GREEK-CYPRIOT PUPILS' REPRESENTATIONS OF NATIONAL OTHERS: A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF 'EUROPE' IN A PRIMARY SCHOOL CURRICULAR INTERVENTION

PHILIPPOU STAVROULA

Abstract – *Over the last three decades the term 'European dimension in education' has been used by the European Union and the Council of Europe to denote some of their educational initiatives to prepare young people for an increasingly integrated Europe. Cyprus, a country at the margins of Europe and characterised by ethnic conflict and division, has had to respond to such demands as a condition of EU membership. The 'European dimension' was conceptualised as a subtle approach for a curricular intervention, to alleviate the ethnocentrism of primary curricula and to shift Greek-Cypriot pupils' extreme views. This study showed that there were some interesting shifts which point to the potential of curricula in providing children with a wider range of 'tools' with which to represent national others.*

Introduction

O ver the last thirty years the concept of a 'European dimension in education' has been increasingly used by the European Union (EU) and the Council of Europe to denote their concern and influence on their member-states' education. At this political level, the European dimension has been assigned the role of developing a sense of European identity and citizenship. These concepts have been highly contested in academic writing, since the manner in which a regional identity is introduced to national educational systems, which historically have had a 'nation-building' role, is not without problems (see for example, Philippou *at al.*, 2009).

Cyprus, a country at the margins of Europe and characterised by extreme nationalism that has long divided its society, must now respond to these issues as a condition of its EU membership in 2004. The European dimension has been defined in various ways. Shennan (1991) defined it as a process of making Europe a focal point of normal school experience in preparation of European citizens concerned with knowledge *about* Europe and the EU, skills of living and working *in* Europe and attitudes *for* Europe. Furthermore, encountering, tolerating, accepting and respecting 'others' and diversity are included in many definitions,

as both the EU and the Council of Europe have been trying increasingly to address Europe's diversity in their policies, taking into consideration intercultural dialogue and education as well as a European citizenship (see Keating et al, 2009 for historical overview). At the same time, there has been academic critique of the elitist, exclusionary, neo-liberal and Eurocentric constructions of 'Europe' contained in these policies (e.g. by Hansen, 1998; Sultana, 1995; Novoa & Lawn, 2002). However, there has been relatively little research into how 'Europe' could be applied in existing national curricula or what its impact could be amongst pupils' European and national identities in general and their views of national outgroups in particular.

This paper explores the possibilities of shifting nationalistic bias in pupils' representations of national outgroups using post-colonial and post-modern understandings of 'Europe' as a curricular tool. The aim is to present some of the findings of a broader study, which involved a curricular intervention with a European dimension for the subjects of History and Geography, amongst ten-year-old Greek-Cypriot pupils. In this paper, I focus on pupils' social representations of certain national outgroups, investigating whether or how pupils drew on the curricular intervention's discourse to alter, shift and revisit these representations, thus exploring the potential of the European dimension to challenge potential nationalist or racist constructions of national outgroups. The paper is comprised of four parts. The first part locates the study within the socio-political context of Cyprus and within the literature on children's social representations of others. The second part describes the research design and instruments employed to evaluate the impact of the curricular intervention. The third part describes the findings, presented through comparisons between and within the experimental and control groups. The significance of the findings and their curricular implications for Cyprus and other countries conclude the paper.

Cyprus, politics and curriculum

Cyprus is located at the margins of (traditional geographical definitions of) Europe in the eastern Mediterranean. After its application in 1990, the Republic of Cyprus became a full EU member in May 2004. The resulting questions of European identity and citizenship have further added to an already highly sensitive area. Ethnonational identities have been an issue of huge debate in the context of the Cyprus problem, as the island's two larger communities, Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots, have engaged in conflict to respectively claim either '*Enosis*' (Union with Greece) or '*Taksim*' (partition of Cyprus between Greece and Turkey). Cyprus gained independence from the British as 'The Republic of Cyprus' in 1960

with a new Constitution which proved unable to balance the two communities' nationalisms. Thus, the post-independence period was characterised by ethnonationalism, inter-, and intra-communal conflict, and eventually civil war.

A coup, organised by the dictatorial government of Greece, against the government of Cyprus to achieve *Enosis* led (or was used as a pretext by an already expansionist Turkey), so the Greek-Cypriot official narrative argues, to the tragic Turkish invasion in 1974. This resulted in a divided Cyprus and in people losing their homes and loved ones. The Turkish-Cypriot official narrative maintains that the 1974 military intervention was a peace-keeping operation undertaken to protect Turkish-Cypriots from Greek-Cypriot nationalism, the painful results of which, they had experienced during the 1960s, such as displacement and killings.

After independence and until 1963, responsibility for education was assigned to the Greek and Turkish communal chambers, thus continuing the colonial legacy of segregated education for the two communities. Each educational system was entirely influenced by Greece or Turkey, as the two communities ensured their ethnonational orientation through education. After the inter-communal conflicts in 1963-64 and the withdrawal of the Turkish-Cypriots from the government in an act of protest, the Greek-Cypriots unilaterally established a Ministry of Education in 1965, to cater for their needs. The study presented in this paper is located within the Greek-Cypriot educational system. As the country remains divided today, the Republic of Cyprus, the applicant and only recognised state on the island in the south, entered the EU in May 2004. This fact exerts further pressure to resolve the Cyprus problem, as the *acquis communautaire* is under suspension in the northern areas of the island not controlled by the Republic of Cyprus.

Education and curricula have reflected these historical conflicts, divisions and debates. Two opposing official historical narratives of the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities have been present, for example, in the Cyprus history textbooks of both communities and mirror each other in the ways in which they construct blame, silence the pain of others, and de-legitimise the historical existence of others (Papadakis 2008). Ultimately the national 'Self' is constructed as a helpless victim, in the hands of a more powerful 'Other' who is systematically demonised as a victimiser, an 'Enemy'. Within these narratives, the British and the Americans are understood as the 'foreign powers' for the interests of whom a small and weak Cyprus was 'sacrificed'.

Since 1974 Greek-Cypriot education has become an area of conflict between three ideologies or discourses of identity: *Hellenocentrism*, which emphasises the Greekness of Greek-Cypriots and has been mainly supported by the political right; *Cypriocentrism*, which emphasises the Cypriot identity which the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities share and has been mainly supported by the

political left (Spyrou 2001); and Hellenocypriocentrism, which represents Cyprus as a monocultural state inhabited by citizens of Greek origin and of Greek-Orthodox religion; those who identify with this discourse perceive themselves as descendants of the first Greeks and, though they have no political agenda for 'Union' with Greece, their representation of Cyprus excludes Turks and Turkish-Cypriots as 'Others-Enemy' and includes only the south part of Cyprus that is under the control of the Republic of Cyprus (Pachoulides, 2007).

Within this context, although 'Europe' provides a framework from which policy documents increasingly draw upon to introduce curricular innovation, the nationalistic (Hellenocentric and Hellenocypriocentric) discourses of citizenship 'appropriate' 'Europe' in ways which legitimise both ethno- and Euro-centrism and moreover fail to alleviate existing tensions between communities in Cyprus (Philippou, 2009). This approach leaves the traditional ethnocentrism of the curriculum untouched. It also leaves unexploited the potential of the European dimension in education, as a way of shifting existing nationalistic tensions and the exclusion of 'Others', (communities, immigrants, minorities etc.). Which brings us to the focus of this paper: how did a curricular intervention with a European dimension influence pupils' social representations of national outgroups? Before this question is addressed directly with the findings of the study, I present the theoretical framework through which these social representations were explored before and after the intervention.

Children's representations of national others

Drawing on social and developmental psychological theories and studies to design instruments and interpret findings, pupils' representations of national outgroups were explored with Moscovici's (1973) Social Representations theory, which stresses the importance of the constructions that people use to understand the world and so act. Social representations theory encompasses a view of communication and everyday thinking in today's world and an analysis of the anonymous facts that are their counterparts. Its central idea is that 'people come to understand their social world by way of images or social representations which are shared by the members of a social group', (Potter, 1996, p. 121) and that common sense is actually sediment of past theorising on psychology and the self.

Social representations are defined as the products or features of social groups and form organised systems of values, ideas and practices; through shared access to them, individuals are able to understand the structure of social life and to communicate with others. Representations are social, not only because of individual and group contribution to them, but primarily because they are shaped

through interaction and communication processes; the individual and the social are thus bridged. Representations are also social because they can be used to define a group as made up of people who share social representations on various aspects of the world. Representations are of a changing nature, always 'in the making, in the context of interpretations and actions that were themselves always in the making' (Moscovici, 1988, p. 219).

For example, the ideology of nationalism, of which the curricular manifestations were the focus of this study, creates a system of social representations, which understands the world as multi-national, in which national social identity becomes another 'natural' category. Various features of the social representations of nationality and ethnicity are diffused into common-sense understanding; education plays a significant role in constructing-imposing nation-states and shared national myths. Despite globalisation and massive immigration, the nation-state continues to be a significant reference point in international politics and for individuals. In fact nationalism's potency is indicated by its invisibility, its taken-for-granted-ness, what Billig (1995) has called 'banal' nationalism, a form of routine, everyday nationalism which is not extreme nor exotic, but nonetheless dangerous. Different theoretical perspectives focus on different components of national identity, but on the whole these include both a substantial system of knowledge and beliefs about, as well as an extensive system of feelings, emotions and evaluations of, the national ingroup and various national outgroups (Barrett, 2005).

What do we learn from these theoretical understandings about the ways in which children construct their national identities? Or about their representations of national outgroups i.e. national groups other than the one to which they self-categorise themselves as members? Such research seems to accept a positive relation between knowledge about, and affective attitudes towards, foreign and own peoples (Johnson, Middleton & Tajfel, 1970; Middleton, Tajfel & Johnson, 1970). According to Lambert & Klineberg (1967) as well as Johnson *et al*. (1970), children in their studies seemed to know more about people they regarded positively, but were not as informed about people they disliked. As far as the affective aspects of national identity are concerned, children express preferences for different nations despite their lack of knowledge; they actually agree more about which countries they like and dislike than about information or facts concerning those countries (Bennett *et al*. 1998). Relevant studies also showed children as negatively prejudiced towards other peoples of various degrees, at different ages, in various social contexts (Barrett, 2005). English children liked, for example, French and Spanish most, Italians next and Germans last, whom children associated with war/weapons/army and aggression (Barrett & Short, 1992; Bennett *et al*. 1998).

This finding seems to confirm the 'enemy' effect identified amongst Greek, Turkish and English children by Buchanan-Barrow *et al*. (1999): children displayed greater negativity towards the outgroup traditionally represented as 'the enemy' by their own ingroup. Adopting a social constructivist point of view, such research attributes these findings to the existing representations of national outgroups, of the social contexts in which children grow. However, the development of these representations is not seen as a mere transmission of knowledge but an active process, on the part of the children, since they constantly negotiate knowledge through social interactions. In the case of representations of the nation, for example, 'through a variety of sources, such as communicative interchanges with others, media presentations, and formal pedagogical contexts, young children make informally guided discoveries of their group's representation of itself and, to a lesser extent perhaps, its view of out-groups' (Bennett, *et al.,* 1998, p. 903). In contexts of prolonged and intractable conflicts, such as Israel or N. Ireland, these representations tend to be rather extreme or polarised, as they include well-defined 'enemies' (cf. Bar-Tal & Teichman, 2005; Cairns, 1996); this also seems to be validated by research amongst Greek-Cypriot children, to which I turn below.

Greek-Cypriot children's identities

Research into Greek-Cypriot children's identities needs to be located within the political problem and the narratives of identity that have prevailed during the last century in Cyprus. Psychological, sociological and anthropological studies have indicated the impact of the Cyprus problem amongst its Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities and have identified the degree, depth and content of the largely prejudiced, stereotypical and hostile ways in which the two (adult) communities construct each other (see, for example, Papadakis, 1995; Kizilyürek & Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis 1997; Constantinou & Papadakis 2001). However, there is a scarcity of research amongst children and adolescents. The few studies available amongst children have shown that Greek-Cypriot children construct the Turks as 'Others=Enemies' (Spyrou, 2002; Ioannidou, 2004) and that they variably draw from both *Hellenocentrism* and *Cypriocentrism* as discourses of identity to talk about their national identities (Spyrou, 2001). Education, mass media, the family and the community as socialising factors seem to encourage such constructions. For example, in his ethnographic study in two Greek-Cypriot schools, Spyrou (2002) found that in the classroom and at school the discourse appears to be a nationalist-Hellenocentric one. This essentialises identity through an emphasis on shared attributes like the Greek language, religion, and history,

and erects a firm symbolic boundary which keeps 'us' (the Greeks) separate from 'them' (the Turks). One of Spyrou's (2002) conclusions was that the primary 'other' against whom Greek-Cypriot children construct their national identities are the Turks, for whom they have well-constructed images.

Another study amongst Greek-Cypriot 10-12-year-old children indicated that the Turks were the least preferred out of 13 national outgroups, systematically at the bottom of the ethnic hierarchy. Children's explanations for their choices associated the Turks with the political problem of Cyprus, however they held negative views for other national outgroups as well (Koutselini *et al*., 2002). In my study, the curricular intervention could create a certain degree of 'heteroglossia', of a variety of voices (concerning the Turks and other national groups). Impact of the European dimension intervention programme could mean greater contradiction and ambiguity, if these are viewed 'as the very thing of identity, not its pathological problems' (Spyrou, 2002, p. 268). The ways in which pupils' representations of national others were operationalised in the research instruments used in the study are described in the second part of this paper, including a brief description of the curricular intervention.

Research design

The research design combined curriculum development, action research, quasi-experimental and multiple case study strategies. The centrepiece of the research design was a curricular intervention in History and Geography, which was comprised of 40 worksheets, and was implemented for four months during the school year 2000-2001. Each subject is allocated two 40-minute teaching periods per week and this timetable was not disrupted during the intervention. Sampling was opportunistic since it involved four teacher-volunteers (two taught History, one Geography and one taught both History and Geography) who were interested in participating in the study. The classes and schools where these teachers worked constituted the experimental group of the study; after this group was established, control classes and schools, comparable to the experimental ones in terms of size and location, were sought.

Eventually, 140 10-year-old pupils from six 5th Grade classes and their teachers participated in the study. The intervention programme was taught to three of those classes (experimental, named in this paper as Grades 5A, 5B and 5C), whereas the other three (control, Grades 5D, 5E, 5F) followed the standard Greek-Cypriot National syllabi and textbooks for the two subjects. The pupils came from four schools; two of the schools were located in semi-urban and two in rural areas. In each location schools had similar socio-economic profiles, with parents'

professions being of lower socio-economic status. Greek-Cypriot public schools are all mixed-sex schools and largely homogeneous in terms of the religion (Christian Orthodox) and the ethnicity (Greek-Cypriot) of the pupils.

To develop the intervention the standard textbooks taught in Greek-Cypriot schools (which prescribed the study of the Byzantine period in History and European geography for Geography for 5th grade) were analysed. Furthermore, teachers' and pupils' views were collected and nine European dimension principles, derived from the literature in the field, were applied to the existing subject-matter (the analysis of the official materials and those of the intervention are described in detail in Philippou, 2007; for the theoretical underpinnings of the intervention see Philippou, 2005a). In brief, a critical and constructivist approach to 'Europe' was adopted. The European dimension was defined to include a critical pedagogy, which would encourage pupils to critically reflect on Europe, Byzantium and their own identities. The programme was not 'closed', but attempted to show how Europe can be a rich resource rather than a 'fortress' and how it can be introduced in existing subjects, rather than as a political, 'pro-Brussels' education or as a European studies subject. In Geography, geomorphology, frontiers, ecology, economy, culture, colonisation, stereotypes were concepts used to illustrate the constructed and changing nature of Europe, its interdependency with the rest of the world, its multiculturalism and diversity.

In History, nationalistic constructions of 'heroes' and the Byzantine Empire were challenged through the use of multiple historical sources-interpretations and the examination of the multicultural nature of the Empire. Additionally, its imperialism, changing frontiers, intercultural exchanges and conflicts with neighbouring nations, its positioning in a world context, social and cultural resources were also studied. The programme construed Europe and the EU as multiple and diverse. Furthermore it promoted an awareness of their multicultural past- and present societies, and questioned stereotypes, identities and views that represented societies to be static, singular or pure. In both subjects, the emphasis shifted from conveying knowledge and information to the critical study of multiple sources and maps, and the construction of concepts and collaborative work. The selection of History and Geography is due to their historical nation-building role, as well as the high profile they have held in local debates across the divide in Cyprus over their role in relation to national identities.

Data amongst pupils was collected with tests and interviews, the aim being to compare any shifts or changes between pre- and post-evaluation of pupils' historical and geographical understandings and their national and European identities. The data set reported in this paper includes 280 questionnaires (140 pre and post), 12 focus-group and 12 individual pupil interviews and focus on those items which addressed pupils' representations of national others. Questionnaires

were administered to all 140 pupils. Two items from the questionnaires investigated pupils' general attitude towards 6 national groups, as well as within a proximity context (sharing their desk in class) with 13 peers of different nationalities. These thirteen national groups (Greeks, English, French, Americans, Russians, Israelis, Japanese, Swiss, Germans, Bulgarians, Gypsies, Arabs and Turks) were selected both because they were the groups the pupils would encounter in the study of geography and history during that period, but also because they were the groups for whom there were frequent references in the media or public debates at the time. Pupils could circle one of five degrees of liking from 'not at all' (0) to 'very much' (4) on the questionnaire.

These two items were repeated in the interviews in the form of tasks to offer pupils an opportunity to establish a discussion and to discursively develop their representations of national groups. Individual and focus group (of mixed ability and gender) semi-structured interviews were conducted with six pupils from each of the six classes. Pupils were asked to evaluate and hierarchise the national outgroups. In this paper the findings from these two items in the questionnaire and interviews are presented. The methodological decision to use semi-structured interviews drew again from social representations theory, for which attitudes and social representations are closely knit: 'the former have the latter as their precondition. We can become favourable or unfavourable towards something, only after we have perceived and evaluated it in a different way' (p. 226-7). Moscovici (1988) replies in this way to distinguish the two terms in contrast to those who equate them, arguing that we cannot use the former without the latter. In other words, there is no direct relationship between attitudes and reality or people, but the former are mediated via social representations towards images of the latter. A significant consequence of this view is that attitudes towards other groups of peoples cannot exist without some sort of knowledge, of a social representation underpinning it. The act of acquiring knowledge does not take place in a vacuum, but 'exists and can be recognised only by its outcome, in what is directed towards others and preserved. Mental states that are shared do not remain mental states, they are communicated, take shape, tend to materialize, to become objects' (p. 230). In this study, while talking about national outgroups to articulate and justify their attitudes during interviews, children 'revealed' how they represented them, their stereotypes, beliefs, views, emotions, knowledge etc. Thus, pupils' representations of national others were explored as indicators of the potential global impact of the programme on their identities.

All interviews were fully transcribed and analysed with the use of the ATLAS.ti software package. A descriptive content analysis approach was followed using inductive coding techniques. Pupils' participation in the interviews is indicated with pseudonyms. My participation is denoted with the letters 'Res'

for 'Researcher'. Statistical analyses of the quantitative data was carried out with SPSS.10 and focused on paired samples t-tests so as to indicate any significant changes from pre- to post-evaluation. For the purposes of the statistical analysis of the test's ordinal data, I initially conducted non-parametric tests in order to compare pupils' responses to the pre- and the post-test (since such comparisons were the focus of the study).

To investigate the commonplace treatment of ordinal data in statistical analyses within education and the social sciences as interval, I also conducted their parametric analogues. This exercise showed that the results of the two analyses were almost identical. More specifically, only 3 out of 180 test statements (1.7%) produced different results from the ones produced by paired-samples (parametric) t-tests and Wilcoxon (non-parametric) tests. Given this congruence, it was decided to report the, more powerful, parametric tests. Finally, factor analysis was conducted to investigate whether national outgroups were 'grouped' within pupils' representations in various ways. Findings are presented below through comparisons between and within the experimental and control classes, before and after the intervention drawing upon both qualitative and quantitative data.

Pupils' representations of national others

Pupil discourse contained views, beliefs, understandings, stereotypes and attitudes which revealed emergent representations of the national outgroups in question. To gain an overview of pupils' views, I first explored how they evaluated national outgroups in the test. The test data were useful in providing an overview of pupils' representations of national outgroups, in terms of how pupils evaluated each national outgroup individually. In comparing pupils' general liking of peoples, there were statistically significant shifts (indicated on the post-test column of the tables; a single asterisk indicates significance below 0.05 and a double asterisk indicates significance below 0.01) within the experimental group, but not within the control group, as Table 1 illustrates (Table 1). Effect sizes were computed as Cohen's d where a positive effect size represents improvement and a negative effect size represents a worsening of views towards the national group in question.

The mean score of the experimental pupils showed a higher positive rating (statistically significant) in relation to the French, German and Swiss than in the pre-test, but a lower rating (not significant) by the control group. In fact, there was no statistically significant change in the control pupils' responses towards any of the peoples included in this item. Also, and as indicated by the means, the only groups who received a higher positive score from the control pupils in the post-test, compared to pre-test responses, were the Greeks and the Turks. For the

TABLE 1: Pupils' evaluation of national groups

| | Experimental | | | | | Control | | | | |
| Statement | Pre | | Post | | | | Pre | | Post | | |
	M	SD	M	SD	Cohen's d	M	SD	M	SD	Cohen's d
Greeks	3.85	0.43	3.79	0.54	-0.12	3.70	0.85	3.76	0.55	0.08
French	2.21	1.39	2.77**	1.13	0.44	1.80	1.24	1.81	1.22	0.00
Swiss	1.47	1.25	2.19**	1.15	0.59	1.33	1.16	1.18	1.04	-0.13
Germans	1.41	1.24	2.11**	1.21	0.57	1.17	1.01	1.09	1.14	-0.07
Bulgarians	1.19	1.02	1.43	0.96	0.24	1.03	1.01	0.90	0.97	-0.13
Turks	0.33	0.92	0.24	0.66	-0.11	0.11	0.51	0.19	0.58	0.14

experimental pupils, they were the only two groups who received a lower score. This is a rather contradictory result, but with no statistical significance. All three groups (French, Swiss and Germans) for whom experimental pupils stated more positive attitudes are Western European nationalities and were studied in both the official and the intervention curriculum. The calculated effect sizes (Cohen's d) were 0.44, 0.59 and 0.57 respectively, medium values. It is also noted that the 'order' of liking of the six nationalities, as indicated by the descending order of means for each national outgroup, was the same for both groups and did not change in the post-test. Approximately the same order for these six peoples occurred in the following item, which elicited the degree to which pupils would be prepared to share their desk in class with a person of a particular nationality.

As in Table 1, experimental pupils stated, to a statistically significant level in the post-test, that they would consider sharing their desk with an English, French, American, Swiss and a German pupil. The effect sizes were 0.32, 0.34, 0.30, 0.84 and 0.54 respectively, ranging from medium to large effect sizes. The control pupils were more sympathetic towards an English, French and Turkish pupil. The effect sizes were 0.32, 0.24 and 0.39 ranging from small to medium effect sizes. The last finding could perhaps be attributed to the extreme negativity the control group exhibited in the pre-test (X=0,03). Overall, experimental pupils seemed more positive towards more peoples in the two items in comparison to their pre-test, than their control counterparts. However, the Greeks and Turks were systematically positioned first and last respectively, forming a 'bipolar' which remained 'intact' for both groups and between which all other groups were located. This finding is further discussed later in the paper.

TABLE 2: Pupils' acceptance to share their desk with a(n)

| Statement | Experimental | | | | | Control | | | | |
| | Pre | | Post | | | Pre | | Post | | |
	M	SD	M	SD	Cohen's d	M	SD	M	SD	Cohen's d
Greek	3.74	0.77	3.75	0.69	0.01	3.50	1.13	3.61	0.74	0.11
English	2.24	1.47	2.70*	1.32	0.32	1.59	1.34	2.03*	1.36	0.32
French	2.09	1.38	2.56*	1.33	0.34	1.36	1.16	1.68*	1.39	0.24
American	1.90	1.52	2.33*	1.34	0.30	1.46	1.39	1.65	1.42	0.13
Swiss	1.22	1.18	2.21**	1.15	0.84	1.17	1.14	1.09	1.06	-0.07
German	1.35	1.19	2.01**	1.28	0.53	0.98	1.06	0.94	1.08	-0.03
Russian	1.39	1.24	1.78	1.42	0.29	1.37	1.35	1.39	1.35	0.01
Japanese	1.27	1.21	1.54	1.25	0.21	1.17	1.24	1.05	1.20	-0.09
Israeli	1.26	1.20	1.33	1.14	0.05	1.16	1.19	0.98	1.15	-0.15
Bulgarian	0.96	1.12	1.20	1.04	0.22	0.84	0.93	0.88	0.94	0.04
Arab	0.60	0.96	0.85	0.82	0.28	0.36	0.65	0.60	1.03	0.27
Gypsy	0.73	1.14	0.70	1.03	-0.02	0.28	0.74	0.39	0.76	0.14
Turk	0.15	0.57	0.25	0.57	0.17	0.03	0.19	0.26*	0.80	0.39

Geopolitical groupings of national outgroups

To further understand pupils' attitudes towards national groups, as well as whether pupils 'grouped' specific national groups together, a factor analysis was conducted of the two items. For the extraction of the factors, the rotated varimax analysis was used. Additionally, a mean score for each factor was calculated in order to understand the ways pupils hierarchised any potential groups of peoples. The rotated varimax factor analysis extracted five factors, explaining 64.71% of the variance. Table 3 presents the constitution of the five factors and the loadings received by each people. It also presents the variance explained by each factor, the mean scores for each factor, and the respective Cronbach A reliability measure.

The table indicates that the factor which received the highest mean was 'Greek', followed by positive attitudes towards 'Anglo-Saxons' and 'Western Europeans'. Peoples from Eastern Europe, Middle East and Asia were grouped in a separate factor. The Turks also formed a separate factor, with the lowest means,

TABLE 3: Pre-test groupings of national groups by all pupils

Factor structure coefficients / Statement	Western European	Eastern European/ Middle East/Asian	Anglo-Saxon	Greek	Turk
Like Germans	.808	.203	.060	.007	.113
Share desk German	.799	.232	.245	.051	.012
Like French	.758	.147	.194	.081	.084
Share desk French	.696	.101	.504	.032	-.025
Like Swiss	.693	.407	.017	.205	.110
Share desk Swiss	.618	.416	.122	.065	.020
Share desk Israeli	.147	.743	.124	-.049	.008
Share desk Bulgarian	.069	.715	.364	-.025	.052
Share desk Japanese	.185	.686	.164	.056	-.078
Like Bulgarians	.294	.660	.050	.032	.076
Share desk Arab	.209	.588	.034	.108	.263
Share desk Russian	.277	.554	.091	.126	-.003
Share desk Gypsy	.116	.509	-.061	-.165	.389
Share desk English	.233	.218	.786	.113	.138
Share desk American	.308	.227	.784	.081	.009
Like Greeks	.102	-.042	.025	.913	.008
Share desk Greek	.097	.114	.131	.876	.058
Like Turks	-.013	-.038	.197	.045	.796
Share desk Turk	.137	.157	-.062	.047	.780
Mean	1.46	0.97	1.77	3.69	0.15
Standard Deviation	0.95	0.73	1.31	0.77	.49
Reliability Alpha	.88	.79	.76	.78	.59
% of variance	34.50	9.67	7.87	6.81	5.85

which again indicated pupils' animosity towards them. It is interesting that national outgroups were grouped by pupils, without differentiation in their responses for the two items, even though the second item asked whether they would consider sharing a desk with a peer and thus provided some 'space' for pupils to consider variability within each national outgroup.

Factor analysis on the two items was repeated with the post-test data, and separately for the control and experimental groups. Apparently the 'neat' geopolitical categories of national outgroups which appeared in the pre-test, were disrupted in the post-test, since different factors occurred for each, in which the categorisation of the national groups was more 'mixed'. Inspection of the resulting factor structure for the experimental and control groups indicated that four factors were formed each time. These factors contained all statements of the two items and accounted for 68.03% and for 68.93% of the total variance for the experimental and control group respectively. Tables 4 and 5 show the constitution of the four factors and the loadings received by each people for the experimental and control groups respectively. They also present the variance explained by each factor, the mean scores for each factor, and the respective Cronbach A reliability measure.

In the pre-evaluation pupils seemed to 'group' national outgroups into categories which followed conventional geographic-cultural criteria, as shown in Table 3. Interesting shifts occurred, however, during post-evaluation. The experimental group 'mingled' the Greek category (the favourite) with the Bulgarian national group, which was included in the History intervention. This finding is also reflected in the pupils' more positive evaluations of the Bulgarians in the post-test (see Tables 1 and 2), even though the change was not statistically significant. However, the factor with the highest means for the control group was the one which included the Greeks only. For the experimental group the 'Western Europeans' factor (second in preference) now included the Bulgarians, whereas Anglo-Saxon and Eastern peoples (including traditionally disliked people like the Arabs) were positioned in the same category. However, Gypsies seemed to be disliked to the same degree as the Turks. Apparently, the 'clear' geopolitical criteria of groupings in the pre-test, had shifted and the categories of peoples became more 'mixed' and transcended traditional dislikes. For the control group the least liked 'Turkish' category included even more groups (Arab, Israeli, Gypsy). The control group's views of the Bulgarians positioned this national group third in preference factor. Anglo-Saxons formed the second factor and were more liked than the Germans and Swiss (even though the latter two nationals were included in the pupils' study of the standard textbook). The intervention programme seemed to have begun to 'blur' or 'confuse' the categorisation of national groups for the experimental group.

TABLE 4: Post-test groupings of national groups by experimental group

Factor structure coefficients Statement	1	2	3	4
Like Germans	.881	.091	.074	-.131
Share desk Swiss	.870	.219	-.095	.086
Like Swiss	.787	.209	-.040	.054
Like French	.777	.213	.190	-.161
Share desk German	.713	.470	.080	-.028
Share desk French	.708	.447	.121	-.065
Like Bulgarians	.501	-.053	.469	.406
Share desk Japanese	.122	.829	.165	.125
Share desk American	.321	.769	-.036	-.167
Share desk English	.261	.601	-.045	-.103
Share desk Arab	.101	.588	.442	.204
Share desk Russian	.485	.576	.265	.253
Share desk Israeli	.308	.508	.361	.146
Like Turks	-.002	.026	.920	-.183
Share desk Turk	.006	.136	.876	-.113
Share desk Gypsy	.090	.417	.505	.026
Like Greeks	-.069	.083	-.131	.835
Share desk Greek	-.138	-.062	-.100	.786
Share desk Bulgarian	.307	.480	.208	.503
Mean	2.18	1.76	0.40	2.91
Standard Deviation	0.56	0.90	0.62	0.56
Reliability Alpha	0.90	0.83	0.70	0.52
% of variance	37.39	12.49	11.00	7.13

TABLE 5: Post-test groupings of national groups by control group

Factor structure coefficients / Statement	1	2	3	4
Share desk French	.823	.297	.068	.010
Share desk English	.809	.052	.261	.012
Share desk American	.802	.133	.203	.106
Share desk German	.722	.364	.210	.175
Share desk Japanese	.698	.163	.430	.042
Like French	.696	.434	.050	.027
Share desk Russian	.474	.307	.253	.181
Like Bulgarians	.124	.847	.272	-.099
Share desk Bulgarian	.167	.765	.259	-.111
Like Swiss	.380	.675	.249	.148
Like Germans	.501	.626	.120	-.010
Share desk Swiss	.454	.582	.223	.268
Share desk Gypsy	.071	.334	.763	-.127
Share desk Israeli	.354	.207	.661	-.011
Like Turks	.161	.511	.611	.150
Share desk Arab	.326	.525	.598	-.096
Share desk Turk	.459	.071	.595	.213
Like Greeks	.086	.053	-.075	.862
Share desk Greek	.088	-.077	.070	.838
Mean	1.52	1.02	0.49	3.69
Standard Deviation	1.01	0.83	0.66	0.57
Reliability Alpha	0.90	0.86	0.81	0.68
% of variance	45.86	10.52	6.99	5.54

Why did such evaluations and groupings occur during pre-evaluation, and then shift, during post-evaluation? Were there any criteria pupils used and how did they represent each group? Could any of the representational elements pupils used be linked to the findings presented above? Finally, did children draw from the curricular intervention to represent national outgroups during post-evaluation? The analysis of the qualitative data provides some insights to these questions.

Understanding pupils' representations of national groups

In one of the earliest, developmental and cross-national studies of pupils' perceptions of foreign nationals, Lambert & Klineberg (1967) found that those perceptions included diverse descriptive characteristics such as physical features, clothing, language, habits, personality traits, political and religious beliefs and materials possessions. In the interviews conducted for this study, pupils were encouraged to express their views and justify their choices, while repeating the test items in a group-task format i.e. while evaluating and hierarchising the national outgroups. These discussions clearly indicated some of the contents of pupils' representations of other nationals, which included stereotypes, prejudice, bias or enthusiasm. The sources from which pupils drew their opinions, mentioned either in the flow of our conversations or when directly asked how they knew some of the information they referred to, included trips (their own or of people they knew), tourism in Cyprus, television, their parents, friends or relatives, the subject of History or (rarely) some teachers and the school.

In some cases, pupils' views were *ambiguous-conflictual*, which means that they included conflicting views about the same national group, while in other cases they were *homogeneous*: there being no disagreements between pupils. The distinction of pupils' views of national outgroups in these two categories derived from Moscovici's distinction (1988) between 'hegemonic' and 'polemical' representations (Breakwell, 2001; Jost & Ignatow, 2001). 'Polemical' describes representations which have been 'generated in the course of social conflict', are not shared by society but are determined by 'antagonistic relations between its members'. 'Hegemonic' are the representations which are shared 'by all members of a highly structured group' and are uniform and coercive (Breakwell, 2001, pp. 274-6).

As a preliminary analysis, I tried to summarise the representational elements about each people. Though this may seem mainly a descriptive task (an argument charged against early stereotype research in the 1920s and 30s), it is a necessary introduction to my later discussion of the 'rules' pupils were applying in representing other nationals and the changes which occurred during post-

evaluation. Moreover, it is also necessary since no qualitative studies of Greek-Cypriot pupils' perceptions of national outgroups have been found. Therefore, this discussion draws a baseline from which we may begin to understand those perceptions held by 10-year-old pupils at the time and to compare them with the perceptions held by the same pupils after the curricular intervention, as well as with pupils' perceptions in other countries.

Representations of the English, Japanese, Russian, Bulgarian and American national groups were *ambiguous*, since pupils referred to conflicting representational elements. Disagreement over views of these peoples resulted from the different role each people presently has in comparison to the past. Pupils were particularly enthusiastic about the English, because of their 'good culture' and referred to the large numbers of Cypriot migrants there (some referring to their own relatives), as well as the importance of English tourists to the Cyprus economy. However, at some point almost all groups would refer to the colonial past of Cyprus: 'they made war against Cyprus, we were occupied by them and they kept us in prisons in [19]59'. They also referred to instances of perceived betrayal by the British during the Second World War: 'they told us to fight Italy together [with them] and [they would] set us free and when we threw Italy into the sea, they lied to us and enslaved us'. However in spite of these negative views, the English were one of the most liked peoples both in the test and in the interviews.

In the case of the Japanese, pupils were not able to provide as much information and referred to them as 'clever' and 'scientists' with important 'inventions', from which we all benefit. For example, 'most cars come from their country'. Japan was perceived as having 'a lot of good things', and the Japanese were viewed as friendly, but some of their customs as 'bad', and pupils disliked their appearance (eyes) and language, mimicking its sounds 'tsi tsio tsi'. Some pupils also compared them to the Turks, as being a very strong country; there was no specific reference to the Second World War.

Conflicting views were also put forward for Russians: some pupils considered them to have a 'good upbringing', whereas others referred to Russian tourists in Cyprus as people who, 'go to the clubs and [are a] bad example to the Cypriots' or 'when they go out, they all do crazy things'. Furthermore, some pupils compared Russians to the Greeks because 'they help us…as if they are our compatriots…', 'like Greece'. Others thought that they 'are not so friendly to us' and some associated them with wars and killings (which were in the news at the time).

Bulgarians caused confusion; some positive experiences of relatives who went to Bulgaria for medical treatment or tourism, opposed those experiences of others who were 'victims' of theft or swearing or bad behaviour while there. For example, 'there is a market [in Bulgaria] and you must keep your hands like this

[close to your body] so that they don't cut them off, if they see you wearing jewellery they will cut your arm off'. Also, some pupils were convinced that 'they are not all barefoot or…not all Bulgarians are the same […] say one might be good, but another one bad', whereas others remarked that 'they are not good', 'they are like gypsies' or 'magicians'.

Discussions about the Americans also resulted in diverse information about them. There were references to their culture and people as 'good', with 'nice habits', food and the same language as the English ('but they pronounce it differently' some pupils noted). Americans were viewed as entertainers: 'They have a lot of fun' or 'they are funny, they have fun, they make others have fun, make them laugh in the films that we see'. The image of the Americans included their being rich and living in a big country, even though for some pupils these were reasons for disliking them: 'Because it is the biggest country, it does whatever it wants to the other countries' or 'it may take advantage of us'. Pupils also referred to them as having 'the most weapons': 'They think they can talk with power and they've got a lot of military stuff' and 'they are not good, they keep making wars'. Pupils perceived them as partly responsible for the Cyprus problem, too: 'It's they that made EOKA II which made the coup […], and with the Polytechnio, it's the Americans who encouraged the Greeks to do that'. Some pupils expressed in this way, a widespread leftist view in Cyprus, such that the USA, in the context of the Cold War, supported the dictatorial regime in Greece (1967-1974). The Greek Junta violently stopped a student uprising in 1973 (Polytechnio) and organised the coup in Cyprus in 1974. Other characterisations against the Americans included 'proud', 'stubborn', 'wiseguys', 'selfish' and that 'they have gone beyond the limits', in the way they used power and weapons.

For the English, Japanese, Russian, Bulgarian and American people, pupils did not hold homogeneous views, whereas for the rest of the peoples they did, even though for some these views were positive and for others negative. For the French the representational elements were *homogeneous* and positive, since pupils only mentioned positive information about and dispositions towards them. Pupils' only ' reservation' with the French, was that 'their language is a bit difficult' and 'mixed'. Other than that, pupils referred to tourism from France to Cyprus, as well as the perceived good food, numerous sights, hospitality and politeness of the French to justify their positive evaluations. Even though references to the Swiss were positive, pupils' representations of them were poor: 'We don't know a lot about their lifestyle, about them. We haven't learnt'. They referred to it only as, a 'nice' country with 'a lot of tourists'. Surprisingly, pupils' views of the Israelis were unanimously positive, largely because pupils thought that, 'they believe in the same religion as us'. This perception resulted from the knowledge that Christ had lived there and from some pupils' visits to the Holy Lands. Pupils also had

positive experiences of relatives who had been to Israel for medical treatment.

Finally, pupils constructed *homogeneous* representations of the Germans, Gypsies and Arabs (and of the Turks who are discussed separately, later in the paper), since they were unanimous in their negative views against these four national groups. Germans 'are in the bad people [group]', pupils said. This because of what they did during the Second World War, which included making war 'against Greece and Cyprus', and who 'take pride' because of their strength, 'like the Americans'. Similarly, pupils expressed only negative information about the Gypsies; they were actually one of the peoples they spoke most about. Pupils perceived Gypsies as being 'black', 'poor', 'stupid' and leading unhygienic lives: their feet are 'black because they play barefoot in the streets all day', they smell because 'they don't have baths', 'they come with ugly clothes, not nice [clothes] like us', 'stay in tents which have many diseases, they haven't got homes' and generally, 'they are not clean, they sleep wherever they find, they eat scrap food from garbage bins' pupils explained. Gypsies' behaviour was also commented upon; pupils explained that they steal, take drugs, their women smoke and that, 'they have learnt to behave towards others in a bad way'. Similarly, Arabs were also viewed as 'black' and 'dirty'.

Pupils' talk about other peoples, as some examples have shown, ranged from verbal abuse to 'naïve' and generalised estimations of 'goodness' or 'niceness'. However, the relationship between positive or negative representations was not analogous to the rank given to each national outgroup. For example, even though representations of the English and the Americans included some negative information, their rank amongst the rest of the nationalities indicated that they were more liked than the Swiss or the Israelis for whom pupils had only positive things to say. This seemingly apparent discrepancy between cognition and affect, could also indicate that in representations the two are interlinked. In line with this finding, the qualitative analysis indicated some 'rules' that pupils' employed to represent national outgroups and which perhaps point towards more nuanced interpretations of their representations.

Using rules to represent national outgroups, friends and enemies

One of the most interesting findings from the interviews before the curricular intervention was that, during our discussions about national outgroups, pupils were quite eloquent as to *why* they liked or disliked them. Thus, they revealed some of the rules they employed to represent others and to reach their decisions when evaluating or ranking them. I conceptualised 'rules' or 'criteria' by which pupils made decisions in the form of continua between bipolar opposites:

a. *familiarity-unfamiliarity:* Pupils would link their attitudes towards a particular people, with how much they thought they knew or didn't know about them, leading to positive or negative attitudes accordingly. This rule did not apply for the Turks.

b. *similarity-dissimilarity:* With the second rule, pupils were systematically disposed more positively towards the people they perceived more similar and more negatively to those perceived dissimilar to their ingroup.

c. *threat and danger/benefits and advantages:* The third rule was linked to whether national groups were perceived as threatening and dangerous or beneficial and advantageous to the pupils personally, to their national ingroup (both Cyprus and Greece) or to other national groups, in the past or in the present. This rule showed pupils' 'utilitarian' or 'instrumental 'thinking' in the sense that, pupils regarded positively peoples whom they thought they could or had gained something from, and negatively those peoples who could be or had been a threat. In either case, pupils 'measured' liking of the various peoples according to perceived personal or national gains.

d. *negative-positive characteristics:* The fourth rule referred to positive or negative characteristics ascribed to a particular group to justify pupils' positive and negative attitudes respectively. Though in this case the pupils did not comment on how this particular characteristic benefited or threatened them as they did with the previous rule. With the positive-negative characteristics rule, the source was stereotypical knowledge about national groups, who were judged according to, and only because of, how they 'are'.

These rules were thus activated by pupils in their efforts to represent national outgroups and perhaps they support the argument, that pupils did not have complete representations about many of the national outgroups included in the instruments. Thus, in their effort to respond to the task, and faced with a lack of information, the use of the rules could be viewed as cognitive strategies of simplification of the information available, and of the facilitation of pupils' thinking so helping them to process the available information and reach a 'decision' about each nationality. For example, both schema research and social representations emphasise the use of 'cognitive shortcuts', or 'heuristics' in the processing of social information (*c.f.* Augoustinos & Walker, 1995).

The use of these four rules became particularly clear when Greeks and Turks were discussed. The findings suggest a bipolarity between the national groups of the Greeks (ingroup) and the Turks (enemy). Given the way other nationalities were positioned along a continuum between the two poles of Greek and Turk

(see Tables 1 and 2), it could be argued that the social representation of national identity by Greek-Cypriot pupils could have a bipolar opposite as its *figurative nucleus*. This is understood as 'an image structure that reproduces a conceptual structure in a visible manner' (Moscovici, 1981 as cited in Lloyd & Duveen, 1992, p. 22). Lloyd & Duveen (1992) confirm this in their study of social representations of gender in pre-school settings, where the image of gender is represented as a bipolar opposition, a binary that may serve as a mechanism of clarity and simplicity of the social world, consistent with children's capacity for cognitive elaboration (Lloyd & Duveen, 1992). Similarly, pupils in this study may use the Greek-Turk bipolar as a tool to construct and structure the representation of national identity, drawing upon the historical context discussed in the first part of this paper.

The pre-test data showed that when pupils evaluated national groups, the Turks were the least preferred, whereas the Greeks were the most favoured. In the interviews, pupils repeated this process; the Greeks and the Turks were actually the first groups the pupils knew how to evaluate or hierarchise. It seemed helpful for them to position the Greeks first, the Turks last, and from there onwards continued to engage with the task of positioning the remaining national groups between the two poles. It was also particularly interesting to find out that the Turkish people were often used as a measure of comparison for other peoples and a standpoint from which attitudes towards other peoples, positive or negative, could be adopted:

> *Res:* Let's go to the Russians, which [degree of liking] for them?
> *Gea:* 'A lot'…[…]
> *Sofia:* Because they are not as bad as the Turks.
> *Gea:* They have got good upbringing […] (Grade 5B)

> *Soula:* […] because they [the French] are…they haven't done anything to us, they haven't beaten us nor enslaved us like the Turks. (Grade 5E)

> *Gea:* [Germans] They are a bit like the Turks.
> *Res:* How do you mean?
> *Gea:* In how they brought so much hatred amongst countries, they killed (Grade 5B)

The Turkish national group was thus a tool pupils used to represent other national groups too. The representation of the Turks was actually one of the richest in content. Both groups of pupils expressed views against the Turks, which

stemmed from the historical narrative the Greek-Cypriots have constructed over the years against the Ottomans and particularly after 1974. From the four 'rules' distinguished above, the only ones used by pupils to justify their views of the Turks were the 'negative characteristics' and 'possible disadvantages'. The 10-year-olds, for example, referred to the Turks being 'dirty', 'uncivilised', 'naughty', 'wiseguys', or described action which 'proved' them to be strong-minded, stubborn, conceited, war-friendly, troublemakers, oppressors and a very strong enemy. Their 'character' was also often implied in references to what they had done to Cyprus in the past, during and after 1974.

Thus, the reference to 'disadvantages' was also a rule abundantly used: pupils justified their views with reference to the Turkish invasion in 1974 and the subsequent problems of the occupation of half of the island, the refugees, the dead and missing persons, the destruction of property and cultural/religious monuments, the restriction of movement to the occupied areas, the enclaved Greek-Cypriots in the occupied areas, the influx of Turkish settlers and army to the occupied areas and the recent (at the time) arrest of some Greek-Cypriots who crossed the Buffer Zone. These negative experiences were 'extrapolated' into the future, as pupils thought that these could be repeated and were attributed singularly to the enemy's 'violent character'; there was no reference to Greeks' or Greek-Cypriots' responsibilities in the Cyprus problem. The reaction of the group from Grade 5E is quite indicative of this rhetoric:

Res:	OK, what about the Turks?
All:	'Not at all'!!!
Res:	Why [did you choose this degree of liking?]?
Petro:	Because they occupied half of our Cyprus, they still have it
Soula:	They've got our missing persons, we don't know what happened, maybe they tortured them, may be they married them with Turkish girls, they won't let us see them, and this is unfair, we tell them what happened with some Turks that we caught, they steal our houses, our fortunes, our cultural heritage…
Oli:	They put their stables in our churches, they broke some of the ancient statues and some others they altered and they said they were theirs.
Soula:	Our crosses, they threw them away […]
Petro:	And because they took half of Cyprus, they took the crosses from our churches and they pulled the eyes out from the icons
Oli:	They changed the names of the streets and they put fake street names, so that we are not able to tell if they are them.
Mara:	'Not at all', because they took our land, and they could blackmail

us, ask 'Where is your house?' and then hurt us, throw stones at us, on the windows.

Soula: Like the Turks did not come with peaceful but with war aims, instead of white doves and with love, they came with hatred and war, with fires. (Grade 5E)

There were also instances of verbal abuse to the degree of hatred:

Joe: I hate them…they are such wiseguys […]
Tim: Isn't there anything worse than 'not at all' to choose for the Turks? (laughter by rest) We've got so much hatred for them!!! (Grade 5F)

The 'enemy effect' was anticipated to reveal a *homogeneous* representation of Turks that all pupils would share; however there were a few occasions when more positive attitudes were expressed (i.e. liking them 'a little' instead of 'not at all' was chosen) or where some 'differentiation' within the Turkish nation was accepted. This occurred when it was considered that sharing their desk with a Turkish child was not so horrible, since it was a child. The following example indicates the 'struggle' in the particular group's discussions caused by the fact that they were asked about a child and that the child was Turkish:

Sofia &
Aris: 'Not at all', 'not at all'!
Gea: 'Medium'…since children are not very…[…] are not very…
Aris: 'Not at all'!
Sofia: Because it's not children who harmed us, it's Denktash [Turkish-Cypriot leader at the time]…[…]
Gea: Children are more sensitive, because their mind is not on war, on evil things.
Leo: Pupils are like friends, because they don't know that we don't want them because the Turks did so may bad things to us!
Res: Aha…what were you saying Ari?
Aris: I think that when they grow up they…
Sofia: They'll understand…
Leo: They'll do the same…
Aris: They'll do the same, too.
Res: The same what?
Aris: With the Turks.
Sofia: With the grownups. […]

Gea:	They won't be sitting next to us, we won't want to share our desk with them when they grow older [..]
Aris:	Because they can become the same too […] If they are not able to conquer Cyprus, they may make war and [the kid will] be against you…(Grade 5B)

Pupils' peer-group identity momentarily challenged the *homogeneous* representation of the Turks, as Turkish pupils were viewed as harmless. Most of the groups however concluded that as grownups, Turkish pupils would not behave any differently from Turkish adults.

At the other end of the bipolar were the Greeks. Pupils' perceived similarity and familiarity with the people in question were put forward to justify why they liked Greeks 'very much'. Thus, this discussion also revealed what these 10-year-olds perceived as 'the substance' of their own national identity, an identity they shared with the Greeks. The examples below are similar to the discussions with all groups:

Res:	OK, Let's go to the Greeks, which card [of degree of liking] would you like to use for them?
All:	'Very much'!!!
Res:	Why?
Sofia & Gea:	We are the same!
Sofia:	We've got the same blood as them…
Gea:	…and we have got the same language, too.
Leo:	It's like we are living together…
Gea:	The same culture, habits, customs…(Grade 5B)
Joe:	'Very much' to the Greeks.
Res:	Why?
Joe:	Because they are like us.
Res:	Meaning?
Joe:	They believe in the same religion, but their language is a bit different?
Res:	Yeah, a little bit different.
Vera:	But we can still understand each other
Tim:	We almost agree…our religion….
Joe:	The things we do…
Tim:	We agree in almost everything! (Grade 5F)

Explanations of the pupils' attitudes towards Greeks also revealed their thinking on several aspects of their own national identity: common kinship and descent, common bonds of blood, religion, language, culture, habits and customs (see also Philippou, 2005b). These components indicated the *Hellenocentrism* which permeated pupils' talk of their national identity, when the latter was associated with the Greeks. Pupils would refer to them as another people ('they'=outgroup), but also as part of their own national identity, as an ingroup. Justifying their Greek identity thus, also revealed pupils' attitudes towards the Greeks, or this identity itself became a reason for viewing the Greeks with positive terms.

The qualitative findings presented so far concerned pupils' representations of national outgroups *prior* to the curricular intervention. The analysis of pupils' responses to the interviews and pre-test revealed that they generally held stereotypical views about national outgroups. Pupils' representations for some groups were homogeneous and for others ambiguous. Pupils used some 'rules' to decide whether they 'liked' groups or not and the extreme views they held against some of these groups. The Turks in particular were systematically the least preferred group by the Greek-Cypriot, 10-year-old pupils of the study, who despite their young age, spoke of the Turks with a language of hatred. At the other end of the bipolar were the Greeks, about whom pupils talked with enthusiasm. 'Greekness' was construed in essentialised, primordial and a-historical terms of kinship and blood bonds, as well as ethno-cultural, religious and historical commonalities. These findings are very interesting in and of themselves and indeed provide a wide forum of potential future research. However, in this study national outgroup representations were explored before the intervention programme so as to allow an evaluation of potential changes afterwards amongst the experimental group; therefore it is to these changes that I now turn.

Shifts in pupils' representations of national groups

During post-evaluation, it was found that the representational elements these 10-year-old pupils used about national outgroups remained to a large extent the same; what changed was the quantity and quality of information pupils would provide, a rather anticipated finding as some of the information they had learnt in the meantime surfaced in the post-interviews. A number of studies show that the growth of geographical knowledge in middle childhood is accompanied by the acquisition and elaboration of stereotypes of the people who live in other countries e.g. between 6-10 years of age, there is an increase in the knowledge about groups of foreign people, an increase accompanied by a decline in negative affect towards them (Barrett, 2005).

More particular, and with regards to the national groups in the focus of this study, pupils' views of the English remained *ambiguous-conflictual*, with no particular new information, apart from reference to the British Bases in Cyprus that the pupils opposed and to their culture as 'very developed'. Representational elements of the Germans were also ambiguous, but remained dominated by references to the Second World War and how Germany was a strong and threatening country then. However, the experimental group referred to them as a people with a very developed culture, and stereotypically considered 'most of them […] disciplined'. The control group talked in more detail about Adolph Hitler and resented the German role in the War and against the Jews. Even though they were more verbally abusive against them than the experimental group (using terms like 'spiteful', 'arrogant' to describe them), the control group also mentioned that 'now Germany is a bit developed' and 'Germans are good now', which probably also derived from their Geography lessons.

Pupils also continued to have conflicting views about the Americans: sometimes viewing them as entertainers and at other times as powerful oppressors, an image which had become more salient in the media at the time because of the war in Yugoslavia. Both groups considered them as a warlike people and a country where a lot of crime occurs. As far as the Israelis were concerned, the experimental group viewed them as 'faithful to God', but explained that they were not Christians and that they 'make various wars, they are a fanatic people'. The control group were more detailed in their views: they stated that Israelis 'make war against the Palestinians' and 'stone pupils'; 'I think Israelis are bad, they don't know what a child or human being means, they think that weapons are important for their lives, tanks, war…'; 'They teach pupils from a young age to wear helmets, guns, and be at war'; ' when something happens and I quarrel with a friend, they are like somebody who would come and mingle in the fight…that's why [we don't like them]'.

Representations of the Japanese also remained *ambiguous* during post-evaluation, since both control and experimental groups referred to them again as warriors and inventors. The experimental group specifically referred to how 'they did various bad things to other countries in the Second World War' and the control group described them as entertainers. The latter also laughed at their religion: thinking they were 'Muslims'. They thought it was absurd that 'they believe in statues and cows'. For the Russians, again the experimental group thought that they had a developed culture and did not mention any negative information. Conversely, the control group was very negative against them, and apart from a Eurovision song, which they liked, they portrayed the Russians as a cause of killings and damage to Greece, as well as a powerful country which abuses its power against others. For this reason they paralleled them to the Turks.

The representational elements identified for the rest of the people indicated somewhat more *homogeneous* representations; these were negative for the Arabs, Bulgarians and Gypsies and positive towards the French and the Swiss. As in the pre-interviews, references to the Arabs remained homogeneous and negative; despite their being taught about their religion and culture in History, both experimental and control groups asked whether they were Muslims, and when I responded that they were, they reacted with statements like 'we don't like them then'. References to their cultural achievements were not made, but they did draw from the History lessons to 'confirm' their negative views about them explaining that 'in the ancient times they almost conquered Europe, they threatened them and if it weren't for the Byzantines and French, they would have taken Europe'. They also repeated their beliefs that Arabs were 'black' and 'dirty'.

In the case of the Bulgarians, pupils rarely referred to what they had learnt about them in History and repeated what they mentioned in the pre-interviews; the information they added was mainly negative. The experimental group referred to some crimes they had seen on the news and generalised from them, saying that Bulgarians have no manners or 'much culture' since 'most of the times when we see on the TV that somebody killed someone, it's a Bulgarian that did it…stuff like that'. The control group justified their negative views with local incidents of home violence or marriage break up, which they attributed to the employment of Bulgarian women as housemaids. The control group was the only one to refer to Byzantium: 'They may have caused wars against us in the Byzantine times, but now we go there for tourism'. It is important to note that there were no positive references to them, in contrast to the pre-interviews; the representations indicated this time a homogenous and negative representation of the Bulgarians.

Gypsies were also negatively evaluated; the experimental group again referred to their 'non-developed' cultures but there was also some protest that their decision should really depend on the particular person who was to sit with them. They felt that their knowledge that they wear jewellery and old clothes was insufficient on which to base a decision. Finally, Rea mentioned their being poor as a pejorative characteristic while smiling in embarrassment. The control group's tone was aggressive toward the Gypsies, accusing them of being 'liars', 'thieves', 'beggars', 'frauds'. Their lifestyle (tents, food, fortunetelling, sitting cross-legged, smoking, wearing flip-flops) was found despicable, rendering them 'black' and 'ugly'. Some pupils were talking from personal experience, which made them talk with intensity.

Both groups held positive views about the French. The experimental group referred to their 'very developed culture', that they liked their language and the fact that they were good at football in the 1998 World Cup. Both groups referred to them as 'civilised' and 'hospitable', but the control group also had the opinion

that France was 'one of the most beautiful countries in the world' as it has many sights which, unlike the pre-interview, they could now name: 'the Eiffel Tower, the Louvre, many museums'. Neither group could mention a lot of information about the Swiss, but what they did mention was positive. The experimental group was anxious because they did not know much about them, and were restricted to mentioning their 'developed culture' and 'nice sights'. The control group referred to them as hospitable.

Overall, the experimental group kept referring to 'developed culture' to evaluate other peoples positively. Their perceived lack of knowledge was also very important to them in making decisions and raised some interesting questions: were pupils more reluctant because they knew less about these peoples? Or by being aware that they were using stereotypes this made them feel too uncomfortable to contribute to the discussion? Also, pupils' refusal to follow the original task (which I discuss later in the paper) made this task very brief with the experimental group and did not allow for many stereotypes to surface. This cannot mean, however, that their stereotypes ceased to exist, as indicated by the fact that stereotypes appeared in their discussion on other occasions.

Pupils (particularly from the control group) seemed to have more sophisticated information. However, they 'filtered' this information to support the attitude they held initially towards the various groups. The more 'positive' information of the programme about the Bulgarians or the Arabs, for example, was not used by the experimental group. The information about European groups in both the official curriculum and curricular intervention was reconstructed in ways (positive or negative) which would better accommodate them in their existing representations. In social representations theory terms, the new information acquired by pupils was *anchored* in their existing representations, without challenging the latter. New information seemed peripheral to pupils' existing views of each nationality.

Shifts in the use of rules to represent national groups

The enhanced sophistication of the representational elements produced by the control group and the experimental group's hesitation in responding to this task was more systematically highlighted by the examination of how the 'rules' were used in the post-interviews. These four rules continued to guide pupils' views of national outgroups. However there were some disruptions, which indicated the impact of the programme.

a. familiarity-unfamiliarity: This rule remained intact for the control group in the post-interviews. The experimental groups however were more hesitant than

the controls in selecting and expressing an attitude towards a national group, if they did not know something specific about them. When they did make a choice, this was more positive than the control group's:

Gea: Then both should be in the same category, either both in 'a lot' or both in 'medium'.
Res: Who?
Gea: The Japanese and the Turks.
Res: Why both together?
Gea: Well, because we don't know many things about their culture, to be able to say if we don't like them 'at all' or whatever, and, well, …that's it! […]
Res: Aha, the Germans?
Leo: 'A lot'.
Gea: 'A lot', and the Japanese 'a lot' I think […]
Res: So, why these people [showing the cards] under 'a lot' and these to 'very much'? How are they different?...I mean, why Greeks, French, English, Americans and Russians under 'very much' and Turks, Germans, Japanese, Bulgarians, Swiss, Israelis and Gypsies to 'a lot'…Gea…what do you say?
Gea: Well, the Greeks French, English, Americans and Russians have got a very developed culture, a known culture to the whole world.

Sofia: (in protest) But Switzerland and Bulgaria and Germany have got a developed culture, why not put them to 'very much' as well?
Gea: But we don't know many things about their cultures…
Sofia: We don't know them very well…we are not sure[…]
Gea: Miss, the Germans and the Swiss have got a very developed culture, too, like these countries…
Res: …but they got into 'a lot'…
Leo: We don't know them very well like the Greeks, the French… (Grade 5B)

Even though Gea uses her lack of knowledge to justify the relatively low ranking of the Germans and the Swiss in the task, in comparison with the Greeks and the French, the group was still more positive than in the pre-interview. Their difficulty to reach a decision was exactly as a result of their awareness of their lack of familiarity with the national groups. In consequence, unfamiliarity was not accepted as an adequate criterion to adopt a particular attitude. For example, when this particular group was asked to put the nationalities in order of preference, their

first reaction was to choose the Greeks first, calling on their better knowledge of them. There was however some protest:

All:	Greeks
Sofia:	Well yes, but we can put a foreign country first too, because the Greeks, we put them first all the time.
Gea:	Yes, but it's them we want to put first, because we know them more.
Sofia:	Well yes, but why shouldn't we want some foreigners as well, why don't we know them, so we should learn about them too!
Leo:	Yes, but if we don't put the Greeks first, then where are we going to put them?
Gea:	Yes, since…we were supposed to want to become an island of Greece very much.
Leo:	And we are supposed to have the English too…
Sofia:	OK (hesitantly), put them there…

In the above incident, the other pupils had to call on the *Hellenocentric* identity narrative to persuade Sofia to put the Greeks first in preference. Her disagreement is important in that it revealed her questioning of the group being positive towards the Greeks all the time and of the fact that they need to learn more about other national groups as well, since not knowing them meant liking them less than the Greeks. When, during the same task, Gypsies were put last in preference by this group, soon followed by Turks and Israelis as last, the rule of 'familiarity-unfamiliarity' was again mobilised:

Sofia:	Well, because we know nothing, we haven't learnt anything about them […]
Gea:	Because we think their cultures are not civilised, we don't know them well like the others.
Sofia:	(in protest) It's got nothing to do with culture, it's related to the person you are going to sit with, say for the Gypsies, we know nothing about them, I don't know them very well, I know them very little, I know nothing about them, say we know that they wear some clothes…
Aris:	…which are worn out…
Sofia:	Yeah, jewellery, loads on their body, Israelis, we know very few people, that they are faithful to God, like…but not Christians, and the Turks, they believe in mosques, they haven't believed in the real God yet.

In this 'outburst', Sofia reveals some stereotypical knowledge about the nationalities in question, but is also critical of this information and considers it inadequate to determine a choice of attitude. This indicates a lack of 'trust' of her 'knowledge'. Later:

Res: For what reasons?...Leo…?
Leo: Well, for the Germans and the Swiss we know almost the same things, and before that we put them all together, the Turks with the Bulgarians, they are almost in the same category…we know the same stuff.
Res: If you learnt more about these peoples, the Germans, the Swiss etc, would their position change?
Sofia: Yes, for sure!
Aris: May be.
Sofia: It would surely change, because we don't know very much about them yet, we haven't studied Germany yet [at school] so that we [could] know many things, if we were a German child….
Leo: We know fewer things…
Sofia: ….we wouldn't say these things, we may put Greeks last. (Grade 5B)

Res: What did you think…why did you say 'not at all'? [to Pete]
Lia: He [Pete] might have thought that if we shared our desk with him, he might do something to us…because he doesn't know us very well and…
Akis: But when we get to know him, it will be all right. (Grade 5C)

Sofia's hypothesis, apart from the potential of improving attitudes after learning more about the people in question, also revealed an ability to think from the point of view of other peoples. There was a realisation that if they were of different nationality, their attitudes towards others, particularly the Greeks, would be different. Pupils considered changing their attitude to the positive, if they learnt more things about a particular nationality, but were also more positive when they did not know a lot about them. It is noted that this rule was the dominant (i.e. the most frequent out of the four) 'rule' which the experimental group used.

b. *similarity-dissimilarity:* It is interesting that the two experimental groups, from Grades 5A and 5B, did not utilise the similarity-dissimilarity type of rule in the post interviews to justify their answers. However, this rule remained the most

frequently used rule by the control groups, particularly in their talk about the Greeks.

c. threat and danger/benefits and advantages: Pupils would again consider some relations or contact with some 'conditions' of advantages: economic relations, political-military support, opportunity of travel, experience and learning, i.e. circumstances which entailed some kind of benefit for them personally or their ingroup. Thus, this rule was used in the same way as in the pre-interview, but was now supported by the most sophisticated information pupils had acquired in the meantime about each national outgroup. The experimental group reduced the use of this utilitarian rule in their post-interviews, whereas the control group used it more. It is also interesting to note the distinction made by some pupils in the examples above between 'past' and 'present' behaviour of, for example, the Bulgarians or the English: their 'better' behaviour today was used to justify more positive attitudes that their 'past' behaviour would not justify.

d. negative-positive characteristics: Pupils continued to refer to positive and negative characteristics to justify their views. These characteristics were drawn from more sophisticated (in comparison with the pre-interviews), and at times more 'extreme', stereotypical knowledge about them. An interesting comparison between experimental and control groups, is that the former decreased their references to negative characteristics, whereas such talk was more salient by the control group. However, when they used this rule, both groups seemed to talk less about positive characteristics and referred to the negative characteristics they thought each national group had.

Becoming aware of stereotypical thinking

The discussion of pupils' beliefs about the national outgroups in question and the ways in which they used the rules in the post-interviews indicated some slight changes or disruptions from what had occurred in the pre-evaluation. A more striking finding, however, occurred when the experimental groups showed they were conscious of the fact that this task 'made' them use stereotypes they had about these peoples. This realisation took two forms.

First, the experimental group would at times object to the process of hierarchising peoples. They would sometimes express difficulty in doing so and would ask to 'interact' with the task and put groups of peoples in order, instead of all the individual national groups. For example, Grade 5A took the initiative of

using the 5 cards with the degree of liking ('not at all', 'a little' etc.) as categories under which they placed the peoples in question. The criterion of responding to this task thus became which category was more 'suitable' for 'groups' of nationalities, rather than evaluating each national group individually. Grade 5B followed the same procedure when evaluating groups and also 'interfered' with their hierarchisation: after they had completed the ranking starting with the Greeks and finishing with Gypsies (with considerable protest by Sofia for leaving the Turks third before last), Gea had some doubts:

Gea:	No, miss, I think these are almost in the same order…[putting Gypsies and the Israelis on the same level of hierarchy with the Turks]
Res:	Like that?
All:	Yes.
Res:	So, you want the Turks, Israelis and Gypsies in the same order?
All:	Yes. (Grade 5B)

They repeated this process in the other relevant item and put 'Swiss and German together…and Turks and Bulgarians together', because, as Leo explained 'for the Germans and the Swiss we know almost the same things and before when we put them all together again, the Turks and the Bulgarians are almost in the same category…we know the same things'. Grade 5C also put Americans and Japanese together and the Russian and English together. It is interesting to note that in these 'triads' or 'pairs' of national outgroups, pupils mixed cards showing nationalities towards which they were sympathetic as well as those they did not like (as also shown by factor analysis earlier in this paper; see Table 4). These pupils were thus somewhat reflective and questioning of the hierarchisation of national outgroups. Such incidents did not occur in the control group interviews.

Stereotypical knowledge was still drawn upon to justify expressed attitudes towards each people. However, a second sign of the experimental groups becoming aware of the use of stereotypes in their talk was the frequent instances of 'guilty realisation' of the use of such stereotypes, an awareness of generalising some attributes to a whole national group. For example, Rea interrupted the task to say:

Rea:	But miss, these are all stereotypes that we are saying now, aren't they? Because we put the Americans here with the group because the Americans, we hear about crimes for the group, but they are not all…and the little kids, but we put them there because most of the times the States is the country with most crimes, that's why […]

Pambo:	Yeah, we've got stereotypes
Res:	We've got…what…meaning?
Pambo:	Well we've got them.
Res:	So what do we do, what does it mean?
Pambo:	Say, like Rea said for the Americans, it's not all of them that make wars say… (Grade 5A)

Pambo also referred to stereotypes as something he would remember, when asked at the end of the post-focus group interview what they would remember most from the intervention in Geography and History: 'The stereotypes against the Cypriot girl, I will remember that!' (the rest nod in agreement) (Grade 5A). Grades 5A and 5B were thus more hesitant at times to formulate such stereotypes. This led to a difficulty in answering the relevant items, stating that they didn't know a lot, or did not know as much as for other nationalities, so as to confidently select an evaluation card. This was also indicated by the fact that the 'familiarity-unfamiliarity' rule became more salient in the post-interviews for the experimental group than for the control.

To conclude, the experimental group appeared to be more positive towards certain national outgroups in the post-test. They were reluctant to evaluate some nationalities, as they were aware at times that this involved using stereotypes or because they felt they didn't know 'enough'. They at times interfered or questioned the tasks and used the 'negative characteristics' and 'similarity-dissimilarity' rules less. However, the experimental group did not make use of the curricular intervention information on the Bulgarians and the Arabs to 'enrich' their representations. Indeed both groups seemed to use new information to 'confirm' existing representations of nations. However, shifts did occur in their views of the Turks, which is perhaps one of the most important influences of the intervention and to which I turn below.

Other and self: outgroup variability for the Turks?

Pupils' discussions and ranking of national outgroups indicated that they still positioned the Turks and the Greeks at either end of a bipolar continuum. Factor analysis, however, showed that both groups put more peoples in the 'Turk' category (see Tables 4 and 5). The experimental group's 'interference' with the national outgroup evaluation and hierarchisation task during the interviews, in which Turks were ranked alongside others perhaps also points to a de-isolation of the Turks from the rest of the nationalities, since their justifications pointed to how the Turks were also 'human beings' too, and not just enemies. I further explore these issues below.

In the post-interviews, use of the 'negative characteristics' and 'disadvantages' rules, dominated both control and experimental groups' talk about the Turks, as had happened in the first interviews. The arguments referring to the attack on and occupation of half of Cyprus, the refugees, the destruction of cultural heritage were repeated by both groups. The danger the Turkish people constitute for the future of Cyprus, since they were perceived as an 'uncivilised' and strong country, were again brought to the surface:

Res:	So, what about the Turks?
All:	Not at all!!!
Res:	Everybody agrees…why?
Tim:	They invaded us and came and took half of our Cyprus and took our island, our country, and now we are going to offer them hospitality?
Joe:	And as if it's not enough that they took half, they want the other half too, lousy old dogs!!! (Grade 5F)

The group from Grade 5F seemed to be the most verbally aggressive towards other peoples, and particularly against the Turks in the post-interviews. This could be associated with the fact that their school was near a refugee settlement area. Many pupils' parents in school K were Greek-Cypriot refugees since 1974 who could hold much more negative views against the Turks than the rest of the Greek-Cypriots. Petro from Grade 5E was the exception to a rule of negative attitudes towards the Turks and of argumentation which backed up these attitudes by the control group:

Petro:	A little.
Oli:	I think a little.
Soula:	A little…
Res:	Why Petro?
Petro:	I don't know, like, 'cause they conquered us, they are kids too, if we become say friends and not care that they invaded us…become friends, play together…and talk, say if we do Religious Studies, say if the time to study the religion of our Turk desk mate, and then our desk mate must accept to hear about our own religion.
Oli:	We should put 'a little' to the Turk, because they conquered us, took our cultural heritage, put cows in our churches, turned them into stables and I don't like them very much! (laughter by the group) (Grade 5E)

The experimental group also argued against the Turks to justify negative attitudes. However, the dilemma between the fact that they would have to deal with a child, who would however be Turkish, became more salient and caused some strong disagreements by some pupils. Firstly, when the cards with the names of the peoples were spread out on the desk, Sofia commented:

Sofia: Miss…like here where it's got Turk, say what's the little Turks' fault? It's Denktash's [Turkish-Cypriot leader at the time] fault.

Res: OK, let's see the question now […]
All: (Whisper)
Sofia: The Greek [we would like to share our desk with] 'very much'

Gea: No, medium.
Sofia: Medium, medium…the Turks 'a lot', because it's not their fault, it's not them, it's Denktash that took us…[…] the Turks we are sure for 'a lot' because they are good, the little Turks, deep down, they've got a soul too, but Denktash, he doesn't have a soul.[…]a black child went to school where they were all white and nobody wanted it, because it was black…we shouldn't judge only from the outward appearance, but we should see how people are inside. (Grade 5B)

Later on during the discussion, when Sofia realises that the group has left the Turks for last in their order of preference:

Aris: Greeks… English…French…
All: Americans…Russians…
Sofia: Turks!..ehm…no
Aris: Germ…
Leo: The Swiss…
Aris: OK the Swiss, the Germans…
Sofia: The Turks!
Aris: The Japanese…
Sofia: Why, the Turks, they haven't done anything to us the little Turks!

All: (embarrassed laughters)
Aris: Last?
Gea: But we hate them a lot!
Leo: Not last.
Sofia: Not last…ehm…Bulgarians [for last]? I don't know. (Grade 5B)

Scepticism around the Turks also occurred in the other two experimental groups:

Pambo: The Turks that we put in 'not at all', we could have put them in 'medium' or even 'a lot' because…it's not all of them who came and fought us…

Rea: But we hate them!

Sam: It wasn't with their own will …

Res: It wasn't with their own will…of Turkey?

Sam: Not the simple everyday peoples', it was the government's [will]. (Grade 5A)

Akis: I don't want 'not at all', I want 'a little'

Res: You want 'a little'…why?

Akis: 'Cause the little Turks, it's not their fault what happened in Cyprus…it's the grownups' fault, so what's their fault?

Res: So you wouldn't mind having one as your desk mate?

Akis: No. (Grade 5C)

The other three members of this last group agreed with Akis and answered in a very short and neutral way as to why they had still, despite their previous answer, positioned the Turks last amongst the rest of the peoples:

Res: OK…and the Turks last…why?

Pete: (in English) There is a 'problem'!

Res: What 'problem' (in English)?

Pete: The Cyprus problem!!! (laughter from the group) (Grade 5C)

It can be seen that all three experimental groups started not to take their negative attitude against the Turks for granted so much, that there were moments in the interview when they would question or alter their answers-choices. Of course these were only instances and cannot be taken as the rule of the post-evaluation views of the Turks. Such instances, however, also occurred at other points during the interviews where peer-group identity appeared to be stronger than resentment against the Turks. The examples above show that some answers by the control, but more frequently, by the experimental groups, allowed variability within the Turkish nation (differentiating between adults and children, or between the Turkish government/soldiers and ordinary citizens). Experimental pupils' 'awareness' of the use of stereotypes (discussed earlier in the paper), also indicated that they accepted greater variability within the national outgroups in

question than in the first interviews. These pupils' representations of the Turks thus largely remained the same in content, but became more *ambiguous-conflictual*, since some 'anomalies' in the 'enemy rhetoric' occurred during post-evaluation.

Discussion

In order to explore the impact of the curricular intervention on pupils' representations of national outgroups, this study adopted a social psychological point of view. This was required to guide the design of the research instruments and the interpretation of findings. It was also necessitated by the fact that the literature on the EU and education has largely focused on analyses of EU or national official documents and educational policies. Investigations of the possible psychological impact of curricular definitions of the European dimension in school contexts have largely been absent from the literature, thereby leaving several unanswered questions as to the value of such interventions amongst children. This is rather paradoxical, as the key aim of education, as articulated by the EU during the last 30 years, has been the development of a European identity and citizenship amongst children and adolescents (Lewicka-Grisdale & MacLaughlin, 2002). This study aimed to address this gap by developing, implementing and evaluating the impact of such a curricular intervention. Particularly in the highly sensitive areas of identity, including children's representations of national others, on which the future of multicultural societies may rest, curricular interventions in conflict societies such as that of Cyprus or others elsewhere could provide ample evidence on which future curriculum development could rely.

The analysis of the pre-evaluation data showed the prejudiced and stereotyped way in which Greek-Cypriot pupils represented a number of national outgroups. Using terminology from social representations theory as an analytical language, it is argued that the *figurative nucleus* of the social representation of national others forms a bi-polar at the positive and negative ends of which are the Greeks and the Turks respectively. Between these two extremes were positioned the remaining national outgroups included in the research instruments, hierarchised by pupils on the basis of various rules-criteria. However, representations were both *ambiguous* and *homogeneous*. Despite their young age, these pupils stated they hated the Turks and had strong (and at times shocking) views against them and other national outgroups; religion was a decisive factor to these views. The Turks were thus the least preferred peoples, always at the bottom of the hierarchy.

This finding seems to confirm the 'enemy' effect identified amongst Greek, Turkish and English pupils by Buchanan-Barrow *et al*. (1999), where pupils displayed greater negativity towards the outgroup traditionally represented as 'the enemy' by their own ingroup. Despite their limited knowledge of many peoples, pupils expressed preferences with certainty. Findings of earlier studies that pupils seemed to know more about people they liked and less about people they didn't like (for example by Lambert & Klineberg, 1967) were not verified here. On the contrary, pupils were able to provide more information about the Turks, the Germans and the Gypsies, whom they least liked than about people they were more positive towards, like the French or the English. Similarly, Johnson, Middleton & Tajfel (1970) found that the relationship between attitudes and knowledge was curvilinear: pupils knew more about the countries they liked rather than those they disliked, but least about those they felt neutral about.

Post-evaluation showed that the pupils who experienced the intervention materials were cautious in referring to stereotypes, were not as verbally abusive as the control group, showed instances of empathetic understanding, evaluated national outgroups more positively and grouped them into geographically 'mixed' categories. They occasionally accepted greater variability not only within other national outgroups, but also within the 'Other –enemy', the Turks. These shifts could indicate some 'anomalies' in the enemy rhetoric, a softening of their views, a weakening of the boundaries they constructed to differentiate 'Us' and 'Them', even when the latter referred to the Turks, which is perhaps one of the most significant influences of the intervention. As I argue elsewhere drawing upon additional instruments of pre-and post-evaluation in this study, these anomalies became more frequent when Turkey was viewed within the European context, for which the European prospect was now not 'forbidden': the experimental group drew from the programme's reference on EU membership criteria to accept as well as 'condition' Turkey's membership (Philippou, 2005c).

The curricular intervention did not aim to make pupils insecure about their national identities nor uncritically 'European'. On the contrary, national history and European geography were employed to encourage pupils' thinking about their identities, and, in the Cypriot context, to tackle even attitudes towards the Turks. There was some evidence to show that these pupils started to be more reflective and questioning of the issues in question. The European dimension, and more particularly the principles employed in this curricular intervention (*c.f.* Philippou, 2005a), could thus prove useful to those teachers, policy-makers or curriculum developers who would like to challenge nationalistic bias in school curricula or Eurocentric approaches to the European dimension and who would like to implement it cross-curricularly, contextualise it in their national context and explore its pedagogic potential, while adhering to the predominantly subject-based structure of current curricula.

In addition, what has been learnt in terms of pupils' representations in this study could arguably inform future policy and curricula content on stereotypes. For example, recognition of outgroup and ingroup variability could be enhanced by focusing on everyday people, peers and subgroups (since pupils in this study tended to differentiate such groups from the 'whole' group) rather than politicians, historical figures, war events etc. Such material would encourage constructions of 'everyday' as opposed to 'symbolical' others and of ambiguous-conflictual, rather than negative-homogeneous, representations of national others. This study also indicated pupils' ability to recognise the use of stereotypes as well as their meaning and repercussions on the ways in which others are represented. This programme was taught for only 11.42% of total school hours for a period of four months. Future research could explore the impact of similar or other curricular interventions in the field of stereotypes, prejudice and racism to encourage cultural tolerance and understanding. These issues are currently highly topical across the divide in Cyprus, as both Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot educational systems have been engaged in a long-standing debate about revising curricula and textbooks in ways contributing to a peaceful future in Cyprus, especially in social studies subjects.

The findings presented in this paper have limitations, to be sure: this was not a representative sample of pupils. The pupils who participated were those whose teachers agreed to participate as experimental or control classes in the research project. In addition, the reported shifts by no means suggest that all participating pupils progressed in the ways that they viewed national outgroups. However, these findings do provide some insights into how pupils in Cyprus think and talk about national outgroups, and provide some conceptual tools for future research and curriculum development. Indeed, my argument in this paper is not that the program was equally effective with all pupils, but that, in a conflict-ridden and divided society, it succeeded to *some* extent and among *some* pupils in shifting extreme representations of national outgroups. Social developmental research could compare the ways pupils construct social representations of national outgroups at different ages and in other countries (and across the divide in Cyprus) and how these would be similar or different to the findings elicited during pre-evaluation in this study, in order to explore how children negotiate diverse sociocultural contexts, in- and out-of-school curricula, to construct their identities. To this effect, for example, I have returned to the same school sites and collected data in the school year 2007-08, in order to compare the pre-evaluation data presented in this paper with the new set of data; the aim is to explore and account for the changing context and how this may be reflected in children's discourses in the period between the two studies, a period during which numerous social, political and cultural challenges attendant to issues of identity and diversity have become quite salient in Cyprus.

The study supports social constructivist arguments that education and curricula can play a critical role in developing democratic societies that support and respect national outgroups, within national or regional borders. The European dimension was conceptualised as a subtle approach (within a war-stricken country) to alleviate nationalistic bias in two specific subject areas and to moderate pupils' extreme views. This study has indicated the potential of the European dimension as a curricular tool against ethnocentrism. In a Greek-Cypriot context where 'Europe' tends to be a 'normativity' in the road to modernity (Argyrou, 1996) and where the 'Other=Turk=Islam' is polarised and at times demonised, the European dimension might be useful to hybridise 'European' identity so as to include the 'Others'. The shifts identified in this paper might point towards the potential of curricula, as part of the social context, in providing children with a wider range of 'tools' with which to represent others and themselves. This is significant not only in Europe, but for young people growing up in increasingly inter- and intra-connected regions of the globe.

Stavroula Philippou *is Assistant Professor (Curriculum & Instruction) with the Department of Education Sciences at the European University, Cyprus. E-mail: S.Philippou@euc.ac.cy*

References

Argyrou, V. (1996) *Tradition and Modernity in the Mediterranean: the Wedding as Symbolic Struggle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Augoustinos, M. & Walker, I. (1995) *Social Cognition; an Integrated Introduction*. London: Sage Publications.

Barrett, M. (2005) Children's understanding of, and feelings about, countries and national groups. In M. Barrett & E. Buchanan-Barrow (eds) *Children's Understanding of Society*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Barrett, M. & Short, J. (1992) Images of European people in a group of 5-10-year-old English schoolchildren, *British Journal of Developmental Psychology,* Vol.10(4), pp.339-363.

Bar-Tal, D. & Teichman, Y. (2005) *Stereotypes and Prejudice in Conflict: Representations of Arabs in Israeli-Jewish society.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bennett, M., Sani, F., Lyons, E. & Barrett, M. (1998) Children's subjective identification with the group and in-group favouritism, *Developmental Psychology,* Vol.34(5), pp.902-909.

Billig, M. (1995) *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage Publications.

Breakwell, G. M. (2001) Social representational constraints upon identity processes. In

K. Deaux & G. Philogène (eds) *Representations of the Social*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Buchanan-Barrow, E., Bayraktar, R., Papadopoulou, A. Short, J. Lyons, E. & Barrett, M. 1999) Children's representations of foreigners. Paper presented at 9th European Conference on Developmental Psychology. Greece: Spetses.

Cairns, E. (1996) *Children and Political Violence*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Constantinou, C. M. & Papadakis, Y. (2001) The Cypriot state (s) in situ: cross ethnic contact and the discourse of recognition, *Global Society,* Vol.15(2), pp.125-148.

Hansen, P. (1998) Schooling a European identity: ethno-cultural exclusion and nationalist resonance within the EU policy of 'The European dimension in education', *European Journal of Intercultural Studies,* Vol.9(1), pp.5-23.

Ioannidou, E. (2004) On language and identity among Greek Cypriot students, *The Cyprus Review,* Vol.16(1), pp.29-51.

Johnson, N. B., Middleton, M. R. & Tajfel, H. (1970) The relationship between children's preferences for and knowledge about other nations, *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology,* Vol.9, pp.232-240.

Jost, J. T. & Ignatow, G. (2001) What we do and don't know about the functions of social representations. In K. Deaux & G. Philogene (eds) *Representations of the social*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Keating, A., Hinderliter Ortloff, D. & Philippou, S. (2009) Introduction: Citizenship Education Curricula: changes and challenges in global and European integration, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Vol.41(2), pp.145-158.

Kizilyürek, N. & Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis, M. (1997) An analysis of the Cyprus conflict: its structure and causes. In H. J. Axt & H. Brey (eds) *Cyprus and the European Union, New chances for solving an old conflict?* München: Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft.

Koutselini, M., Neophytou, L., Taliadoros, G. & Mylonas, G. (2002) Preferences and coexistence readiness with foreigners who live in Cyprus today and with foreigners in general: a study of the perceptions of Cypriot students in the 6th grade of the primary school. In A. Gagatsis, L. Kyriakides, N. Tsaggaridou, H. Phtiaka & M. Koutsoulis (eds.) *Proceedings of the 7th Pancyprian Conference of the Cyprus Pedagogical Association: Educational research in the globalisation era (Vol. 1)*. Nicosia: University of Cyprus. [in Greek]

Lambert, W. E. & Klineberg, O. (1967) *Children's Views of Foreign Peoples*. New York: Meredith Publishing Company.

Lewicka-Grisdale, K. & McLaughlin, T.H. (2002) Education for European identity and European citizenship. In J. Ibanez-Martin & G. Jover (eds) *Education on Europe: Policies and Politics*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lloyd, B. & Duveen, G. (1992) *Gender Identities and Education; the Impact of Starting School*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Middleton, M.R., Tajfel, H. & Johnson, N.B. (1970) Cognitive and affective aspects of children's national attitudes, *British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology,* Vol.9, pp.122-134.

Moscovici, S. (1973) Foreword. In C. Herzlich, *Health and illness*. London: Academic Press.

Moscovici, S. (1988) Notes towards a description of social representations, *European Journal of Social Psychology,* Vol.18, pp.211-250.

Nóvoa, A. & Lawn, M. (2002) Introduction: fabricating Europe: the formation of an education space. In A. Nóvoa & M. Lawn (eds) *Fabricating Europe: The Formation of an Education Space*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Pachoulides, K. (2007) *The National Identity of Greek-Cypriots: A Socio-psychological Genetic Approach [in Greek].* Doctoral thesis, Panteion University, Athens.

Papadakis, Y. (1995) Nationalist imaginings of war in Cyprus. In R. Hinde & H. Watson (eds) *War a Cruel Necessity? The Bases of Institutionalized Violence*. London: Tauris Academic Studies.

Papadakis, Y. (2008) Narrative, memory, and history education: a comparison of schoolbooks on the 'History of Cyprus', *History & Memory*, Vol.20(2), pp.128-148.

Philippou, S. (2005a) The 'problem' of a European dimension in education: a principled reconstruction of the Greek Cypriot curriculum, *European Educational Research Journal,* Vol.4(4), pp.343-368.

Philippou S. (2005b) Constructing national and European identities: the case of Greek-Cypriot children, *Educational Studies,* Vol.31(3), pp.293-315.

Philippou, S. (2005c) *What is Europe? Using 'Europe' to challenge understandings of Turkey amongst Greek-Cypriot pupils.* Paper presented at the First All Cyprus Social Sciences and Humanities Conference, Cyprus Academic Forum, Intercollege, Nicosia, Cyprus, 18-19 March 2005.

Philippou, S. (2007) Re-inventing 'Europe': the case of the European dimension in Greek Cypriot curricula of History and Geography, *The Curriculum Journal,* Vol.18(1), pp.57-88.

Philippou, S. (2009) What makes Cyprus European? Curricular responses of Greek Cypriot Civic education to Europe, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Vol.41(2), pp.199-223.

Philippou, S., Keating, A., & Hinderliter Ortloff, D. (2009) Conclusion: citizenship education curricula: comparing the multiple meanings of supra-national citizenship in Europe and beyond, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Vol.41(2), pp.291-299.

Potter, J. (1996) Attitudes, social representations and discursive psychology. In M. Wetherell (ed.) *Identities, Groups and Social Issues*. London: Sage publications.

Shennan M. (1991) *Teaching about Europe*. London: Cassell/Council of Europe.

Spyrou, S. (2001) Those on the other side: ethnic identity and imagination in Greek-Cypriot children's lives. In H. Schwartzman (ed.) *Children and Anthropology: Perspectives for the 21st century*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Spyrou, S. (2002) Images of 'the other': 'The Turk' in Greek-Cypriot children's imaginations, *Race, Ethnicity and Education,* Vol.5(3), pp.255-271.

Sultana, R. G. (1995) A uniting Europe, a dividing education? Supranationalism, Euro-centrism and the curriculum, *International Studies in Sociology of Education,* Vol.5(2), pp.115-144.