish settlers felt after the influx of Greek Cypriots in the North following the opening of the cross points.
In figure 5.38, the bar chart clearly points out what the two sides “fear”. A large number from both sides fears “clashes between the two communities” which mostly relates to the security issue. The security issue is considered as one of the major and key issues in the Cyprus problem.
Figure 5.39: Do you believe that the opening of the crossing points has brought the two communities closer?

In figure 5.39, the total percentage of “Definitely” and “Probably” responses in the North to the first and second questions is 47.6% (37.2% + 10.4%) and the percentage of “Definitely Not” answers is 46.4%. The clear-cut division with almost equal distribution is due to the Turkish settlers and age groups. Older groups and nationalists as well as settlers tended to give a “Definitely Not” response.

As for the South, the general “hesitating” approach is demonstrated here as well when one considers the percentage of responses to the questions starting with “Probably”, which totals 77.2% (29.0% + 21.4% + 26.8%).
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Figure 5.40: How does the opening of the crossing points has influenced you in financial terms?

In figure 5.40 a significant point is the percentage of residents in the North, who were positively influenced (27.1%). This, most probably, represents the Turkish Cypriots working in the South.

As for the South, the small percentage of respondents who were influenced (3.6%) are the traders. The same explanation is valid for those who were negatively influenced.
In figure 5.41 the bar chart is self-explanatory. The high percentage of respondents who replied “Yes” (73.5%) has both an economic and “curiosity” aspect. The percentage of “No” responses is due to the settlers who are not citizens of the Republic.

For the South the majority of “Yes” respondents are displaced persons who crossed to the other side to see their place of birth.
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Figure 5.42: When you have visited the other side which of the following best describes your feelings?

The most striking finding in the bar chart of figure 5.42 is the high percentage of respondents in the South who answered “Anger” (52.3%). This response stems from a sense of nostalgia for the family paternal home the respondents abandoned but are now allowed access to. The “hostility” (8.1%) response also stems from the same feeling.

For the Turkish Cypriots the high percentage of survey participants who replied “Happiness”, “Satisfaction” and to a lesser extent “Indifference” (29.9%, 37.8% and 23.2% respectively) coincide with the purpose of the visit. “Anger” (7.3%) for the North is the same “nostalgic anger” as in the case of the South.
Figure 5.43: Do you plan to visit the other side in the near future?

The bar chart regarding figure 5.43 is indicative of the moods of the respondents on both sides. The high percentage of “No” responses in the South reveals that there was disillusionment after the first visit.

For the North the drop in the “Yes” percentage is also normal. The number of people who visited the South out of “curiosity” corresponds to the percentage drop.
The bar chart regarding figure 5.44 is indicative of the mood of the respondents on both sides. The low percentage of the “very hostile” on both sides is due to the presence of the low percentage of extremists (Grey Wolves in the Turkish side and nationalists in the south).

As for the “hostile” elements this is due to people who were directly affected from the intercommunal conflict (missing persons families etc).

The high percentage of “neither friendly nor hostile” is indicative of the businesslike relation between the two communities. Regarding the “friendly” column it is comparatively high because this is due to the generation that grew up after 1974 without recognising each other. When the cross points opened and dialogue started among the young generation, they discovered a lot of common elements joining them rather than separating them.
In this figure, 63.7% of the Turkish Cypriots responded favourably to the question. However, besides the favourable “Definitely” response, another significant outcome is that, despite the fact that 66.8% of the Turkish Cypriot respondents lost a relative in the period 1960-74, they still believe that reconciliation is possible.

This is true, though to a far lesser extent, for the Greek Cypriots. Out of the total of Greek Cypriots 11.7% who respondent favourably to the question, (16%) of them had lost a relative in the 1960-74 period. This shows that on both sides people are ready for reconciliation. They are ready to “forgive”, something that can be described as a “patch of hope”.
Figure 5.46: What are your fears of living together with Greek/Turkish Cypriots under the same regime/government mechanism?

In analysing the data regarding this cross-tabulation of figure 5.46 one has to take into consideration the psychology of both sides as well as the status of the communities; that is, the minority/majority issue at the given period. These two factors are of paramount importance, perhaps, even the root cause of the non-solution of the problem.

In light of these factors, it is understandable that 62% of the Turkish Cypriot respondents expressed fear about their "Security/Personal safety". Another reason why the Turkish Cypriot respondents consider "security" important is that 73.6% of these respondents had a relative killed in the intercommunal clashes. The corresponding percentage for the Greek Cypriots is 33.1%.

Security considerations are also important to the Greek Cypriots but not to the same extent as the Turkish Cypriots. Among the Greek Cypriot respondents 30.8% expressed fear about "safety". The Greek Cypriots’, fear about “safety” does not stem from the presence of the Turkish Cypriots but the presence of the Turkish occupation troops.
Another significant finding that is worth consideration is the relatively high percentage of Greek Cypriot respondents who were concerned about crime. This was 16% for the Greek Cypriots while for the Turkish Cypriots it was 2.5%.

Finally, another important result of this cross-tabulation is the number of Turkish Cypriots (16.3%) who feared “economic segregation”. This can be put down to the fact that the Turkish Cypriots are the minority and economically weaker community.

Figure 5.47: Would you feel comfortable living once again peacefully with Greek/Turkish Cypriots?

In this cross-tabulation (figure 5.47) 41.2% of the Turkish Cypriot respondents who had a relative killed as a result of intercommunal clashes said they would feel comfortable living with the Greek Cypriots again. By contrast, 34.7% of Turkish Cypriot respondents who had a relative killed as a result of intercommunal clashes said they would “Definitely Not” feel comfortable living with the Greek Cypriots again. Here one
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should take into consideration the age groups of the Turkish Cypriots which was between 45-54, and over 54. These two age groups had experienced all the stages of the Cyprus conflict between 1955-1974.

As for the response of the Greek Cypriots, a high percentage of “Probably Yes, Probably Not” replies are due to the age groups.

Figure 5.48: In your opinion what is the best possible solution for the Cyprus problem?

More than 75% of the Turkish Cypriot respondents to this survey (figure 5.48) favoured, one way or other, “federation”, be it bizonal or non-bizonal (43.1% + 33.5% = 76.6% total).

This is the expected result for the North since the Turkish Cypriots have always opted for federation. On the one hand 18% of the respondents in the North opted for a “unitary Cyprus state”. On the other, 38.2% of the respondents in the South opted for a unitary state (38.2%).
The striking result as far as this survey is concerned is the relatively high percentage of Greek Cypriot respondents (13.0%) who preferred the establishment of two separate states and, contrary to the policy of their leadership, supported a two state solution. The percentage of respondents in the North in favour of a separate state is surprisingly low (2.8%).

This shows that the Turkish Cypriots are more inclined to support power sharing under a federal structure than the Greek Cypriots in the South.

**Figure 5.49: In your opinion what is the best possible solution for the Cyprus problem?**

In this cross-tabulation, the Turkish Cypriots preference, among all age groups, for a federal settlement is obvious (more than 75%). Also given a choice between bi-zonal federation and federation their preference was for bi-zonal federation (43.1%) and then for federation (33.3%). The Turkish Cypriots, of the age groups over 54 and the 45-54 age group (49.5%) constituted the highest percentage in favour of a bizonal state. These
two age groups preferred bizonal federation because they had experienced the unitary state period of 1960-1963.

Besides, the high percentage of responses among all the age groups in the North in favour of a federal settlement is normal because in a federal settlement the Turkish Cypriots will be considered politically equal to the Greek Cypriots. In the "unitary state" the question of "minority" and "majority" will gain importance and the Turkish demand for political equality will be done away with. The high percentage of support among the Greek respondents for unitary state (38.1%) stems from this concern.

The high percentage (12.9%) of Greek respondents favouring two separate states is due to the lack of a desire for power sharing among the Greek Cypriots, who would rather give up territory to sovereignty. On the other hand, no age group appears to support the "two independent states" idea within the Turkish Cypriot community.

**Figure 5.50: Do you believe that reconciliation between the two communities would be ever possible?**
In this survey (figure 5.50) 63.7% of the Turkish Cypriot respondents, of all age groups, believe that reconciliation between the two communities is possible, and the highest percentage (70.5%) of respondents is within the age group of 35-44. A similar high percentage of respondents within the Greek Cypriot community replied "Probably", with the 35-44 age group constituting the highest percentage (50.8%).

The relatively high percentage of Turkish respondents within the 18-24 and over 54 age groups, whose answers was "Definitely Not" (18.2% and 25.0% respectively) is due to the Turkish settlers and hard core nationalists.

The overall result, as it stems out of this discussion is that the majority of the respondents in both communities believe that reconciliation is possible.

Figure 5.51: What are your fears to live together with Greek/Turkish-Cypriots under the same regime/government mechanism?

In this survey (figure 5.51), 62.5% of the Turkish Cypriot respondents' major fear, in all age groups, is security. The highest percentage is among the over 54 age group and then
comes the 46-54 age group (71%). The second greatest "fear" among the Turkish Cypriots (16.3%) is "economic segregation". These two "fears" within the Turkish Cypriot community emanate from the fact that at the end of colonial rule and after Cyprus became an independent state, the Turkish Cypriots were treated as a minority and were subjected to attacks as a community or as individuals. Also in the business life, the Greek Cypriot private sector (capital) was stronger. Therefore, these "fears" from their point of view could be considered legitimate. Security is also the main fear of the Greek Cypriots though to a lesser degree (30.6%). Another important "fear" among the Greek Cypriots is the "crime" factor (16.2%) which has "social" rather than political roots.

Figure 5.52: In which political spectrum do you position yourself?

In figure 5.52 the Greek and Turkish Cypriot respondents from the whole political spectrum except a high percentage of Greek Cypriot Greens, believed 1974 division did...
not solve the Cyprus problem. Only the Greek Cypriot respondents who identified themselves as "Greens" replied "Probably".

Therefore, the respondents across virtually the whole political spectrum on both sides consider that the division of the island is NOT a solution.

The illegal Turkish settlers in the occupied area account for the small percentage advocating division.

5.3 Empirical application of correspondence analysis

In this section correspondence analysis is applied in an attempt to shed light on the complex interrelationships of ethnic conflict in Cyprus and graphically represent and interpret them within different ethnocultural contexts.

Correspondence analysis is a method of visually representing the associations between different categorical variables. Its primary goal is to "transform a table of numerical information into a graphical display, facilitating the interpretation of this information." It is not a method of testing a hypothesis, although it does draw on the logic of Pearson's chi-square statistics in computing distances for purposes of graphic representation. Correspondence analysis is most often employed, as it is used for the purposes of the current thesis, as a method for portraying data for visual inspection and analysis, rather than a method for testing statistical significance.

The distinct advantage of correspondence analysis is that it allows the researcher to visually represent two different structures in our case, attitudes perceptions and ethnocultural background on the same graph and to visually represent the relationships within
each structure and between the two structures. Thus, it “allows both the social and the
cultural dimensions to be plotted within the same measurement space” (Harcourt, 2003).

5.3.1 Theoretical properties of correspondence analysis in the context of the current thesis

As was already noted earlier in Chapter 1, correspondence analysis is an easy-to-
interpret interdependence technique that originated in France. The technique offers
tremendous flexibility in terms of the types of data it can analyse.

The aim of correspondence analysis is to find a low-dimensional representation of the
dependence between predetermined categories in a two-way contingency table (Van der
Heijden and de Leeuw, 1985; Hair et al., 1995). The technique typically relies upon the
association between objects and descriptive attributes. Among the compositional
techniques, correspondence analysis is most similar to factor analysis. In its most basic
form, correspondence analysis employs a contingency table derived from a
crosstabulation of two categorical variables. It then transforms the non-metric data to
metric form and performs dimensional reduction similar to factor analysis and a form of
perceptual mapping similar to multidimensional scaling, where categories are
represented in the multidimensional space. Proximities in the graphical display indicate
the level of association among row or column categories. The ability of correspondence
analysis to deal with frequency data provides a practical methodological strength, for it
is possible to work with data that may not meet the restrictions on data necessary for
other statistical analyses (Williams and Lawson, 2004). Thus, the researcher is not
forced into proceeding “as if” the data conform to a normal distribution (Shavelson,
1988).
There are two ways to understand correspondence analysis, geometric and algebraic. The geometric approach is easier to explain. In essence, what correspondence analysis does is to take a contingency table of rows and columns—where rows (for example, persons) and columns (for example, political situations) index different types of phenomena and to represent all rows and columns as points in a single "space" of some number of dimensions, often two. The location of each row is a function of the tendency for that item to have its own distribution across columns. Conversely, the location of each column—point in the "space" is a function of the tendency of that property to be manifest with differential likelihood by each of the row items. In this sense, the underlying logic is that the rows "are" the columns, and vice versa.

In simplified terms, correspondence analysis can be described as a process in three parts. In the first step, it takes a contingency table (a two-by-two table of categorical variables) and norms the cell entries by row proportions and weights. In other words, it turns the row entries into percentages (row profiles) and then weights these by the relative mass of each row in relation to the total number of observations. This places all cells on a comparable metric in relation to each other. In step two, it plots these entries in multidimensional space using these weighted cell values to determine vector points for each row and column. When it does this, it does not use Euclidean distance, but instead uses what is known as "chi-square distance." This makes sure that the multidimensional space reflects distances in relation to what one would expect if the contingency table had been completely random. In step three, it reduces the dimensionality to two dimensions. Using weighted least squares, it finds the plane that captures and explains as much of the multidimensional distribution as possible. It then produces a two-dimensional graph a "correspondence map" that visually represents the
contingency table. If the two primary dimensions explain a lot of the variation, it produces a two-dimensional graph that may explain more than seventy-five or ninety percent of the inertia where the inertia represents the spread of the vector points in multidimensional space. It is then necessary to interpret the correspondence map.

For the purposes of the current project, correspondence analysis offers several advantages. First multiple categorical variables, such as perceptions and attitudes and a set of political facts and situations, can be represented simply through the crosstabulated data. Second, it portrays not only the relationships between rows and columns, but also those between the categories of either the rows or columns. Third, its flexible data requirements permit quick and easy data collection. Finally, the canonical version of the technique produces a joint display of row and column categories in a similar dimensionality. The interpretive strength of correspondence analysis lies with its representation of low-dimensional solutions in graphical displays, which permit the researcher to make comparisons between participants, between variables, and between participants and variables in their relative placement in shared low-dimensional space (Williams and Lawson, 2004).

This graphical output is a tremendous aid for demonstration purposes. It can act as a pictorial anchor or serve as an overhead in a presentation of perceptual and attitudinal patterns. The visual output, in essence, is the picture that speaks a thousand words (Yavas and Shemwell, 1996).

Correspondence analysis is not without its critics. Some argue that it is model-free or theory-free, because it does not test hypotheses. It is often criticised for being "merely descriptive" or "data-dredging." Its proponents, however, claim this to be a virtue. One of its staunchest advocates and popularisers in France (van Meter et al. 1994), in fact,
promoted correspondence analysis specifically because of this. It is a method that lets the data speak without imposing any preconceptions on the data. The guiding principle is that "the model must follow the data and not the reverse." Naturally, other statistical methods, such as log-linear modelling, can be used to complement correspondence analysis once hypotheses have been formulated.

It has to be noted that correspondence analysis provides a perceptual map of opinions and attitudes of respondents towards certain statements, objects or situations. Scholars suggest that the interpretation of correspondence tables has to be done with great care and attention since the subjectivity that is involved in interpreting the perceptual maps can be misleading.

5.3.2 Rationale behind the use of correspondence analysis

The underlying objective of this thesis is to examine whether through the course of an intensive (albeit quiet) conflict in Cyprus, each of the two communities has evolved an ethos of conflict which shapes and manifests the group’s social, behavioural and cognitive frameworks, something that in turn serves as the epistemic basis of the conflict. Having this as a basis, it is aimed to empirically examine whether increased contact between people from both communities can lead either to the reduction or escalation of ethnic conflict and towards a new laissez-faire for their co-existence under the same state mechanism.

Such objectives, grounded within a socio-psychographic framework demand the utilisation of such analytical methods and techniques that would have the ability to capture complex relationships and at the same time accommodate the heterogeneous
data sets collected for the purposes of this thesis. Having in mind the particularities of this thesis, the theoretical properties of correspondence analysis (as these were raised above), as well as the theoretical context within which the utilisation of correspondence analysis is conducted were decided on the basis of the following reasons:

a. Correspondence analysis is an appropriate analytical method for the analysis of categorical data and at the same time avoids the unease of using traditional multivariate techniques such as factor analysis on such data.

b. The technique produces a visual representation between the row categories and the column categories in the same dimensional space.

c. The technique is versatile: it can be used with frequency data, with percentages, with data in the form of ratings and with heterogeneous data sets.

d. The method is relational and allows the visualisation of the full structure or system of relations. Instead of dealing with one variable and its effect on the variable to be explained, it represents the full gamut of variables and their interrelations.

e. The technique also allows the researcher to represent the duality of practice and culture. As Breiger (2000) explains, "A great deal of the popularity of (correspondence analysis) with structural analysts and practice theorists alike derives from its ability to portray two types of entity... in the 'same' space." In sum, correspondence analysis is particularly appropriate to study the duality of meaning and practices. This is because it allows us to visually represent the web of meanings and practices in one space. It holds constant routine associations and portrays only those that are "above average." It shows us how the categories are interrelated to each other in different contexts.
5.3.3 Methodological considerations

Correspondence analysis is relatively free from assumptions about the nature of the data. It can work with a variety of data formats, and as mentioned above, does not require data that conform to a normal distribution (Greenacre, 1984). The main assumption, and for some, limitation, of correspondence analysis is that all of the relevant variables are included in the analysis (Hair et al., 1995). If a key variable is overlooked in the design stage of the research, then the final scaling solution is impoverished. For the purposes of this thesis, particular care was taken so as to ensure that all the variables included in the analysis are reasonably comprehensive and at the same time directly relevant to the research objectives and hypotheses.

Another methodological decision that had to be taken prior to the analysis was the choice between the different methods of normalisation; principal normalisation-columns, principal normalisation-rows and symmetrical normalisation. The differences between the methods of creating the graphical representations has caused debate in the literature about the most appropriate choice of normalisation and methods of interpretation of the visual display (Greenacre, 1984; Hair et al., 1995; Gabriel, 2002). Gabriel (2002 reported in Williams and Lawson, 2004) calculated goodness-of-fit for the various forms of graphical representation available in correspondence analysis. He concluded that researchers who have a specific interest in actual magnitudes of difference between rows and columns should choose the appropriate principal normalisation (row or column). However, researchers whose interest lies in comparing the general orientation of row points and column points, rather than visualising actual magnitudes, are well served by the symmetrical normalisation option. As Gabriel (2002, p.435) noted “The symmetric biplot, in addition to its optimal fit of the data,
proportionally fits the form and the variance almost optimally and is an excellent
candidate for general usage, unless one requires representation of the actual
magnitudes”.

The concern in the current thesis lies with interpreting the meaning of the dimensions
extracted in the low-dimensional solution, and in interpreting the placement of
participants relative to those dimensions. Taking these factors into consideration, it was
decided to select symmetrical normalisation for the graphical representation and analysis
in this thesis.

5.3.4 Empirical application of the correspondence analysis

The application of the technique involves several steps. To facilitate the process, a
detailed application of the technique is provided for the first contingency table
(relationship between variables). The detailed application will provide a thorough
understanding on how the technique is applied for the purposes of the current thesis and
at the same time it will allow the application of the technique to other contingency tables
without having the need to repeat (in detail) the methodological steps and reporting of
all the tables of results that are generated by the analysis routine.

5.3.4.1 Examination of attitudes and perceptions of Cypriots after the opening of the
crossing points

The objective at this point is to examine whether the opening of the crossing points has
influenced positively and/or negatively the attitudes and perceptions of both ethnic
groups towards each other.
Correspondence table

The initial step in a correspondence analysis is to enter the frequencies of participants’ responses in the form of a contingency table. The “Correspondence Table” below is simply the crosstabulation of the row and column variables, including the row and column marginal totals, serving as input.

**Table 5.1: Observed frequencies Greek Cypriot sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Probably</th>
<th>Probably yes</th>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>Definitely not</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>222</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.2: Observed frequencies Turkish Cypriot sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Definitely</th>
<th>Probably</th>
<th>Probably yes</th>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>Definitely not</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>249</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The row and column profiles

Each row and column of the contingency table is characterised by its profile, which, according to Benzecri (1992), is a “system of proportions”. To begin with, the correspondence analysis calculates the so called “row profiles”, which are the relative proportions of each variable within all of the variables mentioned by each participant.
The row profiles permit a within-participant comparison of the variables. Tables 5.3 and 5.4 present the row profiles for the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot sample.

**Table 5.3: Row profiles Greek Cypriots**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Number</th>
<th>Row Name</th>
<th>Coordin. Dim. 1</th>
<th>Coordin. Dim. 2</th>
<th>Mass Quality</th>
<th>Inertia Dim. 1</th>
<th>Cosine² Dim. 1</th>
<th>Inertia Dim. 2</th>
<th>Cosine² Dim. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>-0.449262</td>
<td>0.385596</td>
<td>0.157658</td>
<td>0.344105</td>
<td>0.336977</td>
<td>0.570322</td>
<td>0.395218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>-0.317803</td>
<td>-0.201994</td>
<td>0.207077</td>
<td>0.192445</td>
<td>0.221620</td>
<td>0.676777</td>
<td>0.142541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>0.173110</td>
<td>-0.070461</td>
<td>0.243243</td>
<td>0.613035</td>
<td>0.060842</td>
<td>0.077192</td>
<td>0.738889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>0.096893</td>
<td>-0.221828</td>
<td>0.229730</td>
<td>0.750725</td>
<td>0.110612</td>
<td>0.022872</td>
<td>0.120426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Over 54</td>
<td>0.448836</td>
<td>0.303167</td>
<td>0.162162</td>
<td>0.399603</td>
<td>0.291986</td>
<td>0.341339</td>
<td>0.680804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.4: Row profiles Turkish Cypriots**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row Number</th>
<th>Row Name</th>
<th>Coordin. Dim. 1</th>
<th>Coordin. Dim. 2</th>
<th>Mass Quality</th>
<th>Inertia Dim. 1</th>
<th>Cosine² Dim. 1</th>
<th>Inertia Dim. 2</th>
<th>Cosine² Dim. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>-0.480814</td>
<td>-0.262286</td>
<td>0.156627</td>
<td>0.254470</td>
<td>0.230579</td>
<td>0.766279</td>
<td>0.859294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>-0.315861</td>
<td>0.095520</td>
<td>0.164659</td>
<td>0.107147</td>
<td>0.104611</td>
<td>0.825660</td>
<td>0.077983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>-0.223980</td>
<td>0.121297</td>
<td>0.265060</td>
<td>0.103496</td>
<td>0.084677</td>
<td>0.691902</td>
<td>0.202428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>0.342376</td>
<td>0.055375</td>
<td>0.240964</td>
<td>0.174002</td>
<td>0.175871</td>
<td>0.874198</td>
<td>0.033354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Over 54</td>
<td>0.603306</td>
<td>-0.116635</td>
<td>0.172691</td>
<td>0.360886</td>
<td>0.400626</td>
<td>0.937945</td>
<td>0.121941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Next the correspondence analysis routine calculates the “column profiles”. The column profiles are the proportion of each variable mentioned by each participant as a total of all participants’ mentions of that variable. Profiling participants across the column variables permits between-participant comparisons. Tables 5.5 and 5.6 are the column profiles of Greek and Turkish Cypriots respectively.

**Table 5.5: Column profiles Greek Cypriots**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column Name</th>
<th>Column Number</th>
<th>Coordin. Dim. 1</th>
<th>Coordin. Dim. 2</th>
<th>Mass Quality</th>
<th>Inertia Dim. 1</th>
<th>Cosine² Dim. 1</th>
<th>Inertia Dim. 2</th>
<th>Cosine² Dim. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.318855</td>
<td>-0.283831</td>
<td>0.166666</td>
<td>0.926263</td>
<td>0.200233</td>
<td>0.179441</td>
<td>0.516779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.190063</td>
<td>0.346700</td>
<td>0.292783</td>
<td>0.999849</td>
<td>0.282327</td>
<td>0.112007</td>
<td>0.231049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.522020</td>
<td>-0.001848</td>
<td>0.216216</td>
<td>0.981525</td>
<td>0.370224</td>
<td>0.623948</td>
<td>0.981513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.057393</td>
<td>-0.132921</td>
<td>0.270270</td>
<td>0.552121</td>
<td>0.063284</td>
<td>0.009428</td>
<td>0.086760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.362396</td>
<td>-0.330618</td>
<td>0.054054</td>
<td>0.979524</td>
<td>0.081944</td>
<td>0.075176</td>
<td>0.534290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.6: Column profiles Turkish Cypriots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column Name</th>
<th>Column Number</th>
<th>Coordin. Dim. 1</th>
<th>Coordin. Dim. 2</th>
<th>Mass Quality</th>
<th>Relative Inertia</th>
<th>Inertia Dim. 1</th>
<th>Cosine² Dim. 1</th>
<th>Inertia Dim. 2</th>
<th>Cosine² Dim. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.288237</td>
<td>0.122336</td>
<td>0.373494</td>
<td>0.986638</td>
<td>0.198927</td>
<td>0.197599</td>
<td>0.836246</td>
<td>0.286671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.371484</td>
<td>-0.081386</td>
<td>0.104418</td>
<td>0.770038</td>
<td>0.107080</td>
<td>0.093099</td>
<td>0.735255</td>
<td>0.035090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.672826</td>
<td>-0.586093</td>
<td>0.036145</td>
<td>0.972320</td>
<td>0.159389</td>
<td>0.104196</td>
<td>0.552831</td>
<td>0.644646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably not</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.819892</td>
<td>-0.078243</td>
<td>0.024096</td>
<td>0.825957</td>
<td>0.106573</td>
<td>0.103149</td>
<td>0.818503</td>
<td>0.007657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely not</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.413127</td>
<td>-0.030501</td>
<td>0.461847</td>
<td>0.999241</td>
<td>0.427130</td>
<td>0.501957</td>
<td>0.993824</td>
<td>0.022302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Summary table

The chi-square test for both samples reported in table 5.7 (Greek Cypriot sample $x^2 = 35.99; \text{df} = 16; p<.005$ and Turkish Cypriot sample $x^2 = 46.23; \text{df} = 16; p<.005$) clearly reveals that the row (i.e. age) and the column (i.e. attitudes towards the re-opening of the crossing points) variables are related. However, this does not provide a clear picture of the nature of the relationship between the variables. Questions such as “what are the similarities among the age groups with the levels of attitudes/perceptions?”, “What are the similarities of the various levels of attitudes/perceptions with respect to the age groups?” and “Which age/attitude pairs are in closer proximity?” remain unanswered.

To address these issues and to obtain a graphical representation depicting the relationships among age groups and the attitudes/perceptions the perceptual map (biplot) produced through the correspondence analysis is needed. However, before commenting on the biplot, an explanation of the various statistical data provided by the summary table will be explained.

*Singular value.* A singular value is the square root of an eigenvalue. It is interpreted as the maximum canonical correlation between the categories of the variables in analysis for any given dimension.
Total inertia. Inertia means variance in the context of correspondence analysis. Total inertia is the sum of eigenvalues and reflects the spread of points around the centroid. Total inertia may be interpreted as the percent of inertia (variance) in the original correspondence table explained by all the computed dimensions in the correspondence analysis. However, usually only the first two dimensions are used in the correspondence map, so the effective model will explain a percent of inertia in the original table equal to the sum of eigenvalues for the first two dimensions only. For the analysis conducted here the total inertia for the Greek Cypriot sample for both dimensions sums up to 15.3% while for the Turkish Cypriot sample sums up to 17.6%.

Chi-square significance of total inertia. The statistical programme computes a chi-square test for total inertia, along with the corresponding probability level. If this level is <= .05, the conventional cutoff, the researcher concludes the dimensions are associated with the values of the variables in the original correspondence table. Note this does not demonstrate that the two variables which are the source of the points in the original correspondence table are significantly associated. A significant chi-square for total inertia merely shows that the total inertia is not so low as to be insignificantly different from zero.

The proportion of inertia accounted for by a given dimension is its eigenvalue divided by total inertia. Thus, if the proportion of inertia accounted for by dimension 1 for the Greek Cypriot sample is .582, then dimension 1 explains 58.2% of the variance which is explained (measured by total inertia) in the original correspondence table. Thus, if the total inertia is .162, meaning all the factors explain 16.2% of the variance in the original
correspondence table, then factor 1 explains 58.23% of this 16.2%. It does not explain 58.23% of the variance in the original table as is sometimes misreported.

Table 5.7: Correspondence analysis summary table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Dims</th>
<th>Singular Values</th>
<th>Eigen Values</th>
<th>Perc. of Inertia</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
<th>Chi Squares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.307296</td>
<td>0.094431</td>
<td>58.23871</td>
<td>58.2367</td>
<td>2096362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.243541</td>
<td>0.059312</td>
<td>36.57979</td>
<td>94.8185</td>
<td>13.16727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.090036</td>
<td>0.008106</td>
<td>4.99952</td>
<td>99.8180</td>
<td>1.79963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.017178</td>
<td>0.000295</td>
<td>0.18198</td>
<td>100.0000</td>
<td>0.06551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graphical displays

The correspondence map in the form of a biplot displays two of the dimensions which emerge from principal components analysis of point distances, and points are displayed in relation to these dimensions. For instance, the analysis conducted here seeks to relate age (18-24, 25-34, .... etc.) with attitudes towards the opening of the crossing points “probably” to “definitely”, etc., and the correspondence map might show how people from different age groups perceive that the opening of the crossing points can potentially bring people from both communities closer. This is illustrated below.
There are different ways of interpreting correspondence analysis graphs. One approach is to interpret the dimensions by associating with each dimension those row and column labels which seem most expressive of it. Another approach has to do with the angle and location of the different points with respect to the centre or origin of the graph. In this thesis, the first method is employed and focus is given primarily on how certain categories give meaning to the different dimensions of the correspondence maps.

Figure 5.53 illustrates the graphical output generated by correspondence analysis from the data in tables 5.5 and 5.6. This representation is very important since it reveals the underlying structure and positioning of the attitudes/perceptions in relation to the age groups of respondents.

As can be seen from figure 5.53, the perceptual map which depicts the views/attitudes of Greek Cypriots provides an unclear pattern since there is not a convergence between the row and the column points. The only inference that can be extracted is that the age groups (over 54) have been positively influenced in terms of their attitudes and...
perceptions towards the Turkish Cypriots by the opening of the crossing points. It can be suggested that this perceptual pattern is a result of the confusion (both at emotional and political levels) that has resulted after the unexpected decision to open the crossing points. On the contrary, when the perceptual map for the Turkish Cypriot side is examined, a more clear pattern emerges. The age groups 45-54 and over-54 are negatively disposed towards the statement that the opening of the crossing points had a positive impact on their perception and attitudes towards the Greek Cypriots. On the other hand the age groups 25-34 and 35-44 support the statement. It is evident that people who have experienced ethnic conflict, prior to 1974, are much more reserved and cautious in expressing their feelings, attitudes and perceptions. From a psychographic point of view, this is totally understandable since the social and political realities on the island before and after 1974 have nurtured an environment where feelings of mistrust, wariness and security were, and still to some extent, are predominant.

5.3.4.2 Age differences and perceptions of increased contact through the opening of the crossing points

The examination of the above perceptual maps demonstrates a clearer pattern in relation to the analysis that was conducted in section 5.4.3.1.

A chi-square test for the Greek Cypriot sample \((x^2=32.79; \text{df}=16; p< 0.05)\) clearly reveals that the row and column variables are related. The total inertia for the Greek Cypriot sample for both dimensions adds up to 14.83% and the proportion of inertia accounted for by dimension 1 explains 70.8% and dimension 2, 26.9%.

The chi-square test for the Turkish Cypriot sample \((x^2=29.708; \text{df}=16; p< 0.05)\) also reveals that the row and column variables are related. The total inertia accounts to 11.93% and the proportion of inertia accounted for by dimension 1 explains 70.8% and dimension 2, 26.9%.
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Figure 5.54: Correspondence analysis biplot - Age differences and perceptions of increased contact through the opening of the crossing points

The interpretation of the perceptual map for the Greek Cypriot sample indicates that the 45-54 and over 54 age groups are more positively disposed towards the statement that the opening of the crossing points has brought the two communities closer. On the contrary, the Greek Cypriots who belong to the age group 18-34 are more hesitant to endorse such a statement.

The analysis of the Greek Cypriot sample reveals important differences between age groups since the younger generation seems to have a negative predisposition towards the statement.

The perceptual map which portrays the views of the Turkish Cypriots provides a very clear pattern from which interesting observations can be extracted. At the same time sharp differences can be identified between the two samples. The Turkish Cypriots who belong to the age group 25-54 appear to be definitely sure and confident that the opening of the crossing points has brought the two communities closer. The same opinion is also shared by the age group 18-24 but not to the same degree of certainty. A sharp contrast in the attitudes and perceptions, in relation to the other age groups, is demonstrated by
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Turkish Cypriots over the age of 54 who are characterised by a dogmatic view that the opening of the crossing points has not brought the two communities closer.

At this point it is interesting to note a paradox that emerges from the comparison of the two samples. For the Greek Cypriot sample, the younger age group (18-34) appears to be negatively disposed towards the statement in contrast to the Turkish Cypriot sample where this notion is shared by the oldest age group (over 54). A possible explanation for this paradox can be traced to the biomes and experiences of both age groups in relation to ethnic conflict on the island. The Turkish Cypriots of the age group over 54 have experienced at all levels (childhood, adolescence and adulthood) ethnic conflict, violence, exclusion and living in ghettoes and enclaves. The life experiences that this age group has gone through has formulated a negative stereotype towards the “others” (Greek Cypriots).

On the other hand the Greek Cypriots who belong to the age group 18-34 were born in a country where division was (and still is) a de facto situation. Also, this age group has grown within an environment where the feelings of mistrusts, anger, insecurity and fear (of the other) armed conflict and/or intervention from Turkey are predominant. In addition, the high levels of the standard of living and the relative affluence has (unfortunately) given rise to an informal but at the same time widespread notion that any change from the status quo may endanger them. It can be argued that this notion is unconsciously dominating and influencing at the same time the perceptions and attitudes of this particular age group.

At this point someone may pose a question as to why the Turkish Cypriots in the age group 18-54 are positively disposed towards the statement that the opening of the crossing points has brought the two communities closer. This question can be answered
by taking into consideration the social and economic conditions in Cyprus prior to 2002 where the GDP per capita for the Greek Cypriots was $19,250US and that for the Turkish Cypriots was $5,600US. The Turkish Cypriots at the time hoped that EU membership of a united Cyprus would improve their quality of life economically, socially, democratically and politically. At the same time it was expected that a solution together with EU membership was going to close the gap between the standards of living of the two communities. The prospect of joining the EU has united the Turkish Cypriots for a common struggle and as a result 91 NGOs came together and formed the “Common Vision Movement” in North Cyprus and “This Country is Ours” platform which organised many activities in 2002 including mass demonstrations with about 80,000 participants calling for the unification of the island. Probably the words of Mehmet, a Turkish Cypriot construction worker, demonstrate much more clearly the positive attitudes of Turkish Cypriots towards the opening of the crossing points: “There’s no work and no money in the North... why shouldn’t we live with the Greek Cypriots?” (The Guardian, 27 December 2002).

Another point that emerges through the comparison of figure 5.53 and figure 5.54 is that both ethnic groups are relatively more positive to the notion that the opening of the crossing points has brought the two communities closer than that it has influenced positively their attitudes and perceptions towards each other. This is natural since attitudes and perceptions are influenced positively gradually through increased contact which in turn reduces prejudice and negative stereotypes.
6.3.4.3 *Age differences and prospects for reconciliation*

The analysis of the perceptual patterns as they appear in figure 5.55 provides very interesting insights in relation to the extent that the attitudes of people of both ethnic groups have shifted/been influenced by the opening of the crossing points.

A chi-square test for the Greek Cypriot sample (1st cross section \( x^2 = 48.552; \) df=16; \( p < 0.05; \) 2nd cross section \( x^2 = 35.100; \) df=16; \( p < 0.05 \)) clearly reveals that the row and column variables are related. The total inertia for the Greek Cypriot samples for both dimensions amounts to 24.87% for the first cross section and 15.95% for the second. The proportion of inertia for the first cross section accounted for by dimension 1 explains 72.26% and dimension 2, 21.18%. For the second cross section dimension 1 accounts for 84.87% and dimension 2 for 8.92%.

The chi-square test for the first cross section of the Turkish Cypriot sample (\( x^2 = 16.174; \) df=16; \( p < 0.05 \)) reveals that the row and column variables are not related. However, as was noted in section 5.3.1, this does not influence the reliability or validity of the results since it does not provide a clear picture of the nature of the relationship between the variables which emerge through the analysis of the perceptual map. For the second cross section the chi-square statistic shows that the variables are related (\( x^2 = 30.701; \) df=16; \( p < 0.05 \)). The total inertia for the first cross section amounts to 6.73% and the proportion of inertia accounted for by dimension 1 explains 68.8% and dimension 26.3%. For the second cross section the total inertia is 12.28% for which dimension 1 accounts for 74.31% and dimension 2 19.79%.
Figure 5.55: Correspondence analysis biplot - Age differences and prospects for reconciliation

**Greek Cypriots Before (a)**

- 2D Plot of Row and Column Coordinates; Dimension: 1 x 2
- Input Table (Rows x Columns): 5 x 5
- Standardization: Row and column profiles

**Greek Cypriots After (b)**

- 2D Plot of Row and Column Coordinates; Dimension: 1 x 2
- Input Table (Rows x Columns): 5 x 5
- Standardization: Row and column profiles

**Turkish Cypriots Before (c)**

- 2D Plot of Row and Column Coordinates; Dimension: 1 x 2
- Input Table (Rows x Columns): 6 x 5
- Standardization: Row and column profiles

**Turkish Cypriots After (d)**

- 2D Plot of Row and Column Coordinates; Dimension: 1 x 2
- Input Table (Rows x Columns): 6 x 5
- Standardization: Row and column profiles

---

Figure 5.55(a) indicates that prior to the opening of the crossing points the Greek Cypriots in the over 45 and 25-34 age groups had a clear opinion about the possibility of reconciliation while the age group 18-24 was relatively sure. After the opening of the crossing points it can be observed that there was a significant negative shifting in the perceptions and attitudes of the Greek-Cypriots towards the statement that reconciliation between the two communities will ever be possible. This stands for the over 45 and 18-24 age groups. An explanation for this phenomenon is that the sudden and unexpected opening of the crossing points has caused confusion, mixed feelings as well as anxiety to the Greek Cypriot population. The anxiety felt by the Greek Cypriots can be attributed...
to the fear that was generated by the influx of Turkish Cypriots as cheap labour in the South and the emergence of a new, unexploited and cheaper destination for local and international tourists. This is in line with the argument that was stated above about the unconscious preference of Greek Cypriots for the status quo which paradoxically has ensured economic prosperity and well being but, sadly, maintained division.

On the other hand, the examination of figures 5.55 (c and d) for the Turkish Cypriots sample presents a much clearer pattern of attitudes and perceptions before and after the opening of the crossing points. More specifically, most of the age groups prior to the opening of the crossing points appeared to be uncertain about the possibility of reconciliation between the two communities. After the opening of the crossing points a much more clearer pattern has emerged where the age group 18-54 appears to be positively disposed towards the prospect of reconciliation and the over 54 age group was negative towards such a possibility. It is evident that the opening of the crossing points had a determinative role in shaping the perceptions and attitudes of Turkish Cypriots towards reconciliation.

5.3.4.4 Political affiliation and attitudes and perceptions towards Greek/Turkish Cypriots

The chi-squared test for the Greek Cypriot sample provides very strong evidence of an association between political affiliation and perceptions/attitudes towards Turkish Cypriots ($\chi^2 = 48.564; \text{df}=16; \ p<0.05$). The results suggest that the patterns between the two variables may be perfectly represented in six dimensions. However, the first two dimensions cumulatively explain 90.27% of the total inertia which is 22.8% (60.28% for the first dimension and 29.99% for the second).
For the Turkish Cypriot sample the chi-squared statistics reveal that the row and column variables are not related ($x^2=27.172$; df=16; $p<0.05$). The total inertia amounts to 11.71% and the proportion of inertia accounted for by dimension 1 explains 46.2% and dimension 2, 44.6%.

The results for both samples suggest that focus should be given to two-dimensional solutions.

**Figure 5.56: Correspondence analysis biplot - Political affiliation and attitudes and perceptions towards Greek/Turkish Cypriots**

Figure 5.56 demonstrates clearly that the supporters of the centre left Greek Cypriot political parties have been influenced positively by the opening of the crossing points.

The rightists appear to be in between. Considering the current political conditions in Cyprus, it can be suggested that the pattern, as it is portrayed in the perceptual map, resembles the current political reality in Cyprus. The perceptual map for the Turkish Cypriot sample also demonstrates a clear picture since the centre left appears to be positively influenced in comparison with the right and nationalists who were not positively influenced by the event.
5.3.4.5 Fears, mistrust and the opening of the crossing point

A chi-squared test for the Greek Cypriot sample ($\chi^2=50.287; \text{df}=24; p<0.05$) clearly reveals that the row and column variables are related. The total inertia for the Greek Cypriot samples for both dimensions amounts to 22.96%. The proportion of inertia for the first cross section accounted for by dimension 1 explains 68.6% and dimension 2, 19.1%.

For the Turkish Cypriot the chi-squared test provides strong evidence of an association between the row and column variables ($\chi^2=41.356; \text{df}=24; p<0.05$) where the total inertia amounts to 20% (dimension 1 accounts for 51.3% and dimension 2 for 28.5%).

A comparison of the above figures leads to the extraction of very interesting conclusions. In particular, the Greek Cypriots that were not influenced positively by the opening of the border appear to have symbiosis with Muslims as the main source of fear. Two more reasons influence those that are uncertain as to whether the event has
positively influenced them - the fact that the Turkish Cypriots will move freely in the South and the danger of clashes between the two communities. On the other hand, the Turkish Cypriots present a rather complicated pattern with regard to the association between the event and the factors which cause fear and insecurity. Even those Turkish Cypriots who are definitely sure that they have been influenced positively by the opening of the check points are pre-occupied by a fear of clashes between the two communities. On the basis of the above observations it can be suggested that both ethnic communities on the island are dominated by insecurities and fears that originate from a turbulent and violent past. On the basis of the contact theory which was discussed earlier in Chapter 4 it can be assumed that increased contact between the two communities will gradually lead to their elimination.

5.3.4.6 Attitudes and perceptions towards reconciliation between the two communities before and after the opening of the crossing points

A chi-squared test \( (x^2=351.75; \text{df}=12; p< 0.05) \) clearly reveals that the row and column variables are related. The total inertia for the sample for both dimensions amounts to 37.50% and the proportion of inertia accounted for by dimension 1 explains 88.3% and dimension 2, 9.7%.
Figure 5.58: Correspondence analysis biplot - Attitudes and perceptions towards reconciliation between the two communities before and after the opening of the cross points

The objective behind the analysis of figure 5.58 was to capture in perceptual space the shifting (if any) of the opinions/perceptions of the two ethnic communities as to whether reconciliation will ever be possible.

A visual inspection of the figure clearly indicates that the Turkish Cypriot sample both before and after the opening of the cross points were definite that reconciliation could be possible in Cyprus. On the contrary the first cross section of Greek Cypriots (conducted before the opening of the cross points) indicates a relative disbelief as to whether reconciliation could ever be achieved. Interestingly, this attitudinal pattern shifts to a more positive one for the second cross section, something that demonstrates in real life...
terms the positive influence of contact in reducing prejudice and mistrust, and thus increasing the likelihood for reconciliation and conflict resolution.

5.3.4.7 Prospects of business relationships and peaceful coexistence between Greek/Turkish Cypriots

A chi-square test for both samples (Greek Cypriot sample, $x^2=174.05; df=16; p< 0.05$; Turkish Cypriot sample $x^2=159.15; df=16; p< 0.05$) clearly reveals that the row and column variables are related. The total inertia for the Greek Cypriot sample for both dimensions amounts to 65.87%. The proportion of inertia for the first cross section accounted for by dimension 1 explains 57.23% and dimension 2, 30.84%. For the Turkish Cypriot sample the total inertia sums up to 46.39%, where dimension 1 contributes 54.17% and dimension 2 34.49%.

Figure 5.59: Correspondence analysis biplot - Prospects of business relation and peaceful co-existence between Greek/Turkish Cypriots

To prevent violent conflict, societies must build voluntary co-operation results in peaceful co-existence among diverse communities within and between nations (OECD,
2001). Through economic co-operation mistrust and hostility between the two communities can be reduced and differences can be bridged.

Figure 5.59 demonstrates clearly that people from both ethnic groups who are positively inclined towards co-existence have a positive attitude towards the prospect of having business relations. The same is also true of those who are negatively inclined towards co-existence; that is they have a negative attitude towards having business relations with each other.

5.3.4.8 Current status of the intercommunal relationships after the opening of they crossing points

A chi-squared test for the Greek Cypriot sample ($\chi^2=13.662; df=16; p>0.05$) clearly reveals that the row and column variables are not related. The total inertia for the Greek Cypriot samples for both dimensions amounts to 16%. The proportion of inertia for the first cross section accounted for by dimension 1 explains 76.4% and dimension 2, 12.1%.

For the Turkish Cypriot the chi-squared test provides strong evidence of an association between the row and column variables ($\chi^2=38.663; df=16; p<0.05$) where the total inertia amounts to 38.66% (where dimension 1 accounts for 83.7% and dimension 2 for 13%).
The perceptual maps, as they appear in figure 5.60, reveal the attitudes and perceptions of people from both communities with regard to the relationship between Greek and Turkish Cypriots after the opening of the check points.

For the Greek Cypriot sample it is evident that there is a mixture of feelings. This is explained by the confusion, strong emotions and puzzlement that has resulted from the sudden and unexpected opening of the crossing points. It is for this reason that the perceptual map for the Greek Cypriot sample presents mixed responses to the question whether the communities have been brought closer after the opening of the crossing points.

The perceptual map for the Turkish Cypriots sample can be interpreted and explained much more easily since it is evident that two distinct groups emerged out of the analysis. Those who felt happiness and satisfaction following their visit to the South and at the same time believe that the opening of the crossing points has brought the two communities closer, and those that felt hostility and anger and are absolutely sure that...
the opening of the crossing points has not had any positive influence in bringing the two communities closer.

5.4 Can Greek and Turkish Cypriots co-exist? - An empirical quantification using a multivariate logit model

The rationale that underlies the conceptual as well as methodological underpinning of this section is graphically illustrated in the following figure (see figure 5.61).

From the figure it is evident that there are two distinct relationships involved: the ethnic conflict characteristics/attributes relationship and the Cypriots characteristics/attributes, relationship.

**Figure 5.61: The model and its relationships**

To enable the quantification and empirical examination of the above relationships, a Multivariate Logit analysis will be utilised.

In the context of the model, the Logit analysis enables the quantification of perceptions/feelings of Greek and Turkish Cypriots in the form of a set of conditional probabilities. These conditional probabilities give a measure of perceptions/feelings of the two sets of populations, given their characteristics and their perceptions and attitudes towards each other. The conditional probabilities will then be used to provide a ranking
order for the determination of the probability for living once again with Greek/Turkish Cypriots peacefully under the same state mechanism.

As was already discussed in Chapter 1, Logit analysis is used for unordered responses, when the dependent variable is polytonous. According to Seddighi (2000) and Gujarati (1995) the wide applicability of the Logit model in the social sciences stems from the following attractions:

a.) The fact that the Logit model is based on the logistical curve for all the values of the independent variables (regressors), constraining the value of the dependent variable (the probability of positive response) to fall between zero and one.

b.) The probability function is a non linear function following a logistical curve.

c.) The estimation of the Logit model is quick and easy and there are many software packages that can compute the Logit-based models (STATISTICA, E-Views, Minitab, SAS, Microfit, SPSS).

Figure 5.62: Applicability of the model

The conceptual model which has been developed in the above sections is to be empirically analysed with the aim of establishing the applicability of the model and, additionally, to identify the type/profile of Cypriots (from both communities) that are most likely to live again peacefully under the same regime/state mechanism, given their attitudes towards certain characteristics (independent variables). More specifically, the objective here is to predict the conditional probability of a Cypriot (Greek or Turk)
living once again with a Greek/Turkish Cypriot, given his/her attitude towards a number of statements and his/her personal characteristics (see table 5.8).

Table 5.8: Legend for Tables 5.9 and 5.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X3 Age</td>
<td>(1) 15-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X4 Education</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X9 Time of evaluation</td>
<td>Before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1 In which political spectrum do you position yourself?</td>
<td>Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X5 In the near future do you expect any progress for the solution of the Cyprus problem?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X11 Do you believe that reconciliation between the two communities would be ever possible?</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X10 The division of the island in 1974 in your opinion solved the Cyprus problem between the two Communities?</td>
<td>Definitely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X6 Did you ever have any business relationships with Greek/Turkish-Cypriots?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X12 Do you think religion was a factor for inter-ethnic polarisation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X7 Have you had any relatives killed as a result of inter-communal clashes during the 1960-74 period?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The various combinations of the independent variables and characteristics generated 4×4×2×4×3×3×2×3×2 cells which theoretically identify 41,472 different types of decision-making behaviours towards the intention of living once again with Greek/Turkish Cypriots. To recapitulate, the objective here is to calculate the predicted probability that Greek/Turkish Cypriots will live again peacefully under the same regime/state mechanism. At this point it must be noted that each type of behaviour is based on the combination of the above characteristics and variables. Based on the above it can be also suggested that the presence of all the above 10 characteristics as displayed in table 5.8 is necessary in order to enable the identification of a particular type of decision-making behaviour towards reconciliation and peaceful co-existence.

Tables 5.9 and 5.10 present the estimated co-efficients and t ratios on the basis of which the predicted probabilities were calculated for the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot.
samples respectively. The Logit model was estimated by using the Microfit 4 interactive econometrics analysis program.

Table 5.9: Significance tests of the variables – Greek Cypriot sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Estimated Coefficient</th>
<th>Asymptotic standard error</th>
<th>Asymptotic t-ratio [Prob.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>-.27953</td>
<td>.15297</td>
<td>-18.273 (.069)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td>-.70437</td>
<td>.20810</td>
<td>-33.847 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3$</td>
<td>-.12270</td>
<td>.27400</td>
<td>-44.782 (.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_4$</td>
<td>.92937</td>
<td>.35430</td>
<td>26.231 (.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$</td>
<td>19.991</td>
<td>.79036</td>
<td>25.293 (.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_6$</td>
<td>.075862</td>
<td>.41666</td>
<td>-1.8207 (.856)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_7$</td>
<td>.067516</td>
<td>.44258</td>
<td>.15255 (.879)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_8$</td>
<td>-.33783</td>
<td>.31995</td>
<td>-10.559 (.292)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_9$</td>
<td>21.355</td>
<td>.32939</td>
<td>64.834 (.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{10}$</td>
<td>.078146</td>
<td>.23735</td>
<td>.32924 (.742)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pseudo R-Squared: 0.45683

Table 5.10: Significance tests of the variables – Turkish Cypriot sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Estimated Coefficient</th>
<th>Asymptotic standard error</th>
<th>Asymptotic t-ratio [Prob.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>-.31290</td>
<td>.11354</td>
<td>-27.558 (.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td>.054676</td>
<td>.13421</td>
<td>.40738 (.684)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3$</td>
<td>-.37707</td>
<td>.13827</td>
<td>-27.270 (.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_4$</td>
<td>.48799</td>
<td>.32545</td>
<td>14.995 (.135)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$</td>
<td>.79045</td>
<td>.30987</td>
<td>25.509 (.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_6$</td>
<td>.46025</td>
<td>.26891</td>
<td>-17.116 (.088)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_7$</td>
<td>.46557</td>
<td>.29927</td>
<td>15.557 (.121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_8$</td>
<td>-.24005</td>
<td>.14506</td>
<td>-16.548 (.099)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_9$</td>
<td>10.837</td>
<td>.22150</td>
<td>48.927 (.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_{10}$</td>
<td>-.49521</td>
<td>.14021</td>
<td>35.319 (.000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pseudo R-Squared: 0.2647

A point of concern is the insignificant t-ratios reported for some of the regressors for both samples. However, this does not have any significant implications since any combination of these regressors is not in itself of interest. This study is interested in the combined influences of all regressors that jointly identify different types of decision-making processes. This practice, where the overall significance of the model is preferred over the individual significance of the variables, is widely found in the literature (see for example Heyma et al., 2001; Grendigen et al., 2000; Woo Gon and Arbel, 1998).
In the case of this study the reported pseudo R-square for the Greek Cypriot sample is high (0.456). This is an indicator that the independent variables which were included in the model explain by 45.6% the dependent variable. In other words, the characteristics (both personal and attitudinal/perceptual) included in the model can explain by 45.6% the intention of an individual to live once again with a member of the other community.

In the case of the Turkish Cypriot sample the pseudo R-square is at acceptable levels (26.4%).

It must be asserted that the results of the above empirical model, although they appear to have a considerable low explanatory power (0.456 pseudo R-square for the Greek Cypriot sample and 0.264 for the Turkish Cypriot sample), do not suffer from incongruity regarding the levels of predicted probability and the response patterns of the sample.

One way of interpreting the illustrative results is to distinguish between individual characteristics on the one hand and perceptions/attitudes towards statements on the other. Following this line of inquiry the two samples will be examined so as to develop profiles of individuals from the two communities on the basis of the conditional probabilities with regard to their intention to live again with members of the other community under the same state mechanism.

From the analysis of conditional probabilities, it appears that those with the highest probability of having a negative attitude towards living again peacefully with Greek Cypriots are those that belong mostly to right or centre political parties, with most of them belonging to the 45+ age group. On the contrary those with the lowest probability of having a negative attitude are leftists, who, at the same time, cannot be differentiated in terms of age.
By considering the referendum on the Annan Plan, as well as the position of the Turkish Cypriot political parties on the Cyprus issue, the findings above are fully substantiated. Although education does not appear to be a distinguishing factor, when the two extremes are compared, that is, those most likely to have a negative attitude towards living again with the Greek Cypriot vs. those with a positive attitude, it is evident that the latter have higher education levels (secondary and tertiary education). In addition, the results demonstrate that the majority of those most likely to have a negative attitude never had any business relations with Greek Cypriots. At this point, a significant factor is unveiled, which is that business relations, under some conditions can have a positive influence in enhancing understanding and shrinking the gap between the two communities.

Also, the respondents who replied negatively to the question “In the near future do you expect any progress in the solution of the Cyprus problem?” are those most likely to have a negative attitude. Furthermore, the same group gave a positive reply to the question “Did division of the island in 1974, in your opinion, solve the Cyprus problem between the two communities”?

The analysis of conditional probabilities in relation to the question “Do you believe that reconciliation between the two communities would ever be possible?” perhaps produces the most clear cut definition of group profiles since those with the greatest negative attitude appear.
Finally, the respondents who believe that religion has played a significant role in interethnic polarisation appear to have the highest conditional probabilities of having a negative attitude towards living again peacefully with the Greek Cypriots.

When the profile of the Greek Cypriots is constructed, in relation to the set of conditional probabilities, some striking conclusions are unveiled. In particular, the Greek Cypriots do not appear to distinguish clearly in terms of their political ideology in relation to the probability of having a negative attitude towards living again peacefully with Turkish Cypriots. Considering the Annan Plan referendum, this finding is substantiated since the two largest political parties in Cyprus, the Communist party (AKEL) and the right wing Democratic Rally (DISY), were split on the issue.

In terms of age, those with the highest probability of having a negative attitude towards living again with the Turkish Cypriots appear to belong mostly to the age group 18-44. This finding is worrying since it demonstrates that the gap that has grown through the years between the two communities has created a negative predisposition in young Greek Cypriots towards the Turkish Cypriots. The tension and instability through the years has created the fear of the “unknown” to those who have never had the chance to interact, co-operate and associate with members from the other community group. At the same time, this finding demonstrates that Cypriots who belong to the 45+ age group and who had the chance to interact and associate with Turkish Cypriots, have a lower probability of having a negative attitude towards living again with Turkish Cypriots.

The analysis of the conditional probabilities of the Greek Cypriots as regards the question “Did the division of the island in 1974, in your opinion, solve the Cyprus
problem between the two communities”? demonstrates clearly that, irrespective of the negative or positive attitude of the Greek Cypriots towards reconciliation, they all share the same opinion that the de-facto division as a result of the events in 1974 has not solved the Cyprus issue. Indeed, despite the different approaches and political positions of all political parties, there is a definite consensus that the status quo has resulted from 1974 cannot be accepted as a solution to the problem.

In contrast to the Turkish Cypriot sample, an unclear pattern emerges in relation to the attitude of the Greek Cypriots towards the statement that “religion was a factor in inter-ethnic polarisation”, since there is no variation between those with high probability of having a negative attitude towards living again with Turkish Cypriots and those with low probability.

Finally, a common characteristic between the two samples is that the vast majority of the respondents with a high probability of a negative attitude are disposed positively towards the statement that reconciliation between the two communities would ever be possible.

5.5 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a thorough and an in-depth analysis of the data that was collected for the purposes of this thesis.

Initially, through the utilisation of descriptive analysis, it attempted to construct a profile of the respondents in relation to their demographic, social and economic characteristics. Then a series of crosstabulations were analysed so as to provide an insight into how the
two ethnic communities perceive various political, social and cultural realities of the past, present and future. It also aimed to investigate how the attitudes and perceptions of the two ethnic communities have shifted as a result of the opening of the crossing points after almost 30 years of de facto division and the absence of any sort of contact.

The complex relationships that have emerged through the descriptive statistical analysis required the application of more sophisticated statistical techniques with more analytical capabilities so as to allow the researcher to capture, understand and analyse them. For this reason correspondence analysis and multivariate logit analysis were utilised.

Correspondence analysis has enabled the visualisation of the complex inter-relationship and has made possible the extraction of important conclusions regarding the perceptions and attitudes of the Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots towards each other and in relation to social, economic and political realities on the island.

Finally, multivariate logit analysis was utilised in order to allow the empirical testing of the research hypothesis of this thesis. Logit analysis has enabled the formulation of the profile of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots with the highest and lowest probability of living together under the same state mechanisms.

In the next chapter the empirical findings as they have resulted from the analyses performed in this chapter will be extrapolated to grass roots level activities via the proposal of a peace education program aiming the reduction of conflict between the two communities.
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“Efforts to improve human relations are as old as the hills. What is new is the ability and the will to evaluate the success of these efforts”

Gordon Allport, 1960 (p.238)

6.1 Introduction

The empirical application of the contact hypothesis provided in Chapter 5 has offered insights regarding the attitudinal and perceptual patterns of people from both the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities towards each other. In addition, a number of implications have been identified which demand further elaboration and evaluation.

Findings from application of contact hypothesis provide fertile ground for the development of inter-ethnic educational projects. The development and implementation of such projects and activities should aim towards inter-communal reconciliation. It has to be recognised that these projects cannot (and are not to) be expected to have considerable catalytic effects on the conflict resolution process in Cyprus. Such a claim would be a mere utopia. However, the implementation of such programmes will constitute initial “ice breakers” and provide, in the long run, the prospects for people from both communities to overcome prejudice, fear and distrust.

Current study implications have led me, the primary researcher, to formulating a program that will enable people from both communities to come closer and develop systematic and sustained attitudes towards peaceful coexistence. What is proposed here is a scenario for a “Conflict Management and Peace Education” program that will have, as its ultimate aim, the reduction of conflict between the two communities through the gradual reduction of mistrust, while simultaneously assisting them to overcome negative stereotypes and prejudice.
This chapter, therefore, aims at extrapolating current empirical findings to grass roots level activities via the proposal of a peace education program.

### 6.2 Prospects for a “Conflict Management and Peace Education” program

At the core of peace education lays the notion of changing attitudes and relations between conflicting groups through contact and communication (Maoz, 2003). One very important theory for reducing intergroup conflict is contact hypothesis, which, in its original form, states that “...interaction between individuals belonging to different groups will reduce ethnic prejudice and inter-group tension” (Hewstone and Brown, 1986, p. 1). The contact hypothesis has been a major topic for social psychological research since Allport’s (1954) variant, but not so much in the specific context of intractable conflict and peace education as exemplified in the case of the Cyprus problem. For this reason, it is both important and innovative to test the dynamics of contact hypothesis on prejudice in peace education encounters in regions of intractable conflicts, such as Cyprus. For intergroup prejudice to be reduced through peace education encounters, however, the important factor is the initiation and perpetuation of a dialogue between the conflicting groups. It should be noted that in order for such dialogue to have an effect, both contact hypothesis and its modifying criteria (modifying in terms of its applicability for the Cyprus problem) must already have been met and that any potential effects of the “conflict-dialogue” will be additional.

Intractable conflicts, such as the conflict in Cyprus, are among the most challenging types of conflicts. These conflicts are highly resistant to resolution, being both pervasive and destructive and involve well-entrenched hostile perceptions of the out-group, which
drag on for an extended period of time, and are thereby prone to negative escalation over
and over again. (Kriesberg et al 1989; Coleman 2000; Gürkaynak and Genk, 2007). In
such conflicts, traditional peacemaking mechanisms, like negotiation and power
mediation, have been insufficient because of the extent of entrenchment of hostile
attitudes and perpetration of destructive behaviours by the conflicting parties, both of
which are vital ingredients for peace.

Peace-building interventions, such as interactive conflict resolution, peace education,
track-two diplomacy, and non official negotiation practices, have become widely
applied, in the last couple of decades, to tackle aspects of intractable conflicts that are
particularly resistant to official diplomacy. These interventions generally aim at
reducing inter-group prejudice and negative stereotyping, thereby promoting inter-group
empathy and understanding, as well as building invaluable trust. Lederach (1997) has
stated that in divided societies, reconciliation requires both a ‘focus’ and a ‘locus,’ that
is, a ‘focus’ on the relational aspects of conflict and solution; and, a ‘locus,’ on the
social space where people, ideas, and stories come together.

Allport (1954) noted that it is easier to smash an atom than a prejudice. Salomon (2003,
p.8) added to this observation that “this becomes practically difficult when the
stereotypes are rooted in collectively held narratives, historical memories, beliefs about
one’s self righteousness and strong feelings of anger, hatred, and frustration.”

The negative attitudes of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots toward each other attest
to the existence of a strong ingroup-outgroup schema consistent with social identity
theory (see Chapter 4, section 4.2.1). In societies experiencing inter-ethnic conflict,
people are socialized in the context of discourse that is marked by 'mutual delegitimization and dehumanization' of the 'other' (Kelman, 1997, p.210). In these settings, young people learn to see 'the other' as a diametrically opposed mirror image, that is, their thinking, feeling, and acting patterns are dominated by the 'We are good, and they are bad' mentality and are, therefore, likely to grow up to be adults with a dichotomous "us/them" worldview (Volkan, 1998). In the case of the Cyprus problem, although members of both groups had had little or no prior interpersonal contact with each other since 1974, they tended to deny each other's humanity based on decade and century-old stereotypes. These negative stereotypes and images of each other were extended to the whole population of both the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities sharing mutually negative mirror images and perceiving their counterparts as "monstrous," "evil," "threatening," "violent," "murderous," and, generally, "inhumane."

The studies by Bar-Tal (2004) and Oren et al. (2004) provide a better understanding of the function and unique meaning of the negative ingroup-outgroup schema developed by rival groups involved in intractable conflict. In such situations, where there is a long history of intergroup conflict, each group tends to evolve "an ethos of conflict which supplies context to the meaning of the group's social identity, and serves as the epistemic basis for the conflict. In other words, the ongoing conflict assumes a life of its own and comes to define the very existence of the opposing groups to the point where without conflict, they simply don't exist. Moreover, the antithetical societal beliefs and the opposing cultures of ethos of the two groups provide a steady supply of contradictory views to group members, which fuel the continuation of the conflict (Oren et al. 2004, p. 133).
Bar-Tal (2004) and Oren et al. (2004) further supported that a conflict ethos gradually develops as an important part of the social identity for groups in conflict. This ethos has a twofold function: it supplies meaning to the stressful conditions under which the groups live, thus enabling them to adjust to such adverse conditions, while, unfortunately, at the same time ensuring the continuation of several negative sociocultural beliefs, such as those emphasizing the legitimacy of one’s goals while portraying a dehumanized image of the other as the villain (Oren et al. 2004, p. 134). Interestingly by applying this rationale to the context of the Cyprus conflict, diachronically, it can be asserted that such beliefs have constituted mirror images of each of the rival groups. Therefore, approaches to conflict resolution that aim to bring together members of ethnic groups involved in intractable conflicts should primarily aim at changing ongoing negative sociocultural beliefs through the mechanisms of differentiation and personalization. Such mechanisms sought to treat members of the rival groups as human beings who have both legitimate needs and objectives, while at the same time recognizing the fact that both sides have suffered and are victims (Oren et al. 2004, p. 150).

According to Bar-Tal (2000), reconciliation requires moving from a ‘conflictive ethos,’ where a psychological infrastructure is developed to help the individual/society cope with the adversary, to an ‘ethos of peace’ where self-protecting ethnocentrism is changed to a more complex sense of self and other. Further to this point, Johnson (2007, p.24) argued that it is through empathy (i.e., the ability to understand the feelings or experience of another) and perspective-taking (i.e., the ability to look at things from different points of view)—two skills taught through peace education—that conflict can be transformed toward reconciliation. Peace education seeks to capitalize on the
importance of the school learner whose knowledge, dispositions, and skills are desperately needed to bring about cooperative living in a new sociocultural climate where both groups live in an environment characterized by justice, tolerance, civic responsibility, and environmental sustainability. At the same time, peace education also seeks to develop personal capacities for seeing and negotiating the world in more collaborative ways.

The analysis and findings of Chapter 5 suggest that contact between the two communities after the opening of the cross points has yielded positive results. On this basis, it can be suggested that a viable and effective “Conflict Management and Peace Education” program can be conceptualized and implemented aiming at the gradual reduction of mistrust between the two groups while at the same time overcoming negative stereotypes and prejudice. The findings of Chapter 5, combined with the conclusions extracted in Chapter 4, suggest that the utilization of a mixed model can play an instrumental role in creating the necessary circumstances for the development and implementation of a “Conflict Management and Peace Education” program. It is proposed that this mixed model should incorporate elements from the various models of intergroup contact. Using as a foundation the innovative combined approach of Pettigrew (1998), it is strongly believed that opportunities for tapping into the collective narrative (the comprehensive collection of stories, beliefs, histories and current explanations that a group holds about itself and about its surroundings), of the other side—and thereby fostering cross-group friendships and addressing asymmetrical power relations—will be created.
For developing a “Conflict Management and Peace Education” program that works, the proposed mixed model should address three pivotal questions which impose, for some decades now, considerable obstacles:

- What types of contact between members of both ethnic groups on the island (in other words the protagonists of conflict) are most effective in yielding positive outcomes?
- Should the proposed program highlight individual or group identities or, alternatively, build a new common identity?
- To what extent should the national identities of Greek-Cypriots be emphasized? To what extent should they be downplayed?

As demonstrated in Chapter 4, each of the three models of intergroup contact has its shortcomings as well as limitations. For this reason, leading scholars have suggested combining various strategies (Brewer, 1996; Gaertner et al., 1996; Pettigrew, 1998). The proposed mixed model program should include both categorization and decategorization techniques by addressing interpersonal and political-intergroup dynamics. As such, this program should emphasize individual identities, highlighting similarities, togetherness, cooperation, and intimacy between members of both ethnic groups. At the same time, attention should be focused on individual characteristics, personal experience, and commonalities between participants with the purpose of promoting mutual understanding and empathy, overcoming stereotypes, developing positive intergroup attitudes, and building interpersonal relationships. Furthermore, the enactment of joined tasks with a common goal (such as planting trees in the green zone to develop “peace forests”, joint provision of humanitarian aid to other countries; joint road safety
campaigns; joint projects for preservation of culture with possible E.U. funding) will instil a sense of connection and, ultimately, togetherness between the two ethnic groups.

Table 6.1: Use of Multiple Categorisation Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorisation Model</th>
<th>Emphasis of Contact</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decategorization</td>
<td>Interact as individuals. Time is devoted for individuals to know each other on a personal level in joint activity tasks. National identity id de-emphasised. Participants can discover similarities, challenge cross-group stereotypes, and form cross-group friendships.</td>
<td>Relying solely on this model tends to avoid addressing political conflict issues and external asymmetry, promoting in this way the status quo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorization</td>
<td>Interact as members of groups in conflict. Participants will have the opportunity to discuss core conflict issues and act out of national identity on a daily basis during coexistence sessions led by professional facilitators from both sides.</td>
<td>This model will give the opportunity to people from both communities to present their people’s cause. Relying solely on this model can lead to greater tensions and pigeonhole participants into fixed identities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recategorization</td>
<td>Interact as members of one common group that of being people living on the same island (Cypriots). This new, overarching identity should be consciously created and celebrated. Promotes equality while allowing participants to maintain individual beliefs.</td>
<td>In order to be successful this new identity must respect and not erase existing identities. It is positive in that it provides a sense of purpose and gives participants something in common. However by participating in such a program may lead to internal conflicts and confusion with one’s national or social identity particularly during times of acute tension between the two communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Models</td>
<td>Under the proposed “conflict management and peace education program” it will be possible for participants to interact via decategorisation methods. During joint activities (coexistence) participants will be interacting on the basis of a categorised model while discussing conflict issues. Through joined activities they will be able to work towards a common goal.</td>
<td>The mixed model acknowledges the fact that people are composed of numerous identities. Different models may appeal to different individuals and groups. Various models can be used as long as pre-existing identities are not erased. However, at times internal confusion and conflict can ensue between a new overarching identity and one’s national identity, especially tension between the two communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the same time, the model, in accordance with Social Identity Theory, should emphasize intergroup and national identities and allow the expression of conflict that
exists in reality. Furthermore, both sides should be enabled to acknowledge that there is a basis for the existence of conflict between the two groups and that the path to resolving it requires a search for constructive ways to build bridges between the disparate goals of the two groups. Under this framework workshops may be organized with participants from both communities. These encounters should be viewed as a microcosm of reality in which external majority-minority relations are expressed and addressed. Participants will be related to as representatives of their groups, rather than as individuals, and emphasis will be given to promoting constructive intergroup processes. In these workshops, potential topics for discussion may include national identities, national and civil aspirations, and discrimination. A fundamental ingredient that should underline these encounters should be the assumption that the conflict between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots is between two national identities and not between individuals. Therefore, the objective that should underline these encounters can potentially be achieved only by sharpening these identities and by facing up to the reality of the conflict between the two people as reflected by the two groups engaged in the encounter. At the workshops, centre stage should be given to core conflict issues and power relations that reflect the external political situations between the two groups as opposed to the inner psychological processes of the participants and their interpersonal relations. The ultimate goal of these encounters should be to provide participants with the tools and motivation to change the status quo. These intergroup meetings should help participants analyse the reality in which they are living. Ideally, this understanding will motivate participants to promote social change in their immediate surrounding which, in turn, can prepare the ground for long term large-scale change.
Another approach that is proposed to be developed is the organization of story-telling workshops in which participants will have an opportunity to share personal stories of their families’ experiences regarding the conflict. The workshops should be addressed to all age groups. Particular focus, however, should be given to young people 12 to 18 years old. Ultimately, these workshops will provide opportunities for participants to interact and get to know each other as individuals, as members of groups in conflict discussing core, conflict issues, as well as members of one common group.

In addition, bi-communal camps should be organized. Participants could interact with each other on a personal level during mealtimes and rest hours, discovering their common interests in relaxed, non-demanding environments. In this way, participants will become acquainted with each other as both individuals (thus building togetherness) and members of conflicting groups (with their decade- and century-old conflicts and animosities), a process that may ultimately help ease their so-called insurmountable conflicts. This co-existence portion of the program, in which conflict issues will be discussed and debated in a humanized manner and environment, will ultimately motivate people to seriously attempt to resolve their differences. At the same time, working on joint activities, such as planting trees, providing humanitarian aid, producing a play, or playing a sport (such as, football, basketball, or volley ball), will promote the construction of a new salient common identity.

The proposed “Conflict Management and Peace Education” program, therefore, will have at its core the building of a new, overarching identity where participants will have the opportunity to cultivate a sense of belonging to the same group. Thus, in addition to
relating to each other through individual and group identities, participants will also interact with each other as members of the same group with a common identity.

In creating this new common identity, it is proposed to adopt what Gaertner et al (1996) refer to as the strategy of creating a superordinate identity, one that expands the inclusiveness of one’s ingroup to include people who would otherwise be regarded as outgroup members in order to reduce bias and promote more positive intergroup attitudes and behaviours. The examination of the practical implications of the recategorization strategy is quite informative since it appears that it is a challenge to find an overarching identity for groups in conflict that would appeal to all members of the groups without detracting from their original identity. This study suggests that in order to create such an identity, it must recognize and honour prior existing identities and keep them intact.

The proposed “Conflict Management and Peace Education” program will ultimately aim at affirming the participants’ individual and group identities, while at the same time creating a new, overarching, common identity with a strong sense of mission, purpose, togetherness, and accomplishment; all critical components and fundamental preconditions in promoting a sense of equality amongst all participants. The participants of the proposed program must be free to express themselves and their own viewpoints, while at the same time maintaining their individual beliefs and practices. This will help avoid accusations against the participants from home communities of having been brainwashed. This type of accusations were widespread in Cyprus before and after the referendum in 2004. More specifically, programs funded by the U.S. Government through their embassy in Cyprus (UNOPS, USAid, UNDP) have been accused, both
officially and unofficially, for brainwashing young people to pursue policies and political behavior that serves the interests of the funding bodies. For this reason, the proposed program should be communicated in detail to all political parties of both communities before its implementation. The endorsement of this program by the political parties will greatly reduce the skepticism that Greek and Turkish Cypriots demonstrate towards such initiatives.

The mechanism for building a common identity is through the use of intergroup cooperation towards the achievement of superordinate goals. As was discussed in Chapter 5, this is one of the central conditions of contact hypothesis and several researchers have theorized that such strategies help reduce intergroup conflict (Sherif and Sherif, 1953; Allport, 1954). According to Amir (1998, p. 70) “in many contact situations it is not sufficient to bring the antagonistic groups into contact and that those groups should have or should be given superordinate goals to make them cooperate across lines. Only such superordinate goals can make the contact effective, thereby reducing prejudice and group tension”.

The “Conflict Management and Peace Education” program aims to design creative activities that promote cross-group cooperation and common goals as mentioned above. A fundamental and very important criterion for the success of these activities is that both Greek-Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots should be actively involved in determining the agenda and the nature of these joint, superordinate tasks, something that will allow them to express ownership (at a later stage) for their accomplishments. Furthermore, opportunities will exist so that the needs of one group will not be denied and its agenda will not over benefit it while under benefiting the other.
Chapter Six: Prospects for a “Conflict Management and Peace Education Program”

The findings of this study, both from the empirical and theoretical standpoints, lend significant support to the use of a mixed model whereby participants can interact with each other both as individuals and as members of conflicting groups. As was previously mentioned, through the adoption of a mixed approach, participants will potentially form cross-group friendships, while at the same time having the opportunity to learn more about the collective narrative of the other side. During daily co-existence meetings, where the categorized approach will be used, participants will learn more about each other’s collective narrative. In addition, during other times of the day, such as coffee and lunch breaks, participants will be able to relate to each other as individuals and form cross-group friendship.

Access to the Collective Narratives of the two Groups

Worchel (2004) noted that modern social psychology has ignored the important role played by the history of rival groups in perpetuating intergroup conflict. Interestingly, the factor of ‘history’ received the highest endorsement. In a similar vein, in recent studies (Adwan and Bar-On, 2004; Salomon, 2004a; Weitzman, 2005) conducted on interventions between Israelis and Palestinians, learning about the history or collective narrative of the adversarial group was identified as a significant goal in peace education programs. Abu-Nimer (2004, p. 418) also noted that programs should be designed so that participants have the opportunity to “understand the complex, multi-dimensional historical and political circumstances that created the contemporary schism between the two communities.” It is also important to note that an individual can acknowledge the narrative of the other side without necessarily agreeing with it or abandoning his/her own (Salomon, 2004a).
The results of the cohort survey design that was conducted for the purposes of this thesis confirm the importance of acknowledging the other side’s narrative. Through the use of a mixed method approach, the proposed program provides opportunities for participants to gain access to the other side’s collective narrative. Participants will have the opportunity to learn important aspects of the other side’s collective narrative thus helping them understand the behaviour and actions of the other side, as well as becoming more empathic to their plight and suffering. Overall, by tapping into the collective narrative of each other, participants will have the opportunity to apply critical thinking skills, question the various sources of information and historical misinformation that they have been socialized in throughout their lifetimes, and entertain additional perspectives and ideas.

Salomon (2004a) explains why it is important to focus on the collective narratives of the groups involved in the encounter. By definition, a collective narrative, “the comprehensive collection of stories, beliefs, histories and current explanations that a group hold about itself and about its surroundings” (Salomon, 2004a, p.274), serves to unify a group by fostering, among its members, a sense of shared identity. Indeed, a community constructs and interprets historical events through the filter of its collective narrative. However, for groups in conflict, their particular collective narrative also serves to negate and delegitimize the other side’s narrative, including their pain, suffering, history, and aspirations, thereby fueling the conflict (Bar-Tal, 2004). As Salomon (2004a, p. 276) indicates “the collective narratives of groups in conflict contradict each other and mirror each other. Thus, whereas a group’s collective narrative bolsters the group’s self-identity and justifies its role in the conflict, it also invalidates the other side’s collective narrative and its role in the conflict”.
Consequently, Salomon recommends that the delegitimization of the other side’s collective narrative be an important target for change in peace education programs.

The importance of learning about the narrative of the other side has received support from two other peace education programs that have recently focused on this goal. Bar-On and Kassam (2004) used a story-telling approach in their encounters between Israeli-Jews and Israeli-Palestinians in which each group member interviewed a family member about the conflict and then presented this personalized narrative to the group. As mentioned above, another interesting project which focused on accessing the other side’s narrative is that of a shared history project implemented through PRIME (Peace Research Institute in the Middle East), in which Palestinian and Israeli-Jewish teachers worked together to write a joint textbook presenting both the Israeli and Palestinian narratives in regard to three pivotal historical events (Adwan and Bar-On, 2004). This textbook was then presented to students in the participants’ classrooms, thus providing an opportunity for Palestinian and Israeli students to learn about the other side’s narrative. The researchers note that although some of the students’ first reaction was to “deconstruct the other narrative,” many students responded with interest and curiosity, with some Palestinians indicating that they wanted to meet with Israeli students to discuss the texts together.

**Learning About the Narratives of Other Conflicts**

The findings of this study suggest that learning about other conflicts is also an important tool in helping participants understand the narratives and dynamics of their own conflict. At the “Seeds of Peace” program, opportunities are created for participants to learn more about the collective narratives of other conflicts, since youth from other conflict-ridden regions, such as the Balkans, Cyprus, India and Pakistan, are included in the program.
Many of the participants indicated that learning about other conflicts, with similar characteristics of mirror-image narratives and victimization enhanced their insight into the dynamics of their own conflict. The discovery of certain common features in the various narratives gave them a universal dimension.

Role of Cross-Group Friendships

For decades, the intergroup relations literature has posited that the creation of opportunities for developing cross-group acquaintanceships and friendships is an important condition of contact hypothesis and is critical in reducing intergroup tension and overcoming negative stereotypes (Allport, 1954; Amir, 1969; Cook, 1978; Pettigrew, 1997, 1998, 2000). However, the role of cross-group friendships between members of groups in intractable conflicts has received little attention in the professional literature. Recently, the question of how personal friendships between individual adversaries could be extrapolated to positive perceptions of their associated collectives has been identified as a fruitful issue for research (Salomon, 2004a).

A major finding of this study is the significant role played by cross-group friendships between members of adversarial groups. These relationships appear to help break stereotypes about the other side, individuate and humanize the outgroup, enhance the capability and willingness to listen to members of the rival group, increase understanding of the other side’s narrative and perspective of the conflict, and result in greater empathy for the plight of the other side. As Weitzman (2005) noted, cross-group friendships often led to more self-disclosure as opportunities arose for members of the conflicting groups to hear personal accounts of each other as to how they were affected
by the conflict. Consequently, such friendships tended to humanize the conflict, enhance feelings of empathy, and promote positive inter group behaviour.

Current research findings portray a picture of how cross-group friendships can influence perceptions of rival groups. Friends are perceived to be a more credible source of information regarding the nature of conflict. Consequently, more trust is placed in what cross-group friends have to say about the conflict and how it affects their lives. Furthermore, when cross-group friendships are combined with talking about the conflict and identity issues, deeper, and thus more lasting changes can occur thus easing the tension between the two groups.

Unfortunately, the majority of peace education programs do not include follow-up activities and continuity once the encounter is over. Indeed, as mentioned by Abu-Nimer (2004, p. 412) at the conclusion of most interventions, "participants and schools, for the most part, simply were disconnected from the organizations that conducted the workshops." In addition, such programs should conduct regular meetings, without too much of a gap between them. Such meetings should ultimately address the needs and interests of the participants, taking into account the characteristics of the targeted population, such as age, as well as include a similar number of participants, facilitators, and staff members from both groups (Maoz, 2002).

Institutional Support

Another important condition for the application of contact hypothesis is that of support from authority which is considered instrumental in promoting and facilitating constructive efforts to strengthen intergroup relations. As it was explained in Chapter 5,
intergroup contact should be sanctioned and legitimized by governing and social institutions. Such support is theorized to impart legitimacy and promote equality provided of course that it is initiated by all groups in conflict. Abou-Nimer (2004, p. 419) suggested that “government support for such activities should be carefully reviewed and weighted...organizations should reject conditions that influence or inhibit their contribution to reconciliation and justice, such as limiting the encounter to cultural exchange and excluding all political discussions”.

Upon analyzing the history of intergroup encounters between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities, it becomes evident that support from their respective governing and institutional bodies was sorely lacking. As previously mentioned, most of the programs that were implemented in Cyprus, were under the auspices of the United Nations, the U.S. Embassy, international organizations (UNOPS, USAid, UNDP), and non-governmental organizations. These institutions were always faced with suspicion and mistrust by the majority of the population in both communities (and especially by the Greek-Cypriot community) and in many occasions there was an informal “silent” opposition by the respective authorities.

On the other hand, programs organized by the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot authorities, or supported by them, were usually biased towards supporting their respective side, thereby indirectly supporting the status quo or even further exacerbating the division between the two groups. Therefore, an important precondition for the success of such government and community sponsored programs is the provision of unbiased support from authorities.
As Weitzman (2005) noted, there is a certain paradox whereby peace education programs may frequently appear as having opposing aims compared to government sponsored ones. By providing a transformational experience in which participants come to humanize the adversary and focus on issues pertaining to justice, equality, and human rights, peace education programs may ultimately encourage participants to question the status quo and seek to radically change it for the benefit of all parties involved; as opposed to government sponsored ones that tend to promote the benefit of their own group thereby promoting the status quo. Thus, although support from governmental bodies is a crucial factor, their involvement is a mixed blessing and must be carefully considered and dealt with appropriately. It is absolutely vital that participants ultimately have the freedom to express themselves without governmental interference. Any attempts by governments to impose conditions that limit the freedom and independence of participants, or compromise key aspects of the functioning of the program, should be rejected.

6.3 Conclusion

It is well acknowledged that in post-conflict societies like Cyprus, peace building efforts are typically met with great resistance from those who want to retain the status quo in the name of nationalistic inclinations and rationalisations for preserving cultural heritage, national identity, and security (Johnson, 2007).

Following Worchel’s (2004, p.301) point of view, like a garden that requires constant care and tending, so, too, does the approach to ethnic conflict require constant effort. No single contact, no single course on cultural training or peace education, no single effort to redefine groups, and no single war or violent contact can make a lasting difference in the course of ethnic conflict. Approaches to ethnic conflict must include a long-term
focus and the initiation and continuance of viable and equality-based programs. Further, these approaches must not only be applied during times of obvious strife. In fact, these may be the least appropriate times to encourage contact or recategorization. The seeds of ethnic conflict are always present in the soil of the human landscape. Contact, cooperation, and understanding between ethnic groups must be emphasized in times of peace as well as during times of conflict.

Finally, another fundamental factor that should be taken into consideration is that the roots of ethnic conflict are not only deep, but they are also broad. They extend into schools, job settings, religious institutions, political parties and social clubs. They influence political leaders, the media, and all aspects of sociocultural life. As a result, efforts to manage ethnic conflict should be applied to the wide spectrum of the social and cultural life of individuals from conflicting groups.
The main aim of this thesis was to empirically examine whether increased contact between people from the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities can lead either to the reduction or escalation of ethnic conflict and towards a new laissez-faire environment for their co-existence under the same state. To achieve this objective, a number of factors were identified, such as:

1. The century-old reasons behind the generation and sustenance of ethnic conflict in Cyprus.

2. The dynamics of the intensive, albeit quiet, conflict that is perpetrated by each of the two communities, which has evolved to an ethos of cold-war mentality that is manifested in the psychological, sociological, and social psychological characteristics of the everyday socio-cultural life and politics of their people.

A number of secondary objectives were also identified, which aimed to:

1. Investigate the causes and the factors which have led to ethnic conflict in Cyprus.

2. Identify the reasons behind the sustained ethnic conflict in Cyprus through the years.

3. Examine whether through the course of an intensive (albeit quiet) conflict in Cyprus, each of the two communities has created an ethos of conflict, which is
manifested in, and comes to shape, the group’s social, behavioural, and cognitive frameworks that, in turn, serve as the epistemic basis of the conflict.

4. Provide a theoretical framework that would allow the application of the contact hypothesis theory to examine ethnic conflict in Cyprus and at the same time identify conflict resolution strategies.

Having identified the research problems, the research hypotheses were extracted and analysed using data provided by two sets of surveys carried out simultaneously both in the North and South parts of the island.

The current study applied the theoretical and methodological principles of contact hypothesis to the Cyprus Conflict, which mainly emanates from the century-old conflict between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots—an unexamined and neglected application. At the present, there has not been a single piece of scientific research examining inter-ethnic conflict resolution in Cyprus based on the theoretical and methodological framework of contact hypothesis. The review of the literature, carried out for the purpose of this thesis, revealed that contact hypothesis theory, as applied to the Cyprus Conflict, currently lacks substantial and extensive application. It is anticipated that this thesis will contribute towards the development of an original and comprehensive methodological approach towards the examination of inter-ethnic conflict resolution via the innovative use of such hypothesis. In this thesis theoretical and empirical frameworks were synthesized (under an interdisciplinary approach) encompassing dimensions of nationalism, ethnic conflict, conflict resolution and contact theory. The thesis sheds new light onto the epistemology of contact hypothesis as applied in the context of the Cyprus Conflict and, therefore, has the potential of
enhancing both scientific and populist understanding of the socio-psychological characteristics, elements, and factors of the conflict.

In particular, the current thesis investigation has:

1. Developed an empirical framework for the examination of the socio-psychological dimensions of ethnic conflict in Cyprus via the application of contact hypothesis theory (Chapter One)

2. Devised a novel methodological approach for the application of contact hypothesis in inter communal conflict situations using cross sectional primary data collected and collated through detailed questionnaires; this approach constitutes a major innovation in the use and application of contact hypothesis since in the literature it is mainly applied to observable groups (see Chapter One).

3. Established a theoretical foundation for understanding the terms, concepts, and theories necessary for the examination of the extent to which the application of contact hypothesis can lead to a reduction of inter communal tensions between Turkish and Greek Cypriots in the island (see Chapters Two and Three).

4. Provided a detailed discussion of the origins and central premises of contact hypothesis, contact theory, and intergroup contact (see chapter Four).

5. Offered an empirical setting for developing and applying a detailed questionnaire for collecting the opinions, values, and attitudes of Turkish and Greek Cypriots in order to explore the extent to which contact between people from both communities can lead either to the reduction or escalation of conflict (see chapter Five).
6. Proposed a scenario for a “Conflict Management and Peace Education” program which aimed at reducing conflict between the two communities through the gradual reduction of mistrust, while simultaneously assisting them in overcoming negative stereotypes and prejudice.

The review of the literature (see Chapter Two) provided the theoretical basis for the development of the analytical and empirical framework of the current thesis investigation. A number of terms have been used interchangeably in this thesis, such as nation, nationalism, ethnicity, and ethnic conflict, which were all examined and explained in detail in order to provide an adequate basis for understanding how theoretical overtures have been, and can be implemented on various issues concerning the ethnic conflict in Cyprus.

Furthermore, in Chapter Two, various studies on ethnic conflict were analyzed and discussed in order to provide insight as to the applicability of the evolution of conflict in Cyprus. In particular, their results have enabled the devising of a methodological/analytical framework for the insightful examination of the research problems of this study.

Chapter Three provides a thorough review of the history of Cyprus that has, in turn, provided the basis for the identification, understanding, and appreciation of the main forces that have shaped the social, political, and economic realities on the island through the centuries. This is particularly important for the present study given that the different rulers of Cyprus left long-lasting cultural and political imprints on the island. Although foreign rulers tended to govern the island over lengthy periods of time, the termination
of their reign was typically abrupt, thereby leaving the citizens of Cyprus feeling insecure about their social and economic destinies, with motherland Greece as their only hope (through unification) for stability and security.

In essence, these chapters offered a diachronic analysis of the evolution of the history of Cyprus, identifying the primary mechanisms of generation of ethnic conflict in the island.

As has been clearly and repeatedly demonstrated through many treatises, ethnic conflict between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities surfaced during 1957 and escalated during 1958-59. Following the independence and the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus in 1960, the ethnic conflict on the island intensified. Between the beginning of 1964 to the end of 1970, was a period during which the Cyprus problem could have been solved. The first possible solution was Enosis, which could have been achieved if in return some territory was ceded to Turkey. The second solution could have been to reach an agreement on an improved constitution regarding the reduction of the participation of the Turkish Cypriots in the executive, legislative, civil service, and the police, as well as the abolition of the separate majorities. In return, the Greek Cypriots would give autonomy to the Turkish Cypriots in local government. If during the period 1968-1970 the government and opposition had made a realistic evaluation of what constituted a feasible solution, the situation in Cyprus today would have been different. Cyprus would have had a much improved constitution compared to that of 1960 and the Republic would have escaped the 1974 multi-catastrophe of the coup, invasion, and occupation, all of which opened the “Pandora’s Box” bringing about all sorts of ills to its people as well as violating international law, human rights, and human dignity.
On the contrary, the institutional framework of the Republic of Cyprus reflected the animosities of a divided past and the antagonistic enmities of the two ethnic groups. In fact, the presence of a deep ethnic fragmentation and a parallel political segregation of the two communities had a catastrophic impact on the newly formed Republic (Clerides, 1990). Political separation along ethnic lines prevented the two communities from participating and interacting in a common political arena. Both communities looked at each other as ethno-political enemies. The deep-rooted mistrust and antagonism between the two communities prevented any healthy cooperation in order to create a unified democratic state. The Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots had separate and distinct communities with their own cultural values, customs, and practices, and most of all, their own antagonistic religions. For instance, many times, the heroes of one community were the villains of the other. Unfortunately, there was no effort by the two communities to assimilate each other and form a coherent state (Clerides, 1990).

The two communities could not reach any consensus because their values were based on two different philosophical systems. The Greek Cypriots wanted Enosis whereas the Turkish Cypriots were opposed to this idea. There was no common ground on which to base a satisfactory solution. However, in the whole history of the Cyprus problem, the Greek Cypriot leader President Makarios committed his biggest mistake by rejecting the Turkish Cypriot side’s 1970 proposal for a solution. The Turkish Cypriots wanted to be granted local government rights but President Makarios was not prepared to view the Turkish Cypriots as equal citizens of the Republic. Therefore, the sword of division was granted to the Turkish Cypriots by President Makarios, who blindly sought to create a Greek state. As Clerides (1990, p.18) correctly pointed out: “If the errors of the past
have taught us a lesson, however costly it might have been, then there might still be hope for a solution of the Cyprus problem.”

Chapter four provides a detailed discussion of the origins and central premises of contact hypothesis, contact theory, and intergroup contact. The objective of this chapter is to provide the methodological and theoretical foundation for linking the theory of ethnic conflict with the contact hypothesis theory in order to develop the appropriate theoretical foundation upon which to base the empirical examination of the etiology and resolution of ethnic conflict in the context of Cyprus. As was explained in the introductory chapter, it is beyond the scope of this thesis (due mainly to space limitations) to discuss the intercommunal talks and peace efforts after 1974. However, a chronology of the intercommunal talks from 1968 to 2004 is given in Appendix 2 in order to provide the reader with an overall idea of the intricacies of such talks.

One of the aims of this chapter is to also present the shortcomings and various criticisms that surround contact hypothesis research. The voluminous work on contact hypothesis has led to the development of a rather self-referential field where the core assumptions and beliefs that underpin its major premises are simply taken for granted and remain unchallenged (Connolly, 2000). Indeed in attempting to theorise its influence and effects, it is clear that these cannot be fully understood without a proper appreciation of the broader social contexts within which participants are located and the various factors that help to construct and sustain racial and ethnic divisions.

The review of the extant literature has also extracted important theoretical implications concerning contact hypothesis, which are dealt with in the next chapter, chapter five.
The first implication is that the quality of the actual contact can be useful in predicting not just attitudes or prejudice, but also intentions to behave in a particular manner towards other groups. A second implication is that quality contact can have positive effects on intergroup relations, even in situations where all the conditions outlined by Allport (1954) and Pettigrew (1998) are not met. The third implication relates to the fact that quality, rather than quantity of contact, strongly affects the nature of future intergroup relations. Hence, the mere amount of contact may not be useful in improving such relations.

In retrospect, then, "contact hypothesis" has come a long way since it was first introduced by Allport (1954). Experimental and field research indicates that its effectiveness as a method of reducing intergroup prejudice depends on a complex interaction of the structure and quality of the contact experience, and the frequency and extensiveness of contact relationship. None the less, in the long run, co-operative contact does seem to be the key in improving intergroup relationships and changing the social psychological processes that underlie prejudice and discrimination.

For example, in the current investigation, results indicate that when age of the respondents is taken into consideration, those with the most negative predisposition concerning living side by side with Turkish Cypriots tend to be mostly in the 18-44 age group. Although a worrisome finding, this tends to confirm the major premise of contact hypothesis since it demonstrates that the contact that the younger individuals have been deprived of throughout the years since 1974 and before has created a negative predisposition in younger Greek Cypriots towards Turkish Cypriots, thereby resulting in the development of a negative attitude towards the Turkish Cypriots. In particular, the
lack of substantive contact between the two sides throughout the years, has created such psychological and emotional tension to those who have never had a chance to interact, co-operate, and associate with members of the opposing group, that unsubstantiated, but, nonetheless, ‘real’ fear of Turkish Cypriots was created thereby sabotaging any well intended efforts for peaceful re-unification. At the same time, however, Greek Cypriots in the 45 and older age group, who have had substantive contact with Turkish Cypriots before the 1974 events, were found to have the least negative predispositions and attitudes towards reunification with Turkish Cypriots.

The next chapter, Chapter 5 tests empirically the research objectives of this thesis. To achieve this, descriptive statistics as well as multivariate statistical models are utilized in order to enable the extraction of conclusions and recommendations based on empirical evidence. Overall, this chapter has provided a thorough and in-depth analysis of the data that was collected for the purposes of this thesis.

Initially, the utilization of descriptive analysis has led to the construction of a respondent profile in relation to their demographic, social, and economic characteristics. Having done that, a series of cross tabulations were analyzed so as to provide an insight as to how the two ethnic communities perceive various political, social, and cultural realities of their past, present, and future. It also aimed to investigate how the attitudes and perceptions of the two ethnic communities have shifted as a result of the opening of the cross points after almost 30 years of de facto division and the absence of any sort of physical contact.
Chapter Seven: Conclusion

The complex relationships that have emerged through the application of descriptive statistical analysis techniques required the application of more sophisticated statistical techniques with more analytical capabilities so as to allow the researcher to capture, understand, and analyze them. For this reason, correspondence analysis and multivariate logit analysis were utilized. Correspondence analysis has enabled the visualization of the complex inter-relationship that characterizes the two rival ethnic groups and has made possible the extraction of important conclusions regarding the perceptions and attitudes of the Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots towards each other and in relation to the social, economic, and political realities of the island.

Finally, multivariate logit analysis was utilized in order to allow the empirical testing of the research hypothesis as it applies to this thesis. Logit analysis has enabled the formulation of the profile of Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots with the highest and lowest probability of living together under the same state mechanisms.

The overall and unique contribution of this thesis to the broader field of inter-ethnic conflict resolution is that it is the first that has been ever conducted to investigate the attitudes and perceptions of two long-standing clashing cultures and proclaimed enemies—the Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots—before and after the opening of cross points that have kept the two sides separate in all realms of their everyday affairs.

Greek and Turkish Cypriots should be able to live together and achieve unity amongst diversity, in an effort to create for themselves a true common home while condemning and abandoning the idea of partition once and for all. The search by the international community of just a convenient *modus vivendi*, in order to secure 'negative peace', i.e. the avoidance of armed conflict, is not enough in a situation involving grave violations.
of international law. In fact it avoids addressing the issue. It would clearly mean condoning and tolerating illegalities and would definitely not be a deterrent for their repetition in the future.

As the above analyses and discussions attest, creating a nation on Cyprus from the ashes of years of hostilities requires great time and multi-level efforts from many different directions. But it must be done somehow, or else peace efforts at the formal level only will remain superficial and their effects will hardly reach the public. Frustrated in its efforts and being concerned more and more about the expenses of the UN peacekeeping forces on the island, the UN tends to push the Cypriot parties to reach a compromise as quickly as possible, as also exemplified by the latest Annan Plan. But considering the existence of psychological barriers between the communities, it appears that a quick solution on Cyprus is neither feasible nor desirable. A Cypriot nation cannot be created through “outside pushes” but can only be derived from internal dynamics. Third-parties, including the UN, may be helpful in this process, however, working as communicators and facilitators, but not as decision-makers in place of the parties themselves. What is actually needed is an infrastructure that sustains present and prospective peace efforts. Although the UN has been relatively successful in keeping the conflict calm by deploying peacekeeping forces for over four decades and keeping the door open for negotiations between the Cypriot leaderships, very few initiatives to promote intercommunal understanding and to create a Cypriot identity eventually have so far taken place. This should be the area in which peace efforts must concentrate.

It is hoped that this thesis has contributed to the understanding of the root causes of conflict in Cyprus and has offered ways to resolve it. It is well understood that there is
no magic recipe for resolving the conflict on the island. It is also recognized that several theses, research projects, articles and peace plans, have been unsuccessfully applied or devised. It is strongly believed, however, that if people at all levels (including academicians, researchers, politicians, professionals, and workers) are pragmatically in their evaluations of the conflict and its resolution plans, then perhaps the day is near for bringing about a feasible and reliable peaceful resolution on the island. I still want to believe that my father’s ‘thesis’ (as given in the introduction) has found through the results of this research its antithesis...
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Dear Sir/Madam,

Your perceptions, opinions and attitudes with regards to the issues addressed in this questionnaire are very important to this study. Your response will help us to understand how you perceive ethnic conflict in Cyprus and at the same time will help to evaluate/assess if there are any common grounds for reconciliation/rapprochement between the two communities. Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. The information that you provide will be kept completely confidential and the final results of the research will not reveal the respondent’s identity.

### Part A: Social and Demographic Characteristics

**Directions:** The following questions are about you personally. For purposes of classification we would be grateful if you could answer them.

1. **Nationality:**
   - □ Turkish-Cypriot
   - □ Minority (Armenian, Maronite, Latin)
   - □ Turk in Origin
   - □ Other; Please specify

2. **Gender:**
   - □ Male
   - □ Female

3. **Age:**
   - □ 18-24
   - □ 25-34
   - □ 35-44
   - □ 45-54
   - □ over 54

4. **Marital Status:**
   - □ Married
   - □ Single
   - □ Widowed

5. **Education:**
   - □ Primary
   - □ Secondary
   - □ Tertiary
   - □ Other

6. **Income:**
   - □ Under US$2000
   - □ $2001-$5000
   - □ $5001-$8000
   - □ $12001-$16000
   - □ $16001-$20000
   - □ Over $28000

7. **Occupation:**
   - □ Business and Professional
   - □ Labourer
   - □ Skilled Worker
   - □ Salaried and semi-professional
   - □ Student
   - □ Other; Please specify

8. **In which sector do you work?**
   - □ Private sector
   - □ Public sector
   - □ Other
Appendix I - Institute for Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies

9. What is your mother tongue/language?
   - Turkish
   - Greek
   - Armenian
   - English
   - Other; Please specify

   - Greek
   - Turkish
   - Armenian
   - English
   - Other; Please specify

10. In which religion do you belong?
   - Muslim
   - Catholic
   - Other; Please specify

   - Christian
   - Catholic
   - Other; Please specify

11. Do you live in:
   - Municipality; Please specify
   - Village; Please specify

12. Are you a displaced (Refugee)?
   - Yes
   - No [if no go to Q14]

13. When were you first displaced?
   - 1963
   - 1974

14. Where do you position yourself in the political spectrum?
   - Nationalist
   - Right
   - Liberal
   - Other; Please specify

   - Centre
   - Left
   - Greens
   - No party inclination

15. THIS QUESTION IS OPTIONAL
   Would you please name the political party you belong to or you voted for the last elections?

Part B: Pre-1974 Inter-communal Relations

1. How would you describe inter-communal relations between Greek and Turkish Cypriots prior to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very friendly</th>
<th>Friendly</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Unfriendly</th>
<th>Very Unfriendly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Did you ever have any business relationships with Turkish-Cypriots? (Greek-Cypriots)
   - Yes (go to Q.3)
   - No

2a. If you were given the opportunity would you do business with them in the future?
   - Definitely
   - Probably
   - Might or Might not
   - Probably not
   - Definitely not
   - No opinion/I do not know
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3. Do you think Language was a barrier for better communication between the two Communities?

☐ Definitely ☐ Probably ☐ Might or Might not ☐ Probably not ☐ Definitely not
☐ No opinion/I do not know

4. How do you evaluate the role of the Greek-Orthodox Church?

☐ It was a catalyst for reconciliation
☐ It had an active role towards the development and escalation of ethnic strife
☐ It had an active role for the development of the nationalist movement
☐ It had a neutral role
☐ Other; Please specify ____________________________________________________________

5. Have you had any relatives or close friends killed as a result of inter-communal clashes during the 1960-74 period?

☐ Yes ☐ No

6. Do you think religion was a factor for inter-ethnic polarisation/differences?

☐ Definitely ☐ Probably ☐ Might or Might not ☐ Probably not ☐ Definitely not
☐ No opinion/I do not know

7. Was the nationalistic feeling/inclination of both communities strong enough to be a factor in the tension between the two communities?

☐ Definitely ☐ Probably ☐ Might or Might not ☐ Probably not ☐ Definitely not
☐ No opinion/I do not know

8. To your knowledge, when did the inter-communal differences first appeared?


9. Do you believe that the involvement of the Greek and Turkish governments contributed to the escalation of the conflict between the two Communities?

Greek ☐ Turkish ☐ Both ☐ ☐ No opinion/I do not know

To what extent

☐ Definitely ☐ Probably ☐ Might or Might not ☐ Probably not ☐ Definitely not
☐ No opinion/I do not know

10. Do you think that Cold War antagonism was a factor that complicated and/or enhanced the conflict between the two communities?

☐ Definitely ☐ Probably ☐ Might or Might not ☐ Probably not ☐ Definitely not
☐ No opinion/I do not know
11. Do you believe that the movements for Enosis (Union) and Taksim (Partition) have contributed to the escalation of ethnic strife?

☐ Definitely ☐ Probably ☐ Might or Might not ☐ Probably not ☐ Definitely not
☐ No opinion/I do not know

12. Do you believe that prior to 1974 both communities were treated equally on economic, social and religious issues?

**Economic Issues**

☐ Definitely ☐ Probably ☐ Might or Might not ☐ Probably not ☐ Definitely not
☐ No opinion/I do not know

**Social Issues**

☐ Definitely ☐ Probably ☐ Might or Might not ☐ Probably not ☐ Definitely not
☐ No opinion/I do not know

**Religious Issues**

☐ Definitely ☐ Probably ☐ Might or Might not ☐ Probably not ☐ Definitely not
☐ No opinion/I do not know

13. In your opinion which of these factors led to the intercommunal strife?

☐ Cultural differences
☐ Language
☐ Religion
☐ Strategic interests of motherlands
☐ British government policy towards both communities
☐ East and West antagonism
☐ Economic factors/antagonism
☐ No opinion/I do not know

**Part C: Post 1974-Prospects for Reconciliation**

1. In your opinion what would be the best possible solution for the Cyprus problem?

☐ Establishment of one single unitary Cyprus State
☐ Establishment of a bi-zonal Federation
☐ Establishment of a Confederation
☐ Establishment of a Federation
☐ Establishment of two independent states
☐ Integration of North Cyprus with Turkey
☐ Retain the Status Quo
☐ Other; Please specify
☐ No opinion/I do not know

2. In your opinion did the division of the island in 1974 solve the problem between the two communities Cyprus?

☐ Definitely ☐ Probably ☐ Might or Might not ☐ Probably not ☐ Definitely not
☐ No opinion/I do not know

3. Do you believe stability and safety will result after reconciliation (solution to the problem)?

☐ Definitely ☐ Probably ☐ Might or Might not ☐ Probably not ☐ Definitely not
☐ No opinion/I do not know
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4. Do you believe that reconciliation between the two communities would be ever possible?

☐ Definitely ☐ Probably ☐ Might or Might not ☐ Probably not ☐ Definitely not
☐ No opinion/I do not know

5. In the near future do you expect any progress for the solution of the Cyprus problem?

☐ I expect progress
☐ I do not expect progress
☐ Other; Please specify __________________________
☐ No opinion/I do not know

6. Would you feel comfortable living once again in the same neighbourhood with a Greek-Cypriot? (Turkish-Cypriot)

☐ Definitely ☐ Probably ☐ Might or Might not ☐ Probably not ☐ Definitely not
☐ No opinion/I do not know

7. What are your fears about living together with Greek-Cypriots under the same regime/government mechanisms?

☐ Security/Personal Safety
☐ Unwanted cultural influence
☐ Crime
☐ Economic segregation
☐ Mixed marriages
☐ Unfair competitive practices
☐ Other; Please specify _______________________________
☐ No opinion/I do not know

Part D: European Union Membership and Conflict in Cyprus

1. Would you like Cyprus to join the EU?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes at a later stage ☐ Other; Please specify _______________________________

2. Considering the latest developments for the solution of the Cyprus problem, should Cyprus join the EU?

☐ Definitely ☐ Probably ☐ Might or Might not ☐ Probably not ☐ Definitely not
☐ No opinion/I do not know

3. What will be the most important benefits from the EU?

☐ Higher income and standard of living
☐ More employment opportunities
☐ More foreign investments
☐ More exports
☐ Economic Stability
☐ More democracy/freedom
☐ Reconciliation between the two communities
☐ More opportunities to work abroad
☐ Stability/Safety -More security and peace
☐ Other; Please specify _______________________________
4. In your opinion how would you like Cyprus to join the EU?

☐ Turkish-Cypriots should never enter the EU
☐ Turkish-Cypriots should enter the EU after the solution of the Cyprus Problem and following Turkey’s membership.
☐ Turkish-Cypriots should enter EU after the solution of the Cyprus Problem
☐ Turkish-Cypriots should enter EU after the solution of the Cyprus Problem and upon recognition of candidate status of Turkey
☐ Turkish-Cypriots should immediately enter EU
☐ Cyprus should enter EU together with Turkey
☐ No opinion/I do not know
☐ Other; Please specify

☐ Turkish-Cypriots should never enter the EU
☐ Turkish-Cypriots should enter the EU after the solution of the Cyprus Problem and following Turkey’s membership.
☐ Turkish-Cypriots should enter EU after the solution of the Cyprus Problem
☐ Turkish-Cypriots should enter EU after the solution of the Cyprus Problem and upon recognition of candidate status of Turkey
☐ Turkish-Cypriots should immediately enter EU
☐ Cyprus should enter EU together with Turkey
☐ No opinion/I do not know
☐ Other; Please specify

---

2ND CROSS SECTION ONLY

Part E: The New Scene: The opening of the cross points

1. Do you believe that the opening of the borders has influenced your perceptions/attitudes towards the Greek-Cypriots?

☐ Definitely  ☐ Probably  ☐ Might or Might not  ☐ Probably not  ☐ Definitely not
☐ No opinion/I do not know

2. Do you believe that the opening of the border has brought the two ethnic communities closer?

☐ Definitely  ☐ Probably  ☐ Might or Might not  ☐ Probably not  ☐ Definitely not
☐ No opinion/I do not know

3. How has the opening of the border affected you in financial terms?

☐ Positively  ☐ Neither  ☐ Negatively  ☐ No opinion/I do not know
4. Have you visited the Greek side (south)? (if no go to Q5)

- Yes
- No
- No opinion/I do not know

4b. When you visited the other side which of the following characterize/express your feelings:

- Happiness
- Joy
- Apathy
- Anger
- Hostility
- No opinion/I do not know

5. Do you intend to visit the other side in the future?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion/I do not know

6. How do you describe the bi-communal relationships between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots today?

- Very friendly
- Friendly
- Neither friendly nor unfriendly
- Unfriendly
- Very unfriendly
- No opinion/I do not know

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Your responses will be a valuable contribution to what is presently known about ethnic conflict in the context of Cyprus.

Thank You!
Sayın Bay /Bayan,
Bu anketteki sorularla ilgili, fikirleriniz yaklaşımanızı, görüşlerinizi ve algılarınızı, bu çalışma için fevkalade önemlidir. Vereceğiniz cevaplar Kıbrıs etnik çatışmaya ilgili görüşlerinizi anlamamıza katkıda bulunacak, aynı zamanda da iki toplum arasında uzlaşma ve yakınlaşmayı sağlayabilecek ortak bir zeminin var olup olmadığını değerlendirmesini yapmanıza yardımcı olacak. Bu çalışmaca katılmınız tamamen gönüllü olup vereceğiniz cevaplar ve bilgiler, gizlilik ilkesine tamamen sadık kalınarak değerlendirilecek. Araştırmamın nihai sonuçları verilirken sorulara muhatap olanların kimlikleri ait olamanak durumdadır.

Alakalı sorular karmaşık sorular; Tasnif amaçlı bu soruları yanıtlarsanız memnuniyet duyacağız.

1. **Milliyeti**
   - [ ] Kıbrıslı Türk
   - [ ] Etnik Türk
   - [ ] Azılılık (Ermeni, Maronit, Latin)
   - [ ] Diğer; Lütfen belirtin

2. **Cinsiyet:**
   - [ ] Erkek
   - [ ] Kadın

3. **Yaş**
   - [ ] 18-24
   - [ ] 25-34
   - [ ] 35-44
   - [ ] 45-54
   - [ ] over 54

4. **Medeni Hali:**
   - [ ] Evli
   - [ ] Bekar
   - [ ] Dul

5. **Eğitim:**
   - [ ] İlkokul
   - [ ] Orta/Lise
   - [ ] Yüksek Okul/Üniversite
   - [ ] Diğer

6. **Gelir:Dolar**
   - [ ] $2000'den az
   - [ ] $2001-$5000
   - [ ] $5001-$8000
   - [ ] $8001-$11000
   - [ ] $11001-$13000
   - [ ] $13001-Artı

7. **Meslek:**
   - [ ] Ticaret ve Serbest meslek
   - [ ] İşçi/Emekçi
   - [ ] Kalifiye İşçi
   - [ ] Memur ve Aylıkçı
   - [ ] Öğrenci
   - [ ] Diğer; Lütfen belirtin

8. **Hangi Sektörde çalışıyorsunuz?**
   - [ ] Özel sektör
   - [ ] Kamu sektörü
   - [ ] Diğer

9. **Ana Dili ne?**
   - [ ] Türkçe
   - [ ] Rumca
   - [ ] Ermenice
   - [ ] İngilizce
   - [ ] Diğer; Lütfen belirtin

10. **Mensubu Olduğunuz Din?**
    - [ ] Müslüman
    - [ ] Hristiyan/Katolik
    - [ ] Diğer; Lütfen belirtin

11. **Yaşadığınız Bölge:**
    - [ ] Belediye; Lütfen belirtin
    - [ ] Köy; Lütfen belirtin

12. **Göçmen misiniz?**
    - [ ] Evet
    - [ ] Hayır (Yanıt HAYIR ise Soru 14'e git)

---
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**Kıbrıs'ta Türk ve Rum toplulukları arasında etnik çatışma üzerine yoklama**
13. İlk kez ne zaman göçmen oldunuz? □ 1963 □ 1974

14. Siyasi velpazenin neresindesiniz?
□ Milliyetçi □ Sağ □ Liberal □ Merkez/Orta □ Sol □ Yeşile □ Diğer; Lütfen belirtin

15. **BU SORU TERCİHİ BİR SORUDUR**
Hangi Siyasi Parti Üyesiniz, veya son seçimlerde hangi siyasi partiye oy verdiniz?

**Bölüm B: 1974 Öncesi Toplumlar arası ilişkiler**

1. Türklerle Rumlar arasındaki (Toplumlararası) ilişkiler aşağıda belirtilen tarih öncesinde nasıl?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1955</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1964</th>
<th>1974</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gayet dostça</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dostça</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiçbiri</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dostça değil</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiç dostça değil</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Kıbrıslı Rumlarla her hangi bir ticari ilişki olduğunu?  
□ Evet (Soru 3’e git) □ Hayır

2a. Gelecekte olanak sağlanırsa, Rumlarla ticari ilişkiye girer misiniz?

□ Kesinlikle Evet □ Muhtemelen □ Belki evet Belki hayır □ Muhtemelen hayır □ Kesinlikle hayır □ Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

3. Dili, iki toplum arasında daha iyi bir ilişki kurulmasına engel olarak görüyor musunuz?

□ Kesinlikle Evet □ Muhtemelen □ Belki evet Belki hayır □ Muhtemelen hayır □ Kesinlikle hayır □ Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

4. Rum Ortodoks kilisesinin rolünü nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz?

□ Barış yolunda bir katalisizörüdı □ Etnik çatışmaların gelişip tramnamasında faal bir rol oynadı □ Milliyetçi hareketin gelişmesinde faal bir rol aldı □ Tarafsız bir rol aldı □ Diğer; Lütfen belirtin
5. 1963-74 Toplumlararası çatışmalar nedeniyle her hangi bir yakınınzı, veya yakın arkadaşınız kaybettiniz mi?

☐ Evet  ☐ Hayır

6. Toplumlararası kutsalmaında din bir sebep miydı?

☐ Kesinlikle Evet  ☐ Muhtemelen  ☐ Belki evet Belki hayır
☐ Muhtemelen hayır  ☐ Kesinlikle hayır  ☐ Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

7. İki toplum içinde milliyeti duygular/eğilimler gerginlik faktörü sayılacak kadar güçlü müydü?

☐ Kesinlikle Evet  ☐ Muhtemelen  ☐ Belki evet Belki hayır
☐ Muhtemelen hayır  ☐ Kesinlikle hayır  ☐ Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

8. Bildiğiniz kadarda toplumlararası ayrılık ilk kez hangi tarihde başladı?


9. Size göre Türk ve Yunan hükümetlerinin ilgisi toplumlararası çatışmaları tırmanmasına katkıda bulundu mu?

Rum ☐  Türk ☐  İkisi de ☐  Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum ☐

Ne derece?

☐ Kesinlikle Evet  ☐ Muhtemelen  ☐ Belki evet Belki hayır
☐ Muhtemelen hayır  ☐ Kesinlikle hayır  ☐ Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum
10. Size göre Soğuk Savaş dönemi ziddiyeti, iki toplum arasındaki çatışmanın tırmanmasına veya karmak duruma gelmesinde sebep miydi?

- Kesinlikle Evet
- Muhtemelen
- Belki evet Belki hayır
- Muhtemelen hayır
- Kesinlikle hayır
- Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

11. Size göre “Taksim” ve “Enosis” hareketleri etnik çatışmaların tırmanmasına katkıda bulundu mu?

- Kesinlikle Evet
- Muhtemelen
- Belki evet Belki hayır
- Muhtemelen hayır
- Kesinlikle hayır
- Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

12. Size göre, 1974 öncesi iki toplum da ekonomik, toplumsal sosyal ve dini konularda eşit muamele görüyor muydu?

**Ekonomik konular**

- Kesinlikle Evet
- Muhtemelen
- Belki evet Belki hayır
- Muhtemelen hayır
- Kesinlikle hayır
- Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

**Sosyal/Toplumsal konular**

- Kesinlikle Evet
- Muhtemelen
- Belki evet Belki hayır
- Muhtemelen hayır
- Kesinlikle hayır
- Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

**Dini konular**

- Kesinlikle Evet
- Muhtemelen
- Belki evet Belki hayır
- Muhtemelen hayır
- Kesinlikle hayır
- Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum
13. Size göre toplumlararası çatışmalara hangi faktörler yolaçtı?

☐ Kültürel ayrıklar
☐ Dil
☐ Din
☐ Anavatanların stratejik çıkarları
☐ Britanya hükümetinin iki topluma karşı uyguladığı politika
☐ Doğu Batı ziddiyeti
☐ Ekonomik faktörler/ Rekabet
☐ Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

Bölüm C 1974-sonrası Barış olanakları

1. Size göre Kıbrıs sorununun en iyi çözüm şekli hangisidir?

☐ Bütünsel tek bir Kıbrıs devletinin kurulması
☐ İki bölgelik bir federaasyonun kurulması
☐ Konfederasyonun kurulması
☐ Federasyonun kurulması
☐ İki bağımsız devletin kurulması
☐ Kuzey Kıbrıs Türküyeye ile entegrasyonu
☐ Statükonun muhafazası
☐ Diğer; Lütfen belirtiniz
☐ Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

2. Size göre 1974’te Ada’nın bölünmesi, Kıbrıs sorununu iki toplum arasında çözüldü mü?

☐ Kesinlikle Evet
☐ Muhtemelen
☐ Belki evet Belki hayır
☐ Muhtemelen hayır
☐ Kesinlikle hayır
☐ Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

3. Size göre Kıbrıs sorunu çözümlenirse istikrar ve güvenlik sağlanacak mı?

☐ Kesinlikle Evet
☐ Muhtemelen
☐ Belki evet Belki hayır
☐ Muhtemelen hayır
☐ Kesinlikle hayır
☐ Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum
4. İki toplum arasında barışın mümkün olduğuna inanıyor musunuz?

☐ Kesinlikle Evet
☐ Muhtemelen
☐ Belki evet Belki hayır
☐ Muhtemelen hayır
☐ Kesinlikle hayır
☐ Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

5. Yakın bir gelecekte Kıbrıs sorununun çözümünde herhangi bir ilerleme bekliyor musunuz?

☐ İlerleme bekliyorum
☐ İlerleme beklemiyorum
☐ Diğer; Lütfen belirtin____________________
☐ Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

6. Kıbrıs Rumlarla aynı mahallede/semtte tekrar yaşamamız durumunda kendini rahat hissedecek misiniz?

☐ Kesinlikle Evet
☐ Muhtemelen
☐ Belki evet Belki hayır
☐ Muhtemelen hayır
☐ Kesinlikle hayır
☐ Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

8. Kıbrıs Rumlarla birlikte aynı rejim/hükümet mekanizması altında yaşamaktaki korkunuz/endişeniz nedir?

☐ Güvenlik/Kişisel güvenlik
☐ İstenmeyen kültürel etki
☐ Suç
☐ Ekonomik ayrım
☐ Karışık evlilik
☐ Haksız rekabet
☐ Diğer; Lütfen belirtin____________________
☐ Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum
Bölüm D: Avrupa Birliği Üyeliği ve Kıbrıs İhtilafi

1. Kıbrıs'ın Avrupa Birliği üyeliğini istiyor musunuz?

☐ Evet  ☐ Hayır  ☐ Evet, daha sonraki bir aşamada  ☐ Diğer; Lütfen belirtin

2. Kıbrıs sorununun çözüm yolundaki son gelişmeler dikkate alındığında, Kıbrıs'ın Avrupa Birliği üyeliğini olmaya doğru mu?

☐ Kesinlikle Evet  ☐ Muhtemelen  ☐ Belki evet Belki hayır  ☐ Muhtemelen hayır  ☐ Kesinlikle hayır  ☐ Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

3. Avrupa Birliği üyeliğinin sağlayacağı en önemli fayda ne olacak?

☐ Yüksek gelir ve Yüksek yaşam düzeyi  ☐ Daha fazla iş olanağı  ☐ Daha fazla dış yatırım olanağı  ☐ Daha fazla ihracat  ☐ Ekonomik istikrar  ☐ Daha fazla demokrasi / özgürlük  ☐ İstikrar/Güvenlik-daha fazla güvenlik ve barış  ☐ Diğer; Lütfen belirtin

4. Size göre, Kıbrıs Avrupa Birliği nasıl katmalı?

☐ Kıbrıslı Türkler AB hiç girmemelidir  ☐ Kıbrıslı Türkler Avrupa Birliği Kıbrıs sorunu çözümlendikten ve Türkiye'nin AB üyeliğinden sonra üye olmalıdır.  ☐ Kıbrıslı Türkler AB'ne Kıbrıs sorunu çözümlendikten sonra üye olmalıdır.  ☐ Kıbrıslı Türkler AB'ne Kıbrıs sorunu çözümlendikten sonra ve Türkiye'ye aday ülke statüsü verildikten sonra üye olmalıdır.  ☐ Kıbrıslı Türkler derhal AB'ne üye olmalıdır  ☐ Kıbrıs Türkiye ile birlikte AB'ne girmelidir  ☐ Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum  ☐ Diğer; Lütfen belirtin

Ethnic Conflict in
I. Sınırların açılması Kıbrıslı Rumlara karşı olan yaklaşıminizi/tavrınızı etkiledi mi?

- Kesinlikle evet
- Muhtemelen
- Belki evet belki hayır
- Kesinlikle hayır
- Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

2. Sınırların açılması iki etnik toplumu daha da yakınlaştırığına inanıyor musunuz?

- Kesinlikle evet
- Muhtemelen
- Belki evet belki hayır
- Kesinlikle hayır
- Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

3. Sınırların açılması mali bakımdan sizi nasıl etkiledi?

- Olumlu
- Etkilemedi
- Olumsuz
- Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

4. Güney Kıbrıs’i ziyaret ettiniz mi? (yanıt hayırsa beşinci soruya lütfen geçiniz)

- Evet
- Hayır
- Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

4a. Diğer taraf ne zaman ziyaret ettiniz? Aşağıda belirtilen sözcüklerden hangisi gerçek hislerinizi yansıttıyor?

- Coşku
- Sevinç
- Kayıtsız/ilgisiz
- Kızgınlık
- Hasimane
- Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

5. Karşı tarafı ziyaret etmeyi düşünüyör musunuz?

- Evet
- Hayır
- Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum
6. Kıbrıslı Türklerle Rumlar arasındaki iki toplumlu ilişkileri nasıl tanımlayorsunuz?

- Gayet dostça
- Dostça
- Ne dostça ne düşmanca
- Düşmanca
- Gayet Düşmanca
- Fikrim yok/Bilmiyorum

Bu anketleki soruları yanıtladığınız için teşekkür ederiz. Verdiğiniz yanıtlar Kıbrıs'ta etnik çatışma çerçevesinde yapılan gelişmeyi değerli katkıları olacak.
Appendix 2

Intercommunal Talks (Before 1974) Part A

INTERCOMMUNAL TALKS

24 June 1968 to 25 June 1968 was the period of exploration. Broad areas of agreement and disagreement were noted but neither side submitted proposals.

29 August 1968 to 9 December 1968 written proposals were exchanged on the judiciary, police, legislative, the executive and on local government. The issue of local government proved to be the most crucial.

20 January 1969 to 17 August 1970 sub committees were formed to study technical problems related to a revised electoral system. The sub committees met until 1970 but due to lack of agreement they stopped. Both communities’ spokesmen affirmed that their optimism for the success of the talks was diminishing.

The problem of the talks was whether Cyprus should become a unitary or a federal state. In December 1969 Denktash and Clerides agreed to shelve temporarily the local government issue and move on the other areas where compromises seemed easier. The judiciary was discussed from January 1970 to March 1970 and legislative problems were dealt with between April 1970 and June 1970.

21 September 1970 until 20 September 1971 the discussions again focused primarily on the problem of local government. On 30 November 1970 Mr Clerides handed to Mr Denktash the Cyprus government position and proposals on all the issues. After delivering it, the Greek Cypriot government declared it would not make further concessions.

The rise of the National Front proved to the Turkish Cypriot community that violent Enosist groups posed a credible threat to the continued existence of the Makarios administration. By August 1971 both communities publicly recognised that the talks were deadlocked. There was a fundamental disagreement on local government which could not be breached. The last meeting of the intercommunal negotiations was held on 20 September 1971. The talks failed. The Cyprus problem could have been solved if Enosis and Taksim were not viewed as desirable or feasible goals by the two communities.
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INTERCOMMUNAL TALKS

The opening of the re-activated talks at the Ledra Palace hotel on 8 June 1972. The actual talks began on 4 July 1972, 14 meetings were held. Judge Dekleris and Professor Aldikacti two eminent jurists made a proposal for constitutional amendments.

The most important and crucial meeting with Makarios occurred on 12 December 1972. It was crucial because if Makarios had accepted the proposed amendments, the coup and invasion with the consequent thousands of dead, wounded, missing people, refugees and the destruction of the economy would have been avoided. His refusal to compromise over the question of local government meant the Cyprus problem was not solved in 1972.

Makarios refused to authorise Mr Clerides to reach an agreement because he thought he could neutralise the resistance of the Turkish community through economic pressure and impose the solution he had in his mind. That decision sealed his own fate and that of Cyprus.

July 1974. Sampson coup precipitated Turkish invasion and occupation of north Cyprus.

February 1975. Start of intercommunal talks in Vienna.

After the invasion of 1974 President Makarios and Mr Denktash met in February 1977 for the four guideline agreement.

Death of President Makarios

In May 1979, the ten point high level agreement was concluded between President Kyprianou and Mr Denktash.

In 1984 President Kyprianou submitted a framework for a comprehensive solution of the Cyprus problem. In May the UN Secretary Council called for the the Turks to hand over Varosha and allow the original inhabitants to return to their homes. In September/October proximity talks were held in New York between the UN Secretary General and President Kyprianou and Mr Denktash separately in search of a solution.

In 1985 January a high level meeting was held in New York between President Kyprianou and Mr Denktash. In April a document was presented by the UN Secretary General accepted by the Greek Cypriot side and rejected by the Turkish Cypriot side.

In March 1986 the Secretary General submitted a draft framework agreement. The Turkish Cypriot side responded. Its response was an indirect rejection since it had put forward unacceptable conditions for the acceptance of the draft agreement.

In February 1987 a new proposal by the UN was accepted by the Greek Cypriot side but rejected by the Turkish Cypriot side.

George Vassiliou elected President

In August 1988 President Vassiliou and Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash met in Geneva and agreed to start a dialogue on 15 September 1988.
In January 1989 President Vassiliou presented a proposal for the establishment of a Federal Republic and for the solution of the Cyprus problem.


In May 1992 a new round of UN talks begins in Nicosia. In June proximity talks start in New York. In August the UN Secretary-General Boutros Ghali presented a set of ideas and map with territorial adjustment. President Vassiliou accepted the draft settlement as a basis for negotiation but it was rejected by Denktash. A third round of talks in October was suspended without agreement.

In May 1993 a new round of talks began in New York.

In February 1994 a EU official was appointed as observer to the intercommunal talks. On 21 March 1994, a document was presented on confidence-building measures which was accepted by Greek-Cypriot side but rejected by the Turkish-Cypriot side. In August 1994 the Turkish-Cypriot side abandoned federation as a solution to the Cyprus problem.

On 29 January 1997 UN Secretary General’s special representative Han Sung Jou arrived for talks with President Clerides and Mr Denktash aiming to find a common basis for negotiations.

In February 1997, Mr. Gustave Feissel began separate talks with President Clerides and Mr Denktash to pave the way for face-to-face negotiations. From 9 to 13 July direct talks between President Clerides and Mr Denktash took place in Troutbeck (New York). On September 15, it was announced in Nicosia that President Clerides had accepted a proposal by the US State Department Coordinator Thomas Miller to start a dialogue with Mr Denktash on all issues concerning security without any preconditions.

In May 1997 Clerides ordered Russian S-300 missiles. Turkey made threats against their deployment.

In July 1997 Clerides and Denktash met for 5 days of UN-sponsored talks in Troutbeck, New York.

In August 1997 high level meetings were held in Glion, Switzerland. Further talks were cancelled after dispute on UN proposals and Denktash objections to application to join EU.
Mr. Clerides re-elected as President of the Cyprus Republic (1998)

In 1998 Turkish Cypriot leader Mr. Denktash proposed the establishment of a Cyprus confederation, a proposal which was contrary to the UN resolution calling for the establishment of a bizonal, bicomunal federation with a single international personality and citizenship. President Clerides rejected Mr Denktash’s proposal.

In December 1998 Clerides agreed not to deploy Russian missiles. Instead they are sent to Crete.

On 3 December 1999 UN sponsored indirect talks are held in New York. They ended without progress. Turkey was given EU candidate status.

From January 31 to 8 February 2000 was the second round of UN – sponsored proximity talks in Geneva. Furthermore in 5 July 2000 third round of UN sponsored proximity talks began in Geneva. Between 12-26 September forth round of proximity talks was held in New York. From 1 to 10 November fifth round of proximity talks was held in Geneva.

In 2000 Negotiations continued without result. Denktash was re-elected in disputed process. July hundreds of former Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot fellow Villagers met at a reunion in Pergamos. Talks end in November with no progress.

On 27 November 2001 Turkey declares that it will reject any solution that will reduce the Turkish Cypriots to a minority status and is determined to protect their interests on the divided island.

16 January 2002, the direct UN sponsored negotiations start to take place weekly.

On 9 October 2002, the European Commission recommended that the European Council that was to be held in Copenhagen on 12-13 December should accept Cyprus as an EU member by 1May 2004.

On 11 November 2002, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan presented to the Security Council a proposal to re-unite the two parts of the island in a federation of equal states. 28 February 2003 was set as as the deadline for Clerides and Denktash to decide whether to accept.

At the European Council Summit held in Copenhagen on 12 and 13 February 2002, the Republic of Cyprus was officially recognised as one of the ten new states that would join the EU in May 2004.
On 16 February 2003, Tassos Papadopoulos head of the DIKO (the democratic party), defeated Clerides in the Presidential elections.

On 11 March 2003, Kofi Annan organised negotiations in The Hague between President Papadopoulos and Rauf Denktash. Kofi Annan proposed that the new peace plan be submitted to a referendum on both parts of the island on 30 March 2003. Rauf Denktash rejected the peace plan saying that it was not acceptable to the Turkish Cypriots.

In April 2003, the Republic of Cyprus officially signed the accession treaty to the EU in Athens.

On 24 April 2003, for the first time in 29 years Greek and Turkish Cypriots could cross the ceasefire line.

On 24 April 2004, the Annan Plan for the reunification of the island was rejected in the south, with 76% voting against. In the Turkish north 65% voted in favour of the plan despite official opposition.

1 May 2004, the Republic of Cyprus finally became a member of the European Union.