Articulating Goals and Monitoring Progress in a Cyprus Conflict Resolution Training Workshop

(From Ross, Marc and Rothman, Jay (eds.) (1999) <u>Theory and Practice </u>in Ethnic Conflict Management: Theorizing Success and Failure London: Macmillan Press)

By Jay Rothman

Introduction

The long-standing conflict in Cyprus presents a unique opportunity for the field of conflict resolution. For the past three decades, conflict resolution experts and theorists have gone to the island of Cyprus with two goals in mind: to attempt some progress in the long stalemate between Greek and Turkish Cypriots and to simultaneously test and refine theory and practice in the field. In effect, the conflict in Cyprus has become an incubator for conflict resolution scholars as they apply their skills to a relatively non-volatile but nonetheless deeply intransigent conflict.

The intervention described in this chapter is distinguished from earlier conflict resolution efforts by its scale and its "multi-track" nature (MacDonald and Diamond, 1993). In 1994 over four months the "Cyprus Conflict Resolution Consortium" conducted over 10 workshops with hundreds of Greek and Turkish Cypriots. The goals and backgrounds of the participants was varied: many were community leaders committed to peaceful paths to peace and seeking an "infusion" of new skills, connections, and inspiration; some were Fulbright students studying for degrees in the U.S., and there were political leaders who came with a mixture of open ears and great skepticism and resistance.

In this chapter I will describe and illustrate how as an action-researcher I sought to help promote reflexive articulation of goals among and between participants and facilitators, and to enhance the participants' reflexive consideration of their experiences during a conflict resolution training workshop. An action-researcher has a double role--undertaking systematic analysis while employing that analysis to enhance self-conscious and effective practice by those being studied (see Lewin, 1951, Kemmis and McTaggart, 1988). Action-research as I employ it is a reflexive process by which the subjects become their own objects of study as participants study their own experience, facilitators their own, and both each others. By reflexive I mean the experience of interactive reflection by, in this case, participants and facilitators, about their respective and shared goals and experiences in such a way that these goals are refined and self-consciousness is promoted (see Rothman, 1997). This experience of playing the role of action-researcher in a conflict where I had previously been a convener proved pivotal in the development of an emerging conflict resolution evaluation methodology called "action-evaluation" (see Rothman, 1997, 1998 and Chapter X).

In this chapter I will describe my first steps and the rationale in the development of a systematic approach to goal setting and evaluation in conflict resolution. This work, which is part of a larger Pew Charitable Trust, sponsored research project on defining and measuring success in conflict resolution, was operationalized initially as part of the "Cyprus Conflict Resolution Consortium" intervention. I will chronicle my efforts in this workshop to assist facilitators and participants in defining and reflecting upon their own goals, designing activities consistent with

them, and promoting active and on-going reflexivity among workshop participants about their experiences. Both of these activities are derived from my own theories of practice as a conflict resolution theorist and practitioner. I believe that much of the richest and most meaningful work in our field comes when all parties involved in conflict resolution become finely attuned to their own and each others' values, assumptions and goals. Indeed, one of the main goals of my own conflict resolution work is to employ conflict as a vehicle for reflection among disputants and facilitated learning by them about shared, unique and contrasting (or opposed) goals, values, beliefs and so forth. In this way insight can be fostered and action taken to ensure that those goals that disputants share are embraced and acted upon, and that those concerns that are different and unique or opposed are surfaced and agreements are reached about what (constructively) to do about them (Rothman, 1992, 1997). In short, that the level of self-consciousness is raised and tacit beliefs and assumptions are converted into explicit communications (see Polyani, 1966). This theory of practice guided my work in this intervention as I switched roles from intervener to action-researcher.

I begin with a brief overview of the Cypriot conflict itself. Next I provide some background for "Cyprus Conflict Resolution Consortium "intervention, describing how Cyprus has long been, for better or worse, international conflict resolution's testing ground (see Mitchell Chapter 2). Then I turn to describing how I worked with the group of interveners and participants attempting to spell out goals and criteria of success in this intervention. I also share some of the data generated in illustrative ways. During this workshop, I experimented with several formats for gathering and using data in an action-research design, which integrated research and practice. The first was asking all interveners and participants to articulate their initial goals for the project, to say why they held them and how they hoped they might be accomplished. Next, in an effort to make research-in this case as active, systematic reflection on goals and experiences--part of participants' practice, participants were guided through a process of active self-reflection and on-line analysis of their own goals and experiences. At the end of each day during the weeklong workshop in which I was involved, several Turkish-Cypriot and Greek-Cypriot participants volunteered to meet to summarize the important insights from the day. They would then organize a presentation for the rest of the group to be shared at the start of the next day's workshop in the form of poems, skits, presentations and journal entries. At the conclusion of the workshop, after struggling with the best way to summarize and evaluate what participants learned, we invited them write letters to themselves, which consisted of reflections on how their own goals changed from the outset of the workshop, and what they felt they gained from their participation. Finally, we attempted to convene a bi-communal research team to conduct and analyze post-workshop data about success.

Overview of Conflict

It should be said about the brief summary of the conflict which follows, that describing the history of protracted ethnic conflicts, like the one in Cyprus, to the mutual satisfaction of all parties is about as difficult as arbitrating an acceptable solution--which is to say, nearly impossible. Each side's own historical descriptions of such conflicts are loaded with diametrically different interpretations of past and future. If there is any historical fact about such conflicts, it is perhaps best found in the intersubjective meanings that may be discovered in exploring the separate interpretations each party has about the conflict--its definition, causes, and possible solutions.

[Ruled for centuries by the Ottoman Empire, Cyprus later became part of the British Empire until independence in 1960...] While various parties trace the origins of the Cyprus conflict differently, its modern expression may be most clearly marked by the uneasy founding of the Republic of Cyprus in 1960. While representatives of both the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities signed the agreements Great Britain, Greece, and Turkey hammered out the year before, they had not participated in the negotiations and had no direct say in the political arrangements for the island. Three years after independence, an uneasy power-sharing relationship between the Greek Cypriots and

Turkish Cypriots broke down. As Wolfe writes:

> From its creation the new regime showed all the signs of succumbing to immobility. In the cabinet, Greek Cypriot ministers accused their Turkish Cypriot colleagues of obstructionism, and the latter retorted that the government circumvented them. The failure to establish constitutionally mandated separate municipalities in the five largest towns brought about the final deadlock, which [President] Makarios sought to resolve in November 1963 through the introduction of constitutional amendments that proved unacceptable to both the Turkish Cypriots and to Turkey.... Civil war erupted (Wolfe (1986: 110).

Tension and hostilities between the communities continued on the island until 1974 when the leaders of an extreme Greek military faction threatened to annex the island, which in response prompted Turkish military intervention. The result was a war followed by the division of the island into two zones one controlled by the Greek Cypriots in the south and one by the Turkish Cypriots in the north, and the transfer of people out of areas in which they were a minority. In 1983, the Turkish Cypriot legislative assembly established the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, a status Greek Cypriots immediately rejected as illegal, and to this day Turkey is the only government which recognizes this fledgling state. Since 1974 repeated attempts to launch meaningful negotiations have ended in stalemate, as each community remains steadfast on its mutually exclusive position--the Greek Cypriot demand for a return to a unified state, and Turkish Cypriot insistence on the creation of two separate federated states. The current situation leaves the island partitioned along an East-West axis known as the "Green Line." The Turkish Cypriot territory makes up 37 percent of the island, and is defended by some 35,000 troops from mainland Turkey. A UN peacekeeping force controls a buffer zone between it and the Greek Cypriot population, and movement across the "green line" by Greek and Turkish Cypriots is greatly restricted (Coughlan, 1992).

Conflict Resolution Efforts in Cyprus

For as long as Cyprus has been divided, outside parties have sought to contribute to conflict resolution there. Dozens of workshops have been run with participants from at all sectors of society--grass roots, professional and political. The first workshop was run in 1964 by some of today's leading figures in the field of conflict resolution--including Chris Mitchell, Herbert Kelman, Roger Fisher, and others (see Chapter2). This workshop, like many in Cyprus that would follow, in effect became a testing ground for conflict resolution scholars as they guided discussions between high level but non-official representatives of the disputing parties in an attempt to engage in "controlled communication"(Burton, 1969). Since then, many others have sought a peaceful resolution of this conflict, including Leonard Doob from Yale University, Ronald Fisher from the University of Saskatchewan, myself, and most recently, Louise Diamond of the Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy and Diana Chigas of the Conflict Management Group, under a major grant from US-AID. I believe these attempts by conflict resolution practitioners have had a mutually positive influence: the often academic third parties have gained invaluable hands-on experience in a complex conflict situation and the recipients have gained important insights, meaningful interactions with colleagues from across the green line, and often emotionally cathartic experiences constructively recalling profound political and emotional traumas dating back to the war of 1974 and before. However, the challenge facing all of these efforts has been making the transfer from the internal or educational affect, to external or political change.

On the other hand while most of these efforts have been well managed and at least internally meaningful for the participants, some of the academic-interveners have erred badly, or at least that is the perception in Cyprus, on the side of "testing" and have given all interventions a bad name. Some five years ago as I was researching the conflict on the island, I was pointedly told by one person I met: "Some years ago one of your ilk ran a so-called 'conflict resolution' workshop with us, promised confidentiality and then proceeded to write a biased and harmful article

about the situation. He should have called it a 'conflict escalation' workshop." While research like this can indeed lead to conflict escalation if perceived as biased or if confidentiality is broken; if done thoughtfully, conflict resolution research can also become a useful tool for constructive change. This can occur when an inclusive process of articulating goals takes place with full input from participants, through engaging them in reflecting upon and telling their own stories about their hopes for reconciliation and peacemaking and how the specific conflict resolution activity they are engaged in may contribute (see Rothman, 1991).Moreover, by helping participants engage in "research" about their goals for and experience in a conflict resolution effort while it is underway, that experience can become more integrated into participants own experiences and "action-learning" (Morgan and Ramirez, 1984).Hopefully, so goes the theory of practice behind many conflict resolution workshop type interventions, as participants in such micro-experiences internalize and become self conscious about such insights such that they can explain them to others, upon "re-entry" to their personal and political lives "back home," they may facilitate a transfer new ideas for peaceful change to the general population or to policy elite (see Fisher, 1996).This "spillover effect" may then help to foster an environment conducive to problem solving and negotiation (see Kelman, 1992).

This kind of interactive research process is all the more important when it comes to the sensitive and potentially loaded issue of evaluation. No one wants someone looking over their shoulder while engaged in delicate online work, especially if they feel they may be poorly evaluated for any "mistakes" or decisions. Moreover, determining what makes a conflict resolution initiative successful is in itself a daunting task. To date there is no agreed-upon standard for what constitutes success (internal, external or both) in ethnic conflict resolution and accordingly, evaluation in this context is akin to shooting at a moving target. Therefore, in addition to interveners' sensitivities about evaluation, how can outside evaluators do their job in good faith if standards for success are so lacking? Thus while the need for effective evaluation is so evident in conflict resolution, carrying it out is often stymied. Only when criteria for success have been richly articulated and agreed upon first and foremost by those conducting and participating in conflict resolution efforts, will it be really possible to evaluate them effectively. Thus, we have pioneered a method, first foreshadowed in this Cyprus workshop, to encourage people within projects to systematically and interactively articulate their goals and criteria for success. These goals as internal criteria-of-success are then used to guide projects as well as provide standards, as these goals evolve and are monitored, for evaluation.

The Cyprus Conflict Resolution Consortium and Action-Evaluation

The Cyprus Conflict Resolution Consortium's intervention, which is my focus here, was a weeklong workshop held in Ledra Palace, an old luxury hotel (now in a decrepit state), in the middle of the no-man's land patrolled by UN peacekeeping forces. It brought together forty community-based representatives of the two sides (i.e. teachers, lawyers, bureaucrats, artists, activists, and so forth) who are divided by the neutral zone and thus have had virtually no contact since the island was partitioned during the 1974 war. This workshop was part of the Consortium's larger project aimed at helping community and political leaders on each side find ways to reach across the divide. In developing a strategy of action-evaluation, I gathered data on workshop goals and reflections on them in four ways during the weeklong session, which I now describe. At the same time it should be clear that while I describe various goals the parties established, the data we collected do not speak to the question of the extent to which either the participants' or interveners' goals were actually met.

Goal-Setting. It should be noted that the data presented below is part of a total "action evaluation" process (see Rothman, 1998) of using goals to help various stakeholders in conflict resolution initiatives articulate success and then compare, monitor and finally assess it within and across their groups (e.g. conveners, participants, funders,

etc.). When this Cyprus workshop was conducted, however, it was still very early in the evolution of action evaluation and in this case the main purpose and use of goal articulation was to encourage the various individuals and stakeholding groups involved to be explicit and self-conscious about their goals. The full action-evaluation process is designed to articulate and analyze shared goals, unique goals and contrasting goals within and across different stakeholding groups. This analysis is then fed back to intervention organizers as they plan next steps in an intervention and attempt to design a process which is responsive to the goals and motivations of as many stakeholders as possible. It also provides a baseline for agreements about success that can be used to monitor the project, watch as goals evolve from this baseline and ultimately use evolved goals as internally agreed upon standards for assessment.

In order to determine internal criteria for evaluating success, it was necessary to first develop a baseline of the participants' and interveners' goals. What were their general and specific objectives for involvement in conflict resolution and in this particular initiative? What did the different parties think about their initial and evolving goals and the extent to which they had been met when they had an opportunity to revisit their goals throughout the workshop and in the months following it?

An immediate end to violence and the promotion of peace are only the most superficial (or grandiose) and often not very realistic of goals for small-scale workshops in bitter conflict situations such as Cyprus. To understand conflict resolution in theory and practice, a much more nuanced view about the nature of success and how those engaged in such initiatives define and track it is required. As an action-evaluator, I sought to play a double role: a somewhat detached observer who would write about the goals guiding the intervention, but also an engaged researcher whose observations would have a positive and immediate impact on the ongoing intervention design of my colleagues. In the latter role, I sought to promote self-consciousness about evolving motivations, insight and goals among all involved--interveners and participants alike. My hope was admittedly very ambitious and surely only attainable in part: that this process would help raise the level of learning to that of deep inquiry in which everyone involved would continuously reflect upon and discuss their respective and shared experiences and insights. My goal was to promote a workshop environment of collaborative self-study to encourage ownership and mid-course corrections of the design, which would most fully reflect the analysis, and evolving goals of participants as well as the abilities and insights of the interveners.

During a preparation meeting for trainers and researchers the day before the workshop, the trainers and I collaboratively designed a research instrument for the articulation of goals that would serve as part of the training itself. We agreed that at the start of the workshop participants and trainers would be asked to interview each other in pairs about their own goals for the workshop.

Trainers' Goals. Prior to the start of the Cyprus initiative, a meeting for many of the third parties and researchers involved was held in Washington DC to set an agenda. We broke into the various groups represented in this complex "partnering" effort: The Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy (IMTD), Conflict Management Group (CMG), Researchers, and National Training Labs (NTL). While each of these organizations has engaged in conflict resolution in bitter ethnic conflicts, it is also the case that the style and focus of each is distinct. Thus, there are a number of similarities and differences between the sponsoring organizations, which may be seen in the goal statements the team members of each of the group's offered in the Washington meeting. Through a process of having all members of each group together articulate their goals (in terms of what, why and how), we then analyzed these goals in terms of shared, unique and opposing concerns. Below are goals regarding what each of the teams sought to accomplish, followed by the subgroup of goals shared by two or more of the groups:

Conflict Management Group

To expand participants' competency and understanding; to be self-conscious of the extent to which what we present is laden with values; to understand the Cyprus conflict better and assist parties empowering them with capacity to catalyze change, appreciate differences, and engage in dialogue; and to produce a precedent for interventions in other conflicts.

Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy

To further world peace and nourish those seeking peace in Cyprus by bringing the communities together; to increase awareness and skills of participants; to build trust and confidence among participants; to build a critical mass of people in two communities for peace building; and to establish a conflict resolution center in Cyprus.

The National Training Lab

To understand basic theories of dispute resolution and develop new skills at using and adapting theories in individual behavior; to be active teachers, learning with the participants; to help build and maintain a creative team of interveners; and to leave in place a competent, goal-directed, and highly motivated bi-communal team of Cypriots.

Shared Goals

All: To increase participants' skills and understanding ("competent and goal-directed;" "empowering them with capacity to catalyze change, appreciate differences and engage in dialogue;" "nourish those seeking peace").

IMTD/NTL: Building critical mass of people in two communities for peace building.

The usefulness of this process is multiple. First of all just the process of articulating goals in advance of intervention, can give conveners the opportunity to really think through their plans carefully and cooperatively before the intervention itself. Secondly, exploring the goals which the various convening bodies share and do not share can provide them with the opportunity to clarify what they separately and together want to accomplish which can help both with internal team building and further contribute to effective and coherent design. Finally, establishing a baseline of goals like this early in a process can provide a point of departure for monitoring how goals evolve and can contribute to visions of success, which can later be used as standards to assess the achievement of success.

Having helped conveners to articulate and compare their goals, when the workshop took place some six months later we also devised an opening process whereby the participant too would articulate their goals.

Participants' Goals. After introductions in the plenary session, we broke the 40 participants into pairs (it was their choice who to pair with, some stayed within national groups others went across them), and they interviewed each other about their goals and motivations in coming to the workshop, their prior commitments to peacemaking, but also talked about each other's resistances. These revealed goals such as: respecting each other, learning, communication, self awareness, collaboration, participation in bi-communal projects, as well as fears such as: the time commitment involved, speaking totally openly with those on the other side, the need to accept that the "other" is not mostly to blame, and go public about the experiences.

Each person was then asked, to write down his or her personal goals for the workshop. Some evoked deep feelings about the conflict and a desire to find new ways to address it. For example, one eloquent participant wrote:

> My first goal is to learn new techniques about human relations. This will lead me to a new and open view as an actor and a leader in society. Second, I want to express myself and my society's needs to the other society [Greek Cypriots] and I would like feedback to see if the other side understands what I am trying to say to this small group of people. Thirdly, I want peace. I want to talk about our future not about the past. I want to make people look forward, not back. I want to be able to tell my family that I believe brilliant days will soon come.

Using all 200 goal statements from the participants (such as this one in which four discreet goals statements were "extracted": 1. learn new techniques for human relations; 2. express myself and my community's needs to the other community; 3. be understood; 4. promote peace in Cyprus.), we then categorized them thematically into groups which had at least three similar goal statements in each. Once they had been grouped together with at least three similar goal statements, we then named the common theme they shared.

Participants Goals

> Increasing our sense of hope and empowerment about the situation.
> Increasing self-awareness about our own and each other's perceptions and attitudes about each other and the conflict.
> Gaining new understanding, empathy and trust for the other side.
> Acquiring conflict resolution skills.
> Learning to deal effectively with resistance or opposition to cooperative efforts between Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities.
> Gaining and promoting new vision about the conflict and how to solve it.
> Designing bicommunal projects.
> Helping to resolve the Cyprus conflict.
> Sharing insights from this training project with others.

These goals were then presented back to the group as those that we found shared across at least three or more of them and were also presented to the convener team in the hope that it would contribute to their on-line processing and on-going design of the workshop.

Daily Debriefings. As ongoing research was introduced in this workshop as part of practice, we sought to include participants in continual analysis about and reflection on their experience. In addition to general discussions about what went well and what could be improved at the end of each day, we also recruited two Greek-Cypriot and two Turkish-Cypriot volunteers to meet after the workshop, to write separately on a question such as "Compare and contrast your feelings from yesterday and today." and, "What have we gained from this experience, and what are our hopes and fears as we return to our home, workplace and communities?", and then to meet in the evening and combine their responses in a formal to be presented at the start of the next day's session.

Following a very emotional session around half-way through the workshop in which each side told its own "story" we focused on the following question "As my experience was expressed and the other side heard and absorbed it, how did that effect me?" Two participants wrote and interwove letters to each other about this experience and shared this to the whole group the next morning. This experience of having representatives of the two communities work together to articulate their shared, unique and possibly contrasting experiences and perceptions was a means

of raising the level of all participants' ongoing and deepening ownership of and reflection on the workshop.

<div align="center">Reflections</div>

What a striking feeling... No sleep, no rest... We both left the Saturday meeting very upset, annoyed, fearful, and unsettled...What had just happened? Such tension, such violence, not even eye contact... Both communities had to talk about and then present their own human drama. We spent a couple of hours discussing and arguing about what the issues were and how to present them... The content was burning all four essences to actually see that a lot of voices were lost, a lot of resources not used, and a lot of energy wasted. At times, arrogance took over and the voice of the heart could not be heard.

Not surprisingly, the way the two groups worked reflected shared culture of the two communities. However, during the presentation a different mode evolved. The Turkish Cypriots started by expressing a lot of pain through their personal experiences whereas the Greek Cypriots expressed a lot of anger. Here are some of our reflections of both presentations:

<div align="center">***</div>

"How much we brought to this room as Turkish Cypriots: pain death, blood. Humiliation... and it is wonderful to still have hoped to push for the resolution of our conflict. I wonder whether Greek Cypriot compatriots thought we were "exaggerating" whether they can understand our true feelings... We are going deep now"

"As a Greek Cypriot, this is how I felt as I listened to the Turkish Cypriot presentation: I don't know what happened... I'm sorry that you are in such pain... I didn't realize that you are so much hurt... What can I do? I hope nobody hurts you like that again. I'm really sorry. I heard a lot of anger in the presentation by my compatriots, a different kind of pain than before. Pain with anger... I wonder why ... I don't know what to do... Does the other group feel that we have pain? What is their experience listening to us?"

> "As a Turkish Cypriot, this was how I felt after listening to the Greek Cypriot presentation: How much injustice there is in the thinking and convictions of people... Only 4 out of 16 had respect for the Turkish Cypriot community as a whole. Most of them did not acknowledge the experience of Turkish Cypriots during 1963. Most did not deal with the reasons of the conflict, but with the symptoms and the consequences..."

<div align="center">***</div>

> After all this explosion of feelings and opening of wounds, what else was left but to go home without even saying good-bye... Most of us couldn't sleep, and kept on scratching wounds, only to create more pain... In the morning, we brought our bleeding wounds into the same room to see what would happen next. On Sunday we practiced how to listen, appreciate, paraphrase and express our own view. A difficult but powerful process. How hard is it to express appreciation

for a view that you don't actually share... Even harder it is to get rid of your ears, forget they are there and listen with your eyes; those eyes look into the heart... Will that make a difference? Will it bring any solution? We don't know... We can't make any promises. However, we saw the group transforming by internalizing a deeper understanding of who the other is. Gradually, some of the pain and frustration gave way to a new possibility of understanding.

Letters to Myself. At the conclusion of the workshop, I had planned to ask each participant to revisit their original goals for the workshop and evaluate their "satisfaction" with how each of them specifically had been met or evolved. Along with the trainers, however, I decided to look for amore organic way to further track and monitor participants' goals that would deepen their own learning and insight in addition to providing data on the changes that had taken place in the workshop. I therefore decided to ask each participant to write a letter to themselves in whatever format seemed appropriate which reflect on their original goals in light of the workshop experience. A number of participants commented that this was a useful exercise in summarizing their experience to themselves and they found it even more meaningful several weeks later when their letter arrived at their door and the experience of the workshop was vividly reawakened.

Dramatist that he is, the same person who wrote the narrative excerpted in the section above under "participants' goals," wrote about a journey that began poorly but ended well. In this letter, a prototype of the reflexively rich narratives that were written by the participants, by way of reflection on his own goals, the author wrote allegorically, both about the Cyprus conflict and its negative hold over him and about his involvement in this workshop and the changes it wrought within him.

Dear Me,

How do you feel? I feel well now. If you ask me the weather here; well, I think the freezing days have already past and the spring came at last.

I had a bitter experience at the first day. Everywhere was dark, cold and I was frightened. I tried to light a fire but I had no lighters. I looked for matches and I found out that my matches were wet in my pocket. I tried to find a secure, non windy corner, but wind was flowing everywhere. I was almost hopeless. I could see thunder and lighting through an open hall window. I was cold, wet, and frightened.

I needed a warm chest to put my head on, but I couldn't. I then lay down on the floor and started to recover myself by my own spirit and energy of life. I breathed and breathed. On the second day, the wind was not so strong (somehow). I discovered that I was rolling on the floor with the waving of the waves. I discovered that I was in a ship. An ancient ship which was as old as the history of the human being! I rolled onto someone's arm. I heard a voice. I searched with my hands. I was afraid to get up. Afraid of stepping on someone's body. And I was afraid of being stepped on. I touched to

someone's face. I tried to realize how he would look like. I felt someone's hands on my face, beard, neck and all the rest of my body. It was not friendly, it was not dangerous. I then tried to catch the hand. I held it. I saw the thunder through the window. We started to walk together, holding each other's hands.

The other day we reached to the window. Another thunder lightened my other's face. I saw pain, I saw tears, I saw wounds on it. It was a crying baby doll! The next day after yesterday I kicked to the window. I kept on kicking the window for a year. That was not enough. I kept on kicking for the past twenty--thirty--thirty-nine years. I with a baby doll in my hand. I feel dawn on a boat. Suddenly I realized that the wind was not strong and the waves were not so high I could hardly see now. I now was a baby with a doll and alone on a boat. In fact there was no wind, no waves. I was shaking the boat rushing from here to there.

The day after...

I am hopeful. It's already sun rising time. I started to climb on the mast.
Sincerely yours,

Me

Longitudinal Analysis. Having systematically gathered goals before, during, and at the end of the workshop, we hoped to track the impact of workshop and devised a follow-up questionnaire based on the goal categories the participants had generated at the beginning of the workshop and sent to participants nine months after the intervention. The Cypriot research team, made up of volunteers from both sides of the island, asked all participants about the extent to which they felt the workshop had helped them attain the goals in each of the ten categories. The team asked all 40 to fill out a questionnaire concerning the extent to which they felt the workshop had helped the to gain "insight/skills/tools." Apparently due to a host of logistical problems confronting the research team as it tried to do follow-up research on the divided island where contact across the two sides is severely circumscribed proved too difficult to surmount. Only 18 (and, worse, only three from Turkish Cypriots) were been collected so it is not possible to say much about the substantive impact of the workshop. While this was the most unsuccessful part of this action-research project, I nonetheless wanted to briefly mention the effort as at least in principal it seems like it could bean effective way to longitudinally track workshop "success" based on the goals and standards for success that the participants (and other stakeholders) themselves articulated and which were, more or less, used to guide the intervention itself.

Conclusion

The larger theory of practice beneath this process of systematic articulation and monitoring of goals by key stakeholders in conflict resolution interventions is that in through process internal goals of participants will become aligned and external goals for their positive effect on the wider conflict system shared. That is, for example, we reconveners and participations to richly share goals for their activity together, they could soon become team players in pursuing them. Further, in being on the same team, as it were, in terms of their activities with each other, conveners and participants could at some point turn their shared energies to determining how best to generalize their learning and progress beyond the micro-intervention to the larger social and political arena. In this essay, however, only the initial activity of developing shared and explicit goals was demonstrated.

Moreover, while indeed this experiment in goal articulation did have a noticeable and I believe salutary effect on

the Cyprus workshop described, the main benefit of this action-research project was not so much in what it contributed to it, or in the microanalysis of a specific intervention that it enabled, but rather as a pilot-test for a new methodology. It illustrated for the way goal articulation and self-consciousness about workshop goals and experiences for facilitators and participants can be fruitfully and fairly unobtrusively woven into the specific workshop design. More broadly this action-experiment became a central experience in the evolution of "Action-Evaluation," a research methodology used for developing, monitoring, and tracking goals as a vehicle for establishing criteria of success (described in the concluding chapter of this book). This workshop proved pivotal in the development of action-evaluation for two reasons. First it showed how rich goal articulation can be and how organically it can be woven into actual intervention and training work. Secondly, it demonstrated the need for amore systematic means of gathering, organizing and analyzing the very rich data that can be generated by having individuals and groups in conflict resolution efforts articulate and reflect upon their goals at various stages in interventions. Once again, for better and perhaps for worse, the Cyprus conflict has proved to be an invaluable resource for the development of conflict resolution theory and practice. Hopefully the field of conflict resolution has done half as much for Cyprus as Cyprus has done for conflict resolution.

References

Argyris, Chris, et. al. (1985). <u>Action-Science: Concepts, Methods, and Skills for Research and Intervention</u>. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

James H. Wolfe, "A Historical Review of the Dispute." In Diane B. Bendahmane and John W. McDonald (eds.), <u>Perspectives on Negotiation</u>, Four Case Studies and Interpretations Washington, D.C.: Foreign Service Institute, U.S. Department of State, 1986.

MacDonald, John and Diamond, Louise, (1993) Multi-Track Diplomacy: The Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy, Washington, DC.

Lewin, Kurt, (1948). "Action Research and Minority Problems." In K.Lewin, <u>Resolving Social Conflicts</u> (G. Lewin, ed.) New York: Harper and Row.

Polyani, Michael (1966). <u>The Tacit Dimension</u>. New York: Doubleday.

Coughlan, Reed (1992). "The Cyprus Problem..."

Rothman, Jay (1992). From Confrontation to Cooperation: Resolving Ethnic and Regional Conflict. Newberry Park, CA.: Sage.

Rothman, Jay (1997). Resolving Identity-Based Conflict in Nations, Organizations and Communities. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rothman, Jay (1997). "Action-Evaluation Methodology and Conflict Resolution Training."
Journal of International Negotiation, Winter.

Rothman, Jay (1998). "Action-Evaluation and Conflict Resolution in Theory and Practice." Mediation Quarterly, Spring.