

20th Century British Colonialism in Cyprus through Education*

İçim Özenli ÖZMATYATLI**
Ali Efdal ÖZKUL***

Suggested Citation:

Ozmatyatli, I. O. & Ozkul, A. E. (2013). 20th Century British Colonialism in Cyprus through Education. *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 50, 1-20.

Abstract

Problem Statement: The island of Cyprus, due to its strategic location, was under the influence of many conquerors throughout the centuries. Cultural traces of these captors have survived to the present day. This long, turbulent history has had a profound effect on the Cypriot educational system, with the most recent influence being the impact of the British Administration during the 19th and 20th centuries.

Purpose of Study: This article attempts to reveal the influence and consequences of British Colonial policies on education, focussing on curriculum and its aims in the 20th century. The emphasis is more on the opinion of the recipients of education concerning their experience with the education system and their perception of its success or failure rather than on the aims and goals as set by the administrators and educators.

Methods: This study encompasses a qualitative research approach to gain in-depth data based on interviews of Turkish-Cypriots and Greek-Cypriots of different backgrounds who were students during the colonial times. The data regarding issues of primary and secondary school curriculum and its aims, nationalism and religion at schools, identity, and ties between the two communities and their "motherlands" was recorded, analysed thematically, and presented in detail.

* This article is a summary of a chapter in the book called British Colonial Influence on Cypriot Education written by İcim Özenli Ozmatyatlı and published by Lap Lambert Academic Publishing.

** Corresponding author: Phd., Near East University, Department of History Teaching, North Cyprus, Mersin 10 Turkey, icimozenli@hotmail.com

*** Assoc.Prof.Dr., Near East University, Department of History Teaching, North Cyprus, Mersin 10 Turkey, aezkul@gmail.com

With thanks to Eftychia Kourempa for her help with the Greek-speaking portion of the research

Findings and Results: By implementing sometimes extreme measures, the British followed the tactic of “*Divide and Rule*” which led the two communities to ethnic division. The authors discern the trends of the British Colonial policies towards the establishment of a more British society, which was accomplished by influencing the educational and socio-political aspects of life on the island.

Conclusions: The British educational policies helped both Turkish and Greek Cypriots to create ethno-nationalism, which inspired the subsequent resistance of both communities. Although it is apparent that Cypriots placed a high value on education, this development was confined only within the context of being Greek or Turkish. Indeed, it would appear that within a curricula context, for the most part, this served as a forum in which all parties sought to construct national identities. The cost remains to be seen.

Keywords: British colonialism in Cyprus, educational administration, curriculum, identity

With the arrival of the British in Cyprus in 1878, the relatively poor and neglected dominion of the Ottoman Empire was promptly assimilated into British administrative structures; systems were overturned, constitutive challenges were introduced to the political and religious authorities, and the process of colonization began; this was a process that would deeply imprint on the diverse and multifarious tapestry of Cypriot life to the present day. Certainly, the Cyprus conflict is bound up in fractious socio-political issues of ethnic conflict, religious and national identities, and Western dominance, as well as modern processes of secularization and modernization, all of which will now be examined.

Cyprus was initially colonized by the ancient Greeks and subsequently conquered by every ruling empire in the surrounding area up to 1571, when the Ottoman Turks gained control. Since then, the Cypriot conflict has been an identity-based conflict that sits in the center of the binary divide between east and west. Put simply, Cyprus was a unity, and the inhabitants, who had no real classification of identity, were subjects, not citizens (Byrant, 2004, p.21). Dependence on the British, imposed upon the Turkish community, was used to check Greek antagonism and Hellenic nationalism as well as to guarantee the continuation of the Turkish Cypriot support for the maintenance of colonial rule (Gazioğlu, 1997, p.13; Reddaway, 1986, p.14-15). The central issue here is that the ethnic division and system of governance created by the British colonial administration ultimately coerced individuals to choose between certain aspects of their identity in order to adhere to the “official” definition of their prescribed ethnicity, whether they truly identified with it or not.

One field that the British government would never entirely control was education. Opposition was strong, especially because education in both communities was a sacred rather than a secular practice (Byrant, 2004, p.124). Indeed, the British could initially do very little in educational terms without consulting the archbishop

and the mufti in charge of the priests and imams who were also teachers of Cypriot village schools, at least in the first few years of British administration. While British policy maintained and undoubtedly encouraged the religious division within education, the divide became increasingly linked to ethnic nationalism. Furthermore, the discourse of colonial Britain in dividing, ordering, and classifying the schools actually helped create ethno-religious boundaries that “assisted and in turn was supported by the emerging Greek and Turkish ethno-nationalisms and their reifications and violence on the ground” (Constantinou, 2007, p.250). In other words, the British occupation and the educational policies implemented actually served to empower means of resistance from both bi-ethnic groups.

In an educational context, both Greek and Turkish Cypriots maintained that schools were essential for their nationalist futures, not because the schools taught nationalist histories but due to the way those histories were directed towards the future of a patriotic life (Bryant, 2004, p.158). The role of policy and curricula in Cyprus, particularly towards the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, fuelled both groups’ nationalistic desires (Philippou, 2009, p.202). While the British continually attempted to quell national feeling through limiting national symbols and celebrations, particularly during the 1930s, the curriculum became “a key forum wherein all parties (the colonial administration, Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot educational authorities) sought to construct national identities” (Philippou, 2009, p.203). In 1935, aiming to suppress the rising nationalism, the British government tried to set intercommunal standards concerning education. In addition, Cypriot schools had to adapt to the British system, and world histories and European literatures replaced Cypriot regional and nationalist histories and literatures (Bryant, 2004, p.161).

The expansion of the west has inevitably resulted in the modernization of non-western societies (Said, 1978, p.205), but what is more important is the reaction of the leaders of these societies, in particular the Islamic east. When Ataturk inaugurated his revolutionary efforts to modernize the new Turkey, he created a society that was “Muslim in its religion, heritage and customs but with a ruling elite determined to make it modern, western and one with the west” (Huntington, 1996, p.74). Such divisions in identity were a continual process and problem in Cyprus. According to Berger (1969, p.130), when secularizing mechanisms take hold, there tends to be an institutional separation of church and state. By instigating this crisis of modernity and identity in Cyprus, the British occupation helped create deeper divisions and educational segregation—not only within the Greek and Turkish-Cypriot ethnic groups but within factions of each community, too.

While it is clear to see that education in general was highly regarded by Cypriots, Bryant (2004, p.127) claims that the ethnic experience of education was directly linked to ethnic identity. More specifically, “becoming a ‘true’ Greek or a ‘true’ Ottoman (and later a ‘true’ Turk) was something achieved through education”. Thus, while education was seen as important and vital to one’s growth and development, it was limited only to the extent that this growth was understood in terms of being specifically Greek or Turkish. Education keeps identities separate, and there is a

severe lack of a united Cypriot identity present in any historical or even current educational syllabi (Byrant, 2004, p.206). Local context appears to be completely absent: as was the case with the strategic interests of the colonial power during the British occupation, the rights and opportunities of the Cypriot people appear to have been administered and relegated to the limiting scope of international and regional politics (Mallinson, 2005, p.3).

The fact that even today Cypriot identity continues to be inextricably entwined with being either Greek or Turkish-Cypriot is not encouraging in the sense of any development towards facilitating communication or unification between the two groups. What is fundamentally needed is the very element that has been severely absent since the British occupation of Cyprus: the Cypriot voice. Philippou (2009, p.217) argues that the curricula could be used to really examine not only what it means to be European but what it means to be Cypriot. Furthermore, she would like to see the ambiguities and complexities of the Cyprus conflict be used as a didactic tool to promote discussion in the classroom and even to envision solutions.

As we have seen, Cypriot identity is not only absent but inextricably and abstrusely entwined with national, religious, and global identities. As Fisher (2001) correctly points out, the Cyprus conflict continues to be on the schedule of the international community with no resolution. The field of education should examine new, progressive forms of identities that have or still are developing in post-colonial and post-modern Cyprus.

Methodology

Sample

The participants in the study comprised 10 Turkish-Cypriots and 10 Greek-Cypriots. The researchers used the maximum variation as a sampling strategy. As Patton (1987) suggests, this method enabled the researchers to work with Greek and Turkish-Cypriot participants with different demographic characteristics such as their gender, the village they lived in, and the schools they attended during their primary and secondary education.

The Turkish-Cypriot sample interviewed for the purpose of this article ranged between the ages of 71 and 93 years. Slightly more than half (60%) were born in villages, and 40% were born in the urban areas of the time. The overwhelming majority attended their local primary school, but they continued on to attend the Victoria Girls' School in Larnaca, The American Academy for Boys in Iskele/Larnaca, and The English School.

The Greek-Cypriot sample interviewed for the purpose of this article ranged between the ages of 64 and 83 years. The vast majority of them (80%) were born in villages, and only 20% were born in the urban areas of the time. Half of the interviewees who went on to secondary school attended the Greek Gymnasia, 40% attended either the English School or the American Academy, and 10% attended a private Commercial-Vocational College.

Data collection and analysis procedures

Two types of human sources were used in this study, namely Turkish and Greek-Cypriots who were randomly chosen as participants depending on their willingness to be interviewed. The researchers primarily collected data through semi-structured interviews to allow the interviewees to focus on the issues under investigation. The semi-structured interviews took from 20 minutes to 1 hour and 8 minutes, depending on how much each participant remembered. The researchers tried to elicit information about the participants' experiences and perspectives on their primary and secondary education by asking open-ended questions without imposing a certain framework and thus threatening validity.

The qualitative method was used in this study. The researchers used interviews and written sources to collect data, which served to increase reliability. The greatest emphasis for data collection was placed in the interview data; this was collected through 10 main interview questions and their sub-questions. The researchers recorded the interviews and quoted ideas verbatim where relevant to highlight the nature of the participants' primary and secondary education.

Findings

Turkish-Cypriots

As far as nationalism in school is concerned, only 10% of the interviewees said that their school was nationalistic since it was located in a Turkish-only area. The remaining 90% stated that there was no nationalism in their school; more particularly, they mentioned that they were just children doing their studies. In secondary school, all interviewees stated that they were not allowed to display any national or nationalistic tendencies. The English or American Head Teachers implemented measures that did not allow any national emblems such as flags, pictures, or maps of the "motherlands", i.e. Greece and Turkey. Also, the British administration had forbidden school textbooks to be imported from the motherlands in an effort to curb nationalistic feelings in the student population. Finally, students were not allowed to sing the national anthems of the motherlands. On the contrary, they were encouraged to sing the British National Anthem, "*God Save the King/Queen*". However, during the last years of British Colonial times in Cyprus, nationalistic feelings between the Greek-Cypriots and the Turkish-Cypriots began to manifest in tension within the school environment, usually through nasty teasing.

When asked about the main subjects at primary and secondary school, slightly different responses from the interviewees were elicited, mainly due to their age and their hazy memories. However, all these fragments of memory can form a picture of the curriculum at that time. The main subjects as remembered by the participants were the following:

- a. Turkish language lessons—reading, writing, grammar, calligraphy
- b. Mathematics

- c. History and Geography of Cyprus
- d. Physical Education
- e. Science
- f. English

The secondary education of all the interviewees included all the subjects found in Primary education. Finally, in the first year of the Lycee, the students of one community were obligated to learn the basics of the language of the other community. All subjects were compulsory both in primary and secondary schools but students could select their GCSEs.

The Cypriot educational system greatly emphasised English under the British administration. The language was not generally taught at the primary level, with the exception of the 5th and 6th year classes in large schools in the urban areas. However, at the secondary level, the lessons ranged from 2 hours per week to daily periods of instruction. Half of the sample population responded that this emphasis was justified because *“the young students wanted to secure a well-paid job after their graduation and more specifically to enter the civil sector of the British administration”*. Furthermore, 20% of the interviewees mentioned that the instruction of the English language also benefitted the British agenda to adapt the Cypriot population to British culture and nationalistic ideas. Finally, the remaining 30% of the respondents mentioned the hours of instruction but not the reasons behind this.

Overall, as far as the central aim of the curriculum is concerned, the majority of Cypriots wanted to receive a good education to be prepared for their future life, and the goal of 70% was to acquire the knowledge that would lead to a well-paid job, ideally in the British administration sector. A further 20% stated that the aim of the curriculum was actually to *“divide the Cypriots, and they succeeded as they had done in other countries they had conquered. You learnt to look upon the British as rulers and you believed that they were smarter and stronger than you”*. However, a very modest 10% stated that the curriculum was not at all politically influenced by the Administration, and *“it was not designed to make you British.”* Finally, 60% of the sample population claimed that the aim of the curriculum was successful in what it set out to do, even in its nationalistic direction.

Each community had different roots and sought to maintain ties with their motherland culture. As previously mentioned, the British administration did not allow any manifestations of nationalism in the schools. Therefore, 70% of the participants responded that *“there were no celebrations connected with Turkey”*, which is not at all surprising. 30% of the respondents, however, mentioned that there were some holidays from Turkey, such as Youth Day, which they were allowed to celebrate at their schools. Half of the sample population stated that the school children would celebrate British national days, such as the Sovereign’s birthday and Victoria Day, and they would sing the British National Anthem. As one participant said, *“We didn’t mind, it was something we took for granted. We were children and we liked the celebrations because that way we would miss lessons”*. Finally, 10% of the respondents

mentioned that there was punishment if they failed to observe the rules regarding abstinence from Turkish celebrations and participation in the British ones.

Religious studies represented religion in primary education. Half of the respondents in the interview mentioned this particular subject, where the students were taught the basic principles of the Muslim faith and some prayers but, in their words, *"there was no conservatism, no pressure."* However, religion in the secondary school was differentiated. 20% of the respondents mentioned that they had religious studies lessons at the secondary level as well. Some of them mentioned that the lessons aimed to make the students good citizens with ethics and principles. Some others were more religious in their outlook, and they mentioned both lessons at school ended with an end-of-the-year exam. In some schools, the subject of religious studies was stopped but was substituted with weekly visits to the mosque. For some schools, this was obligatory, with punishment threatened. Others were more relaxed, and they accepted the students' sporadic attendance.

Regarding their identity, half of the participants stated that they feel they are Turkish-Cypriots, whereas 20% claim that they are Cypriots. Only 10% emphatically stated that they are Turkish and they consider Turkey their motherland. 10% did not respond to this part of the questionnaire, while a further 10% discounted the identity label "Cypriot", maintaining that *"it is your background which influences who you are and how you see life"*.

Having shared living space for hundreds of years, the two communities had formed ties and had learned to live together harmoniously. Therefore, it is not surprising that 80% of the participants stated that they had friendly relations with the Greek-Cypriot community both as children and as young adults. For instance, male participants mentioned the football matches in the streets which both Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot children enjoyed, and female participants mentioned visits to homes and invitations to weddings. Only 20% of the respondents claimed that they did not have close relations with the Greek-Cypriot community, either because they had grown up in a Turkish-only village or *"for no reason at all, it just happened."*

The period after the British Administration appears to be greatly changed. Only 20% of the interviewees maintained good relations with the Greek-Cypriot community due to distance or personal choice. A further 50% of the participants expressed bitter feelings towards the Greek-Cypriot community as they blame them for the friction and violent episodes towards the Turkish-Cypriot community. Among these, there are some respondents who also blame the British, claiming that they *"poisoned the relations between the two communities and achieved the division"*. Finally, 30% either lost contact with the Greek-Cypriots due to the exchange of populations, or they did not provide an answer to this part of the question.

Upon reflection, 60% of the respondents stated that the education system during the British Administration was good and that they were happy with it and its results. In their own words, *"We were happy with the system the way it was"*, and, *"It was a perfect system [...] the British education system is the best in the world"*, mentioning that there was discipline in the school and respect towards the teachers. 20% stated that

the system was "OK", and it was adequate for the needs of the students preparing for employment in the British Administration. However, a further 20% stated that the British education system was a bad one for various reasons. First, certain respondents believed that there were hidden agendas in the curriculum, considering the measures taken by the British Administration. Also, other respondents mentioned that the British did not give enough importance to education, and the "Cypriots started learning when the British left."

Unanimously, the sample population of this survey responded negatively when asked about the solution to the Cypriot problem. Replies such as "no light at the end of the tunnel", "not confident", "not optimistic", "nobody can answer", and "don't know, only God knows" were the norm. The reasons behind these answers varied greatly. 40% of the respondents blamed the Greek-Cypriot community, whose greater numbers would turn the Turkish-Cypriot community into a minority. A further 30% accused the foreign powers of Greece, the EU, or the USA, who created this difficult situation and perpetuated it for their own interests. Finally, 40% put forward the negative emotions which currently exist between the two communities. More specifically, the respondents stated that due to the past bitter experiences and violence which erupted on the island, the two communities fear and mistrust each other so much so that if they were put together into one country again, they would begin fighting. Finally, 20% maintained that only by creating two separate states with good relations and close co-operation would Cyprus be able to solve this thorny issue.

Greek-Cypriots

The vast majority (82%) of the participants said that there were no nationalistic feelings in school. 45.5% of them emphasized this lack especially in the Primary level, since the students were very young, and they were only interested in learning their "letters and doing well at school". These same participants, though, mentioned that there were some nationalistic tendencies in the secondary level, with the majority of them stating that it was due to those politically difficult times. Troubles in the 1950s influenced the education system greatly; the British shut down the schools, as many students participated in the fights against the Colonial powers. 30% stated that "there was a certain nationalistic feeling mainly against the British since the Colonial regime did not allow national identity emblems either through rules or by force". Also, some respondents mentioned the Union with Greece Movement which gave schools a nationalistic feeling. There was also mention of passive nationalism, where an English-speaking school emphasized preparation for studies in the UK or the USA and in that way directed students towards the Western culture and viewpoint.

The Greek-Cypriot respondents gave various answers to question about the main subjects at school, as they are of advanced age and their memories do not provide great detail. Similarly to the Turkish-Cypriot sample, the Greek-Cypriot remembered the following main subjects:

- a. Greek language-reading, writing, grammar, calligraphy
- b. Mathematics

- c. History and Geography of Cyprus, Greece, and the East Mediterranean
- d. Religious Studies
- e. Phytology (Study of the Flora)
- f. English

According to the interviewees, all the subjects were set by the Teachers' Association, and they were compulsory.

The secondary level of education in the Greek-Cypriot community was divided into two categories. Students could choose to attend the Greek Gymnasium, where the medium of instruction was the Greek language. The respondents also stated that the subjects were compulsory but the students were able to choose the direction they would take in their studies, either Practical – Sciences and Mathematics – or Classical – Languages and Literature. The second category is that of the English-speaking schools where the language medium was English, while the native languages were taught for only a few hours per week.

English was an important addition to the curriculum of schools in Cyprus. Although small primary schools in rural areas did not teach the language, the larger ones did so in year five and six for two to three hours per week. In addition, the Greek Gymnasia offered between three and five hours of English, whereas the English-speaking schools utilized a basic form of Content Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) where the students were taught various subjects with English as the language medium. As a result, not only did the students learn the subject but also improved their English language skills to a great extent. The reasons given by the respondents behind such emphatic instruction are varied. Slightly more than half (55%) claimed that *"it was necessary for those who wanted to secure a job by entering the civil service immediately after graduating Secondary Education"*. A further 35% were more abstract in their viewpoint, saying, *"English was an international language that was used by many people around the world and it would be useful to learn it so that you could communicate and not be isolated"*. Only 10% mentioned that learning English was useful only for those who wanted to study abroad.

Overall, as far as the central aim of the curriculum is concerned, the participants' answers varied greatly. The largest percentage of the respondents (30%) replied that the central aim of the curriculum and their schooling was simply to *"learn their letters"* and become educated people, which was largely successful. Another 25% stated that since they were a British Colony; they were taught in such a way that it would help them *"later to get a job in the British Administration or learn how to communicate and co-operate with the British Authorities"*. They also mentioned that the curriculum and the schooling aimed to make them good, conscientious citizens. A further 20% stated that the aim was to prepare the students to study in universities abroad, which was also a success. Moreover, 10% claimed that due to the ban enforced by the British Authorities immediately after the Mutiny of 1931 on books imported from the *"motherland countries"*, the schooling was not particularly successful. What is more, 10% stated that the emphasis of the curriculum in the

Greek secondary level was on Greek, and especially Ancient Greek, but it did not have a specific agenda; it was more along the lines of emphasizing the Greek identity. Finally, 5% mentioned that they had very good impressions of their English-speaking schools, and these schools enabled them to be successful later in life.

The strong ties with the two “motherland countries”, Greece and Turkey, influenced the island’s population and culture. As a result, a strong majority of respondents (70%) replied that their schools, both at the primary and secondary level, celebrated national Greek holidays. However, 10% of the interviewees stated that they were allowed to celebrate National Days in the local Greek primary but not at the English-speaking secondary. In addition, another 10% mentioned that the British Administration did not allow Greek National Days celebrations before 1940, but changed their policies during WWII and afterwards to appease the Greek-Cypriot population who had joined the war. Finally, a further 10% mentioned that they only remember the celebration that took place during the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II in 1953 as it was something out of the ordinary, and there were presents given to the students in the schools.

In the Greek-Cypriot educational system, religious studies is a compulsory subject taught both at the primary and the secondary levels. The respondents stated that religious studies was not influenced by the British Administration but was actually at the discretion of the Head Teacher of each school. It is for this reason that we see 20% claiming that religion in primary school was not important, a further 40% stating that its importance was medium, with the subject mostly being taught in class and a few visits to the church on holy days, and a final 40% mentioning that religion was very important in primary school, and any absence from church services would be punished severely – a mention of a Head Teacher instructing the students to spit on their “truant” colleague was made. At the secondary level, the situation was more relaxed. The 50% of the respondents who specifically mentioned their secondary education religious practices said that they were not important, and they were not forced to attend church.

Regarding their identity, the majority of the respondents (50%) stated that they were Cypriots, with 10% of them clarifying that they were Greek-speaking Cypriots. A further 25% stated that they felt Greek-Cypriot, having been influenced by the “motherland country” at some point in their lives, while another 25% emphasised their religion in their identity by stating that they were Christian Orthodox Greek-Cypriots.

A vast majority, 90%, stated that the relations between the two communities during the British Colonial times were very good. Most lived in mixed villages or attended mixed schools, and the interviewees stated that they attended weddings, bayrams or religious celebrations, family dinners, or barbecues at Turkish-Cypriot homes. Out of these respondents, 33% maintained that their opinion of the Turkish-Cypriot community had not changed, and some of them still got together regularly with their families “to catch up on each other’s news”. However, another 33% stated that their relationships had changed since there had been so many violent events and also due to the island’s division limited access to the other community. The

remaining 22% did not make any mention of changes in the relationship between the Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots after the British had left. Finally, only 11% mentioned that due to living in a Greek-only village, they had had no contact with the Turkish-Cypriots.

Regarding their overall opinion on the education system, the responses were equally divided. Half of the respondents replied that the education system of their time was good, and it did not require improvements. Their answers ranged from "excellent", "very good overall, just some teachers I did not care for", "I was happy with it and I have some good memories from those times", and "better than it is today". On the other hand, the other half of the interviewees stated that the education system of their time could have been improved. For instance, the best school at the time, the English School, although academically sound, was reported to be very strict in its regime; 10% of the participants who had been students there mentioned aloof and distant teachers. A further 10% reported that their education system actually had needed more instruction in English and more textbooks for the other subjects as well as the use of modern teaching methods. Another 10% complained that the schooling in the Greek Gymnasias was inferior to that of their English-speaking counterparts. Finally, another 10% stated that the education system had the ultimate goal of directing the students to Greece if they wanted to do something better in their lives and discouraged them to stay in Cyprus.

Similarly to the Turkish-Cypriots, the Greek-Cypriots were unanimous in their responses: they do not see a solution to the Cypriot problem. They all believe that the outside powers - Greece, Turkey, Britain, and America - were the ones who created this problem and who continue to support this division of the island. They especially lay the blame with the Greeks, who betrayed them politically in the early 1970s, and with the British, who enforced a "Divide and Rule" policy on the island; this was done to keep the population under control by turning one community against the other. Also, they believe that Turkey influenced the Turkish-Cypriot population in a negative way during the peace talks and that this is an extra factor that explains why a solution has not been achieved before and may not be achieved in the future either. A minority of the respondents (20%) mentioned that they had been more hopeful during the Annan 2004 proposal, but they lost hope again when it did not succeed. They all maintain that the Greek-Cypriots and the Turkish-Cypriots can "arrive to a solution in two weeks" if they are left alone to work together without outside influences.

Results: Comparison of the Findings

During the interview process, the authors were able to have access to willing individuals from both communities of the island of Cyprus; however, the Turkish-Cypriot sample was of a more advanced age compared to the sample of the Greek-Cypriot population. Furthermore, while the sample was almost equally divided between the villages and the urban areas of the time, the Greek-Cypriots were mostly born and raised in village settings. Finally, the Turkish-Cypriots almost exclusively attended English-speaking schools during their secondary education, whereas the Greek-Cypriots were divided between Greek Gymnasias, English-speaking schools,

and Commercial-Technical schools. On the other hand, both samples were populated by individuals who had attended their local primary schools and who all continued to attend secondary level education.

All the participants did not recall any nationalistic feelings during their primary level education, which they all attributed to their young age that excluded preoccupation with matters outside their immediate environment of family, village, and school. However, in the secondary level, the respondents identified several nuances of nationalism either on the side of the Greek-Cypriots, the Turkish-Cypriots, or the British Administration. Both Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot interviewees pointed out the nationalistic tendencies of the British, who imposed bans regarding the “motherland” countries and thus controlled the formation of a national identity in the populations of the island. On the other hand, the Greek-Cypriot secondary schools exhibited nationalistic tendencies due to the Movement of Union with Greece that manifested in the 1950s. As a result, an atmosphere of tension was created between the young people of the two communities.

All the participants are senior citizens, which explains why their memories of their primary education (mostly) and their secondary education (to a lesser degree) were fragmented. Both communities mentioned the following among others:

- a. Lessons on their own language for several hours a week, including reading, writing, grammar, and calligraphy;
- b. History and geography lessons centring on the island of Cyprus, the East Mediterranean region, Europe, and the World;
- c. Mathematics;
- d. Religious studies;
- e. English for the year 5 and year 6 students of urban area schools with larger populations and a larger staff;
- f. All subjects were compulsory in the primary education level.

In the secondary education level, the subjects were approximately the same as those of the primary education level; however, some differences are apparent. The Turkish-Cypriot sample consisted of individuals who attended English-speaking schools where, though the subjects were compulsory, the students had the freedom to choose their GCSEs. The Greek-Cypriot students had the freedom to choose the direction their studies would take by opting for a classical or a practical secondary school if they continued in a Greek Gymnasium.

Both the Turkish-Cypriot and the Greek-Cypriot interviewees recalled that rural primary schools did not teach the English language, whereas their urban counterparts did so in the fifth and sixth year for two to three hours a week. In the secondary education, the Greek-Cypriots who continued in the Greek Gymnasias attended English language lessons for three to five hours per week. On the other hand, the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot students who continued on to the English-speaking schools were instructed in the language intensively. Both communities pointed out the fact that knowledge of the English language was imperative if they wanted to obtain a post in the British Administration; this guaranteed a good salary, and thus a comfortable living and a certain status in the

community. Some individuals of the Greek-Cypriot sample also mentioned that instruction of the English language was justified since it was, and is, an international language and necessary for those who wanted to study abroad. However, some individuals of the Turkish-Cypriot sample mentioned that teaching English to the Cypriots was actually part of the British political colonial agenda.

Overall, the majority of the Turkish-Cypriot sample stated that the curriculum was designed to prepare the students to find a well-paid job, as opposed to 30% of the Greek-Cypriot sample who identified this as the central aim. The majority of the Greek-Cypriots stated that the main aim of the curriculum was to “teach children their letters” and “to make them good citizens”, and they found it to be partly successful in that endeavour. On the other hand, the Turkish-Cypriots identified the division of the two communities as another aim of the curriculum, and they considered it successful in this aim.

Neither the Turkish-Cypriots nor the Greek-Cypriots were allowed to celebrate national days of the “motherland” countries by the British Administration. However, the Turkish-Cypriots recall celebrating some innocuous Turkish National Days which did not have any nationalistic nuances, such as Youth Day and so on. The Greek-Cypriot, nevertheless, state that during the Second World War and afterwards they were granted permission to celebrate the National Days of Greece as a reward for participating in the war effort on the side of the Allied Forces. As a result, this explains why the Turkish-Cypriots mostly remember British National Days and the consequences if they did not celebrate them, while the Greek-Cypriots remember Greek National celebrations.

In the primary level of education, both communities had religious studies in their curriculum, but the importance of that subject and other manifestations of religious life were different in the two populations. Nearly half of the Turkish-Cypriot maintained that they did not feel pressure in that area, whereas only 20% of the Greek-Cypriot stated the same. The majority of the Greek-Cypriot stated that they felt medium to great pressure to conform to Christian Orthodox practices. However, in the secondary level of education, both the Turkish-Cypriot and the Greek-Cypriot described varied approaches based on their head teacher’s relationship with religion.

Half of the Turkish-Cypriot sample consider themselves to be Turkish-Cypriots, whereas nearly half of the Greek-Cypriots identify themselves as Cypriots only. A much smaller percentage of the Turkish-Cypriot sample state that they are Cypriots only, and an equally small percentage of the Greek-Cypriots state that they are Greek-Cypriots. There is also emphasis on the Christian Orthodox element on the part of certain individuals in the Greek-Cypriot sample and a smaller but equally powerful emphasis on the Turkish element on the part of certain individuals in the Turkish-Cypriot sample.

Despite the friction due to historical events, the overwhelming majority of both the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot samples expressed positive feelings towards the other community during the British Administration. However, approximately half of these people stated that their feelings changed towards the negative after the division. Smaller percentages mentioned that since they had grown up in single-community villages, they had no contact with the other community and therefore

could not form an opinion. Also, some other smaller percentages had lost contact after the division and could not say whether their feelings had changed.

More than half of the Turkish-Cypriot and half of the Greek-Cypriot samples felt that the educational system of their time was good, and they could not identify any areas that could have been improved. However, the remainder of the interviewees stated that the system could have been better in several areas. Firstly, the Turkish-Cypriots stated that there was political influence which does not belong in education. Secondly, the Greek-Cypriots stated that the system was very strict and regimented, which created distance between the teachers and the students. Finally, students who attended the Greek Gymnasia mentioned that their system was inferior to that of the English-speaking schools.

Both communities gave a unanimous “no” to the “Solution” question. As reasons, the Turkish-Cypriots put forward the Greek-Cypriot attitude (40%), the influence of Greece, Europe, and the USA (20%), and, finally, the negative emotions which exist between the two communities due to the history of the island (40%). They also state that the two communities cannot live together since there is no trust, and if they are once more united into one country, they will fight again. On the other hand, the majority of the Greek-Cypriot accused the outside powers, and especially the British and the Greeks, for creating this situation and the Turkish for the continuation of the division and the impasse in the negotiations. They believe that the Cypriots can find the solution if they are left alone.

Discussion and Conclusions

The current citizens of the island of Cyprus, Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots, are the product of many cultures merging throughout the centuries, and more recently of the British Administration and its colonial policies as they were implemented through the Education system in the 19th and 20th centuries. Divided and conflicted, they were forced to side with ethnic identities which occasionally failed to accurately define them. It is the view of the writers that one can discern the trends of the British colonial policies towards the establishment of a more British society on the island.

Although the participants of the research are of predominantly rural backgrounds, they were encouraged by their families and their communities to pursue higher studies (for that time). This was done in an effort to improve their lives since a better education could lead to better career prospects, with one of the most popular career choices being a well-paid position within the British Administration.

Another popular choice at that time was to attend the English-speaking schools; these offered a higher standard of education and gave the students the opportunity to study in the academic institutions of Britain, thus opening more doors in their future. This, combined with the fact that the Greek Gymnasia offered what was perceived as an inferior quality education, can lead us to believe that for many individuals, success and improvement belonged to British-educated people.

Finally, the British Administration implemented measures which deprived the two communities educational contact with their cultures by banning the import of

textbooks from Greece and Turkey and by forbidding the use of national symbols or the celebration of National Days—though the latter measure was relaxed when the need for support towards the Allies became stronger than the need to anglicise the population.

This research was by no means exhaustive—more qualitative research with new research methods is needed in the field of educational administration, as also suggested by Aydın, Erdağ, and Sarier (2010, p.38)—but it shows the trend of popular opinion of the citizens who were raised in a British Colony and now live with the consequences of those policies regarding education, society, and Politics. Still conflicted, still divided.

Appendix 1- The Table Showing Details About The Turkish-Cypriot Sample Whose Ages Ranged Between 71 and 93

Gender	Identity	Primary	Secondary	Rural/ Urban	Relationship with Others	Solution in Cyprus
Female	Cypriot	Nicosia Ayia Sofia Mosque Primary School	Victoria Girls' School	Urban	Good relations—no racism	No
Male	Turk	Lefke Primary School	Nicosia Kıbrıs İslam Lycee	Rural/ Urban	Good as children – different towards the end	No
Female	Turkish Cypriot	Kırmı&Ayia Sofia Primary Schools	Victoria Girls' School	Rural/ Urban	Good as children—Coldness afterwards	No
Male	Cypriot	Larnaca Primary School	American Academy—Iskele	Urban	Good at first—distant later	No
Male	Turkish Cypriot	Limassol Primary School	Limassol Lycee	Urban	Good at first—British destroyed it	No
Male	Cypriot	Larnaca Primary School	American Academy—Larnaca	Urban	Good at first—changed afterwards. Personally stayed friends.	No
Male	Turkish Cypriot	Lapta Primary School	Nicosia Boys School	Rural/ Urban	Mixed village/friends—changed afterwards	No
Female	Turkish Cypriot	Tatlısu Village Primary School (Mari Kingdom)	Victoria Girls' School	Rural / Urban	Single community village – Met a Greek Cypriot abroad but lost contact	No
Male	Turkish Cypriot	Messaria Village Primary School	Nicosia Turkish Lycee	Rural/ Urban	Mixed Village—had friends—have not changed	No
Male	Turkish Cypriot	Famagusta Primary School	The English School—Famagusta	Urban	No nationalism at first—changed afterwards	No

Appendix 2- The Table Showing Details About The Greek-Cypriot Sample Whose Ages Ranged Between 64 and 83

Gender	Identity	Primary	Secondary	Rural/ Urban	Relationship with Others	Solution in Cyprus
Female	Cypriot	Larnaca Primary School	Greek Gymnasium Larnaca	Urban	Good	No
Male	Greek & Cypriot	Primary School - Village outside Famagusta	Nicosia English School	Urban	Still friends - get together often	No
Male	Cypriot of Greek origin	Primary School- village outside Limassol	Greek Gymnasium Famagusta	Rural/ Urban	Were friends - British divided us	No
Male	Greek Cypriot	Agios Ermolaos Primary School	PanCyprian Gymnasium	Rural/ Urban	Friends - feelings did not change	No- disappoi nted
Male	Greek Cypriot Christian	Primary School- village in Karpaz	Nicosia - English School	Rural/ Urban	Primary school-Turks the enemy but in English School made friends	No
Female	Greek- speaking Cypriot	St John's Primary School Famagusta	Girls' Gymnasium Famagusta	Urban	Friendships - changed afterwads	No
Male	Cypriot	Athiyenou Primary School	American Academy	Rural/ Urban	Friendships - later relationships cooled	No light in tunnel
Female	Orthodox Christian Greek Cypriot	Athiyenou Girls' Primary School	PanCyprian Gymnasium	Rural/ Urban	Before 1960 good - after 1960 changed.	Very difficult
Male	Cypriot - mother tongue Greek	Athiyenou Boys' Primary School	PanCyprian Gymnasium	Rural/ Urban	Good relations -British made us fight	If left alone, yes
Female	Greek Cypriot (but feels closer to Cyprus)	Athiyenou Girls' Primary School	Pallaris Trade Commercial College	Rural/ Urban	All-Greek village	If Turkey says "yes"- British separate d us

References

- Aydın, A., Erdağ, C. & Sarier, Y. (2010). A Comparison of Articles Published in the Field of Educational Administration in Terms of Topics, Methodologies and Results. *Eğitim Araştırmaları Eurasian Journal of Educational Research (EJER)*, 39, 37-58.
- Berger, P.L. (1969). *The Sacred Canopy*. United States: Anchor Books.
- Byrant, R. (2004). *Imagining the Modern: The Cultures of Nationalism in Cyprus*. London, New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Constantinou, C.M. (2007). Aporias of Identity: Bicommunalism, Hybridity and the "Cyprus Problem". *Cooperation and Conflict*; 42, 247-270.
- Fisher, R. J. (2001). Cyprus: Failure of Mediation and the Escalation of an Identity-Based Conflict to an Adversarial Impasse. *Journal of Peace Research*, 38, 307-326.
- Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York, Simon & Schuster: The Free Press.
- Gazioğlu, A. C., (1997). *Two equal and Sovereign Peoples*, Nicosia: Cyrep.
- Mallinson, W. (2005). *Cyprus: A Modern History*. London, New York: I. B. Tauris.
- Özmatyathı, İ.Ö. (2012). *British Colonial Influence on Cypriot Education: Turkish and Greek Cypriot Curricula and Identity (1878-1960)*, Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Patton, M. G. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. California: Sage.
- Philippou, S. (2009). What Makes Cyprus European? Curricular Responses of Greek-Cypriot Civic Education to Europe. *Journal of Curricula Studies*, 41(2), 199-223.
- Reddaway, J. (1986). *Burdened with Cyprus, The British Connection*, London.
- Said, E.W. (1978). *Orientalism*. London and Henley: Routledge and Keegan Paul.

20. Yüzyıldaki İngiliz Sömürgeciliğinin Kıbrıs'taki Eğitim Üzerindeki Etkisi

Atıf:

Ozmatyatlı, I. O. & Ozkul, A. E. (2013). 20th Century British Colonialism in Cyprus through Education. *Eğitim Araştırmaları-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 50, 1-20.

(Özet)

Problem Durumu: Kıbrıs adası Akdeniz'deki özel konumundan dolayı yüzyıllar boyunca birçok devlete ev sahipliği yapmıştır. Onların kültürlerini yansıtan izlerin bazıları günümüze kadar gelmeyi başarmışlardır. Kıbrıs'ın uzun ve fırtınalı tarihinde 19. ve özellikle 20. yüzyılda adaya hâkim olan İngilizlerin uyguladıkları eğitim politikaları adalılarda derin izler bırakmıştır.

Araştırmanın Amacı: Bu araştırmanın amacı 20. yüzyılda İngiliz yönetiminin Kıbrıs'ta uyguladığı sömürge politikasının Kıbrıslı Türk ve Rumların eğitiminin üzerindeki etkileri araştırmaktır. Temel amaç eğitimin alıcı tarafında bulunun Kıbrıslı Türk ve Rumların ilköğretim ve ortaokul seviyesindeki eğitimleri hakkında derinlemesine bilgi toplayarak geçtikleri eğitim sistemi hakkındaki düşüncelerini, bu eğitim sistemi ve müfredatlarla ilgili başarılı ve başarısız buldukları noktaları, kendi düşünce ve bakış açılarından yola çıkarak incelemektir. Araştırmada verilen eğitimin daha sonra Kıbrıslı Rum ve Türk kimliklerini nasıl etkilediği incelenmiştir. Bundan dolayı bu araştırmada, Kıbrıs eğitim yönetiminde söz sahibi olan İngilizlerin ve eğitimcilerin belirleyip takip ettiği müfredat ve bu müfredatların öğrencilerde yaratması beklenen etki, amaç ve kazanımlardan çok bu eğitim sürecinden geçen Kıbrıslı Türk ve Rumların İngiliz eğitim yönetimi hakkındaki düşünce ve yorumlarına değinilmiştir.

Araştırmanın Yöntemi: Bu araştırma, nitel araştırma özelliği taşımaktadır. Araştırmada, veri toplama yöntemi olarak rastgele seçilmiş, konuşmaya istekli 10 Kıbrıslı Türk ve 10 Kıbrıslı Rum ile görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Görüşme yapılan Kıbrıslı Rum ve Türklerin hepsi İngiliz yönetiminde öğrenci olup Kıbrıs'ın farklı köy ve şehir okullarında eğitim almışlardır. O zamanlarda yüksek bir eğitim seviyesi olarak görünen ilk ve özellikle orta öğrenimden geçen bu katılımcılar hatırladıkları noktalara göre en az 20 dakika ve en çok 1 saat 8 dakika arasında süren görüşmelerde araştırmacılara bilgi vermişler. Bu görüşmelerde katılımcılara esas olarak ilk ve orta okullardaki müfredat ve amaçları, okullarındaki milliyetçilik ve dini unsurlar, kimlik, anavatana bağlılık ve toplumlar arası ilişkiler hakkındaki düşünceleri şeklinde yarı yapılandırılmış sorular sorulmuştur. Araştırmadaki bilgiler katılımcıların sorulara verdikleri yanıtlar ve bakış açılarından elde edilen veriler toplanıp tematik olarak derlenmesinden elde edilmiştir.

Araştırmanın Bulguları: Katılımcılar, ilkökul seviyesinde ilgi alanının aile ve yakın çevreleri ile sınırlı olmasından dolayı milliyetçi duyguların gelişmediğini fakat ortaokul seviyesinde İngilizlerin anavatanlardan gelme kitapları engellemelerinden doğan milliyetçi akımların olduğunu anlattılar. Ayrıca katılımcılar ilkökullarda okutulan derslerin kendi dillerinde okuma, yazma, Kıbrıs-Akdeniz-Avrupa ve Dünya tarihi ve coğrafyası, matematik, din, İngilizce (şehirdeki okulların 5. ve 6. sınıflarında) olduğunu ve seçmeli derslerinin olmadığını söylediler. Ortaokulda Kıbrıslı Türkler İngilizce eğitim veren okullarda eğitim almalarından dolayı GCSE konularını seçebileceklerini belirttiler. Buna karşın Kıbrıslı Rumlar klasik ve pratik eğitim veren okullardan birini veya İngilizce eğitim veren okullardan birini seçebilmekteydiler. Katılımcılar her iki toplum için İngilizce derslerinin ağırlıklı, önemli ve zorunlu olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Hatta katılımcılar bir statü sembolü olarak, İngiliz yönetiminde İngilizce bilmenin yaşam standartlarını yükselteceğini ve iyi bir iş sahibi olunmak isteniyorsa Kıbrıs Sertifika sınavlarına girerek başarılı olunması gerektiğini savundular. Her iki topluma göre okullardaki müfredatın esas amacı İngiliz yönetiminde “iyi vatandaşlar” yetiştirmek ile “iyi bir iş sahibi” olmaktır. Ayrıca Kıbrıslı Türkler müfredatın iki toplumun arasını daha da açmak için yapılmış olduğunu savunmalarına karşın genelde okullarda verilen eğitimden memnun oldukları anlaşılmaktadır. Kıbrıslı Rumlardan Rum okullarına gidenlerin İngilizce eğitim veren okullarda okuyanlara göre daha az fırsata sahip olduklarının farkında oldukları ortaya çıkmıştır. İngilizler hem Kıbrıslı Türklere hem de Kıbrıslı Rumlara anavatanlarının özel ve milli günlerini kutlamak için izin vermedikleri gibi anavatanlardan kitap yollanmasına karşı çıkmaları milliyetçi akımların artmasına yol açmıştır. Her iki toplumun okullarında din dersleri olmasına rağmen dinin okulda Kıbrıslı Rumlar için Kıbrıslı Türklere göre çok daha baskın ve önemli olduğu anlaşılmaktadır. Kıbrıslı Türklerin yarısının kendilerini Kıbrıslı Türk ve Kıbrıslı Rumların yarısının kendilerini Kıbrıslı olarak tanımlarken, sadece Kıbrıslı Rumların küçük bir kısmının kimliğine Kıbrıslı Ortodoks Rum olarak tanımlamalarına karşın Kıbrıslı Türklerin kimliklerine dini hiç karıştırmamış olmaları ve Kıbrıslı Türklerin az bir bölümünün kendilerini Kıbrıslı, Kıbrıslı Rumların az bir bölümünün kendini Kıbrıslı Rum olarak tanıtmaları ilginç verilerdendir. Kıbrıslı Türklerle Rumların çoğunun İngiliz yönetimi sırasında birbirleriyle arkadaş oldukları ama bu düşüncelerinin İngiliz döneminde başlayan ve sonra İngilizlerin adadan ayrılmasıyla devam eden bölünmüşlikle beraber daha sonra olumsuz duygulara dönüştüğünü anlattılar. Katılımcılar tüm Kıbrıslı Rum ve Türkler yakın bir zamanda Kıbrıs sorunun çözümüne ilişkin inançlarının kalmadığını belirtmeleri ilgi çekici noktalardandır. İngilizlerin “böl ve yönet” politikasının iki toplumun etnik bölünmüşlüğünü ve İngilizleşmeyi arttırdığı, ama kitapların anavatanlardan gelmesini engellemek gibi tedbirlerin İkinci Dünya Savaşında kendi çıkarları için İtilaf Devletlerine destek aramak amaçlı rahatlattığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Bütüne bakıldığında, İngilizlerin genel yaşamın eğitim ve sosyo-politik öğelerini etkilemeyi başardıkları ortaya çıkmıştır.

Araştırmanın Sonuçları: Kıbrıs'ta uygulanan İngiliz eğitim politikasının esasında her iki toplumun etnik-milliyetçiliğini arttırarak her iki toplumun müteakip direnişlerini canlandırdığı ortaya çıkmıştır. Hem Kıbrıslı Türklerin hem de Kıbrıslı Rumların eğitime önem verdikleri açıkça belli olmasına rağmen, eğitimdeki gelişmenin sadece Türk ve Rum olmakla sınırlı kalması ve özellikle müfredat ve amaçları açısından Kıbrıs'ta etkin olan gerek İngiliz, gerek Kıbrıslı Türk ve Rumların kendi milliyetçiliklerini aşlamak için bir ortam olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Bunların sonuçlarının etkileri yaşanmıştır ve yaşamaya devam edecektir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Kıbrıs'ta İngiliz sömürgesi, eğitim yönetimi, müfredat ve kimlik