

The Pennsylvania State University

The Graduate School

College of Education

**LEARNING ETHNO-NATIONAL IDENTITY IN AREAS OF CONFLICT:
A COMPARATIVE NARRATIVE ANALYSIS OF
GREEK-CYPRriot AND TURKISH-CYPRriot YOUNG ADULTS**

A Dissertation in

Lifelong Learning and Adult Education & Comparative and International Education

by

Christos Anagiotos

© 2016 Christos Anagiotos

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

December 2016

The dissertation of Christos Anagiotos was reviewed and approved* by the following:

Fred M. Schied
Associate Professor
Dissertation Advisor
Co-Chair of Committee

Ladislaus M. Semali
Professor of Education
Co-Chair of Committee

Davin J. Carr-Chellman
Assistant Professor

David M. Post
Professor of Education

Susan M. Land
Associate Professor
Director of Graduate Studies for the Department of Learning and
Assessment Systems

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

Cyprus is a divided country as a result of nationalist conflict. Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots have lived apart and totally segregated from 1974 until 2003. This multiple comparative case study employs narrative analysis to investigate ethno-national identity learning among four young adults, two from the Greek-Cypriot community and two from the Turkish-Cypriot community that were born and raised on the divided island of Cyprus during the segregation period. Using the dialogic/performance approach to narrative inquiry I examined these young adults' experiences as expressed in their narratives to investigate how they understand and learn their ethno-national identity (ethnic and/or national identity). I compared the cases from each community using comparative education methods and identified similarities and differences between the ethno-national identity learning processes of participants from the two communities and the experiences that influenced those processes. This study introduced the term "identity learning" to examine ethno-national identity as a lifelong learning process of becoming, using Dewey's concepts of experience and learning, and theories from the social constructionist approach to identity. The participants in the study have been learning their ethno-national identity throughout their lives. Learning to be Cypriot, Greek-Cypriot or Turkish-Cypriot was a unique process for each one of them. The study shows that ethno-national identity learning is a lifelong learning process influenced and interconnected with the physical, political, social and cultural environment, individuals, groups and narratives in the environment; and that ethno-national self-identifications among young adults in Cyprus are not always fixed, rather they can be dynamic and they often change, influenced by interconnected experiences and through reflection on those experiences.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	vii
Acknowledgements.....	viii
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Overview of the Study	1
A Cup of Identity	4
Research Problem & Rationale for the Study	7
Research Purpose.....	9
Research Questions.....	9
What to Compare and Why?.....	10
Chapter 2 Literature Review and Theoretical Framework	15
Ethno-national Identity in the Cyprus Context	15
Brief History and the Genesis of Ethno-national Identity in Cyprus	16
Overwhelming History and Opposed Identities	25
Civic-territorial versus Ethno-cultural Identity in Cyprus.....	27
Theoretical Perspectives on Identity.....	32
Individual and Collective Identity in Psychology	32
Culture and Identity	34
Construction of Ethnic and National Identity.....	35
Dewey’s Theory.....	45
Dewey’s Concept of Experience	45
Learning for Dewey.....	49
Identity Learning	51
Learning to be Ethno-National	55
Ethno-national identity, context and environment	60
Theoretical Foundations of Narrative Analysis.....	64
Chapter 3 Research Design.....	69
Recruitment of Participants	70
Participants	72
Data Collection	74
Interviews	74
Documents.....	78
Data Analysis.....	79
Multiple Case Study	79
Stages of Analysis.....	80
First Stage of Analysis.....	80
Second Stage of Analysis	80
Third Stage of Analysis	85

Forth Stage of Analysis	86
Fifth Stage of Analysis	88
Researcher's Identity	89
Data Quality	91
Limitations of the Study	94
The Cyprus Context and Rationale for a Comparative Study	96
Equivalence	99
Comparability	107
Chapter 4 Data Analysis and Discussion	112
Presentation of Findings	112
Turkish-Cypriot Participants	116
Fatma's Narratives and Experiences	116
Self-Identification	117
Language	120
Changes in Ethno-national Identity	124
Family	132
Politics	137
Flags and Representation in the Republic of Cyprus	142
Interaction with Greek-Cypriots	144
Turkish Immigrants	151
Crossing to the South	153
Mass Media	156
Nationalist Friends	157
Mustafa's Narratives and Experiences	159
Self-Identification	160
Experiences in Cyprus	167
K-12 Experiences	181
Politics	186
Experiences Abroad	192
Greek-Cypriot Participants	199
Maria's Narratives and Experiences	199
Self-Identification Reflections	200
Maria's K-12 Experiences	204
Family's Political Affiliations	206
Experiences Abroad	208
Returning to Cyprus	216
Annan Plan Period	217
Interaction with Turkish-Cypriots	220
Crossing to the Other Side	226
A solution	228
Nicholas' Narratives and Experiences	229
Self-Identification Reflections	229
Experiences Abroad	233

Changes in Self-identification	236
K-12 Experiences	237
Experiences During Adulthood	243
Interaction with Turkish-Cypriots	244
Crossing to the Other Side.....	251
Politics	253
Discussion on Narratives and Experiences	256
Us and Them.....	256
Chosen Traumas	261
K-12 Experiences	263
The Image of the Other.....	268
Family.....	270
Political Affiliations	272
Experiences Influencing Identity in Adulthood	275
Meeting the Other.....	280
The Crossing Effect.....	282
Changes in Ethno-national Self-identifications.....	283
Chapter 5 Conclusions and Implications	285
Conclusions.....	285
Implications	292
Implications for Lifelong Learning Theory and Identity Theory	292
Implications for Comparative Research	296
Implications for Cyprus.....	297
References.....	301
Appendix: Interview Guide.....	319

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1. Coding: Meaning units to codes	81
Table 3-2. Codes to themes.....	84

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is the outcome of a long and intense effort that I would not have been able to accomplish without the generous help of many individuals and institutions. Special thanks are owed to the Alexander S. Onassis Public Benefit Foundation for the invaluable support through the Foundation's Doctoral Scholars Program.

Above all, I am grateful to my academic advisors Fred M. Schied and Ladislaus (Ladi) M. Semali - with whom I was fortunate to work since my first day at Penn State University - for their overall support, encouragement, patience, and guidance, and my committee members Davin J. Carr-Chellman and David M. Post for their insightful feedback and for making this intellectual journey one of challenge and growth.

Many thanks to the participants to this study and my earlier pilot studies for sharing their stories and views and helping me further understand the people of my beloved Cyprus. Listening to your interviews made me pause so many times to reflect. Your stories were eye-opening for me and an invaluable element of this dissertation.

I am grateful to Laura Snyder, Marios Antoniou and Tataleni Asino for their emotional and intellectual support and most importantly for being there whenever I needed them most. This dissertation benefited greatly from discussions with friends and colleagues that I would like to thank. Special thanks to Zacharias Zacharia, Eleftherios Klerides, Andreas Kazamias, Miye Tom, Alexandra Bell, Andri Ioannou, Nicholas Nicholaou, Christina Kakkoura and Stavros Piperis for the intellectual inspiration and moral support throughout the years.

I would also like to thank the people behind the scenes at Penn State for their important support during the ups and downs of this journey. Special thanks to Laurie

Heininger, Carol Fantaskey, Cathy Watson, Linda Grant-Oishi, Michael Tocimak and Linda Ferriss.

Most importantly, I am grateful to my parents and my brother for their unconditional love and encouragement throughout my education, from kindergarten up until my Ph.D. The journey was long and your presence and faith in my abilities was there every step of the way. My education was always a priority for you and I cannot thank you enough for this.

This dissertation is dedicated to the people of Cyprus
with my sincere wishes for a peaceful and prosperous future.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Overview of the Study

The purpose of this comparative dissertation is to examine and compare the ethno-national identity learning process and the experiences that influence this process in young adults born between 1980 and 1990 in the Greek-Cypriot and the Turkish-Cypriot communities on the divided island of Cyprus. Specifically, I look at how young adults from these communities describe and reflect on experiences from their K-12 education; their social interactions within Cyprus and when visiting the respective motherlands, Turkey and Greece, and third countries; as well as when meeting people from other countries who may be less familiar with the ethno-national identity issues in Cyprus. Further I examine influences from the social and political environments in their communities.

In this study I use the term ethno-national identity, rather than ethnic or national identity, because in Cyprus some people self-identify using national identifications (i.e. Cypriot) or ethnic identifications (i.e., Greek or Turkish) and most people use a combination of these (i.e., Turkish-Cypriot, Greek-Cypriot). Ethno-national identity refers to “a type of identification based on cultural, ethnic, or national characteristics such as the belief of common ethnic or national origin” (Sekulic, 2004, p. 460), national language (Safran, 2004) or membership in a community (Vural & Rustemli, 2006). In recent years the term ethno-national identity and ethno-national conflict has been used by

a number of researchers that study ethnic and national identity issues in Cyprus since it better captures the nature of the conflict and the complexity of these identities among people on the divided island (i.e. Dembinska, 2016; Papadakis, 2008; Psaltis, 2012; Vural & Rustemli, 2006).

My understanding of ethno-national identity is grounded on theories from the social constructionist approach and invented traditions which argue that ethnic and national identities are socially-situated discursive constructs, formed and influenced by the surrounding social, cultural, economic, and political contexts in which learning of the identities takes place (see e.g., Anderson, 1983; Gellner, 1997; Hall, 1996; Hobsbawm, 1983; Taylor, 1994). The study is grounded on Dewey's theory and particularly on his ontological and holistic notions of experience and learning (Dewey, 1925; 1934; 1938) and the contemporary interpretations of his work (i.e. Elkjaer, 2000; 2004; Hager & Halliday, 2009) that suggest that experience and learning are interconnected and highly contextual, and in constant interaction with the environment where individuals exist. Through this interconnection, individuals learn to be members of their communities and hence learn their identities. Based on the idea of learning being highly contextual and mostly informal, the work of Hager and Halliday (2009) on lifelong and informal learning also helped me examine ethno-national identity as a learned identity throughout an individual's life. I argue that ethno-national identity learning in Cyprus occurs in the course of living, within communities, in interactions with other people and groups or imagined and non-familiar people and groups (the "other"), and can be intentional or unintentional and many times based on reason (or inquiry) and reflection. This study also is based on comparative methodologies and their long tradition of examining nationhood

(Mason, 2006; Ninnes & Burnett, 2004; Tikly, 1999), a “unit idea” of Comparative Education (Cowen, 2002). The comparative method and its tools were used to compare ethno-national identity learning between participants from the two major communities in Cyprus: the Greek-Cypriot and the Turkish-Cypriot, and the context in the two communities, where ethno-national identity learning occurred. The comparison is grounded on Raivola’s (1985) criteria of equivalence and comparability.

I used multiple case study (Stake, 1995; 1998; 2005) to examine individual cases of young adults coming from two populations: 1) residents of Cyprus born between 1980 and 1990, who spent at least their first 17 years of life in the south part of Cyprus, are native Greek speakers and Christians (for the purposes of the study I call them Greek-Cypriots), and 2) residents of Cyprus born between 1980 and 1990, who spent the first 17 years of their life in the north part of Cyprus, are native Turkish speakers and are Muslims (for the purposes of the study I call them Turkish-Cypriots). There are at least two elements that make this age group unique. First, because the two communities were totally segregated between 1974 and 2003, these young people, were born and grew up in an all Greek-Cypriot or all Turkish-Cypriot environments without direct contact with the other community until the buffer zone (Green Line) opened in 2003. Second, because they were born after 1974, they did not experience the violence between the two communities that took place between 1963 and 1974. Their experience with the ‘other’ community was limited to the stories told by their parents and grandparents (who experienced the conflict) and the Greek-oriented or Turkish-oriented education (respectively) that they received during their elementary, middle school, and high school years.

The primary sources of data were interviews that were conducted with each participant individually, follow-up interviews (face-to-face or over the phone), and informal conversations with the participants. The main interviews were semi-structured and were recorded and transcribed. Secondary data sources included documents. Across the whole process, I employed triangulation strategies, member checking and peer review (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2002) that included dissertation committee members and scholars working on education, identity, and conflict resolution in Cyprus. I adopted the dialogic/performance approach to narrative analysis (Riessman, 2008) as my main interpretive and analytic strategy, an approach that combines elements from thematic and structural narrative analysis. Narrative analysis is a subset of narrative inquiry that recognizes the subjective understanding of phenomena like identity learning and that for a given experience there can be multiple truths, since different individuals may construct different truths about the same phenomenon. This approach helped me reveal the ethno-national self-identifications expressed in participant's narratives. Key in this approach as described by Riessman (2008) is the influence of cultural, historical, interactional, and institutional contexts in the formation of the participants' narratives.

A Cup of Identity

Aphrodite and Christina are friends. Now in their early thirties, they have known each other since 2000 when they both studied Greek literature at the Kapodestrian University in Athens. Christina, who lives in Athens, is visiting Aphrodite in Nicosia where Aphrodite grew up. Aphrodite works at a high school, teaching Greek literature to

Greek-Cypriot students. That Tuesday just after school, Aphrodite met her friend at *Platia Eleftherias* (Freedom Square) in the center of the divided capital of Nicosia, just outside the south part of the old city. This was not the first time Christina visited Nicosia, but this was the first time she would be able to go to the north part of the Cypriot capital with her Greek-Cypriot friend. After a ten minute walk down Ledra Street, a very popular pedestrian-only street in the old city with many cafeterias, restaurants and shops, the two friends reached the ‘buffer zone,’ ‘dead zone’ or ‘Green Line’ (as the people of the island prefer to call it). A narrow area of land (in some places only few feet wide) controlled by the United Nations (UN) since 1974, it divides the city of Nicosia and the whole island of Cyprus in two areas: the South, governed by the Republic of Cyprus where Greek-Cypriots live, and the North, occupied by Turkey and controlled by the self-proclaimed and internationally non-recognized Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) where Turkish-Cypriots live.

The two friends crossed the Republic of Cyprus checkpoint into sudden, total silence. They were still in the same street, but there were no people around, only two UN officers standing. They walked in the dead zone for less than a minute, until they reached the Turkish-Cypriot checkpoint. Behind a window a lady asked for their identity cards and asked in English for the reason of the visit. “For coffee,” Aphrodite answered. They were issued temporary visas—a small piece of white paper with a stamp of the date on it, good for 24 hours—and they continued walking. Ledra Street came alive again with people walking and talking in Turkish this time. They sat at one of the cafeterias under the warm autumn Cypriot sun. The waitress arrived and asked in Turkish what they would like to drink. Aphrodite asked in English if they could communicate with her

English. The waitress smiled and asked them again in English. Christina asked Aphrodite in Greek, “Do they serve Greek coffee here?” Aphrodite responded, “Sure! In fact, I’m having one, too.” Aphrodite turned to the waitress and asked, “Can we have two cups of Cypriot coffee?” The waitress smiled and said, “Do you mean Turkish coffee?” Aphrodite smiled back and said “Exactly!”

Growing up in Nicosia I did not get the chance to meet Turkish-Cypriots. I was 24 years old when I met my first Turkish-Cypriot and since then, I find a lot of parallels between coffee and ethno-national identity in Cyprus. Greek, Turkish or Cypriot coffee in most cases is nearly—but not quite—the same. The three young women referred to the same beverage but they named it differently. They had the same idea in mind but a different way to describe it, a different language to express it, but (I am sure) the same enjoyment in drinking it.

Most of the lines that divide the two communities are blurry and confusing with the exception of the ‘Green Line.’ This last one is very real, but confusing too. Ethno-national identity in Cyprus is an issue for which the lines that divide may also seem very clear, but in fact they are not. Although ethnic and national identity is widely discussed, how people make sense of it, is many times unclear. For example, for some people in the south part of the island speaking Greek with a Cypriot dialect, being Greek-Orthodox, having similarities in culture with both the Greeks of the mainland and the Turkish-Cypriots of Cyprus, means they are Greek-Cypriot; they are unable or unwilling to separate the Greek and Cypriot parts or define one of them as more important than the other. To others these same exact characteristics means they are Cypriot. They feel they are citizens of the Republic of Cyprus, an independent country, and the connection to the

Greeks is a historical relic, unimportant. For still others, these same exact characteristics means they are as Greek as the Greeks from the islands of Crete or Rhodes (who also have a distinct Greek dialect and are far from the mainland) but for political reasons are not part of the Greek state.

Research Problem & Rationale for the Study

Although there are certain indications about how people in Cyprus view themselves with regards to their national and ethnic (ethno-national) identities, it is unclear how they come to identify the way they do (Akçalı, 2011; Bryant, 2004; Papadakis et al, 2006; Philippou & Klerides, 2010; Vural & Rustemli, 2006). For example, the popular assumption that political affiliations can be an accurate predictor of the national self-identification was proven wrong after the results of a 2000 survey of 1,073 Greek-Cypriots on political and national perceptions (Peristianis, 2006). The study found that political affiliation cannot predict national self-identification in the Greek-Cypriot population and that further research needs to be done for further understanding of the phenomenon. Another assumption that many people in Cyprus still support—that education plays a crucial role in national identity—was also proven not very accurate when almost half of the Greek-Cypriots that were born in the 1980s and graduated from public schools, identified as Cypriot, not as Greek-Cypriot as one would expect, given the Greek-oriented education at the time (Peristianis, 2006).

Further, it is well proven through a number of research studies (see Bryant, 2004; Leonard, 2012; Papadakis, 2008; Perikleous, 2010; Philippou & Klerides, 2010; Spyrou,

2006; Vural & Özuyanik, 2008) that there are differences in ethno-national self-identifications within the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities. Some members of the Greek-Cypriot community self-identify as Greek-Cypriots and others as Cypriots. Similarly some members of the Turkish-Cypriot community self-identify as Turkish-Cypriots and other as Cypriots. These different ethno-national self-identifications create confusion, disagreements and non-violent conflict within the two communities and complicate the search for a solution to the division of the island. How new generations of Cypriots view and learn their ethno-national identities is of great importance for the future coexistence of the two communities. Even in the case of a future reunited island, these multiple identities may cause problems similar to those that led to the violent events of the 1960s. As Cyprus moves towards potentially building a unified country, it is necessary to understand how a post-1974 generation of Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots – those who can now (since 2003) freely associate with people from the other community and have no direct connections to the political turbulence of the 1960s and 1970s – learn their ethno-national identity, and what are the experiences that influence this process and their views? What was the role of schools and other institutions in this process? If we can understand the experiences, narratives and influences through which the identity learning occurred, we can begin to address the issues of ethno-national identity and conflict that has held the island hostage for decades.

Research Purpose

This study aims at comparing and gaining in-depth understanding of how young adults in Cyprus born between 1980 and 1990, who come from the two major communities on the island of Cyprus (the Greek-Cypriot and the Turkish-Cypriot), learn and understand their ethno-national identity; and what are the experiences that influence their ethno-national identity learning?

Research Questions

1. How do Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot young adults (born between 1980 and 1990) learn and understand their ethno-national identity?
 - How do they describe their identity?
 - How do they think their identity came to exist?
 - What is the rationale and justification that supports their ethno-national self-identification?
2. What are the experiences that participants perceive as influential to their ethno-national identity learning?
 - How do participants describe these experiences?
 - How do they think these experiences influenced their ethno-national identity learning?
3. How do Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot young adults compare when it comes to the questions of ethno-national identity?

What to Compare and Why?

This study compares the experiences that influenced ethno-national identity learning among young adults between the two major communities in Cyprus, the Greek-Cypriot and the Turkish-Cypriot, and their perceptions about their ethno-national identity. The comparison is important for few reasons, the most important being—in my opinion at least—to provide information towards a deeper understanding of the phenomenon in the Cyprus context and potentially facilitate the development of a solution that will respect individuals' ethno-national self-identifications on the island.

The Cyprus conflict is deeply grounded in ethno-national identity differences and the opposing aspiration for the political future of the island throughout the 20th century, with the Greek-Cypriots leaning towards Greece and the Turkish-Cypriots leaning towards Turkey. These opposing aspirations, originating from different arguments on heritage and history that the two communities support and combined with claims on territory and resources, resulted in the division of the island and total segregation of the two communities for forty years. Both communities claim ethnic connections to the respective motherlands and competing claims over the Cypriot identity, something that kept them apart for more than a century. The two communities were further estranged from each other after the division in 1974, deepening their own ethno-national identities and political aspirations without the other community and in many cases purposefully against the other community, creating further difficulties in regaining trust and in finding a solution to the Cyprus problem. Even discussing the history of Cyprus and these

opposing claims has become so complex and sensitive that is like “stepping into a political and academic minefield” as Papadakis (2008, p. 129) neatly put it.

The two communities gained independence in 1960—after 82 years of British colonization—and were supposed to live peacefully in one country, on one island with very distinct borders defined by the Mediterranean Sea, under the governance of the Republic of Cyprus. They now—and for the past 42 years—live totally separated in an illegal but *de facto* division, enforced by military forces, on the same land they were supposed to share. With divided governance, divided education, and divided political, economic, and social life, the dilemma of how to study this country called Cyprus became apparent for comparative researchers in particular. The *de facto* division answered this dilemma for many researchers who studied the two communities as two separate entities. Cyprus is an anomaly to the country model suggested by comparatists like Rosselló (1963) who argued that for a study to be comparative two different countries need to be examined. The division in Cyprus makes it possible to study just one country using the comparative method. In fact, the comparative method is the appropriate tool to examine Cyprus as one case by comparing the two communities.

Cyprus—as a political entity—needs to be examined as a whole. But because of the long separation of the two communities, each community needs to first be examined as its own entity and then be compared with the other to find and understand the similarities and differences that will help crafting a solution, accounting for these. Because the Cyprus conflict is built on ethno-national identity differences between the two communities, and because the people in the two communities still feel strongly about their self-identifications, it is essential that these identities be taken into serious

consideration in any proposed solution. Otherwise the risk of a rejection, or even worse, the risk of the violent history of the 20th century repeating itself in case of a solution, will be enormously high.

The leaders of the two communities and the United Nations (UN) desire a solution to the Cyprus problem and have been working for decades to achieve an agreement that will be considered fair by the people in both communities. The failure of the 2004 efforts of the UN Secretary General Kofi Annan and the rejection of the Annan plan by the Greek-Cypriot community through a referendum raises questions about the kind of solution that will satisfy the majority of people in both communities. The Annan plan is an example of a proposed solution that did not consider the aspirations, views, and fears of all people in both communities (Asmussen, 2004; Faustmann, 2004; Varnava & Faustmann, 2009).

Understanding these ethno-national self-identifications and the experiences and context in which they are learned by individuals in the two communities can be facilitated by comparing them. Given that these self-identifications involve the element of coexistence (or not) with the other community or trust and distrust for the other, comparing them can give us a deeper understanding of the phenomenon. It is not possible to fully understand the Turkish-Cypriot identity without considering the Greek-Cypriot community and their identity, since the Turkish-Cypriot identity exists because of the existence of the Greek-Cypriot identity, and vice versa.

There are further important questions to be answered through comparison in studying ethno-national identity learning. For example and framing them in this study's terms: Did Maria (a Greek-Cypriot participant) meant the same thing as Fatma (a

Turkish-Cypriot participant) when she said “I’m Cypriot”? Or did Mustafa (a Turkish-Cypriot participant) mean something similar to Nicholas (a Greek-Cypriot participant) when they pledged allegiance to the motherlands and said that they are proud of the Turkish and Greek elements of their identities respectively?

In this case, the engagement in cross-cultural research and the employment of the comparative method provides the tools to deeper understand the phenomenon (Crosselly & Broadfoot, 1992; Nieben, 1982; Rosselló, 1963). Understanding ethno-national identity learning in the two communities without comparing them will not be beneficial in informing either negotiators on the identity elements to consider in any proposed solution, or policy makers and social activists—in the process of implementing a solution—in what experiences positively influence certain ethno-national self-identifications.

A comparison also can help justify or question efforts to make changes in the two communities before the solution, to prepare people - and particularly younger generations - for coexistence with the other community. For example, the efforts to change history books in K-12 education in both communities to promote a more Cypriot identity rather than Greek-Cypriot or Turkish-Cypriot. Will the promotion of a Cypriot identity in general be beneficial or will it be better to work on accepting our differences and live with them?

Further a comparison can inform theory. The two communities had been evolving in the same environment until 1974 and totally separated after that, but used similar methods to convey their political national narratives to the newer generations, particularly through K-12 education. How the post-1974 generation received and perceived those

narratives from their communities and the motherlands can inform theory on how K-12 education can influence ethno-national identity in areas of conflict.

Further, comparative research among adult populations between the two communities in Cyprus is rarely undertaken, with most of the research focus on ethno-national identity put on K-12 student population, K-12 teachers and the role of schools in ethno-national identity. This study complements research in K-12 education since it looks at young adults' reflections and experiences in adulthood and during their K-12 education and compares participants between the two communities.

Chapter 2

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

In this section I present a brief history of Cyprus and a literature review as it relates to the issues of ethno-national identity on the island. Further, I review a number of major theories about identity, and particularly ethnic and national identity, and explain how they helped me conceptualize ethno-national identity learning, the core concept of this study. These theories, along with Dewey's theory of experience and learning, were fundamental to my understanding of ethno-national identity learning.

Ethno-national Identity in the Cyprus Context

Although in the literature ethnic and national identities are usually treated as two different types with ethnic identity serving as a grounding element of national identity (Eloy & Suny, 1996) (see also section "Learning to be ethno-national" later in this chapter), in this report when referring to ethnic and/or national identity in Cyprus I use the term ethno-national identity, rather than ethnic or national identity, because in Cyprus some people self-identify using national identifications (i.e. Cypriot) or ethnic identifications (i.e., Greek or Turkish) and most people use a combination of these (i.e., Turkish-Cypriot, Greek-Cypriot). Ethno-national identity refers to "a type of identification based on cultural, ethnic, or national characteristics such as the belief of common ethnic or national origin" (Sekulic, 2004, p. 460), national language (Safran,

2004) or membership in a community (Vural & Rustemli, 2006). In recent years the term ethno-national identity and ethno-national conflict has been used by a number of researchers that study ethnic and national identity issues in Cyprus since it better captures the nature of the conflict and the complexity of these identities among people on the divided island (i.e. Dembinska, 2016; Papadakis, 2008; Psaltis, 2012; Vural & Rustemli, 2006).

Brief History and the Genesis of Ethno-national Identity in Cyprus

Cyprus, an island nation in the eastern part of the Mediterranean Sea, was founded in 1960 after 82 years of British colonization and is a member of the European Union (EU) since 2004. It occupies an area of 9,251 square kilometers or 3,572 square miles and currently has a population of about one million (1,180,000). Issues of ethno-nationalist conflict resulted in the separation of the two major communities on the island, the Greek-Cypriot community (around 800,000 population) and the Turkish-Cypriot (around 180,000 population).

During the 1960s (1963, 1964 and 1967) differences in ethno-national identity sparked bi-communal violent conflict, resulting in the division of the island in 1974 when Turkey invaded Cyprus from the North and occupied 36.2 percent of the island. The north part of Cyprus is considered by the international community as an occupied (by Turkey) territory of the Republic of Cyprus. As a result of the conflict, Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots have lived apart from 1963 until 2003 and were totally segregated from 1974 until 2003 as a result of the division (Anastasiou, 2008). In 1974 Turkish-

Cypriots were forced to move to the part of the island occupied by Turkey to protect themselves from the Greek-Cypriot nationalists and in 1983 formed the Turkish Republic of North Cyprus (TRNC) which is politically recognized only by Turkey; the rest of the international community considers it an illegal state. In 1974 the Greek-Cypriots were forced by the Turkish army to move to the south part of the island, now governed by the Republic of Cyprus. Until 2003 Greek-Cypriots were not allowed to visit the north part of the island and very few Turkish-Cypriots crossed the “Green Line” to visit the South. Therefore the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities have lived apart and totally segregated from 1974 until 2003 (Papadakis, Peristianis, & Welz, 2006).

To understand ethno-national identity and ethno-national conflict in Cyprus and their influence to the people of the island, we need to examine the genesis of ethno-national identities on the island and the historical events that facilitated the evolution of these identities. The British colonialists took over the control of Cyprus in 1878 after persuading the Ottoman authorities that controlled the island from 1571 until that time to cede Cyprus to the United Kingdom. The opening of the Suez Canal in 1864 and the strategic location of the island were the main motivations for the British Colonialists. In 1914, just after Turkey supported Germany in the First World War and consequently became an enemy of the United Kingdom, the latter reacted and annexed Cyprus and in 1925 Cyprus formally became a Crown Colony.

As early as 1878 the British introduced an administrative system of “modernization” in Cyprus, replacing the Ottoman law with English law. In regards to identity and citizenship, under the Ottoman rule identity was not based on ethnicity but on faith and religion. The Ottomans recognized religious leaders for communal

organization and leadership. In the case of Cyprus, Ottomans recognized the Muslim community and the Orthodox Christian community. This changed during the British rule since the “modernization” program formally introduced identity based on ethnicity. Hence the Orthodox Christian community gradually became the Greek community of Cyprus under the leadership of the archbishop, the religious leader of the Greek-Orthodox-Christian Church of Cyprus (a very well established institution even before the Ottoman time) and the Muslim community became the Turkish community of Cyprus and was led by those old Ottoman administrators who chose to stay on the island after the Ottoman rule and who used to represent the political and religious order of the sultanate. Gradually the natives of the Cypriot colony acquired ethnic identities (Katsiaounis, 1996).

By the 1930s the Greek community started an anti-colonial movement. Two entities competed for the leadership of the movement: the Orthodox Christian Church of Cyprus and the newly-founded Left Communist party of Cyprus (Katsiaounis, 2000). The Church of Cyprus managed to take complete control of the anti-colonial movement by the 1950s. By that time the Greek sentiment became so strong among the Greek community of Cyprus that the community started demanded unification with the motherland Greece. In 1955, after decades of lobbying and failed political attempts to unite Cyprus with Greece, EOKA (*Εθνική Οργάνωση Κυπρίων Αγωνιστών* – National Organization of Cypriot Fighters) an exclusively Greek-Cypriot para-military organization was founded, with the Cypriot Church leading its political operations and providing financial support. EOKA started a guerilla against the British colonizers that lasted four years, from 1955 to 1959, aiming self-determination and union with Greece

(*Ενωσης* - Enosis) (Trimikliniotis, 2007). Supporters of the Left Communist party and Turkish-Cypriots were excluded. Turkish-Cypriots responded, claiming unification with Turkey (*Taksim*) and founding Volkan and subsequently TMT (*Türk Mukavemet Teşkilatı* - Turkish Resistance Organization). Nationalism became the theme of the decade with the domination of a dual ethnogenesis based on the pillars of ethnos, religion, history, and language. People who previously coexisted as Muslims and Christians under the control of a shared ruler became adversaries. Nationalism suppressed every other type of identity and the militant actions of nationalists, left the people powerless victims of their will. The armed movement targeted British soldiers and colonial officers as well as Greek-Cypriots who worked for the British, especially if they were also supporting the communist party AKEL and the leftist ideology (Anastasiou, 2008). The British subsequently hired Turkish-Cypriots in the colonial police force to act against EOKA, a fact that essentially fractured relationships between Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots. Soon after, EOKA members started threatening Greek-Cypriots who engaged in commerce with Turkish-Cypriots, something that caused division of the market with people in the two communities avoiding transactions with the other community and placed Turkish-Cypriots under further constraint since they had access to only to a very small part of the market (Papadakis, 2005).

In August 16, 1960 the British colonizers granted independence. The whole island of Cyprus was officially declared an independent state, supervised by three foreign “guarantor” nations: the United Kingdom, Turkey and Greece. The constitution adopted by the newly formed Republic of Cyprus contains a rigorous bi-communalism, whereby the two communities—Greek-Cypriots who made up eighty percent of the population,

and Turkish-Cypriots who accounted for eighteen percent of the population (Cyprus PIO, 1965)—share power in a consociational system, sixty to forty percent respectively (Republic of Cyprus Constitution, 1960). There were also three other minority groups—Maronites, Armenians and Latins—that accounted for the two percent of the population, who had a recognized status of “religious groups” in the 1960 constitution but had no real political power (Trimikliniotis, 2007).

According to the 1960 constitution the president of the Republic of Cyprus should always be Greek-Cypriot and the vice president Turkish-Cypriot, giving to both the president and the vice president the power and the right of veto on all decisions.

Archbishop Makarios III, who led the Church of Cyprus, was elected as the country’s first president. The chosen flag of the Republic of Cyprus represents the shape of the island in copper color centered over a white background with two green olive branches placed below it. The olive branch is symbol of peace and the two olive branches on the flag signifying the peaceful co-existence of the two communities in the new country represented by the flag. None of these symbols, though, were accepted by Cypriots as their own. Instead they viewed them as foreign and felt more attached to the Greek and Turkish flags respectively.

In the years after the independence the implementation and interpretation of the constitution led to a series of disputes and by 1963, it was evident that the constitution was falling to pieces. President Makarios proposed thirteen amendments to the constitution in order to resolve the issue of the constitutional deadlocks. He brought them to the parliament for vote, where the Turkish-Cypriots rejected them, as they were threatening the safeguards that ensured power to their minority. With the Turkish-Cypriot

vote opposing the amendments, they were deemed unconstitutional. Nevertheless President Makarios proceeded with their implementation, something that effectively caused the destruction of the state. The Turkish-Cypriots withdrew from the government and the Greek-Cypriots have carried out the Republic of Cyprus government ever since.

Tension had already been in place among the nationalists of both sides and after the amendments' issue in 1963 serious intercommunal clashes began. Most of the Turkish Cypriots abandoned their homes and found refuge in enclaves. These were all Turkish-Cypriot villages or predominantly Turkish-Cypriot neighborhoods within major cities. The enclaves were guarded by Turkish-Cypriots that ensured the safety of the Turkish-Cypriot families in the enclaves. They operated like cantons where Turkish-Cypriots lived isolated for a decade (from 1963 to 1974). Some Turkish-Cypriots who had jobs outside the enclaves left the enclaves daily, with many of them never returning back again, as a paramilitary group of Greek-Cypriot nationalists was still at arms, kidnapping and executing Turkish-Cypriots. Similarly, Turkish-Cypriot nationalists were killing Greek-Cypriots.

The violence continued between the two communities and meetings between the Turkish, Greek, and Cypriot ministers led nowhere. Disputes and violent conflicts between the two communities persisted, with the more serious outbreaks occurring in 1963, 1964 and 1967, followed by a failed attempt at reconciliation in 1974. In that same year, there was a coup d'état organized by the Greek military junta and the Greek-Cypriot nationalists against the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios III. This prompted an immediate military intervention by Turkey, which by August 1974 had occupied 36.2 percent of the island.

In 1974, Turkish-Cypriots moved to the north part of the island occupied by Turkey and in 1983 they formed the “Turkish Republic of North Cyprus” (TRNC). Politically recognized only by Turkey, it has been condemned by a number of United Nations’ resolutions (Tofallis, 2002). Regarding nationality and citizenship, the constitution of TRNC reproduced the provision of the Republic of Cyprus constitution, providing a Turkish-Cypriot nationality based on ethnicity and religion (Dodd, 1993).

In 1974, Greek-Cypriots were forced to move to the south part of the island governed by the Republic of Cyprus and continue carrying out the administration of the government without the Turkish-Cypriots. Nevertheless, the Turkish-Cypriots are entitled to full citizenship rights in the Republic of Cyprus (Trimikliniotis, 2007).

From 1974 until 2003, the regime in the occupied by Turkey territory in the north part of the island did not allow Greek-Cypriots to visit that area (with very few exceptions). Nor were Turkish-Cypriots permitted to cross the dividing line—“dead zone,” “green line,” or “buffer zone”—to visit the South. Consequently, the two communities were isolated (Papadakis, Peristianis, & Welz, 2006). After 1974 and despite the division, violent events rarely occur (the last recorded was in 1996) but the division and the military guarded Green Line still remains something that classifies the “Cyprus Problem” a non-violent but intractable conflict. Intractable conflicts are broadly defined as “ongoing violent conflicts over tangible resources which are often fueled and sustained by opposing national, ethnic, religious, tribal, or other type of collective narratives that describe the good ‘us’ versus the bad ‘them’ (Salomon, 2002, p. 6), that are “intense, deadlocked, and resistant to de-escalation or resolution... [and] tend to persist over time, with alternating periods of greater and lesser intensity” (Coleman,

2000, p. 428). Based on this definition the Cyprus conflict went through a greater intensity period from 1963 until 1974 and it altered to a period of lesser intensity after the 1974 invasion until today.

The internationally-recognized Republic of Cyprus, which currently has control of the southern part of the island, is a European Union (EU) member state country under its 1960 constitution since 2004. Under this constitution, the EU recognizes that the northern part of the island is also EU land and the Turkish Cypriots who reside there are considered to be EU citizens, as they are constitutionally still citizens of the Republic of Cyprus. De facto though, the Turkish Cypriots live in the north in their self-proclaimed state with economic and military support from Turkey and every possible embargo casted upon them by the rest of the international community. While Turkish-Cypriots today are eligible to hold EU citizenship under the Republic of Cyprus, it is a state that not only they are not actively a part of, but a state that some even consider to be an enemy-state. Politically, the major problematic result of Cyprus' induction into the European Union is that 36.2 percent of the country's land is being militarily occupied by another country, Turkey, which is also for many EU countries an ally NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) member and which also has aspirations for joining the EU.

Throughout the recent (post-1960) history of the island, despite extended periods of previous peaceful coexistence, these two major ethnic groups in Cyprus have "failed to accommodate their linguistic, religious, and other differences in a civic multicultural state of its own right" (Yiangou, 2002, p. 262). Without a doubt, "Hellenic and Turkish cultural foundations of the two communities have been cultivated over many centuries and are deeply rooted" (Calotychos, 1998, p. 14). Nevertheless, external pressures from

Greece, Turkey, and England played a catalytic role in creating distinct identities between the two groups, highlighting their differences and creating ethnic tension. Cyprus' relationship with Greece and Turkey, and the prospective acceptance of Turkey to the European Union, remains an important issue for the future of Cyprus. Reunification prospects could be influenced by nationalistic sentiments of people on both sides, which would affect stability and security in the case of a solution (Yiangou, 2002).

Reunification prospects are influenced by nationalistic sentiments of Cypriot people on both sides, which could also influence stability and security in the case of a future solution. The Cyprus' conflict is deeply grounded in the rise of the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot conflicting nationalisms. Nevertheless, the deconstruction of these opposing nationalisms reveals a conflict that is rooted in the island's more recent history which encompasses colonialism, claims of self-determination, minority issues, intercommunal conflict, ethnic conflict, interstate war, and an ongoing division (Bryant, 2010; O'Malley & Craig, 1999).

The Republic of Cyprus, as well as the international community, wish for a settlement in the Cyprus conflict (also known as the Cyprus problem or Cyprus issue), and this is obvious through the decades-long negotiations and the support of the UN general secretaries through the years. Nevertheless, current negotiations for a just, democratic and viable solution to the "Cyprus Problem" remain at stand still. It is only reasonable to argue that a future political solution on the island could only be successful and viable if Cypriots become ready to coexist in peace.

Overwhelming History and Opposed Identities

There are very well-articulated reasons for those who live in Cyprus to self-identify as Greek-Cypriot, Turkish-Cypriot, or Cypriot. Putting emphasis on certain events (contemporary or historical) one can easily articulate that s/he is a Greek who happened to live in Cyprus, similar to a Greek that happened to live in Crete or in Athens; or on the contrary that s/he is a Cypriot, born in a place that sometime in the past was conquered (or colonized) by Greeks, and hence s/he speaks a variation of ancient Greek language, but without connection to the Greeks anymore, since s/he lives in an independent country.

As stated by Christopher Hitchens' (1997) book "*Hostage of History*," a major problem with Cyprus is not the absence of history, rather the overwhelming presence of history and its influence in the political and everyday life. Or as Papadakis, Peristianis and Welz (2006) put it, Cyprus produces more history than the people of the island can consume. I would add to this that Cyprus holds enough history for one to gather the evidence to prove his political or ethnic view without presenting all the evidence available, a tactic that was adopted by the two communities to prove the wrongs of the "other" without presenting their own wrongdoings.

This presentation of opposed historical claims by the two communities is apparent and at the same time striking when one visits the two museums with the same name, 'Museum of National Struggle,' located in the divided capital of Cyprus, Nicosia. One museum is located on the north and the other one in the south side of the divided city; the sign of the one museum is written in Turkish and the other one in Greek. Both museums

present verifiable and on the whole accurate historical facts but they construct two almost opposite stories (Papadakis, 1998).

The Greek-Cypriot museum proposes the story of an island that has been Greek from the beginning of history, one conquered by various foreign powers causing suffering to its people, the British being the last conquerors against whom the people of Cyprus revolted. Following this narrative, unification with Greece was not only a legitimate request but a historical imperative (Papadakis, Peristianis & Welz, 2006).

On the other side of the 'dead zone', the Turkish-Cypriot museum narrates the story of a Cyprus that was Turkish from the beginning of history, since history began with the Ottoman conquest of the island, where Turkish-Cypriots became victims of Greek-Cypriots aggression. In this narrative, history proves that the communities in Cyprus could not live together but should live separately, that the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC) was legitimate, and "division emerged as the inescapable morally acceptable conclusion of history (Papadakis, Peristianis & Welz, 2006, p. 6).

History in Cyprus is also used as the major battleground of opposed political claims within the two communities. Politicians and historians who support the Cypriot identity present the side of the history that proves their point and likewise those who support the Turkish-Cypriot or Greek-Cypriot identity employ pieces of history to prove their own claims (Papadakis, Peristianis & Welz, 2006).

Civic-territorial versus Ethno-cultural Identity in Cyprus

Although history is used to support the Cypriot, Greek, and Turkish parts of ethno-national identities in Cyprus, these different identities emerged from different ideological grounds. The Cypriot position corresponds to the civic-territorial model of nationhood. This model defines identity along 'subjective' factors: a shared 'patria' of laws and institutions, a common territory, citizenship, and a civic religion understood as a body of political objectives, traditions, and values common to all nationals. On the basis of these elements, *Cypriotness* integrates Greek- and Turkish-Cypriots into a Cypriot nation (Özkirimli, 2005). Thus, this identity is inclusive of ethnically diverse groups depending on their voluntary participation in the community's political creed. In other words, *Cypriotness* resembles the political and territorial model of nationality. It stresses Cypriot autonomy, focusing on civic duties, economic benefits and social interests. It also employs territory and the state as its building blocks, and projects a single Cypriot people that includes Greek and Turkish Cypriots that is separated from the Greek and the Turkish nation.

In contrast, the Greek and the Turkish position correspond to the ethno-cultural model. This stresses 'objective' criteria of national belongingness—common descent and culture defined by religion, language, customs, and arts (Hobsbawm, 1992; Özkirimli, 2005; Smith 1991). On the strength of these resources, *Greekness* constitutes a Greek nation and promotes the membership of the Greeks of Cyprus to this community, excluding the Turks of Cyprus; and vice versa, *Turkishness* constitutes a Turkish nation and promotes the membership of the Turks of Cyprus to this community, excluding the

Greeks of Cyprus. Here, then, both Turkish and Greek identifications are exclusive and rather passive. They are inherited, not chosen.

If we examined the issue historically, it seems that the religious identity of Orthodox Christians in Cyprus was reconstructed into a Greek national identity in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century with the influence of the Cypriot Orthodox Church (Klerides, 2008). As explained in the literature, two factors played a crucial role in this transformation, the creation of the Greek State in 1825 and the British colonial plans to modernize Cyprus. Similarly, the religious identity of Muslims in Cyprus was transformed to the Turkish national identity as a result of the interplay of the creation of the Turkish State in 1923 and the British colonial policy to modernize Cyprus. Muslims and Christians in Cyprus were transformed into Turks and Greeks, through political processes that made language and history important (Bryant, 2004).

Yet, for many scholars, any attempt to establish these identity forms as descriptive and prescriptive categories of analysis is problematic (Eley & Suny, 1996; Özkirimli, 2005; Smith, 1991). They stress that no civic identity has probably ever arisen without the assistance of cultural factors and no ethnic nationality arises purely from a common culture without the assistance of any political factor at all. Another problem is that identities change shape over time and so often partake of elements of both types. Sometimes civic elements prevail while at other times it is the ethnic pillars that are stressed.

These ideologies and perspectives were adopted by politicians and historians and, along with relevant historical facts, were presented in popular forms to the masses who seemed to embrace them. Still the question remains: how do these abstract ideologies

manifest at the level of individual and group identifications? I do not mean just how do people on the island self-identify, but how do they understand and explain their self-identification when it comes to their ethno-national identity? Are their self-identifications purely based on these abstract ideologies?

To begin the conversation that may lead to an answer to this question, I will present William Bloom's (1990) argument that ideologies cannot evoke identification in a psychological vacuum. People adopt them only when these ideologies and the identities they propose correspond and fit to real life situations and current events. In the case of Cyprus these ideologies evoked the different identities on the island because they provided valid comprehensions of the social world, the recent history of the island, and the everyday experiences of the people. As I will show later, for the people this constitutes the proof that these ideologies and identities are all valid.

It is the people that come to choose which one of these ideologies and national identities fits better their comprehension of their reality, and consequently support the identity that corresponds to the ideology they believe. It may, though, well be the exact opposite: people self-identify one way, e.g. because their parents support that identity, and adopt the ideology that can back-up their identity. The question though still remains. How do ordinary people on the island of Cyprus come to learn their ethno-national identity, an identity so fiercely held that it can lead them to kill those who threaten it? What pieces of these ideologies and what parts of history do they employ to support and explain the reason of choosing the identity that they believe fits best? What parts of these ideologies and history fit better their reality and how they reflect on it? After all, how is ethno-national identity learned on the divided island of Cyprus?

One may argue that the people of the island do not really back-up their self-identification with ideologies or historical facts. They just identify the way they do because they grew up with this identity, probably because their social environment (e.g. family and education) supported it. This may be true, but in fact we do not really know how ordinary people understand and justify their national identity. And since conflict still besets the island because of these conflicting national identities, and as future peaceful coexistence on the island may be affected by these identities, we need to understand, to look and find answers.

Only a few decades ago, people from the two communities were killing each other on the basis of different ethnic identities. Just a few years ago, soccer fans were burning national flags of Greece, Turkey, and Cyprus during soccer matches. Violence and conflict based on national differences has been part of the recent history of the island, a history that many Cypriots (including myself) are not proud of. However, the Cypriot government is striving to create a culture of understanding and peaceful coexistence between the two communities that will “cultivate those elements that unite us and characterize us as one people” (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2008) and eventually will make the unification of the island much smoother.

As Cyprus moves forward towards building a unified country, it is particularly important to understand how a post-1974 generation of Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots make sense of their ethno-national identity. The future belongs to the young and their opinions are the ones we should consider to understand where we are going. It is a generation that can now freely associate with people from the other community and have no direct connections to the political turbulence of the 1960s and 1970s. How have they

come to believe what they believe about their national identity, what are the experiences that influence their views about their national identity, and how they believe they have learned their national identity? If we can understand how they conceptualize the experiences, events, and influences in their lives that led to their ethno-national identity learning, we can begin to address the issues of national identity and conflict that has held the island hostage for decades. Understanding how people view their national identity and the way they learn it can inform policy makers and help them create the structures and programs that will promote understanding of the national perspective of the two communities, something that was proven to be non-existent after the independence in 1960 and resulted in the violent events after that.

Additionally, what makes the future peaceful coexistence of the two communities even more challenging is the fact that the two communities lived apart for more than forty years and that two generations of Cypriots were isolated from the other community in a physical and cultural separation, what Bryant (2004) called 'ethnic estrangement'.

Theoretical Perspectives on Identity

Individual and Collective Identity in Psychology

Erikson (1968) was the first to introduce the concept of *identity* to the field of psychology by building on Freud's work on *developmental stages*. Erickson and other psychologists (Abdelal, Herrera, Johnston, & McDermott, 2006; Abdelal, Johnston, McDermott, & Herrera, 2009; Volkan, 1991) distinguished and experimented between the notions of individual and collective (communal or group) identities and, in my opinion, failed to accurately describe the connections between the individual and group identities. Erikson (1968) said that, "We deal with a process 'located' in the core of the individual and yet also in the core of his communal culture, a process which establishes, in fact, the identity of those two identities" (1968, p. 22). Although Erikson (1968; 1980) talked about both the individual and communal aspects of identity (as he named the collective aspects of group identity) and he made the distinction between the two in his work, he conflated the individual's self-identification with the shared characteristics of the group identity. Another way Erikson's theories and those of his followers conflated individual and collective identities is by treating collective or group identities as if they possess properties of individual identities. A common criticism of such theories is that they describe groups' behaviors as if they were individual actors, attributing them capabilities like decision making and applying psychoanalytic concepts to describe them.

Another group of researchers studying identity issues developed *social identity theory*, which more accurately describes and explains the interrelationship between individual and group-level identities without conflating the two. Social identity theory

was developed with the relationships between individual and group identities in its core (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). The basic assumption and tool used by social identity theorists is ‘categorization’, which, according to the theory, allows individuals to process new information efficiently. However, it is also associated with mistaken perceptions about individuals and groups, mainly because of the generalization mechanisms used by individuals to form the categories (Asch, 1952).

Social categorization “allows individuals to structure the social environment and define their place in it” (Taylor & Moghaddam, 1994, p. 83). An individual’s social identity is formed when s/he places himself/herself in a social category and self-identifies as a member of that group. Tajfel (1981) defined social identity as “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (p. 255). Therefore social identity is a potential source of positive self-evaluation that may lead to positive evaluation of one’s social groups and the increase of the perceived status one’s own social groups compared to the status of other groups, through the process of ‘social comparison’ (Tajfel, 1981).

Social identity researchers showed that individuals tend to develop a sense of group distinctiveness and perceived their group and members of their group (in-group) as different and better than other groups and individuals belonging in those other groups (out-group) (Tajfel, 1981; D. M. Taylor & Moghaddam, 1994). Further, Moghaddam and Stringer (1988) found that the more similar two groups are, the greater the discriminatory behavior tendencies of one group’s members were towards the members of other group (Moghaddam & Stringer, 1988).

Social identity theory can be used as an explanatory tool for individual-level psychological dynamics observed in areas with identity-based conflicts. Horowitz (1985) argued that “the sources of ethnic conflict reside, above all, in the struggle for relative group worth” (Horowitz, 1985, p. 143). In his book “*Ethnic Groups in Conflict*,” he employed social identity theory to examine ethnic conflict and found that psychological explanations can describe ethnic conflict better than material explanations.

Culture and Identity

Culture, an overarching concept that embraces both notions of community and identity, is associated with race and ethnicity. Identity is related to more esoteric elements: “traditions, peoplehood, heritage, orientation to the past, religion, language, ancestry, values, economics, and aesthetics” (Hecht et al., 2003, p. 46). Identity is formed when individuals align themselves with particular social structures associated with race or ethnicity and then communicate ideas about who they are to others, a process known as self-identification. In this process, identity is continually being clarified, deliberated, and reformulated (Abrams et al., 2002; Hecht et al., 2003).

This type of constructed identity is symbolic and is centered on a set of cultural forms and symbols (Abrams et al., 2002). Cultural forms and symbols are used by ethnic groups to distinguish themselves from others. Both meanings and behavior are significant, so “identities function symbolically to convey the meaning of the cultural group and to establish uniqueness” (Hecht et al., 2003, p. 60). Ethnic identity is situated around a very particular set of cultural forms and symbols, and thus it communicates

uniqueness and solidarity to the outside world (Lie, 2003; Martin, 1997). Because identity is dynamic and continually renegotiated (Martin, 1997), a community's language or discourse, especially that which references their identity, is a critical component of identity (Hecht et al., 2003, p. 57).

Construction of Ethnic and National Identity

The concept of national identity is regarded by some historians as “perhaps the most fundamental and inclusive” of collective identities (Smith, 1991, p. 143). However, until recently national identity has received relatively limited attention in psychological research compared with the enormous attention it has received in the fields of political science and sociology (DeVos & Banaji, 2005; Schildkraut, 2002). Scholars in all fields agree that national identity is not a unitary construct (Schildkraut, 2003) and that its meaning differs across contexts and historical periods. Each field, however, developed different ways of examining the development of national identity. There is no common definition of the term “national identity” amongst the many scholars from various fields who have studied the phenomenon. Indeed, both pieces of the term, *national* and *identity*, are used to refer to multiple concepts.

The literature reveals two main approaches to examine national and ethnic identity, nationalism, and the nation: the primordialism (or essentialism) and instrumentalist (or situationalism). The main difference of the two approaches comes from their understandings of how nations and ethnic and national identities originated and developed. To primordialists, ethnic and national identity is a “given” (Geertz, 1973). To

instrumentalists ethnic and national identity is the outcome of a decision making process, during which individuals choose their identity influenced by their environment (Fearon & Laitin, 1996). Most academic work since the mid twentieth century favors instrumentalist views over primordialist for the study of nations, nationalism, and ethnic and national identities and view the notion of the nation as constructed or invented. Primordialist views are more popular outside academia and particularly in areas of conflict and ethnic tension (Eley & Suny, 1996).

Primordialism (or Essentialism)

Geertz (1973) described the primordial view of national and ethnic identity as, ...the givenness that stems from being born into a particular religious community, speaking a particular language, or even a dialect of a language, and following particular social practices... One is bound to one's kinsman, one's neighbor, one's fellow believer, *ipso facto*; as the result not merely of personal affection, practical necessity, common interest, or incurred obligation, but at least in great part by virtue of some unaccountable absolute import attributed to the very tie itself... [these attachments] seem to flow more from a sense of natural—some would say spiritual—affinity than from social interaction. (p. 259)

According to primordialism, people can have a single ethnic identity which is fixed in the present and future (Chandra, 2001). When ethnicity is conceived in this way, identity-based conflicts are seen as flowing naturally from the ties of blood and their

associated ancient hatreds. “The implication of this perspective is that ethnic conflict is inevitable; it is the ‘natural outlet’ for primordial attachments” (Green & Seher, 2003, p. 521) connections to blood ties and attachment to groups based on race. This was the view of the conflict in the case of Cyprus between 1963 and 1974, when Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots saw themselves as different people coming from two different ethnic groups with no connections to each other.

Instrumentalism (or Situationalism)

On the contrary, the instrumentalist view presents ethnic identity as fluid rather than fixed by birth. Therefore ethnicity is “a social, political, and cultural resource that individuals can adopt to suit their strategic needs” (Hutchinson & Smith, 1996, p. 8). For instrumentalists, national and ethnic identities are shaped by the environment and experiences of the individual in a group that promotes a certain ethnic or national identity. Identities in general are seen as the outcome of historical processes (Geertz, 1973). They “are produced through processes of socialization and acculturation” (Green & Seher, 2003, p. 521). Although instrumentalism fails to explain why ordinary people tend to believe that their ethnic identities are fixed and immutable (Hutchinson & Smith, 1996, p. 9), it does explain how ethnicity and nationality have been used and manipulated throughout the nineteenth and twentieth century by leaders and elites to unite the masses and gain power. (Eley & Suny, 1996; Varshney, 2003).

The current favorable view of instrumentalist approaches in academic circles and the shift in the study of nationalism from a primordialist, essentialist notion of the nation

to the currently dominant view of the nation as constructed or invented (Eley & Suny, 1996) is attributed to a number of influential works in the fields of sociology and political science in the second half of the twentieth century (i.e. Anderson, 1983; Gellner, 1983; Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1983; Smith, 1986). Although there is a consensus about this shift in the study of nationalism and ethnic and national identities, there is no agreement on the nature of it. Some scholars, like Hall (1992) see this shift as a process of deconstruction of the concepts and ideas of national cultures and national and ethnic identities, as perceived by primordialists. Others such as Smith (1999) describe the shift as a shift towards a modernist paradigm: a new perspective in explaining the nature and origins of nations. Based on this view, the constructed nature of nationhood is at the same time a modern way of looking at the nation and nationalism. Although Smith supports the argument of the constructed nature of identities, he also advocates that ethnic and national identities were not constructed in vacuum, rather they were built in pre-national ethnies that pre-existed the modern construction of ethnic and national identities (Eley & Suny, 1996; Smith, 1986).

More recently, a new set of approaches appeared (Bhabha, 1990; Billing, 1995; Hall, 1992), employing post-modern and post-colonial perspectives in examining nationhood and identity. They did not represent a distinct explanatory category of the nation, nationhood and ethnic and national identities, but they used a constructionist mode of analysis to support and operationalize the modernist arguments (Smith, 2001). Emphasizing the role of national narratives, discourse and meaning in identity construction (Eley & Suny, 1996), they are known in the literature as social constructionist approaches in examining nations, nationalism and identity. In the

following paragraphs I will review these most recent approaches and their influence in the study of ethnic and national identities. These approaches were most influential in my examination of ethno-national identity in this study.

Imagined communities and ethno-national identities

In 1983 Anderson proposed that all nations are “imagined political communities.” The main argument to support his claim about the imagined nature of nations was that nation in the twentieth century stretched beyond the immediate experiences of its members, its nationals. The nation includes far more people than the nationals are personally acquainted or can possibly meet and in far more places than the average national has lived in or even visited. So in fact any nation is an abstraction for any of its nationals, or as Anderson called it “imagined” but finite, bounded, autonomous, and horizontally uniform. As he put it,

The nation is imagined as limited because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations. ... It is imagined as sovereign because ... nations dream of being free... Finally it is imagined as a community, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship. (Anderson, 1983, p. 7)

Similarly, national identity that derives from an imagined nation can be conceived as an imagined mental construct, one that promotes a common image of the self among a

group of people and distinguishes that group from other groups. The imagined nature of national identity in this sense can be observed in the sense of unity that heterogeneous national groups have. Despite the often significant differences between sub-groups or individuals in one national group (particularly in multicultural nations), the nationals feel united under the common nation and the national identity.

The examination of nations and national identities as imagined is not a denial of their reality and material effects. Rather, it is recognition of their constructed nature and the ability of people to pledge allegiance to these imaginary constructs and to connect and self-identify the same as people they never met. Hence, nations and nationalities, in Anderson's words, "are to be distinguished not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined" (p. 6).

Ethno-national culture

Stuart Hall (1990; 1992), who also rejected the primordialists views on nationhood and national identity, extended the conversation of the nature of nations and nationhood to the realm of national culture and national representation, claiming that national unity that is dependent on national culture is also imagined. It is an imagined form of solidarity. He argued that,

... a nation is not only a political entity but something which produces meanings – a system of cultural representation. People are not only legal citizens of a nation; they participate in the idea of the nation as represented in its national culture. (Hall, 1992, p. 292)

For Hall (1992) national identity is “a discursive device which represents difference as unity or identity” (p. 297), an overarching identity that the nationals see as a unifying identity, despite their differences that vary in each nation’s case and include elements such as age, class, race, religion or ethnicity. This perceived unity is achieved through a shared national culture and represented as a set of narratives and meanings promoted and practiced by the nation and its nationals.

The other in ethno-national identity

In the post-modern literature on nations there is a consensus that nations tend to highlight and emphasize the inter-national differences for many reasons (i.e. Bauman; 1997; Hall, 1997; Taylor, 1994; Woodward, 1997), most commonly to justify their existence as a different unique nation and to boast their superiority over other nations. Any ethnic or national identity has a dual structure. It is about imagining the national ‘self’ or ‘us’ and at the same time is about imagining and identifying the national ‘others’ or ‘them’. This duality is inherent in the nature of ethnic and national identity as it is understood by post-modern, social constructionist theories of identity. As Hall (1996b) puts it, “there is no identity that is without the dialogic relationship to the Other. The Other is not outside, but also inside the Self, the identity” (p. 345). The presence of otherness in national imaginings is critical in constructing national sameness.

[I]t is only through the relation to the Other, the relation to what it is not, to precisely what it lacks, to what has been called its constitutive outside

that the ‘positive’ meaning of any term—and thus its ‘identity’—can be constructed. (Hall, 1996a, p. 4–5)

Charles Taylor (1994) described the connections between identity and recognition and highlighted the importance for individuals to be able to connect and feel that they belong in a group (in this cases a nation) by recognizing similarities with the people in that group and at the same time by recognizing their differences with other groups. He also presented the dangers of non-recognition. He said,

Our identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, and so a person or group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, if the people or society around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves... Non-recognition or misrecognition can inflict harm [and] can be a form of oppression.... (p. 25)

National narratives

National narratives had been the most successful mode of expressing and disseminating the ideas and values of a nation, and therefore important elements of ethnic and national identities. National narratives are built, employing—among other tools—an amalgam of myth and history. The national identities that derive from such narratives are a mixture of myth and memory, culture and politics (Smith, 1991). In his book “Narrating the Nation” Homi Bhabha (1990) analyzed the connection between nations and narratives. In the beginning of the book, he nicely summarized,

Nations, like narratives, lose their origins in the myths of time and only fully realise their horizons in the mind's eye. Such an image of the nation - or narration - might seem impossibly romantic and excessively metaphorical, but it is from those traditions of political thought and literary language that the nation emerges as a powerful historical idea. (p. 1)

Because of their dependence in historical, metaphorical, and in some cases mythological elements, national narratives give rise in multiple possible identities and views on nationhood, depending on which of these elements they employ. Özkirimli (2005) argued that there is no single narrative for any of the nations as we know them today, since different members of a nation or groups within each nation promote different and in many cases conflicting views and constructions of nationhood and national identity. Many other theorists agree with Hall (1996a), describing cultural and national identities as fragmented and fractured and Calhoun (1997), calling national identities “heterogeneous objects of analysis” (p. 21).

Hobsbawm (1992) attributed this multiplicity not only to different elements of the past—such as history and myth—but also to the roots of national identities and those who express them in the present and their views for the future. He also highlighted that national identities can and do change over time. He said, “national identification and what it is believed to imply, can change and shift in time, even in the course of short period” (p. 11). Wodak et al (1999) went as far as saying that, “there is no such thing as one national identity... [and] that different identities are discursively constructed according to audience, setting, topic and substantive content” (p. 4).

The fragmentation of national identities, their hybridity and contradictory nature established the purpose of this study: to understand not only how these national narratives and identities are constructed but also how these are understood, performed, and learned by individuals in the two communities in Cyprus. In the next section I describe and explain a new framework that I developed which looks at ethno-national identity as learned rather than constructed. Although I do agree with the premise of the post-modern constructionist approaches to national identity described above—that ethnic and national identities are created rather than given—I think that the term ‘construction’ does not reflect the true nature of the process through which ethnic and national identities (ethno-national identities) come to existence, at least in the case of Cyprus. In my view, ethno-national identity is learned throughout an individual’s life, formally but mostly informally, through experiences and his/her interaction with the other people in his/her environment (including physical, social and political elements), social and political institutions, narratives, discourses and ideas, and in many cases with the employment of reflection and reasoning. It is the learning outcome of a process. These are ideas emerged from the work of John Dewey asserting the ontological nature of experience and learning and its interconnection to human life and identity. I examine the concept of ethno-national identity learning in detail in the next section and explain in greater detail why it is more appropriate for understanding ethno-national identity in Cyprus.

Dewey's Theory

Dewey's Concept of Experience

To “learn from experience” is to make a backward and forward connection between what we do to things and what we enjoy or suffer from things in consequence. Under such conditions, doing becomes a trying; an experiment with the world to find out what it is like; the undergoing becomes instruction — discovery of the connection of things. Two conclusions important for education follow. (1) Experience is primarily an active—passive affair; it is not primarily cognitive. But (2) the measure of the value of an experience lies in the perception of relationships or continuities to which it leads up. It includes cognition in the degree in which it is cumulative or amounts to something, or has meaning.

(Dewey, 1916, p. 147)

“Dewey's pragmatism holds the key to... a learning theory and reflects his view of the continuous meetings of individuals and environments as experimental and playful” (Elkjaer, 2009, p. 74). A key concept in understanding Dewey's view of the world as well as his theory is “experience.” According to Elkjaer (2009) Dewey's concept of “experience” is not very well understood in the educational research and it is often confused with the term “experiential learning” offered from other authors like Kolb (1983). The latter refers to the importance of individual's “experiences” that derive from bodily actions and stored in memory, whereas experience for Dewey is primarily

associated with human beings' lives and the act of living. Dewey's experience is not an inner mental and subjective relation. It is a part of an objective condition for human action that changes through interaction.

When experience is interpreted as subjective, then experience is trapped in the privacy of subjects' action and thinking. There is no experience without a subject experiencing it but it does not mean that experiencing is solely subjective and private. Sharing experience is more than a metaphor, because the objective world is always woven into the subjective experience. (Elkjaer, 2009, p. 80)

Dewey's definition of experience is ontological, it is anchored in the natural and social worlds and based upon the transactional relation between subject and worlds. Its ontological nature creates a strong connection to identity, since—as I will discuss later—an individual's existence in the world is the basis of identity. Dewey's concept of experience is also holistic. It is the interaction or transaction (I will be using the term 'interaction' throughout this report) between the individual and all the elements of the environment (natural, social, political, historical, etc.); a transaction or interaction that can potentially change the individual as well as the environment. It is the continuous and mutual formation of the two. Dewey thinks the self is in a continual process of making in dialectical relation with social life, through its interactions with the environment, as opposed to being ready-made, a blank slate, or biologically determined (Dewey, 1922, p. 138). "Every experience," according to Dewey, "modifies the one who acts and undergoes, while this modification affects, whether we wish it or not, the quality of subsequent experiences" (Dewey, 1938, p. 35). This modification of self (the change or

fluctuation of identity) and future experiences -- through our past and present experiences.

Our own existence—inherently connected to the environment—is changing who we are constantly through constant interaction with the environment. In an ever-changing environment it is impossible for an individual or a group of people to remain unchanged. Hence the changes in individual and collective identities are inevitable. Vice versa, we change the environment by existing in it, because without us it would have been different.

The environment (or enviroing conditions) for Dewey are all those elements and conditions that define the context where the experience and the interaction is taking place. It can be the natural environment (e.g., tree, mountains, building), social environment (e.g., family, friends), institutions (e.g., countries, companies), ideas (e.g., freedom, love), relationships, history, and anything else that surrounds the individual. Dewey argued that we cannot examine any experience isolated from the environment and context, like we cannot examine learning outside of the environment and context.

According to Elkjaer (2009) Dewey used the term “experience” to “denote the relation between subject and worlds as well as between action and thinking, between human existence and becoming knowledgeable about selves and the worlds of which they are a part” (p. 78). Becoming knowledgeable is just a part of the experience as defined by Dewey.

To engage in reflection, reflective thinking or inquiry is how experiences are and plants the germ of becoming knowledgeable. Inquiry begins when an uncertain situation is met and humans work to resolve this situation and apply thinking as an instrument in such a pursuit. (Elkjaer, 2009, p. 80)

Inquiry (or critical and reflective thinking) is an experimental method by which new experience may be had not only through action but also by using ideas and concepts, hypotheses and theories as 'tools to think with' in an instrumental way. Inquiry concerns consequences, and pragmatism views subjects as future-oriented rather than oriented towards the past. This is evident from subjects exercising playful anticipatory imagination ('what if') rather than causal thinking based upon a priori propositions ('if then'). The consequence of the orientation towards the future is that knowledge (in Dewey's terms: 'warranted assertibilities') is provisional, transient and subject to change ('fallible') because future experience may act as a corrective to existing knowledge. (Elkjaer, 2009, p. 75)

Dewey knew that the word "experience," because of its use in other theories and the everyday life, was misunderstood. He worked throughout his career to refine the notion of "experience." In some of his later writings, most of them unpublished, instead of "experience" he used the term "culture" which again is loaded with a variety of interpretations from various schools of thought (Elkjaer, 2009). Elkjaer suggested the word "practice," which is still not neutral as it is used in other well-known theories in education, like the "communities of practice" from the work of Lave and Wenger. Since none of the terms suggested in replacement of the term "experience" can eliminate misunderstandings, I prefer to use the term experience as defined by Dewey.

Another term closely related to experience that Dewey used as a metaphor for the relation between being and knowing, Dewey used the term of 'organic circle' that depicts his holistic view and the interconnections between individuals and their environment.

Experience is a series of organic circles (connected situations). As Elkjaer (2009) neatly put it,

Dewey's notion of the organic circle contains the outline of his work with defining his notion of experience. Thus, experience is a series of connected organic circles, it is transaction, and it is the continuous relation between subject and worlds. Experience is an understanding of the subject as being in the world, not outside and looking into the world, as a spectator theory of knowledge would imply. The subject-in-world is the foundation for becoming knowledgeable of the world and of selves, because it rests upon a bond between action and thinking, being and knowing. (p. 79)

Learning for Dewey

For Dewey all learning is inherently contextual and for it to be understood it should not be examined outside its environment and context. Informal learning, in particular, can be overlooked if examined outside its context or may even not be realized at all (Hager & Halliday, 2009). Dewey emphasized that learning is not a kind of mental state, and should not be confused with understanding or knowing, which are mental states. Looking at learning as a mental state—a perspective that dominates education—reduces learning to a product, a view that is fundamentally misleading. He called it a “philosophic fallacy” and characterized it “neglect of context” (Dewey, 1938) and “the conversion of eventual functions into antecedent existence” (Dewey, 1925, p.

34). Learning for Dewey is a process and a product, inherently connected to the context (situation and social and natural environment). It is “a lifelong learning process in which means and ends are dialectically related” (Hager & Halliday, 2009, p. 166). Dewey rejects the process-product dualism and suggests that even products of learning, like knowledge, “bear the marks” of the process of learning and its context (Garrison, 1999, p. 292). For Dewey, learning is thoroughly implicated and located in its context and needs to be viewed as a complex web of relations that transact over time. So, on this account, “learning is a transactional relationship in which both learners and their environment change together” (Hager & Halliday, 2009, p. 169).

The interconnection between learning and learner is also inherent in the work of Dewey’s followers. Learning changes learners as they learn, but is itself subject to change by learners in Deweyan transactional fashion. Dewey’s transnationalism (Garrison 2001, Vanderstraten 2002) is a rich source of argument along this line. For Dewey, not only is learning contextual, but so is thought in a strong sense that takes it well beyond the cranium. According to Dewey, thought and learning do not even take place entirely in the agent “...but rather is a kind of agent/world interaction. Thought takes place in the interactive interface between agent and world (Burke 1994, p. 164). Thus, for Dewey, learning is thoroughly implicated and located in its context and needs to be viewed as a complex web of relations that transact over time. Note that there is nothing in the above discussion that would prevent us from focusing on the learning by an individual.

Identity Learning

Through experience that included interaction with the world human beings learn how to navigate and exist in the world. They learn how and what to be in order to survive and continue to exist. They learn in which groups they belong; they learn their identity. Identity in a Deweyan fashion is a constant becoming, a constant learning of a new slightly different self through experience, the interaction with the ever-changing world. For example, a baby is born in a specific environment not knowing what his identity is. Growing up, he is learning his identity through the constant interaction with the world. He negotiates roles, culture and power to survive. Given the ever-changing nature of the environment the baby, by the time he will be an adult, needs to constantly learn new identities. It usually begins with gender identity, depending on the social environment, probably race and ethnic identity will come next, religious and national identities, etc. Some of these identities can be changed, others give the illusion that they can be changed and others cannot be changed because they are deeply rooted in the social environment. Theoretically, even those last ones the individual can change by changing the social environment. Regardless of how difficult that may be, according to Dewey, social change can happen when an individual or group of individuals change their social environment through interaction with it and the human beings in it, their ethnic or social community, for example. The existence of identities and their learning process is dependent on the environment. And, vice versa, the environment depends in the existence of those identities. A particular environment only exists if individuals with the particular identities exist in it. In this sense no learning is disconnected from one's life or identity.

Using Dewey's terms of experience, learning, and environment, I argue that individuals learn to be themselves through experiences in constant interaction with their environment (social, cultural and historical). In the context of this study, people in Cyprus learn to be Greek-Cypriot, Turkish-Cypriot, Cypriot, Greek or Turkish through experience (reflective or not) throughout their lives. In other words they learn their ethno-national identity through a lifelong process of interconnected experiences embedded in the particular environment and context where experiences take place.

Analyzing social phenomena and identity learning

Dewey emphasized the holistic view necessary to employ when examining social phenomena. Learning, activity, and context are interconnected and should not be interpreted in isolation. Social practices and any inherent learning embedded in them should also be examined in light of their context. To explain it, Hager & Halliday (2009) used the example of an electric installation. "Thus it is appropriate to judge the connection of wires to terminal blocks within the practice of electrical installation, and that practice provides the context for understanding the activity of connection" (p. 168).

Dewey points out that when attempting to understand complex phenomena we sometimes analyze them into various components and create conceptual distinctions. He does not reject this practice as long as it does not lead to fixed dualisms. Dewey gave the example of the Aristotelian separation of theoretical and practical reasoning that led to the two being viewed as distinct entities: "... [r]easonableness or rationality has been hypostatized. One of the oldest and most enduring traditions in logical theory has

converted rationality into a faculty which, when it is actualised in perception of first truths, was called reason..." (Dewey 1938, p. 18). This separation created problems when examining phenomena that might relate to one another. Dewey offered a different perspective in looking at reasoning and overcome the issue of theoretical and practical reasoning. He suggested that all reason is practical and as such needs to be examined in relation to the practice it refers to within the relevant context. As Garrison (1999) explained:

Reason itself is a contextual achievement according to Dewey who writes:

'For reason, let it be repeated is an outcome, a function, not a primitive force.' ...The meaning of reason itself is something that emerges and continuously evolves in the process of conducting inquiries. Reason evolves... (p. 306)

If we focus on the individual learner from a Deweyan perspective, then both holism and contextuality are important for understanding learning. For Dewey, learning is associated with the learner's activity within its environment. Learning employs a holistic complex of cognitive, conative and affective capacities as well as other abilities and learned capacities. This complex of reasoning, precognitive awareness, habitual reactions and feeling (the learner) is involved in the ongoing reading of changing situations and is itself reshaped by further activities. Thus, personal identity shapes responses and is itself continually reshaped by responses.

However, this account still leaves the focus firmly on the individual set against a surrounding context. But in Dewey there is an even more important sense of holism that extends the learning beyond the individual. The individual is located within an

environment that actually incorporates the individual. Here holism entails the individual being subsumed into the context of learning. Learning involves a change in this broad context. Some of the change can be thought of as happening to the learner, some of it as happening to the environment that surrounds the learner. In the widest sense of the term context is all there is, so learning only takes place in the context. This is the most profound sense in which learning is contextual (Hager & Halliday, 2009).

Nevertheless, for analytical and practical purposes, understanding of learning is usually best served by distinguishing individual learners or groups of learners from the contexts in which they operate as learning takes place. However, in making this distinction, it is crucial to not bring in the trappings of abstract rationality whereby the learner and what is learnt are both viewed as things independent of the environment, and what is learnt is somehow wholly located within the learner. Abstract rationality can be seen as the extreme opposite for the Deweyan position that in the widest sense learning only takes place in the context.

Dewey's means of distinguishing individual learners or groups of learners from the contexts in which they operate as learning takes place is his theory of transactional processes (Dewey & Bentley 1949; Emirbayer 1997; Garrison 2001). Dewey and Bentley contrast transaction with interaction. In interaction, substances or things interact but remain the same entities following the interaction. What changes as a result of the interaction is the relations between them. In transaction, substances or things interact and become different entities following the interaction. What changes as a result of the interaction is both the substances or things and the relations between them. That is, everything has changed. In thinking about learning, on the interaction approach, learner

and context remain the same separate entities, with the relations between them being altered. On the transaction approach, both learner and context change, as do the relations between them. Hence, the situation as a whole is changed. From this whole we can distinguish learner and context for the purposes of advancing understanding, just as in his earliest work Dewey argued that we can distinguish stimulus and response, but actually they are both aspects of a whole, the reflex arc (Dewey, 1896). So, on this account, learning is a transactional relationship in which both learners and their environment change together. In the broadest sense, the overall context changes, and of course continues to change, as time passes. This account renders learning inherently contextual.

Learning to be Ethno-National

Nationality in our times has become “the hegemonic political discourse of sovereignty, the unavoidable—and unanswerable—language of self-determination, of those desiring the name of statehood” (Eley & Suny, 1996, p. 11). Despite the artificial and constructed nature of nationality and national identities, discussed in previous sections, the political and social transformations of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries gave nationalism tremendous resonance and acceptance among people, promising them displacement of all rival forms of loyalty and identification (Eley & Suny, 1996).

The languages of nationalism gave particular shape and meaning to historic social and cultural developments, and the modern representation of ethnicity in Europe became that associated with the nationalist discourse per se. Nationalism did not arise spontaneously from prior

existing nationality, as most nationalists would have it, nor was it the 'false consciousness' of the great transformation from precapitalism to postcapitalism, as some Marxist would say. Nationalism both contributed to the formation of nationality, which often in Europe occurred on the basis of evolving ethnolinguistic or ethnoreligious communities, and evolved itself to become the political expression of mobilized nationalities. (Eley & Suny, 1996, p.11)

Eley and Suny used a historical approach to capture and present "the move from fragmented and localized ethnic identity to a more coherent and unified national consciousness, or from cultural to political demands" (p. 12) that are now in place in most of the world. Their analysis took into consideration the complex political and social determinations to present the story of an imagined idea that conquered the world as we know it today.

In most cases, nationalism was reframed through a given society to the particular environment that the society was operating in, "perceived in a certain way in that society and then acted upon" (Nairn, 2003, p. 88). A new amalgam of political claims based on cultural certainties known as the "discourse of the nation" linked the legitimation of polities to a preexisting cultural and in many cases linguistic community called the "nation." Political innovations combined with cultural innovations came to define the new nations (Williams, 1980). In Williams' (1980) words, "Historians stamped nations out of the ground and wove new tricolours out of old legends" (p. 13).

There is a consensus that the process of any nationalist project began from intellectuals and was then transmitted to the masses, the populace. All nationalism

projects in Europe began by attracting large numbers of educated people to the idea and then outstretched to a wider populace, in the form of popular mobilization (Hroch, 1985; Eloy & Suny, 1996; Nairn, 2003). Hroch (1985) identified three stages in that process. In the first phase small groups of intellectuals develop and elaborate the category of the nation, making it relevant to the historical, ethnic and linguistic realities of the nation in hand. In the second phase a wider network of patriots begin to spread the word through concentrated agitation. He defined patriots as members of clubs and societies, collaborators and subscribers of patriotic journals, academics, journalists and writers but also teachers, small officials and priests. The third phase included serious popular mobilization that was mainly from teachers, small officials, and priests who were the intermediates between the masses and the intellectuals and aristocrats of each society. Hroch's comparative methodology pioneered a social-historical approach in looking at nationalist movements and gave the tools to connect nation forming to larger national transformation processes (Eloy & Suny, 1996).

Hroch's third stage of serious popular mobilization or Nairn's outstretching of the nationalist ideas to a wider populace have striking similarities to lifelong learning methods or methods of popular education. Any nationalist project can be seen as a lifelong learning project targeting specific populations and aiming to teach them formally and informally how to be a member of the nation or the ethnos, respectively. Learning the national anthem and recognizing the national flag, knowing the national history, and naming the national heroes are tasks aimed to younger members of the ethnos or the nation and usually subjects of the elementary and middle school curriculum. But the biggest task behind the idea of the nation is to teach people how to be members of the

nation; how to be Cypriot, Turkish-Cypriot or Greek-Cypriot. This project of teaching people how to be members of the nation uses popular education, adult education, and lifelong learning techniques but most of the ethno-national identity learning happens informally in the course of living.

The ultimate goal is not only for the people to learn how to be members of the nation but also to create a sense of belonging to the nation, in other words a national identity (Eley & Suny, 1996). Members of the nation learn to be nationals informally throughout their everyday life experiences and interaction with other nationals or non-nationals, the media, their participation in political, religious and other organization, etc. In other words, they learn their identity through their everyday experiences, social interactions, thoughts, reflections, and beliefs, a process that I investigate in this study.

Dewey's concept of experience serves nicely as the theoretical vehicle for the examination of young adults' identity learning process, which I argue that occurs formally but mostly informally in the course of their lives. Dewey's concept of experience and its connection to learning works for this project due to its holistic view in approaching human existence and life and its close examination of the interaction (or transaction) between the individual (or self) and the environment (or context). For Dewey learning is ontological and "should be seen as part of life, supplemented but not removed by, formal learning opportunities" (p. xii). A "relational complex that includes learners and their surroundings" (Hager & Halliday, 2009, p. 173).

Hager and Halliday (2009) who perceived learning as "ongoing becoming" provided a model for examining informal learning that I adopt in examining identity learning in Cyprus. The work of Dewey on experience and learning provided the

framework for their model. I expand on their work using further ideas from Dewey's understanding of the interconnection between knowing and acting, and subject and world, as they are interpreted in the pragmatism school of thought and specifically in the work of Bente Elkjaer. For Dewey all human activity and existence is highly contextual and interconnected. Learning and identity as components of this network need to be examined within the context and not separately.

Dewey used the term “environing conditions” that define the context that is complex, diverse and multifaceted (Hager & Halliday, 2009). From Dewey's holistic point of view, context needs to be broad because it should encompass the totality of a phenomenon, all the components, aspects, or elements. Hence, examining social phenomena such as ethno-national identity requires a full consideration of all the environing conditions, all the aspects—social, individual, political, historical, and any other aspects—of the particular phenomenon in the particular environment before we come to final conclusions about the phenomenon. Nevertheless, as suggested by Dewey, initial examination of each component and creation of conceptual distinctions are deemed necessary when examining complex social phenomena. On a second phase the network of all the components of the phenomenon will be put back together to paint the big picture of the phenomenon under examination in light of the context in which the phenomenon occurred. As Hager & Halliday (2009) explained,

The contexts for understanding their purpose may best be found within the tradition to which they are related. In summary, the interpretation of what humans do is related to the context that gives sense and purpose to what they do. These senses and purposes can be nested according to the

interests of the interpreter. Moreover they often overlap. The more complex the activity, the wider the range of contexts within which the activity can be interpreted. (p. 180)

Ethno-national identity, context and environment

The Deweyan “environing conditions”—that I will call “environment”—define the context and are key in understanding the experiences that lead to ethno-national identity learning. The elements of the environment in the case of ethno-national identity include culture, political and social events, history, language, and time as well as any other elements that forms the environment, material and not, that surrounds the individuals and groups that while they develop learn their ethno-national identity. Context also includes specific circumstances and events, political and social which may influence the ethno-national identity learning.

Despite the various views and ideological disagreements, the constructed and imagined nature of ethnic and national identities is probably the most important point of agreement in the most recent literature (Eley & Suny, 1996). Despite their imagined nature, ethnic and national identities were never developed in vacuum. The intellectuals that developed each ethnic or national identity first considered the existing context, the components, factors of elements of the environment that were common among the group that they aimed to ethnicize. In most cases they built on existing environmental elements, for example common culture, linguistic similarities, skin color, common enemies, etc. to set the basis for the development of the ethnos or the nation. Depending on the specific

circumstances, in some cases one component was more important than the others.

“[N]ationality is best conceived as a complex, uneven, and unpredictable process, forged in from an interaction of cultural coalescence and specific political intervention, which cannot be reduced to static criteria of language, territory, ethnicity, or culture” (p. 8).

Or as Deutsch (1966) put it, “What counts is not the presence or absences of a single factor, but merely the presences of sufficient communication facilities with enough complementarity to produce the overall result” (P. 97). He gave the example of the Swiss to illustrate that in some cases certain elements or factors such as language are not relevant,

The Swiss may speak four different languages and still act as one people, for each of them has enough learned habits, preferences, symbols, memories, patterns of landholding and social stratification, events in history, and effectively with other Swiss than with the speakers of his own language who belong to other peoples. (p. 97)

On the other hand, in places like Cyprus language is a determining component of ethno-national identity, emphasized to make the distinction between Greek-speaking Cypriots and Turkish-speaking Cypriots. Cultural similarities between the two groups were considered less important in ethno-national identifications. Nevertheless, we cannot examine environmental elements like language and culture without considering the history, the division, and so many other elements of the environment in which these identities in Cyprus were developed, echoing Dewey’s point that we cannot examine learning or any social phenomenon outside its context.

Back to Deutsch's (1966) arguments, in some cases minor differences in culture or language are considered important and in some cases not. Freud (1917) observed that when two groups that self-identified differently were very similar, members of the two groups emphasized small differences to make the distinction between the two groups, us and them. A phenomenon that Freud named "narcissism of minor differences." These differences in culture and ethnicity were the ones used by nations to make the argument of a group that is different than similar groups. As Eloy & Suny (1996) argued,

Cultures of ethnicity are constructed via fields of difference which are also changeable and dynamic. Ethnicity arises in the interaction between groups. It exists in the boundaries between them. Boundaries are marked by symbols – 'objects, acts, relationships or linguistic formations that stand ambiguously for a multiplicity of meanings, evoke emotions and impel [people] to action.' Such markers differentiate between 'us' and 'them,' they happen unconsciously in everyday experiences. (p. 21)

Eloy's and Suny's (1996) view on ethnicity are in agreement with Dewey's argument about examining social phenomena holistically, taking in consideration the overall context, the environment, the activities and practices, and the groups and individuals involved.

A similar, holistic, and highly contextual perspective that significantly influenced our understanding of nationalism and ethno-national identities came from the study of culture in the field of anthropology. "Culture in one anthropological sense, is an informal, practical, and unconscious territory of everydayness, corresponds, closely to an important tradition of nationalist thinking descending from Herder, which stressed precisely these

holistic principles of definition” (Eloy & Suny, p. 21). To illustrate this holistic view, Jordan & Weedon (1995) proposed using the term “whole way of life” from Herder,

Herder argued that each people – each society, each ethnic group, each linguistic community – could be distinguished by ‘a whole way of life,’ by common customs, ways of thinking, and ways of being. He argued that each way of life is informed by a ‘common spirit’: that the social activities, patterns of thought, and ways of being of a given group are produced in and through what we might call today a kind of ‘grammar’ or ‘syntax’ of everyday life, that is, by general values, categories, and so on, that guide and make sense of specific activities. (Jordan & Weedon, 1995, p. 565)

Ethnicity, nationality, culture, and the respective identities were not developed in a vacuum, rather in very specific environments and situations creating a very specific context in each case. As such we need to examine them with consideration of the totality of all these elements surrounding these phenomena. Isolating specific elements of the environments and the situations that created them—whether these may be historical, social, or even individual—may result in misleading or false findings and conclusions.

In light of the above, my examination of ethno-national identity learning in Cyprus will take into consideration the context of the creation and development of these identities, paying particular attention to environmental elements, such as history, culture, politics, religion, and social and individual perception.

Theoretical Foundations of Narrative Analysis

Narrative analysis is a subset of narrative inquiry that recognizes the subjective understanding of phenomena like identity learning and that for a given experience there can be multiple truths, since different individuals may construct different truths about the same phenomenon (Fairclough, 2003; Ruthellen, 2007). Narrative inquiry does not reject any of these truths, rather it sees them as different understandings of the same social phenomenon and provides the tools to examine each one of them and to juxtapose them (Riessman, 2008). Hence in narrative inquiry each participant can have his or her own personal interpretation about his or her ethno-national identity learning. This idea originates from how a narrative is perceived in narrative inquiry. Namely, the function of narrative is,

... to provide meaning and coherence to and perspective on experience and one's social traditions, construct a person's knowledge, including a person's sense of self and identity, produce an organizing principle for human action, alter the person's way of thinking about events, and/or sense of identity. (Smith, 2000, p. 328)

Another element of narrative inquiry that makes it an appropriate analytical and interpretative tool for my study is the fact that "narrative scholars keep a story 'intact' by theorizing from the case rather than from component themes (categories) across cases" (Riessman, 2008, p. 53). My participants come from different backgrounds with stories that, although similar, have differences that may be instrumental in the data analysis. Due to the nature of ethno-national identity there can be many elements that influence it.

Hence an individual's story needs to be seen as a whole to ensure that all elements are accounted for, before coming to conclusions and before comparing an individual's case against other cases. For this reason I provide detailed background information for each participant and detailed examination of their experiences.

In this study I look at the experiences that influence ethno-national identity learning throughout an individual's life and expressed in individuals' narratives. Narrative inquiry provides the tools to analyze this narrative and uncover ethno-national identity learning. As Riessman (2008) stated, narrative analysis has a great deal to offer to disciplines that look how identity is expressed in everyday life with the use of ordinary communicative act-storytelling. Narrative analysis, then, is suited for unveiling individuals' stories, experiences and the way they explain and rationalize their stories and experiences. It also helped me capture subtle changes in ethno-national identity, particularly changes in identity that were not consciously articulated by the participants.

Researchers that use narrative analysis for their studies have developed a number of different approaches based on the research needs of different fields and different studies. The approach that best suits my study is the dialogic/performance approach, introduced by Riessman (2008). The dialogic/performance approach selectively employs elements of the thematic and structural narrative analysis and adds some new dimensions. Specifically, thematic narrative approach interrogates 'what' was told (Ewick and Silbey, 2003; Williams, 1984), something of a particular importance for my study, whereas structural approach looks at 'how' it was told (Gee, 1985; Labov & Waletzky, 1967). The dialogic/performance approach adds the element of 'who', 'when' and 'why' a narrative was spoken, placing particular emphasis on the context (cultural, historical, interactional

and institutional), intentions, and reasons behind what was told, elements that fit nicely and complement Dewey's concept of experience that is the other element of my theoretical framework.

The dialogic/performance approach to narrative analysis is looking not only to what was told but also what was implied or taken for granted. It is looking for hidden narratives between the lines of a story (Riessman, 2008). These are elements particularly important in answering my research questions due to the complex social, cultural, political, and economic context in which the participants learned their ethno-national identity; the fact that the interviewer is Greek-Cypriot (a topic I address later in this chapter); and the changing political and economic environment in Cyprus at the time of the interviews.

Dialogic/performance approach rejects the idea that language simply conveys information. Narratives are not transparent windows into people's lives, they are rather an on-going part of their reality (Bruner, 2002; Gubrium & Holstein, 1998). Words carry their own history and utterances may have hidden historical discourses and internal politics (Riessman, 2008). As Atkinson, Coffey and Delamont (2003) put it,

[N]arratives and interview accounts—are themselves examples of social action. People do things with words, and they do things with narratives. They use biographical accounts to perform social actions. Through them they construct their own lives and those of others... Such accounts are certainly not private, and they do not yield accounts of unmediated personal experience. If we collect spoken (and indeed written) accounts of “events” or “experiences,” then we need to analyze them in terms of the

cultural resources people use to construct them, the kinds of interpersonal or organizational functions they fulfil, and the socially distributed forms that they take. (p. 117)

Narratives may express multiple voices (multivoiced or polyphonic). For the dialogic/performance narrative researcher the narrator is not the final authority. S/he is just a projection of all these narratives that the narrator lives with and expresses in his/her narrative. The narrative is the beginning of the journey to reveal the hidden discourses in a story, some of which the narrator is consciously hiding and others s/he may not know exist (Riessman, 2008).

The interviews with my participants do not only carry the opinion of one person, the narrator, they reflect social, cultural and national narratives and discourses that the narrator adopted consciously or unconsciously, intentionally or unintentionally. The dialogic/performance approach examines narratives as “social artifacts” arguing that they are “telling us as much about society and culture as they do about a person or group.” (Riessman, 2008, p. 105) This view of an individual’s narrative as a “social artifact,” the possible connection of a narrative to wider societal views, is in agreement with my viewpoint of ethno-national identity in Cyprus as it was revealed through this study. In Cyprus, within both the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot community, a number of different social, cultural and national narratives can potentially influence the ethno-national identity of an individual. As I show in the analysis, in some cases these narratives were clearly expressed in participants’ narratives and the way they explained their experiences and ethno-national identity perceptions, and this expression was very conscious. In other cases, though, participants did not identify the influence of societal,

cultural and national discourses and narratives in their narrations, rather they presented them as their own since these discourses and narratives influenced their views rather indirectly and possibly unconsciously.

It is possible, however, that participants may have presented different views if the interviewer was a different person. The narratives are co-constructed by the interviewer and the participant creating a “social reality” that is unique for the particular interaction. The story is coproduced in a “complex choreography – in spaces between teller and listener, speaker and setting, ... and history and culture” (Riessman, 2008, p. 105). What I report is what I captured through that interaction, at that place, at that point in time. Furthermore, narratives are not static, something particularly true for ethno-national identity learning in Cyprus (see Akçalı, 2011; Klerides, 2008; Koutselini-Ioannidou, 1997; Mavratsas, 1999; Vural & Rustemli, 2006). The narratives in the two communities are many and contradictory. Yet participants expressed just some specific ones that they felt represented their ethno-national identity better at that moment in time. They may have presented and supported different ethno-national identities if the interviews took place at a different point in time.

Chapter 3

Research Design

This qualitative research inquiry aims to gain in-depth understanding of the experiences that influence Cypriot young adults' ethno-national identity learning and how they perceive and reflect on those experiences. To achieve this, I interviewed young adults from the two major communities in Cyprus—the Greek-Cypriot and the Turkish-Cypriot communities—and I identified in their narratives experiences, reflections, and explanations relevant to their ethno-national identity learning. Specifically, this study addressed the following research questions:

1. How do Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot young adults (born between 1980 and 1990) learn and understand their ethno-national identity?
 - How do they describe their identity?
 - How do they think their identity came to exist?
 - What is the rationale and justification that supports their ethno-national self-identification?
2. What are the experiences that participants perceive as influential to their ethno-national identity learning?
 - How do participants describe these experiences?
 - How do they think these experiences influenced their ethno-national identity learning?

3. How do Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot young adults compare when it comes to the questions of ethno-national identity?

Multiple case study (Stake, 1995; 1998; 2005; Yin, 2003) was used as a process and product of analysis (Patton, 2002). Hence, every participant in this study was treated as a specific, bounded, information-rich case (Stake, 1995; 1998; 2005; Yin, 2003) that provided insights and in-depth understanding of the phenomenon (Patton, 2002).

Narrative analysis (Mishler, 1999; Riessman, 2008; Ruthellen, 2007) complemented by thematic analysis (Graneheim & Lundman, 2003) and Dewey's conceptual model of experience and learning (Dewey, 1925, 1998; Elkjaer, 2004) and Hager's and Halliday's (2009) informal and lifelong learning theory were used as my interpretive and analytic strategies.

Recruitment of Participants

For gathering data for this study I employed purposeful sampling (Merriam, 2002; Patton, 2002) a method very often used in studies that employ narrative inquiry approaches (see Ewick & Silbey, 2003; Riessman, 2008; Williams, 1984). According to Patton (2014) purposeful sampling is the process of "... selecting information-rich cases to study, cases that by nature and substance will illuminate the inquiry question being investigated" (p. 264). I applied purposeful sampling to this study by using a combination of criterion and snowball sampling (Krathwohl, 2009; Patton, 2002) to identify potential participants. My goal was to choose individual cases from which I can learn the most about the phenomenon of ethno-national identity learning rather than facilitating

statistical generalization. Hence I chose the participants that comprised the most information-rich cases that met the selection criteria, based on information and references, not statistical considerations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2014).

My information from the literature, from my personal experience living in Cyprus, and from a pilot study I conducted indicated that there are four distinct self-identifications relevant to ethnic and national identities in this age group. In the Greek-Cypriot community these are Cypriot and Greek-Cypriot (e.g. Bryant, 2004; Calotychos, 1998; Philippou & Klerides, 2010) and in the Turkish-Cypriot community, Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot (e.g. Akçalı, 2011; Vural & Rustemli, 2006). I purposefully tried to include one individual from each of these groups so that I had data offering different perspectives on ethno-national identity. So I recruited two participants from Greek-Cypriot community, one that self-identified as Cypriot and one that self-identified Greek-Cypriot; and two participants from Turkish-Cypriot community, one that self-identified as Cypriot and one that self-identified Turkish-Cypriot.

The selection criteria for the study were the following:

- Are Greek-Cypriot or Turkish-Cypriot.
- Born and grew-up (at least until the age of 17) in Cyprus.
- Lived outside Cyprus for at least three years.
- Born between 1980 and 1990.
- Are fluent in English.

A pilot study that served as an exploratory study informed and guided my selection criteria, recruitment, and the interview process (particularly the interview guide). The pilot study illuminated certain experiences that influenced ethno-national

identity learning, such as living outside Cyprus or meeting people from the other community. Thus, I looked for individuals with rich experiences relevant to the process of ethno-national identity learning that provided a deeper understanding of the interconnections of experiences and their influence to ethno-national identity learning.

All four participants came from introductions by participants from my pilot study. I had an initial contact with potential participants with a phone call during which I explained the purpose of the study and the time they would need to invest. We had a short conversation about their background and I determined if they met the selection criteria and could provide rich data for the study of the phenomenon.

Participants

My participants for this study came from the two different communities in Cyprus, the Greek-Cypriot community and the Turkish-Cypriot community. Due to the discrete differences between the two communities, I treated as two different groups, which allowed me to compare the participants from these communities using Raivola's (1985) framework of equivalence and comparability criteria that I discuss in detail later in this chapter.

The four participants for this study were residents of Cyprus who were born between 1980 and 1990 and spent at least their first seventeen years of life on the island. Two of them (Fatma and Mustafa) were members of the Turkish-Cypriot community (they speak Turkish and are Moslems). For the purposes of the study I call them Turkish-Cypriots. The other two (Maria and Nicholas) were members of the Greek-Cypriot

community (they speak Greek and are Christians). For the purposes of the study I call them Greek-Cypriots.

I deliberately chose this age group as there are at least two elements that make it unique. First, because the two communities were almost totally segregated between 1974 and 2003, these young people were born and grew up in an all Greek-Cypriot environment (in the case of Greek-Cypriots) or in an all Turkish-Cypriot environment (in the case of Turkish-Cypriots) without direct contact with the other community growing-up. Three of the participants were adults when they met people from the other community for the first time, after the first checkpoints opened in 2003 allowing people from the two communities to visit the other side. Second, because they were born after 1974, they did not experience the violence between the two communities that took place between 1963 and 1974. Living apart, their experience with the ‘other’ was limited to the stories told by their parents and grandparents, who experienced the violent events of the 1960s and 1970s, and the Greek-oriented or Turkish-oriented education (respectively) that they received during their elementary, middle school, and high school years (see Bryant, 2004; Gregoriou, 2004; Koutselini-Ioannidou, 1997; Papadakis, 2008; Spyrou, 2006; Vural & Özuyanik, 2008).

All four participants and the people they referred to during the interviews (i.e. family members, friends, teachers etc.) other than public figures, such as presidents, church leaders etc., were given pseudonyms (Creswell, 2007; Patton 2002). These pseudonyms were used in all the documents and publications relevant to this study except the consent form that has the real name of each participant.

Data Collection

Interviews

The primary sources of data were interviews that were conducted with each participant individually, phone calls, and informal conversations with the participants. Data collection and all communications with the participants were done between March 2014 and January 2015. I interviewed a total of four people for this study, two Greek-Cypriot and two Turkish-Cypriot. The main interviews were semi-structured (Carspecken, 1996; Creswell, 2007; Patton 2002) and conducted face-to-face, they were recorded and transcribed, and were complemented with one or more follow-up phone interviews or face-to-face meetings—during which I took detailed notes—and informal conversations before and after the interviews. The follow-up interviews were conducted for clarifications on topics discussed during the main interview and for member checking of the transcripts and my preliminary analysis. The informal conversations before the interview along with the recruitment phone call were valuable in gaining the trust of the participants and giving them information about the study and my qualifications for conducting the study. The interviews were conducted face-to-face in public places (i.e. coffee shops). The interviews were scheduled at times and places convenient to the participants.

Fatma's main interview lasted one hour and twenty minutes followed by a very informative hour-long informal conversation during which I took notes that I included in my analysis after getting Fatma's approval. After that, Fatma invited me to a talk about the historical dialogue between the communities that took place in another room of the

building where we had the interview. After the talk we had another short conversation about history education as she experienced it as a student; I included this in my analysis. Further we had a 45 minute phone-call after I sent her the transcript of her interview and a preliminary analysis during which she offered her feedback.

Mustafa's main interview lasted one hour and forty-five minutes and was followed with more than one hour informal conversation on topics relevant to the Cyprus problem. During the informal conversation Mustafa asked me to turn on the recorder—which I did—because he wanted to add some information about his political affiliations that he forgot to mention during the main interview. I also took some notes during the informal conversation. Further, we had a follow-up phone call for clarifications and member checking that lasted approximately twenty minutes.

Maria's main interview lasted one and a half hours. We also met a few days later for about an hour when she showed me some books that she mentioned during the interview (history books from her middle and high school years and from her undergraduate studies) and we talked more about her K-12 education years. After I shared her transcript with her we had a phone-conversation of about forty minutes during which we discuss her transcript and she offered some clarifications.

Nicholas's main interview lasted one hour and thirty-five minutes. We had a follow-up phone call for clarifications that lasted approximately half-hour and another approximately one hour face-to-face meeting after I shared with him the transcript of his interview. During the last meeting we discussed the transcript and parts of my analysis of his main interview and he suggested few modifications and additions.

Although I created an interview guide (see Appendix) to direct the topics with specific questions, I readjusted my questions during each interview depending on each participant's responses and on whether a topic was relevant to each participant or not (Carspecken, 1996; Creswell, 2007) but at the same time making sure I covered all the relevant areas. For example, if a participant mentioned that s/he was not religious I would not ask the set of questions that were related to his/her religious practices. On the other hand, if a participant mentioned a topic that was not in my research guide but seemed relevant to my research questions, I asked follow-up questions on the topic and I made a note to add this topic in my interview guide for future interviews (Carspecken, 1996; Fetterman, 1998). This approach helped me gather rich data relevant to each participant and also ensured that we did discuss all topics relevant to my research questions.

My interview guide was loosely based on Seidman's (1998) interview structure. The interview covered four main areas: (a) Background information about the participant; (b) Ethno-national self-identification and reasoning; (c) Past experiences relevant to ethno-national identity learning; (d) Political and historical events relevant to ethno-national identity learning; and (e) Participant's views about the future on the island (ideal future and feasible future). In most cases the five sections were not clearly divided during the interview. Sequencing of topics was influenced more by the flow of the interview than by any well-considered interview plan (Williams, 1984). For example, during background information gathering, when I asked where their parents came from (section one on the interview guide), one participant began talking about a past experiences visiting a parents' houses in the 'other side' when the buffer zone opened (a topic covered in section three of the interview guide). I allowed the participant talk about this

experience and later came back to fill out the gaps in their background information. My goal was to let participants to talk as much as possible without me intervening (Riessman, 2008). The interview guide was not used to structure the interview. It was rather used as a checklist to ensure that all the topics I wanted to examine were covered during the interview.

Before the interview I provided the consent form to the participants, let them read it and then explained verbally the purpose of the interview and the study. I pointed out their right to refuse to answer any of my questions and explained the procedure of the transcription and the analysis. The interview began only after I received the written and verbal consent of the participants to participate in the study and their permission to audio-record the interview.

The main interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed (Carspecken, 1996; Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2002; Patton 2002; Riessman, 2008). With the consent of the participants, I used two audio-recording devices to prevent data loss in case any of the devices failed. I transcribed the interviews myself, a practice that helped me familiarize myself with the data (Creswell, 2007; Fetterman, 1998; Merriam, 2002). Additionally, I took notes during and just after the interview reflecting on the participants' and my own reactions. During the transcription, I added non-lexical interactional content (pauses, silences, expressive sounds, body language) and comments based on these notes in an attempt to facilitate the analysis with information outside what was told (Riessman, 2008). I shared the interview transcripts with the participants who agreed to do so in order to verify the accuracy of my transcription and obtain their feedback with suggested changes and clarifications (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2002).

During the interviews, I observed participants' behaviors that included their attitudes, actions and reactions to my questions and any indications of emotion during the interviews. I took field notes during the face-to-face interviews, noting when I sensed that participants' emotions, moods, or any affective components were changed with the recall of their memories or the change of other contextual factors such as interruptions from a phone ringing or the waiter asking if we needed something else.

After the recorder was turned off, I usually continued talking with the participants. Some parts of these conversations were relevant to the study. I took notes of those during the conversations or as soon as the participant left, along with my general notes about the interview already taken. I used some of the information that was shared with me while the recorder was off, after I got permission from the participants. In one case after getting permission from the participant I turned the recorder back on after the end of the official interview.

Documents

Secondary data sources included public documents, hard copies and web based. Most of the documents were relevant to participants' experiences and events that they mentioned during their interviews and they were analyzed based on Creswell's (2009) guidelines. These included newspaper articles from historic events that participants talked about, like the 2004 referendum for the Annan Plan, history textbooks from participants' K-12 education period, documents from the Republic of Cyprus Ministry of Education's "I don't forget" school campaign, Republic of Cyprus government documents and

information from its website, the Republic of Cyprus Constitution, documents from the website of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and from political parties in the two communities, documents from the Museum of National Struggle in the south and north parts of the island, documents distributed on the two sides of the checkpoints on the Green Line and history books that participants mentioned that they read.

Data Analysis

Data analysis begins with collecting the first data (Carspecken, 1996; Charmaz, 2006; Emerson et al., 1995; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Wolcott, 1994). As Emerson et al. (1995) suggested, "...data do not stand alone: rather analysis pervades all phases of the research enterprise" (p. 144) from data collection through conclusions and theoretical propositions. Further all steps of the research are interconnected and interdependent. As Creswell (2007) neatly put it, "the process of data collection, data analysis, and report writing are not distinct steps in the process—they are interrelated and often go on simultaneously in a research project" (p. 150).

Multiple Case Study

This multiple case study (Stake, 1995; 1998; 2005; Yin, 2003), examines individual cases of young adults in Cyprus and the experiences that influenced their ethno-national identity learning. Each participant in this study was treated as a specific, bounded, information-rich case (Stake, 1995; 1998; 2005; Yin, 2003) that provided

insights and in-depth understanding of the phenomenon. Dewey's holistic approach to the concept of experience and learning, which I used as my theoretical framework, called for a holistic approach in studying the phenomenon, examining multiple facets of each individual's life experiences and the interconnections between experiences, reflections and the environment.

Stages of Analysis

First Stage of Analysis

The first stage of the data analysis was becoming familiar with data (Merriam, 2015; Patton, 2014; Riessman, 2008; Emerson et al., 1995). For this step, I began listening to the interviews and reading transcribed interviews, the field notes, and relevant documents. I then wrote memos, noted questions and drew diagrams reflecting on my earlier insights about links within and across data (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 1995). This process familiarized me with the data and provided me with ideas on how to manage data. It also enabled me to have a general sense of data characteristics and to contemplate the a priori classification originally conceptualized and supported me as I began to create a thick description.

Second Stage of Analysis

For precise data analysis I used the thematic analysis procedure proposed by Graneheim and Lundman (2003) that adopts analytic procedures from a number of

different qualitative traditions and proposes a systematic, rigorous procedure to analyze qualitative data. The themes helped me organize the interview data, but my analysis was based on the interviewee's profile as a whole rather than just on one or more themes or parts of the narrative. These procedures helped me identify themes and categories in each participant's responses and then enabled me to compare those themes and categories between participants.

The first step in this procedure was the identification of meaning units, the constellations of words or statements that relate to the same central meaning. The next step is to label the meaning units, a process that is widely known in qualitative analysis as coding. (See Table 3-1).

Table 3-1. Coding: Meaning units to codes

PARTICIPANT	MEANING UNIT	CODE
Fatma	But when I go back the most important thing that I can never forget is the history books during my pre-school, high school	Memorable history books
Fatma	... because we have really nationalistic history books during that time. That kind of nationalistic things in that books.	Nationalistic books
Fatma	at the end of the books we have too much photographies [photographs] of the killed people. And you know during my pre-school.	Pictures of killed people in history books
Fatma	I really don't want to bring the book together with me home because I'm really afraid of that people at the end of the book. Because you know what? The blood, killed people and eh...	Afraid of the killed people in the pictures in history books

Fatma	Because, you know, I am a child and I am really afraid to look that book, so I really don't want to study on history during that time.	Afraid to study history because of the pictures of killed people in the history books
Fatma	because they always said, "you are Turkish, Turkey came here and they protect us from the Greek-Cypriot."	-Imposed Turkish identity at school -Turkey protected the Turkish-Cypriots in 1974
Fatma	And the Cyprus history started to be [=exist], started from the 1970s and they accuse one side because all the conflict in island,	One sided presentation of history at school
Fatma	so that kind of nationalism in schools make me much more, make me to prefer the Cypriot [identity]	Nationalism in school made me prefer the Cypriot identity
Fatma	That time I realize why I don't want to identify myself as Turkish, when I learned the alternative way of thinking history.	I learned an alternative way of thinking about history
Fatma	I remember my history teacher in high school is also close to the leftist ideology. She also thinks that, OK, we don't have to use these books and she tried to make a kind of alternative way of learning history, so it is also really good for me during that time.	History teacher teaching alternative history
Fatma	Because when she started to explain some issues... eh... objectively in a sense, you started to understand some reasons and you started to understand [that] the other book is too much.... How to say? ... It's not objective and it's only accusing one side.	-History books were not objective -History teacher was teaching history objectively
Fatma	it's [the history book] trying to force you a kind of identity. This kind of thing.	The history books were trying to force the Turkish identity over the Cypriot identity

Fatma	You know I really hate that ceremony also because they always say it is for the children, it is the ceremony for the children to have fun, but we are not having fun under the sun.	She hated the national celebration because it was not really designed for the children
Fatma	And it's the end of April and we have to do some specific things in ... some songs that our teachers choose for us and you know it was not a fun, enjoyable thing for me. Because if it is the ceremony for children really, we can dance whatever we want.	The activities for the national celebrations were imposed to the children
Fatma	We don't have to have flags or specific clothes and everybody not supposed to be same and have same clothes and same colors. That kind of thing. It's not a image for me in my childhood. Probably it's also influenced me to be against flags.	Against flags because of how they were used in school national celebrations
Fatma	We don't have to use flags from Turkey, from TRNC, from Greece, may be we can have only one flag, probably it could be the flag of Cyprus Republic. So it can represent us all. But again I really don't like flags.	No need for flags and national symbols

The next step of data analysis, based on Graneheim and Lundman (2003), is creating sub-categories from codes and then categories and themes. A category is a group of content that shares a commonality. Patton (1987) described categories as internally homogeneous and externally heterogeneous. Theme work like "... a thread of an underlying meaning through, condensed meaning units, codes or categories, on an interpretative level" (p. 107) and they can be seen as an expression of the latent content of the text (Graneheim & Lundman, 2003) (see Table 3-2).

Table 3-2. Codes to themes

CODE	-Memorable history books - Nationalistic history books - Pictures of killed people in history books - Afraid of the killed people in the pictures in history books - Afraid to study history because of the pictures of killed people in the history books - One sided presentation of history at school -History books were not objective -The history books were trying to force the Turkish identity over the Cypriot identity.	-One sided presentation of history at school -History teacher was teaching history objectively	-I learned an alternative way of thinking about history - History teacher teaching alternative history -History teacher was teaching history objectively	Nationalism in school made me prefer the Cypriot identity	- She hated the national celebration because it was not really designed for the children - The activities for the national celebrations were imposed to the children	-Against flags because of how they were used in school national celebrations - No need for flags and national symbols
SUB-CATEGORY	History books	Teaching of history	Alternative way of history thinking	Turkish Nationalism at school	National celebration	Flags
CATEGORY	History Education			Nationalist activities at school		
THEME	The school was pushing towards the Turkish identity rather than the Cypriot identity, causing the reaction of some of the participants					

Third Stage of Analysis

During the third stage included repeatedly listened to the interviews and read the transcripts to understand how participants structured their stories in order to explain and rationalize their ethno-national identity learning (Riessman, 1993). I wanted to make sure that from the very early stages of my analysis I privileged the voice of the participants, keeping in mind, though, that a basic assumption of the dialogic/performance approach of narrative analysis is that that the recorded narrative is co-constructed and is the result of the interaction between the interviewer and the participant (Riessman, 2008).

Personal narratives as understood in narrative inquiry are stories describing past events that are structurally organized to present those events in a sequence that often has a beginning, middle, and ending with variations of temporality, structure, spatiality and reality (Gee, 1986; Labov & Waletzky, 2003; Polkinghorne, 1988; Riessman, 2008). I identified these distinct stories that had clear beginning, middle, and ending and I looked on how and whether stories that did not have these characteristics fit to the overall narrative. My participants' narratives aligned with the short story model as described by Labov and Walezky (2003) with key characteristics or the sequencing of events and the evaluation of these events. I identified four of the elements described by Labov and Walezky (2003) to apply in my participants' stories: (a) orientation, the stories began by providing the basis for the interviewer to understand the story; (b) evaluation, participants verbally or non-verbally indicated whether the story was important and if they agreed with what happened; (c) resolution, they presented how the situation was handled or

resolved; (d) coda, they usually ended with a statement that indicated the end of the story or they returned to the listener in the present.

I also recognized some smaller narratives that were imbedded within larger narratives, what Riessman (1993) called “embedded narrative segments within an overarching narrative” (p. 51). Riessman (1993) draws attention to the possibility of overlooking the larger plot or theme by just focusing on the short stories, something that I avoided by grouping smaller stories into bigger narratives, labeling them in one of three ways: examples of a narrative, explanations about a narrative, or response to a counter-narrative. According to Riessman (1997), “the way individuals craft their tales including the narrative genres they select, carry crucial interpretive understandings” (p. 157). Usually these shorter stories interpret another narrative and hence cannot be ignored as irrelevant. So it is important to find their function within an individual’s story.

The process of data analysis itself risks the danger of compromising the narrative itself. The narratives and the ideas in the narratives were privileged since the analysis was done using the interview data, but the act of identifying themes and stories within the narratives contributes to the interpretation—the meaning—of the narrative as it is presented in this document (Riessman, 2008).

Forth Stage of Analysis

The fourth stage of analysis and interpretation was to examine the interconnections between the narrative and the environment that defined the context, identifying “underlying propositions that make talk sensible, including what is taken for

granted by listener and speaker” (Riessman, 2008, p. 61). A basic assumption in narrative inquiry is that individual life and narratives expressed by individuals are influenced by the surrounding environment (social, cultural, political and other) and as a result carry those influences and external narratives found in the environment. Hence the expression of personal experiences and identities through narratives are not only personal but can also be expressions of social, cultural and political narratives in the individuals’ current or past environments (Riessman, 1993). This is an assumption that is also in line with Dewey’s holistic notion of experience and its interconnection with the environment (environing conditions), a topic discussed earlier.

I used Gee’s (2011) building tasks of language to help me identify and organize the elements relevant with ethno-national identity from the environment as they were expressed in participant’s narratives, as well as the ways in which the participants’ narratives presented their interaction with individuals, social and political structures and narratives in their environment. Gee’s seven building tasks of language are:

(a) *Significance*, that is the value and meaning of something and it was identified through repeated words, phrases, and experiences, and intonation or changes in voice volume; (b) the *types of activities* and experiences that participants chose to describe doing and desiring to do and the activities that they avoided; (c) the *types of identities* they performed, rejected, or desired to perform; (d) the *sorts of relationships* they described having and those they would have liked to have; (e) their *perceptions of social goods*, what goods they considered important to have; (f) the *connections and disconnections* between past, present, and future, people, things; and (g) the *systems of knowledge* and ways of knowing that were privileged in particular settings.

In this stage I also paid particular attention to the context in which the narrative took place. Elements like, when, where and why the interviews and narratives took place, and who is the interviewer and what was his role in the narrative construction, are inevitably influencing what is being said and they need to be kept I mind during the analysis. As Riessman (2003) notes, “settings and relationships constrain what can be narrated and shape the way a particular story develops” (p. 4).

Fifth Stage of Analysis

The fifth stage of analysis included the interpretation of the narratives using the theoretical framework that was based on Dewey’s ontological notion of experience and its interconnection to learning and identity; and Hager’s and Halliday’s (2009) notions of informal and lifelong learning. Dewey calls for a holistic examination of each phenomenon, meaning that as many aspects of the environment and as deeply as possible need to be examined in order to deeply understand phenomena like ethno-national identity learning. Hager and Halliday call for an examination of learning processes as lifelong and similarly to Dewey suggest detailed examination of phenomena. Based on these two approaches I examined ethno-national identity for each participant separately, uncovering experiences not only from the participants’ current experiences but also from their past and put together the puzzle of interconnected lifelong experiences that influenced their ethno-national identity learning. I will not elaborate on the theoretical foundations of these two theories here since I tackle them in detail in Chapter 2 where I describe my theoretical framework.

These two theories are in the foundations of my analysis and interpretation of ethno-national identity learning and they also guided my presentation of the findings. Specifically they guided the detailed presentation of participants' experiences and the detailed examination of the interconnections between experiences and the environment in each of the four cases examined in this study. Throughout my analysis the word "experience" and "environment" refers to Dewey's definitions of these concepts.

Researcher's Identity

One of my main concerns, but one can also be proven to be a strength of this study, is the fact that I could have been one of my participants, fulfilling all the criteria for participation in the study. I expected that I would connect with some of the stories I heard and had very similar experiences throughout my life. This gave me a unique advantage in understanding and connecting with the participants' points of view. This was particularly valuable in the data analysis stage, as it enabled me to read between the lines of what was said. It also creates an issue: that I may have gone into the research with presuppositions or preconceptions based on my own life experiences related to this same phenomenon in the exact same place and in some cases the exact same time.

Further, coming from the Greek-Cypriot community and interviewing Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots on the topic of ethno-national identity can be a source of bias. Throughout the study I kept in mind the possible biases that I specifically addressed in memos in my audit trail at the very early stages of the study and throughout the process of conducting the research. I consciously tried to be aware of my biases and

question my interpretations during the interviews and the analysis of the data. I further discuss the topic in the “Data Quality” section.

Further, I consider myself a person without strong opinions about my ethno-national identity (this was the case even before I began researching the topic) and genuine curiosity to understand the phenomenon, which has helped me keep an open mind while listening to people whose views were different than mine. Throughout my adult life I was confused about what my ethno-national identity was. This was something that helped me question it since I remember, trying to find out if people around me had clearer understanding and better explanations than the ones I had to offer. I consider myself member of the Greek-Cypriot community, citizen of the Republic of Cyprus and the European Union. On the one hand, I do understand and appreciate the historical and current cultural connections and similarities with both the Greeks of the mainland and the Turkish-Cypriots. On the other hand I do consider the people in the Greek-Cypriot community as different than the mainland Greeks and the Turkish-Cypriots, which I do not think is an issue. These differences is what makes me and my community unique and the similarities is what the two communities in Cyprus can built on to accept and respect their differences.

Most of my impressions of the other community have been created through education, especially in primary school, and from conversations with friends and family members. The first time I met a Turkish-Cypriot was at the age of 24 when I participated in a Fulbright conference in Cyprus. Only then did I realize that the constructs of my imagination concerning ‘the other’ were not real, fair, or representative. Even though many young people from both sides of the island (some of them close friends of mine)

are trying to approach the other community and engage in bi-communal activities, there is still a significant problem of reduced trust and respect for ‘the other.’ Researchers have already pointed out that this is partly because of a biased educational system. In my opinion, however, there is also a need to look at other aspects of the social life outside the formal school setting. Through my research I came to understand that ethno-national identities in Cyprus for many individuals significantly change after individuals graduate from their K-12 education and begin to have experiences outside the school system, something that was also the case for me. Like many people of my generation in Cyprus, I reflected and rationalized what I think of my ethno-national identity and this happened after I graduated from high school.

Data Quality

Lincoln and Guba (1986) identified two criteria in assessing the quality of qualitative research: academic rigor, which refers to credibility and trustworthiness; and authenticity, which relates to the fair “presentation of different value and belief systems” (p. 79). To address authenticity, I used my theoretical framework and research questions to constantly guide all the aspects of the research project (Baptiste, 2006; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Peer briefing was another important component of the credibility of this study. My dissertation advisor and my committee co-chair were critical peers providing feedback and reflective conversation since the proposal stages of this project. Peer debriefings were formal and informal sessions and covered theory and methodology. I

also consulted two other scholars familiar with the Cyprus context, one who studies ethno-national identity issues in Cyprus and another who studies conflict and education in Cyprus.

Additionally, I used member checking to establish credibility throughout the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). After the initial stage of analysis when I repeatedly listened to the interviews, I met face-to-face or had a phone call with participants, asking them to clarify some of their responses. Further, I sent the interview transcripts to the participants and I asked them to let me know if there were parts in the transcript that they felt misrepresented what they said. Two of the participants approved the transcripts as they were and the other two suggested changes that I adopted. I also shared parts of my analysis with the participants and I took their feedback in consideration when putting together the final version of the analysis write ups.

Regarding authenticity, I tried to keep as many parts of the interview intact and the presentation of their narratives as close to the narrator's story and associated meanings as possible by including large excerpts of what they said in the presentation of my analysis in this report, following Riessman's (1993) examples and keeping in mind that we lose shades of authenticity with each level of abstraction (Riessman, 1993). I provided a rich presentation of participants' sentiments in their own words, providing both detail for the readers to make their own assessments and also privilege the voice of the narrator. I struggled with the decision to present their words as said or to restructure them grammatically to direct the focus away from how they spoke to what they had to say. Ultimately, I chose to avoid changing their words as much as possible and retain their vernacular and use explanations in parenthesis. In cases where it was tough for the

reader to understand what a participant said I restructured participants' sentences to make them more readable. Further, in line with the structural component of the dialogic/performance approach, I provided support for my interpretations by linking them to features of the text, drawing primarily upon Gee (2011), O'Connor (1994), and Fairclough (2003).

Additionally, I discussed how my positionality influenced the interpretation and analysis (see also "Researcher's identity" section). As Ruthellen (2007) stated, "the researcher's self, with its fantasies, biases, and horizons of understanding is the primary tool of inquiry so self-knowledge and self-reflection are necessary" (p. 545) when conducting research in social sciences. Consequently, it was important to bracket my assumptions by not assuming common interpretations and asking definition and clarification questions. In addition, I presented the dialogic context through 'framing' the narratives so that others can assess the 'fit' of my analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1986, p. 77).

I continuously problematized my positionality as Greek-Cypriot and researcher. Keeping research memos about my reflections on the interviews and ongoing data analysis in my audit trail was one of the ways to ensure my transparency about my positionality throughout the research process. Throughout the study I kept in mind the possible biases that I specifically addressed in my research memos from the very early stages of the study and throughout the process of conducting the research. I consciously tried to be aware of my biases and questioned my interpretations during the interviews and the analysis of the data.

Limitations of the Study

Although for this study I selected one participant for each one of the ethno-national self-identifications identified in my pilot studies for this age group (born between 1980 and 1990), these participants are not representative of their age group in their community. As I explain in the discussions section of this report, I examined each participant as a separate and unique case. Additionally, the selection criteria for participation in this study were very narrow and excluded people from the two communities that do not belong to this age group, or people within the age group who are not fluent in English or did not spend at least three years abroad.

Further, that I am myself Greek-Cypriot can be a source of bias for studying the phenomenon of ethno-national identity in my community and in the Turkish-Cypriot community. Since I have already discussed my possible biases relevant to this point in the “Researcher’s identity” section I will not discuss it further here. There is though one more limitation that originates from the fact that I am Greek-Cypriot. Following Riesman’s (2008) dialogic/performance approach means that the produced narrative from each interview was the interaction between a Greek-Cypriot (the researcher) and a Turkish-Cypriot (the participant). Both Fatma and Mustafa (the Turkish-Cypriot participants) were very comfortable talking with me about their ethno-national self-identification. Nevertheless, there were few instances when Mustafa expressed his opinion about the Greek-Cypriot community and used the words “you” (for example “you need to change” this) referring to the Greek-Cypriot community that included also the researcher. So he was talking to me primarily as a member of the Greek-Cypriot

community rather as a researcher. On the contrary, Fatma in her narratives addressed me primarily as a researcher rather than as a Greek-Cypriot.

The interviews were conducted in English, which is not the native language of the participants. Although all four participants were fluent in English and studied in English-speaking universities, I expect that they would have been equally or more fluent in expressing themselves in their native language. I informed them at the very beginning of the interview that if at any point during the interviews, language became an issue in expressing themselves, they could have used their native language. In the cases that they did so, they right after translated what they said into English. In some occasions they also asked if I could help with a specific word they were looking for, to express themselves better, which I did.

I chose to conduct the interviews in English for few reasons. First, the interviews with Turkish-Cypriot participants needed to be in English since I am not fluent enough in Turkish to conduct interviews in Turkish. I would otherwise have had to conduct them in Turkish with a translator, which would have added another level of interpretation in the analysis of the narratives (Borchgrevink, 2003; Holmes et al., 2013). I chose to avoid this. Further, this report is produced in English so even had the interviews been conducted and analyzed in the participants' native languages, the interviews would have needed to be translated in order to be able to include quotes from the interviews in this report based on Riessman's (1995; 2008) recommendations.

The accuracy or reliability of distant experiences of ten or more years is also a limitation of studies that investigate a phenomenon based on past experiences (Galatariotou, 2008). Due to the nature of the research questions in this study, though,

accuracy was not of an essence. For the purposes of this study it is not the accuracy of the memory of the experience that was important, but the truthfulness (for the participant) of the memory of what happened and the influence of the memory (accurate or not) to participants' current perceptions and self-identifications. If the participant was convinced that the memory was accurate, it was good enough for this study, regardless if what they remembered was exactly what happened.

The Cyprus Context and Rationale for a Comparative Study

This study compares experiences that influence ethno-national identity learning among young adults that were born between 1980 and 1990 and raised in the Greek-Cypriot community or the Turkish-Cypriot community in Cyprus and their perceptions about their ethno-national identity. The case of Cyprus presents a unique situation where two communities (the Greek-Cypriot and the Turkish-Cypriot) live side by side but are separated by a physical division line, a buffer zone or the Green Line, as people on the island prefer to call it. For the past 42 years the boundaries have been creating not only a geographical division but also a cultural, linguistic, political, religious, and educational one, since it separates the two communities—which had distinct differences before the division—and let them develop in their separate ways with no contact with the people of the other community. These differences, though historically imposed by the division of 1974, have created two ethnic groups within one island and one internationally-recognized country called Cyprus. Nevertheless, the two communities operate as separate entities: the internationally-recognized Republic of Cyprus that controls the north part of

the island and the illegal state of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, heavily influenced by Turkey that retains 40,000 soldiers in the north part of the island. This *de facto* division of the two people for 42 years calls for an examination of any social issue in each community separately and justifies a comparative approach in researching these issues in the two sides of the island, given that the criteria for comparability and equivalence proposed in the comparative approach apply. As explained in the introduction, the comparative method enables for a deeper understanding of the phenomenon under examination and can better inform negotiators and policy makers in their attempts to develop a plan for the solution of the Cyprus problem that will respect individuals' ethno-national self-identifications and potentially be accepted by the people from both communities.

The criteria for comparability and equivalence proposed by Raivola (1985) can be applied in the case of the experiences that influence ethno-national identity learning among young adults in the two communities in Cyprus. These young people were born and grew up in an all Greek-Cypriot environment (in the case of Greek-Cypriots) or in an all Turkish-Cypriot environment (in the case of Turkish-Cypriots) without direct contact with the other community growing-up. They did not experience the violence between the two communities that took place between 1963 and 1974. Segregated from the other community, their experience with the 'other' was limited to the stories told by their parents and grandparents, and the Greek-oriented history or Turkish-oriented education (respectively) that they received during their elementary, middle school, and high school years.

Raivola (1985), drawing from the writing of other comparative researchers like Pedro Rossello (1963), stated that the “concept of comparison has been insufficiently investigated” (p. 362). In his 1985 article for the *Comparative Educational Review*, he attempted to point to ways in which the concept of comparison can be methodologically approached. He pointed out the importance of the fulfillment of the essential condition for comparison, which is the identification of comparison variables, variables that are sufficient enough to describe all the phenomena (or units) that are about to be compared. He suggested that based on the comparison variables the researcher should form points of reference (or equivalence criteria or *tertium comparationis*) for every comparison to be established. These points of reference should be the lowest common denominator of the two (or more) phenomena that the researcher intends to compare (or units of comparison). It is a common variable, a third dimension that is constant for all the units under comparison. This ensures that all units can be examined on the basis of these common variables that Raivola named *tertium comparationis*. These common variables should function as comparison variables when comparing the units and form equivalence criteria for the classification of phenomena (or units of comparison in this case). Due to the fact that these variables are the lowest common denominators they allow the comparison of attributes common to both situations (or phenomena or units of comparison).

The Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities be compared in many ways, but the comparison that I attempt has to do with the ethno-national identity learning of young adults in the two communities, specifically comparing: the ethno-national identity learning of the Greek-Cypriots young adult participants and the ethno-national identity

learning of the Turkish-Cypriots young adult participants. Below I will analyze the elements that will serve as the common variables for the comparison of the phenomenon of ethno-national identity learning in the two communities (the *tertium comparationis*, the lower common denominators). To identify the common variables, I will use the concepts of equivalence and variability as described by Raivola (1985).

Equivalence

Often researchers in comparative education, in an attempt to identify and define the common variable in two phenomena, treat comparability as a unidimensional property (Raivola, 1985). In an attempt to resolve this issue, Raivola drew from and analyzed the work of Nowak on the types of relations in theoretical research. Nowak identified five types of relation in theoretical research that rely on the concept of equivalence or correspondence (for the purposes of this paper I will be using the term equivalence rather than the term correspondence). Raivola explained how these five types of relations (identified by Nowak) translate in the field of comparative education: (a) Cultural equivalence: Phenomena are observed in the same way in different cultures; (b) Contextual equivalence: The objects of comparison (people or institutions) are part of a higher level of systems that have earlier been defined as equivalents; (c) Functional equivalence: The objects have the same role in the functioning of the system; (d) Correlative equivalence: Phenomena correlate empirically in the same way with the criterion variable; (e) Genetic equivalence: The phenomena under comparison derive from the same source, namely, the same conceptual class.

Cultural equivalence: Phenomena are observed in the same way in different cultures

Cultural equivalence is based on the assumption of uniformity, that there are certain elements of human activity that can be met in all cultures and thus can serve as the common variables for the purposes of comparison. This idea is rooted in the concept of parallelism that cultural anthropologists use to suggest that “all forms of culture have the same evolutionary development curve, which emerges when they are compared side by side” (Raivola, 1985, p. 367). The concept of parallelism is based on the inherent unity of human psyche, the idea that all human beings are made to function in very similar ways. Thus, human creations, the greater of them being human cultures, are very similar in nature to each other.

Cultural equivalence rests on the concept of convergence that in social sciences means the movement towards a “stable condition, a dominant system, or an ideal” (Raivola, 1985, p. 366) that translates to isomorphism in the field of comparative education. According to Raivola (1985) when performing comparative analysis we need to pay attention to the isomorphism of the elements of the system.

The elements of the system can be evidenced, as based on experience (analogy), as based on generally valid normative rules (homology), or by setting out specific conditions and prerequisites of uniformity (explanation).

Cultural equivalence is the type of relation that seems most appropriate for the purposes of my study. Drawing from Raivola’s suggestion that comparative analysis should focus attention on the isomorphism of the elements of the system, I think that in

my study isomorphism can be identified in the form of analogy, homology and explanation, as explained below.

Homology: Isomorphism based on generally valid normative rules

The norm that can be used as a basis of the comparison in my study is nationhood and from nationhood, the norm found in all modern cultures, ethnic and national identity. Nationhood is a phenomenon observed in every culture around the world today (Anderson, 1983). In fact, it has been so, since the early stages of modernity at the end of 19th century along with the idea of the nation (Anderson, 1983; Smith, 1991; Gellner, 1983) (For more details see section on National Identity.) Nationhood is so embedded in today's societies that it can be described as the need of contemporary people to be associated to a nation (Eley & Suny, 1996; Smith, 1991). Nationhood is the common variable of any culture, an element that can be found in any culture around the world, making it a norm. Consequently, it can be used as a generally valid normative rule for the purposes of cultural equivalence. Nationhood is a claim that both Greek and Turkish-Cypriots are making. It is the lowest common denominator that can be used to compare the construction of national identity in the two communities/cultures.

Explanation: By setting out the specific conditions and prerequisites of uniformity

The key question that answers the equivalence test is: how do the two communities link (or claim) their nationhood to Cyprus? First, recall that most of the

members of the two communities include the word “Cypriot” in their self-definition of their national identity. Whether they identify as Cypriot, Greek-Cypriot or Turkish-Cypriot, through their identity they claim some connection to Cyprus.

The question now that will also help me answer the question of equivalence is how each community makes its claim. What are the tools that each one of them uses to prove the connection to Cyprus and hence verify their claim to Cypriot identity? The answer that applies to both communities includes four elements that directly relate to the concepts of nationhood and national identity: history, heritage, language, and birthplace. These elements can be used as common variables (under the umbrella of cultural equivalence) for the comparison of the construction of national identity in the two communities. Here I explain how the people in the two communities claim their nationhood and national identity based on them:

History. Greek-Cypriots trace their history on the island as far as 14th century B.C. when the first Greeks the Mycenaeans (that are considered the first Greeks, since they were the first people to speak the Greek language) arrived to the island. They created new kingdoms and intermixed with the indigenous people of the island, communicating the Greek culture to the people of the island.

Turkish-Cypriots trace their history back to the time of the Ottoman Empire’s presence on the island between 1571-1878 A.C. After the Ottomans leased the island to the British and left Cyprus, many Muslims stayed to form the Turkish-Cypriot community.

There is another interesting argument about the history of the existence of the two communities on the island. Supported by some historians but not yet confirmed

(Papadakis, 2008), this argument attests that many of the today's Turkish-Cypriots were in fact Christians who changed their religion to Muslim in order to avoid the tax imposed on Christians citizens by the Ottoman Empire. If true, this means that Greek- and Turkish-Cypriots share common history before the Ottoman era.

Heritage. Heritage is the most complex common element of cultural equivalence identified in the two communities in Cyprus, as the heritage of both communities has a dual character. The Greek-Cypriot community has a partly Greek and partly Cypriot heritage, the former coming from the cultural connection to Greek ancestors and the later coming from the connection to the land (the space) of these ancestors. Similarly, the Turkish-Cypriot community has a dual heritage, the Turkish heritage and the Cypriot heritage.

The Cypriot heritage is common for the two communities, not only conceptually (coming from the island of Cyprus) but also literally, since Greek and Turkish Cypriots, with very few exceptions, shared common villages, towns, cities and many times even neighborhoods. Talking about common Cypriot heritage between the two communities goes as close as a common neighborhood. As the ethnographer Rebecca Bryant (2010) noted, the connection of Cypriots with the actual building of their house and their neighborhood is remarkable. They usually spend most of their life in only two houses (their parents' house where they are born and raised and the house they move into after marriage), making the connection even stronger.

The common Cypriot identity was also expressed in another form of identification that was developed in the two communities, mostly through education and the teaching of history. This is,

the image of a small but defiant Cypriot people which since the dawn of history have been destined to suffer and to fight for their freedom and survival against big and powerful peoples who made their way through Cyprus or conquered it due to its advantageous geographical location. This representation of who 'we' are was embedded into the narrative of autonomy and heteronomy. (Klerides, 2008, p. 253)

However, the Greek heritage, attached to the Greek identity and promoted by the narratives of Hellenism and Christianity,

...portrayed a Greco-Christian people who had been Hellenized and Christianized in the mist of time and since then have been engaged in a struggle to safeguard their Hellenic cultural heritage and Orthodox faith against attempts by foreign powers to de-Hellenize and de-Christianize them. Despite these efforts, the people stubbornly hold to their traditions and managed to maintain their Greek consciousness and the Greco-Christian character of the island. (Klerides, 2008, p. 253)

The co-existence of a Greek position with its focus on preservation of the Greek part of the identity and exclusion of anyone who was not Greek, and a Cypriot one with its emphasis on transformation, unity, and inclusion creates what Papadakis (1998) called "the dilemma of the Greek Cypriot identity"(p. 136). Although this dilemma had long existed within the community, it emerged in a radical form after 1974. "On the one hand, Greek Cypriots' dependence on Greece and belief in their Greek origins and cultural heritage requires emphasis on the 'Greek' aspect. On the other hand, the need for rapprochement with the Turkish Cypriots leads to an emphasis on the common 'Cypriot'

dimension" (Papadakis, 1998, p. 136). A similar dilemma began its development in the Turkish-Cypriot community during 1980s and reached its peak during the past decade.

The dominant opinion between researchers of the national identity issues in Cyprus is that education in both communities plays the role of the guardian of both Turkish and Cypriot identity for the Turkish-Cypriot community and both the Greek and Cypriot identity for the people in the Greek-Cypriot community. "The main purpose of national education was to preserve and hand on the heritage of a nation, and by means of this heritage, to foster a sense of national belongingness among citizens and assure the continuity of the nation" (Klerides, 2008, p. 9). According to Mallinson (2005), "It is through the education of the immature [i.e. children] that each society strives to protect and perpetuate its traditions and its aspirations" (p. 14).

Another element that can be used as a common variable for cultural equivalence in the case of the ethno-national identity in Cyprus is religion. The Greek-Orthodox and the Turkish-Muslim are terms in the everyday vocabulary of the people on the island. Religion is an integral part of the cultural heritage, particularly for the older generations. Religion is a source of pride and conflict on the island and a very distinct difference between the two communities.

Language. A fourth element that can be used as normative rule for comparison between the two communities is language. Contrary to the other three elements, it connects not to the Cypriot claim but to the Turkish or Greek claim as the Greek-Cypriot community speaks Greek and the Turkish Cypriot community speaks Turkish. Both communities are taught the language of their respective "motherland" at school. Older generations, particularly Turkish-Cypriots, spoke both languages since the Greek was the

language of commerce before 1974 and, as Greek-Cypriots were the majority of the population, knowing Greek made life easier to navigate.

For the people that were born after the separation of the two communities in 1974, language is a very different story. Without contact with the other community, there was no longer the need to learn the language of the “other.” Because of the violent events of the 1960s and the invasion of 1974, parents didn’t want their kids to know the language of the enemy (Bryant, 2010). A whole generation of Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots born after 1974 speak only the one language spoken in their community, making communication with the other community practically impossible. There is a solution: English, which is strongly encouraged as a second language in both communities.

One can argue that language reinforces the Greek or Turkish claim of national identity. But, upon a closer look it is evident that language is also related to the claim of Cypriot nationhood. The dialect spoken—in linguistic terms, the Cypriot-Greek dialect—by Greek-Cypriots speak is very unique to the island of Cyprus. Although the official language of the Republic of Cyprus is the Standard Modern Greek dialect (the same as spoken in Greece), Greek-Cypriots rarely use the Standard Modern Greek dialect in their verbal communications, preferring to use the Cypriot-Greek dialect. Standard Modern Greek is used for written communication and, if spoken at all, is spoken with a distinct accent.

This also happens in the Turkish-Cypriot community, where the official language is Turkish, but everyday conversations happen in a Cypriot-Turkish dialect. This use of the Cypriot-Turkish dialect is even more intentional, since it distinguishes the Turkish-Cypriots from the Turkish settlers that were brought to Cyprus from Turkey after the

invasion of 1974. A very interesting detail (that cannot be explored further here) is the fact that neither the Cypriot-Greek dialect nor the Cypriot-Turkish dialect are written languages.

Birthplace. The claim of nationhood and national identity very often is located to the birthplace. If one was born in Cyprus, he will claim his link to Cyprus by identifying as Cypriot. However, in Cyprus the birthplace it is not a standalone claim. The person may self-identify as Cypriot, but the rest of the population may not consider him/her as Cypriot if he is not a fluent Cypriot-Greek or Cypriot-Turkish speaker. Language is the key element that can support the claim of Cypriots that is claimed based on birthplace (Klerides, 2008).

Comparability

Comparability according to Good (1959) is “the condition existing when two measures are expressed in the same units thus making possible direct comparison” (p. 114). Expressing two measures in the same units it is not always easy when comparing different cultures. This is part of what makes comparative education challenging in some cases. Raivola (1985) asks the question raised by many researchers inside the field of comparative education but mostly from researchers outside the field: “Is it possible to compare different social and/or cultural systems and units scientifically?” (p. 368). In other words, is it possible to compare seemingly different phenomena? Is it possible to compare apples and oranges? The answer to these questions is “yes, if” certain conditions are fulfilled. Warwick and Osherson (1973) break down the first question into smaller,

relatively simpler questions that comparative researchers need to answer in order to justify the comparability of the phenomena they examine (Raivola, 1985). The sub-questions that Warwick and Osherson suggested are: (a) whether the concepts under comparison correspond, (b) how can the correspondence of measurement be assessed, and (c) whether any problems of linguistically expression of concepts can be resolved. Here I examine if and how these sub-questions can be addressed for the purposes of this study.

Do the concepts under comparison correspond?

This question wants to make sure that the concepts investigated have the same meaning in the different cultures that are being compared. It ensures that the definitions of the concepts used correspond are defined the same way in the cultures that are being compared. Lastly, this question intends to examine how easy is to identify the concepts.

How is the correspondence of measurements to be assessed?

Warwick and Osherson (1973) suggested that researchers look for valid indicators for the concepts they are using or planning to use. Researchers need to keep in mind that “there are often different indicators for the same concept depending on the particular bond with culture” (Raivola, 1985, p. 369). Raivola gives the example of age and wonders whether age should be treated as a purely chronological concept or as a socially normative factor, since two years of difference between children means something

different than a two-year difference between adults. Identifying such different indicators in different cultures creates the ground for comparability to exist and makes the comparison possible and comparability possible.

In the case of the Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots, such an issue of the correspondence of measurement does not exist. Even though the two communities have lived apart the last 42 years and there are definitely developments in each culture that are much different from the other, these two communities lived together for centuries and shared many cultural similarities. They spoke the language of each other and understood culturally developed concepts in the other community. The few exceptions usually involve religion, the cultural element that is very distinct between the two communities. For the concepts that I am interested in—nationhood, nationality, national identity and ethnic identity—the two communities share a common set of concepts not only from years of living together but also because of the “Cypriot problem.” The Cypriot problem is rooted in ethno-national identity so closely that from the very beginning the people from the two communities needed to have a common understanding of such concepts in order to be able to communicate their political positions. Through the media, people from both communities were able to deeply understand and articulate terminologies related on national identity from the very early stages of the conflict. One can be surprised from the level of conceptual understanding of terms like national identity, simply because the situation forced them to do so (Bryant, 2010).

Can the problem of how concepts are linguistically expressed be resolved?

The features of culture and language (inextricably linked) occur from semantic fuzziness even within the same culture, and obviously among various cultures. Some of the terms found in one culture and expressed by the language of that culture might not exist in another language/cultures. How will it be possible to compare a concept found in one culture with a concept that the second culture did not even conceptualize and as a result is not reflected in its language? The comparative researcher needs to address this issue and find appropriate ways to express the same concepts in different cultures. If this is not possible, then great questions will be raised about the comparability aspect of such study.

Hence, Warwick and Osherson (1973) cautioned researchers to be conscious of this, particularly in attempts to translate international documents into diverse languages. They recommended the assistance of bilingual or multilingual experts for this task and also the use of repeated translations, back and forth, in order to limit vagueness.

The linguistic expression of concepts can be a valid issue for my study if not carefully addressed. I have spoken to professional translators who speak Greek, Turkish, and English to make sure that the basic concepts that I am using are expressed similarly in the three languages. From this examination it seems that there will be no such issue, at least in regards to the basic concepts of the study. All the terms correspond to English, the language used in the interviews and in this report. Also the participants were fluent in Greek and English or Turkish and English and were able to express all their ideas in English. Nevertheless, I gave them the option to let me know about terms that they

wanted to express that they felt did not translate well in English. None of the participants raised this issue during the interviews or when they reviewed the transcripts. Ultimately, I wanted them to be able to articulate their thoughts in the most accurate way using whichever language accomplishes that best.

Chapter 4

Data Analysis and Discussion

Presentation of Findings

Fatma and Mustafa, the Turkish-Cypriot participants, both grew-up in the Turkish-Cypriot community and self-identify as Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot respectively. Maria and Nicolas, the Greek-Cypriot participants, both grew-up in the Greek-Cypriot community and self-identify as Cypriot and Greek-Cypriot respectively. To understand how each of the participants learned their respective ethno-national identity, their cases needed to be examined individually, taking into consideration as many of the environing conditions as possible. The environing conditions (referred as environment in this study) help me define the context (Dewey, 1925; Elkjaer, 2009) and be able to look at the phenomenon of ethno-national identity holistically for each one of them as suggested by Dewey. In examining these four cases separately, I identified a number of experiences that influenced the ethno-national self-identification for each one of the participants and they are presented in the first part of this chapter separately for each participant.

Although the specific experiences were unique to each participant, I identified broader thematic experiences that some or all of the participants experienced (i.e. experiences abroad, schooling experiences, experiences interacting with people from the other community). In the second part of this chapter I present and discuss similarities and

differences of those broader thematic experiences that apply to more than one of the participants. I compare the two participants from each community to each other and I also compare participants from the one community to participants from the other using the comparative cross-cultural method. The process of cross-cultural comparisons helped me deeper understand the phenomenon of ethno-national identity learning (Crosselly & Broadfoot, 1992; Nieben, 1982; Rosselló, 1963) and provide a holistic view of the phenomenon on the island of Cyprus.

Dewey pointed out that when attempting to understand complex phenomena, we sometimes analyze them into various components and create conceptual distinctions. He does not reject this practice, provided it does not lead to fixed dualisms and out-of-context conclusions. Hager & Halliday (2009) who used Dewey's theory to examine informal learning, similarly to Dewey's point, suggested that,

... for analytical and practical purposes, understanding of learning is usually best served by distinguishing individual learners or groups of learners from the contexts in which they operate as learning takes place. However, in making this distinction, it is crucial to not bring in the trappings of abstract rationality whereby the learner and what is learnt are both viewed as things independent of the environment, and what is learnt is somehow wholly located within the learner. Abstract rationality can be seen as the extreme opposite for the Deweyan position that in the widest sense learning only takes place in the context. (p. 168-169)

During this part of my analysis I will make explicit references to the context and the environments in which ethno-national identity learning occurred in each case and in

each time period, in order to avoid fixed out-of-context conclusions about the phenomenon. In this examination of ethno-national identity learning, the social and historical context will be points of particular emphasis, due to their complex involvement in phenomenon in hand.

Dewey's ontological notion of experience and its interconnection to learning and identity; and Hager's and Halliday's (2009) notions of informal and lifelong learning are in the foundations of my analysis and interpretation of ethno-national identity learning and they also guided my presentation of the findings. Specifically they guided the detailed presentation of participants' experiences and the detailed examination of the interconnections between experiences and the environment in each of the four cases examined in this study. Throughout my analysis the word "experience" and "environment" refers to Dewey's definitions of these concepts.

The length of a segment that is used in the analysis depends on the length of the story presented in each case by the participants and the particular characteristics of each narrator (i.e., the way he structures his stories) but also depends on choices made by the researcher. In the next section, I present mostly lengthy segments from the transcripts in the analysis and discussion of each case, a choice informed by the work of a number of narrative researchers (see Labov, 1972; Riessman, 2003; Williams, 1984) that use longer segments for a number of reasons. For this study I adopted Williams' (1984) technique. As Riessman (2008) explained, Williams worked in a single interview at a time, using fairly lengthy segments or excerpts from long interview narratives, in an attempt to present the experiences he investigated as a whole. At a second stage he isolated episodes from each narrative and compared them to episodes from other individual cases, a

process that he used to map the phenomenon at hand. This holistic approach in analyzing the narratives that describe experiences helped me better illustrate the connections to Dewey's theory that also supports the holistic examination of experiences.

In the case of this study, the lengthy segments from the interviews also privilege the voice of the narrators and reduces the risk of compromising the narrative through the process of data analysis. In essence, it mitigates the power of the researcher over the participants' narratives. In addition, it gives the opportunity to the reader to interact with participants' words and leaves it to the reader to "grapple with the many meanings suggested in the text (readings, of course, will vary with one's interpretative framework)" (Riessman, 2008, p. 39). The possibility of different meanings from the same narrative text is one of the fundamental assumptions of narrative inquiry (Riessman, 2008).

It also provides insight into to how participants structure their narratives, a feature that can give information about how participants prioritized certain elements of an experience and the weight they gave to those elements, features that are lost when narratives from the interviews are presented in small segments. Further, this approach helped me to keep a story 'intact' for the reader (Riessman, 2008) during the presentation of the findings and the discussion.

Turkish-Cypriot Participants

Fatma's Narratives and Experiences

At the time of the interview, Fatma lived in Nicosia in the north part of the island. Born in the late 1980s, she lived in the north part of the island until the age of 18 and she attended public elementary, middle, and high school there. She moved to Turkey for her undergraduate studies in political science and international relations and lived there for four years. After that, she moved to northern Europe for a couple of years where she did her Masters.

Fatma was very familiar with the island's history and the ethno-national identity issues in both communities mostly because of her studies in political science and her involvement in the youth of the Cumhuriyetçi Türk Partisi (Republican Turkish Party, CTP) a left-wing Turkish-Cypriot political party. She could fluently talk about her national identity, the political situation in Cyprus, and her opinions about ethno-national identity issues in Cyprus like the phenomenon of multiple ethno-national identity in the two communities. Although she was familiar with the politics in the Greek-Cypriot community, she was considerably more informed about the politics in the Turkish-Cypriot community. It seemed to me that her opinions about most of the topics we talked about were not formed on the spot; she had reflected on these issues before and her opinions were crystallized before the interview.

Self-Identification

Fatma self-identified as Cypriot and explained that her self-identification was influenced by the current political situation on the island, the division and the isolation of her community. As she explained, “it is a kind of reaction to the conflict on the island.” Her desire for a unified island directed her to choose the Cypriot rather than the Turkish-Cypriot identity although as she admitted the Cypriot identity without the Turkish part was many times confusing to people outside the island,

... when I went abroad for my university education, especially when I went to [she mentioned the name of the country in northern Europe], everybody asked me, because when you meet someone everybody asks where are you from? I said Cyprus. Oh OK! [they answer] Greek side or Turkish side. That’s the second question always you face. And I started to OK eh what should I say? Because really, I don’t want to say I am a Turkish or I am a Greek or ... that kind of things but I’m from Cyprus, and I started to say, OK I am Cypriot and I am coming from northern part of Cyprus... So during that time I started to think a lot, “Am I a Cypriot or a Turkish-Cypriot? Who am I?”

She explained that she felt she was very different than Turks from the mainland which—according to her—should have been obvious to anyone if she identified as Turkish-Cypriot but this was not the case. “They always ask, ‘OK you are a Turkish-Cypriot, so you are Turkish!’” Identifying as Cypriot is her attempt to emphasize where she comes from (Cyprus), which for her is more important than her ethnic identity (Turkish). Fatma did not dismiss her Turkish heritage or the similarities with the Turks

from the mainland, but she felt that where she comes from is more important than her Turkish heritage.

During our conversation I realized that her explanation suited better the Turkish-Cypriot self-identification rather than the Cypriot that she decided to adopt, so I asked why she refused to use the Turkish-Cypriot identity. Her response was,

“Actually it doesn’t matter to me, Turkish-Cypriot, Turkish, that kind of thing [doesn’t matter] but the main think is... OK I’m a Cypriot, I’m living in Cyprus, I’m living in the northern part of the Cyprus, I am talking in Turkish language. That’s the parts that construct my identity. So I can say I’m a Turkish-Cypriot but ... but you know... when you... probably it’s because of the reactions that you get when you say Turkish-Cypriot. It’s the same [reaction] in the Turkey it’s also same in Europe. When you say, ‘I’m Turkish-Cypriot’. [People respond] ‘OK, so you are Turkish!’ You start to say ‘No, I’m Cypriot! I’m not coming from Turkey’, so that kind of thing. Because everybody thinks that if you are Cypriot and you are living in the north, you are a Turkish. That’s why I started to identify as Cypriots. For them [the foreigners] to understand who really I am.”

Her view of her identity is so complicated that it cannot be expressed in one or two words (Cypriot or Turkish-Cypriot). It needed to be explained. Fatma chose the Cypriot self-identification because where she comes from is more important for her than her heritage/descent. The Turkish heritage—and therefore the Turkish identity—is an identity that other people also inherited. For example, Fatma doesn’t wish to be confused with Turks from Turkey. Although the Cypriot identity also is adopted by individuals that are different from her, including individuals from the Greek-Cypriot community who

Speak a different language, this does not seem to bother Fatma. She decided to adopt a ‘territorial identity’ that includes both Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots in an attempt to separate herself from the Turkish nation.

Her language, although she described it as Turkish, does not offer to Fatma any connections to the Turkish nation, other than the fact that it makes it easier for her to speak with Turks and live in Turkey. She did talk about the different dialect that the Turkish-Cypriots have, but she did not use that dialect as a reason to distinguish herself from mainland Turks.

Her studies on national identity changed her views

Fatma acknowledged that her higher education studies in political science and particularly her Masters in northern Europe influenced strongly her view of her own identity and the identities in her community. She said,

Actually after I came here [back to Cyprus after her studies in northern Europe] I was a little bit ... how to say? Confused about it [her national identity]. Because as I said I prefer to express myself as Cypriot but it's also because of my research area, because I observe that, okay, there is the Cypriot nationalism and I started to think that okay, am I doing a kind of nationalism when I say I'm a Cypriot? [both laughing] So that's why I'm trying to be careful about it when I express myself, but still I prefer to say ‘Cypriot’ when I am here [within the Turkish-Cypriot community] because if I say I'm a Cypriot, everybody understands, okay, you are

a Cypriot. You are not a Turkish immigrant or you are not Greek or other things [from the] Greek-part [since you speak Turkish].

INT: When you speak to a Greek-Cypriot, how do you identify?

Fatma: Again Cypriot.

For Fatma the Cypriot identity works when she is in the North among other Turkish-Cypriots because it denotes that she comes from Cyprus and not Turkey although she speaks Turkish. In the quote above she referenced the idea of Cypriot nationalism, a rather new idea on the island. She saw Cypriot nationalism as an undesirable idea, no different from the Turkish or the Greek nationalism. She said any form of nationalism was not beneficial for the people of the island.

Language

Fatma described the tension between the two communities that are both culturally Cypriot but speak two different languages that are inherently important for each community's culture. She acknowledged the communication issues that arise when there is no common language. She thought it was possible to have balance between these elements like it used to be before the conflict. Learning each other's language is another way to do it. "Actually I'm really willing to learn the Greek language," she said, "but it's a little bit complicated for me the way it's written [meaning the Greek alphabet]... but I'm planning to have some lessons soon."

Although she was very clear that she did not consider herself Turkish, Fatma does acknowledge that her language is Turkish. The Turkish language makes communication

with Turkish speakers easier but can be an issue in communicating with the Greek-Cypriots. She overcomes this issue by using English in communicating with Greek-Cypriots when possible, but she understands that for people from the two communities who are not fluent in English, language can be an issue. Since she self-identified as Cypriot but she described her language as Turkish—something that seemed contradictory—I revisited the language issue asking if she ever described her language as Cypriot or Turkish with Cypriot accent. She reacted rapidly and emphasized with laughter “No, no! Turkish! [she laughed] That’s my mother language.” For Fatma, the differences between mainland Turkish and Turkish-Cypriot dialect were not enough to justify the existence of a different language among Turkish-Cypriots. As she said, “OK, we have differences in language but basically we are all speaking Turkish.” She thought that even for a person who self-identified as Cypriot, as she did, there was no good reason to argue that her language was not Turkish. She also explained that speaking Turkish does not make one Turkish, as not all English speakers are English.

Her responses on language were contradictory and she herself acknowledged it. She argued that speaking Turkish does not make her and her community Turkish, yet affirmed the importance of language in her community’s identity. She described a dualism in her identity and used the term “Turkish-speaking Cypriot.” She felt that this combination of a territorial and cultural identity best described her Cypriot identity and her Turkish language. The Cypriot part describes the territorial area of the island of Cyprus where she comes from and cultural characteristics inherent to the people of the island (Greek-Cypriot, Turkish-Cypriot, and other). The Turkish-speaking part of the identity is cultural, but for Fatma is the only cultural characteristic from the bigger

umbrella Turkish culture. I would describe her identity as presentment during the interview: Turkish-only speaking-Cypriot or Cypriot who happened to speak Turkish.

She also mentioned that through conversations with Greek-Cypriot colleagues she realized that in that community people more commonly argued that they did not speak Greek but rather spoke Cypriot.

Fatma: Actually it doesn't matter to me, Turkish-Cypriot, Turkish, that kind of thing [doesn't matter] but the main think is... OK I'm a Cypriot, I'm living in Cyprus, I'm living in the northern part of the Cyprus, I am talking in [speaking the] Turkish language. That's the parts that construct my identity.

INT: Does language influence [your identity]? The fact that you have a distinct dialect, do you think that it makes you Cypriot? Or is it part of that thing that makes you Cypriot?

Fatma: Actually, it's the point that makes you Turkish-Cypriot, because you are talking the Turkish language and if you want to identify yourself according to geographical place and language you should say, 'OK I'm a Turkish-Cypriot' or maybe you can say 'I'm a Turkish-speaking Cypriot' in a sense. There are nuances, according to me.

Then she mentioned characteristics relevant to language that are similar between Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriots, such as body language and the volume of Cypriots' voice when they speak. For Fatma, these later characteristics are part of the Cypriot culture and are more important than the actual languages the two communities speak. She used this view to support her Cypriot identity argument.

INT: For you what are those elements that constitute culture?

Fatma: Actually, ehm... when you look at the literature [she laughs] language is the most important element [they laugh]. When I think about the Cypriot language, OK that the only thing that differentiates the culture [between Turkish-Cypriot and Greek-Cypriot] but for example the way you speak is also same. For example the voice that you have [meaning the volume of the voice], we are all talking in loud voice. For example, when I see a Greek-Cypriot abroad, a Greek-Cypriot not a Greek, I can understand that he is of she is a Greek-Cypriot, but not Greek. Even if he or she talking in Greek.

INT: Because she is louder?

Fatma: Yes, we speak... for example the way we are using body language is also the same, the way you act or react to some issues is also the same. And I also think they are much more important than the actual language you speak.

She also acknowledged that although for the purposes of our own communication in the interview (we spoke English) in some cases there is no common language that two people from the two communities can use to communicate. This was one of the reasons she wished she spoke Greek and that she is planning to take some Greek lesson in the future.

Fatma: OK it is relevant for people who can't speak, for example, we can speak in English and we can understand each other, but if I can't speak in English or in Greek, we can't have a conversation so would have been a big deal for us [the language we speak], but I'm not sure it is constructing an important point for the Cypriot culture. For me not but it probably is for other people... Actually I'm

really willing to learn the Greek language, but it's a little bit complicated for me the way it's written... but I'm planning to have some lessons soon.

Changes in Ethno-national Identity

Schooling

When I asked if she could recall how she self-identified when she was younger, before she began her studies in political science, she went back to her primary school years. She said that she did not remember how she self-identified in primary school but she mentioned that in school Turkish nationalism was embedded in many of the school activities. She described events that made her realize even at the time that the Turkish nationalism at school bothered her. The first memory she pointed out was “nationalistic history books,” specifically sections of the primary school history books that presented the cruel events of the 1960s and included pictures of dead Turkish-Cypriots as a result of the conflict.

Fatma: [W]hen I go back the most important thing that I can never forget is the history books during my elementary school. Because we had really nationalistic [meaning promoting the Turkish identity] history books during that time. At the end of the books we had too many photographs of the killed people [from the conflict of the 1960s]. I didn't want to take the book with me at home because I was afraid of that people at the end of the book [pictures of the dead, covered in blood]. Because you know what? The blood, killed people and ... Because, you

know, I was a child and I was really afraid to look at that book, so I really didn't want to study history during that time. So I think that kind of things make me to identify myself as Cypriot not Turkish-Cypriot...

It was this "reaction to the cruelty in the books" as well as the very nationalistic views that were promoted in the them that resulted in her moving away from the proposed identity, the Turkish-Cypriot identity. As she said, "...so that kind of nationalism in schools made me much more... made me to prefer the Cypriot [identity]."

Nationalistic narrative in school

She described further the content of the history books and the general narrative that was promoted in schools at the time.

Fatma: ... because they always said 'you are Turkish, Turkey came here and they protect us from the Greek-Cypriot.' That kind of nationalistic things in those books. And the Cyprus history started to be... started from the 1970s and they accuse one side [the Greek-Cypriot side] for all the conflict on the island. So that kind of nationalism in schools make me much more... make me to prefer the Cypriot [identity]. When somebody asks me about my identity, I prefer to say Cypriot because, you know, it's not my thing to identify myself with that kind of nationalistic things."

She preferred the Cypriot identity at the time of the interview, but when I asked what was her identity back then, when she was in school and afraid of the graphic history books, she raised another point: "Actually during that time I didn't [wasn't] aware of

them [the identities] I guess.” As a primary school student, she did not really understand what ethnic identity was, adding that primary school kids are too young to really understand identities. Nevertheless, she said that she felt something was not right about the identity that was promoted in school at the time, she did not agree with it but still she could not really pinpoint it. She said, “I remember that I hated that kind of issues and I really didn’t want to be in that book in a sense. I’m not a part of it.” She added that it was only later when she began reading about ethnic and national identities and she reflected on her experiences during her K-12 education years that she was able to explain her negative attitude. As she said, “Actually I can understand it now when I think about that period”. Then she continued with another memory from her primary school years,

Fatma: But you know the same thing, we started the week with that song that says, ‘I’m a Turk, I’m proud of it’. You know, I really didn’t want to be a Turk when I think about all those things. Because they all forced you to be a Turk in a sense.

INT: So at the time, when you were singing this song, did you... was it OK for you or did you react like you react now?

Fatma: Actually it didn’t mean anything for me because I was just a child so I couldn’t understand what was the meaning of it. But the history books were much more influential thing! That’s the issue!”

She emphasized again how much the pictures in the books colored her memories of that period in school and possibly the way she later on self-identified.

The nationalistic views in history textbooks caused some of her teachers with less nationalistic views, particularly in high school, to teach without using the books. The (as

she put it) alternative way of seeing historical events these teachers offered influenced the way she saw her ethno-national identity. It was then that she began questioning the nationalistic curriculum. She said,

Fatma: [A]s I remember my history teacher in high school was also close to the leftist ideology [supporting the Cypriot identity over the Turkish-Cypriot identity]. She also thought that, OK, we don't have to use these books and she tried to make a kind of alternative way of learning history, so it was also really good for me during that time. That time I realized why I didn't want to identify myself as Turkish, when I learned the alternative way of thinking history. Because when she started to explain some issues... eh... objectively in a sense, you started to understand some reasons and you started to understand [that] the book is too much.... How to say? ... It's not objective and it's only accusing one side [the Greek-Cypriot side] ... it's trying to force you a kind of identity [the Turkish-Cypriot identity].”

Seeing the wrongdoings of both communities came to support her Cypriot identity and helped her rationalize why the Turkish identity promoted in school was unsuitable for her. Until that point she only knew that the school curriculum was not compatible with what she felt. The alternative way of seeing history came as a relief and offered her a new way of understanding her own identity. She realized that she did not have to follow the school-promoted identity. Her own school teacher offered her this option. For Fatma, the teaching of history and schooling in general did not work towards the Turkish-Cypriot identity as the school curriculum intended. On the contrary, it promoted the Cypriot identity rather than the Turkish-focused Turkish-Cypriot identity.

High school and the Annan Plan period

During high school another series of events came to influence Fatma's new understanding of her identity. In 2003-2004, Secretary General of the United Nations Kofi Annan proposed a solution plan for the Cyprus problem. During that period it became obvious to her that there were two different schools of thought in the Turkish-Cypriot community: one that was in favor of the unification of the island and hence supported the Annan plan and another one that supported the independence of the Turkish-Cypriot community and later the unification with Turkey. "In my high school period is the Annan Plan period on the island. So it also influenced us because you know it's a huge young mobilization during that time," she said, referring to the many politically-active young people who supported or opposed the unification of the island.

Her high school friends got her involved in the pro-Annan Plan events, experiences that were key in the development of her Cypriot self-identification, her choice of political science as her field of study, and her involvement in bi-communal events. She considered those high school friendships highly influential in the beginning of her quest for her ethno-national identity. She said,

INT: Do you remember how you got involved in the Annan plan movement?

Fatma: Hm... It's through school and my friends. Because as I said we were all mobilized during that period. For example, we had meetings, huge meetings in northern Cyprus and we left school and we had a huge high school youth, a kind of high school youth. We had some papers in our hand and go to that area during that period. I was highly influenced from my friends.

There were many gatherings organized to support both positions on the Annan plan. She attended some of each, forming her own opinion about what kind of solution she preferred and also what identity would have supported this solution.

These experiences, in addition to her learning an alternative history of the island in high school, influenced not only her ethno-national identity but also her chosen field of study for her undergraduate degree.

Fatma: The high school period and as I said the mobilization for the unification of the island really had an impact on my choice for undergraduate studies.... I studied political science and international relations... Actually when I started studying these issues I started to understand myself. I used that words that are right. I prefer to identify myself as that [meaning Cypriot]

Life in Turkey

When asked about her studies in Turkey, Fatma revealed some memories that were relevant to her ethno-national self-identification. This part of the interview was full of her frustration about the ignorance of Turks of Turkey about the Turkish-Cypriot.

Here is part of our conversation on the topic,

INT: How about your studies in Turkey? How has that influenced your thinking about your national identity? You are now in a different environment [outside Cyprus] but you study political science. I want you to tell me more about that.

Fatma: So during that time I started to think a lot, “Am I a Cypriot or a Turkish-Cypriot? Who am I?” [she laughs sadly] I prefer to say I’m a Cypriot but they

always want to learn if you are a Turkish or Greek. So that's why I started to say eh... I am a Cypriot but I'm coming from northern part of the island, for then to realize who I am... Turkish people prefer to use the motherland [Turkey] and baby-land [Cyprus] thing, and they always, when I started to talk in Cypriot-Turkish, they all [said], 'Wow, how pretty you can talk in Turkish'. So they react that kind of thing. And you know, I really don't want to change my accent to the mainland-Turkish or Turkish in the way that Turkish people speak. And you know some time people react, 'OK, you learned Turkish very well' and I started to, 'OK my mother tongue is Turkish' [she laughs] That kind of thing. So, but political science students are much more into the issue so they know about Cyprus, they know about the Cyprus issue, the political environment on the island, so it is much more easy to express yourself to them, but in my daily life it is not like that."

Fatma knew a lot about Turkey before she moved there for her studies. She learned Turkish history and literature from her K-12 education and about events, cultural norms, and the Turkish accent from the media. However, she soon realized that Turkish people in Turkey knew almost nothing about her community and even the few things most of them knew were different from her views. In some cases she even described them as "wrong and one-sided."

She raised two points of frustration in her interactions with people in Turkey. First was the motherland and baby-land narrative promoted in the media and adopted by many of the people she met. Fatma disagreed with the view that the north part of Cyprus is part of Turkey, since she considered her community very different from the rest of Turkey

and she did not want the Turkish army on the island. She felt this was all they knew about her community; they did not even recognize that she has a Cypriot-Turkish accent. Her second source of frustration was the assumption that she was a foreigner that learned Turkish very well. She did not want to change her accent and adopt the mainland - Turkish accent, since she considered her accent as an integral part of her identity and she believed people in Turkey should, at least, recognize it. For Fatma, keeping her accent during her communications with people in Turkey is also a way to inform them about the existence and uniqueness of her community.

This ignorance did not apply to people she met in her political science and international relations program: because of their education, they all knew about the Cyprus issue and its implications. She did not spend much time talking about those experiences with people in the program, preferring to spend more time in the interview describing her frustration with the ignorance of everyday people in Turkey about her community.

When she met individuals that knew about the Turkish-Cypriot community, she said that most of the time they were talking about how much the Turkish-Cypriots owe to Turkey because Turkey saved them in 1974, another issue that frustrated Fatma. She gave the example of a typical conversation in a cab with Turkish taxi drivers.

Fatma: [E]specially people who are driving taxis, always wanted to share their experiences in Cyprus. ... I don't know if it [their experience in Cyprus] is true or not, but they really want to share with you that they had their military service in Cyprus during the war period [1974] and that kind of thing. You know. And it is kind of embarrassing... Because everybody who had a taxi and they realize that

you are a Turkish-Cypriot, because of your language [accent] they always started to say, 'OK you are the baby-land of Turkey and we came here, we saved you' that kind of nationalistic thing.

Family

My questions about her family and their ethno-national identities made her realize that she did not know much about her family's identities and experiences during the conflict. Given that her graduate work was relevant to ethnic and national identity in her community, it seemed surprising to me, as much as to her, that she was not sure how her parents or grandparents self-identified. She puzzled through this,

Fatma: But I'm not sure about how they [mother's side of the family] identify themselves, because I didn't talk [about] this issue before. I didn't ask, 'How you identify yourself?' I'm really not sure.

Fatma: Actually I think [my father] identify himself as Cypriot, but I'm not sure maybe he prefers to say Turkish-Cypriot or something. As I said I didn't talk about that issue with my family before but I will!

INT: You don't have to.

P: No I am now really curious about it since you asked. Because I'm really thinking, I don't know how my family identifies!

Maternal family

Fatma's mother and her family (mother's siblings and father) were internally displaced during the bi-communal conflict. Fatma did not know the details of the misplacement, such as the year or event that forced them to leave. She only knew that they left their village near the city of Paphos in the southwest part of the island and they went to the north part near Nicosia – she was not sure about the exact place of the original move. After 1974 they settled in a village in the north near Morphou. She explained she did not know the details because her mother and her family did not talk about those days, at least not while she was around.

Fatma: Actually, my mother's family immigrated from Paphos. Eh... But they came to the northern part after the war, I guess... I'm not sure. But they are not sharing much from that experience during the war time. They all prefer to share good days in the village [near Paphos] and they always miss it there.

Fatma used the words 'immigrated' and 'move' to describe the displacement. Throughout our interaction she did not mention the words 'refugees,' a word often used to describe the displacement (Papadakis, Peristianis & Wetz, 2006), or even 'internally displaced people,' the official term used by the United Nations. Her choice of words is consistent with her view for avoiding conflict. In the Cypriot context particularly the word 'refugee' has negative connotations since it is connected with violent move of populations in 1974 (Papadakis, Peristianis & Wetz, 2006). Fatma continued,

Fatma: And the important thing that my mother always told me that, 'I don't want you to experience that kind of thing [the conflict] in the island.' She [was] always

in favor of the unification of the island, in a sense. Because she really didn't want to experience those days again and she thinks that the unification is the solution to that kind of conflict...Because she was living peacefully with them [the Greek-Cypriots] once [when she lived in Paphos], she thinks is possible [to peacefully live with them in the future]

According to Fatma, her mother's side of the family avoided sharing memories from the conflict to keep her from developing hateful feelings for the Greek-Cypriot community. They support the unification of the island and shared their good experiences with Greek-Cypriots before the 1960 to encourage her to support peaceful coexistence with Greek-Cypriots. That strategy seemed to work since she supported those ideas.

Her grandfather went a step further, showing her how it was possible to have good relationships with Greek-Cypriots. He got to know the previous Greek-Cypriot owners of his current house in the village near Morfou. He developed a close relationship with the Greek-Cypriot couple in 2004 when they visited the village and came to see the home they left in 1974. Fatma said, "Actually when the gates opened [the checkpoints] Greek-Cypriots came to visit my grandfather's home, the previous owners in a sense... And now they have a close relationship with them. So it is OK for them [parents and grandfather]."

Later in the interview I identified another element that may have led her mother's side of the family to avoid sharing details about the conflict and the displacement: it was too painful for them to talk about those days. Possibly they did not want to revisit those experiences or they did not want Fatma to see their emotional reaction while sharing those experiences. Fatma got a taste of the agony that her mother and her sisters suffered

because of the displacement when she visited their southern village near Paphos in 2004.

The village was deserted and held no memories.

Fatma: My second time crossing [to the south part] we visited my mother's village and they [mother and aunts] got really depressed when they saw the old place because it's not like what they remembered about the village. There was nothing in there, some destroyed houses. That's all. Nobody lives there, so that kind of thing. It was not a good experience for me... There are no houses there, there is no one living in the village, so I don't know it was not a good thing when I first got to that village. And it was also not good for my mother's family.

Fatma's mother and aunts were 'depressed' and brought to tears when they witnessed the devastation of the village. An older aunt, who was in her mid-twenties in 1974, remembered the days of the displacement and got even more emotional. Even then they only briefly talked about the displacement and Fatma did not want to make it worse for them by pressing for more details.

Despite the sadness that this visits brought to the sisters, they would like to go back and live there again in the case of a solution, Fatma said. Despite the disappointment they felt during the first visit, they missed their village. Fatma remembered that her older aunt was so disappointed with what she saw that she did not want to go back for few months but then changed her mind,

Fatma: So she is the one that has more memories [from the village]. That's why she really got depressed. She didn't want to go visit the village again, after that time. But she did [she laughs]. But for a period she said, OK I really don't want to go there again. I didn't like this place; it's not my village. That kind of thing, but

after that she went there again plenty of times, because they really miss the village. And they still have the impression that, they still have the will to go there and live there after the unification of the island.

Paternal family

When asked about her father's side of the family she said,

Fatma: ...they are from a village close to Kyrenia (at the northern coast of the island) and he didn't migrate... It's a very small village. It's a Turkish village.

I'm not sure if they had any neighbor Greek villages-

Wondering if there was a conflict-related reason that her father did not talk about his ethno-national self-identification, I asked, "Do your grandparents from your father's side, do they talk about the war, the years before the war?" She said "No" then thought for few seconds and continued, "Actually last year, when I was not here, they found... how to say? During war time when they killed some people..." She was referring to some of the missing from 1974 whose bones were found in 2002 and were identified using DNA samples from their relatives (Papadakis, Peristianis & Weltz, 2006),

Fatma: [they found their bones] close to my father's home and it was a big deal for the village. Everybody started talking about who killed that person and that kind of thing. During that time, firstly my family started to think about the war and in a conversation in my grandmothers [from father's side] home and we started to talk about that period when people killed other people and had that kind of issues and in that time she [her grandmother] started, really started to talk about

the issue and remembered the past, remember that period and she was almost crying when she remembered that kind of things. That's the only time that we talked about the war and these things with my grandmother because she does not always prefer to mention about the period during the war time or the period before we were born. I don't know why, but she didn't prefer to mention, talk about it. Maybe because she doesn't like to share that kind of experiences."

That was the first and only time that Fatma's grandmother shared the experiences during the bi-communal conflict of the 1960s until the invasion in 1974.

Politics

Fatma is an active member of the Republican Turkish Party (RTP) youth, a party that supports social democracy, is in favor of the unification of the island and the Cypriot identity and is against Turkish nationalism. Fatma strongly agreed to the party's policies regarding the Cyprus issue and its proposed solution to the Cyprus problem.

INT: How about their work to find a solution to the Cyprus problem. Are you satisfied with their position or not?

Fatma: Actually I am!

Her connection with the party goes beyond her agreement or disagreement with their policies. As she explained below her parents were heavily involved in the party and from a very young age she was participating in their meetings, originally in her baby stroller and later as a member of the party's youth organization.

INT: So these are the reason you picked this party over other parties? Is it the women's issues and their views on the Cyprus issue?

Fatma: It is also related with my family. Because my family is they were also educated in Turkey and they were part of the leftist movement during the eighties. And they came here and they started to work in this party and they revised the party in a sense through the youth organizations during that time in Cyprus and when I was born I was part of the party in my baby stroller [she laughed]. They are caring me during the meetings and that's why it's a kind of connection from my childhood, in a sense. In a sense I have a kind of emotional connection to the party but of course I am supporting the ideas that they have. But probably if you ask why I chose that party, my emotional connections come first.

Fatma was also involved in a foundation connected with RTP that had as a mission the encouragement of young people from the two communities to interact and participate in activities together. Their first attempt to attain funding from the European Union in order to organize such events was unsuccessful, but Fatma mentioned that they will try again next year since the team considers these activities very important for giving the opportunity to young people from the two communities to meet each other and make the same realization she had when she met Greek-Cypriots: that they are not that different. For Fatma these activities also are important in preparing the young people from the two communities to live together in case of a unification of the island.

Fatma: But we tried to have a project with [an organization in the Greek-Cypriot community]... we tried to have a European Union project with them.

INT: When you say we...

Fatma: I'm working on the name of a civil society organization in North named after the [late] secretary general of the party (Republican Turkish Party). It's a kind of... not a civil society organization but a foundation and we try to make not violent communication awareness for both communities and we are planning to work with young people especially but we didn't get the support from European Union, so we can't do it.

Annan Plan period

In 2004 when the referendum for the Annan plan took place, Fatma was in high school. She was in favor of the plan although she was not of a legal age to vote at the time. The Republican Turkish Party was also in favor of the plan. She participated in events for the plan, she attended public discussions. She described the period as a 'huge youth mobilization' in the north. At the time she had a more romantic view of the unification of the island, something that changed through the years. She realized that the idea of the unification is very good but there are serious political and financial aspects of which, as a high school student, she was unaware. Once only seeing the social and human rights benefits of unification, she now understands that the issue is more complicated than she thought in her youth.

INT: You mentioned the Annan plan before and you said that you were in high school when Annan plan was... so I guess you couldn't vote. You were like fifteen. So what would you vote if you could? Did you take part on that conversation? What was your standing?

Fatma:: Actually, I would prefer to vote 'yes' because I'm in favor of the unification of the island as I said, because you know the conflict is kind of ridiculous for me, I really come to understand some times. Because OK you don't have to love each other that much. For example, you can also have a neighbor that you can't like that much but you can live with him or her. That's my point, so that's why I can't understand the people. OK we have some nationalistic people and some kind of hate speech from both sides but I don't think much influence the society. I think we can live together we can do it even if we don't love each other that much. But I believe if we started to live together and we started to go to the same high schools or be a neighbor with a Greek-Cypriot or other nationalities, we can start to be... How to say? We approach together. That's why I prefer to say 'yes'. But when I think in different aspects now, political aspect or economical aspects now I can understand the complication of the plan and why they really don't want to be together. But during that times I was thinking only the social perspective, that's why I couldn't really understand.

INT: What do you understand now that couldn't understand before?

Fatma: Actually during that times I have some Greek-Cypriot friends and I have good relationship with them...

INT: You had relationships with Greek-Cypriots at the time you mean?

Fatma: Yeah! And we had some meetings in Ledra Palace [a hotel in the buffer zone] [she laughs] bi-communal meetings and that's the only way that we kept us the border. And sometimes... yeah when I think about the plan that's the only thing that I'm thinking about, OK we can do that kind of thing [meaning the

meetings] and we are not killing each other, we are not fighting, we come together and have a conversation and it's like Turkish-Cypriots when you talk with the Greek-Cypriots. And we don't have that much differences. And I really thing we don't have differences in both sides. So I can't understand why we are not unified, if we are not that much different. So that kind of issues I was thinking during my high school.

INT: And now?

Fatma: [She laughs] Now I started to understand the economic and political aspect of it. So that's why sometimes I can understand, how to say, some political parties' respond to the plan. And why they don't want to say 'yes' to the plan and that kind of thing.

As she said her romantic view was positively skewed because of the very good relationships that she was able to develop with a group of Greek-Cypriot students with whom she met regularly at the buffer zone as part of a bi-communal project. Since she was able to communicate and have fun with Greek-Cypriots that she barely knew, without having any confrontations, she felt it possible for the two communities to live together and the Annan was the perfect vehicle for unification. As an adult she realized that—especially for the people that experienced the conflict—interacting with the other community was not as easy or simple. Also due to the long period of division, economic and financial issues, like the large gap between the cost of living in the two communities and property issues, are far too complicated to be resolved.

Flags and Representation in the Republic of Cyprus

Fatma is “against flags” in general, finding them “really really nationalistic symbols.” Reflecting on her elementary school experiences, she said that she “had to hold a flag” although she did not really know what the flag represented at the time. This is a critique against Turkish nationalism in Turkish-Cypriot schools that she talked extensively about when we talked about her K-12 experiences. It was probably a reaction to the fact that there are so many flags in Cyprus representing different views, she said, and those views do not help efforts to find a solution to the island. She suggested one flag for everybody on the island: the 1960 Republic of Cyprus flag. At the time of the interview, though, she added that that flag “now really means Greek-Cypriot community only.” Her comments are consistent with her views for a unified Cyprus with one Cypriot identity, but also her disappointment that her community was not part of the Republic of Cyprus at the time. Below is our conversation about flags in Cyprus.

INT: So, in Cyprus there are many many flags. Which one does represent you more?

Fatma: Actually I’m against flags [she laughs louder]

INT: What do you mean?

Fatma: Because they are really really nationalistic symbols. So that’s why I’m against it.

INT: OK! Since when you are against.

Fatma: I am not sure. Now I’m against but I’m not sure when I got that feeling [they both laugh].

INT: OK let's put it this way, when was the last time you remember yourself holding a flag?

Fatma: Eh... Probably during my elementary school because I had to hold that flag, because we had a kind of children's ceremony in 23rd of April, if you know.

INT: So you feel that there are too many flags.

Fatma: Exactly. We don't have to use flags from Turkey, from TRNC, from Greece, maybe we can have only one flag, probably it could be the flag of Cyprus Republic. So it can represent us all. But again I really don't like flags.

I: So how about... you said it can represent us all, the flag of the republic of Cyprus, why do you think it's not?

Fatma: Because now it is not representing the Turkish-Cypriots. In theory it is but in practice is not. That's my point. That's why it is not representing...

INT: So you think that your people are not represented through the republic of Cyprus.

Fatma: Actually as I said, in practice not. For example, if I want to be part of the government services, I can't! Because they want me to pass to the southern part and start to live there for a period. I'm not sure, five years or something. I'm really not sure. That kind of obligations you have. So you can't live in the northern part of Nicosia, for example, and pass and go to your job to the government services for example. Or you can't demand any rights under the Republic of Cyprus government [when you live in the north part]. That's why it's not representing for me.

Interaction with Greek-Cypriots

Although Fatma was pro-unification, visited the south often, and had contact with Greek-Cypriots, she did not have close Greek-Cypriot friends. She did collaborate with people from the Greek-Cypriot community on bi-communal events, but none of these collaborations led to any close friendships although she kept the possibility of future friendships with Greek-Cypriots open.

Fatma's family did not talk much about the Greek-Cypriots. At school, teachers described them as very dangerous "monsters." She also had in mind the atrocities caused by Greek-Cypriots to her people, illustrated in the pictures at the end of her history book, pictures that made her refuse to take the book home. During the "youth mobilization" during her high school years in support of the Annan plan, she actually got the chance to meet Greek-Cypriots.

INT: OK. So when was the first time that you met Greek-Cypriots?

Fatma: During my high school. It was a kind of bi-communal event, it was some organizations, civil society organizations from both sides, during that period. It was also related with referendum period [2003-2004] because they were trying to bring youth from both sides to be together and talk about the issues. A kind of youth cooperation from both sides. But I'm really not sure about the exact date.

INT: When you first met the first Greek-Cypriots, do you remember that moment that time? Was it in Ledra Palace?

Fatma: I remember, yes.

INT: Describe me that experience. That's what I'm interested in.

Fatma: Yeah, I'm kind of excited to meet the people from [the] other side because, as I tried to say, Greek people always imagine them monsters in elementary school. And you know even you know they are people like you, you wonder who they are, what kind of people they are. You know you are really excited. But when I met with Greek-Cypriots, OK I say [to myself] 'be cool they are people like you' that kind of thing.

INT: How was your family reacting to you doing that? Having contact with Greek-Cypriots?

Fatma: They are OK with that. They are happy with it because they are also supporting the issue, the unification. That's why it's a good thing for them, me having some relation with Greek-Cypriots.

After that first experience Fatma continued participating in bi-communal events. Now she is one of the organizers of such events that bring youth from the two communities together. Her idea of Greek-Cypriots is much different than what she imagined during her elementary and middle school years. She now identifies a lot of what she calls cultural similarities between Turkish-Cypriots and Greek-Cypriots and believes that the culture of the two communities is fundamentally the same and that the only difference is language.

Cypriot culture

Cypriot culture is an important element to her Cypriot self-identification. Sharing the same culture and the same island are the two characteristics that “should have been enough” for all Cypriots to feel like one people. For Fatma, culture is also a way to show to people in her community a path to peace to the island.

Fatma: Actually I think, culture is really close to each other. We don't have different Greek culture or Turkish culture in Cyprus. We have a Cypriot culture I think and we have too much in common. OK it's not only the culture that can unify us but it's a good point to start. We are enjoying the same things so it's a good thing to come together and have that thing and enjoy it together.

Fatma suggested that using some common cultural characteristics—like food and folk music—to bring people from the two communities together. A common cultural event, for example, can be a good starting point for interactions between the two communities that lived apart for so long. She went on to compare both the mainland Turkish culture and the Greek-Cypriot culture to the Turkish-Cypriot culture. She thinks that Turkish-Cypriot culture is almost the same as the Greek-Cypriot culture; although it shares similarities with the mainland Turkish culture, it is in fact very different.

INT: So for you what constitutes your Cypriot identity? ... What are the elements that are more important?

Fatma: Actually, eh... [long pause] eh... actually culture is one of the things because when I observe the Turkish culture, especially when I was in Turkey. OK we have some common things with Turkish people but we have too many

differences. But when we - when I think about Greek-Cypriots we have too much common things. So I think it's a Cypriot thing not a Greek thing or Turkish thing. So it could be the one point that constructs my identity. Because I don't see the division in cultural sense. On the other hand, it's a kind of reaction to nationalism, Turkish nationalism [she laughs] so it also influence me to prefer the Cypriot [identity].

Cultural language

INT: Does language influence [your identity], the fact that you have a distinct dialect, do you think that it makes you Cypriot? Or is it part of that thing that makes you Cypriot?

Fatma: Actually, it's the point that makes you Turkish-Cypriot, because you are talking the Turkish language and if you want to identify yourself according to the geographical place and language you should say, OK I'm a Turkish-Cypriot, or maybe you can say I'm a Turkish-speaking Cypriot in a sense. There are nuances, according to me.

INT: For you what are those elements that constitute your culture?

Fatma: Actually, ehm, when you look at the literature [she laughs] language is the most important element but when I think about the Cypriot language, okay that's the only thing that differentiates the culture [of the two communities].

Fatma made the argument that both communities share a common Cypriot culture; the only important difference between the two communities is their language

(Fatma is not religious so those differences were not important to her). Her community speaks the Turkish-Cypriot dialect and the other community the Greek-Cypriot dialect. She acknowledges that this is in contrast with the literature on culture that attributes to language and dialect the most important role in constructing cultural identities.

In the excerpt below though (a continuation of the one above), she pointed out that although the actual language is different—Turkish and Greek—the way people in the two communities speak and perform their language is very similar. She referred to the intonations that make the two dialects distinct from the motherland languages, the volume of the voice when people from the two communities talk, the similarities in the use of body-language, and the reactions while having a conversation. She said that she was able to identify a Greek-Cypriot when s/he was speaking when she was abroad—even though she did not speak Greek—from these elements in the performance of language that are “the same” as those of people in her community. She considered those elements more important than the actual language.

Fatma: ... but for example the way we speak [Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriots] is also the same. For example, the voice that you have [meaning the volume of the voice], we are all talking in loud voice. For example, when I see a Greek-Cypriot abroad, a Greek-Cypriot not a Greek [from Greece], I can understand that he is or she is a Greek-Cypriot, but not Greek. Even if he or she is talking in Greek.

INT: Because she is louder?

Fatma: Yes, we speak... for example the way we are using body-language is also the same, the way you act or react to some issues is also the same. And I also

think they are much more important than the language you speak. OK it is relevant for people who can't speak for example we can speak in English and we can understand each other, but if I can't speak in English or in Greek, we can't have a conversation so it's a big deal for us [the language we speak], but I'm not sure it is constructing an important point for the Cypriot culture. For me not but...

Fatma emphasized the similarities in the way people from the two communities perform their identity but she also acknowledged the importance of having a common language that two speakers need to have in order to be able to communicate. She used the example of our interview; we used English because we were both fluent, but without this common language we would not have been able to communicate. So, based on her argument, even though we would perform the two dialects—Turkish-Cypriot and Greek-Cypriot dialects—in “the same” way, we would not have been able to communicate. This was an issue for Fatma, but she added that, like our grandparents' generation, we would have known both dialects if the two communities lived together.

Perceptions about Greek-Cypriots

Involved in a civil society organization in the Turkish-Cypriot community, Fatma was working on a proposal for a similar organization in the Greek-Cypriot community to secure funding for a project targeting young people on “communication and awareness between the two communities.” Through this proposal process and her earlier involvement in bi-communal activities during the Annan Plan period, she met young people from the Greek-Cypriot community and got to know more about their political

and social involvement. She said that based on her experiences the Greek-Cypriot young people are not as involved and interested in politics—particularly the politics that are relevant to the Cyprus issue and a possible solution—as the youth in her community. She attributed this disinterest in the lack of optimism in finding a solution in general, something she characterized “sad.” She said,

For young people [in the south], I think they don't care much about the political situation in the island, like people in north. They are not much politically mobilized according to my observation. In a sense I think Turkish-Cypriot people are much more optimistic about a possible solution and in a sense they see a kind of future for a solution. So that's why they are that much involved and get into the issue and try to make some cooperative things with the other part. But when I observe the Southern part the majority of the young people are not that much involved into the issue. Okay there are some civil society organizations or youth organization or political parties that are trying to make something, to cooperate with Cypriots but it is not that high like in north. So that's a sad thing for me.

She also observed that the Greek-Cypriots are more religious than the Turkish-Cypriots, although she acknowledged that her relationships with Greek-Cypriots were not close enough to come to definite conclusions. She did not comment negatively on this observation, as Mustafa did. However, Fatma pointed out that she thought that the Church of Cyprus influenced the religious Greek-Cypriots,

Fatma: I think that Greek people are much more religious than us, in a sense.

INT: Where do you make this observation from?

Fatma: For example I have a friend that she has a housemate from the South and for example she visits the church every week, every Sunday and she continued to do it in Turkey also. So I also observe some people when I pass, they really want to go to church on Sunday and I think the Church also have influence on the politics of the island. So they are much more influencing and religious than us I guess. But really I'm not that good into that issue.

Turkish Immigrants

Fatma identified as non-religious and asserted that most Turkish-Cypriots are not particularly religious. Regardless, she acknowledged that religion played an indirect role in her life. The Turkish government tried to imposed a religious sentiment to the Turkish-Cypriot government after 1974, part of an attempt to make the northern Cyprus more similar to Turkey. Fatma referred to the new mosques that were built on the island, the religious teachers that were sent from Turkey to teach in the Turkish-Cypriot schools, and the immigrants that were sent from Turkey. For Fatma, all these were attempts by the Turkish government to create a homogeneous population similar to other populations in Turkey. She concluded by saying that this effort by the Turkish government was unsuccessful, since there are still a lot of people in the Turkish-Cypriot community that self-identify as Cypriot and are not religious.

INT: What I didn't ask, are you religious?

Fatma: No!

INT: No. So I guess I'm not asking more questions about the religion and how it may have influenced you.

Fatma: It is not influenced me. Actually in a sense it's influencing un in the northern part, because with the impact of the Turkish government now they started to build some more mosques in the northern part of the island and some religious colleges opened. And it's the kind of thing that I reacted. Because you know... how to say? It's a thing that the Turkish government is trying to manipulate the Turkish-Cypriot according to me. And Turkish people are always accuse Cypriot people not being religious. So it's a kind of policy to make Cypriot people more religious and influence Cypriot people more. So I'm a kind of reactive to it.

She continued that she was against the Turkish government policy colonizing Northern Cyprus with Turkish immigrants and pushing assimilation of the Turkish-Cypriot community into the overall Turkish population. She backed her argument with the findings of a research project she was working on about the history and policies for immigration from Turkey after 1974 and the resistance and opposition of the Turkish-Cypriots population to those policies. She attributed the lack of integration between the Turkish immigrant population and the Turkish-Cypriots to the reaction of the later against those policies.

INT: Are there any other things that you see the government of the Turkish government to try and influence the people? To change there... you said trying to make them more religious. more example

Fatma: Actually I work on a paper which is related with immigration to the island in 1974 and I found that this immigration was a kind of. Eh, how to say? Make Cypriot people more Turkish. The government in Cyprus demands some people from Turkey in order to make a homogenous society in Northern part of the island. And they do it a kind of project to make Cypriot people more Turkish at that time, as I found. So they are not successful in a sense because there are people that express themselves as Cypriots now. So I think this is the proof that they are not successful but probably the reaction against immigrants is because of this.

Crossing to the South

First time in the south

Fatma was very curious about what was on the other side of the “green line,” and soon after the check-points opened she visited the south part of the island with her parents. She was in high school at the time. Her first impression of the south side of the island was that it was more developed. She was impressed by wide highways, buildings, and landscapes that looked more like a European city than the north part. She described that first impression,

INT: Have you ever been to the south side.

Fatma: Yes, when the gates opened.

INT: So did you go after the gates were open?

Fatma: Yeah, yeah!

INT: How was the first time you went there?

Fatma: Eh. Actually eh, we had huge line for the... in order to pass to the...

INT: It was just when they opened?

Fatma: Yeah, because everybody [was] wondering about the Greek side. That's why we really had a huge line in the northern part. And as I remember we waited one or two hours in order to pass the gate.

INT: Who did you go with?

Fatma: With my family. And when I first past, we had a kind of a road trip in order to feed our interest and curiosity.... How to say? The kind of more developed part of the island. Because the northern part was not that much developed like the south. That's the first impression that I got.

Visits to the other side

Fatma visited the south often for visits to a variety of places, including archeological sites, cities, villages, and beaches. She also liked to go out for food at her favorite restaurants in the southern part of the divided city of Nicosia or meet with friends from Europe when they visited. She travels to the south casually, as she does in the north of the island. She did not keep track of how often she was traveling to the south.

INT: So how often do you visit the south part and what do you do when you go there?

Fatma: I'm not sure...

INT: Like once a year? Is it like once a month? Every week?

Fatma: Not every week but not once a month. I can visit there whenever I want, so it's not a specific. I go when I have a reason to go.

INT: What do you do when you go there?

Fatma: I don't know. I go there to have some visits to some places. I go there to have a meal with my friends or that kind of thing.

Living in the south

Fatma said she was positive about the possibility of living in one of the cities in the south. She lived in Nicosia when we met for the interview and said, "I love living in Nicosia, so probably I prefer Nicosia rather than somewhere else in south." But the question was irrelevant to her since she considered Cyprus her motherland; the north-south division was not something that concerned her.

INT: If there is a unification would you move from where you live now to go to a place in the south to live. For example, if you find a job there.

Fatma: Ehm... May be! May be. It doesn't matter.

INT: you are not against living in... [the south]

Fatma: No no! Because it's all Cyprus for me. All parts of Cyprus, all parts of my motherland, that's why I don't care. But I love to living in Nicosia, so probably I prefer Nicosia rather than somewhere else in south [she laughs].

She rejected the idea of living in her mother's village, should her mother decide to move back to the village in the south after a solution. Although she felt connected to the place she was not interested in living there.

INT: Would you go there to live there?

Fatma: I'm not sure... No actually! [she laughs]. Because it's only a village, OK.

The Pafos [nearby city] is a really good place, so I can, maybe I can live there.

But I am not a village person after all. After living in a Turkish city.

Mass Media

Fatma did not watch much television and she was getting her news mostly from the websites of Turkish-Cypriot newspapers. She followed the Turkish-Cypriot newspapers closely and was curious to observe how different newspapers with different political views covered the same events, like talks between the two communities or a robbery by a Turkish immigrant. She admitted that she did not follow the Greek-Cypriot community's news, largely due to the language barrier. Regarding the news from mainland Turkey, she followed just one left-wing newspaper that she felt was objective in presenting the news.

INT: So where do you get informed for the news? Are you using television, newspaper, the internet? How do you get your news?

Fatma: Both of them.

INT: Both, meaning ...

Fatma: Internet ... I'm not using the television because you can always reach news and issues from internet, also newspapers; you can use newspapers from the internet whenever you want. So it is much more good for me, because television I think it is kind of time consuming. You can go to a website and check whatever you want. So it is better to watching television and get every knowledge from it.

INT: OK. What newspapers do you usually look at? Is there a particular newspaper that you are following?

Fatma: I'm following the newspapers from northern part of the island. Actually I can't follow the newspapers from south because I can't read them.

INT: Which one of the Turkish-Cypriot newspapers are you following?

Fatma: I'm trying to follow all of them because I'm also trying to see how they are covering the news, same news in a different perspective. You know we have newspapers that are much more connected to some parties or mainstream newspapers but they are trying to manipulate some news. But it is better to check all of them in order to get what the issue and how they are covering the issue.

Nationalist Friends

Although many of her high school friends were highly influential in Fatma's involvement in bi-communal events, she also had friends that were against those events. People with more "nationalistic" views that she still has heated conversations with over possible solutions to the Cyprus issue. Although these friends may have had some impact on her views at the time she was a teenager, as she said, they were definitely not

influencing her current views on her identity and the kind of solution to the Cyprus problem she was supporting.

INT: OK. About your friends? Do you have any friends that you talk about this kind of issues?

Fatma:: Yes actually I have! I have also some nationalist friends and sometimes we have really... how to say? Harsh conversations about that kind of issues. But I'm not that much influenced by them now, because I'm a little bit aware of that kind of issues, so that's why it's not that much influence me. But probably I was influenced before I left for Turkey. When I was young, younger [she laughed].

Mustafa's Narratives and Experiences

Mustafa was born in the early 1980s and was raised in a village in the north part of Cyprus. He went to public elementary, middle, and high schools in the north part of the island. When he finished high school he moved to the U.S.A and then in northern Europe for his bachelors and Masters in business, respectively. When he returned to Cyprus after his studies he moved to a town near Nicosia, where he still lived at the time of the interview with his wife and his baby girl. He was running his own small family business selling furniture imported from Turkey.

Both his parents come from the Paphos area, a coastal city in the southwest part of the island. They both were internally displaced in 1974 to the north. His mother comes from Polis, a mixed city where Turkish-Cypriots and Greek-Cypriots lived together before 1963, where she learned conversational Greek. She had a high school education and was a teacher of Turkish-Cypriot girls, traveling around Turkish-Cypriot villages teaching skills like sewing and housekeeping. His father had a high school education, too. He graduated from the "English School" in Nicosia, a prestigious private school (the only private school in Cyprus at the time), where he studied along with Greek-Cypriots just few years before the separation of the two communities. At the English School he learned both Greek and English. After his graduation and during the conflict he worked for the Turkish Bank in Paphos.

During the interview Mustafa talked a lot about history and his passion for history, which he attributed to his father. "Maybe I'm talking too much historical," he mentioned twice in the interview. Both times I reassured him that that was okay; that it

was important for me to understand how history was connected to his ethno-national self-identification, since this is how he understood it.

Self-Identification

Mustafa self-identified as Turkish-Cypriot and said that his national identity is the most important of his identities. In his own words, “On a percentage scale, my national identity is ninety percent and my religious identity is like ten percent... It’s very important [the national identity].” He used percentages to make his argument although I did not ask for them. Because of his business background, he said that was how he was used to operating, with numbers. Early on in the interview he made it clear that his identity had a dual character: on the one hand it was Cypriot and on the other hand it was Turkish. Nevertheless, he mentioned that he could not separate the two elements of his ethno-national identity. He said, “My identity is both Turkish and Cypriot both, not one of them.” He was very clear that he did not see himself as only Turkish or only Cypriot. He got upset when people assumed that he was Turkish or Greek-Cypriot when he said he came from Cyprus. As he explained, it was an indication that they did not know about the existence of the Turkish-Cypriot community.

I asked questions to understand what constituted this dual identity. When I asked, “What makes the Cypriot part of your identity?” he said,

Mustafa: Cypriot identity: the culture. My father and my mother. I am what they created. The way they speak, the way they laugh, what they talk about, makes me Cypriot and I believe it’s the common ground that we have with the Greek-

Cypriots. We enjoy [long pause] the same things. We laugh with similar things. The way we think is...[long pause] it's similar. But that's something else, but at some point you have to integrate our difference, which makes me Turkish-Cypriot...

Talking about the similarities between Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots, he later acknowledged that he was not sure about the validity of this point, since he had limited interaction with Greek-Cypriots. He said, "I don't have [Greek-Cypriot] friends... I wish I had but no, I don't. I met Greek-Cypriots many times though."

Most of his awareness about the similarities with Greek-Cypriots came from his fathers' experiences from before 1974. This also explained the long pause in the quote above when he talked about the similarities with the Greek-Cypriots. Later in the interview, also questioned this point of his response, because certain historical events he described counter arguments about the two communities being similar. For example, he believed that Greek-Cypriots were very religious and historically influenced by their religious leaders, whereas Turkish-Cypriots were "not religious at all."

History

When I asked about the Turkish part of his identity, he began with a saying in Turkish that he immediately translated in English:

"If you don't know your past, you cannot create or you cannot choose your future path." So what makes me Turkish is what my father has experienced, what his father experienced, what his father experienced. Our history. Because there are

what we've learned so far. Same principle actually applies to humanity. As a human race we are what we were given and what we are learning now. So I learned how to be Turkish-Cypriot. If I was raised in Greece, I would learn how to be Greek.

The Turkish part of his identity is based on the collective experiences of his community and the individual experiences of his parents and grandparents which were passed to his generation through education, language and media. He made the distinction between the history of his community during the Ottoman Era on the island (1571 to 1878) and the more recent history of his community, after the Ottomans left Cyprus and up to this day. He said that the former period created the basis of the connection between the Turkish-Cypriot community and the people of mainland Turkey, and the later period accounted for most of the differences between Turkish-Cypriots and mainland Turks and the distinct Turkish-Cypriot identity in his community. Mustafa believed that mainland Turks and Turkish-Cypriots developed similar but separate cultures even during the Ottoman Era when the Turkish population on the island was bigger. He said,

Mustafa: ... the split [between Turkish-Cypriots and Turkey] goes back to 500 years ago. Again, maybe we are talking too much historical. Mainland Turkey changed, we changed. We evolved in our own ways, they evolved in their own ways, [for example] they went into World War and they changed. We have been in Cyprus War, we changed. My ancestors go back to Ottoman time [in Cyprus]. We are talking about 1571.

Mustafa: ...Ehhh history wise, we have to know our history. [To the interviewer] You have to know your history, but you know that history is written by the

winner. My history makes me Turkish. Depends how much you accept it. I have friends who say, "I don't accept Turkish history" and they say "I'm Cypriot".

Mustafa here points to history to explain the Turkish part of his identity, but he understood that for some people in his community, the Turkish-based history is not acceptable. He did not blame them although he did not agree. Even though he took in consideration that "history is written by winners," he was convinced that what he knew about his community's history and its connection to the Turkish culture and identity was correct. He said,

Mustafa: The information that I have is sufficient... Ottomans invaded Middle East and parts of Europe and Cyprus. I am a descendant of the culture brought from Anatolia. And this is the information and it is a valid information I believe because it's in the books of the, as far as I know, it's also in the Greek books.

It is true that one of the two theories about the origins of the Turkish-Cypriot community is that they are ancestors of Ottoman Turks who stayed in Cyprus after the Ottomans left the island in 1878. What is not true is that "Greek books" support this theory. On the contrary, Greek history books support a second theory that argues that Turkish-Cypriot were in fact Greek-Cypriots that became Muslim during the Ottoman rule in order to avoid the high taxes that non-Muslim populations of the Ottoman Empire had to pay. It seems that the truth lies somewhere in between the two theories, that some Turkish-Cypriots came from the Ottomans that stayed in Cyprus after 1878 and others were Greek-Cypriots who became Muslim during the Ottoman rule (Djavit An, 2016; Jennings, 1993).

Language

In addition to history, he identified education and language as the most important elements of his Turkishness. He explained,

Mustafa: First you start with education and language. Turkish language. And then we watch Turkish TV, we listen to Turkish radio. So first is the language. I mean even if your parents don't teach you the language, it's there. The TV, the media.

INT: What is your understanding of the language that you speak in Cyprus? And then compare it with the language they speak in Istanbul. Is it the same language? Is it different?

Mustafa: We have the same common ground. It's the same. To be honest with you, if you are a Turkish-Cypriot maybe it's a bit different but we understand each other. It's very clear. Our accent is different but even in Cyprus, when you speak in Nicosia it's a different accent, Famagusta different, Paphos is different...

[Also] what makes this Turkish to our advantage is that the alphabet and the written Turkish is the same [the Cypriot-Turkish and Standard Modern Turkish]. Standard.

He pointed out that the Turkish language is everywhere in the environment, from interactions with parents to the media, and that regardless of the variation of the language (Cypriot-Turkish or Standard Modern Turkish) the language is still Turkish. For him, the basis of the Cypriot-Turkish language and the Modern Standard Turkish language is the same and that the Cypriot-Turkish is a variation of the Turkish language. He added that even within the Cypriot-Turkish language there are different regional variations, known

as dialects (although he did not use that term). All these points are in agreement with the current linguistic understanding of the Cypriot-Turkish dialect as a variation of the Modern Standard Turkish language.

Genes vs Culture

Mustafa believed that he is genetically and culturally a descendant of the Ottoman Turks that came to Cyprus from Anatolia during the late 16th century (1571 A.C. and afterwards). Since Mustafa's arguments were compatible with primordialist (or essentialist) theories that support that the people of an ethnic group come from the same race and are genetically similar, I wanted to clarify if he agreed with other elements of the primordialist school of thought, so I asked,

INT: So what you believe is that let's say gene-wise you came from those people that came to Cyprus during the Ottoman times.

Mustafa: True! I believe because there haven't been any marriages [meaning marriages between Turkish-Cypriots and Greek-Cypriots]. If there were examples maybe I would say, like they say in America [meaning the U.S.A.]—you know this—I am 20 percent Chinese, I am 20 percent Italian, 10 percent Mexican and then you have this mumbo jumbo in the middle. In our case you can trace your family and I don't think there is any Greek blood over there.

Since he admitted that he had no proof of this last statement, I tried to challenge his view by presenting him with a hypothetical scenario,

INT: So if you find out that there is no Turkish blood in you. There is—I don't know—Italian blood, invaders. Would that make you change your identity?

Mustafa: No, no... because you have to choose. It's a matter of choice. You can't be raised in a Turkish family and you choose to say 'I'm not Turkish'. It's I respect that. But genetically even if I'm not, if I'm Italian, it's too late now. [they laugh] Because I should start learning Italian, learning Italian jokes, watching Italian TV, support Italian teams.

I: So the experiences are more important to you than the genes let's say.

Mustafa: True!

Mustafa believed that both culturally and genetically he belonged to the Turkish-Cypriot community, but for him the cultural connection was more important than the genetic. He saw my hypothetical scenario as not that possible and he was not bothered. Rather he joked about it and laughed, acknowledging that for him the genetic connection between the members of the Turkish-Cypriot community was less important than the cultural connection.

Later on in the interview when we talked about his experiences in mainland Turkey. He mentioned that—even though he saw similarities in culture with the Greek-Cypriots—the similarities with the Turkish culture of the mainland Turkey were stronger for him. He felt more connected to the history and culture of the mainland, he said, and if he had to choose between a united Cyprus and a Northern Cyprus that was part of Turkey he would have chosen the second because of this connection to the history and culture of the Turkish people of the mainland. That said, this did not mean that his culture was the same with the Turks of the mainland. He was “proud” of his Turkish-Cypriot identity and

the elements of his culture specific to this community. He felt “obligated” to keep this identity and pass it to his children, because his parents and grandparents generation worked and fought really hard to keep it alive. As he said, “So if I want to leave that identity [the Turkish-Cypriot identity], I feel like I’m ignoring the efforts that has been done [by my parents’ generation] to keep it alive.”

Experiences in Cyprus

Family

Mustafa’s mother was born in the city of Polis near Paphos and his father in a village in that same area. Both of them were fluent in Greek; his mother because of her interaction with Greek-Cypriots in Polis (a mixed city before 1974) and his father from his interaction with Greek-Cypriot classmates during his middle and high school years at the English School in Nicosia. They both had Greek-Cypriot friends before the conflict. Mustafa said that his mother did not share much about her interaction with Greek-Cypriots and she definitely did not share any negative experiences with Greek-Cypriots during the conflict. Mustafa mentioned that because of her job as teacher during the conflict, he believed that she did not have much interaction. She spent most of her time in only Turkish villages and enclaves teaching Turkish-Cypriot girls. As he said, “[During the conflict] my mother didn’t have too much interaction with the Greeks but she had friends. Poli was bi-communal. Um... she never said anything against Greeks. She never said, ‘I have this friend who did this and that.’”

His father, however, talked often about his interaction with Greek-Cypriots both before and during the conflict. He also shared his views on the Cyprus problem with Mustafa. Mustafa attributed to his father his own love for history, particularly the history of Cyprus, and a lot of his historical knowledge and political opinions. In the interview, he shared with me much of this knowledge in explanation of some of his views on the Cyprus conflict and his perceptions about the Greek-Cypriot community. As he put it, "...it's your family and your close friends who help you create, understand your history."

His father attended the English School, a very well respected and prestigious middle and high school in Nicosia, and the only school on the island for both Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot students (Antoniou, 2015). According to Mustafa, his father recalled, although he attended school with Greek-Cypriots in the late 1950s and early 1960s (before the initial conflict in 1963), that society at the time was highly segregated. He described what he learned from his father about that time,

Mustafa: But what my father told me that [during] the time that he was in school, the separation was created for them. You either had to be EOKA or TNT. You had to make this choice. Otherwise you couldn't get a job. You couldn't find networking. It was the clubs. So you had to choose a club. If you were stuck in the middle you couldn't go anywhere. You didn't get any support. My father was born in 1943 so by the time he was in high school things started warming up.

Mustafa said that his father, despite having very good relationships with individual Greek-Cypriots, because of his experiences during the 1960s he did not trust them enough to live among large groups of Greek-Cypriots. This distrust for the Greek-Cypriots was something that he tried to press on Mustafa, who said that he always had it

at the back of his mind when it came to decisions relevant to the Cyprus problem and living with Greek-Cypriots. He attributed this distrust to his father's experiences during the conflict and particularly the fact that many of his father's friends were killed by Greek-Cypriots during that period. Here is how he put it,

Mustafa: He had many Greek friends because of the bi-communal school. With some of them he even had some business agreements, he was actually planning to do, starting-up businesses with them [this was just before 1963]. People-wise, individually, he doesn't have any problem with individuals [Greek-Cypriots]. But when it comes to the idea of Greeks joining up and Turkish joining up, he is on the right-wing and at this point or even at that time he wouldn't live together with Greeks. So I'm trained to think like this. I try not to think like this but I'm trained to think like this... [My father says that] Greeks are very good people. You can have very good time with them, you can enjoy, spend good time with them. But when ten Greeks get together—this is what he says—and it's about Cyprus, things change.

Mustafa: His friends died, I mean don't know how to put it. Us, we don't have this. If you have twenty friends and ten of them die [because of the conflict]. You change. There is no other explanation to this. And my father's generation and also same with Greek-Cypriots there friends died, my father's friends died and there is no turning back for my father. I accept him the way he is... We [referring to the interviewer and himself] never lived together, we don't really know.

Mustafa's father did not trust the Greek-Cypriots when it came to the Cyprus issue and the co-existence of the two communities on the island. Because Mustafa did not

have his own direct experiences living with Greek-Cypriots, he relied on what his father shared with him, which made him cautious when it came to interacting with Greek-Cypriots. Also, and despite his lack of contact with the Greek-Cypriots, he believed that the Greek-Cypriots did not change much since the 1960s in terms of national claims on the island and their attitudes towards Turkish-Cypriots. For Mustafa, a key to the attitudes of Greek-Cypriots is the influence of the Greek Orthodox Church of Cyprus on this community, which he believed it was still very religious.

INT: Your father said that when ten Greek-Cypriots come together about Cyprus it's dangerous. What is your perspective on what your father told you?

Mustafa: Religion is plays a major role. Turkish-Cypriots are not religious people. It's true. You can talk to anyone. It's there. What we see is that the Orthodox Church has a major impact on the way Greeks have been thinking. And they are strict. We believe we are more flexible because of our religious attachments. We don't have religious attachments so we are over it. That's why I believe that the Greek community hasn't changed much since that time. The agenda is still there. Maybe not for everyone but for the majority the agenda is still there.

Mustafa: The newer generation shouldn't have this 'split table idea' but I have really serious suspicions about the Orthodox way of thinking... I have serious suspicions about what they are told there [at the churches]. There is a big question mark. Are they still talking about revenge? We are afraid to what they are teaching to the new generation. I was never taught to hate Greeks or revenge or they did this, they did that.

The Greek-Cypriot agenda he referred to is the one that led to the conflict when Greek-Cypriots wanted the whole island for themselves, an idea he believes is still embraced by the Church of Cyprus and the religious and nationalist Greek-Cypriots whom he believes to be the majority of the Greek-Cypriot community (The accuracy of this is addressed in sections on Politics and Religion). Mustafa also talked about what his parents shared with him about the current division of the island,

Mustafa: My father believes, so does my mother, they believe that the buffer zone is for the good for both communities, for both cultures because it gives us the potential to have this safety zone and think twice before we do something. At his [my father's] time we [the two communities] were so mixed that you couldn't have a proper Turkish or proper Greek authority, it was so mixed. My father's experiences, because Turkish were a minority they had to live in enclaves. I don't know if it's in the books. It was like tiny, tiny, tiny Turkish zones and mainly Greek-controlled cities. When you live in those small areas you wish that all the small areas were actually one together, separate [from the Greek-Cypriot areas]. At least you have freedom to move [in a bigger area] and this is what we have now.

His parents consider the division better than living oppressed in enclaves as they did prior to 1974. Even within the enclaves they felt unsafe because they were fewer in number than the Greek-Cypriots. This is a view that Mustafa agreed; he could see the benefits of all the enclaves being connected to one area, the north part of Cyprus. He considered the current division as a "privilege" for his community because it offers freedom of movement and safety. Nevertheless, he wished that things were even better

for TRNC. The isolation of the Turkish-Cypriot community and the non-recognition of TRNC were issues that bothered him. He talked extensively about it (see section on Politics).

Interaction with Greek-Cypriots

Mustafa met Greek-Cypriots occasionally through Turkish-Cypriots friend who were involved in bi-communal activities. He did not have any Greek-Cypriot friends. He admitted that because of this lack of regular interaction with Greek-Cypriots he felt that he did not know the Greek-Cypriot community very well. As a result, he did not trust them. Meeting Greek-Cypriots more often and getting to know their perspective was not a priority for him at the time. Mustafa said that he wished he had more contact with Greek-Cypriots, but based on his responses he did not seem to be willing to invest any time to do so. This was the only part in our conversation that I had to ask several questions since he was giving me very short answers,

INT: Do you have Greek-Cypriot friends?

Mustafa: Not friend. Unfortunately... I wish I had but...

INT: You mentioned you met Greek-Cypriots.

Mustafa: Yes I do but we are not friends.

INT: How do you know them?

Mustafa: Actually is mainly through my friends. Turkish-Cypriot friends that are involved in bi-communal activities. I didn't have the opportunity. Well it's not exactly right. [Better put] I didn't create the opportunity for this [to meet Greek-

Cypriots.] I didn't create that integration, the connection. It's not the best thing to say but I didn't spend enough time. I made a choice of focusing more on my business life, my family life. To be honest I don't have much time left to get into this bi-communal.

INT: As I understand you are okay with having contact with Greek-Cypriots.

Mustafa: Any time. I wish I had more.

INT: And you are okay with people trying to have more connections with Greek-Cypriots with bi-communal events?

Mustafa: Yes yes! I learn a lot through them [my friends] and I am perfectly fine with meeting any Greek-Cypriots. Any! Even if he is on the right wing.

INT: Do you think it's needed for you to get to know Greek-Cypriots and understand their perspective or is it something you can live without?

Mustafa: At this time I can live without it. At this time.

INT: No need for you to know what is going on the other side.

Mustafa: I try to follow them on news and other things. But at this point we have much more serious problems other than the integration. First we have to get our economy and our culture properly and then. Because the flirting [between the two communities] is good. But how long can you flirt? At some point the flirting has to go to a relationship or the flirting has to stop. I don't want to keep this as a routine. I have friends that meet their Greek-Cypriot friends every weekend. I'm happy for them. For me I have more other stuff to worry about.

Perceptions about Greek-Cypriots

Inherited distrust

What I saw in Mustafa was a person that tried to make amends with Greek-Cypriots, but the stories and images from the past—which he did not experience first-hand but heard a lot about—wouldn't let him trust the other. It was not just his father's stories or the images and documentaries about the 1960s, it was the combination of all these that created a persistent image of the 'other' as having the same nationalistic agenda they had in 1960s that required Turkish-Cypriots to be extinct.

Mustafa's perceptions about Greek-Cypriots came in part from his limited interaction with them, but mainly from what he learned from his father's extensive experience interacting with Greek-Cypriots before the 1974. His views were very similar to what he described as his father's views. He admitted that he relied on what his father told him about the Greek-Cypriots,

Mustafa: Greek-Cypriots because of the experiences [my father shared with me] – because we never lived together, we don't really know. [His father said] Greeks are very good people. You can have very good time with them you can enjoy, spend good time with them. But when ten Greeks get together—this is what he [my father] says—and it's about Cyprus, things change.

The distrust inherited by from his father came several times in our conversations. For example, he said that he feels uncomfortable being in a place where there are many Greek-Cypriots and few Turkish-Cypriots, like at a soccer game with Greek-Cypriot teams.

Mustafa: if you ask me, 'Are you fine going to a football stadium?' I'm not fine.

INT: Why is that?

Mustafa: Somehow I feel a tension. May be is the numbers that I pointed out.

When you have ten Greeks together it's different. When you have one Greek it's okay. I can't imagine ten thousand Greeks at the same place. I wouldn't go there.

He repeated another one of his father's lines, about the similarities between the Greek-Cypriots and the Turkish-Cypriots,

Mustafa: Anything besides the Cypriot problem, we are very similar. When it comes to the Cyprus problem and we start talking about it, things change... I

believe that the Greek community hasn't changed much since that time [1960s].

The agenda [to have the whole island for themselves] is still there. Maybe not for everyone but for the majority the agenda is still there... We always learned that they [the Greek-Cypriots] hated us but we didn't know how much they hated us.

Mustafa's perceptions about the Greek-Cypriots, since they come from his father's experiences from more than forty years ago and his own K-12 education promoting the image of the other as the dangerous enemy, carries the same distrust that the 1960s Turkish-Cypriot community had against the Greek-Cypriots. Although he visited the South part very often and he had the opportunity to have closer relationships with Greek-Cypriots through his "left-wing Turkish-Cypriot friends" in a safe environment, he chose to keep his distance. This distance made him feel safer. It's like he preferred to preserve this perception about the other.

His distrust fit perfectly with his hopes for the political future on the island; he preferred unification with Turkey rather than a unified Cyprus. He saw the Greek-Cypriots as a neighboring country that he would like to have good relationships with but

will never fully trust. He explained that he believed that the Greek-Cypriots still wanted to get the whole island back by any means. He made an analogy to make his point:

Mustafa: Let's say this is the table, and you say 'I want the table' and I cut it in half, give you half and I keep the other half. You [the Greek-Cypriots] say it was my table and you still want the table. And even if we had it split, you say "It was my table" and I say, "Okay it was but now it's not." In that perspective, if we come to the numbers [meaning percentages] Greeks actually had a major loss. When it comes to statistics. It's a loss. When you lose something you want it back. In Turkish perspective we won [gained] something and when you win [gain] something you are flexible because it wasn't there. It came from nowhere. But the lose I believe it's so big for Greeks that the idea to get it back is still there for their generation [Greek-Cypriots of his father's generation].

Mustafa: Actually we were taught actually that Greeks did it to themselves. If Greeks were moving all together. This wouldn't have happened. Because Greeks turned to each other, it gave Turkish-Cypriots this opportunity. We didn't really had to work too hard for it. Greeks did it to themselves. This is what we have been learning.

The Church of Cyprus

He attributed a lot of the influence towards the "Greek-Cypriot agenda" to the Orthodox Church of Cyprus. He believed it was still influential since "Greek-Cypriots are religious." He also said, "I don't know. You tell me. What do they say in the weekend when they go to church?" He was not sure but he was not very suspicious about the

influence of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus to the aspirations of the Greek-Cypriots and the “Greek Orthodox way of thinking” as he called it.

Mustafa: But this is one of my concerns, if religion gets in the way I know it will be extra influential. We went to school, we finished school, we read the book, we closed the book, [the ideas in the] books are gone! But this idea of Church hasn't changed and I don't think it will change, maybe in another hundred years. It's programmed to be like that. It has to be like that otherwise it won't be Orthodox... And somehow- don't misunderstand me I'm not against your religion - somehow Greek-Cypriot, they need to find a way out of this Orthodox thinking for me to feel safe. It's my perspective. As long as they are religious I will not feel safe.

Turkish Immigrants

Mustafa has regular contact with immigrants from Turkey and is very comfortable interacting with his Turkish “friends, co-workers, business associates.” But when I asked if he considered them part of his community he first distinguished the immigrants from Turkey in two groups. The first group is those who had been in northern Cyprus for decades, most arriving between 1975 and 1977 from Turkey, and whose children grew up in Cyprus. In the literature, this group is known as “settlers.” The second group are those who came to Cyprus for a short period of time to work, earn money, and leave, known as “economic migrants” (Besim, Ekici & Guven-Lisaniler, 2015; Hatay, 2005; 2008). Mustafa said that though those two groups share the same history and the same popular

culture, he only considers the settlers as part of his community, not the short term economic migrants. He explained his view,

Mustafa: There are people who came very shortly after 1974 and then there are guys who came in 2005 let's say. The guys who came after 1974-75 I went to school with them, I played football with them. Their families are my parents' friends. So the immigrants in my understanding you have to split them into these two groups. There are these newcomers who have no idea about our culture who came in 2004 2005. They came here actually to make money and go back. They are not here to stay and live. Any person who has good life in Turkey wouldn't even care to come here. If they come here it means they don't have a house [in Turkey], they don't have a job; something is missing. They were coming here for better opportunities.

The economic migrants from Turkey moved to the north part for better financial opportunities than the ones they had in Turkey. For Mustafa, they moved to Cyprus to make money, take advantage of the opportunity, and then leave; they were not putting down roots. Although Mustafa did not consider the Turkish migrant group as part of his community, he still wanted them to be in Cyprus, as he considered their contribution to the economy important. According to him, their economic importance evident during the past few years when large numbers of Turkish immigrants left the North to go back to Turkey because,

Mustafa: Now Turkey is so ahead of us [Turkey doing better financially]. North Cyprus used to be a hot spot for a better job for a better standards of living. I don't know the exact numbers but thousands of immigrants, actually, went back

[to Turkey] last year. ... And this is a big problem for us because we don't have people to work, the labor. Labor is gone. Even selling them one bread, is a contribution to the economy.

Then I asked about the settlers,

INT: The people that came in 1974 that you went to school with, do you think are Turkish-Cypriot or Turkish.

Mustafa: The majority of them have integrated. The most critical question is how they feel. Like you asked me are you Turkish-Cypriot or Cypriot? I ask the same question to them. If they say Turkish-Cypriot and they are part of the community, it means that they are part of the community and I have to accept that. There is no reason for me to ignore them because they are there! I mean they are paying their taxes, they are living with me, we went to the same school, we go to the same market [same shops], we play football together. They are Turkish-Cypriot to me.

Mustafa considered the settlers and particularly their children (now in their 30s and 40s) as members of the Turkish-Cypriot community. He argued that they grew up together, they went to the same schools, they contribute to the economy of the community, and he lives and interacts with them daily.

When I asked if the same set of principles to consider a person Turkish-Cypriot applied to people than migrated from other parts of the world in the north part, he said that cannot apply to them. He highlighted that with the Turkish settlers they share the same "background," particularly popular culture and history. Mustafa feels he is part of the Turkish nation, so Turkish history is an essential element of his identity. That, then, is

something that he shares with Turkish settlers and immigrants but not with people that came from countries other than Turkey.

INT: Does this apply to people that came from other countries, not from Turkey, as immigrants? Their kids were born here and they are growing here. And they speak Turkish but the countries they came from are different. Do you consider these people as Turkish-Cypriots or something else?

Mustafa: Something else. Because we lose [we don't have] the common ground with them. Let's say someone coming from Bulgaria. Yes, he is but when you talk about it he doesn't share the same background with you. With people that came from Turkey we share the same history. We share the same, let's say, popular culture. We listen to the same music, Turkish music, we enjoy the same activities. Things like that.

Mustafa did not mention the fact that many Turkish-Cypriots consider them very different from them and Turkish-Cypriots want to differentiate from them for many reasons. One reason is that they do not want Turkey to be in Cyprus with its military. A second reason is that many Turkish-Cypriots blame Turkey for the isolation of the Turkish-Cypriot community after 1974. So they see any friendships with the immigrant population as a reinforcement of the current situation or an agreement with it. Hence they avoid any connections with Turkish immigrants in general.

K-12 Experiences

Education as a reminder

Mustafa described his overall K-12 educational experience as a “reminder” of what his community went through for him to be able to feel safe. For him, his education in the Turkish-Cypriot community was not one that promoted hate for Greek-Cypriot, but rather was a reminder of what his community had gained through struggle. That said, he was “taught that they [the other] hated us,” a narrative that both communities developed through their educational systems. Their community consisted of peaceful people, but the other community hated them and attacked them, and for this reason, they had to defend themselves, sometimes with violence (see Bryant, 2010; Hadjipavlou, 2002; Mamkrianni, 2006; Papadakis, 2008; Perikleous, 2010; Vural & Ozuyanic, 2008).

Mustafa recognized the importance of knowing the history of his community and its “reminder,” but he was critical of some of the methods used, describing them as “too much.” He gave the example of schools and streets in the North that are named after Turkish-Cypriots who were killed during the 1960s and the use of the suffix “sehit”—which means martyr—attached to their names,

Mustafa: For instance, this is a detail. We have eighty percent of streets named sehit [martyr] something, eighty percent of schools we have sehit. Şehit! Şehit! Şehit! It’s not the right thing to do. I don’t believe this is the right thing. It is nice to remember but you don’t have to call every school sehit! sehit! sehit! For example you are six years old [and someone asks you], “Where do you go to

school?”[You answer,] “Şehit Mustafa Sari!” I respect that he died in the war but for the six year old saying şehit, şehit, şehit, all the time is not good. You know!

INT: So you think this influenced you or the other kids in the school?

Mustafa: In one way. Because it’s part of the everyday life. You try to tell a street and the street is şehit Mustafa Sari.

INT: That influence you by hating the other community, by being proud about that person...

Mustafa: No, no. Not necessarily proud. War is not something to be proud of, but it’s a re-mi-nder [he emphasized each syllable of the word “reminder” individually]. That someone died... You know that this school is named after someone, so there is a cost paid for it, so next time you do something, remember it! But it doesn’t affect me in a way of revenge or hate. For us the education was more about, reminder! Know this, behave accordingly. We were never told to get into action. For us it was not the action part. It was, know and at least keep what you have, because it’s a privilege that you were given.

INT: So this line was throughout your education? The reminder?

Mustafa: Yes! It was not like, do this, do that. It was like, this this happened, know it! And be happy with what you have, because remember what your father went through, remember what your mother went through. If you don’t want those days to happen make sure that you keep what you have.

Despite the isolation and his complaints about the non-recognition of TRNC and the traveling restrictions that bothered him, Mustafa still believed that he enjoyed “a privilege,” something that his education taught him. Mustafa used lines similar to

“...know and at least keep what you have, because it’s a privilege that you were given” when he talked about the solution he preferred to the Cyprus issue. He wanted a solution in which the Turkish-Cypriots would keep the North part of the island and would not have to share it with Greek-Cypriots. For him, the division line and the separation “is a good thing” because it provided safety to his community from the Greek-Cypriot aggression which he never experienced but learned from his father and from school.

History education

Regarding the knowledge he received from school about Turkish and the Turkish-Cypriot history, he said that it was not enough. His lifelong conversations with his father and with friends were the major sources of information about history. He and his father supported a history of his community that is Turkish and supports the Turkish-Cypriot identity. This history is in agreement with the narrative of the political party they supported, the right-wing Ulusal Birlik Partisi UBT (National Unity Party), a topic I discuss later in this section. However, Mustafa’s friends supported left-wing parties which present the Turkish-Cypriot community as a separate and independent entity from Turkey and hence supported a Cypriot identity. Conversations with these friends and the need to prove the validity of his Turkish-Cypriot claim pushed him to seek and find historical evidence to support his Turkish-Cypriot identity. He did that by reading and by seeking help from his father. He said,

INT: So let’s go to your school years again. History! So were you taught Turkish history, I’m guessing and Turkish-Cypriot history? How was that?

Mustafa: It always starts with the pre-Ottoman history, it goes to the Ottoman time, so you can connect the Cyprus history.

INT: So it was connected to the Turkish history. Do you think that you were taught enough Turkish history or enough Turkish-Cypriot history?

Mustafa: May be not through school but my father reads a lot of books and he talks about history. I like history! So we talked a lot since I was a kid. Just school is not enough. When people graduate from school and you ask ‘What did you learn from school?’ they don’t care. School history was okay but you know, you write a paper and next day you don’t remember anything from the books. Actually it’s your family and your close friends who help you create, understand your history... We went to school, we finished school, we read the book, we closed the book, the books are done!

INT: Do you have any friends that they help you understand history or make you be more interested or influence your identity as you understand it?

Mustafa: Yes! Actually... It’s hard to put it this way but the way my friends think forced me to do more research about my history. Not in a good way, I mean we are not on the same page, they are always on the other side of the story and I had to get more details to get back to them.

INT: What do you mean ‘other side’?

Mustafa: ... Most of my friends are actually left wing. And many of the people in my community and they say, “I don’t accept Turkish history” and they say “I’m Cypriot”.

INT: So when you talk with people in your community, do you refer to Turkish-Cypriot as Turkish-Cypriot or as Cypriot?

Mustafa: Turkish-Cypriot. Actually I have very tough arguments. One of my friends, Hasan, we are north and south poles [when it comes to our identity]. He says he is Cypriot. So I kind of have to keep this Turkish-Cypriot thing when I talk to him. If I make any fluctuation, I lose the case. Even within the community I have to clarify that I'm Turkish Cypriot.

Mustafa admitted that as a student he did not pay much attention to what was told in the classroom. He saw school as a means to getting to university and later a good job. He attributed his knowledge of history to the love for it that he inherited from his father, the lengthy conversations they had together, and the books he read in high school. His knowledge of history came from Turkish and Turkish-Cypriot sources. He also admitted that due to the language barrier (he could not read or speak Greek), he did not know much about the Greek-Cypriot perspective on the recent history of Cyprus. He did ask me for the Greek-Cypriot perspective on the history of the 1960s and 1970, something that we talked about after the end of the interview. When I mentioned that there are books in English that presented the Greek-Cypriot point of view for that era, he asked me to suggest few books that he could get and read, which I gladly provided.

Politics

Political affiliations

Mustafa is an active member of the Ulusal Birlik Partisi UBT (National Unity Party) the right-wing conservative party that favors good relationships with Turkey and a solution based on two separate states.

INT: What makes this party a good choice for you?

Mustafa: They believe, which is also what I believe, which is the existence of the Turkish-Cypriot community in a united Cyprus but under the right terms. They are not as flexible as CTP which is the left-wing party. They have tougher expectations. So do I.

INT: What do you mean tougher expectations?

Mustafa: Strict. How to say it? For CTP full integration is. Just one Cyprus with no local governments and full integration. Everybody going back to their villages, Turkish-Cypriot and Greek-Cypriots. Just like it was in 1960s before the fights. A dream come true. But UBT is more realistic and they say, okay this happened. Our history pushed us to this point, we have to keep our Turkish-Cypriot identity, you have to keep your Greek-Cypriot identity. We have to have our own zones, safety zones so that we don't mess with each other.

Mustafa described briefly but very accurately the position of his UBT party on the Cyprus issue. It was obvious throughout the interview that he was in agreement with that position, of keeping the two communities separate, not divided but not under one united

government either. As he explained, “so we don’t mess with each other,” referring to the 1960s and 1970s conflict and his fear that in a united country the conflict may be repeated. Mustafa’s distrust for the Greek-Cypriot community and his fear for his safety were also expressed in his stance against the Annan plan, his overall political views, and preferred solution for the Cyprus issue. He said that the communities are not ready to live together and there is a risk of further violent conflict if a solution is forced on the two communities. He justified this by citing many supporters of respective nationalist right-wing political ideologies in both communities that are not ready to live together. He also highlighted once again the influence of the Church of Cyprus to this group of “fanatics” in the south,

Mustafa: I mean if you were to say, okay tomorrow we live together. Conflict will begin again. Because numbers are not there. Numbers as in, let’s say fanatics. Let’s go with left-wing, right-wing. Right-wing it’s still strong there [in the south], right-wing it’s still strong in north Cyprus. The idea is still there. And somehow- don’t misunderstand me I’m not against your religion - somehow Greek-Cypriots, they need to find a way out of this Orthodox thinking. It’s my perspective.

Annan Plan

Mustafa was against the Annan plan for the same reasons. When I presented him with the fact that 70 percent of the people in his community voted “Yes,” he explained that they did so because it was their only way out of the isolation they suffered since

1974 living in an internationally non-recognized country. He argued that they were not ready even if they voted for the Annan plan and that most people in his community would have taken any solution over the current political situation. It was a way out of bad situation.

INT: About the Annan Plan. What did you vote? Did you vote?

Mustafa: I was in the United States but if I was here would have voted 'No'.

I: Why not?

Mustafa: Back to the same idea. The communities are not ready.

INT: You think that none of the communities was ready? Because most of the Turkish-Cypriot voted 'Yes'. Do you think that those people that voted 'Yes' are ready to live with the other community.

Mustafa: Not really. They didn't have a choice. It's like you are stuck in a way [talking about the Turkish-Cypriot people]. You are not part of Turkey. You are not part of Europe. You are not part of Cyprus. You are not part of anything, people don't recognize you. Your passport doesn't exist, your identity doesn't exist, your address doesn't exist. You cannot fly anywhere else other than Istanbul. You are stuck! And in that that position you are already at the bottom. I mean, how worse does it get? Whatever is offered to you is better. Because you don't have a choice... they are not really dying 'We want to live with Greeks!'. They are more like, 'We are stuck! We don't have a choice.' This is an opportunity for us to integrate with Europe. And it was actually the package. The package was like, join in and next day you are in Europe. They didn't vote, I believe, let's live together [with Greek-Cypriots] next to each other, you know

“let’s get married” kind of thing. It was like, let’s do this so we can jump to Europe. It was an opportunity.

INT: For you that opportunity wasn’t a real opportunity?

Mustafa: It was not opportunity because I believe the two communities should get together because they want to live together. It shouldn’t be based on economic reasons. It’s like we are getting married so I can get your money.

He used the metaphor of a marriage in which one partner weds to take advantage of the benefits of marriage rather than because s/he loves the other person or wants to live with him or her. He used the same metaphor throughout our conversation about a possible solution.

Regardless of his rejection of the Annan plan, Mustafa was not happy with the political situation of non-recognition of TRNC, something that he expressed directly but also indirectly by using negative phrases like “You are not...” and “You cannot...,” nine consecutive times in very short sentences. He used the “generic you” to indicate a shared, common experience (O’Connor, 1994) among Turkish-Cypriots.

Opening of checkpoints

Mustafa believed that the opening of the checkpoints that allowed people from the two communities to visit the other side was a very positive step that will help the people from the two communities, particularly people like him born after 1974, to meet people from the other community. Mustafa pointed out that he was not sure what to expect on the other side and what kind of people he would have met.

INT: Do you think that the opening of the checkpoints helped the communities?

Mustafa: It was the best thing to do. It was a wake-up call. At least for our generation.-But it gave us an insight about the other community. Until that time I didn't know what Greeks were thinking. I didn't know what they were doing. I didn't know if they were happy with what they had. I didn't know how much they hated us. We always learned that they hated us but we didn't know how much they hated us. So it gave us this opportunity [to meet].

Talking to some Greek-Cypriots after the opening of the checkpoints he realized that felt similarly. He also realized that the Greek-Cypriots had the impression that the Turkish-Cypriots were very poor and oppressed, which he added was not true.

Mustafa: The best thing, which I'm a bit proud of, and don't misunderstand me... The Greeks that I talked to after the border opened, they had no idea about the way of our living. They were thinking of us as if we were living in small villages, poor houses, no infrastructure, no luxury cars. They had no idea of our status because as I understand the Greek government and the Church emphasized that we were actually suffering in the north. "People are not happy in the north, they are begging for a united Cyprus" [he is laughing] and this it was a big wake up call for Greeks, "OK we are dealing now with people who have cars, who have houses, who have income, they have hotels, even an airport." I think it gave us a chance to flirt.

Crossing

Mustafa crosses very often to the south though he does not have any friends there. He has visited his father's village few times, but he said that he did not really feel any connection since he had no memories or people he cares about there. He said,

INT: Did you visit your father's village?

Mustafa: Yeah. It was great to see and listen to my father talking about the village and his life there. I even have him on video and everything but I don't have the attachment because there is nothing that pulls me back there. If let's say I had an uncle living there I would have an attachment... There are no memories there for me.

INT: How often do you go to the south? You went to see your dad's village. Was that the only time you went there?

Mustafa: I go to south quite often for shopping and other things... when I go I don't go specifically to meet Greek-Cypriots friends. I don't have any. I go for my own thing for my own sake.

Experiences Abroad

Need to explain his identity

Mustafa spent the first eighteen years of his life in Cyprus. In later years, he traveled to Turkey for business and moved to the northern Europe and the United States for his studies. While he was in Cyprus within the Turkish-Cypriot community he never felt the need to explain his identity. When he began having interactions with non-Turkish-Cypriots abroad he realized that people, even in Turkey, did not know much about his community and his ethno-national identity, which frustrated him. Realizing that people did not know about his community pushed him to “feel stronger” about his Turkish-Cypriot identity and spend more time talking to people about his community and his ethno-national identity. As he said,

You exist in your own community so you don't know what the rest of the world things about you... You go out there and you see that they have no idea about you. It's very upsetting!... you are, 'Okay, something is missing' this means you have to work harder... I didn't like it, because for them I didn't exist.

Experiences in Turkey

Mustafa felt that he belongs to the Turkish nation, but wanted to preserve his Turkish-Cypriot identity. He did not want to be confused with people from mainland Turkey because as he said, “I'm proud of my [Turkish-Cypriot] roots” and regardless of the cultural similarities with people from mainland Turkey, he believed that the Turkish-

Cypriots are a different people. When he described his visits to Turkey, he expressed his frustration because most Turkish people did not know much about the Turkish-Cypriot community. Some of them even ignored its existence. Furthering his sense of obligation to preserve his Turkish-Cypriot identity and because of the ignorance of many people in Turkey, Mustafa felt that it is necessary to explain where he came from and that he was Turkish-Cypriot not Turkish.

INT: When you go to Turkey, how do you feel? Interaction with people. Do you feel home? How is it?

Mustafa: I feel home but in a way I always feel responsible for explaining them because they don't get the idea of being a Turkish-Cypriot. Here [in Cyprus] we say I'm a Turkish-Cypriot. Over there they try to define me as Turkish. I believe one of my obligations, when I meet a Turkish person, [is to] always explain them, "OK, we have a common ground but I'm a Turkish-Cypriot" [emphasis on the word Cypriot].

INT: Why do you feel that? Because they don't know?

Mustafa: First they don't know. Second they think of north Cyprus, Turkish-Cypriots, as part of Turkey. Like Adana, Angara [cities in Turkey] and I tell them, just because we speak the same language doesn't mean we have the same, same exact cultures. We have many many common things but there is this part which makes me Cypriot.

INT: So you want people to know that you are a bit different.

Mustafa: Yes! I want them!

INT: Even though you believe you belong to Turkey as a Country, you want to identify yourself as something different.

Mustafa: Yes!

INT: Why is that?

Mustafa: I am proud of my roots and also the split [between Turkish-Cypriots and Turkey] goes back to 500 years ago. Again, maybe we are talking too much historical. Mainland Turkey changed, we changed. We evolved in our own ways, they evolved in their own ways. They went into World War and they changed. We have been in Cyprus War, we changed. My ancestors go back to Ottoman time. We are talking about 1571.

Mustafa expressed his frustration with the narrative—heard often when he visited Turkey—that the Turkish-Cypriot community owed its existence to Turkey because Turkey saved the Turkish-Cypriots from Greek-Cypriots with the military operation in Cyprus in 1974. He said that Turkey’s military intervention came much later than it should. He argued that Turkey did not come to support Turkish-Cypriots when they needed them most during the 1960s and that his father’s generation managed to keep the community alive during the conflict without any help from Turkey. For Mustafa it was possible that the community could have been extinguished during that period. As he said addressing Turkish people, “you saved us because we existed.” During the interview he expressed his view in a very passionate tone, describing it as a “classic conversation” he had several times when visiting Turkey. Through this dialogue Mustafa presents the narrative of the Turks as saviors of Turkish-Cypriots that he encountered when talking to Turkish people and his opposition to that narrative.

Mustafa: So I want them [Turkish people] to know [that] we were left here [in Cyprus] on our own without their support until 1974. Because they say “We were always there for you” blah blah blah. [And I respond] “No, you were not there for me. If you were there for me, you should have come in 1963’. You know. Why waited this long. I hate this, “We saved you”. “You didn’t save me”. Because in their perspective Cyprus problem started in 1974 and they came and sorted it out. One day! It’s not like that. It’s much more complicated. And correct or wrong something happened in 1963 and between 1963 and ‘74 our fathers, our mothers worked very hard to keep what they had. Assimilation is part of everyday history. This nation has been assimilated, that nation assimilated, people change. Actually as Turkish-Cypriot we did our best not to assimilate. British took this place in [1871] ... from that point until 1963 there was a big struggle to keep the Turkish-Cypriot identity. So if I want to leave [abandon] that identity, I feel like I’m ignoring the efforts, the sacrifices that has been done. They [the Turks] certainly helped. I recognize that. But they are like “We save you!” “No, you saved us because we existed”. From ‘63 to ‘74 there were many opportunities, and could have been worse, the Turkish-Cypriot community could have been totally lost. It was my father and their generation that managed to keep it that way... Actually I’m doing this for my father and my family. My father’s generation. Good or bad there have been a struggle. My job is to remind people that it was not that easy. Even if it’s people from mainland.

He also used the metaphor of a movie to illustrate that the Turkish people are missing the big picture: that they have the ending of the movie in mind and they think

that they know what the movies was about. With the movie being the struggle for survival during the 1960 and the ending of the movie being the events in 1974,

Mustafa: Greek-Cypriot's agenda was to make it [Cyprus] a Greek island.

Turkey came like in the last ten minutes of the 'movie'. The 'movie' is over now [he laughed]. Welcome to the finale! They didn't watch the whole movie and they are like "Oh yeah I know the movie." "You don't know anything about the movie" [both laughed].

People abroad

The experiences of misrecognition were "even worse" when he moved to northern Europe and the United States, since people there would assume that he was Turkish or Greek-Cypriot but "never, never Turkish-Cypriot."

INT: So you went to the US and then to the UK. Did that influence the way you understood your national identity?

Mustafa: Good question. Actually I have a very good answer to that. It helped me out to realize that I had to keep my identity even stronger. Because any fluctuation that you made gave this other person, let's say American, Chinese, anyone outside of Cyprus, they were calling me Greek. "From Cyprus? Oh, you are Greek". You get so much emphasis that you are "Okay, something is missing" this means you have to work harder... I didn't like it, because for them I didn't exist.

He attributed this non-recognition or misrecognition of his ethno-national identity to the division of the island and the non-recognition of the TRNC and in extension the Turkish-Cypriot community. He said,

Mustafa: [With the division] [w]e lost culture, we lost identity. Before '63 you could say I'm a Turkish-Cypriot because you were there, you were accepted. The world knew. Okay, forty percent of the government is Turkish, sixty percent Greek. [Now] we are totally lost on the map. And this lose is not something we can get back by finance. It's not there. And you have to work much harder to explain people, because the guy there hasn't heard about you. [For him] "It's a Greek island brother."

Particularly disappointing for Mustafa were the interactions with Greeks from mainland Greece that he often had in the northern Europe. Their disappointment when they realized he was not Greek-Cypriot was devastating,

Mustafa: Sometimes if you meet a person he says, "Oh, where are you from?" you say, "I'm from Cyprus" and automatically start talking to you in Greek, if he is Greek. And I'm like "Sorry brother, sorry mate, I don't speak Greek." And then his face changes. You see at that second, within two seconds you understand that he is actually disappointed. I saw this in many faces.

Similar were his experiences with people from other countries,

Mustafa: Or you say Turkish-Cypriot and they say, "Isn't that Turkey?" You get that response a lot. That actually pushed me further. If I didn't go to the United States, I wouldn't have notice these details. You exist in your own community so

you don't know what the rest of the world thinks about you. You go out there and you see that they have no idea about you. It's very upsetting!

Immigration authorities in the U.S.A.

He also described his experience traveling in the U.S. for the first time with the TRNC passport, which not recognized by the United States government,

Mustafa: ...To get a visa for the United States, I had to go to this, not even embassy, this little office, I had to fill out application, show my passport and they wouldn't even give me a valid visa. They would give me this piece of paper which acted as a visa and then I went to the United States and at the airport [at the immigration office] the officer asked to see the passport and when I showed this piece of paper, he said, "What is this?" [he laughs]. And then I have to explain, "I come from Cyprus..." First I had to explain Cyprus, the location. Then I had to explain North Cyprus. Then you have to explain "Look, this is the passport." And I showed them – I don't want to call it a piece of paper -- but a meaningless passport. The Turkish-Cypriot meaningless passport. And then he looked at it and it looks odd. And then said "I'm going to stamp this" and I said "No! No! The visa is actually not in here." Normally the visa is in your passport. And he said, "Let me ask my supervisor." I waited in line, the guys behind me staring at me. And they think "Who are you? Who is this guy?" It was irritating!

Greek-Cypriot Participants

Maria's Narratives and Experiences

Maria was born in the early 1980s from Greek-Cypriot parents in the city of Limassol on the southern coast of Cyprus. She grew up there and attended public elementary, middle and high schools in Limassol. After high school she moved to Greece, where she stayed for five years to study political sciences at a public university. She later moved to the northern Europe for a Masters in Business Administration (MBA) and then to Brussels for few months for an internship at one of the European Commissions' offices. She returned to Cyprus in 2004, moving to the divided city of Nicosia for a job at a private company. In 2006 she changed jobs and she began working for an NGO there. At the time of the interview, Maria self-identified as Cypriot and practicing Christian Orthodox.

Maria expressed a very close relationship with her parents and she frequently referenced their views and feelings for most of the topics covered during the interview. Living in Limassol since 1974, Maria's parents were both internally displaced that year from the Famagusta area in the north part of the island. Her paternal grandfather went missing during the 1974 events, "a great burden for the family" that Maria experienced keenly throughout her life, until 2007 when her grandfather's remains were found in a mass grave in the north part of the island.

The 'refugee identity' and her grandfather's case were prevalent during the first 18 years of her life. As she said, "I was coming from a family that are refugees and especially [the fact] that my grandfather was a missing person at the time [before

eighteen], it was always strong.” In the eyes of young Maria the suffering came from Turkey. At the time she ignored the existence of Turkish-Cypriots. She described her view from those years, “...this happened because of the Turks. We were not even talking about Turkish Cypriots. It was Turks. So it was Turks on the one side, Greeks on the other. There was never a discussion about Cypriots or Turkish-Cypriots.”

Self-Identification Reflections

At the time of the interview Maria self-identified as Cypriot. We began this part of the interview with the conversation below:

INT: Where do you come from?

Maria: Cyprus.

INT: If you are outside Cyprus and someone asks the same question? What do you say?

Maria: I come from Cyprus. Well, now I say Cyprus. Before, when I was in school [K-12] or the beginning of my [undergraduate] studies, I would say Cyprus, near Greece.

INT: What if they don't know where is Cyprus now?

Maria: I usually say, 'Cyprus, it's an island in the Mediterranean near Greece and Turkey. For years actually, I thought that Cyprus was closer to Greece than Turkey, which is not true, but that was my impression. I guess because of school.

INT: How about the people that know about Cyprus? Do you get any other questions?

Maria: Yes, yes! They ask [from the] Greek side or [the] Turkish side?

INT: What's your reaction to this question?

Maria: Usually I say, 'There is one Cyprus. Two communities and I come from the Greek-Cypriot community.' I don't get to the politics if I don't know them well but I insist saying that there is one Cyprus, two communities.

INT: How about the language? What language do you speak?

Maria: I say Greek!

INT: And what's your national identity?

Maria: The answer is, well, now I feel that my identity is Cypriot... Before I was saying to myself that 'I'm a Greek-Cypriot.' Actually it was more like 'Greek of Cyprus.' It's not that I don't think that we have Greek origins and that there were Greeks in Cyprus but now I feel that the identity that defines me more is the Cypriot identity.

Maria from the very beginning points out that her self-identification through her teenage years was different than it is currently. Even her perception of the location of the island was different. While she self-identified as Greek-Cypriot or "Greek of Cyprus" she located the island closer to Greece, while at the time of the interview when she self-identifies as Cypriot she said that she mentioned both Greece and Turkey when she was talking about the location of the island, she said "near Greece and Turkey." The North coast of Cyprus is less than 100 miles from the closer coast of Turkey and around 450 miles from the closest Greek island, Crete. Just as she grew up understanding Greek to be closer geographically, she believed Greece to be closer culturally, as well. As she discovered during her undergraduate studies in Greece, she was mostly educated just like

any Greek K-12 student, with the same books and the same values (Klerides, 2008; Papadakis, 2008). For Maria the transition from one identity (“Greek of Cyprus”) to the other (“Cypriot”) was very clear. She identified specific experiences, interactions with people, and conditions in her environment that made her realize that being a Cypriot was what she felt she was. She talked very linearly about those experiences, year after year, period after period of her life and I tried to keep it that way for the purposes of the analysis, since in her case the progression from the one identity to the other was very chronologically linear.

Language

Maria said that she spoke Greek and even though she admitted that there are differences in her language that she called Cypriot “dialect” compared to the language they speak in different places in Greece she said,

Maria: I didn’t study the language thing and I will not argue against people who say we speak a different language than Greeks, but for me it’s a dialect of the Greek language. I just don’t want people to stop using it [the Cypriot-Greek dialect]. And I think it will help the Cypriot identity.

Religion

Maria considered herself religious. She was a practicing Orthodox Christian and she mentioned that she went to the church weekly and she was a strong believer. She

highlighted that despite the fact that the Turkish-Cypriots are Muslims, religion and her beliefs influenced her positively her relationship with them. She said,

INT: What is your relationship with religion? Are you religious?

Maria: I do believe in God and I go to the church very often. It never affected me in my relationship with the other community... I would say it may have influenced me positively...

She referred to the words of her priest and she said that,

Maria: Our religion is about loving people. It doesn't matter if they belong to another religion, but anyway Turkish-Cypriots are not religious in general. But even if they were it doesn't change anything.

INT: How about the Greek-Orthodox idea that the Cypriot church is promoting?

Maria: I didn't experience it that much to be honest. Also my mother who is religious, like very religious, but was never with [supporting] the Greek and Orthodox together. She never said she is Greek as far as I know. She is left-wing.

European identity

Maria also mentioned later in the interview that she also felt European but this identity was more rational. She did not use the word "I feel" like she did when she described her Cypriot identity, rather she said, "I say that I'm European but it's not the first thing I say about myself." The European identity for her is useful but not a priority. She explained that embracing the European identity can help the two communities to coexist peacefully on the island. She talked from personal experience saying, "Cyprus

entering the EU helped me to escape from the two identities. I define myself as European and Cypriot.” She explained that, as the European Union (EU) by definition is made of peoples with different cultures and languages, being in the EU and sharing a European identity as Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots is possible and acceptable if a European identity is embraced. She continued,

Maria: I believe in European Union’s vision. And I also believe in Europe as a federation... and the values of cooperation, justice etc. etc. [supported by EU]. This helped me pull myself out of the Cyprus issue. If so many nationalities can exist in European Union, work and respect each other, why not Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots? I believe that Turkish-Cypriots should have access to the EU exactly the same way as we [Greek-Cypriots] have.

Maria’s K-12 Experiences

Maria, who studies political science, articulately described her K-12 experiences in regards to her ethno-national identity,

Maria: During elementary school, the fact that we were celebrating all the Greek national days, the history books that were taught were the books from the Greek Ministry of Education, plus the [Greek and Republic of Cyprus] flags, the language, the religion and everything. [The main idea was] that we were Greeks and that there is a problem with Turks, and by promoting our Greek identity, that will help us to establish that this is a Greek island and it belongs to the Greeks. Of course all these things were not clear in our minds at the time. We [the students]

were not putting all these together but now when I go back [to remember] I see that as one of the things that affected my identity.

At that time, Maria was self-identifying as Greek-Cypriot and believed that she was as Greek as any other kid from Greece with some characteristics that were only slightly different, or regional, like the Cypriot-Greek dialect. She also said, “Our educational system did not help us to create our identity as Cypriots. They never work from 1960 afterwards to create a Cypriot identity.”

As a high school student Maria found history very appealing. She saved some of the books from high school that she showed to me during one of our interviews. As she said,

Maria: History was my favorite subject in high school. The percentage was like 65-70 percent Greek history versus 35 percent Cypriot [history] and nobody cared about Cyprus history because the exams to get in a public university [in Cyprus or Greece] did not include anything related to Cyprus history. Nobody cared... So it was more Greek history than Cypriot.

Even Maria’s Cypriot history books held no reference to the Turkish-Cypriots since the Cypriot history that Maria referenced covered the pre-historic era, the ancient times through the Turkish occupation of the island, the British colonization, and the 1960 independence (Papadakis, 2008). The bi-communal conflict and events between 1960 and 1974 were not covered since they were considered too fresh and very sensitive. Maria finished high school without knowing that mass killings of Turkish-Cypriots happened in 1963. She believed that only the Greek-Cypriots suffered during the conflict. The Turks, a group that included the Turkish-Cypriots, were the enemy, Maria said,

Maria: ... [They] took for no good reason part of the island. This was the level of ignorance that they served us in school ... Ignorance is very frustrating. I think this is our problem [in the Greek-Cypriot community]. That's why I believe in a Cypriot history that will give all the information. If kids in school learn the history from both sides, it will help them not to hate the other community.

Her frustration can be seen in her choice of words "level of ignorance" and "they served us" as well as the tone of her voice.

The 1974 invasion was covered through memorial events in schools, poems, and the pictures from the occupied areas that to this day still cover the walls of Greek-Cypriot public schools, for the younger generation to learn and remember the north part of the island. For Maria, "a kid from refugee parents," those images were "everywhere." She remembered the images of the places in the north, the villages, sights, and monuments:

Maria: Even the diaries from the banks had pictures from the north places. Every picture was from the north, the occupied areas. Everywhere. In my house, in the classroom, in Nautica club of Famagusta in Limassol. It was these same pictures of Famagusta, Kyrenia. And especially at school in all the walls. These picture stick with you and make you feel this are ours. Our places.

Family's Political Affiliations

Politically, Maria's parents come from families that supported the two major opposite political parties. Her father supported DYSI, the right-wing political party whose many supporters lean towards the more Greek identity and are in a favor of the

good relations with Greece. Her father grew up with the idea of enosis (unification with Greece) and held as childhood heroes the right-wing martyrs of the 1955 EOKA guerilla against the British. Meanwhile, Maria's mother came from a left-wing background supporting AKEL, a party traditionally supporting good relationships with Turkish-Cypriots and the Cypriot identity. Her uncle was assassinated by EOKA during the 1950s because of his opposition to unification with Greece and his communist ideology. As Maria said,

Maria: My grandfather's brother was killed by Greek-Cypriot nationalists, the EOKA people during the 1950s. And mother's family remained left because of that. The people that wanted Enosis killed my mother's uncle because he was communist and he was more related to Moscow than Greece. And my father grew up wanting enosis. The idea of Greece as a motherland was not strong in my mother's family like it was in my father's. It's not that my mother's family had better relationships with Turkish-Cypriots, actually they had almost no interaction with them before 1974. It's not like they had good stories or anything. It was just that the Greek identity and the Greek motherland as an idea for unification was not strong in their family.

Because of these differences, Maria's parents agreed not to raise these ethno-national identity issues in conversations with Maria. As her father years later told her, Maria recalls, "We wanted you to get what the school was saying [about identity] because we have different ideas with your mother." She explained,

Maria: My parents had an impact to my national identity because they didn't say something different than the school. They kind of agreed with the school by not

mentioning anything different. So silently they were supporting the school [promoted] identity... They never told me what to vote in elections, what political party. They were neutral, indifferent. Because of the difference in the family - they don't vote the same thing... We never had Cypriot or Greek flag at home for example.

Experiences Abroad

Studies in Greece

Maria moved to Greece for her undergraduate degree in 1998. Her ethno-national self-identification at the time was "Greek of Cyprus." She felt as Greek as anyone from mainland Greece or its islands; her living in the independent and divided country of Cyprus was incidental. Of her beliefs in 1998, she said,

Maria: We could have been part of Greece if the enosis movement [in 1955 to 1958] was successful. For political reasons we are not, because the British didn't want that [unification with Greece]. This didn't make me feel less Greek, you know."

She also compared Cyprus with Greek islands that still maintain distinct cultures and dialects very similar to Cyprus. "I was like, 'We could have been like Crete and Rhodes.'" She reflected, "What I didn't understand at the time was that what happened, happened. It's history. It doesn't go back. We didn't become part of Greece and we are another country."

Her identity until around the age of nineteen was focused of the Greekness of Cyprus. She recalled the first few months of her studies in Greece when she felt so Greek that she got involved with a Greek-Cypriot student organization in Greece that she characterized in the interview as "... hardcore Greek nationalist. Let's be honest. They are!" She said,

Maria: I was supporting them. They are very right-wing and they are still supporting enosis [unification] with Greece. The reason [I followed them] was that Turkey was acting very radically against Greece at the time, with Turkish planes flying above Greek waters in the Aegean. And it was covered a lot in the news and newspapers. Also it was after the Turks killed two people in the buffer zone in Cyprus who tried to cross to the North. So it was like "Look what they [the Turks] do to Greece, what they did to those two guys in Cyprus etc."

Feeling Greek, she saw Turkey as an enemy that was harming the Greeks in different places. Whether that was happening in the air above the Aegean Sea or in Cyprus, it was irrelevant. To her, the Greek nation was one and the Turks were acting against it. Reflecting of her choice of that student organization she said, "At the time I was feeling very Greek and I wanted to support a party that saw me as Greek."

Particularly the experience of the events in Cyprus reinforced the perception that she had about belonging to the Greek nation. She experienced the second killing intimately,

Maria: I was close by with my parents when it happened. We went to the funeral of the first person that the killed days before. And the second guy run in the buffer

zone and climbed on the flagpole to take the Turkish flag down. And a Turkish soldier shot him...

She reflected on the experience saying, “The enemy couldn’t be more real. I mean really, think of the mentality of a teenager. They were killing people hundred meters [300 feet] from me. I heard the shot. I didn’t see the guy but I heard the shot. Then I saw it on TV of course.” It was a very dramatic experience for Maria that—with other events from history she learned at school, where Turks were the occupiers and oppressors of Greece and Cyprus, and the more recent events in the Aegean Sea—she directly connected to her choice of a radical nationalist student organization to support.

She recalled a shift from her Greek-emphasized Cypriot identity that she held as a child to a purely Greek self-identification when she first moved to Greece. Then a series of “shocking” events, related to others’ perceptions about her identity and community, prefaced a troubled move to more of a Cypriot identity.

Less than a year after her move to Greece, Maria recalled a slow but steady shift from her Greek-oriented identity to a Cypriot-focused one. She recalled that experience,

INT: You mentioned few times, ‘before’ and ‘now.’ When is that time, that period where the change happened?

Maria: I think after I came back [to Cyprus] from my studies or during my studies because I studied political science in Greece. Going there I was feeling ‘Oh, I’m going to Greece.’ Maria: My university in Greece was very much in favor of teaching us about Cyprus in a different way... Going there and studying political science I was feeling that there is a difference from what I was taught to be in school and what is the reality. Not reality exactly, but that there is another side

from what I was taught, so after coming back and during my studies, I started studying history from another perspective not only the educational one [from K-12 education]. And slowly, slowly I became more skeptical and more critical about the education I got from the state [public] education from the state information, from what I heard from the state [Greek-Cypriot] perspective.

INT: Can you explain this a bit more?

Maria: The school of political science it had a more, a line that was not so nationalistic in a way. It was because of the professors I had at that time. They were professors from the left and the way they presented history, especially diplomacy, it was not the way I used to know or see it in Cyprus... Basically I saw that there is not only one way in how we see the political events in 1974 and after. The relations between Greece and Cyprus, etc.

Experiences in Greece

Maria described a series of experiences in Greece that made her realize that Greeks—neither the government or everyday people—did not see her as one of them. Contradictory to how she felt about her identity, this frustrated her. Her political science studies, under professors who saw Cyprus as an independent country, made her reevaluate her ethno-national self-identification. She considered the international law she was learning and the political events after 1974 in Cyprus and Greece. She described those experiences in a higher volume than the rest of the interview,

Maria: I got the first shock when I went to Greece [for my studies]. I went to Greece saying that I'm Greek but for them I was Cypriot. I was a foreigner.

INT: Tell me a bit more about this.

Maria: [During my studies in Greece] I got a part-time job and they issued an alien card for me. I was shocked. They issued an alien card like any other immigrant. Everywhere I was a foreigner. *Everywhere* [emphasized].

INT: Outside the immigration thing? How did people see you?

Maria: I was Cypriot. I never felt that thing that 'we were the same,' that they [people in Greece] thought we were the same. I was always Cypriot. Granted, I went there [to Greece] believing I was Greek like any other Greek from any Greek island... At the beginning especially, I was at that nationalist student organization that believed in Enosis and suddenly [moments later] I was in the classroom and they were separating us to Cypriots and Greeks. And I would say, "We are all Greeks. Some from Greece, some from Cyprus."

Maria: That's when I realized we are a different state [from Greece], independent country. We do have common history, common language, common religion, etc. but there are other countries that have this. And common religion and history does not constitute common identity, for me. Our identity has other mixtures [cultural elements] also... I do believe that the first that inhabited Cyprus were Achaeans, the same people that inhabited Greece... We have common language. Or at least our languages have the same roots. We have religion common. I don't think—how to explain it?—I don't think we have the same identity. We are not the same group, the same people.

Maria acknowledged the similarities with Greeks—common history, religion, even language—that before 1998 she considered as elements of a common identity. But after that experience and through her studies she came to believe that they do “...not constitute common identity,” a view that she also expressed at the interview as the current understanding of the similarities between Greek and Greek-Cypriots.

Studies in northern Europe

In 2002, following her undergraduate studies in Greece, Maria moved to northern Europe to complete a Master’s in Business Administration (MBA). The degree itself did not influence her self-identification but the experience of being in the United Kingdom did. Her class included a Turkish-Cypriot and she was unhappy to realize that, as far as the university was concerned, she and the Turkish-Cypriot were no different in terms of nationality and immigration status.

Maria: I don’t think that it was the education in ... [she mentioned the northern European country where she studies] I think it was the fact that for the university there was no difference if I was Greek-Cypriot or Turkish-Cypriot. They didn’t care in a way. I remember the first day they had a big world map and they put marks, dots, to the countries where the students in the program came from [one dot for each student]. And they put two dots on Cyprus and I was like, “Who is the other Cypriot?” I got the list with the name before and I didn’t see any Greek-Cypriot names or anything. I knew the Greeks [Greek classmates]... I stand there staring at the dot and I was like, “Who is he?” I was not aware, it didn’t cross my

mind that it was a Turkish-Cypriot. I insisted, “But I saw the names. And then I met him at the party and I was like, “Oh yeah, for English people, they don’t care if he is Turkish-Cypriot or [Greek-Cypriot].”

Coming from the very homogeneous Greek-Cypriot community in Cyprus, “Cypriot” for Maria at the time meant only Greek-Cypriot. Although she had read about them and, a few years earlier at a conference in Greece, even met a Turkish-Cypriot, she was still not used to the idea that there were people on the island that were not Greek-Cypriots. They were never part of her everyday life in Cyprus. Her studies in northern Europe marked the first time in her life in which she had regular contact with a person from the other community. Maria was very open to meet Adil, her Turkish-Cypriot classmate, and because of the cohort structure of the course there were plenty of opportunities to work together and interact with him in the twelve-months program. She talked about the realization that, although she needed English to communicate with Adil, they had more in common than a divided island. She was positively surprised by the common food, common words that the two languages shared, same traditional music with different lyrics, similar customs, and the same pain and loss from the tragic history of the island.

Maria: I realized that although I was having a lot of fun with my Greek friends, I had more things in common with my Turkish-Cypriot classmate. We had all these common food, common words [she spoke Cypriot-Greek and he spoke Cypriot-Turkish]. In the meantime, the checkpoints [in Cyprus] opened. We were in [northern Europe] when the Green Line opened. He shared with me things like, ‘My parents went to see their house in Limassol.’ Then we found out that their

house in Limassol was very close to my grandmother's house in Limassol. And all these. It was the first time in my life that I realized that there is something there. Common ground in a sense.

It was “common ground” literally and metaphorically, as Maria realized that her grandmother shared the same neighborhood with Adil's parents few decades ago, and that she shared not only a similar culture with Adil but the same vision for a unified Cyprus. “I got a lot more than an MBA from those eighteen months,” she said as she wiped a tear from her cheek. The transaction with Adil revealed her ignorance about the other community. She said, “I felt bad that I didn't know about them before. But how could I? Where? Isn't it ironic, I'm asking 'where' and they were literally few meters away my whole life but apparently not close enough.”

Brussels for an Internship

Just after her MBA, Maria moved to Brussels to work for the European Commission of the European Union for four months as an intern. Although her stay there was short, it reinforced a growing realization that her and her community's political views were not shared by all or that the distinction between “politically correct” terms—such as North Cyprus versus Turkish Cyprus—were seen as important. Once again Maria realized that her understanding of her identity and the Cyprus problem was one-sided.

Maria: Getting those questions from people about Cyprus and realizing that people don't care basically. They were asking questions like, “Which side,

Turkish or Greek” and I was, “There is no Turkish side!” So I got to understand that not all the world cared about this problem or that all the world had the same feelings or the same [political] positions that we have.

What was so important for her—the preservation of the idea that there is only one country in Cyprus—did not seem to apply in Brussels, or at least people did not think that the distinction between the two communities was as important as she did.

Returning to Cyprus

The move to Nicosia

In 2004 Maria moved back to Cyprus to take a job in Nicosia, a new place for her, at a time when things were changing fast in the divided capital of Cyprus. The checkpoints had been open for a year, a very positive development for Maria, who strongly wanted to interact with people from the other community. But even bigger change was in the making for Cyprus. Maria was moving in the city just few weeks before the referendum for the Annan plan, the proposed solution that would potentially change the 40-year-long division of the island. For Maria, given her interest in politics, “...it was great time to be in Nicosia.” Discussions about the plan and its various aspects were taking place almost daily, organized by political parties and civil society organizations. Maria participated in many of those events because she wanted to learn more about the plan.

Annan Plan Period

Maria voted 'Yes' at the referendum for the Annan Plan. Although she participated in discussion and events in support of the plan, she was not very vocal, respecting her family's wish to avoid tensions in the family, which included many 'No' supporters. Maria at the time was occasionally participating in bi-communal events and although she met Turkish-Cypriots she did not have close Turkish-Cypriot friends. She strongly "wanted a solution," she "believed in a solution," and for her the Annan Plan was a great opportunity for a solution although it was not a perfect one.

Maria: I believed in a solution. We needed one. But although I decided to vote 'Yes' from the very beginning, I was asking questions to [get to] know more but for the sake of a solution, I voted 'Yes' anyway. I had some concerns. Particular concerns about the Turkish army remaining on the island for a long period of time and other things but I don't remember the details now. But I have to admit that I respected my family's, my parents' mostly, wish not to be fanatic either to the one side or the other. So I attended seminars or discussions but you wouldn't see me wearing a 'Yes' t-shirt or pin.

The Annan Plan and proposed solutions were accepted by the Turkish-Cypriot community but rejected by the Greek-Cypriot community. Maria said, "I was so disappointed with the Greek-Cypriot community. I really wanted a solution." In one of the discussion events for the Annan Plan Maria met the like-minded Eva. Eva, who is a Greek-Cypriot, was also involved in bi-communal events, running her own NGO and working with people from the Turkish-Cypriot community.

Maria: I met my very good friend Eva that I mention here because I think it's an important milestone in my life during that period and my views of ethnic issues in Cyprus. She was the one who introduced me to bi-communal organizations and activities. The first time it was a meeting in Pila. We went there and started talking with Turkish-Cypriots about a beach party we wanted to organize. I got involved by doing things but not so passionately about it... I was not a member. I was just a friend of someone who was a member of a bi-communal youth organization. I was not involved as an active member in a bi-communal organization at the beginning. Just going to some events with Eva.

Despite the negative climate after the Annan Plan (Asmussen, 2004; Varnava & Faustmann, 2009), Maria with Eva's encouragement continued participating in bi-communal activities and other civil society organizations. It helped her re-evaluate her perspective about the solution and her own identity. She said,

Maria: I think the move to Nicosia and starting getting involved with civil society organizations really changed me. I was feeling more Cypriot because I was actually working with other Cypriots [Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots] to solve problems in Cyprus. Some in the South and some in both sides. I realized we could do things even without a solution... It took some time after the referendum of course. You know people were disappointed but by 2006, I would say, I was very much involved in a lot of bi-communal projects.

INT: What kinds of projects?

Maria: Environmental issues, human rights issues, organizing youth from the two communities. A lot of projects.

INT: So was this your job?

Maria: Well it became. I was working in a private company at the time, not relevant to NGOs, but I was spending a lot of time with NGOs. At the time again Eva told me, “Maria, I think you should get a job in an NGO for your career an I think you will like it more than your current job.” So I got a full-time job in an NGO in 2006.

INT: So was this a bi-communal NGO?

Maria: No, but in a sense there were a lot of programs that we were working together with Turkish-Cypriots NGOs and promoted capacity building and a strong civil society in both communities. So it was not directly a peacebuilding organization but indirectly through its work it was bringing people from the two communities together. For example, in environmental projects.

INT: And that was the time that you met more Turkish-Cypriots.

Maria: Yeah! I had a Turkish-Cypriot colleague as well and we were very close and I was going to the north for work a lot... so it for me it was like the island was one thing. One country.

Interaction with Turkish-Cypriots

First contact with Turkish-Cypriots

Talking about her perceptions about Turkish-Cypriots and the idea of the enemy and the other that the school promoted and she adopted at the time she said,

Maria: ...We were not even talking about Turkish-Cypriots. It was Turks. So it was Turks on the one side, Greeks on the other. There was never a discussion about Cypriot or Turkish-Cypriots.

INT: So the Turks and the Turkish-Cypriots were one thing then?

Maria: Yes! I mean they were Turks of Cyprus, like we were Greeks of Cyprus. So yes they were the same, like we were the same as Greeks.

INT: When did you realize that they are different?

Maria: I think that I first realized that, at least this is the first time I remember, when I was at the University [in Greece] that I had the opportunity to attend a conference at a Greek island that was also organized by a Turkish organization [co-organized between her university and the Turkish organization]. And that was the first time I heard someone saying, 'I'm Cypriot' but didn't speak Greek... I had the opportunity to talk to this Turkish-Cypriot that I still appreciate a lot. He was Turkish-Cypriot and he said he was Cypriot. And I was shocked! So at that time I said, 'Okay, I will read a little bit more' and I read a very good history book about Cyprus, not taught at school, written by a Greek-Cypriot and putting things in the story that I was missing from the history from school [K-12]. Like 1963, what happened in 1963, and the shock for me was that there were Turkish-

Cypriot missing persons, that I, at that time I was, I didn't know that. I was not aware.

INT: Do you remember the author of the book?

Maria: Yes! It was Katia Xatzidemetriou.

The first meeting with a Turkish-Cypriot for Maria was a shocking experience. It happened outside Cyprus, during her studies abroad, at a conference in Greece. Not only did Maria not meet Turkish-Cypriots before this time in her early 20s, but she admitted that she was not even aware of the existence of Turkish-Cypriots as a community. Her parents and school avoided this nuance. In school, the other was the Turks, the enemy, the people that probably killed her grandfather and occupied the “beautiful city of Famagusta” and the areas around it, along with almost half of the island. For her at that time, Cypriot meant Greek-Cypriot, “Greeks of Cyprus” as she put it. The people in the north did not belong there and in her mind they needed to leave and return Cyprus to its legal residents and owners, the Greek-Cypriots.

This interaction with this Turkish-Cypriot who was also a student, who offered a different perspective about the division and the history of the island, was the beginning of an investigation to find out if this person was right or he was just serving the “propaganda purposes of the Turks.” His story seemed consistent but Maria knew that Turkey was using propaganda for these kind of issues. She began searching for books in the university library. More than ten years later, she still remembers the author of the book that opened her eyes to a history that no one shared with her. The first revelation was that in 1963, a year that “I’ve heard about it before but wasn’t sure if something important happened,” was the year that the Greek-Cypriots “hurt” the Turkish-Cypriots. Up to that

moment, Maria believed only Greek-Cypriots suffered and experienced loss. “The shock for me was that there were Turkish-Cypriot missing persons,” she recalled. It was a very familiar concept for Maria, whose grandfather was missing for her whole childhood. She very often saw the “sadness” in her father’s face and knew how much he suffered, emotionally and financially, by losing his father at a young age and growing up without him. She was just learning that the others (the Turkish-Cypriots) suffered the same losses. They not only existed but there were also people among them that experience the same loss as hers and her family’s.

From that time afterwards “...things were never the same. What else I didn’t know? What other lies they told me?” As she described her reaction the volume of her voice dropped. She paused, sighed, and said,

Maria: I had this very strange and maybe bad reaction to my parents firstly. ‘You never told me this. You never told me these things happened in Cyprus. That there were Turkish-Cypriot missing persons or that they were killings from Greek-Cypriots to Turkish-Cypriots and all these.’ Their reaction was a little bit like that they were taught too this same things... [My father’s] reaction was like, ‘it’s not that I was not aware of what you are talking about but’ and he said ‘I thought that by keeping that not know in a way it was better. I didn’t do it deliberately, it’s just this is the school education that you are getting, this is the information that you are getting and...’ He believed at that time that by keeping the history as an ideal thing we would have more opportunities to through Turkey away in a way, out of Cyprus.

Family's experiences with Turkish-Cypriots

After the book incident and the heated arguments Maria had with her parents, her father decided to share with her some of the experiences with the Turkish-Cypriots before 1974,

Maria: After that he began sharing stories like he said, 'Yes, we didn't have Turkish-Cypriots in our village but there were some Turkish-Cypriots coming and we were friends. They bought halloumi [Cypriot cheese] from your grandfather.' My grandfather made halloumi.

After this experience Maria was determined to learn more about the history of Cyprus in the 1950s, '60s and '70s. She started talking to her extended family about their personal relationships with Turkish-Cypriots before 1974. As she neatly put it, "A new chapter in history started as I was exploring," She continued,

Maria: And all of a sudden everything changed... After I started asking got these very nice stories of living together, having some problems but really living together. The new term was, 'Oh people didn't have any problems back then. It was Turkey that was the problem or Turkey and Greece that had a problem. So all this was around 2004 2006, through my studies again and through some bi-communal activities.'

She believed that her grandfather's uncertain fate "was so strong in my family and in my identity that everything good that happened by Turkish-Cypriots was shadowed, was not explicitly said."

INT: So you changed your family's understanding about the other community at that time.

Maria: Yes, in a way.

INT: What was the reaction? Parents, extended family.

Maria: The reaction was not good at the beginning, but not from my immediate family. Mostly from the extended family. My parents were saying, 'We understand you are doing it because you're in politics, for your interest about this country, but be a little bit careful because don't forget that this other community killed your grandfather and maybe our family will not accept that you are so much involved.'

Maria: I always respected them. I was always acknowledging their sadness, their pain. I was always acknowledging that. And I never said 'Look I don't care about your pain. Turkish-Cypriot are my friends' I was acknowledging that this happened but I was showing them that similar cases happened to the other community and that there is pain in the other community as well. The most important thing was that my family started to get interested in that as well.

In 2006 Maria invited for the first time one of her Turkish-Cypriot friends to her parents' house. It was a very big step for the family of internally displaced people with a missing person in the family. It was during the same period that Maria's family had some news about her missing grandfather. The family already knew that he was possibly dead but they did not know where he was buried and this gave them hope but no closure. Her friend's own story about a missing person in her family and her willingness to help Maria's family to find out about Maria's grandfather changed Maria's parents opinions

about the other. So Maria indirectly changed their perception of the other by introducing them to her Turkish-Cypriot friend. Maria said,

Maria: In 2006 my Turkish-Cypriot friend came to my house in Limassol and she was a relative of a missing person as well. And they [her parents and the friend] shared some things about what happened. By that time the missing persons' committee told my parents that there was a possibility that my grandfather's remains were found and they needed to give DNA samples to check this. And the interest that my Turkish-Cypriot friends has shown to help us find out if it was true, helped my family understand [that] in terms of pain people don't care about their nationality. They see the problem as a problem of someone who is in pain and trying to help.

Then in 2007 another event came to shock the family. She described this experience,

Maria: In 2007 [after 33 years] my grandfather remains were found. So we found out what happened and everything. We found out that he was killed by Turkish-Cypriots and not the Turkish army, which is what normally happened to missing people from 1974. He was killed by Turkish-Cypriots... our compatriots. People we used to live peacefully together as I was discovering. I was afraid that now that they [extended family members] found that he was killed not by the army but by Turkish-Cypriot citizens, like normal people, not army. I was afraid, I thought that now definitely things would get worse in the family in terms of moving back to the Greek identity and moving back to the nationalist thing. 'We are Greeks.

See the Turkish-Cypriots are not our brothers. Turkish-Cypriots are Turkey's puppets.'

Maria's fears did not come true. As she said, "Things have moved so much in my family so quickly after 2004 and after my involvement with bi-communal things."

Despite the connection of Turkish-Cypriots to her grandfather's death, the family moved on accepting that in the Turkish-Cypriot community there were good and bad, similarly to the Greek-Cypriot community.

Crossing to the Other Side

The first time crossing

The first time Maria crossed to the north side was few months after the opening of the checkpoints in 2003. She went with her parents to see their houses from before 1974. Her mother comes from Famagusta and her father from a village few miles outside Famagusta. When they visited, they found a family of Turkish-Cypriots in her mother's house and a family of settlers from Turkey in her father's house.

Maria: In my father's house people from Anatolia live now. They were very friendly. Apparently so friendly. They opened and they still open their house every time we go. The same happened with my mother's house in Famagusta, where Turkish-Cypriot live there. They speak Greek and they were very friendly. So the perception of them being a bad community that they don't like us was totally wrong.

Maria: The Turkish Cypriot family that lived in her father's house were particularly empathetic since they were themselves internally misplaced. They said, "We went to our house in Paphos but unfortunately there is no house because the house was demolished." Her mother did not expect this and she said, "Oh, are they refugees too?"

Defining the sadness in Famagusta

Maria got the chance to see the closed city of Famagusta, deserted after 1974 since the Turkish military did not allow anybody in or out the city. She grew up seeing images of the area near the beach as it was before 1974 and its then-modern hotels. It was, as she said, an image "that was everywhere, in classrooms, in my parent's house, on [the cover of] school notebooks." But what she saw from a tall building just outside the closed city, known as the 'ghost city,' was not the same.

INT: Did you see the closed area of Famagusta?

Maria: I did. I did... The reaction the first time [I saw the deserted city] and it is still the reaction. Some people say that I'm a bit more sensitive or romantic. I was shocked! Because Famagusta in the pictures I grew up seeing was so beautiful. And seeing the closed city and especially the area by the sea and all this, is sad. But now I can define the sadness. It's not sad because the someone did it. It's sad because this happened. The first time [I saw it] I was as well to the Turkish military that did that and kept the city like that. Now I'm sad because this is happening. Sad for the situation rather than the people that did that.

A solution

Similarly to her belief in 2004 during the Annan Plan period, Maria believed that the people of the island need a solution soon that will help the two communities interact and restore their relationships. She said,

Maria: If the solution will be called federation or co-federation, I don't care. Since we are in the EU the important thing is to have one Cyprus. I don't want to go to conferences or somewhere and have "North Cyprus" and "South Cyprus". I don't want to see the country split in a way... I don't mind having a mayor or minister Turkish-Cypriot. I don't mind.

INT: Would you live in the north in case of a solution?

Maria: Yes, I would and I don't mind if it's under a Turkish-Cypriot administration. I wouldn't mind at all. It actually something I want to do... A beach house or even a permanent house. First because I like the Famagusta area. And because I continue to believe—and I know it's a bit romantic—I consider Cyprus one place.... It bothers me that I have to show passport to go to the north. I don't care that much, but I don't like it.

Nicholas' Narratives and Experiences

Born in the early 1980s from Greek-Cypriot parents, Nicholas was born and raised in the south a few miles from the Nicosia city center, in a neighborhood that is divided by the Green Line. Other than the four years that he spent in the northern Europe earning his Masters in linguistics and working there, he has always lived in Cyprus. At the time of the interview he was working on linguistics project studying the Cypriot-Greek dialect.

Nicholas' mother was internally displaced from a village in the north part of the island and his father came from a village in the Nicosia province in the south part of the island. Nicholas' family and extended family members are supporters of the Greek-Cypriot left-wing party AKEL. Throughout his childhood and teenage years (until the age of eighteen) he was involved in the AKEL's youth organization, called EDON, and he regularly attended their weekly meetings and events. At the time of the interview he said that even though he was registered in the party, he did not participate in their events and he was not interested in having affiliations with them anymore, something that he avoided mentioning to his parents and extended family.

Self-Identification Reflections

Nicholas self-identified as Greek-Cypriot and as he said, "I'm both Greek and Cypriot." He did not particularly mind if people called him "just Greek," particularly when he was abroad among other Greeks. He said that while in northern Europe when he was with Greek friends from mainland Greece there were many such incidents.

Nicolas: If someone foreign [not Greek or Greek-Cypriot] asked, like, all of us as the group if we were Greeks, I didn't mind saying 'Yes, we are Greeks' and I didn't have the need to clarify that I was Greek-Cypriot but if a Greek person is asking in Greek [language] I will say 'Cypriot' and he will understand I'm Greek-Cypriot since I speak Greek. If someone foreign asks just me what I am, I will say Cypriot. And usually in ... [northern Europe] where I was they know about Cyprus so they then ask 'From which side?' so then I say 'Greek-Cypriot.'

INT: So you don't answer north or south if they ask about the side?

Nicholas: Yes! Right! Usually they ask north or south and to make sure that they know what we mean south, I say 'From the south side, Greek-Cypriot.'

He acknowledged that his ethno-national self-identification was heavily influenced by his studies in linguistics—particularly the Cypriot-Greek language—as well as his passion for the Classic Greek culture. Rejecting the Greek or the Cypriot part of his identity was not an option for him, he said. "They are both important because, the way I see it, we listen, all the music we listen is Greek. We don't have Cypriot music productions really... All our culture begins and in many cases ends in Greece..." Even if one rejects the Greek heritage, he argued, one cannot reject connections to the Greek popular culture. As he said,

Nicholas: By defining your ethnic identity, at the same time you define a part of your culture. And your culture is no independent from Greece. I'm talking about sports, about music, about everything [in the Greek-Cypriot community]. What's the word? You lie to yourself [connive] if you say that 'I'm separate from Greece

and I wouldn't want to be called Greek.' Then why are you so happy when the Greek national team wins?

INT: How about the opposite argument? "We are Greeks that happened to live in Cyprus, like there are Greeks in Crete for example" [Crete is an island in the Greek Republic close to Cyprus].

Nicholas: Well, it depends how they present it. Nationalists many times use these arguments to downgrade the Cypriot identity. They want to downgrade this part of the identity. This is also a problem, particularly for the part that I'm interested, the [Cypriot-Greek dialect]. This downgrading it may be the reason the dialect may disappear in the future... If people don't use it and they only use the Standard Modern Greek.

The use and preservation of the Cypriot-Greek dialect is one of the topics that he was professionally interested as a linguist and lead us to an extensive conversation about the Cypriot-Greek dialect and the connections he saw to his identity and the ethno-national identity of the Greek-Cypriot community in general that he considered very important.

Language

We had the conversation below regarding his perception about his language that was heavily influenced by his studies in linguistics and his work on the Cypriot-Greek dialect.

INT: So what is your native language?

Nicholas: Greek!

INT: Greek! Not Greek-Cypriot or Cypriot.

Nicholas: [pause] You know I'm a linguist [he laughed]

INT: One more reason I'm more interested to know what you will say [they laugh].

Nicholas: Because the Cypriot dialect is part of the Greek language, there is no need to explain that I speak a particular kind of Greek. Plus if I say Cypriot-Greek, many times they don't even know where Cyprus is, so it's pointless to talk about the dialect of a place they don't know.

He explained that the meaning of the term 'dialect' in linguistics—which is the meaning that he used—is different than the same term used by most people in Cyprus to describe their Cypriot-Greek language.

Nicholas: According to linguistics, every linguistic code of communication—and Cypriot-Greek is a communication code and the *Koini Neoelliniki*, Standard Modern Greek, is another one—is an independent code. It has its own rules. And even if it is not written [like the case of Cypriot-Greek] the grammar exist in the minds of the people who speak it. It's called conceptual grammar. So as a code, as a structure, yes, it is different than the Standard Modern Greek. And there is a lot of overlap between the two. Of course, the problem is that people confuse Standard Modern Greek, the official language of the Republic of Cyprus and Greece, with the Greek language. The bigger Greek language; let's say Greek [language] as a whole. They think that Standard Modern Greek, is the Greek

language and it's not! It's just not true! Standard Modern Greek is just another dialect of the greater Greek language, like Cypriot-Greek is a dialect. So linguistically Standard Modern Greek and Cypriot-Greek they are equal but people think that, people in Cyprus [in particular], that the Cypriot-Greek dialect is under the Standard Modern Greek because the Standard [Modern Greek] is the official language of Greece and the Republic of Cyprus. The Greek language is the Standard [Modern Greek] dialect and all the non-standard dialects together, like Cypriot-Greek, Crete-Greek, Smyrna-Greek and many others together make the Greek language. So I consider Cypriot-Greek as an integral part of the Greek language and not smaller or under the Standard [Modern] Greek... You can't imagine how many times I explain, I have to explain people this. It's everywhere this misunderstanding.

Experiences Abroad

Experiences with people from Greece

Nicholas feels particularly connected with Greece and the Greek people. He supports the Greek national sports teams when they play in international and European tournaments. He visits Greece very often, almost every year, and feels very comfortable being there. One of the reasons is the ability to use his language, Greek, to communicate. He said, "I don't feel that I am in a foreign country when I go to Greece. I am in a place where I can communicate in my own language." Though he has to adjust his dialect and

avoid words from the Cypriot-Greek dialect that the Standard Modern Greek does not share, Nicholas argues that he is using his own language. This is consistent with his view that the Cypriot-Greek dialect is part of the bigger Greek language family.

He said that in general his experiences visiting Greece were very positive. He added that he got the chance to interact with Greeks in a regular basis during his studies in northern Europe, something that strengthened his bond with the people of Greece and reinforced his feelings of belonging to the group of Greek. He said that, “Cypriots and Greeks we were one group. I didn’t feel different. It was very normal for me to be part of that group.” He also self-identified as Greek when he was in groups with Greeks in the northern Europe “If someone foreign [not Greek or Greek-Cypriot] asked like all of us as, the group, if we were Greeks, I didn’t mind saying ‘Yes, we are Greeks’ and I didn’t have the need to clarify that I was Greek-Cypriot.”

Dancing

Nicholas talked about his experiences as amateur dancer of Greek and Cypriot dances at a dancing club in Cyprus. He said, “I’m particularly proud to dance the traditional Cypriot dances, especially abroad and especially in Greece, a country that understands us. I represent my country and my culture, letting people know about the people of this island.” He described a joint event in Athens between his dancing club and a Pontian Greek dancing club. He said that that experience made him realize what he said earlier in the interview, that he is not only Cypriot but also Greek,

Nicholas: We danced with a Pontian dancing club. It was a dream come true. I consider Cypriot, Pontian, and Cretan dances to be the top Greek dances, let's say. It was organized to commemorate 1974 [the invasion of Turkey to Cyprus] and the Pontian genocide by Turkey. Our musicians played together, we danced together, and it all came so natural. They danced our dances and we danced theirs. It was a very special collaboration. And honestly if someone felt that being Greek-Cypriot he is not Greek at the same time that event would have changed his mind. There we were those very special kinds of Greeks, on the same stage and in the same pain.

INT: The pain, the suffering comes from Turkey.

Nicholas: Right! In both these cases.

INT: What are your thoughts and feelings about the Turkish element in that?

Nicholas: Well... the fact that the Turkish policy is hostile and against Cyprus is there. This doesn't say much about the people of Turkey. Many of them don't even know where is Cyprus.

Experiences in Turkey

When I asked him about his view about Turkey, Nicholas distinguished the "Turkish policies that are hostile and against Cyprus" and the many people of Turkey that "don't even know where is Cyprus" nor know or care about the Cyprus issue. He recalled a visit to Ankara, Turkey for a conference, which he described as a very positive experience. He said, "I had been once in Turkey for a conference in linguistics... I had a

great time. Amazing hospitality. They were extremely friendly. It was a very nice experience.” Then he described how he tried to project a peaceful message through his presentation,

Nicholas: I had a presentation in front of a very big audience, a lot of them were Turks but also a lot of Europeans since it was a European conference. And I closed my presentation telling them “I will close my presentation with the two official languages of my country, Cyprus” and I wrote on my slide “Thank you” in both Greek and Turkish. It was a peace statement. At least that’s how I meant it to be, that my country has your language as one of the official languages. It is something very positive.

Changes in Self-identification

Nicholas had several changes in his self-identification throughout his upbringing that he connected to experiences that made him reflect, and adjust how he thought about himself. His family and extended family, both maternal and paternal, were loyal supporters of the left-wing party AKEL, the Cypriot identity and the Republic of Cyprus flag. When I asked about his parents’ self-identification he said,

Nicholas: They define themselves as Cypriot. They are leftist so they will never say that they are Greeks if someone asks. They didn’t live abroad so I don’t know what they would respond under other circumstances [outside Cyprus] but I think they would still say ‘Cypriot’ though. I think they are clearly Cypriot.

Here Nicholas referred to the tendency of people who support the left wing party AKEL in Cyprus to self-identify as just Cypriot. The party supports this self-identification as opposed to Greek-Cypriot. In the homogeneous community of Greek-Cypriots, self-identifying as Cypriot using the Cypriot-Greek language means that one belongs to the Greek-Cypriot community. According to Nicholas this was the self-identification of his parents, very common among AKEL supporters. Nevertheless, his parents did not talk about politics and ethno-national identity at home. As he said, “[my dad] never really thought much about them. He is the kind of person that thinks like, ‘I’m with AKEL, I support their sports teams, and this is the truth and there is nothing else.’ And his mother did not talk about politics in general.

K-12 Experiences

Elementary school years

In his elementary school years the biggest influences came from school, which promoted the Greek-Cypriot identity with emphasis on the Greek identity. As he said, Nicholas: Our education [at the time] was particularly Greek-centered... It’s true that school [K-12] influenced me very much on the opposite direction than the family. My family did not fanaticized me to the, “You are Cypriot. You are not Greek,” this kind of thing.

INT: Did you talk about it at all?

Nicholas: No, but I knew that they were pro-rapprochement with the Turkish-Cypriots.

Nicholas mentioned a teacher, Mrs. Mary, who was a supporter of the Greek identity and the unification with Greece. He was in her class for two years in the fourth and fifth grades and she strongly influenced Nicholas' self-identification at the time. Through the environment in school he developed a Greek-oriented identity. He said he felt "Greek of Cyprus" at the time. He also developed a fascination about the Classic Greek culture that reinforced his passion for the Greek identity.

According to Nicholas, this elementary school teacher, Mrs. Mary, whom he described as a "Greek nationalist," was "making Greek propaganda in the classroom." Mrs. Mary talked with passion about Istanbul, expressing a belief that it is Greek and the Greeks will eventually get it back. She also talked a lot about the guerilla against the British and the dream of 'Enosis' (unification with Greece), an idea that she strongly supported. As Nicholas said,

Nicholas: She was developing ethnic Greek feelings to us through her teaching. I felt very Greek at the time and I was actually sad that we lost Istanbul to the Ottomans in the fifteenth century and I wanted Greeks to get it back and I thought that it was unfair that the British didn't let us become part of Greece in the 1960s. At the time all these seemed very natural [normal] to me as a kid. The teacher said it so this is it! So there was that time in school that I defined myself as Greek, and Cypriot of course, but I was very proud for being Greek. I still am [proud of being Greek] but I now understand what it means. At the time I did not realize that she was doing political propaganda in the classroom, something that I consider

wrong... Of course it was the overall environment in schools more nationalistic then but not all my teachers were like Mrs. Mary... [M]any of them were neutral and they didn't want their political views to be shown to the students.”

The political ideas of Mrs. Mary were the exact opposite of the ideas his parents supported, but since his parents were not very vocal about their political beliefs—at least not when he was that age—his teacher's view was the one that he was exposed to and the one he supported at the time.

He also talked about the connection he felt with the occupied areas in the north, the romantic sentiment of going to his grandfather's house,

INT: What was your relationship with the other side while you were in school?

Nicholas: I was what it was cultivated in school in general. I remember a composition I wrote [titled] “*Palinostisi*” [repatriation] about returning back to our land. I wrote that I went to find my grandfather's village in the north, I took some soil and I came back. It was that romantic mood for the “*katehomena*,” the occupied areas.

On several occasions students were shown documentaries about the north and the invasion that Nicholas described as particularly emotional and influential in the construction of the image of the enemy,

Nicholas: I remember many times watching the documentaries and crying. The documentaries, the videos from the war, the destruction, you know with the sad background music. I was getting very emotional. Emotionally charged, let's say. And I was sincerely sorry that these areas were lost. Lost, taken from us, the Greek-Cypriots. I knew that they were taken by some barbarians, the Turks... I

knew there were Turkish-Cypriots but they didn't have any real role in the game.

They just happened to be there. That was my understanding of the occupied areas.

Middle school

Nicholas' middle school environment was similar and, additionally, his school was very close—only feet away—from the Green Line. He said, “My middle school is on the Green Line. One of the exits is permanently closed because it opens in the buffer zone.” The proximity of the Turkish soldiers whom he could see from the school's yard and the national celebrations and protests against TRNC and Turkish “occupation of the North part of the Greek Cyprus” reinforced further his Greek identity feelings and hatred against this enemy. The Turkish-Cypriots, although he knew they existed, “were not in the picture” then, since he never met one and rarely heard about them. Nicholas participated in protests against the Turkish occupiers and he remembered that he always held a Greek flag, not a Republic of Cyprus flag, which was mainly because of his fascination with the Classic Greek culture and the Greek oriented identity he developed with the influence from school and his teachers. When describing those experiences, the pace of his voice picked up.

Nicholas: Every November 15 [date the self-proclaimed TRNC was founded] my school was in ‘war.’ We were throwing stones to the Turkish soldiers [guarding the other side of the buffer zone], we were getting in the Green Line etc. It was particularly intense. We were literally next to the Green Line. So I was living [experiencing] intensively this hatred with the conqueror, the Turks. I knew there

were Turkish-Cypriots but they seemed let's say irrelevant because I never saw them.

INT: So who were you throwing the stones too?

Nicholas: It was the enemy. The Turkish soldiers. We could see them and they had guns and they wouldn't let us cross. Now I know they could have been Turkish-Cypriots but at the time all I saw was Turkish soldiers. We were also singing patriotic songs that we prepared with the music teachers and yell slogans against the Turks and that Cyprus is Greek etc. I was usually involved in those rather than the stone throwing.

INT: No Cypriot [Republic of Cyprus flag].

Nicholas: Yes, I was Greek and the Turks on the other side were the enemy and I wanted them out of Cyprus. Cyprus was Greek in my mind.

INT: And the Turkish-Cypriot?

Nicholas: Eh. I don't know. They weren't in the picture I guess.

In a conversation with his dad, Nicholas mentioned that he was holding a Greek flag at the protests, his dad reacted asking, "Why did you put a Greek flag on you? Are you a coup supporter [meaning the 1974 coup against the Republic of Cyprus president]?" This was the spark for a conversation with his father and the realization that Nicholas' perceptions about his identity were somehow different than those of his father. Although his father was not very clear in the explanations about "... why we are Cypriot and not Greek," Nicholas realized that he needed to reconsider what he learned about his identity,

Nicholas: That was the first time that I realized that there was something else than what I thought, my perception [of the flag]. I was thinking, ‘What’s going on here?’... At the same time my dad was taking me to EDON [left wing party’s youth organization] and there they were using only Republic of Cyprus flags. So I kind of figure out something was not right.

Nicholas was around fourteen years old. At the weekly left-wing party youth organization (EDON) meetings he attended, people began offering more satisfactory explanations about the flag issue. Nicholas was persuaded that “We are a different country than Greece with our own flag [the Republic of Cyprus flag]” and “If we are using the Greek flag the people on the North will use the Turkish flag” something that would have made the solution of the Cypriot issue more difficult. This, along with his father’s disapproval of the Greek identity and the use of the Greek flag, slowly convinced him to align with the party’s and his family’s Cypriot identity.

Before that time he was unaware of the ideological contradiction in the Greek-Cypriot community about the ethno-national identity of the community, expressed in the right-wing and left-wing oppositional political narratives and projected on the use of the Greek or Republic of Cyprus flag, respectively. He said,

Nicholas: My whole life [up to that point] I was doing things relevant to the party. If I needed a doctor I was going to the party’s doctors, we went to the Cypriot-Soviet organization events [he laughs]. For me all these seemed normal. I didn’t realized what they meant. I needed to come to a certain age to look at all these more critically... Sometime around the flag incident with my dad I begun realizing that that group, EDON was not exactly what I was learning in school. In

EDON they didn't really talk about ethnic stuff. Well we went to some conferences but I didn't understand literally anything. I was just feeling I was belonging to that group. I had friends we were doing things, that's all.

Experiences During Adulthood

When he went into the army, Nicholas said he was mature enough to really think about his identity. "I was eighteen," he said, "I began looking at things more critically". Because of the army service he stopped participating at the EDON meetings. At the same period he began reading, talking to people and reflecting on his (at that time) Cypriot identity. He realized that, in fact, the flags and the ethno-national identities in Cyprus did not represent the Greek or Cypriot nation or Republics. Rather "they were used as political party identities [in the Greek-Cypriot community]." His studies in Classics at the University of Cyprus—two years later, at age twenty—reminded him his fascination with the Classic Greek culture and the Greek language. He also realized that "rejecting the Greek part of my identity was wrong" since "the language I speak is Greek, the music I listen to is Greek, and so many things in Cyprus are Greek." So he self-identified as Greek-Cypriot, which for him meant "both Greek and Cypriot."

That was how he self-identified at the time of the interview. He declared that he was "proud of my Greek and Cypriot identities," which he embraced through his studies on the Cypriot-Greek dialect and his favorite hobby, dancing Cypriot and Greek traditional dances in a dancing club. He said,

Nicholas: I find it very natural [normal]. We are part of the Greek civilization in Cyprus too. Important part of the Ancient Greek civilization but also important is our part today. So participating and presenting the Greek culture and civilization as Cypriot is something that empowers the overall Greek civilization. And why not?

He stopped his involvement in the left-wing youth organization or the left-wing party in general, since he no longer felt they represented the dual nature of his identity, although he admitted he never told his parents that he felt that way, to avoid any potential conflict with them. He did not join any other political party either. He described these changes to his ethno-national self-identifications with an analogy, “It went from the one extreme Greek ethnocentric identity to a turn to the other direction [Cypriot identity] probably more than I should, and it was afterwards that came to balance.”

Interaction with Turkish-Cypriots

Nicholas’ view of Turkish-Cypriots dramatically changed in the course of his life. Once a child believing the elementary school image of Turkish-Cypriots supporting the “barbarians” that took his family’s house, now a decade after the opening of the borders, Nicholas is in his early 30s with two very close Turkish-Cypriot friends that he described as “...like us but they are also different.” He said he is no longer ignorant about that first image. As he put it, “I knew there were Turkish-Cypriots but they didn’t have any real role in the game. They just happened to be there... They were not different than the enemy on the other side, in my mind.”

First contact

In 2003 in his twenties, Nicholas got the chance to meet and interact with “the other.” Although it was few months after the opening of the checkpoints, his first interaction with Turkish-Cypriots did not take place in Cyprus. It took place in Boston, U.S.A. where Nicholas participated in a summer camp organized by Fulbright.

Nicholas: It was a student program. Seven Greek-Cypriots, seven Turkish-Cypriots. It was the first time I lived with Turkish-Cypriots. I had everyday contact with them. I made very good friendships there. This changed my idea of them and I can tell you that after that I was very open to communication with them and the possibility of a solution.

It was the experience that transformed Nicholas’ perception about the other and gave hope to his expectations for solution and a unified country, a chance that was in the making since the negotiations for the Annan plan were at their peak.

At the same time his parents—who had been pro-rapprochement even before the opening of the checkpoints—had contact with people from his mother’s village in the North immediately after the opening of the checkpoints. Nicholas did not join them right away. As he said “My parents had contact with the Turkish-Cypriots that live at in my mother’s village. They were coming here, my parents went there, and they went to parties, social events. They did have contacts... and they were very happy that I made Turkish-Cypriot friends [from the camp in the U.S.A.] in the other side and I began going there too.”

Learning about the other

From his contact with Turkish-Cypriots Nicholas realized that there were a lot of things that he didn't know about the Turkish-Cypriot community, many of which surprised him. He said,

Nicholas: I was learning things that I didn't know before [about the Turkish-Cypriots]. For example that they are not as religious as we are. Not at all religious in fact. That they are not darker skin, like many people believe here [in the Greek-Cypriot community] they look more or less like we do. That they had the same fears and perceptions about as that we had about them. I have a friend, Turkish-Cypriot friend that lives on the other side [north side] of my neighborhood. The Green Line separates us. And she told me that as a kid at night she was afraid that the Greeks will come and capture them. And I thought how insane this sounded to me. But I had the same exact issue that we lived too close to them [the Turks] and they will come get me and harm me, etc. This demonization of the other. Somehow these fears disappear from inside me when I met them. And you know I was more than twenty years old!

Nicholas: Or when a Turkish-Cypriot friend came to my place and my grandfather was there and he kissed his hand in a particular way and I was, 'What are you doing there?' It was like he kissed his hand and then put it [place it] on his forehead as a sign of respect. To show respect to my grandfather. And my grandfather knew this because I asked 'What did happen just now?' and he told me, 'That's how Turkish-Cypriot do it.' And I was like, '[There are] so many

things I don't know! In what world they lived before and I have no clue.' It was a very nice and interesting, the journey of discovery. They are like us but they are also different in essence. And both [different and the same] are very nice. This was very fascinating!

He also realized that in a similar way his Turkish-Cypriot friends were learning things and changing misconceptions about the Greek-Cypriot community. He recalled an incident when he visited a Turkish-Cypriot friend who just discovered that his father and grandfather were fluent in Greek when they spoke to Nicholas,

Nicholas: Also I went to a Turkish-Cypriot friend's house and his father and grandfather spoke to me in perfect Greek. And he [my friend] was shocked that they spoke Greek. He had no idea they knew [spoke] Greek. And he said to his dad, 'I had no idea you spoke another language!' [he laughed]

Nicholas had a very unique take on the issue of the differences between the two communities, which was a major factor in the bi-communal conflict in the 1960s. He believed that the two communities should not try to change, rather they should try to accept the other as different and embrace those differences and learn from each other. When I asked if he thought that the differences with the Turkish-Cypriots could be an issue like it was in the 1960s, he responded saying, "This is our problem; that we see differences as a bad thing." Then I continued,

INT: Then what is your opinion on the argument that as Greek-Cypriot we need to emphasize less the Greek elements of our identity and more the Cypriot elements so we can ... it is easier to see the similarities with the Turkish-Cypriots?

Nicholas: Rejecting any part of your identity creates more problems than offers solutions. Rejecting that I'm Greek for me is rejecting the truth, really. And, yes, I am pro-rapprochement and I have Turkish-Cypriot friends but I am interested to see, to examine, our differences. Because difference is not a bad thing. Difference is a good thing... We have differences between the two communities that I find very interesting... Asking Turkish-Cypriots to renounce their Turkish identity and I renounce my Greek identity for both of us to be more Cypriot, I consider it a big mistake. For me, I am interested to investigate the other part [of the identity] and find out what differences we have. And to be honest I think it's good to have cultural differences in a society. Why do we have to be mono-cultural, let's say? ... What I want to say is that the fact that there are differences is not a problem per se. I like differences so I don't see it as a problem.

Learning about the suffering of the other

Nicholas compared the documentaries that he had seen earlier in his life about the pain, suffering and loss that the Greek-Cypriot community experienced and documentaries that he saw after 2003 that compared the narratives of suffering from the two communities. I will let him present the two perspectives in his own words,

Nicholas: During the memorial events for the invasion on July 20, I remember many times watching the documentaries and crying. The documentaries, the videos from the war, the destruction, the sad background music. I was getting very emotional. Emotionally charged, let's say. And I was sincerely sorry that

these areas were lost. Lost, taken from us, the Greek-Cypriots. I knew that they were taken by some barbarians, the Turks. I knew there were Turkish-Cypriots but they didn't have any real role in the game. They just happened to be there. That was my understanding of the occupied areas... I knew about the suffering that we experience, and I had personal experiences from my mom's family [that lost their house]...

Nicholas: After the opening of the checkpoints I saw a documentary in Boston [at the bi-communal camp] so we saw it all fourteen of us together [seven Greek-Cypriots and seven Turkish-Cypriots] and it presented both sides of the story something that you don't see often. And I saw a similar documentary at Ledra Palace [a hotel located in the Buffer Zone] and it was something like an eye-opener. What I realized is that there are certain pictures, images, that are marks for each community. For us, is the pictures with the refugees in camps, for example. You see it very often on TV. And I asked my Turkish-Cypriot friend, 'Do you have this picture in mind?' and he said, 'No, never seen it before.' Then we saw the mass graves of Turkish-Cypriots killed by Greek Cypriots and I asked if these are pictures they see often and they said 'Yes! We grew up with these images.' It was the first time I ever saw those pictures. It made me realize how our understanding of the conflict was different because of these images. But the most shocking was, at the end of the documentary at Ledra Palace, a Turkish-Cypriot went to the director, he was Greek-Cypriot so he talked to him in English, and I overheard him saying to the director, "Thanks for helping me see that the Greek-Cypriots suffered, too." And I was like, "What?" I didn't say it but I

thought about it. I was shocked because my whole life I thought that everybody knew that *we* suffered. But no! They thought that they were the only ones that suffered from the conflict. And the guy at the documentary was like, “Oh, Greek Cypriots suffered too.” We were both in our suffering world. The victims and the other was the attacker. Total deception.

As Nicholas neatly put it, “Total deception.” The narratives of suffering in the two communities during the period after 1974, even up to this day, are unilateral. Both communities present their community as the only one that suffered: the Greek-Cypriots from the 1974 invasion and the Turkish-Cypriots during the 1960s. Both narratives are true but the two communities avoid presenting the suffering of the other (Papadakis et al, 2008) with the exception of few documentaries, two of which Nicholas referred to.

Projects

Nicholas worked on two projects with Turkish-Cypriots that were aiming to facilitate Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot language learners to learn the language of each other easier. These were the first professional collaborations he had with Turkish-Cypriots. He commented about the project,

Nicholas: You know so many times communication is an issue. I speak English, so I can communicate with Turkish-Cypriots that speak English, but for people that they don't speak English it doesn't work. They are left out. So I hope this projects will encourage people to begin learning the language of the other community.

Crossing to the Other Side

Nicholas visits the north side very often to see friends, to visit places and monuments, go to the beach, or just to hang out in one of the cities in the North. The most memorable of his visits were the earliest ones. He crossed for the very first time just days after the opening of the checkpoints. He had to wait in line for hours since there were a lot of Greek-Cypriots that wanted to cross. It was dark by the time he crossed, and because Greek-Cypriots needed to return to the South before midnight, he had just a few hours to go to Kyrenia, a city on the very North coast of the island with a Venetian castle and an iconic small port. He described that first visit,

Nicholas: We decided to go see Kyrenia. Greek-Cypriots have something with Kyrenia. It's on many posters, on the elementary school notebooks. The Kyrenia castle at the small port is everywhere. It was a picture that I saw everywhere since I was a kid and I never imagined I would be able to actually be there. I drove and it was dark when we got there. It was a shock that I was actually there! Also they were playing the song from the [movie] 'Zorba the Greek' [a very popular Greek song] at a restaurant at the port [very close to the castle]. So it was just few minutes that we spend there because we had to head back to the checkpoint before midnight. But it was shocking. Very memorable. I couldn't believe it... I had goosebumps. 'I am here!' It was weird, surreal. It was like a static, dead picture, almost a painting turning real.

INT: Did this happened when you visited other places?

Nicholas: Not really. It was okay. But Kyrenia castle is very special for me.

The image of Kyrenia castle and the small port, the landmarks of that city even before 1974, were used in the campaigns in schools to keep the memory of the places in the north alive even for the younger generations that had never seen them before. Which is exactly what happened to Nicholas.

Although Nicholas had been crossing the Green Line for more than ten years, a few things make him feel uncomfortable when visiting the north. In general he never felt unsafe visiting the other side, but he was still uncomfortable when driving by military bases. He said, "I'm thinking, this is the enemy. I'm afraid that they can arrest me. I have this issue, that it's them, the one that occupy this part." He also mentioned that the huge flag made of rocks on Pentadaktylos, a mountain in the north, is very close to her mom's village. He said,

Nicholas: I drove by it... I was like 'Am I next to this thing that I could see my whole life from my house?' This was very weird.

INT: What do you mean weird? Explain to me.

Nicholas: It's a desecration of the mountain. It is a stain on the mountain. I don't mind looking at it from distance. Now that they have it lit at night I even find it ridiculous. It was the first time that I felt aversion for that thing. For me it was always there but being next to it, it was different.

Politics

Annan Plan

Nicholas participated in the 2004 referendum for the Annan Plan, but he submitted a “white ballot” (blanc ballot), voting neither “yes” nor “no” and showing his disapproval for the plan. As he said, “I honestly wanted a solution at the time but the specific plan was just not good.”

Nicholas characterized the 2004 Annan plan as a “big disappointment” for two reasons. First, he felt that the Greek-Cypriot political leadership “did not negotiated [good] enough in order to have a good plan for a good solution. I don’t know what were the reasons they didn’t negotiate better but the plan they suggested was not good.” His main concern was safety.

INT: So the plan was not satisfactory?

Nicholas: It scared me!

INT: Why?

Nicholas: Safety issues firstly. Mostly that. And I was not sure that the plan could work. There were weird things in there, with foreign judges etc... I had relationships with Turkish-Cypriots for like a year and I trusted those people but I know there are nationalist people in both sides and the plan didn’t provide any safety measures to avoid, to prevent those people from violence. I was afraid that with that plan the 1960s [events] could have happened again. We got it wrong one time [in 1960] I didn’t want to be responsible for another failure.

He was disappointed by the people from his community. He realized how unready they were for any kind of solution and the possibility of living together with the other community. He said,

Nicholas: My biggest disappointment was from the Greek-Cypriots. Not because they [the majority] voted “No” but the realization that we were not ready or mature for a solution. Everything came out with the plan. What I saw, it was a social reaction of Greek-Cypriots that they suddenly realized ‘Those others in the other side do exist and there is a possibility to live together’ and in reality they [the Greek-Cypriots] didn’t want it. This is what bothered me. Because this was the truth. It was uncovered.

INT: Did you felt ready to live with the other community?

Nicholas: Yes! Yes, because I already had contact [with the other community].

INT: What kind of contact?

Nicholas: My first contact was a year or so before [the referendum] at a bi-communal camp in Boston and also with my parents. My parents had contact with people from the other community from my mom’s village in the north. So, yes, I was ready to live with them on a psychological level. But socially, politically what this solution meant, it was scary. I was thinking, if we agree on a solution just because we want a solution—any solution—and all the elements of the society, the extremist also, [what] if we end up in bi-communal conflict again? I was scared of this possibility although I wanted a solution. So I didn’t vote ‘yes’ at the referendum. But ‘no’ neither. I gave a ‘white’ [blanc ballot]. It was one

way to protest, that what they offered me [the plan] was not a good solution... It was not a solution and it couldn't have been a solution.

Future solution

When I asked what kind of solution he would prefer, Nicholas distinguished between what he would like and what he considered possible,

Nicholas: I know that the people that were forcefully moved out of those places want to go back. At least a lot of them. In this sense I still feel these are places, villages and cities that we [as Greek-Cypriots] lost. And I don't mean we lost them ethnically. I mean we lost them in a humanitarian sense. These people lost the places they grew-up, they lost their houses. In this sense is a pity. It's sad. On the other hand I'm a realist. The best that can happen is a solution and not everybody will go back. I don't expect the settlers to leave. I'm a realist. If federation is the solution, let it be it. If we can have one unified state, everybody under one government, I like it but I want to be a realist. I don't think it will happen.

Discussion on Narratives and Experiences

Us and Them

All four participants represented the other community as different from their own, as the “other.” Even Fatma and Maria, who self-identified as Cypriot and argued that they saw all the people on the island as Cypriot, in fact considered the two communities as separate ethnic entities. Their definition of the “Cypriot” identity was one that included the identities of the two communities, the “Greek-Cypriot” identity and the “Turkish-Cypriot identity.” On the surface, the Cypriot identity for them did not differentiate people from the two communities, since they used the term Cypriot for both communities. At a closer look, though, it did. Differences in language and the fact that the two communities still live apart were the main reasons Maria and Fatma saw the two communities as separated. Even in their views for a future solution in which people from the two communities will live in one country under one government and free to reside in any area of the island, Maria and Fatma talked about separate educational systems for the two communities, where Greek-Cypriots will be taught in Greek and Turkish-Cypriots will be taught in Turkish. Both claimed that the separate educational systems—which was the case since formal education was introduced to Cyprus during the Ottoman era (Weir, 1952)—will ensure the respect of the linguistic differences between the two communities. They both suggested that in the separate educational systems there should be opportunities to learn the language of the other community and a history education that will present the views of both communities. In essence, both Maria’s and Fatma’s

Cypriot identity included the ethnic signifiers that the 1960 constitution of the Republic of Cyprus had, although neither of them was very clear on whether they preferred the rigorous ethnic division in the new administration that the 1960 constitution included.

Nevertheless, both Maria and Fatma supported a civic-territorial view of their ethno-national identity. They believed in the idea of one country and an identity that will emphasize the Cypriot part of the two sub-identities (Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot identities). They felt having one country means the Cypriot people need to invest in that one Cypriot national identity. They used similar arguments and examples from their lives to justify their views. They both referred to their studies in the motherlands where they realized that they were different from the mainland Greeks and the mainland Turks respectively. And their experiences meeting people from the other community when they realized that they were very similar.

For Mustafa and Nicholas, who self-identified as Turkish-Cypriot and Greek-Cypriot respectively, dismissing or shadow the Turkish and Greek elements in their identities was not acceptable. Mustafa felt both Turkish and Cypriot and Nicholas similarly felt both Greek and Cypriot. Both claimed to be proud of their roots that encompassed both identity elements.

Mustafa asserted that historically the two populations have different heritage and come from different ethnies, the Turkish ethnos and the Greek ethnos. Despite their similarities from the long co-existence on the island (before 1963) their differences are deeply rooted and should not be forgotten. He also mentioned that he felt more connection and he saw more similarities to the Turks from mainland Turkey rather than the Greek-Cypriots. He particularly emphasized that the recent violent history proved that

the two communities cannot live under one unified government. He rather suggested a confederation where the two ethnic communities had their own administration and operated under a federal government (an idea supported by the political party he supported, something I will discuss later in this section). He also believed that at this point the Greek-Cypriots cannot understand the needs of Turkish-Cypriots and vice versa, and he asserted this as another reason for two separate administrative units in case of a solution.

Nicholas' statements also supported the idea of two separate ethnic groups on the island and was grounded in the different heritage and traditions between the two communities. His fascination for the classic Greek culture, the connection he felt with the contemporary Greek culture and the study of the Cypriot-Greek dialect (part of the Greek language as he suggested) were also elements that reinforced the Greek elements of his Greek-Cypriot identity. Hence, for him, the two communities are different and those differences should be respected.

There were few fundamental differences, though, between his view and the view of Mustafa. Nicholas saw the ethnic differences as a "good thing." He said, "differences is not a problem, per se. I like differences so I don't see it as a problem... I find [them] very interesting." On the other hand, Mustafa saw differences as a potential source of bi-communal problems. Nicholas thought the two communities can live peacefully together and respect each other's differences, but Mustafa did not believe that this was possible, since he did not trust the Greek-Cypriots.

The source of their different positions can be traced in their experiences. Mustafa, in addition to his education, had inputs reinforcing this distrust for Greek-Cypriots from

his father, who experienced severely the conflict, and from the political position of the right-wing political party he supported (National Unity Party UBP). He also had very limited contact with Greek-Cypriots and, as he admitted, a lack of knowledge about politics, religion, and social issues in the other community. On the contrary, Nicholas had regular contact with Turkish-Cypriots, including two very close friends. Because of this contact with Turkish-Cypriots, his conversations with his friends and his regular visits to the north part of the island, he had a very good understanding of the political and social issues in the Turkish-Cypriot community and trusted the Turkish-Cypriot people. He considered the regular people in the two communities as victims of political situations rather than the perpetrators of the conflict, a view that Mustafa had.

A second important difference was that Mustafa was rather sure that he was culturally different and most probably genetically different from the Greek-Cypriots, a primordial view of his ethno-national identity (Geertz, 1973). The history he was taught—and said he had no reason to question—was that he is the ancestor of the people that came from Anatolia, not genetically connected to the Greek-Cypriots “because there were no marriages” between the two communities, based on his knowledge. Nicholas’ view was more compatible with notions of invented traditions from the constructivist school of thought and supported the idea that nations and ethnic identities were invented in the eighteenth and nineteenth century, but said that does not make them not real. “If people believe in them we need to respect them.” He said he was raised to be Greek-Cypriot and nobody should try to take it away from him or anybody else.

I wanted to highlight that none of the participants in this study or the pilot studies I conducted with this age group, the after 1974 generation, mentioned religion as an

important element of their ethno-national self-identification. This made sense for the cases of Nicholas, Fatma, and Mustafa who identified as non-religious. Maria said that she was a strong believer and practicing Orthodox Christian and she attended church very regularly. She specifically said, however, that she never felt that religion was a determining factor for her Cypriot identity and the fact that Turkish-Cypriots were not Christians was never an issue for her. On the contrary she argued that Christianity taught her to respect all people regardless of their religion.

I find the religion aspect particularly ironic, since hundred-fifty years ago, during the Ottoman era and up to the 1930s, it was the most important element that differentiated the two communities. The Greek and Turkish ethnic identities that seemed to be embedded in this generation's self-identifications were introduced as a colonial modernization project by the British. Slowly, during the beginning of the British colonial era in Cyprus (1878) the Muslim and Christian population became Turks and Greeks. The Greek ethno-national identity, though, soon got out of control, with the Greek-Cypriots demanding unifications with motherland Greece. The British engaged in an effort to distance the Greek Christian Orthodox population of the island from the mainland Greece and the nationals there, with the introduction of a Cypriot ethnic identity that would be distinct and distant from the Greek mainland identity. This was the first time the terms "Greek-Cypriot" and "Turkish-Cypriot" were introduced (Bryant, 2010; Weir, 1952). The Cypriot parts of the identities tried to encompass all the people of Cyprus, regardless of ethno-religious identity differences. The British attempt to introduce the Cypriot identity failed, as the people's affiliation with the Greek and Turkish ethnies was far stronger and by the 1950s both groups demanded unification with their respective motherlands. So

based on my data and the work of others examined earlier in this report, the colonial efforts for modernization and distancing the people of the island from their religious identities and towards the modern ideas of ethnic identities was successful. The second stage of that modernization attempt, the “Cypriotness” project, though it is still under construction.

Chosen Traumas

After 1974 the two communities developed separate national historical narratives based on what Volkan (1994) called “chosen victories and chosen traumas”, that is, selective memories from the conflict that supported the national historical narrative for each community. Papadakis (2003) wrote about these narratives in Cyprus, “[E]ach narrative suggests a different story through which issues of identity and ‘otherness,’ self-justification and blame are negotiated in order to define the ‘imagined community’ of the nation, its enemies and its pertinent history” (p. 253). For example, the 1960s conflict during which many Turkish-Cypriots were killed by Greek-Cypriot nationalists and were forced to live in enclaves, served as a chosen trauma for the Turkish-Cypriot community, whereas the Greek-Cypriot community “forgot” about it (Papadakis, 2008). In the Greek-Cypriot community, those events were never mentioned in K-12 education (Papadakis, 2003) and soon became forgotten, blocked from the collective memory and the national narrative. In fact, Maria and Nicholas, who were born twenty years after those events that stigmatized Cypriot history and began the conflict, never heard of them until well after they became adults. When those events were occasionally mentioned in political

discussions in the Greek-Cypriot community they were referred to as “the Turkish-Cypriot mutiny” and the emphasis was on the fact that the Turkish-Cypriots left the Republic of Cyprus government—which is a correct historical fact—and not the violent conflict against the Turkish-Cypriots by a group of Greek-Cypriot nationalists the same year—another correct historical fact (Papadakis, 2008). In contrast, the 1974 military intervention became a chosen trauma for the Greek-Cypriot community. The Greek-Cypriot participants and the Greek-Cypriot narrative called it an “invasion” by Turkey that brought death to many people in their communities, missing people and refugees. In the Turkish-Cypriot community the 1974 military intervention is known as the “Happy Peace Day Operation.” The operation that helped the Greek-Cypriots by ending the escalation of the civil war among them, and at the same time restored freedom for Turkish-Cypriots (Papadakis, 2003, 2008).

Based on these opposing narratives, the idea of the Greek-Cypriot ethno-national identity was constructed in the Greek-Cypriot community and the Turkish-Cypriot ethno-national identity was constructed in the Turkish-Cypriot community. Along with these identities the image of the other as the enemy was also created. These narratives, identities, and the image of the other were inherited to the after-1974 generation mainly through their K-12 education and particularly through history education (Lacher & Kaymak, 2005; Papadakis, 2008; Yilmaz, 2005) and national celebrations and commemorations in schools and the communities in general (Papadakis, 2003).

K-12 Experiences

Turkish-Cypriots' K-12 education

During the time that the Turkish-Cypriot participants were in elementary and middle school in 1980s and 1990s, the right-wing political party “monopolized power on the Turkish Cypriot side with the explicit aim of preserving the *de facto* partition of Cyprus” (Papadakis, 2008, p. 135). The national narrative of the Turkish-Cypriot community was projecting this view mainly in the history education and in-school national celebrations. The narrative represented the arrival of Ottoman Turks on the island (1571 B.C.) as the beginning of the civilized history that saved the Greek-Cypriots from Venetian cruelty. In the history books Turkey is referred as “Our Motherland Turkey” and all the history books open with a Turkish flag on the first page along with self-declared TRNC flag, superimposed over the Turkish national anthem and next to the picture of Mustafa Kemal Atatürk (the founder of modern Turkey), a practice enforcement by law (Papadakis, 2008). Overall the period that received the most emphasis in the history books is 1963 to 1974, a period of Greek-Cypriot barbarism (‘Dark years’ as is called in the books), with detailed references to the battles, the killings by Greek-Cypriots, the Turkish-Cypriot mass graves and the displacement, village by village and day by day, with photographs and descriptions. The 1974 military intervention by Turkey is called ‘Happy Peace Operation’ and described as the day when the ‘Heroic Turkish Army’ saved the Turks of Cyprus from the Greek-Cypriot aggression and the Greek-Cypriots from a civil war. In the books there are no references for the Greek-Cypriot suffering and displacement of 1974 (Papadakis, 2008, p. 136). The overall

historical narrative is presented in a way that supports the view that the two communities cannot live together.

Both Turkish-Cypriot participants agreed that during their elementary and middle school years they were too young to understand the national narratives promoted at school. They sang the national songs at the national celebrations, the national anthem, they held the national flags (of Turkey and TRNC), and they learned history, but it was only when they were in high school that they began to understand what it meant to be a member of the Turkish-Cypriot community, what the flags represented, and what the songs talked about. At that time Mustafa thought, “this makes sense,” whereas Fatma thought, “that kind of nationalism in schools make me prefer the Cypriot [identity].”

Mustafa described his K-12 education as very normal, in agreement with what his father was telling him and what people were talking about during national holidays: that he was Turkish-Cypriot with strong ties to Turkey and that the Greek-Cypriots on the other side of the buffer zone “hated us.” So the TRNC and Turkish flags together, the Turkish national anthem, and the songs saying “I’m Turkish, I’m proud of it” seemed normal to him then and at the time of the interview. Mustafa did not describe any anomalies or contradictions between his Turkish-Cypriot identity and his experiences throughout his K-12 education. On the contrary, his K-12 experiences empowered his ethno-national identity learning because it was in accordance with it.

Fatma, however, experienced a number of contradictory events beginning from very early during her elementary school years. Fatma’s first knowledge about the conflict came from her history education and the history books during elementary school years. The elementary education presentation of the conflict and the image of the Greek-

Cypriots as “monsters” did not much the positive stories about life with Greek-Cypriots that young Fatma was hearing at home. Additionally, the pictures of violence and dead Turkish-Cypriot people in the books scared her to the extent that she did not want to carry the books home or have the same identity as “those dead people.” For her, history education created fear for the Greek-Cypriot “monsters” and distance from the Turkish-Cypriot identity. Also she did not enjoy the national celebrations at school, where they had to sing national songs and “...stand under the sun for hours ... to celebrate something we didn’t understand.” Reflecting on her K-12 education and its relation to her ethno-national identity, Fatma criticized it as being very nationalistic, promoting fear and violence, and a Turkish rather than a Cypriot identity.

Both Mustafa and Fatma criticized the references of their education to the conflict period as being simplistic and incomplete. Mustafa said that, “Just school history [was] not enough.” Their K-12 history education highlighted “only one side of the story,” as Fatma said.

Greek-Cypriots’ K-12 education

In the K-12 education of the 1980s and 1990s, the national narrative in the Greek-Cypriot community promoted Greek nationalism and the narrative that the Greek-Cypriot people were suffering from the actions of Turkey and struggled to survive on the island that was inherited from their Greek ancestors. The beginning of civilized history is placed on the 14th century B.C. when the first ancient Greeks arrived to the island. Most of the books used in the classrooms came from Greece and were identical to the books used in

mainland Greece schools and consequently include Greek history. The rest of the books, published in Cyprus, are called “History of Cyprus” books and presented a history of Cyprus that is an extension of the history of Greece. The Turkish-Cypriots are presented as Ottoman Turks that came to the island on 1571, much later than the Greek-Cypriots who had been on the island since their first ancestors arrived during the 14th century B.C. The 1960s bi-communal conflict is very briefly described (just few pages) in some of the books and represents the Turkish-Cypriots as mutineer Turks whereas the 1963 events are called “Turkish-Cypriot mutiny” (Papadakis, 2008). Turkish military and Turkish-Cypriots are presented as one group that aggressively attacked the Greek-Cypriots on the island in 1974, similarly to what they have done to Greeks in other places like Smyrna and Istanbul throughout history.

In addition to history education, the Ministry of Education introduced soon after 1974 the “I don’t forget” (“Δεν Ξεχνώ”) campaign in Greek-Cypriot schools. The campaign—which continues today—aimed to teach the new generations the geography and traditions of the Turkish-occupied areas in the north, in order to learn about them and not forget their parents’ villages and cities in the north. The campaign was supported by pictures of the places and monuments in the north and maps that showed the occupied areas painted in red and dripping paint representing the wounded land that was dripping blood. The pictures were placed in classrooms and throughout elementary, middle and high schools. The elementary school notebooks provided to the students by the Ministry of Education, also had the same pictures printed on the front and back covers. The “I don’t forget” campaign was introduced in the curriculum as an interdisciplinary subject that covered geography (with maps and characteristics of the areas in the north), Greek

language (with literature about the areas in the north and the suffering of the Greek-Cypriots), history (specifically dedicated to the historical monuments in the north and the 1974 invasion) as well as art and music with songs about the occupied areas, refugee life and hope for the return to the land of their parents.

Maria and Nicholas were in K-12 during the late 1980s and 1990s, a period more than ten years from the division when the hopes for a solution were deteriorating in the Greek-Cypriot community (Klerides, 2008). The right-wing governments at the time implemented policies that emphasized the Greekness of the island. During demonstrations against the Turkish occupation, protestors used slogans like, ‘Cyprus is Greek;’ demanded the removal of Turkish troops from Cyprus with slogans like ‘Out the Turks from Cyprus;’ and urged the re-unification of the island with slogans like ‘Our borders are in Kyrenia’ the city on the Northern coast of the island. Schools were among the first institutions to promote these narratives, along with the Greek-oriented history and the “I don’t forget” campaign. In these narratives the Turkish-Cypriots were non-existent, something that both Maria and Nicholas very clearly recalled. The term ‘Greeks of Cyprus’ that was used in the 1960 constitution of the Republic of Cyprus was replaced with the term ‘Greek-Cypriots’ (Gregoriou, 2004). This terminology acknowledges both the ethnic background of Greek-Cypriot community and at the same time—with the ‘Cypriot’ part—backs up the legitimacy of the Republic of Cyprus as the only legal government on the island, 36.2 percent of which was occupied by Turkish troops (Philippou & Klerides, 2010).

Maria remembered that this narrative seemed normal to her and that at the time she considered herself Greek-Cypriot, which for her at the time it meant Greek of Cyprus

or a Greek person who happened to live in Cyprus. She had this self-identification throughout her K-12 education years and up to the first year in college. Nicholas felt the same way during elementary and middle school. Through the teaching of history and few influential teachers in elementary school, he developed a fascination for the Classic Greek culture and considered himself descendant of the people that developed the Classic Greek culture. Also because of the proximity of his school from the Green Line (just a few feet away) he was able to see the Turkish soldiers guarding the Green Line, giving him an even stronger image of the enemy as described in the history books. They were the Turks, the enemy of the Greeks for centuries, with guns stopping his people from going to their houses in the North.

For both Maria and Nicholas the “I don’t forget” campaign was very influential. They saw the pictures of the occupied places every day on the school walls and on the covers of their notebooks. The pictures of the occupied areas became symbols for them. The efforts to unify Cyprus was not an abstraction. They wanted to go to those specific places. They were yelling at the protests for the Turkish army to leave the island so they could go there.

The Image of the Other

Both the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot participants were raised in a mono-communal environment without meeting the other. The Turkish-Cypriot participants growing-up knew about the other community, since the Greek-Cypriots were presented as the oppressors in the Turkish-Cypriot national narrative and the history education.

Mustafa said that, “We knew they hated us but we didn’t know how much” and Fatma said that as a kid she thought that the Greek-Cypriots were “monsters” that were killing Turkish-Cypriots. However, the Greek-Cypriot participants did not have a clear image of the Turkish-Cypriot community while they were in K-12 education. Nicholas mentioned that he knew about them but that “they were irrelevant.” The Turks were the important element in the north, “the enemy” he was throwing stones at during demonstrations. Maria was not only unaware of the 1960s conflict, but she was almost not aware of the existence of the Turkish-Cypriot community until she met one, when she was an undergraduate student in Greece. For her, the north part of the island was occupied by Turks that forced her family out of their houses and killed her grandfather. For the Greek-Cypriot national narrative of the 1980s and 1990s the Turkish-Cypriots were not necessary. The Cyprus conflict was one between the Greek-Cypriots and Turkey that invaded and occupied the north part of the island. In fact it was safer for the national narrative this way: If the new generation did not know about the Turkish-Cypriots, they wouldn’t raise questions like, “Why did the Turkish-Cypriots move to the north after the invasion?” that would potentially bring-up the forgotten “un-chosen,” (if we use Volkan’s terms) 1960s events.

For all the participants, the “other” was the reason their respective communities suffered. All participants mentioned that during their K-12 education they thought that their community was the only one that suffered from the bi-communal conflict. Their respective educations and their parents did not mention the suffering of the other community, something that distanced the “other” even more and, in the case of all four of the participants, created fear about the other. Nicholas was afraid that Turks would

kidnap him at night, Fatma was afraid the Greek-Cypriots would kill her like those Turkish-Cypriots in the pictures in her history education books, and Mustafa was afraid that they would kill him like they killed his father's friends. The demonization of the other created a stronger sense of 'us' versus 'them' and for all the participants contributed in learning the identities promoted by the opposed national narratives in the two communities, the Greek-Cypriot identity on the one side of the Green Line and the Turkish-Cypriot on the other. It also strengthened the ties to the mainlands (or motherlands as expressed in the national narratives) that were seen as people coming from the same ethnic group and nation, and as part of the 'us' (particularly for the Greek-Cypriot participants). The motherlands were also seen as protectors that kept each community safe – politically and physically – from the enemy. These were elements that strengthen the Greek and Turkish parts of the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot identities.

Family

When Maria found out about the 1963 mass killings as a college student, she was very upset with her parents for not telling her that Turkish-Cypriots suffered, too. Turkish-Cypriots even had missing people from the conflict, like her grandfather. Her grandfather's loss was so strong during her upbringing that she could not believe that her parents could have kept from her that there were Turkish-Cypriots that were going through the same kind of pain. Her parents, like Nicholas' parents, avoided talking about the conflict in general. So for both Greek-Cypriot participants was the major source of

information about the conflict and the recent history of Cyprus was their education, which partly explains why both Greek-Cypriot participants were so attached to the school national narrative during their K-12 education years (Marian until high school and Nicholas until middle school). Maria's father said that the topic was very sensitive so he preferred to let the school inform her with the "correct" way that the events happened. Of course, schools presented only a partial and distorted version of the history, so Maria did not really know what happened in the 1960s. Greek-Cypriot participants' parents supported that national narrative by not saying anything different, by being silent about the experiences and knowledge from the before 1974 conflict.

On the contrary, the parents of the Turkish-Cypriot participants did share those experiences with the other. Nevertheless, they did not share everything. Fatma's parents mostly shared experiences from before the conflict. They talked about the peaceful coexistence of the two communities and the collaboration with the Greek-Cypriots in everyday activities, experiences that were contradictory to the Turkish-Cypriot national narrative and the proposed ethno-national identity presented at school. This contradiction, between what she heard at home and what she learned at school, was one of the first indications for young Fatma that "something was not right." Fatma growing up was more influenced by her family's perspective something that she used to support and justify her Cypriot self-identification and her view that Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots belong to Cyprus and as such "... we are all Cypriot."

For Mustafa on the other hand things were smoother. His father talked a lot about the conflict and his experiences living in enclaves during the 1960s, experiences that were very much in agreement with the Turkish-Cypriot national narrative. Mustafa's

father also shared peaceful stories with Greek-Cypriot classmates and friends during his studies at the English School in the 1950s but those were used as an example for not trusting the Greek-Cypriots who were willing to kill classmates and friends when it came to Greek nationalism. So for Mustafa the bridge that connected the two communities via trust was burned from a very young age, something that was still the case in his thirties when I interviewed him. He very clearly stated that for him one identity for both communities was not possible, it was an illusion. He self-identified as Turkish-Cypriot, different from the Greek-Cypriots but also different from the Turks.

Political Affiliations

Turkish-Cypriots' political affiliations

Both the Turkish-Cypriot participants supported political parties that were also supported by their parents. Mustafa supported the right-wing “National Unity Party” (Ulusal Birlik Partisi, UBT) and Fatma the left-wing “Republican Turkish Party” (Cumhuriyetçi Türk Partisi, CTP). Both participants’ views about the solution to the Cyprus issue were in agreement with the views of their families and the political parties they supported. Mustafa preferred a solution where the two communities live separately under a federal government, the Turkish-Cypriots in the north and the Greek-Cypriots in the south. This is in agreement with his ethno-national identity views of two separate identities in the two communities, the Turkish-Cypriot identity and the Greek-Cypriot. Fatma wanted a unified country where the two communities will live together in the same

areas with one national identity, the Cypriot identity, and one international representation as a unified country. The way they perceived and talked about their experiences was not only in agreement with their ethno-national self-identification, but it came to support and justify it. Their views were definitely not developed in a vacuum. They respectively represent the two political narratives in their community that are supported by the two major political parties in the Turkish-Cypriot community, the UTP and CTP (Dembinska, 2016; Papadakis, 2003). Both Mustafa and Fatma are active members of UTP and CTP respectively and they explicitly said that their political affiliation had major influence in their ethno-national self-identification.

Greek-Cypriots' political affiliations

On the contrary, both Greek-Cypriot participants said that at the time of their interviews they were not affiliated with any political party although their self-identifications were supported by the two major political parties in their community. Maria's Cypriot self-identification is supported by the left-wing party "Progressive Party of Working People," AKEL (*Ανορθωτικό Κόμμα Εργαζόμενου Λαού, Α.Κ.Ε.Λ.*) and Nicholas' Greek-Cypriot self-identification is supported by at least three other parties in the community: the right-wing, conservative, Christian-democratic party "Democratic Rally," DISY (*Δημοκρατικός Συναγερμός, ΔΗ.ΣΥ.*); the centrist Democratic Party, DIKO (*Δημοκρατικό Κόμμα, ΔΗ.ΚΟ.*); and the social-democratic party "Movement of Social Democracy," EDEK (*Κίνημα Σοσιαλδημοκρατών, ΕΔΕΚ*). For both Greek-Cypriot participants political affiliations did not positively influenced their self-identifications.

Specifically, Nicholas' family strongly supports the left-wing AKEL. Although as a teenager he was attending AKEL's youth organization events and gatherings, at around the age of eighteen he decided to stop attending them, specifically because he disagreed with their stance on ethno-national identity. AKEL tends to de-emphasize the Greekness of the Greek-Cypriot community and emphasize the Cypriot elements of the identity and the similarities with the Turkish-Cypriots. Nicholas was very proud of his Greek and Cypriot identity and he considered AKEL's stance on the issue to be wrong. He said, "Asking Turkish-Cypriots to renounce their Turkish identity and I renounce my Greek identity for both of us to be more Cypriot, I consider it a big mistake." He also thought that there was nothing wrong with having differences, He said, "Differences is a good thing... We have differences between the two communities that I find very interesting..."

Maria's mother supported the left-wing AKEL and her father the right-wing DISY. So although Maria was politically active, she preferred not to be a member of any of the political parties because of the political differences within her family and extended families. Instead, her political involvement was channeled through NGOs and civil society organizations. She worked very often with Turkish-Cypriots in bi-communal projects through her job at an NGO. Her Cypriot self-identification was influenced by this work since it made her realize that she had similar aspirations and views for the future in Cyprus with her Turkish-Cypriot colleagues and friends and that they were able to change things in Cyprus when they worked as one entity with her Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot colleagues.

Experiences Influencing Identity in Adulthood

Non-recognition abroad

Although the participants self-identified in different ways and gave a variety of explanations to support their ethno-national self-identifications, all of them wanted their respective identity of their community to be seen as unique and different from those of the mainlands (Greece and Turkey). Interactions with outsiders who did not recognize the participants' identities frustrated and upset them. When participants were among people of a different culture they strived for recognition; they wanted to separate themselves from the people from mainland Greece and Turkey. They wanted the people they interacted with to recognize the existence of their community and their unique identity and culture. Participants described how these experiences made them to rethink, re-learn and adjust their identity and the ways they chose to introduce themselves when meeting people outside Cyprus in order to avoid misrecognition or non-recognition. These were issues that participants did not face before they traveled abroad since in the homogeneity of their communities their ethno-national identity was not questioned.

Participants' experiences and views outside Cyprus support Charles Taylor's (1994) ideas about the "politics of recognition" (p. 2). Charles Taylor stated that,

Our identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, and so a person or group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, if the people or society around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves... Non-recognition or misrecognition can inflict harm [and] can be a form of oppression... (p. 25)

Non-recognition or misrecognition experiences were particularly emphasized by the Turkish-Cypriot participants who reported that they faced them more often. There are few possible explanations for this. The population of the Turkish-Cypriots is substantially smaller than the Greek-Cypriot population (approximately 180,000 compared to 800,000). Also because of the non-recognition of TRNC and the embargos that were casted upon TRNC, traveling outside the north part of the island and Turkey was difficult (up to 2003) and not very common for Turkish-Cypriots. For these reasons, if foreigners had previous contact with people from the island, it was mostly likely with a Greek-Cypriot rather than a Turkish-Cypriot, so when a person from Cyprus introduces himself as Cypriot, many assume he is Greek-Cypriot. Also because of the non-recognition of TRNC many people abroad are not aware of the existence of the Turkish-Cypriot community. All these made the Turkish-Cypriot participants—in this study and in previous studies (see Akçalı, 2011; Vural & Rustemli, 2006)—more sensitive on issues of non-recognition or misrecognition and more likely to recall and report them during the interview.

Fatma and Mustafa described similar (to each other's) experiences while they were in Turkey. Their major issue was the misconceptions that people in Turkey had about their community. They both mentioned that they did not like that people in Turkey considered the north part of Cyprus as the baby-land of Turkey; they felt it undermined the significant differences between the Turkish-Cypriot community and the people in mainland Turkey. Fatma pointed out that people in Turkey did not even know that Turkish-Cypriots spoke with a distinct accent. Both of them used the same wording “we came to save you” to describe how Turkish people described the 1974 operation. For both Fatma and Mustafa this was a misleading statement that meant the people in Turkey did

not know what happened in 1974. In Mustafa's words, "You saved me because I existed." He expressed his frustration that Turkey's intervention came much later than needed (in 1974 instead of 1963). The Turkish government promoted it as saving the Turkish-Cypriots, but in his view it was the Turkish-Cypriots themselves that managed to survive the Greek-Cypriot aggression between 1963 and 1974. Fatma had a different take on the "we came to save you" argument. She thought it was very "nationalistic" and ignored that the 1974 intervention was a war, came with a lot of suffering and created a situation of non-recognition that the Turkish-Cypriots are to this day trapped in.

Mustafa and Fatma had several experiences of non-recognition during their studies abroad. Although Mustafa studied in the U.S. and northern Europe and Fatma in the northern Europe, their experiences were very similar. People from other countries confused them for Greek-Cypriots when they said they came from Cyprus. Mustafa recalled incidents when people began talking to him in Greek when he said he came from Cyprus. When they said that they were Turkish-Cypriots many people were unfamiliar with the political situation in Cyprus and assumed that they were Turks.

Both the experiences of non-recognition in Turkey and in other countries made them realize that they needed to explain their identity to people that they did not know about their community. Mustafa said, "It was frustrating... The guy there hasn't even heard about you." So both of them explained that even though it was many times frustrating that they cannot express their identity in one or two words, they took the time to inform people about their community. This non-recognition was not only non-recognition of their community but also of the existence of their culture and their political entity, the TRNC.

In particular, Fatma, who self-identified as Cypriot, chose to introduce herself as a Cypriot from the north when she first moved to northern Europe, avoiding the Turkish-Cypriot identification. As she mentioned these experiences made her rethink her identity and eventually settled to the Cypriot self-identification, “So during that time I started to think a lot, am I a Cypriot or a Turkish-Cypriot? Who am I?”

Living abroad

Maria and Fatma pursued their undergraduate degrees in their respective mainlands, Greece and Turkey. For both, the experiences there reinforced their Cypriot identity. They reported that while living there they realized that their similarities with the mainlanders were not as strong as they thought. Maria said that her first reaction to her Greekness came when she prepared her paperwork to work part-time in Greece during her studies. She was issued an alien work visa. Then she observed other events that made her realize that people in Greece and in the Greek government did not consider her one of them. She said, “I was shocked. They [the Greek authorities] issued an alien card like any other immigrant. Everywhere I was a foreigner. *Everywhere.*” These experiences along with the knowledge about the feasibility of the political connections between the Greek Republic and the Republic of Cyprus from her degree in political sciences, made her realize by the fourth year of her studies that no matter how hard she tried to be Greek, she was not. She was Cypriot.

Fatma also questioned her Turkishness after leaving Turkey, but for her it worked the other way around. She was the one who first did not feel Turkish when people from

the mainland tried to define her as such. She felt different than the mainlanders and she wanted them to know. The reasons for her persistence goes back to the non-recognition and misrecognition issue for the Turkish-Cypriot participants and the political non-recognition of TRNC that I discussed earlier in this section.

Maria's experiences living in the northern Europe and Brussels also contributed in learning her Cypriot identity. As she said, particularly the British did not care if she was Greek-Cypriot or Turkish-Cypriot, which led her to question whether she needed to feel strongly about being Greek-Cypriot. On the contrary, Nicholas who spent four years in northern Europe said that his experience there made him feel more Greek because he was interacting frequently with (mainland) Greek students at the University and he just felt as Greek as they did. Mustafa also studied in the U.S.A. and the northern Europe and the non-recognition he experienced there helped him feel stronger about his Turkish-Cypriot identity. He wanted people to know about the existence of his community as a separate from Turkey and Greek-Cypriots.

The above examples from the cases of the four participants illustrate the complexity of ethno-national identity learning and its dependence on the environment (political, historical, cultural, and social), as well as previous experiences and perceptions of each individual. It is not possible to generalize that experiences abroad can reinforce one self-identification over another because it is not that simple.

Meeting the Other

Turkish-Cypriots meeting the other

For Fatma, meeting people from the Greek-Cypriot community made her realize that not only they were not “monsters,” they were “people like [her]” and in fact very similar to her. The similarities she mentioned had to do with everyday activities like cooking, shared customs, and similar gestures and body language while talking and expressing themselves. Comparing the Turkish-Cypriots’ similarities to Greek-Cypriots with the Turkish-Cypriots’ similarities with the people in mainland Turkey, she realized that she felt closer to Greek-Cypriots than Turks. As she said, “[we have] too much in common [with Greek-Cypriots]... So I think it’s a Cypriot thing, not a Greek thing or Turkish thing.” Her first interactions with Greek-Cypriots in 2003 and the similarities she identified and the prospect of unification from the Annan plan a year later, influenced her ethno-national self-identification substantially. From that time on she began realizing that the Cypriot identity was better suited for her.

Mustafa also identified a lot of similarities with Greek-Cypriots despite his limited interaction with them. He said, “Anything besides the Cypriot problem, we are very similar.” Regardless of the similarities, the differences on the Cyprus problem that led to the conflict, and the history of the conflict between the two communities were more important for him. His argument was that during the 1960s the two communities probably had even more similarities in their everyday lives than they do now, but these similarities were not enough to prevent the conflict. As he said “...obviously our differences are more important [than the similarities].” The two Turkish-Cypriot

participants perceived a very similar experience and the observation that they were very similar to Greek-Cypriots very differently. Through reflection and based on both this experience of meeting people from the other community, along with previous experiences and perceptions, led Fatma closer to Greek-Cypriots and the Cypriot identity but did not work the same way for Mustafa, who decided to keep his distance from the Greek-Cypriots and retain his Turkish-Cypriot identity.

Greek-Cypriots meeting the other

Nicholas met Turkish-Cypriots for the first time at age twenty-three in a camp in the U.S.A. organized by Fulbright. He got the chance to live with Turkish-Cypriots for few days, do activities with them, and talk. He reported that that experience totally changed his view about the other community. As he put it, he realized that “[t]hey are like us but they are also different,” referring to the numerous similarities but also the differences between the people from the two communities. He realized how much he did not know about the other community, for example that they were not religious as the Greek-Cypriots and not as dangerous or barbaric as he thought. After that experience Nicholas was ready to continue communicating with his new friends and get to know more about their community. He also mentioned that he felt ready for a solution. This experience and subsequent interactions with Turkish-Cypriots were also eye-opening for his ethno-national self-identification. His similarities with Turkish-Cypriots made him feel more Cypriot. Nevertheless, Nicholas was very clear that he did not believe in one Cypriot identity, since he found the cultural and linguistic differences between the two

communities fundamental to their existence. But his interaction with the other made him accept the possibility of a dual Cypriot identity on the island, Turkish-Cypriot and Greek-Cypriot identity.

Maria said that she had around ten Turkish-Cypriot friends and almost daily contact with Turkish-Cypriots through her job at an NGO. Maria's views were similar to Nicholas' with the exception that Maria believed in one, national, Cypriot identity. Her view came from her political science background and it was rather politically motivated, meaning that Maria's Cypriot identity represented her view of one state rather than one nation. One unified country rather than one people with the same culture and language.

The Crossing Effect

The experience of crossing to the other side of the Green Line seemed to have influenced the Greek-Cypriot participants more than the Turkish-Cypriot participants. All participants had at least one internally displaced parent, so each of them crossed for the first time to visit a parent's village or city. The Turkish-Cypriot participants said that their parents were very emotionally charged going back to their houses after forty years, but neither Fatma nor Mustafa felt any connection to those places. The lack of memories from those places or people they knew there (e.g., friends or relatives) were the main reason for this lack of connection to their parents' places. Mustafa said that visiting the south part of the island is like visiting another European country. Fatma on the contrary said that Cyprus is her homeland and she could live anywhere in the north or south part

of the island, but her mother's village would not have been a place she would choose because "... it's just a village."

On the contrary, both Nicholas and Maria claimed a connection to their parent's places but also to landmarks in the North like the small port of Kyrenia and the enclosed city of Famagusta. One possible explanation for these feelings — which reinforced the Cypriot identity of the Greek-Cypriot participants — is the effect of the "I don't forget" campaign that specifically aimed to keep the memory of the places in the north alive, even in the generation that never been there, through pictures and literature. Another possible explanation that is not reported in the literature but is grounded in my personal experiences being Greek-Cypriot, is that there is embedded in the Greek-Cypriot culture a deep connection of the Greek-Cypriots to the land of the place they grew up and the actual building they call home. This is true even for people that did not lose their properties during 1974, something that is not as strong in the Turkish-Cypriot's community culture.

Changes in Ethno-national Self-identifications

Three of the participants reported at least one change in their ethno-national self-identification. Fatma from Turkish-Cypriot to Cypriot, Maria from Greek of Cyprus to Cypriot and Nicholas from Greek of Cyprus to Cypriot and then Greek-Cypriot. In some cases, participants reported specific events that led to those changes but there was always a process connected to that change. The reported event was either the beginning of that process, like when Maria met Turkish-Cypriots for the first time, or the turning point, for

example when Nicholas had a heated conversation with his father about whether he should hold a Greek flag or not. Regardless of those events, the change came as a result of reflection and was influenced by a number of other elements in the environment and the interaction of those elements with each other and with the individual. As Dewey (1925) said we cannot examine any experience outside its environment or outside the context. Learning and knowing is a process embedded in that environment. Or as social constructionists would argue, ethno-national identities, despite their imagined nature, cannot be developed in vacuum, they are always surrounded by the relevant social, political and cultural environment.

Chapter 5

Conclusions and Implications

Conclusions

This comparative dissertation using narrative inquiry (Riessman, 2008) presented an in-depth analysis of the process of ethno-national identity learning of four young adults on the divided island of Cyprus, two from the Greek-Cypriot community and two from the Turkish-Cypriot community. Each young adult was treated as a specific, bounded, information-rich case (Stake, 1995; 1998; 2005; Patton, 2004; Yin, 2003) that provided insights and in-depth understanding of the phenomenon of ethno-national identity learning. The analysis looked at how these young adults learned and understood their ethno-national identity; and what were the experiences that influenced their ethno-national identity learning? Through the examination of these four cases the study introduced and employed the concept “identity learning” as a new learning oriented perspective on looking at ethno-national identity in Cyprus. This new perspective combines the concepts of identity from the social constructionist approaches (see Anderson, 1983; Hall, 1996; Hobsbawm, 1994), the concept of experience from Dewey’s theory (1925; 1934; 1938) and the concept of learning from the informal and lifelong learning theory (Hager & Halliday, 2009). The “identity learning” concept introduced in this study, expands lifelong learning theory to the sphere of learned identities - an area that lifelong learning literature did not explore yet – by specifically looking at participants’ ethno-national identity as a lifelong learning process of becoming.

The findings from this study suggest that ethno-national identity learning among these individuals occurred in the course of living, within their immediate and extended communities, in interactions with other people and groups. It was sometimes intentional and others unintentional, and many times based on inquiry, reasoning and reflection. The findings also problematize the examinations of ethno-national identities in the two communities in Cyprus as fixed and learned in childhood and adolescence. The findings rather suggest that these identities should be examined as malleable identities, influenced and informed by experiences and learned throughout the lifespan. As such they need to be examined as lifelong learning processes.

Dewey's notion of experience that is interconnected to learning and living was used to support the lifelong learning nature of the identities examined. The ontological nature of Dewey's experience provided the lenses to examine the ethno-national identity learning as a phenomenon interconnected to the participants' lives and its holistic nature allowed me to look for the interconnections of the phenomenon to elements in the environment, or as Dewey preferred to call it environing conditions. In the case of ethno-national identities in Cyprus the holistic view of the experiences (suggested by Dewey) could not be achieved without looking at both the Greek-Cypriot and the Turkish-Cypriot communities, as a lot of those experiences were related to both communities. Further, all ethno-national identity narratives from each community were heavily connected to favorable or unfavorable view of the other community. Hence, examining these interconnected experiences between the two communities and comparing opposed narratives and the views of "us" and the "other" (expressed in the national narratives and/or the participants' narratives) helped me uncover the big picture of identities'

genesis and development in Cyprus and the ways that they influenced each participant's ethno-national identity learning process. The analysis of the four cases revealed the complexity of the phenomenon of ethno-national identity learning in Cyprus and its deep interconnections to national narratives, the political and social environment within the two communities, experiences specific to each participant and reflections on those experiences by each participant.

The findings from this study suggest that ethno-national self-identifications among young adults in Cyprus can be dynamic and they often change, influenced by a number of interconnected experiences and through reflection, reasoning and inquiry. The participants in the study have been learning their ethno-national identity throughout their lives. Learning to be Cypriot, Greek-Cypriot, or Turkish-Cypriot was a unique process for each one of them. It was the process of interaction (or transaction in Dewey's terms) between people, experiences, knowledge, and the surrounding social, political and historical environment in each case. Interactions did change the participants and at the same time changed their environment. For example, Maria's self-identification change from Greek-Cypriot to Cypriot and her friendship with Turkish-Cypriots, influenced her parents' views about Turkish-Cypriots and led them to begin having relationships with them. Since all four participants grew up on the island, certain events and elements of the environment were similar or the same for all or some of them, i.e. historical events relevant to both communities (although they may have not influenced participants the same way). Many other elements were different for each community or each participant.

The comparative method (Raivola, 1985) was employed to compare participants from the two communities on the island. The more than forty year of *de facto* division in

Cyprus that let the two communities separated, made it possible to study just one country, Cyprus, using the comparative method that is usually used to examine two or more different countries (Rosselló, 1963). The comparative method helped me identify similarities and differences between the environments in the two communities that influenced participants' self-identifications and experiences, as well as similarities and differences between the ethno-national identity learning processes of participants from the two communities and the individual and collective experiences that influenced those processes. Particularly, I examined how certain experiences played similarly or differently in the context of each community and how the different context in each community influenced the phenomenon for each participant.

The comparison between participants from the two communities revealed similarities and differences that helped understand the phenomenon of ethno-national identity learning deeper. In fact the comparison revealed that Maria (from the Greek-Cypriot community) and Fatma (from the Turkish-Cypriot community) who self-identified as Cypriot had more similarities between them than with the participants from their community. For example, they defined their identity in civic-territorial terms and both connected it with their future aspirations for a unified country. This led them to support the "Yes" movement for the solution suggested by the Anna Plan in 2004, something that they both in retrospect characterize as an emotional move, driven by their desire for a solution and exit of the division. Also both of them had similar experiences in the respective mainlands Greece and Turkey, where they studied and felt overwhelmed from the differences between their culture and the culture of the people in the mainlands, and how they were perceived by the people in the mainlands respectively. For both of

them these experiences came to contradict their understanding of their ethno-national identity during elementary and middle school, when they believed that they were more or less the same with the people from the mainlands. This contradiction for both of them reinforced their Cypriot identity.

Similarly Nicholas (from the Greek-Cypriot community) and Mustafa (from the Turkish-Cypriot community) who self-identified as Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot respectively, claimed Greek and Turkish heritage and history as important elements of their ethno-national identity. They both said that they voted “No” to the Annan Plan because the suggested solution did not provide enough security measures, indicating distrust to the other community. Although distrust was a more important element in Mustafa’s narrative in general than it was on Nicholas’.

Contact with the other community and its connection to trust was also another theme similar in the narratives of participants from both communities. Nicholas, Maria and Fatma had regular contact with members of the other community and they both indicated that they would support a solution for a unified country rather than two separate governments. Mustafa on the other hand, had very limited contact with the other community and supported a two state solution to the Cyprus issue, claiming that the two communities are not ready yet.

Key difference between the participants from the two communities that influenced their ethno-national identity learning process was the experience of misrecognition when meeting people abroad. Turkish-Cypriot participants reported that they got upset when people abroad wrongly assumed that they were Greek-Cypriots or Turks and it came in addition to the non-recognition of their self-proclaimed state TRNC in the north part of

the island. On the contrary Greek-Cypriot participants faced less incidents of misrecognition (probably because the Greek-Cypriot community population is bigger and the Republic of Cyprus is recognized in Europe as an EU member) were more flexible when facing incidents of misrecognition, when people mistook them as Greek.

What it meant to be member of their ethnic community (Greek-Cypriot or Turkish-Cypriot) was different for each participant and for some it changed throughout their lifespan because of contradictions between the narratives that led them to their original self-identification (heavily influenced by their parents and narratives in their education promoted by the leadership in the two communities) and their personal experiences. For the participants' generation, the post-1974 generation whom were born after the bi-communal conflict and did not experience active violence on the island during their life, what it meant to be member of their community was different than what it meant to their parents' generation, who experienced the violent conflict of the 1960s and 1970s. The parents' self-identifications was heavily influenced by the "us" versus "them" narrative because of the conflict. So it was only reasonable that the national narrative that their parents' generation formed, and the ethno-national identity connected to that narrative, would not resonate with some of the participants and many of the people in the participants' generation (Akcaki, 2011; Calotychos, 1998; Philippou & Klerides, 2010; Vural & Rustemli, 2006), a generation with substantially different, less violent experiences than their parents.

The participants did not hesitate to question the ethno-national identity that was "inherited" and promoted to them by their family, their K-12 education, and the historical, social, and political environment in their community earlier in their life. When

they questioned their ethno-national self-identification it was because of experiences contradictory to the national narrative or changes in their environment. Changes in their self-identification occurred after reflection on those experiences and reasoning. The exception to that was their original self-identification, learned mostly while they were in elementary and middle school, which they all reported seemed very normal at the time. Reflecting on those years, all of the participants reported that they were not mentally able to understand what it meant to be Greek-Cypriot or Turkish-Cypriot, their reported self-identifications. The experiences that, in most cases silently, influenced ethno-national identity learning in the earlier years of their lives (up to middle school) were interactions with their parents, experiences at school, like history education, national celebrations and commemorations, teachers' views on ethno-national identity, and the Cyprus conflict, and participation in protests against the enemy.

For those participants who questioned their self-identification at one or more times during their lives (three out of four participants in this study), this came later during their high schools years or adulthood. Interconnected experiences and the way these experiences influenced ethno-national identity learning varied in each case and was also related to their previous experiences. I was able to identify, though, some experiences that were influential for more than one of the participants in similar or different ways. For example, the experience of meeting people from the other community (something that none of the participants was able to do before 2003), meeting people from other countries abroad, crossing to the other side of the Green Line, learning about the history as presented by the other community, and learning about the suffering of the other.

Implications

Due to the multidisciplinary approach undertaken in this project, the implications from the study to theory and practice extend to fields inside and outside education. Specifically its implications touch the fields of lifelong learning, comparative education, K-12 history education, identity theory as examined by the fields of social and political sciences. Further and due to the relation of ethno-national identity issues to the division of the island, the findings from this study have important implications for policy makers and politicians in Cyprus and the United Nations in their efforts for settlement of the Cyprus issue.

Implications for Lifelong Learning Theory and Identity Theory

The current study combined literature from the social constructionist approach to identity and the informal and lifelong learning approach to offer a new learning-oriented perspective on ethno-national identity. This study did not examine the connections between identity and lifelong learning (for example, how identity influences learning or how learning influences identity), an endeavor undertaken multiple times in the literature. Rather, it examines identity as the object of learning. From this perspective, identity is not the influence to learning, it becomes the actual learning. This new perspective of identity combines the concept of identity from the social constructionist approaches (see Anderson, 1983; Eloy & Suny, 1996; Hall, 1996; Hobsbawm, 1994), the concept of experience from Dewey's theory (1925; 1934; 1938; Elkjaer, 2000;2004), and the

concept of learning from the informal and lifelong learning theory (Hager & Halliday, 2009). The combination of these theoretical perspectives gave birth to the “identity learning” concept introduced in this study. The identity learning concept expands lifelong learning theory to the sphere of learned identities, an area that lifelong learning literature has yet to explore.

Although I agree with the constructed nature of ethno-national identities offered by the social constructionist approach, through this study I problematized elements of identity construction, as described by theorists of the constructionist approach, as a process happening outside people’s lives. In short, social constructionists described ethno-national identity construction as a top-down approach, where the elites and leaders of groups of people—in many cases equivalent to what we know today as nation-states—constructed those identities, using culture and history to support them. They then offered the constructed identities to the masses through education and media, and in return, the masses accepted and internalized those identities. My approach looks at how these proposed identities are perceived, understood, and experienced by normal people and how they are performed and learned through their everyday course of living. Based on the findings from this study, I formulated a theoretical model that suggests that on the individual level ethno-national identity is learned (rather than constructed) in the course of living. I introduced the term and concept “identity learning,” suggesting that ethno-national identity comes to exist as a lifelong learning process, not as recipe proposed by the leaders and elites of the Cypriot communities. As shown in this project, using this theoretical model in examining ethno-national identity helps examining individual and group experiences and their role in ethno-national identity learning. Using Hager’s and

Halliday's (2009) work on informal and lifelong learning this study shifted the research focus on ethnic and national identity from the construction focus to a lifelong learning process focus. This shift does not reject the constructed nature of ethnic and national identities in their initial conceptualization and introduction to different communities. It rather expands our understanding of identities on the individual level from a sponge-like metaphor, where the individual absorbs stimuli and information from the environment, to a continuous and lifelong interaction between the individual and the environment, an interaction that is nicely described in Hager and Halliday's informal learning theory as a learning process.

Hager and Halliday's ideas were built on Dewey's work and his notions of experience, learning, and environment as interconnected elements of living that are in constant interaction. Hence, this new identity learning framework also expands Dewey's work, applying his concept of experience in examining ethno-national identity. Deweyan experience is ontological, interconnected to learning and living, providing the lenses to examine the ethno-national identity learning as a phenomenon interconnected to the participants' lives. Its holistic nature allowed me to look for the interconnections of the phenomenon to elements in the environment where each individual learned his or her identity.

This study built new bridges between educational theories—specifically the works of Dewey on experience and Hager and Halliday's work on informal and the lifelong learning—and the fields of cultural studies and social and political sciences that traditionally had been theorizing on and researching the concepts of ethnic and national identities. Thus far, educational research used ethnic and national identities to examine

educational processes, but never looked into the nature of the concepts of ethnic and national identities. This study broke down these boundaries which kept educational research on the perimeter of these identities. It gives a fresh learning-oriented perspective in examining how ethno-national identities come to exist among everyday people. It can be argued that this process strengthens a multi-disciplinary collaboration to better understand the nature of ethnic and national identities, and possibly other identities, as they emerge in the 21st century.

The current study only examined and proved that ethno-national identity is a learned identity among a very specific group of people on the island of Cyprus. Hence, the identity learning concept is not yet proven to be an appropriate tool in looking at other identities or other individuals and groups. Further research needs to be done first to examine if this concept can be expanded in other groups in Cyprus; second, in other populations in other countries where ethno-national identity is contested; and third, in countries where ethno-national identity is less contested and less controversial. This approach will help determine whether the contested nature of identity and the conflict are elements that make ethno-national identity learned or whether the learned nature of ethno-national identity is also encountered in areas not highlighted by conflict and contested identities.

Because of the similarities and interconnection of ethnic and national identities to other kinds of identities, like racial and class identities, that are also heavily influenced by social, historical, and cultural elements of the environment, I suggest that research looking at those identities need to be undertaken, guided by the identity learning framework to examine whether these identities can also be understood as learned.

Implications for Comparative Research

This study expands the comparative education spectrum, offering a new perspective on what can be compared and what research can be considered comparative research. Traditionally comparativists like Rosselló (1963) suggested that for a study to be comparative two different countries need to be examined. Whereas in most comparative studies this distinction may be clear cut, this study showed that in the case of Cyprus this is not the case. Although politically Cyprus is considered one country, due to the extreme circumstances of the lengthy *de facto* division and the differences between the Greek-Cypriot and the Turkish-Cypriot communities, a comparison between the two communities that live in the same country can be undertaken and, indeed, offer valuable insights. At present, it is rather difficult to conduct research examining Cyprus as one uniform country. I suggest that we need to approach cases of conflict and post-conflict (like Cyprus) with an open-research-mind in regards to what can be compared. Rather than rejecting studies within the same country as not comparative, we should focus on how the comparative education tools and methods can be used to more deeply understand populations within the same country with substantial differences with each other, like the case of Cyprus.

I further suggest that Raivola's (1985) comparability and equivalency criteria (used for the comparison in this study) be used even in cases where there are no division lines between communities, where theoretically communities can freely interact, but in reality have no interaction. Such phenomena can be observed in countries with heavy race, caste, or economic status divisions that serve as artificial division lines between

groups that live in the same country, in some cases in the same cities, but with substantial cultural differences and very limited interaction between members of these communities. Those communities, though they can theoretically develop their culture with the other, they chose to develop it without, leading to consequences in how people self-identify and how they perceive the other.

Implications for Cyprus

This study also offers insights valuable specifically to Cyprus, particularly at this time in the island's history when intensive talks for settlement of the Cyprus problem are undertaken by the leaders of the Greek-Cypriot and the Turkish-Cypriot communities. This study presents in detail the connections that participants make between their self-identification and a possible future solution/settlement to the Cyprus issue. For all four participants, ethno-national self-identification was closely connected and supported the desirable (for each one of them) solution. I suggest that further research on how people in Cyprus self-identify will give researchers and negotiators valuable information on the kinds of solutions that different groups of people may be willing to accept and the kinds of social structures and education that will support those, avoiding simplistic explanations based just on political affiliations that is often what is happening in the case of Cyprus. In the 2004 referendum it became obvious that people in Cyprus would not blindly follow the suggestions from the political party they support. Paradoxically, there had been no research trying to understand why people voted against the 2004 Anan Plan and against the major political parties' guidelines. This study reveals some information on the topic.

The findings show that ethno-national self-identifications played an important role on what the four participants voted, suggesting that further research examining large samples of the population of the two communities may indicate whether this is true in other groups in the two communities.

The findings from this study bring in question the role of K-12 education in ethno-national identity learning in areas of conflict, urging for re-examination of history education, national narratives, and relevant identities promoted in schools in the two communities in Cyprus that are not in agreement with students' experiences outside schools. For example, narratives that promoted "us" and "them" perceptions, with "them" as the aggressive and dangerous enemy contradicted with students' experiences meeting peaceful people from the other community.

As showed in this study, ethno-national identities learned by students during their K-12 education years are not the ones that these individuals continue to have throughout their lives because they are not compatible with the rest of their life experiences. Further, individuals in adulthood have more experiences that influence and inform their identity learning compared to those they had during their school years. Based on my findings, the adult life experiences are the ones that influenced ethno-national identity the most, the perception of the other and the views for the solution to the Cyprus problem. Further, the participants as elementary and middle school students lack the sufficient cognitive development to look critically at history education and its connections to the political issue in Cyprus. My findings suggest this critical examination of history seems to be happening during the late teenage years and throughout early adulthood.

The leaders of the two communities and the United Nations (UN) desire a solution to the Cyprus problem and have been working for decades to achieve an agreement that will be considered fair by the people in both communities. The failure of the 2004 efforts of the UN Secretary General Kofi Annan and the rejection of the Annan plan by the Greek-Cypriot community through a referendum raises questions about the kind of solution that will satisfy the majority of people in both communities. The Annan plan is an example of a proposed solution that did not consider the aspirations, views, and fears of all people in both communities. The findings from this study can be useful to negotiators, policy makers, or other actors (like NGOs) who need to be informed on the identity elements to consider in any proposed solution to the Cyprus problem. It is important for them to know what experiences positively influence certain ethno-national self-identifications and which of those self-identifications—and the groups supporting them—can potentially support certain solutions and resist to others. Understanding ethno-national identities in the two communities can be beneficial in developing a plan that will consider and accommodate the different identities on the island and hence avoid rejections like the one in 2004 for the Annan plan. As long as people on the island self-identify in different ways, these self-identifications need to be acknowledged and respected in any proposed solution. Failure to do so may cause problems similar to those that led to the violent events of the 1960s. The transition from a division heavily influenced by ethnic differences and ethnic conflict to a unified island calls for respect and careful handling of ethno-national identities of all people in Cyprus.

This study was just my first step in understanding the complex phenomenon of ethno-national identity learning on the divided island of Cyprus. I examined only a small

number of people in Cyprus that were grew up in a specific period of time at a very particular moment in history of the island of Cyprus, with higher education and with experiences outside Cyprus. I suggest that further research needs to be done with people from other age groups, different educational levels, and from different socio-economic levels to understand how people in those different groups learn their ethno-national identity. Given the interconnections between ethno-national self-identifications and a peaceful co-existence of the two communities on the island, it is imperative that we deeply understand the phenomenon of ethno-national identity in Cyprus through projects similar to the one presented in this report. Narrative analysis and the proposed theoretical framework of identity learning can be the tools to be used to undertake such projects or projects.

References

- Abdelal, R., Herrera, Y. M., Johnston, A. I., & McDermott, R. (2006). Identity as a Variable. *Perspectives on Politics*, 4(4), 695-711.
- Abdelal, R., Johnston, A. I., McDermott, R., & Herrera, Y. M. (Eds.). (2009). *Measuring Identity: A Guide for Social Scientists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Abrams, J., O'connor, J., & Giles, H. (2002). Identity and intergroup communication. In W. B. Gudykunst & B. Mody (Eds.), *Handbook of international and intercultural communication* (2 rd ed., pp. 225-240). Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.
- Akçalı, E. (2011). Getting real and fluctuating national identities: Insights from northern Cyprus. *Antipode*, 43(5), 1725-1747.
- Anastasiou, H. (2008). *The broken olive branch: Nationalism, ethnic conflict, and the quest for peace in Cyprus*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Anderson, B. R. (1983). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, England: Verso.
- Antoniou, M. (2015). *The prospects for peace education in Cyprus: Exploring the potential for future unified education through the examination of a bi-communal school*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Pro Quest Database (Accession No. 3703711).
- Asch, S. E. (1952). *Social Psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Asmussen, J. (2004, July). Cyprus after the failure of the Annan-Plan. *European Centre for Minority Issues*.
- Atkinson, A., Coffey, S. & Delamont, A. (2003) *Key themes in qualitative research: Continuities and changes*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

- Baptiste, I. (2006). *Research quality: Optimizing investigators' talent and resources*.
Unpublished manuscript. Pennsylvania State University. University Park, PA.
- Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bekerman, Z., Zembylas, M., & McGlynn, C. (2009) Working towards the de-essentialization of identity categories in Conflict and postconflict societies: Israel, Cyprus and Northern Ireland. *Comparative Education Review*, 53(2), 213-234.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1990). Narrating the nation. In H. K. Bhabha (Ed.), *Nation and narration*. London: Routledge.
- Billing, M. (1995). *Banal nationalism*. London: Sage.
- Billig, M., & Tajfel, H. (1973). Social categorization and similarity in intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 3(1), 27-52.
- Bloom, W. (1990). *Personal identity and opinions*. London. England: Sage Publications.
- Blunden, A. (2010). *An interdisciplinary theory of activity*. Leiden, Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV.
- Borchgrevink, A. (2003). Silencing language of anthropologists and interpreters. *Ethnography*, 4(1), 95-121.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- Bryant, R. (2004). *Imagining the modern: The cultures of nationalism in Cyprus*. London, England: I.B. Tauris.
- Bryant, R. (2010). *The past in pieces: Belonging in the new Cyprus*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Bruner, J. S. (2002). *Making stories: Law, literature, life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burke, T. (1994) *Dewey's New Logic: A Reply to Russell*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Calhoun, C. (1997). *Nationalism*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.
- Calotychos, V. (1998). *Cyprus and its people, nation, identity, and experience in an unimaginable Community, 1955-1997*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Chandra, K. (2006). What is ethnic identity and does it matter? *Annual Review Of Political Science*, 9, 397-412.
- Coleman, P. T. (2000). Intractable Conflict. In M. Deutsch, & P. T. Coleman, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice* (pp. 428-450). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Cowen, R. (2002b) Sketches of a future: renegotiating the unit ideas of comparative education. In Caruso, M. & Tenorth, RE. (Eds.) *Internationalisation: comparing educational systems and semantics*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions* (1st ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cyprus PIO. (1965). *Facts about Cyprus*. Nicosia, Cyprus: Press and information office of the Cyprus Republic

- Dembinska, M. (2016). The imagined 'other' and its shifts: Politics and identifications in Turkish Cyprus. *National Identities*, 18(1), 1-19.
- Deutsch, K. (1966). *Nationalism and social communication: An inquiry into the foundations of nationality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Devos, T., & Banaji, M. R. (2005). American= white. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(3), 447-466.
- Dewey, J. & Bentley, A. (1949) *Knowing and the Known*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Dewey, J. (1915). *The school and society*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Dewey, J. (1922). *Human nature and conduct*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company.
- Dewey, J. (1925) *Experience and Nature*, (ed.) J.A. Boydston, vol. 1 of *John Dewey: The Later Works, 1925-1953* (1988 printing). Carbondale & Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1933) *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. New York, NY: D. C. Heath and Company.
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as Experience: Having an experience*. New York, NY: Milton, Balch and Company.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Logic: The theory of inquiry*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.
- Dewey, J. (1998). *Experience and education: The 60th anniversary edition*. Indianapolis, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

- Diehl, M. (1990). The Minimal Group Paradigm: Theoretical Explanations and Empirical Findings. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 1, 263 - 292.
- Dilthey, W. (1976). *The construction of the historical world in the human studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dodd, C. H. (1993). *The Political Social and Economic Development of Northern Cyprus*. Cambridgeshire, England: The Eothen Press.
- DuBois, W. E. B. (1961). *The soul of black folks: Essays and sketches*. New York, NY: Fawcett.
- Eley, G. & Suny, R. G. (1996). *Becoming national: A reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Elkjaer, B. (2000). The continuity of action and thinking in learning: Re-visiting John Dewey. *Outlines. Critical Social Studies*, 2, 85-101.
- Elkjaer, B. (2009). Pragmatism: A learning theory of the future. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists... in their own words* (pp. 74-89). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Emerson, R., Fretz, R., & Shaw, L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Emirbayer, M. (1997). Manifesto for a Relational Sociology. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 103(2), 281-317.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity, youth, and crisis*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Erikson, E. H. (1980). *Identity and the life cycle*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Ewick, P. & Silbey, S. (2003). Narrative social structure: Stories to legal authority. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(6), p. 1328-1372.

- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for social research*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Faustmann, H. (2004). The Cyprus Question Still Unsolved: Security Concerns and the Failure of the Annan Plan. *Südosteuropa Gesellschaft*, 6, 44-68.
- Fearon, J. D., & Laitin, D. D. (1996). Explaining interethnic cooperation. *American Political Science Review*, 90(4), 715-726.
- Fetterman, D. M. (1998). *Ethnography: Step by step (2nd Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Freud, S. (1917). *Civilization, Society and Religion*. Canada: Penguin Freud Library
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1975). *Truth and method*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Garrison, J. (1999) 'John Dewey's Theory of Practical Reasoning', *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 31: 3, 291-312.
- Garrison, J. (2001). An introduction to Dewey's theory of functional "trans-action": An Alternative Paradigm for Activity Theory', *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 8(4), 275-296.
- Gee, J. P. (1986). Units in the production of narrative discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 9, 391-422.
- Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to do discourse analysis: A toolkit*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures; selected essays*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Gellner, E. (1983). *Nations and nationalism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Gellner, E. (1997). *Nationalism*. Phoenix, AZ: Phoenix Press.
- Good, C. V. (1959). *Dictionary of education*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

- Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2003). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: Concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*, 24, 105-112.
- Green, D. P., & Seher, R. L. (2003). What role does prejudice play in ethnic conflict? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 6, 509-516.
- Gregoriou, Z. (2004). De-scribing hybridity in "Unspoiled Cyprus": Postcolonial tasks for the theory of education. *Comparative Education*, 40(2), 241-266.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (1998). Narrative practice and the coherence of personal stories. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 39(1), 163-187.
- Hadjipavlou, M. (2002). Cyprus: A partnership between conflict resolution and peace education. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles and practice in the world* (pp. 193-208). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hager, P. & Halliday, J. (2009). *Recovering informal learning: Wisdom, judgement and community*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity, community, culture, difference*. London, England: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hall, S. (1992). The question of cultural identity. In S. Hall, D. Held & T. McGrew (Eds.), *Modernity and its future*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Hall, S. (1996a). Introduction: Who needs 'identity'? In S. Hall & P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity*. London, England: Sage.
- Hall, S. (1996b). Ethnicity: Identity and difference. In G. Eley & R. G. Suny (Eds.), *Becoming national: A reader*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

- Hardwick, S. W., Marcus, M., & Isaak M. (2010). Education and national identity in a comparative context. *National Identities*, 12(3), 253-268.
- Hecht, M. L., Jackson, R. L., & Ribeau, S. A. (2003). *African American communication: Exploring identity and culture*. Routledge. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hitchens, C. (1997). *Hostage to history: Cyprus from the Ottomans to Kissinger*. New York, NY: Noonday Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1992). *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. J., & Ranger, T. O. (Eds.). (1983). *The invention of tradition*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Holmes, P., Fay, R., Andrews, J., & Attia, M. (2013). Researching multilingually: New theoretical and methodological directions. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 23(3), 285-299.
- Horowitz, D. L. (1985). *Ethnic groups in conflict*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hroch, M. (1985). *Social preconditions of national revival in Europe: A comparative analysis of the social composition of patriotic groups among the smaller European nations*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Hutchinson, J., & Smith, A. D. (Eds.) (1996). *Ethnicity*. London, England: Oxford University Press.
- Jennings, R.C. (1993) *Christians and Muslims in Ottoman Cyprus and the Mediterranean World, 1571–1640*. New York, NY: New York University Press

- Jordan, G. & Weedon, C. (1995). *Cultural politics: Class, Gender, Race and the postmodern world*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Katsiaounis, R. (1996), *Labour, society and politics in Cyprus during the second half of the nineteenth century*. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- Katsiaounis, R. (2000). *Η διασκεπτική με ανασκόπηση της περιόδου 1878-1945 [The Consultative Assembly with a Review of the Period 1878-1945]*. Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre.
- Ker-Lindsay, J. (2011). *The Cyprus problem: What everyone needs to know*. London, England: Oxford University Press.
- Klerides, L. E. (2008). *The discursive (re)construction of national identity in Cyprus and England with special reference to history textbooks: A comparative study*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from EThOS Database (Accession No. 498300).
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Koutselini-Ioannidou, M. (1997). Curriculum as political text: The case of Cyprus (1935-90). *History of Education*, 26(4), 395-407.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (2009). *Methods of educational and social science research* (3rd ed.). Long Grove: Waveland.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Labov, W., & Waletzky, J. (2003). Overall structure of narrative. In C. B. Paulston & G. R. Tucker (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: The essential readings* (pp. 74-104). Boston, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Lacher, L., & Kaymak, E. (2005). Transforming identities: Beyond the politics of non-settlement in North Cyprus. *Mediterranean Politics*, 10(2), 147-166.
- Lange, M. (2012). *Educating ethnic violence: Identity, educational bubbles and resource mobilization*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Lave, J., and Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Leonard, M.(2012). Us and them: Young people's constructions of national identity in Cyprus. *Childhood*, 19(4), 467-480.
- Lieberman, M. D. (2009). What zombies can't do: A social cognitive neuroscience approach to the irreducibility of reflective consciousness. *In two minds: Dual processes and beyond*, 293-316.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. S. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry (1st ed.)*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lincoln, Y. & Guba, E. G. (1986). But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and multiplicity in naturalistic evolution. In D. D. Williams (Ed.), *Naturalistic evolution: New directions for program evolutions* (pp. 73-84). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mallinson, W. (2005). *Cyprus: A modern history*. London: I. B. Tauris.
- Martin, A. K. (1997). The practice of identity and an Irish sense of place. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 4(1). 89-114.

- Mason, M. (2006) Comparing cultures. In Bray, M., Adamson, B. & Mason, M. (2006) (Eds.) *Comparative education research: approaches and methods* (pp. 165-196). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Mavratsas, C. (1999). National identity and consciousness in everyday life: Towards a sociology of knowledge of Greek-Cypriot nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism*, 5(1), 91–104.
- Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (2015). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Ministry of Education and Culture (2008) *F: 7.1.05.21: Objectives of the School Year 2008–2009*. Nicosia: Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Cyprus. [In Greek]
- Ministry of Education and Culture of Cyprus. (2008). Annual Report. Nicosia, Cyprus.
- Mishler, E. (1999). *Storylines: Craftartists' narratives of identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Moghaddam, F. M., & Stringer, P. (1988). Out-group similarity and intergroup bias. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 128(1), 105.
- Nairn, T. (2003). *The break-up of Britain: Crisis and neo-nationalism*. Australia: Common Ground Publishing.
- Nevzat, A. & Hatay, M. (2009) Politics, Society and the Decline of Islam in Cyprus: From the Ottoman Era to the Twenty-First Century. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 45(6), 911-933.

- Ninnes, P. & Burnett, G. (2004) Postcolonial theory in and for comparative education. In Ninnes, P. & Mehta, S. (Eds.) *Re-imagining comparative education: Postfoundational ideas and applications for critical times* (pp. 181-200). New York and London: Routledge Falmer.
- O'Malley, B. & Craig, I. (1999). *The Cyprus conspiracy: America, espionage and the Turkish invasion*. London, England: I.B. Tauris Publishers.
- O'Connor, P. (1994). You could feel it through the skin: Agency and positioning in prisoners stabbing stories. *Text*, 14(1), 45-75.
- Özkirimli, U. (2005) *Contemporary debates on nationalism: a critical engagement*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Papadakis, Y, Peristianis, N. and Welz, G. (2006) Modernity, history, and conflict in divided Cyprus: An overview. In Y. Papadakis, N. Peristianis, & G. Welz (Eds.). *Divided Cyprus: modernity, history, and an island in conflict* (pp. 1-29). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Papadakis, Y. (1998). Greek Cypriot Narratives of History and Collective Identity: Nationalism as a Contested Process. *American Ethnologist*, 25(2), 149-165.
- Papadakis, Y. (2003). Nation, narrative and commemoration: Political ritual in the divided Cyprus. *History and Anthropology*, 14(3), 253-270.
- Papadakis, Y. (2008). Narrative, memory and history education in divided Cyprus: A comparison of schoolbooks on the "History of Cyprus". *History and Memory*, 20(2), 128-148.
- Parmeter, L. (1999). Constructing National Identity in a Changing World: Perspectives in Japanese education. *British Journal of Sociology and Education*, 20(4), 453-463.

- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Perikleous, L. (2010). At a crossroad between memory and thinking: The case of primary history education in the Greek Cypriot educational system. *Education 3-13*, 38(3), 315-328.
- Peristianis, N. (2006) Cypriot nationalism, dual identity, and politics. In Y. Papadakis, N. Peristianis, and G. Welz (Eds.). *Divided Cyprus: modernity, history, and an island in conflict* (pp. 100-120). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Philippou, S., & Klerides E. (2010). On Continuity and Change in National Identity Construction: An Initial Note on Greek-Cypriot Education, 1960-2010. *The Cyprus Review*, 22(2), 219-233.
- Polkinghorne, D. E. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Psaltis, C. (2012). Intergroup trust and contact in transition: A social representations perspective on the Cyprus conflict. In I. Markova, & A. Gillespie (Eds.). *Trust and conflict: Representations, culture and dialogue* (pp. 83-104). London, England: Routledge.
- Raivola R. (1985). What Is Comparison? Methodological and Philosophical Considerations. *Comparative Education Review*, (29)3, 362-374.

- Riessman, C. (1993). *Narrative analysis* (Vol. 30). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Riessman, C. (1997). A short story about long stories. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7(1-4), 155-158.
- Riessman, C. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Riessman, C., & Speedy, J. (2007). Narrative inquiry in the psychotherapy professions. In J. D. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp. 426-456). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rosselló, P. (1963). Concerning the Structure of Comparative Education. *Comparative Education Review*, 7(2), 103-107.
- Ruthellen, J. (2007). The ethical attitude in narrative research: Principles and practicalities. In D.J. Clandinin (Ed.), *The Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp. 537-566). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Safran, W. (2004) Introduction: The political aspects of language. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 10(1), 1-14.
- Salomon, G. (2002). The nature of peace education: Not all programs are created equal. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles and practice in the world* (pp. 3-13). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schildkraut, D. J. (2002). The more things change... American identity and mass and elite responses to 9/11. *Political Psychology*, 23(3), 511-535.
- Schildkraut, D. J. (2003). American Identity and Attitudes Toward Official-English Policies. *Political Psychology*, 24(3), 469-499.
- Schugurensky, D. (2006). Informal learning in local democracy. *Learning in places: The informal education reader*, 249, 163.

- Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Sekulic, D. (2004) Civic and ethnic identity: the case of Croatia. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 27(3), 455–483.
- Smith A. D. (1986). *The ethnic origins of nations*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Smith, A. D. (1991). *National identity*. Reno, NV: University of Nevada Press.
- Smith, A. D. (2001). *Nationalism: Theory, ideology, history*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Smith, A. D. (1999). *Myths and memories of the nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, C. P. (2000). Content analysis and narrative analysis. In H. T. Harry & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology* (pp. 313-335). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Spyrou, S. (2002). Images of ‘the Other’: ‘The Turk’ in Greek Cypriot children’s imaginations. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 5(3), 256-272.
- Spyrou, S. (2006). Constructing ‘the Turk’ as an enemy: The complexity of stereotypes in children’s everyday worlds. *South European Society & Politics*, 11(1), 95–110.
- Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative Case Studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3 ed., pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stake, R. E. (1998). Case Studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (Vol. 2, pp. 86-109). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: studies in social psychology*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- Taylor, C. (1994). *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Taylor, D. M., & Moghaddam, F. M. (1994). *Theories of intergroup relations: international social psychological perspectives* (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Tikly, L. (1999) Postcolonialism and comparative education. *International Review of Education*, 45(5-6), No. 5/6, 603-621.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (2005). Identity negotiation theory: Crossing cultural boundaries. *Theorizing about intercultural communication*, 211-233.
- Tofallis, K. (2002). *A history of Cyprus: From the ancient times to the present, an illustrated history*. London, England: The Greek Institute.
- Trimikliniotis, M. (2007). Nationality and citizenship in Cyprus since 1945: Communal citizenship, gendered nationality and the adventures of a post-colonial subject in a divided country. In R. Baubck, B. Perchinig and W. Sievers (Eds.). *Citizenship policies in the new Europe* (pp. 263-291). Amsterdam, Netherlands: IMISCOE/Amsterdam University Press.
- Vanderstraeten, R. (2002) Dewey's Transactional Constructivism. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 36(2), 233-246.
- Varnava A. & Faustmann, H. (Eds.) (2009). *Reunifying Cyprus: The Annan Plan and beyond*. New York, NY: I.B. Tauris.

- Varshney, A. (2003). *Ethnic conflict and civic life: Hindus and Muslims in India* (2nd ed.). New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Volkan, V. D. (1991). Psychoanalytic Aspects of Ethnic Conflict. In J. V. Montville (Ed.), *Conflict and peacemaking in multiethnic societies*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Volkan, V. D. (1994). *Need to have enemies and allies: From clinical practice to international relationships*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson Inc.
- Vural, Y., & Özuyanik, E. (2008): Redefining identity in the Turkish-Cypriot school history textbooks: A step towards a united federal Cyprus. *South European Society and Politics*, 13(2), 133-154.
- Vural, Y., & Rustemli, A. (2006). Identity fluctuations in the Turkish Cypriot Community. *Mediterranean Politics*, 11(3), 329-348.
- Warwick, D., & Osherson, S. (1973). *Comparative research methods*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Weir, W. W. (1952). *Education in Cyprus: Some theories and practices in education in the island of Cyprus since 1878*. Nicosia, Cyprus: Cosmos Press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, G. (1984). The genesis of chronic illness: Narrative re-construction. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 6(2), p. 175-200.
- Wodak, R., De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Liebhart, K. (1999). *The discursive construction of national identity* [A. Hirsch and R.J. Mitten, Trans.]. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Yiangou, G. S. (2002). *Forms of nationalism and national identity: A comparative study of civic and ethnic nationalism in Switzerland and Cyprus*. Unpublished PhD in International Relations, University of Cambridge.
- Yilmaz, M. (2005). The Cyprus conflict and the question of identity. *Uluslararası Hukukve Politika*, 4, 74–90.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Youn, C., & Baptiste, I. (2007, June). *Learning: A procedural outcome of human activity*. Paper presented at the 48th Adult Education Research Conference.

Appendix: Interview Guide

A) Screening questions:

1. At this point I would like to ask you some questions in order to make sure that you fulfill all the criteria for participating in the study:
 - a) Are you Greek-Cypriot or Turkish-Cypriot?
 - b) Were you born and grew-up in Cyprus?
 - c) Where you born between 1980 and 1990?
 - d) Are you fluent English?

B) Background information about the participant

2. Where were you born?
3. When where you born?
4. Have you lived outside Cyprus?
 - a) Where?
 - b) For how long?
5. Where did you go to school (elementary, middle school, high school)?

C) Ethno-national self-identification and reasoning:

6. Is ethnic and national identity is important for you?
7. Is there any other identity that is more important for you?
8. How would you define your national identity?

NOTE: Clarification/follow-up questions will follow this question to make sure I get a clear picture of the participant's self-identification. Examples are questions 9 and 10.
9. What makes you Cypriot, Greek-Cypriot or Turkish-Cypriot? (depending on the response to question 6)
 - a) If response was Greek-Cypriot: Are you both Greek and Cypriot?
 - b) If response was Turkish-Cypriot: Are you both Turkish and Cypriot?
10. I guess, you know that in your community there are people that self-identify differently than you. What do you think about this?
11. When you are outside Cyprus/abroad do you self-identify the same way?
12. When you speak to a person in your community in your native language do you self-identify the same way?
13. What is your native language? Is it relevant to your ethnic or national identity? (If not included in response to question 9)
14. Do you consider yourself religious?
 - a) What is your relationship with religion?
 - b) Is it connected in any way to your ethnic or national identity?

D) Past experiences relevant to ethno-national identity learning:

Introduction: "Let's go back in your life and examine your ethnic and national identity from childhood until now. As far as you remember"

Initial investigations on experiences and people:

15. Do you remember any experiences or key events in your life that influenced your national identity and your view about national identity?
16. Do you think that any people in your life that influenced your national identity.
17. Did you experience or considered any changes of how you define your national identity throughout your life? Tell be about these changes and what led you to these changes.

NOTE: From questions 10, 11 and 12 I am expecting to get a lot of the information asked in the questions below.

Family:

18. Tell me about your family. Where do they come from?
19. Are your parents refugees or internally displaced people?
 - If yes:** If you they told you, tell me:
 - c) What you know about the place they used to live on the other side.
 - d) There life there.
 - e) Their story of moving out.
 - f) After the opening of the checkpoints, did they visited their old place (from before 1974 or 1963)
20. Do you know how your parents self-identify? Do you or did you talk about ethnic and national identity?
21. Do you or did you talk with them about the history of Cyprus?

K-12 years:

22. How did you self-identify when you were in school (elementary, middle school, high school)?
23. Describe:
 - a) National celebrations in school
 - b) History education
 - c) Geography
 - d) For Greek-Cypriots: The "I don't forget campaign"
24. Do you remember and teachers that were influential to your views on ethnic and national identity?
25. Do you remember any events at school that were influential to your views on ethnic and national identity?
26. Was what school was teaching the same as what you heard at home from your family?

Friends:

27. Did you have any discussions with your friends about your ethnic and national identity?
28. Do your friends self-identify the same was as you do?

Crossing to the other side:

29. Have you ever crossed to the other side?
 - a) How often do you go?
 - b) Where do you go? (looking for places)
 - c) What do you do there? (looking for activities)

Meeting the “other”:

30. Have you ever met Greek-Cypriots?
31. Do you remember that first meeting?
32. What did you think about them before you met them? Did your perception change?
33. Are your friends Greek-Cypriots or Turkish-Cypriots? Do you have friends from other nationalities ethnicities?

Political affiliations:

34. Are you a member of any political party?
35. Why did you chose this party?
36. Do you agree about their views on the Cyprus problem?

Other affiliations:

37. Youth organizations
38. Non-Government Organizations (NGOs)
39. Sports Teams

Experiences abroad:

40. During your stay abroad did your ethnic/national identity changed?
41. If yes, can you tell me what influence this change? (Looking for people, events, reflections etc.)
42. Did you visit Greece or Turkey? Tell me more about the visit (people places, events).

News:

43. Do you follow the news?
44. Where do you get news? Name your sources.

E) Political and historical events:

45. Do you remember the opening of the checkpoint in 2003? Tell me about that experience
46. Did you vote at the 2004 referendum about the Annan plan?
 - a) Did you vote “yes” or “no”? Why?
 - b) Would you change your vote if the plan was offered now?

F) Participant's views about the future on the island (ideal future and feasible future).

47. Would you like a solution to the Cyprus problem?
48. What kind of solutions would have been ideal for you?
49. Do you think the ideal solution for you is feasible?
 - a) If no, what do you think is a feasible solution?

50. NOTE: Double check that you covered all the areas
That's all from me. Are there any topics or experiences that we didn't cover and you think are relevant to this interview?
51. Do you have anything to add or clarify?
52. Thank You!

VITA

Christos Anagiotos

EDUCATION

- **Dual Title Ph.D.** Lifelong learning and Adult Education & Comparative and International Ed., Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA, 2016
- **M.A.** Adult Learning, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut, USA, 2011
- **B.A.** Science of Education, University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus, 2007

WORK EXPERIENCE

- Graduate Assistant, Project Manager & Assessment Specialist, Media & Learning Design, WPSU & World Campus, Penn State University (2011-2012, 2013-2014)
- Lead Graduate Assistant & Teaching Assistant, Adult Education, Pennsylvania State University (2010-2011, 2012-2013)
- Graduate Research Assistant, Adult Learning Program, Educational Leadership Department, University of Connecticut (2008-2010)
- Elementary School Teacher, Ministry of Education, Republic of Cyprus (2007-2008)

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS & AFFILIATIONS

- American Association of Adult and Continuing Education
- Commission for International Adult Education
- Adult Education Research Conference
- Pennsylvania Association for Adult and Continuing Education
- Comparative and International Education Society
- Comparative Education Society in Europe
- Teachers Association of Cyprus

GRANTS, SCHOLARSHIPS & AWARDS

- A.S. Onassis Foundation Scholars Program
- Fulbright Scholarship for Graduate Studies
- A.G. Leventis Foundation Grant for Graduate Students
- Award of excellence from the Cyprus Teachers Foundation

SAMPLE PUBLICATIONS

- **Anagiotos, C., & Zaballero A. G.** (2014). Optimizing talent in the federal workforce: An introduction. In W. Rothwell, A.G. Zaballero and J. G. Park (Eds.). *Optimizing talent in the federal workforce* (pp. 1-18). Tysons Corner, VA: Management Concepts Press.
- **Anagiotos, C., Haynes, C., & James, A.** (2014). Knowledge Transfer. In W. Rothwell, A.G. Zaballero and J. G. Park (Eds.). *Optimizing talent in the federal workforce* (pp. 219-248). Tysons Corner, VA: Management Concepts Press.