

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF ARMENIA

**RACIAL THEORY:**  
**STATE PROPAGANDA THROUGH PUBLIC EDUCATION**  
***ARMENIA AND AZERBAIJAN***

By

Anahit Hakobyan

May 2014

Master's Essay in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts in Political Science and International Relations

# SIGNATURE PAGE

---

Faculty Advisor

Date

---

Program Chair

Date

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF ARMENIA  
May 2014

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

First and foremost I would like to express my great appreciativeness to my Master's Thesis supervisor, my dearest professor Dr. Arpie G. Balian for her inspiration, encouragement, motivation and belief in me. I would like to thank her for helping me and responding to even the most minor problems. And I am grateful for teaching me real research and having a great investment in my way of becoming a researcher. Her advice is priceless for me.

I would also like to acknowledge with appreciation the help of our Program Chair Dr. Douglas Shumavon, my professors, especially Dr. Vahram Ter-Matevosyan for his advice and help. And I am grateful to my University for being my second home during this time.

Last but not least, I am grateful to my family for their encouragement and motivation and all my friends who supported, encouraged and helped me.

And I am thankful to my Tigran for his patience and staying with me during difficult times, helping to stay objective and giving me strength.

Also I would like to thank all the Armenian and Azerbaijani respondents of the surveys for their time and interest.

## CONTENTS

<b>CHAPTER ONE — INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>DEFINING PROPAGANDA.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>CHAPTER TWO — LITERATURE REVIEW.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>NATION BUILDING IN THE POST-SOVIET ERA .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>THE CASE OF ARMENIA AND AZERBAIJAN .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>CHAPTER THREE — METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS &amp; SAMPLING.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>DATA ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>CHAPTER FOUR — DATA ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>DOCUMENT ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>TEXTBOOK ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>SURVEY ANALYSIS.....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>CHAPTER FIVE — FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE .....</b>	<b>75</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Importance of History Education.....	29
Table 2. Process of Tendering History Textbook Development.....	33
Table 3. Teaching History in the Classroom.....	36
Table 4. Words and Phrases Describing War.....	41
Table 5. Negative Connotations of the Enemy.....	42
Table 6. Words and Phrases Used to Dehumanize Enemy.....	44
Table 7. Cross tabulation: Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Armenian family friend? Do you think Armenians and Azerbaijanis would be able to coexist peacefully? .....	47
Table 8. Correlation between the positive first impression and knowledge of history.....	48
Table 9. Method of Learning History v. Attitude towards the Enemy.....	50
Table 10. Source(s) of Learning about History v. Approach to Resolving Conflict.....	50
Table 11. Manner of Acquiring History Knowledge and View of the Enemy.....	51
Table 12. Memorizing Content of History Textbooks v. Attitude towards the Enemy.....	51
Table 13. Memorizing Content of History Textbooks v. Approach to Solving Conflict.....	51
Table 14. Cross Tabulation - Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Azerbaijani family friend? * Do you think Armenians and Azerbaijanis would be able to coexist without conflict? .....	54
Table 15. First Positive Impression v. Learning History in School.....	55
Table 16. Learning History in School v. What should be done with the Enemy.....	56
Table 17. History Knowledge from School and Attitudes toward Conflict Resolution.....	57



## CHAPTER ONE—INTRODUCTION

*“Our notion of ourselves and our people, as well as the image of other peoples, highly depends on how we were taught history in our childhood.”*

*Marc Ferro*

### **BACKGROUND**

In the introduction to *Die Judenfrage im Unterricht* (The Jewish Question in the Classroom), Fink and Streicher (1937) make the following statement: “The National Socialist state requires its teachers to teach German children racial theory. For the German people, racial theory means the Jewish problem.” In fact, German teachers’ manual on the Jewish case upholds that German children have an inborn hatred of Jews, which is systematically heightened by negative propaganda or references made to Jews in German newspapers, conversations, and songs. Along those lines and following a similar line of thought, the projection of Armenians as the enemy by the Azerbaijanis, and vice versa, is a subject that merits investigation given the atrocities perpetrated upon communities.

One must first understand Armenia–Azerbaijan relations, as well as perceptions of the Armenian and the Azerbaijani societies of each other. The republics of Azerbaijan and Armenia had formal governmental relations between 1918 and 1921, which continued through the Soviet era until the escalation of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict. Due to recurring hostilities between these two countries, subsequent relations were shaped primarily around the conflict over the region of Nagorno-Karabakh. Currently, there is no diplomatic representation between Armenia and Azerbaijan and the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict continues to flare up both republics. The escalation of the Karabakh war after both Armenia and Azerbaijan declared independence (1991) led to increasing the rift between the two

nations and their total isolation from each other. Communication between these two nations, both at the levels of government and society, is down to near zero. Both nations currently focus their attention intensely on the conflict — the ‘terrible’ years of war, hatred and confrontation in almost every sphere of life. However, there have been times of peaceful coexistence, cooperation, mutual trust, and peaceful neighborly relations between Azerbaijanis and Armenians. Those periods were not in times immemorial, rather just three decades ago. With this in mind, it might be possible to achieve peaceful communication between these two societies, if negative attitudes and hatred were eliminated or curtailed.

## **PURPOSE AND IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY**

The identification of sources and approaches that shape attitudes is important. The current study focuses on one of the assumed instruments for the dissemination of hatred by way of creating negative images of another — the public education system. This research attempts to examine the role of state education policy, particularly history textbooks, in the process of creating, developing and spreading a negative image and hatred of the ‘enemy’ in the population.

While prior independent research exists on related topics, the uniqueness of this study is that both cases, Armenia and Azerbaijan, are examined in an integrated and comparative way. Prior research has shown, to some extent, that there exists propaganda in history textbooks in both countries. However, beyond merely examining the existence of negative propaganda in history textbooks, this research attempts to uncover the impact of such propaganda on society.



## RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

Building on earlier research, the hypotheses that were tested in this study explore the extent to which teachers are required to teach children racial topics. For the Armenian or Azerbaijani people, does racial theory suggest that Armenian children must recognize the Armenian problem as the problem with Azerbaijan? Similarly, should Azerbaijani children recognize the Azerbaijani problem as their problem with Armenia? In fact, do teachers' manuals uphold that Azerbaijani or Armenian children have hatred that is learnt from propaganda of different sorts or references made in history textbooks? Along those lines, the projection of Armenians as the enemy by the Azerbaijanis, and vice versa, is a subject that merits investigation.

More specifically, the research questions that this study addresses are:

**RQ1:** What is the intended role of history textbooks in educating the younger generations in Azerbaijan and Armenia?

**RQ2:** What is the process of adopting a history textbook in either state so it serves the intended role?

**RQ3:** Is there political pressure or intervention in writing history textbooks in both states?

**RQ4:** Are history textbooks used as a propaganda tool to create a negative image of the enemy?

**RQ5:** What attitude prevails towards each other in both societies?

**RQ6:** Is the prevailing attitude towards each other in the two societies the result of education?

Thus, the hypotheses formulated around this topic are:

**H1:** Azerbaijan uses the history textbooks to promote hatred against Armenians by creating a negative image of the enemy.

**H<sub>2</sub>:** Armenia uses the history textbooks to promote hatred against Azerbaijanis by creating a negative image of the enemy.

**H<sub>3</sub>:** As a consequence of state education policy, there is prevailing negative attitude towards Armenians and Armenia in Azerbaijani society.

**H<sub>4</sub>:** As a consequence of state education policy, there is prevailing negative attitude towards Azerbaijanis and Azerbaijan in Armenian society.

## **DEFINING PROPAGANDA**

The word *propaganda* is translated from the Italian or modern Latin *congregation de propaganda fide* (congregation for propagation of the faith), simply to mean ‘to propagate’ or ‘to sow seeds’. In 1622, the Vatican established a missionary organization in that name to spread the faith of the Roman Catholic Church. As Catholicism was meant to be spread to the ‘New World’ against Protestantism, the term propaganda took on more of a negative or fake attempt directed to persuasion. Its neutrality often turned to a more destructive reflection.

Words frequently used in literature as synonyms of *propaganda* are *lies*, *manipulation*, *mind control*, *brainwashing*, *psychological warfare*, and others (Jowett and O’Donnell, 2012). Nowadays the terms *spin* and *news management* imply that news is portrayed or presented in such a way so as to minimize any negative connotation or damage to self-interests. In that context, *spin* is often used as manipulation of political information. Besides using unethical, harmful, and unfair tactics, propaganda also relies on *organized persuasion*.

In terms of the level of acknowledgment of the source and accuracy of information, propaganda takes different colors, *white*, *black* or *grey*. What this means is that *white* propaganda is when the source of the information is correctly identified and the information

tends to be generally accurate. For the receiver of the information, *white* propaganda is credible. *Black* propaganda is when the source is concealed or falsified; therefore it tends to spread lies, fabricated news, and deceptive information. The degree to which *black* propaganda succeeds generally depends on the receiver's willingness to acknowledge the source and accept the content of the message. *Grey* propaganda, as the color suggests, is somewhere between white and black propaganda. The source may or may not be correctly identified, and the accuracy of the information is more or less uncertain (merriam-webster.com; G. Jowett and V. O'Donnell, 2012).

Using this term, Finlay (2007) explains propaganda as

*communication which: (a) is produced by particular groups of people; (b) is disseminated to a mass audience; (c) aims at promoting a particular ideology through reinforcing or changing particular sets of beliefs and/or behaviors; (d) is part of a body of such communication”* (M. Finlay, 2007).

According to the dictionary (merriam-webster.com), the term *propaganda* is defined as “manipulation of information to influence public opinion through spreading of ideas, information, or rumors that are often false or exaggerated for the purpose of helping or injuring an institution, a cause, or a person, spread in order to help a cause, a political leader, or a government.” Propagandists emphasize the elements of information that support their individual or collective positions and deemphasize or exclude those that do not. The propagandist could be a government agency attempting to instill in citizens patriotic feelings in a situation of war. The propagandist seeks to control the flow of information, manage public opinion, and manipulate behavioral patterns. To reach the desired effect on public opinion, propagandists resort to the use of misleading statements and even lies, as defined by several dictionaries.

Similarly, the U.S. Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms defines propaganda as “any form of adversary communication, especially of a biased or misleading nature, designed to influence the opinions, emotions, attitudes, or behaviors of any group in order to benefit the sponsor, either directly or indirectly.” Jowett and O’Donnell, (2012) claim that during wartime propaganda boosts morale when directed by a country at its own civilian population and military forces, whereas propaganda against the enemy is more in line with psychological warfare (merriam-webster.com; U.S. Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms, 2010; G.Jowett and V. O’Donnell, 2012).

## **CHAPTER TWO—LITERATURE REVIEW**

By nature, humans tend to define themselves as good and the opponent as ‘not-so-good’ or simply ‘bad’. Members of each group evaluate themselves in a positive way regarding the self in comparison to the other. Sometimes, unwanted features of the self are transformed and placed into the enemy. Thus, the image of the enemy becomes the inverse image of self. This tendency almost always leads to disrespect or even violent acts towards the other. The uncritical acceptance of self-images is dangerous and exacerbates conflict situations. In fact, it is this phenomenon that translates to antipathy and gives rise to ethnic conflict among different groups of people. People perceive themselves as victims and dehumanize the other. They recognize their version of the story as the 'truth' and deny the validity of the other's version. Violence is always believed to be initiated by the other and the need for violence as a defense mechanism is necessitated by the 'victims'. This culminates in fights of righteousness often making permanent resolutions impossible (Horowitz, 1985; Fabick, 2004; Vuorinen, 2012).

Building such a disapproving image of the opponent represents a threat to the self and motivates humans to be vigilant and defensive and, even in extreme cases, to be ready for the self-protective first attack. Destroying the enemy that was defined and perceived as evil and destructive is often considered heroic, honorable and legitimate. The creation of this image provides justification for violence and war. Thus, the enemy image activates a motive for action by self and the situation can easily escalate into conflict, insinuating that the image of the enemy is so harmful that there is no need to negotiate or to compromise. Societies who have strong enemy images tend to reinterpret any presented information in a manner that fits their rooted stereotypes. Thus, these images cause close-mindedness and are obstacles for

negotiating and listening. Both sides of the conflict perceive the other as acting in the worst possible way. Every statement and action made by the opposite side is perceived as a threat and dangerous action. Since each side expects the worst from the other, they both take protective action, and each side perceives the opponent's defensive moves as aggression. As several authors have stated, the compelling stimulus for such behavior is not merely hatred, but also fear and insecurity. The fear of being a victim, fear of loss of property or life converts to hate in the end. These senses of fear and insecurity are spread through propaganda machines and, under such influence, society begins to believe exaggerations, distortions and fabrications spread by the authorities (Mueller, 2000; Oberschall, 2000; Fabick, 2004; Vuorinen, 2012; Rudolph, 2006).

Accordingly, portrayal of the image of the enemy can be realized through various propaganda tactics. Sometimes it takes the form of non-fiction textbooks, news articles and broadcasts, as well as fiction and documentary movies. Hope (2011) claims that there are advantages to fictionalized portrayals as they can attract larger audiences and shape emotions effectively. Accusing the enemy of inhumanity is less effective than graphically depicting inhumane enemy acts on the screen or printed page through characters with which people identify. Beginning with birth, movies become an important propaganda tool for enemy portrayal. Educational movies also serve as a tool used for disseminating the image of the enemy. As Hope shows in her analysis of the instructional films during the Cold War, such movies were used during those times and were adopted as part of the standard school curriculum in the Soviet Union and in the U.S. students accepted the content of those films as the truth without raising questions (Fabick, 2004; Hope, 2011).

Mass media also is a powerful propaganda tool used for manipulating people. Ynagizawa-Drott (2011, 2012) provides evidence on this issue in a couple studies arguing

that, at least under certain conditions, mass media can influence conflict development. As evidence, the author uses data from a Rwandan village study that estimates the impact of local radio broadcasts on the level of civil aggression. The results of the study indicate that approximately ten percent of those participating in violence during the Rwandan Genocide are considered to be affected by radio broadcasts. Based on those findings, the author claims that in the case of mass media aiming at escalating violence, the results are more visible when the targeted population is relatively small and defenseless, and even more effective when they lack basic education. The author claims that an educated population hampers the effectiveness of media propaganda because such people have increased interest to access alternative media sources. Along those lines, McLean Hilker (2010) posits that education policy in Rwanda had a crucial role to play in the escalation of tensions and violence. Much like decades ago of propagating racial theory among Germans, the government-approved Rwandan education curriculum contains the history of Rwanda, which is written in a manner that promotes ethnic intolerance towards 'enemy' groups (McLean Hilker, 2010; Ynagizawa-Drott, 2011; Ynagizawa-Drott, 2012).

One of the most influential means for creating and disseminating the images of the self and the enemy has been the system of education. Formal education is perceived as the medium for shaping the understanding, attitude and behavior of people. Considering that the state is the official body for designing the curriculum for schools and for higher educational institutions, the system controls textbook content and other educational material intended for students of all ages. This is how the state dictates and monitors the level and content of what is considered to be the most reliable and sound sources of knowledge. As Hickman and Porfilio (2012) claim, textbooks are considered to be the primary means for standardizing the curriculum and teacher performance. They are the most widespread state-controlled vehicle for shaping public opinion. The specific political goals of the state can be easily

distinguished by looking into what is included or excluded in history books. As several authors claim, the analysis of history textbooks helps to portray the dominant ideology of a given society. They also reflect the dominant values and stereotypes of that society. The history textbooks are the state-authorized versions of the nation's history and they are the only books that most people will ever find and read in many states. Accordingly, people's knowledge base of history comes mainly from those books (Applebaum, 2010; Morgan, 2012; Hickman and Porfilio, 2012; Chikovani, 2013).

History textbooks are thus meant to reflect the social and political needs of the state. The image of the enemy is portrayed by political authorities and is disseminated throughout society through history textbooks. This image may change according to the needs of the state. The hate-provoking features of the enemy always emphasize negative features. The image of the enemy is created by stressing cruelty, inhumanity and other weaknesses to increase vulnerability. However, it is important not to embellish the monstrous nature of the enemy so as to allow people to celebrate victory, to make people believe that they can defeat the enemy and to rely on their strength to fight the enemy (Wunsch, 2002; Applebaum, 2010; Chikovani, 2013).

As an example, a study by Keith Crawford (2003) concludes that Serbian history textbooks are nationalized and standardized. There is only one 'authorized version' of history textbooks available in schools. The content of textbooks has been altered and the knowledge gained thereby is designed to justify otherwise unacceptable government behavior and action. State control of textbook content is the main vehicle used for ideological control of society, otherwise stated 'state propaganda'. Through what is written in textbooks, the state is able to legitimize a specific set of values that train people to accept or look favorably to the actions the state takes. The government forces teachers to follow curricula or use



textbooks that were created and accepted by them. The textbooks are used as ‘holy books’ by teachers who make students memorize everything that is presented there as factual (Crawford, 2003; Morgan, 2012).

Furthermore, history books portray past events in a manner that is most favorable to state propaganda. Morgan (2012) argues that information in these textbooks is limited and most important events are not presented in sufficient detail. When readers wish to learn more or get additional information on certain events, they should look for other sources beyond these textbooks. Also the author argues that the scarcity of information in these state-published textbooks is not the result of ignorance; rather it is the result intentional government effort — organized propaganda. However, most hate messages and cruel images of the enemy are not depicted in textbooks consciously or intentionally. They reflect the feelings of the nation during that period in history. The other question is whether or not the textbooks alone promote stereotypes or create ‘negative’ feelings (Crawford, 2003; Morgan, 2012).

The role of history is important in the formation and maintenance of national identity. The historical consciousness and reconstruction of the past plays a major role in the process of nation-building. The historical narratives are often used to mobilize the members of a nation to a certain behavior. Nations resort to historical narratives to raise their distinctiveness. For this reason, history is subject to manipulation. History can be partially or totally reconstructed — meaning that writing history is a process by which some stories and events are emphasized while others are de-emphasized or even left out. For example, a particular set of facts, including exaggerations and lies, is presented (or misrepresented) in the version approved by political oligarchs. The history textbooks are written in language that aims at strengthening students’ sense of national identity and used as a vehicle through

which national norms, values, behaviors, attitudes, and perceptions of a nation are acquired and promoted. As an example, Kabapinar (2005) posits that the Turkish history education curriculum is constructed in a way that it fosters national values and promotes Turkishness, including respect for Turkish heroes depicted in history books. This is emphasized in the curriculum such that every lesson represents a step toward the implementation of Turkish national goals, primarily to instill in students the belief that the Turkish nation has shown dominance since ancient times and served as an excellent model nation. A critical historiography recognizes that there are competing interpretations of events. However, not all histories are equally valid or legitimate (Kabapinar, 2005; Dupuy, 2008; Gabbard and Ross, 2008; Clark, 2010; Dupuy, 2008; Hope, 2011; Geukjian, 2012).

Thus, education can have both a socially constructive as well as destructive impact. It can be used for achieving certain political goals. Especially in conflict situations, the education system can be used as a tool to propagate the state-formulated view and disseminate it among students throughout the country. It is therefore appropriate to conclude that the education system and textbook content have a significant role in dealing with historical conflicts among nations and rewriting content helps to present events in a very different form.

On the flip side, a state's education system can also nurture and sustain an ethnically tolerant climate and, by doing so, prevent ethnic escalations and conflicts. This is possible when both content and process of education promote peace, social justice, respect for human rights and acceptance of responsibility. The UNESCO report (2010) on curriculum content suggests strategies for reviewing content and structure of school curricula, including the removal of elements that can fuel conflict, preparation of new syllabi and textbooks including all stakeholders (UNESCO, 2010; Gamaghelyan and Romyancev, 2013).

Marko-Stockl (2008) and McLean-Hilker (2010) argue that schools should foster reconciliation-promoting behavior and conflict prevention. Negative images of the enemy should be deconstructed. Education through one's history plays a central role in achieving this goal. It can reconstruct stereotypes, myths and hatred rooted in societies throughout. Education should help people to think critically and become more sensitive to biases. Education should help to build a world community where people are interdependent, eliminating the rooted stereotypes among nations, including fear and escalation of negative feelings toward other nations. They should respect the uniqueness of their own group and, at the same time, see themselves as part of the world community (Marko-Stockl, 2008; McLean Hilker, 2010).

However, several authors accept that the ultimate goal of government-controlled textbooks is to 'educate patriots'. While recognizing that the fundamental objective of teaching history is to inspire patriotism, the authors posit that instilling deep patriotic feelings in society could lead to renewed escalations of conflict in a way that a patriotic society will rise to protect its motherland against the enemy (Fabick, 2004; Marko-Stockl, 2008; McLean Hilker, 2010).

As mentioned earlier, formal education systems play a vital role in building peace, especially in the case of countries that have suffered armed conflict. A study by Dupuy (2008) conducted in three countries — Guatemala, Nepal, and Liberia — has helped highlight four ways in which education contributes to long-term peace: (a) by lowering motivation and raising opportunity costs for participation in armed conflict; (b) by building peace through government investment in formal education systems; (c) by delivering education in violence-free environments, thus promoting non-violent conflict resolution; and (d) by using curriculum that heightens constraints against the use of violence, thus promoting

human rights. Children need to learn skills of negotiation, problem solving, critical thinking and communication that will enable them to resolve conflicts without resorting to violence. Young people need access to factual information on their history and must learn to read critically so they become credible writers and researchers (Kenneth and Saltarell, 2000; Fabick, 2004; Dupuy, 2008).

Education is used to propagate ethnic intolerance, escalation of conflict and even war. During the Cold War, the schools were responsible for raising the U.S. credo. As the Cold War represented an ideological battle in which the U.S. and the Soviet Union sought to impose their respective world views domestically and internationally. Spreading ideology through education became a legitimized propaganda vehicle adopted by both nations. The curricula of both states were based on these factors. Anne Applebaum (2010) claims that countries politicize history and use past events to justify decisions that are made in the present. When the state has certain political goals, such as painting a negative image of the enemy, history curricula could serve as a reliable and effective tool for accomplishing that goal (Dupuy, 2008; Clark, 2010; Applebaum, 2010; Hope, 2011).

## **NATION BUILDING IN THE POST-SOVIET ERA**

After the collapse of the Soviet Union and the subsequent emergence of the new independent states, the process of building national identities began as these young republics strived to gain sovereignty by way of adopting various strategies, national goals and objectives. The emergence of the independent states in the post-Soviet space was accompanied by a transformation of previous Soviet identities to separate identities of the newly independent states. In all cases, the creation of a nation included the act of self-examination and the challenge of defining or redefining the self and the other (or the enemy). One of the primary means to disseminate these images of self and others was through the

system of education. Courses in national history in post-Soviet states have been used as a central tool for ‘building’ one’s own identity in comparison to other nations. This is how pupils learned how to distinguish friends from enemies and how to respond to possible threats to national security interests. Through textbooks, one began to perceive one’s own nation, its role in history and the image of others, mainly neighbors (Karpenko, 2013; Chikovani, 2013).

Thus, the picture of the enemy gets distorted and national heroes are glorified. This also helps legitimize or delegitimize political decisions and violent acts. A single approved version of the history in each state becomes one of the most important instruments for the mobilization of society. The majority of newly independent states have inherited territorial disputes from the Soviet Union. For decades, these states have made every effort to construct their national identity within an environment of conflict with neighbors. In many cases, these conflicts have served as catalysts for politicians and historians to develop accounts of history, which duly reflect their own perceptions of the conflict and justifications of violent acts. This is how history has played and continues to play a crucial role in nation-building within the South Caucasus (Karpenko, 2013; Chikovani, 2013; Beteeva and Karpenko, 2013).

One of the many examples of conflicts that emerged from the collapse of the Soviet Union is the Georgian-Ossetian territorial dispute, which is about the legitimate ‘right of statehood’ for the territory of the former Ossetian Autonomous Oblast. Both sides have developed mutually exclusive versions of history — the history of their territorial claims concocted with distorted statements and entitlements. According to an analysis by Beteeva and Karpenko (2013), the independence of each side is viewed as one of the main features of the state’s existence and its security and defense as the most important national interest. Almost the same situation can be observed in accounting for the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict. The Abkhazian textbooks are written so as to shape a belief that the Soviet and

present Georgian administration are guilty of starting the conflict (Beteeva and Karpenko, 2013; Gitsba, 2013).

The same process of re-interpreting and re-writing the past so as to create a different image of the other also started in post-Soviet Georgia. A single history narrative was written and adopted. This narrative covered the situation of territorial conflicts among various ethnic groups and subsequent events in Georgia. Chikovani (2013) claims that in previous Georgian history textbooks, the image of the ‘others’ was presented, and the differences between ‘the others’ and the Georgian nation were highlighted. The Abkhazians and Ossetians were presented as acting against the legitimate regime of Georgia. However, the author argues that after 2005, a new law was adopted in Georgia establishing the basis for teaching Georgian history in a way to make it more interpretive. Moreover, the *Tolerance Building through History Education* project conducted in 2008-2011 under the sponsorship of EUROCLIO (European Association of History Educators) changed the content of education curricula to a great extent. It brought together a group of diverse historians to reflect their approaches and to create the version of history that they would like the new generations to learn, and to think more critically and creatively (Smilansky, 2011; Chikovani, 2013).

## **THE CASE OF ARMENIA AND AZERBAIJAN**

In “The Black Garden: Armenia and Azerbaijan between Peace and War” Thomas De Waal posits that “the problem ... is rooted within the societies themselves, which display an inability to get rid of illusions and rhetoric and to get ready for reconciliation with a country that they still consider as their historical enemy” (De Waal, 2005).

In 1991, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the states of Armenia and Azerbaijan gained independence. The old dispute over the Armenian-populated Nagorno Karabakh

Autonomous Oblast of Soviet Azerbaijan turned to a violent war between the two newly independent states. Although the 1994 ceasefire put an end to the violence, no political resolution has been reached to this date. The sides are violating the ceasefire through frequent sniper shootings and even killings along the border. The sides are engaged not only in a military arms race, but also in an ideological war through propaganda in the national media and systems of education. Through these instruments, each nation creates a positive image of the self and negative image of the other or the enemy. The image of the enemy is even intensified in periods of ceasefire. It is manipulated by the state-controlled media and education systems and shaped and rooted in both societies. Every aspect of the other state's identity, including culture, religion, language, and traditions, is perceived negatively. Images of the enemy were formulated throughout the pages of history textbooks. Tasked with such an important endeavor, all those responsible for drafting the official textbooks selected historic events with caution or presented evidence that justifies and explains current actions. Texts describing the enemy were often written in bashing language and led to ethnic mobilization in the event of new conflict.

Education develops and nurtures the environment whereby future disagreements and tensions are rationalized. This is how generations are trained to be ready for military confrontation versus people opting to resolve problems through peaceful negotiation and resolution of the conflict.

After gaining independence from the Soviet Union, both countries launched the creation and development of their respective history textbooks. The soviet history education stressed the notion of "friendship between peoples," which was presented as peace between all soviet republics and an era free of conflicts. All the existing conflicts among different soviet republics and ethnic groups were excluded from history narratives and conflicts that

had roots in times before the creation of the Soviet Union were not illustrated in detail in the textbooks.

As Huseinova (2013) argues, both in soviet and post-soviet history textbooks each event and fact is remembered or forgotten on purpose. The soviet textbooks interpreted the Nagorno Karabakh conflict in terms of class issues ignoring the real cause and nature of the conflict. After the collapse of the USSR the textbooks were revised and the new nationalist governments gave a more prominent place for describing the conflicts. Alakbarov (2001) argues that with independence Azerbaijani history textbooks started to portray Azerbaijan as an independent and sovereign state, unlike the soviet ones, which described them as part of the Persian or Turkish nations, or as Tatars of Russia. And as the author states, after independence Azerbaijani historians started to write about killings and massacres of Azerbaijani people by the Armenians, but in soviet times they were afraid of soviet authorities as the Armenians were under their protection (Alakbarov, 2001; Huseinova, 2013; Matevosyan, 2013).

Elibegova and Adibekyan (2013) examined the state propaganda of Azerbaijan against Armenia. They examined the state propaganda of Azerbaijan against Armenia and Armenians. Their analysis was limited to the content of Azerichild.info website, which is a project that presents children's books by Azerbaijani writers and works of children themselves. As evidence of the existing state propaganda, the authors suggest analyzing the different aspects of Azerbaijani public life, such as the prohibition of Armenian names in Azerbaijan and of positive attitude towards Armenians, as well as propagating usage of hate of Armenians in official speeches, in mass media, and in textbooks of history and literature. They mainly concentrate their analysis on the Azerichild.info website, which is a project that presents children books of Azerbaijani authors and works of children themselves. The



authors claim that the actual scale and level of Azerbaijani propaganda are much higher. However they do not deny that Armenian society may also express similar attitudes (Elibegova and Adibekyan, 2013).

Sayfutdinova (2011) analyzed the representations of Armenian-Azerbaijani relations in the Azerbaijani literature to reveal the perception of the existing conflict between these two nations. The findings indicate that the main causes and blame for the Nagorno-Karabagh conflict and the war are directed toward Moscow and Armenia. There also exists an image of a ‘good’ Armenian in the literature — defined as those that are integrated into Azerbaijani society and have very friendly and close relationships with them. However, there are clear boundaries between the two nations. In the conflict period, however, the image of ‘bad’ Armenians emerges, who are depicted as newcomers and outsiders vis-a-vis Azerbaijan and the Caucasus. They are hostile and hate Azerbaijanis and generally all Muslims. The ‘good’ Armenians also suffer from their hostilities. There is tendency to portray that the ‘good’ Armenians die and are replaced by the ‘bad’ ones (Sayfutdinova, 2011).

The Nagorno Karabakh conflict has a special place in the Armenian and Azerbaijani history textbooks. Several authors claim (Gamaghelyan and Romyancev 2013; Novikova 2012; Matevosyan, 2013) that after independence the state-controlled education system produced history textbooks with content directed by state ideology. As the authors posit, Armenian history textbooks describe the enemy as Turks and Azerbaijanis (who are often viewed as having the same identity). The depiction of the ‘enemy’ is cruel, inhuman, and violent, whereas the self is heroic, patriotic and courageous (Novikova, 2012; Gamaghelyan and Romyancev, 2013).

Zolian and Zakaryan (2008) conducted an analysis of Armenian textbooks, pointing to the importance and role of history textbooks in constructing the image of the ‘other’. These

authors claim that except for history textbooks there also are other mechanisms for growing racial theory, shaping the enemy image, including fiction, cinema, as well as mass media and Internet articles. In line with the image of the 'conqueror', to which Armenia was subject since ancient times, Azerbaijan is presented as the enemy in the context of the Nagorno-Karabagh conflict. The authors conclude that, despite widely spread Armenian practice of associating Azerbaijanis with Turks, this is not the case in the textbooks. More importantly, the blame for Sumgait and Baku massacres is not laid on the Azerbaijani nation, but on the Russian state and the Azerbaijani government.

Similarly, according to several authors (Rumyantsev and Abbasov, 2008; Yunusov; 2011) the content of Azerbaijani history textbooks is controlled by the state and portrays the official ideology of the state. The history textbooks are written by a group of specialists approved and controlled by the state. In Azerbaijani history textbooks the single image of the 'enemy' focuses on Armenia and Armenians. In some places, the authors posit that the enemy is presented through Armenian-Russian collaboration. The central role is reserved not to cultural figures but to those who fought for the motherland. History textbooks teach citizens to be able to distinguish "self" and "others" and, if and when necessary, to fight against the enemy of the state (Zolian and Zakaryan, 2008; Yunusov, 2011; Rumyantsev and Abbasov, 2008).

### **CHAPTER THREE — METHODOLOGY**

The research methodology of the current study is mixed; both quantitative and qualitative approaches are used in the design. Data collected and analyzed include content analysis of documents and textbooks, and a survey conducted in both states included in this study. Analysis of the data led to findings that answered the research questions of the study and helped test the hypotheses.

The mixed method provided the opportunity to use both quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments. Once the proposed hypotheses were confirmed by two or more independent measurements, the uncertainty of their interpretation was greatly reduced. Naturally, validity and reliability increased by minimizing possible errors in each instrument and by a reasonable belief in the different and divergent effects of the sources of error.

The survey was used primarily to measure public attitude, feelings, experience and perceptions in accepting or refuting the hypotheses. The role of history education in promoting a feeling of hatred in respective nations was measured through the surveys. As stated earlier, the survey was conducted both in Armenia and in Azerbaijan.

For the qualitative part of the research content analysis of various state documents was used, which allowed answering several of the study's research questions. The analysis of documents — constitutions, education laws, government decrees and policies, etc. — helped to identify the exact process the states require for writing and adopting the history textbooks that are taught in schools and the types of interventions used in these processes.

## **DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS & SAMPLING**

The survey questionnaires for Armenia and Azerbaijan were constructed identically in order to get unbiased results. The surveys were tested using a group of university students. Fifteen students volunteered to participate in the testing. The questionnaire was modified and improved based on feedback received from participating respondents: the wording of some questions was changed in order to eliminate differences in understanding among the test takers and some questions or response options were added to several questions in the survey.

The surveys were distributed in English and in the national languages of the respective states to let the respondents comprehend the questions and answer candidly. Realizing the limitations arising from the relationship between the two states, the survey in Azerbaijan was conducted online through an anonymous profile. The questionnaire was placed in a number of social network sites and people were invited to take the survey. To keep the two surveys identical the one in Armenia was also conducted online in the same manner.

The research used a stratified population for the survey. The number of acceptable (completed) responses received was 120 for Azerbaijan and 107 for Armenia. The selected target population aimed at was respondents 15 to 25 years of age. This age group was selected taking into account the fact that for this type of research people who have received education after the collapse of the USSR were better positioned to identify the issues related to the research questions. This is because the research measures the impact of history education of the independent states of Azerbaijan and Armenia.

## **DATA ANALYSIS**

The primary data gathered from the surveys was analyzed through statistical analysis using SPSS. In order to find cause-and-effect relationships, data analysis included mainly cross tabulations and correlations. The correlation analysis used two-tailed tests with Pearson *R* at a confidence level of 99%. In the qualitative part of the research, content analysis of textbooks and documents was performed. The classification and coding of reviewed text were derived from the research questions; descriptors were formulated to facilitate analysis and reduce bias. Each descriptor was measured by its corresponding strength in the analyzed text.

## **LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

The research study has limitations mainly arising from shortage of time and other resource-related constraints. Time limitations minimized the possibility of assuring a larger number of respondents to the surveys. Another serious constraint arose from the current status of Armenian-Azerbaijani relations, which limited full access to Azerbaijani sources and technical difficulties associated with conducting the survey.

## **CHAPTER FOUR—DATA ANALYSIS**

### **Document Analysis**

The content analysis of documents is discussed below. For the purposes of this analysis, several descriptors were identified at start to facilitate classification of the documents reviewed, as was mentioned earlier. The strength of each descriptor found in text was measured on a scale of 1 to 5, where 5 meant complete agreement or acceptance of the statement and 1 meant total denial or disagreement with the descriptor; the weights between 1 and 5 were distributed such that the middle score 3 represented neutrality on the stated issue.

### Importance of History Education

It is stated in the “Guidelines for Armenian History Teachers” in Armenia that it is impossible to call oneself a full member of a nation if one does not know one’s national history. Studying Armenian history raises national consciousness and nurtures national identity. Thus, the importance of studying one’s national history is clearly articulated in Armenia (See Table 1, descriptor 1, Mean equals 4.4).

The importance of studying the national history of Azerbaijan is articulated in the official webpage of the Azerbaijani Ministry of Education, stating that Azerbaijan’s historic leader Heydar Aliyev has always paid special attention to the preparation of textbooks for schools. He has consistently emphasized the significant role that history and other textbooks play in education. In addition, according to the “Guidelines for educating children in the spirit of patriotism,” all subjects taught in schools present great opportunities to instill a sense of patriotism among the youth (See Table 1, descriptor 1, Mean equals 4.5).

**Table 1. Importance of History Education**

<b>Descriptors</b>	<b>Mean</b>	
	<i>Armenia</i>	<i>Azerbaijan</i>
1. Government deems important the role of history education and textbooks	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.5</b>
2. History is taught through government-approved textbooks only	<b>5</b>	<b>4.6</b>

According to the Constitution of the Republic of Armenia (reference Articles 89.5 and 39) the government of the state implements comprehensive state policies in the area of education, and sets the procedures for establishing and operating educational institutions as defined by law. Similarly, according to the Constitution of the Republic of Azerbaijan the state sets forth the educational standards and controls the education process. Thus, in both

cases the process of adopting and implementing educational policies is regulated by the constitution and controlled by the state.

The law on Education of the Republic of Armenia requires that textbooks and teacher manuals for the schools be approved by the Ministry of Education and comply with the state general education criteria developed and ratified by the Ministry of Education. The schools are allowed to choose the textbooks, guidelines for teaching methods, and other instructional materials. However, they may only choose from the approved list provided by the Ministry of Education (See Table 1, descriptor 2, Mean equals 5). Likewise, it is stated in the Law on Education of the Republic of Azerbaijan that among the state's responsibilities in the field of education is the charge to ensure the development, approval and publication of textbooks and other teaching aids for educational institutions (See Table 1, descriptor 2, Mean equals 4.6).

## Process of Tendering Textbook Development

*Armenia:* Since 1998, the selection of textbooks for schools is conducted through competition. After the tender is announced by the Ministry of Education, the publishing houses select an author or group of authors to develop the textbooks and submit their bid to participate in the tender. Although competition is open to all publishers, there is no mention of independent authors' rights to participate on their own (See Table 2, descriptor 1, Mean equals 4). Under the purview of the Minister of Education, two commissions are established for managing the competition: the Commission on Content, which assesses the merits of the submitted textbook content; and the General Commission, which is responsible for other tasks, such as organization and associated technical issues. During the assessment process both Commissions also take into account the advice of school teachers and their reflections from the textbook trial period as discussed below (See Table 2, descriptor 3, Mean equals 4). The textbooks are assessed according to their compliance with general education standards and program guidelines. However, no specific assessment criteria are set or appear in any document reviewed (See Table 2, descriptor 4, Mean equals 4.3).

The competition is held in three stages. In the first stage, the experience, financial abilities of the publisher, the production quality of textbooks and other related issues are reviewed. Textbooks that meet at least 80 percent of the set criteria are selected to move to the next phase of the competition. In the second phase, the textbooks of those publishers that have met the relevant criteria are submitted to the Commission on Content to review content and physical appearance of submitted textbooks. The third phase of the competition deals with the best price quoted by the respective publishers. The textbook that gathers the highest score for content and price is approved for adoption by the Ministry of Education (See Table



2, descriptor 2, Mean equals 4.5). Since 2009, there were two committees for textbook assessment. One committee comprises school teachers and the other scientists and methodologists. The textbook is selected on the basis of the mean of all reviewers' assessment scores.

There are various participants in the textbook adoption process, including schools, school teachers, pupils, and parents. As the sixth descriptor in Table 2 indicates, the views of participating groups are taken into account to some extent. After the textbooks are selected and approved they go through a two or three-month pilot test in the schools. Based on the teachers' feedback after use of the textbooks, they are reviewed one more time. Before final adoption, additional discussions are held with teachers. The objective of these discussions is to consider the diverse opinions and suggestions by teachers for consideration in revising the textbooks. Still, not every stakeholder's interests and advice is taken into account by the state (See Table 2, descriptor 6, Mean equals 4.3). Periodically the textbooks are refreshed. The facts and events that lose meaning in time are revised, given new interpretations, or deemed not essential and removed. Further, new text is incorporated reflecting more recent events and facts (See Table 2, descriptor 5, Mean equals 5).

According to the guidelines for Armenian history teachers, the main goal of teaching national history is to raise citizen consciousness, instill national and universal values, and increase among them tolerance and respect for human rights. Studying national history is expected to inspire people such that they impart and contribute to the struggle of protecting the sovereignty of the nation. Studying history will connect children and future citizens with the motherland and make them more responsible. The heroic events of national liberation movements, the brave and self-sacrificing acts of Armenian heroes are expected to inspire children to love and protect the motherland even at the expense of their personal lives.

Classification Code — Descriptor	Mean	
	<i>Armenia</i>	<i>Azerbaijan</i>
1. Different scholars are allowed to compete in writing history textbooks	4	4.8
2. Competition is open for developing history textbooks for adoption	4.5	4.5
3. A government-created body reviews history textbooks before publication	4	5
4. There are preset criteria for accepting history textbooks	4.3	5
5. History textbooks are updated periodically	5	3
6. The process includes other parties' viewpoints in the adoption of the history textbooks	4.3	4
7. The history textbooks should be written in a language that nurtures negative attitude towards the enemy	3.4	3.8

**Table 2. Process of Tendering History Textbook Development**

The seventh descriptor implies that the history textbooks should be written in a way that negative attitude towards the enemy is instilled in pupils. However, in the guidelines for teachers and teaching programs there is nothing about the content of the textbooks and the ways that the ‘enemy’ should be described. Nevertheless, instilling in pupils a sense of tolerance and respect towards human rights mitigates possible aggressive and intolerant attitude towards any nation (See Table 2, descriptor 7, Mean equals 3.4).

*Azerbaijan*: According to the textbook policy of the Republic of Azerbaijan, the Ministry of Education announces a competition to develop textbooks or orders it. The Ministry is responsible for setting the assessment standards of textbooks; for defining procedures for the preparation of new textbooks; for determining the required standards; for providing the list of textbooks; and subsequently for approving the textbooks.

The set of textbooks can be prepared by a group of authors or single author submitted by the publishing company to the tender committee. Thus, unlike in the case of Armenia, any Azerbaijani citizen with relevant qualifications is allowed to bid for authoring a textbook and submitting it to the Committee. The publishing houses also have an equal opportunity to participate in the tender (See Table 2, descriptor 1, Mean equals 4.8). The textbooks are evaluated in accordance with the “Textbooks Assessment Criteria” approved by the Minister of Education (See Table 2, descriptor 4, Mean equals 5). The Ministry announces the competition (See Table 2, descriptor 2, Mean equals 4.5). The assessment of submitted textbooks is conducted by the Textbook Assessment Council (TAC) in two phases. The Ministry of Education appoints the chairman of the Council and approves the other members selected by the Chairman.

After completing the assessment of the textbooks, the Ministry of Education approves the textbooks based on the report of the Textbook Assessment Council and announces the list of adopted textbooks (See Table 2, descriptor 3, Mean equals 5). The textbooks are approved for a five-year use, which is considered a valid period for the use of textbooks as long as changes in educational plans and programs are taken into account in the course of teaching. Nevertheless, no exact period is set for updating the textbooks and the process for updating adopted textbooks is also absent from the documents (See Table 2, descriptor 5, Mean equals 3).

Regulations of the Textbook Assessment Council, Textbook Assessment Standards, Rules for preparing new textbooks, and Technical and (physical) *sanitary* standards of textbooks are approved by the Ministry of Education. Although the Textbook Policy of Azerbaijan states that the views of scientists, experts, authors, teachers and parents are taken

into account in the preparation, assessment, confirmation and publication of the textbooks, there is no such reference in the published process (Table 2, descriptor 6, Mean equals 4.4).

In the Azerbaijani textbook policy and assessment criteria it is stated that content should not include national, religious, racial and political discrimination. It should rather ensure a sensible approach to gender, race, ethnic and religious issues. The “Guidelines for educating children in the spirit of patriotism” states that *Armenian aggressors, who caused deaths of heroes in the battle of life and death, and morally damaged their lives* should serve as the basis of patriotic education. An exhibition is conducted in the schools of Azerbaijan titled “War through the eyes of children.” The purpose of this exhibition is to enhance the children’s and youth’s imagination and understanding of war. The children meet with eye-witnesses of the war, who tell them stories; read excerpts from books; show films, etc. This provides an opportunity to promote among children a sense of citizenship; ask questions as to why they love the motherland; who are Armenians; who is a better citizen; what is their civic duty; when and how did the Khojaly tragedy happen; etc.

The sixth descriptor in Table 2 indicates that the textbooks should be written in a way that instills negative perceptions among pupils towards the enemy. In the Azerbaijani case, there is no mention of textbook content, however, the described methods for teaching patriotism show that instilling negative feelings towards Armenians is a priority in educating the youth (See Table 2, descriptor 7, Mean equals 3.8).

### Teaching History in the Classroom

*Armenia:* The guidelines and aid for teachers teaching Armenian history is written following general education criteria and requirements. The guideline provides teachers with

a variety of teaching methods. The document also includes the requirements for assessing and grading the learning results.

**Table 3. Teaching History in the Classroom**

Descriptors	Mean	
	Armenia	Azerbaijan
1. Pupils are encouraged to analyze what they learn from history textbooks	4.3	4.3
2. Pupils are expected to memorize the content of the history textbooks	3.6	3.6
3. Teachers should explain the lesson without going beyond the content of the history textbooks	1.75	3
4. There are established criteria for giving assignments or exams, and grade students'	4.05	4.2
5. Pupils use additional materials on history aside from history textbooks	3.7	4.6

The Law on Education of the Republic of Armenia states that one of the objectives of education is to promote analytical and critical thinking among learners, and one of the responsibilities of teachers is to develop independent thinking and creativity among students. In order to make students learn better, broaden their horizon and promote critical thinking, the teachers are expected to ensure content instruction, practical work and demonstrations while covering a topic. Thus, the third descriptor in Table 3 states that teachers should not go beyond the content of the textbook while explaining the lesson has a lower value (See Table 3, descriptor 3, Mean equals 1.75). Teachers are expected to promote among learners critical thinking, the ability to make decisions and solve problems, and to self-educate. The first descriptor in Table 3 measures the extent to which pupils are encouraged to analyze content of textbooks. Although there is no mention of textbook content, it is believed that the development of critical and logical thinking in pupils will lead to analytical skills while minimizing the inclination to memorize content (See Table 3, descriptor 1, mean=4.3, descriptor 2, mean=3.6).

In the past, teaching programs were prepared by the higher authorities and given to teachers to implement; at present, the program is developed and adopted by the Ministry, but the teaching criteria offer a range of methods, such as discussions, debate, inquiry, working with primary sources, etc. The guideline includes examples of exam questions, home assignments and grading criteria. Teachers are expected to apply effective teaching methods by using, at their choice, textbooks and instructional materials, manuals and evaluation methods for gauging knowledge from the approved list of material supplied by the Ministry of Education (See Table 3, descriptor 4, Mean equals 4.05).

The teachers follow guidelines that are meant for ensuring acquisition of subject matter, as provided by the state general education criteria. Beyond the required minimum, students are free to search for and have access to any additional information. However, the right to search for information on their own does not imply that the pupils use additional information pertaining to the lesson or that the teachers provide or assign additional information other than textbook (See Table 3, descriptor 5, Mean equals 3.7).

*Azerbaijan:* The Azerbaijani State approves the state standards of education and curricula and oversees compliance with state standards. The Law on Education of the Republic of Azerbaijan, as well as the General Education Concept or National Curriculum depict the objectives of education as the responsibility to develop the learners' oral and writing abilities, communication skills, cognitive abilities, and logical reasoning. The fundamental elements of logical and creative thinking, skills related to reviewing and assessing historical events, collecting and categorizing additional facts and sources, and developing a feeling of patriotism and national pride are expected to be transferred to children. The teachers should give instructions and materials to the students that are not given in the textbooks (See Table 3, descriptor 5, Mean equals 4.6). The students should be able to

provide hypotheses and considerations related to historical events; and to make proposals on solving important issues. Here, similar to the Armenian case, there is no mention of analyzing or memorizing textbook content. However, the skills related to critical and analytical thinking augment the possibility of analysis and decrease the possibility of simply memorizing (See [Table 3](#), descriptor 1, Mean equals 4.3; descriptor 2, Mean equals 3.6).

The state provides teaching and methodological support of teachers. The textbooks are adopted along with accompanying methodological aid for teachers, which include recommendations for the development and conduct of lessons and approaches for assessing students. In the guidelines for teachers, instructions on how to grade each level of student performance are provided in detail with concrete examples. However, it is also mentioned that the teachers are free to choose the form, method and means of teaching (See [Table 3](#), descriptors 4, Mean equals 4.2). There are special training courses organized by the Ministry of Education for teachers to implement the practical use of the textbooks. The teachers are expected to provide additional materials to students outside of textbooks. In addition, according to the textbook assessment criteria the lesson should be planned in a way that develops critical thinking, comprehension, and self-assessment. Thus, while the Textbook Policy of Azerbaijan tells about the trainings for the correct use of textbooks, in the Assessment Criteria reference is made to the right of teachers to give additional materials other than the textbooks (See [Table 3](#), descriptor 3, Mean equals 3).

It is important to mention that the Armenian Law on Education prohibits political propaganda in schools, clearly stating that “engaging in political activities or carrying out political propaganda in educational institutions shall be prohibited” (Article 4.8), while the corresponding Azerbaijani Law on Education there is no mention of such prohibition.

## **Textbook Analysis**

In Armenia, the first mention of Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis in history textbooks appears in the ninth grade, while the history teaching begins in the fifth grade. Before that the only mention is the chapter about Armenian-Tatar War, where Tatars are referred as Azerbaijanis. The current ninth grade history textbook was adopted in 2008. The textbook covers Armenian history starting with the emergence of the first Armenian republic in 1918 up to the Nagorno Karabakh war and the subsequent ceasefire in 1994. The textbook is a total of 163 pages. There are two chapters dedicated to Armenia's relations with Azerbaijan, each having two sub-chapters. The first chapter is entitled "The Policy of Reconstruction and the National Question" and has two subtopics: (1) State Reconstruction and the Karabakh Movement, and (2) The Process of Declaring the Independent Republic of Armenia; and the second chapter is entitled "The Republic of Nagorno Karabakh (1991-2006)" and also has two subtopics: (1) The Republic in the years of Independence and War, and (2) the Internal Situation of the Republic. Along with these two chapters, there are also other sections in the textbook that briefly touch upon Armenian-Azerbaijani relations.

In Azerbaijan, the current national history textbooks for all grades were adopted in 2002. Unlike in the case of Armenian history textbooks, the image of Armenia and Armenians appear from the fifth grade, which is the first year of national history instruction. First appearing in the fifth grade the image of Armenians develops in each year textbook and reaches its culmination in the eleventh and last year textbook.

The content analysis of history textbooks will be discussed below. Words and phrases used referring to the enemy are classified into three groups in accordance with their severity in denoting the enemy.



- The first group includes words and phrases that may appear in every description of a war scene, which do not instill hatred in the reader.
- The second group comprises words and phrases that depict the enemy in a bad manner, characterizing it with negative qualifications.
- The last group represents words and phrases that qualify and present the enemy to an extreme such that the enemy is dehumanized.

In the Armenian textbook, there is no mention of the word *enemy* referring to Azerbaijanis before getting to coverage of the Nagorno Karabakh war. However, it is used repeatedly when describing military operations in that period. The word *enemy* can be found in other parts of the textbook, when reference is made to other types of military operations with states other than Azerbaijan, such as military operations between Armenia and Turkey, or between the USSR and Germany. In the Azerbaijani textbooks, Armenians are referred to as the *enemy* both during descriptions of war operations, as well as in other parts of textbooks. In addition, the word *enemy* is always accompanied by qualifiers such as *evil*; *cruel* or *historical enemy of our nation*. And when referring to Armenia it is written in the textbook that *an old enemy cannot become a friend*.

Table 4 illustrates the group of words and phrases that describe the enemy in a relatively neutral way. These words and phrases appear mostly in those sections of the textbooks that describe military operations. They are considered *neutral* as they also appear in other sections of the textbook that address another party involved in war. Consequently, every depiction of war, no matter who is on the opposite side, is referenced as the *enemy*. However, the reader may draw some negative feelings when reading that his/her homeland was *attacked*, *looted*, *invaded* or *bombed* by another nation, especially when these actions took place in the recent past. Some phrases, such as *provoked* or *initiated the war*, *military*

*aggression, or the lost pleasure of freedom because of the enemy put every responsibility of the start of the war on the opposite side and blame them for being the aggressor.*

**Table 4. Words and Phrases Describing War**

<b>Armenia</b>	<b>Azerbaijan</b>
attack/ed by...	attack/ed by...
lootings by...	lootings by...
invaded/conquered/annexed by...	invaded/conquered/annexed by...
confiscated property	confiscated property
Criminals	bandits
military aggression	bombed by...
displaced people	occupiers
Threat	lost pleasure of freedom because of...
provoke/initiate	
<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>

Table 5 comprises a group of words and phrases that characterize the enemy with negative qualifications and instill negative attitude and feelings in the reader towards the enemy. For instance, reading about a certain nation how *brutal* or *cruel* they were performing *vandalism, violence* and *killing* or *injuring* one's nation will naturally instill negative attitude towards that nation, especially when the exact number of killed or injured is provided.

The Azerbaijani history textbooks refer to Armenians as *faithless people dressed in black*. First, this appears in the fifth grade textbook in the form of a collective image of Georgians and Armenians several times in sections where the Azerbaijani people struggle against Armenian and Georgian feudal lords and their patrons, which are referred as *faithless people dressed in black*. After, the term is used to refer only to Armenians. A separate section in the seventh grade textbook is titled “The struggle against the giariorous (faithless) dressed in black in the epic.” Byzantine, Armenian, and Georgian feudal lords were called

*giarrious, who tried to set Turks against each other, conducting the policy of their self-extermination.*

**Table 5. Negative Connotations of the Enemy**

<i>Armenia</i>	<i>Azerbaijan</i>
Brutal	cruel
Vandalism	violence
killed/injured by...	killed/injured by...
we should punish them	an old enemy cannot become a friend
anti-Armenian policy/propaganda	fascists
	dirty purposes
	Because of Armenians Azerbaijani people lost 2-3 generations
	evil
	treacherous
	traitors
	conspirators
	notorious for their deceitfulness
	liars
	hypocritical
	death blow to the independence of the state
	displayed their meanness until the last moment
	aggression
	tragedy
	black ingratitude
	destroy/ruin
	chauvinists
	faithless
	jealousy of talented Azerbaijani generals
<b>5</b>	<b>23</b>

Later in the textbooks, Armenians are labelled as *fascists* and *chauvinists* because of whom the *Azerbaijani people lost two-three generations* of their *best people*. Everywhere in

history textbooks Armenians are referred to as *traitors, liars, treacherous, hypocritical or conspirators*, who always express *black ingratitude* and have *dirty purposes*.

Table 6 includes a group of words and phrases that dehumanize the enemy to the extreme. Use of such words promotes building an image of the enemy, which is inhuman and remorseless in the minds of the readers. In the Armenian textbooks we come across the words *massacre* and *ethnic cleansing* (հայաթափում) of Armenians by Azerbaijanis. In the Azerbaijani history textbooks Armenians are described as *bloodsuckers*, saying that they committed *bloody crimes swallowing blood everywhere and choking with blood*. They are remorseless and *show no mercy; they kill everyone, even children, pregnant women, elderly people and after killing they even mutilate the corpses*. These phrases are common in the sections describing alleged *genocides* of Azerbaijanis by the Armenians.

In March 1918, in Baku during the fight for power over Baku between Musavatists and Bolsheviks in alliance with Armenian Dashnaks, several thousands of people were killed. The decree by President Heydar Aliyev on 26 March 1998 declared the 31<sup>st</sup> of March as the ‘genocide memorial day’ in Azerbaijan. The fifth grade history textbook tells the story about these events through a dialog among 10 to 15 Azerbaijanis. Below is a section of this dialog:

*How can you tolerate Armenian troops moving around the city and doing what they want? The Armenian government disarms you on your own land and prepares to annihilate all other people. What can you call this? ... This is genocide. If the government is consciously annihilating the people who live in their own territory, this is called genocide. They want to exterminate our people.*

**Table 6. Words and Phrases Used to Dehumanize Enemy**

<b>Armenia</b>	<b>Azerbaijan</b>
Massacre	massacre
ethnic cleansing	ethnic cleansing
	they showed no mercy
	they drank blood
	they choked with blood
	terror
	annihilate
	genocide
	bloody crimes
	mutilated the corpses
	many women, children, and the elderly who managed to leave the country were killed on the way
	they did not even spare pregnant women
<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>

The topic reemerges again in the seventh grade history textbook, and a separate section in the eleventh grade textbook entitled “Genocide of the Azerbaijanis in March 1918.” The second *genocide* of Azerbaijanis by Armenians took place on 25 February, 1992 in Khojaly.

*At 21:00 hours on 25th February, 1992, Armenian armed groups, together with Russian 366th mechanized regiment...attacked Khojaly... A total of 613 people were killed in the Khojaly massacre, 487 were injured, 1,275 were taken captive, six whole families were killed and the town was burned. Many women, children and elderly people who managed to leave the town on the snowy frosty night were intercepted and killed by the Armenian fascists. The cruel enemy even mutilated the corpses.*

## **SURVEY ANALYSIS**

### **Azerbaijan: The Attitude towards Armenia and Armenians**

The survey results indicate that many more people have had negative first impressions of Armenia and Armenians than positive. In addition, the majority of those that have had

positive first impressions have subsequently changed their opinion. And the majority of those that have had negative first impressions did not change their attitude. Thus, the negative first impression stayed unaltered, and the positive turned to negative, suggesting that negative attitudes prevail. The most common reason for changes in opinion is the way they see things changed or they get more knowledgeable. For the majority of respondents meeting and knowing an Armenian did not change the negative opinion about Armenians. Thus, it seems that talking and meeting an Armenian did not change the prevailing view. Considering that most of the respondents met an Armenian during an international event or trip abroad, the time might be too short to know each other to change opinion.

Those respondents that had a neighbor or close Armenian family friend also answered that they would not like to communicate with them again, majority of them being neutral. The overwhelming majority of respondents (61.5%) indicate that the main reason for not wanting to communicate again with Armenians is that they do not trust them anymore.

The preferences to meet and know an Armenian were distributed in a way that about 46% of the respondents would not like to meet and know an Armenian, and about 32% of them would like to meet and know an Armenian, while 20% being neutral in this regard. As to the reason for meeting and knowing an Armenian the majority of the respondents (47%) stated that there is no specific reason for that; and about 23% said that “one should know one’s enemy well.” As to the question on what their attitude will be when they meet an Armenian, half of the respondents answered positively that it would be interesting and also it depends on the person, and the other half answered that they would not trust any Armenian and will dislike

**A respondent writes...**

*“After I met a lot of Armenians, I realized that it is a waste of time to try to change history (their version of the truth).”*

one. Only two people said that they would beat or kill the Armenian they meet and three people stated that they would become friends.

Regarding the question whether or not they would have a change in attitude if they met and liked someone and later found out that he/she is an Armenian, 32% said that they would begin to distrust, dislike the person and be cautious; about 40% said that it will not make any difference and it depends on what type of relations they had before; and only four people said that they would like him/her even more.

The majority of respondents said that they would not marry (44.2%) or would never fall in love with an Armenian (23.1%); and 38.5% responded that they would not live next door to an Armenian; 37.5% responded that they would never work with an Armenian; and an equal percentage stated that it depends on the person. Accordingly, the respondents consider possible business relations with Armenians, while completely denying close relations.

**A respondent writes...**

*“I want to meet an Armenian to show that we Azerbaijanis are not bad people, contrary to what they were taught in their schools. We were good neighbors for many years. Azerbaijanis always shared everything with them: bread, salt, cotton, oil, gas during Soviet period. But their nationalists started an undeclared war against Azerbaijan, occupied Karabakh with surrounding districts, and committed the Khojaly genocide against Azerbaijanis.”*

The respondents were asked to rank order who they consider their personal enemies. The majority of the respondents or 43.5% ranked first that their enemies are those who cause pain to their nation. Clearly, the vast majority or 75.6% of respondents said that Armenia and Armenians are a threat to their country. Similarly, 86.8% answered that they consider Armenia an enemy county; 92.3% answered that Armenians consider Azerbaijanis their enemy; and 92.3% posit that Armenians hate Azerbaijanis. From the respondents that think that Armenians hate Azerbaijanis, the majority or 54.5% stated that their attitude will change

if Armenians treat Azerbaijanis well. The vast majority of the respondents or 66.3% said that they want hatred between the two nations to be eliminated and 52.2% stated that the two nations could coexist peacefully.

The majority of those respondents that consider Armenia an enemy indicated that they'd prefer to see the conflict resolved peacefully, including “forgetting everything and live in peace thereafter; finding mutually acceptable solutions; establishing committees to discover the truth or to reach compromise.” Considerably less people preferred to destroy the enemy or to win the war; an equal number of respondents that considered Armenians to be the enemy stated that they would negotiate, compromise, and reach agreement; and that one day they'd become friends as opposed to fighting against the enemy; protecting their motherland from the enemy; killing them; or relying on God to punish them.

**Table 7. Cross tabulation: Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Armenian family friend? Do you think Armenians and Azerbaijanis would be able to coexist peacefully?**

			Do you think Armenians and Azerbaijanis would be able to coexist peacefully?					Total
			Yes	A little	Neutral	Not much	No	
<i>Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Armenian family friend?</i>	Yes	Count	15	7	5	6	3	36
		% within Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Armenian family friend?	41.7%	19.4%	13.9%	16.7%	8.3%	100%
	No	Count	13	3	5	7	8	36
		% within Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Armenian family friend?	36.1%	8.3%	13.9%	19.4%	22.2%	100%
	I don't know	Count	6	2	4	2	2	16
		% within Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Armenian family friend?	37.5%	12.5%	25.0%	12.5%	12.5%	100%
<i>Total</i>		Count	34	12	14	15	13	88
		% within Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Armenian family friend?	38.6%	13.6%	15.9%	17.0%	14.8%	100%



Table 7 presents a cross tabulation of what people who have had a close Armenian neighbor or friend think about Armenians and Azerbaijanis being able to coexist peacefully v. the position of people who have not had an Armenian friend or neighbor. Clearly those who have had an Armenian neighbor or friend are more likely not to want hatred between the two nations.

### **Azerbaijan: The Impact of Education on Society's Attitude**

An analysis was conducted to find out if there is a cause and effect relationship between education in schools and the impression of youth about Armenia and Armenians, i.e., if there is hatred or tolerance among the new generation of Azerbaijanis.

**Table 8. Correlation between the positive first impression and knowledge of history**

		I remember what I have learnt in school on the history of Azerbaijan	Positive impression of Armenians
<i>I remember what I have learnt in school on the history of Azerbaijan</i>	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.718**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.006
	N	13	13
<i>Positive impression of Armenians</i>	Pearson Correlation	-0.718**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.006	
	N	13	13
<i>Do you think Armenians hate Azerbaijanis?</i>	Pearson Correlation	-0.780**	0.946**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.005	0.000
	N	11	11

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level of confidence (2-tailed).

The vast majority of respondents from Azerbaijan learnt about Armenia and Armenians during their school or pre-school years. More specifically, the majority of them have learnt about Armenians from their family and peers/teachers from school. The analysis indicated that there is a strong correlation between the fact that people remember what they've learnt in school on their history and their positive first impression about Armenians. In Table 8 the negative correlation of **-0.718** indicating that the more people remember what

they've learnt in school on history, the less likely it is to have a positive their first impression about Armenians. In addition, the vast majority of people that said they have their current knowledge of national history from school had negative first impressions about Armenia and Armenians, rather than positive.

Further, those respondents that have learnt about Armenia and Armenians first in school were grouped for further analysis. A larger number of respondents have had a positive first impression than negative. (Negative impression included wariness to protect the motherland from Armenians; that Armenians are enemies and are in conflict with them.) Later, those that have had a positive first impression stated that their opinion has changed because of the way they see things changing. Half of the respondents with a negative first impression changed their opinion and another half did not.

In order to measure the impact of education on people's attitude, several variables were selected, including (a) if the current history knowledge of people is from school; (b) if people have acquired history knowledge elsewhere besides school; and (c) if they had analyzed or simply memorized the textbook content. The majority of respondents who had acquired their knowledge of history from school stated that when choosing a friend with foreign origin they'd rather exclude an Armenian from the list. Similarly, the vast majority of respondents who had learned about their history from sources aside from school and history textbooks also stated that they would rather exclude an Armenian as a friend. There were no differences between those two groups.

As [Table 9](#) illustrates there is a strong correlation between the way people think the enemy should be treated and the method of learning about their national history. Although rather weak, a positive correlation exists between respondents that have read other books, watched other programs and films on history, and acquired knowledge from family besides

school, and how they think the enemy should be treated. This reveals that additional sources of acquiring history knowledge do affect the way people think the enemy should be treated.

**Table 9. Method of Learning History v. Attitude towards the Enemy**

		I have read other books about history of Azerbaijan, besides my history textbook	I have watched other national history programs or films, besides my history textbook	Besides school, I have learnt history of my country from my family
What should be done to the enemy? _ Positive	Pearson Correlation	0.269**	0.274**	0.269**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	11	11	11

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level of confidence (2-tailed).

Similarly, the positive correlation in Table 10 indicates that the more people acquire knowledge from sources other than school, the more they think that the conflict should be solved in a peaceful manner.

**Table 10. Source(s) of Learning about History v. Approach to Resolving Conflict**

		I have read other books about history of Azerbaijan, besides my history textbook	I have watched other national history programs or films, besides my history textbook	I have learnt history of my country from my family
Stop conflict negative	Pearson Correlation	0.279**	0.260**	0.219**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.002
	N	11	11	11

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level of confidence (2-tailed).

Taking yet another look, Table 11 indicates that there is strong correlation between the manner in which people acquire history knowledge and the way they view the enemy and conflict resolution. The negative correlations of **-0.413** as well as **-0.371** show that if respondents' knowledge of national history is from school, they are less likely to consider treating the enemy more positively and solving the conflict peacefully.

**Table 11. Manner of Acquiring History Knowledge and View of the Enemy**

		What should be done to the enemy- Positive	Stop conflict Positive
My knowledge of national history is from what I learned in school	Pearson Correlation	-0.371**	-0.413**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0.000
	N	11	11

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level of significance (2-tailed).

Table 12 and Table 13 indicate that there is strong correlation between memorizing the content of history textbooks and attitude towards the enemy and ways of solving the conflict. The positive correlations of **0.220** and **0.473** show that people that have memorized their history textbooks are more likely to treat the enemy negatively and want to stop the conflict by fighting and by force.

**Table 12. Memorizing Content of History Textbooks v. Attitude Towards the Enemy**

		Stop conflict negative
We were required to memorize the content of the history textbook	Pearson Correlation	0.220**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.002
	N	11

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level of significance (2-tailed).

**Table 13. Memorizing Content of History Textbooks v. Approach to Solving Conflict**

		What should be done to enemies? negative
We were required to memorize the content of the history textbook	Pearson Correlation	0.437**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000
	N	11

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Although these correlations show that school education has an impact on individual attitudes towards Armenians, there are exclusions. The cross tabulations reveal that the

majority of respondents that have acquired history knowledge from sources aside textbooks consider Armenia and Armenians a threat and an enemy of Azerbaijan. These people also think that Armenians hate Azerbaijanis and consider Azerbaijanis their enemies. In addition, the majority of those that did not acquire knowledge from any other source aside from school have the same opinion and attitude. And the vast majority of all respondents want the hatred between the two nations eliminated. Thus, other ways of acquiring knowledge, such as history books, programs, films and one's contacts (family and friends) also play a significant role in the formation of attitudes towards Armenia and Armenians. Negative feelings may be shaped through either way.

The cross tabulations also revealed that the majority of respondents does not want the hatred between the two nations to be eliminated. Both the majority of those that have analyzed and/or memorized their history textbooks think that Armenians are a threat, an enemy to their nation. None of these respondents thinks that there is no hatred between the two nations. Thus, this reveals that analyzing and/or memorizing history textbooks seems to have little impact on shaping attitude towards Armenia. As mentioned earlier, this may be explained by the fact that other sources, besides textbooks, have some impact on how Azerbaijanis feel towards Armenians.

### ***Armenia: The Attitude towards Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis***

The results of the survey indicate that the vast majority of respondents from Armenia have had negative first impressions about Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis than positive. However, the majority of those that have had positive first impressions have changed their opinion in time. And the vast majority of those that have had negative first impressions did not change their attitude, which means that currently negative attitudes prevail in Armenian society. The most common reason for change of opinion that people cite is the way they see

things changing or acquiring additional knowledge in time. Meeting and knowing an Azerbaijani may change some negative attitude, such as the way one is wary of Azerbaijanis or feels the need to protect oneself from them. However, the opinion that Azerbaijan is an enemy and that there is conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan has not changed.

The majority of respondents that had a neighbor or close Azerbaijani family friend answered that they would not like to communicate with them; as 72.7% of those respondents indicate the main reason for not wanting to communicate is that they do not trust Azerbaijanis any more.

In Armenia, the desire to meet and know an Azerbaijani was distributed as follows: about 46.7% of respondents would not like to meet and know an Azerbaijani and about 39% would. The overwhelming (46.9%) reason cited is that they'd want to know an Azerbaijani to check if they've got the right opinion of them or not and about 22% stated that they ought to know the enemy well. The majority of respondents stated that they'd be interested to meet an Azerbaijani and also that their attitude depends on the person they meet; the majority also stated that if they were treated right they'd also treat them well in return; 23.3% said that they would probably become friends; others stated that they would not trust any Azerbaijani and would definitely dislike one; and only three people said that they would beat or kill the Azerbaijani they meet.

The vast majority of respondents said that they would not marry (38.3%) or would never fall in love (29%) with an Azerbaijani. The majority also thinks that they would not live next door (42.2%) to an Azerbaijani, although the majority would consider possible business relations with Azerbaijanis, while denying building close relations.

The vast majority (91.6%) of respondents in Armenia considers Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis a threat to Armenia and 89.7% considers Azerbaijan an enemy; and 96.3%

believe that Azerbaijanis consider Armenians their enemy. Among those respondents that think that Azerbaijanis hate Armenians, the majority (61.6%) stated that their attitude will change if they were sure that Azerbaijanis do not hate them and treat Armenians well. The vast majority of respondents (48.6%) indicated that they'd want the hatred to be eliminated and 83.1% said that the two nations could coexist peacefully.

The majority of respondents that consider Azerbaijan an enemy prefer to solve the conflict in a peaceful manner, such as forget everything and live in peace (15.6%); find mutually acceptable solutions (67.7%); or establish committees to discover the truth (27.7%); a much fewer number of respondents would opt to destroy the enemy (9.4%) or win the war (24%). Further, 66.7% of those respondents that consider Azerbaijanis the enemy said that they'd the two nations should negotiate and find a solution; and that one day they might become friends (9.4%); others think that they should fight against the enemy (18.8%); protect their motherland from them (26%); kill them (8.3%); or God will punish them (16.7%).

**Table 14. Cross Tabulation - Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Azerbaijani family friend? \* Do you think Armenians and Azerbaijanis would be able to coexist without conflict?**

			Do you think Armenians and Azerbaijanis would be able to coexist without conflict?					Total
			Yes	A little	Neutral	Not much	No	
Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Azerbaijani family friend?	Yes	Count	4	5	1	6	3	19
		% within Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Azerbaijani family friend?	21.1%	26.3%	5.3%	31.6%	15.8%	100%
	No	Count	18	11	5	21	9	64
		% within Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Azerbaijani family friend?	28.1%	17.2%	7.8%	32.8%	14.1%	100%
	Don't know	Count	11	3	3	5	2	24
		% within Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Azerbaijani family friend?	45.8%	12.5%	12.5%	20.8%	8.3%	100%
Total		Count	33	19	9	32	14	107

**Table 14. Cross Tabulation - Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Azerbaijani family friend? \* Do you think Armenians and Azerbaijanis would be able to coexist without conflict?**

			Do you think Armenians and Azerbaijanis would be able to coexist without conflict?					Total
			Yes	A little	Neutral	Not much	No	
Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Azerbaijani family friend?	Yes	Count % within Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Azerbaijani family friend?	4 21.1%	5 26.3%	1 5.3%	6 31.6%	3 15.8%	19 100%
	No	Count % within Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Azerbaijani family friend?	18 28.1%	11 17.2%	5 7.8%	21 32.8%	9 14.1%	64 100%
	Don't know	Count % within Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Azerbaijani family friend?	11 45.8%	3 12.5%	3 12.5%	5 20.8%	2 8.3%	24 100%
Total		Count % within Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Azerbaijani family friend?	33 30.8%	19 17.8%	9 8.4%	32 29.9%	14 13.1%	107 100%

Cross tabulation in Table 14 shows that those that have had a close Azerbaijani neighbor or friend think that Armenians and Azerbaijanis would be able to coexist without conflict, compared to those that have not had an Armenian friend or neighbor. And the majority of the people that have had an Azerbaijani friend or neighbor want the hatred to be eliminated.

***Armenia: The Impact of Education on the Society's Attitude***

The majority of respondents in Armenia learnt about Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis in their pre-school period and another large segment learned in school. However, more than half stated that they have learnt about Azerbaijanis from family and the rest learned from the media, university or friends. Only 9.2% of respondents stated that they have learnt about Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis in school. However, in order to measure the impact of school in shaping attitude, further analysis was conducted.



Table 15 indicates that there is no correlation between what people remember from what they've learnt in school v. their first impression of Azerbaijanis. The same is true with respect to people's current knowledge of history from school and their first positive impression.

**Table 15. First Positive Impression v. Learning History in School**

		First impression positive	I remember what I have learnt in school on the history of Armenia
First impression positive	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.103
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.291
	N	120	106
I remember what I have learnt in school on history of Armenia	Pearson Correlation	-0.103	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.291	
	N	9	9

As stated earlier those who have learnt about Armenia and Armenians first in school were grouped for further analysis. Quite similar to the pattern of responses from Azerbaijan, the vast majority of those respondents had negative first impressions of Azerbaijanis. Later, the majority of those who had positive first impressions stated that their opinion had changed and those who had negative impressions did not change opinion.

		What should be done to the enemy positive	What should be done to the enemy negative
My current knowledge of history of my country is from what I acquired in school	Pearson Correlation	0.058	0.119
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.551	0.223
	N	9	9

Similar to the analysis of the survey data from Azerbaijan, several variables were used to test the impact of education on the people's attitude: if the current history knowledge of people is from school; if people have acquired history knowledge elsewhere besides school; and if they were analyzing or memorizing textbook content. Respondents who have acquired knowledge of history from school said that if they choose a foreigner as a friend they would rather exclude Azerbaijanis. Similarly, respondents that have not acquired history knowledge from school only also excluded befriending an Azerbaijani. Further, the majority of respondents that acquired history knowledge from sources other than school also stated that they would rather exclude an Azerbaijani as a friend. Much in the same pattern, those who tend to memorize, rather than analyze history textbooks, are also more likely to exclude having an Azerbaijani friend. These are quite the same as the responses of Azerbaijanis.

The same set of correlations was used to test the data collected from Armenia. [Table 17](#) show that there is no correlation between of history knowledge acquired in school and negative or positive attitudes toward conflict resolution.

**Table 17. History Knowledge from School and Attitudes toward Conflict Resolution**

		Stop conflict positive	Stop conflict negative
My current knowledge of history of my country is from what I acquired in school	Pearson Correlation	0.071	-0.169
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.857	0.664
	N	9	9

There is also no correlation between the tendency of people to analyze (Sig. equals 0.311) or memorize (Sig. equals 0.347) their history textbooks and the way they think the enemy should be treated or the conflict resolved.

A series of cross tabulations support the idea that school has no impact on the attitude towards Azerbaijanis revealing that the vast majority of respondents who acquired history knowledge from school think that the conflict should be solved in a peaceful manner and the enemy should not be treated with force.

A number of cross tabulations show that the vast majority of respondents that have learned about their national history from school consider Azerbaijan an enemy and a threat to Armenia; they also think that Azerbaijanis hate Armenians and consider them the enemy. Similarly, respondents whose history knowledge is not from school only also think that way.

The cross tabulations revealed that the vast majority of people that acquired their history knowledge elsewhere besides school, such as other history books, movies or family, stated that they consider Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis a threat to and an enemy of their country. These people also think that Azerbaijanis hate Armenians and consider them enemies. Accordingly, other ways of acquiring history knowledge play a significant role in shaping attitudes towards Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis.

In addition, the cross tabulations show that other sources of learning history have higher impact on the way that people think the enemy should be treated and the conflict resolved. The vast majority of those respondents who acquired history knowledge elsewhere aside from school tend to be more negative about the ways of treating the enemy and solving the conflict. In contrast, most people that comparably did not learn history from any additional source tend to want the conflict resolved peacefully. Thus, again the impact of

other sources on the formation of negative attitudes is high. And the school's impact on the negative opinions is either positive or slim.

## CHAPTER FIVE — FINDINGS

In order to test the first and second hypotheses — that history textbooks promote hatred by creating a negative image of the enemy — it is important to find the degree to which the state controls the process of educating the young generations. Document analysis provided an opportunity to analyze the process of adopting history textbooks and find out if there is state intervention in the process. Subsequently, the analysis of history textbooks helped uncover whether there is negative or dehumanized image of the enemy in those texts.

**H1: Azerbaijan uses the history textbooks to promote hatred against Armenia by creating a negative image of the enemy.**

The document analysis revealed that the Azerbaijani government deems important history education of younger generations and textbooks used in schools should only be those approved by the government. Any Azerbaijani citizen is allowed to participate in the competition, if having relevant specialization and competition is held among the applicants. Although the Textbook Policy of Azerbaijan states that the views of scientists, experts, authors, teachers and parents are taken into account in the preparation, assessment, confirmation and publication of the textbooks, there is no specific process mentioned in this regard. The textbooks are assessed by the government and according to government-established criteria. Accordingly, the government controls the whole process of textbook selection and adoption. Racial theory is fully integrated into school history curriculum.

The teachers are expected to provide materials and information not available in textbooks. However, the teachers are taught to use the content of textbooks in the classroom. The survey results indicate that the vast majority of the respondents agree that the teachers are/were indeed giving additional materials and information outside of the textbooks. And the vast majority of them responded that they have read other books, watched other programs on national history besides school material. In addition, most people agree that they've learnt history from their families. According to the documents, Azerbaijani pupils are educated in a way that promotes analysis rather than memorizing the content of textbooks. In addition, the survey results indicate that more than half of respondents agree that they were/are analyzing each topic in the textbook. But, the proportion of respondents that agree or disagree that they memorize textbook content is almost equal, with 30 percent being neutral. As a result, the document analysis and survey results revealed that pupils are prone to acquiring additional information from their teachers or additional materials. However, the role of textbooks in education is high and analysis rather than memorizing content is encouraged.

Document analysis showed that instilling negative attitude towards the 'enemy' in Azerbaijan is done through teaching patriotism in a way that the *aggressor* Armenians should kept in focus. In addition, children should know everything in detail about the war, about the *genocide* committed by Armenians. In contrast, the document analysis also revealed that the policy provision that textbook content should not include any national, religious or political discrimination is not actually upheld or enforced.

Further, on the issue of creating a dehumanized or evil image of the enemy through textbooks revealed that neutral words and phrases are the least frequent in Azerbaijan. Instead, negative and dehumanized qualifications of Armenians are much more frequent, the inhuman qualifiers being so dominant so as to depict Armenians as *showed no mercy, drank*

*blood, mutilated the corpses, did not spare pregnant women, etc.* Thus, Azerbaijani history textbooks are more intense in creating a dehumanized image of Armenia and Armenians as their enemy.

Thus, the control of textbook adoption is in the hands of the state, the content of the textbooks is approved by the state, and the content of textbooks includes severely dehumanized images of Armenians as the enemy of Azerbaijan. Accordingly, Hypothesis 1 is accepted.

**H<sub>2</sub>: Armenia uses the history textbooks to promote hatred against Azerbaijan by creating a negative image of the enemy.**

The government of Armenia has assigned an important role to history education of youth and controls the publication and choice of history textbooks. Different scholars are allowed to participate in the competition of writing textbooks provided they are approached by a publishing house who is preparing to bid. Discussions are held with teachers and the textbooks are piloted in schools so as to give teachers the opportunity to comment. The final decision to select the winning textbook and adopt it is made by the Ministry of Education according to the state education standards. Thus, the whole process of textbook selection, assessment and adoption is controlled by the state.

The document analysis revealed that the pupils are given opportunity and access to additional materials and information. And the teachers are expected to ensure content instruction, practical work and demonstrations while covering a topic. Thus, they go beyond the textbook while explaining the lesson. In addition, the survey results indicate that the vast majority of respondents agreed that the history teacher was giving additional materials outside of the textbook. And the vast majority have read other history books and watched other programs and films on history textbook. Besides, they have acquired knowledge from

family and friends. The document analysis also showed that school children are encouraged to analyze textbook content rather than memorize it. And indeed, the majority of respondents disagreed, but not totally, that they were required to memorize content. Overall, the document analysis and survey results both revealed that besides textbooks, people acquire history knowledge from other sources. But textbook content is considered to be very important in school education. Document analysis also revealed that teaching children national and universal values, tolerance, respect for human rights, and conscious patriotism mitigates possible aggressive and intolerant attitude and behavior towards any nation.

In the Armenian history textbooks the words *brutal*, *vandalism* are the most negative qualifiers of Azerbaijanis and their most negative actions are the *anti-Armenian propaganda*; the *killings* of Armenians; *massacre* and *ethnic cleansing*. These are relatively softer than the qualifiers used by Azerbaijanis. The most frequently appearing words and phrases in the Armenian textbooks are in the first group, which are rather neutral, war-describing words. These words are double more than the words in the other two groups separately. In fact, there are only a few sections in Armenian history textbooks referring to Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis. The reason for this is that according to Armenian sources the state of Azerbaijan was created only after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the people before that were called Caucasus Tatars and were spread throughout the Caucasus.

To conclude, the process of textbook selection and adoption is controlled and content approved by the state, but does not include a dehumanized image of Azerbaijanis. Accordingly, the second hypothesis is only partially accepted.

**H3: As a result of the state education policy to promote the negative image of the enemy, there is prevailing negative attitude towards Armenians and Armenia in the Azerbaijani society.**

Although there are people in Azerbaijani society that have had comparably positive first impressions of Armenia and Armenians, currently, as a result of getting more knowledge or change in worldview, most of them have changed their opinion and the prevailing common attitude towards Armenians in Azerbaijan is mostly negative. The negative attitude is so strong that meeting or knowing an Armenian does not have any positive effect on it. However, as most people have met an Armenian during an international event or other travel, the time limitation may be considered reason for not changing opinion. Some people have had a friend or a neighbor of Armenian nationality, but half of them do not want to communicate with them as they do not trust Armenians any more.

Although most respondents stated that they would not like to meet an Armenian, the percentage of those who want to meet and know is not too little (32%) and most of them for no specific reason, while others to know the 'enemy' better. There are many in Azerbaijani society that have not extremely negative attitudes or who are not against meeting and knowing an Armenian and having normal relations with them. However, the prevailing attitudes and opinions are still negative, denying close relations and trusting each other.

The larger mass of people consider Armenia and Armenians a threat and enemy of Azerbaijan. Similarly, the vast majority of people think that Armenians consider Azerbaijanis their enemy and hate Azerbaijanis. However, the majority of people is ready to change attitude if they were assured that Armenians would not hate Azerbaijanis and treat them well. The majority would prefer the hatred between the two nations to be eliminated and thinks that the two societies will be able to coexist in peace. Thus, it is obvious that most people in Azerbaijan want to solve the conflict peacefully. However, the prevailing view that Armenia is an enemy and a threat has a constraining effect and contributed to racial theory.



This imposes a security dilemma, as Azerbaijanis think that Armenians hate them; if they were sure that this is not the case, they might change attitude.

Data analysis revealed that people who have first learnt about Armenia and Armenians in school tend to have negative first impressions about them, which have subsequently changed among half of the population surveyed. However, the majority of people continue to have negative attitude. Fewer people use other sources, besides school for learning history. The more their knowledge of history is from school, the more they tend to think that the enemy should be treated harshly and the conflict solved by force. This shows that school builds strong racial animosity and makes people have more aggressive and negative feelings towards the enemy. However, data analysis also shows that both those who have used other sources to learn history and those who have not perceive Armenians as the enemy and think that they hate Azerbaijanis. Accordingly, other sources do not necessarily cause or increase positive attitude, rather they may amplify negative feelings or create new ones.

According to the analysis, memorizing history textbook brings to the belief that they should fight and kill the enemy, to protect the motherland. However, regardless of having memorized content or not, most tend to have a negative attitude towards Armenians revealing that analysis of history text has little impact on the shaping of attitude. Thus, on the one hand the impact of school is important in shaping negative feelings and attitudes towards the enemy. On the other hand, other sources of knowledge about Armenians have also comparable effect on the formation of intolerance and hatred. Accordingly, though the school has a significant role in growing hatred towards the enemy, external sources outside of school also influence shaping hatred towards Armenians. Thus, the third hypothesis is partially accepted.

**H4: As a result of the state education policy to promote the negative image of the enemy, there is prevailing negative attitude towards Azerbaijanis and Azerbaijan in the Armenian society.**

Although few people have had positive first impressions about Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis, currently the negative attitudes prevail in Armenian society. Data analysis shows that meeting and knowing an Azerbaijani has changed some negative feelings such that Armenians should be wary of Azerbaijanis or protect themselves from them. However, the opinion that Azerbaijanis are an enemy and there is conflict between the two nations has not changed. Many respondents would like to meet and know an Azerbaijani mainly to check if their opinion is right and also because one should know the enemy well. The majority of people who have known Azerbaijanis now do not want to communicate with them again as they do not trust them any more.

As the data analysis shows, the vast majority of Armenians think that Azerbaijanis are an enemy and a threat to Armenia. They also perceive that Azerbaijanis hate them and consider them the enemy. However, the vast majority said that if they are sure that Azerbaijanis do not hate and treat Armenians well, they will change their attitudes. In addition, most people think that if an Azerbaijani treats them well, they will also treat them well. Here, the same security dilemma appears here as in the case of Azerbaijan. The lack of trust and insecurity towards the other brings about negative attitudes and intolerance towards the other.

Data analysis also measured the impact of school history education on the negative attitudes of Armenians towards Azerbaijanis. The analysis revealed that both those who have learnt history only from school as well as those that learnt through other sources do not want an Azerbaijani to be their friend. The correlation analysis showed that school history

education has no impact on shaping opinion and attitudes towards Azerbaijanis. The prevailing negative attitudes have not been formed in school. In addition, as data analysis proved other sources of learning history or about Azerbaijanis have more impact on the formation of negative attitudes and intolerance towards Azerbaijanis. Accordingly, the fourth hypothesis is rejected as school education has no dominant impact. This fact may also be true because in Armenian schools children start to learn about Azerbaijanis only in ninth grade, and the curriculum allocates very few topics for learning about Azerbaijan and Armenian-Azerbaijani relations.

## **CONCLUSION**

The evidence of the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict shows how two nations that have had years of experience of peaceful coexistence neighboring each other, currently are in a state where negative attitudes prevail in each society. As racial theory and prior research suggest, one of the reasons for this is states' concerted effort for creating a dehumanized image of the opponent and making its own citizens to hate and distrust the other. And among the tools that states use for this purpose is the education system. Through history education, particularly, governments promote the image of the 'enemy' and educate a 'patriotic' society ready to fight against the 'aggressor' when the need arises.

This research has shown that the state of Azerbaijan uses history textbooks to create a negative and dehumanized image of Armenians and disseminates that in society. The survey conducted in Azerbaijan discovered that negative attitudes, distrust and intolerance towards Armenians prevail in Azerbaijani society. As such, the role of history education is shown to be benefitting racial theory. However, other sources for learning history and getting information about Armenia and Armenians also have a huge impact on shaping attitudes.

In the case of Armenia, the study revealed that Armenian history textbooks, sponsored by the state, do not play a significant role in creating a negative or dehumanized image of Azerbaijanis. The impact of school history education in the formation of negative attitudes towards Azerbaijanis is slim to none. However, the survey showed that negative feelings and distrust towards Azerbaijanis are dominant in Armenian society and other sources of information about the history of Armenia and Azerbaijanis have a higher impact on shaping negative feelings.

Thus, in one case, history education is an important tool for creating and disseminating a negative image of the enemy in society; while in the other case history education does not have such a huge role in dehumanizing the enemy; and that negative feelings result from other factors.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

As the survey analysis revealed the impact of other sources of information on the formation of negative attitude towards one another, it might be useful to look into this using larger samples and additional data and corresponding analysis.

As the survey in both states showed, the vast majority of Azerbaijanis and Armenians, 66.3% and 48.6% respectively, want the hatred between the two societies to be eliminated. The majority of both nations said that if they were sure that the opponent treats them well their attitude will also be positive. 54.5% in Azerbaijan and 83.1% in Armenia think that the two nations will be able to coexist together without conflict. In addition, despite the fact that negative attitudes prevail, there are many people in both societies that are ready to cooperate and communicate, and most people naturally do not want war and want to solve the conflict

peacefully. However, the lack of trust towards each other, dominance of the negative image of one another are obstacles in this regard.

Accordingly, these feelings may be lessened by eliminating the negative image in both societies through more intense and systematic communication. These will make the people of both states know each other and break the rooted stereotypes and the concocted image of the perceived 'enemy' and start building mutual trust. Communication can take the form of capacity-building projects between the states, e.g., community youth peacebuilding through the media; conflict transformation seminars in Baku and Yerevan and other projects. The peaceful coexistence of the two nations in society is important in terms of eliminating the rooted hatred and peace-building. And as Carl Sandburg wrote in his poem “What if they declare a war and nobody came?”(Sandburg, 1936)

## Bibliography

- Adibekyan, Armine & Elibegova, Anzhela., 2013 «Armenophobia in Azerbaijan», Department of Public Relations and Mass Media of the Office of the President RA
- Alakbarov, Farid. 2001. «Writing Azerbaijan's History: Digging for the Truth», Azerbaijan International
- Applebaum, Anne. 2010. Russia Redefines History. "*European Network Remembrance and Solidarity*". Accessed October 8, 2013, <http://enrs.eu/en/cooperation-details/47-articles/60-russia-redefines-history>
- Beteeva, Madina & Karpenko, Oksana. 2013. " Problems of Teaching 20th Century South Ossetia History in Schools". *Myths and Conflict*, Vol. 1. Instrumentalization of Historical Narratives. *International Alert*. 92-114.
- Chikovani, Nino. 2013. " The De-Sovietisation and Nationalisation of History in Post-Soviet Georgia". *Myths and Conflict*, Vol. 1. Instrumentalization of Historical Narratives. *International Alert*. 72-91.
- Clark, Anna. 2010. "Politicians using history." *Australian Journal of Politics and History* (Australian Centre for Public Policy) 56, no. 1: 120-131.
- Crawford, Keith. 2003. "*Culture Wars: Serbian History Textbooks and the Construction of National Identity*". Ormskirk, England: Edge Hill College of Higher Education.
- Dupuy, Kendra. 2008. *Education for Peace: Building Peace and Transforming Armed Conflict Through Education Systems*. International Peace Research Institute, Oslo (PRIO).
- De Waal, Thomas, "*Black Garden: Armenia and Azerbaijan through Peace and War*", New York University Press, 2003
- Fabick, Steve (Ed.), 2004 "Enemy Images: A Resource Manual for Reducing Enmity", Psychologists for Social Responsibility, Washington, DC.
- Finlay, Mick. 2007. "The propaganda of extreme hostility: Denunciation and the regulation of the group". *British Journal of Social Psychology*. The British Psychology Society.
- Gabbard, D.; & Ross, E. W. (Eds.). 2008. "*Education under the security state*". New York: Teachers College Press retrieved from Hickman, Heather, and Porfilio J., Brad. 2012. *The New Politics of the Textbook: Critical Analysis in the Core Content Areas*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Gamaghelyan, Philip, and Rummyantsev, Sergey. 2013. "Armenia and Azerbaijan: The Nagorny Karabakh Conflict and the Reinterpretation of Narratives in History

- Textbooks”: Myths and Conflict, Vol.1. Instrumentalization of Historical Narratives.*International Alert*.166-190.
- Gitsba, Inar. 2013. “The De-Sovietisation and Nationalisation of History in Abkhaz Textbooks”. Myths and Conflict, Vol.1.Instrumentalization of Historical Narratives.*International Alert*.115-134.
- Heinzen, Jasper. 2004. "Memory War": The Manipulation of History in the Context of Sino-Japanese Relations." *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies* 6: 148-164.
- Hickman, Heather, and Porfilio J., Brad. 2012. *The New Politics of the Textbook: Critical Analysis in the Core Content Areas*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Hitler, Adolf. 1926. “*Mein Kampf*”, Bottom of the Hill Publishing.
- Hope Williams Llewellyn, Claire. 2011. “*Cold War Educational Propaganda and Instructional Films, 1945-1965*”, Richmond, Virginia: Virginia Commonwealth University.
- Horowitz, Donald, "*Ethnic Groups in Conflict*", London: University of California Press, 1985, p. 95.
- Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2010. ” *Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms*". Washington DC: Defense Technical Information Center
- Jowett, Garth, and O'Donnell, Victoria. 2012. *Propaganda and Persuasion*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Karpenko, Oksana. 2013. "Results of a Comparative Analysis of School Textbooks". Myths and Conflict, Vol.1.Instrumentalization of Historical Narratives.*International Alert*.14-30.
- Kabapinar, Yücel, 2005, “*The Image of ‘Others’ and Tolerance in Turkish History Textbooks: ‘Not Us’, ‘the Other is to Blame’*”, Center for Values Education, Istanbul
- Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/> (accessed October 20, 2013).
- McLean Hilker, Lyndsay. 2010. “*The Role of Education in Driving Conflict and Building Peace-The Case of Rwanda*”, Background Paper prepared for UNESCO for the EFA Global Monitoring Report.
- Marko-Stöckl, Edith. 2008. “*My Truth, Your Truth – Our Truth? The Role of Truth Commissions and History Teaching for Reconciliation*”, Specific report on the role of history for reconciliation, MIRICO: Human and Minority Rights in the Life Cycle of Ethnic Conflicts.
- Morgan, Katalin. 2012. “Stereotypes, Prejudices, Self and ‘the Other’ in History Textbooks”. *Yesterday & Today: No. 7*, pp. 85-100
- Mueller, John. 2000. "The Banality of «Ethnic War”". *International Security*, Vol 25.

- Novikova, Gayane. 2012. "The Nagorno Karabagh Conflict through the Prism of the Image of the Enemy", *International Order, Security and Strategic Studies*, Springer-Verlag.
- Oberschall, Anthony. 2000. "The manipulation of ethnicity: from ethnic cooperation to violence and war in Yugoslavia". *Routledge Journals Taylor & Francis Ltd: Ethnic and Racial Studies*: Volume 23, number 6.
- Rudolph, Joseph, 2006. "*Politics and Ethnicity: A Comparative Study*", New York: Palgrave Macmillan,
- Rumyansev, Sergey and Abbasov, Ilham. 2008. «Ways to perpetuate the past: Analyzing the images of «others» in Azerbaijani textbooks». *Contemporary History Textbooks in the South Caucasus*. Association for International Affairs (AMO)
- Said, Edward, 1977. "*Orientalism*", London: Penguin
- Sayfutdinova, Leyla, 2011, "Good" and "bad" Armenians: Representation of the Karabakh conflict in Azerbaijani literature", *Changing Identities: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia*. Heinrich Böll Stiftung South Caucasus
- Smilansky, Blandine, 2011, "Tolerance Building through History Education in Georgia", *Uncovering Diversity in History*, EUROCLIO Program-History for Change
- Vuorinen, Marja. 2012. "*Enemy Images in War Propaganda*", Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Ynagizawa-Drott, David. 2012. "*Propaganda and Conflict: Theory and Evidence from the Rwandan Genocide*", Harvard University.
- Yanagizawa-Drott, David. 2011. "*Propaganda vs. Education: A Case Study of Hate Radio in Rwanda*", *Oxford Handbook of Propaganda Studies*.
- Ynusov, Arif, 2011. "*Myths and "Enemy" images in the Historical Sciences and History Textbooks of Independent Azerbaijan*", <http://www.kavkazoved.info/news/2011/10/11/mify-i-obrazy-vraga-v-istoricheskoi-nauke-azerbajdzhana-i.html>
- Zolian, Mikayel&Zakaryan, Tigran, 2008. "The images of "Self" and "Other" in textbooks on History of Armenia", *Contemporary History Textbooks in the South Caucasus*, Prague: Association for International Affairs
- Wunsch, Sinikka, 2002, «Image Research and the Enemy Image: The Soviet Union in Finnish Newspapers during the Winter War», *Looking at the Other-Historical Study of Images in Theory and Practice*, Oulu University Press



## List of Documents Used

### Armenia

- ❖ Law of the Republic of Armenia on General Education, July 10, 2009
- ❖ Ա. Ղուկասյան, “ Հայոց Պատմություն 8-9” Ուսուցչի ձեռնարկ, Մանմար, Երևան, 2007, հաստատված է կրթության եվ գիտության նախարարության կողմից
- ❖ Հայոց Պատմություն և Համաշխարհային Պատմություն Չափորոշիչ, Ծրագիր, Պլանավորում, 2013
- ❖ Կարգ Հանրակրթության Պետական Չափորոշիչի Ձևավորման և Հաստատման մասի, ՀՀ Կառավարության n 439 որոշում, ապրիլի 8, 2010.
- ❖ Հայոց Պատմություն, Ընթացիկ գնահատման փաթեթ
- ❖ Հանրակրթական հիմնական դպրոցի Հայոց Պատմություն առարկայի չափորոշիչ և ծրագիր (6-9-րդ դասարաններ), Հավելված 1, ՀՀ կրթության և գիտության նախարարի 2012թ. 20.01 N39-Ա/Ք հրամանի
- ❖ Դասագրքերի մրցույթը՝ նոր մեխանիզմներով, 26-11-2009, edu.am, <http://edu.am/index.php?id=3393&topMenu=-1&menu1=-2&menu2=-1>
- ❖ Յոթ դասագիրք՝ ավագ դպրոցին, Armedi.am, 18.05.2009
- ❖ ՀՀ կրթության և գիտության նախարարի հրաման N 752-Ն, ՀՀ հանրակրթական ուսումնական հաստատությունները դասագրքերով ապահովելու, հանրակրթական առարկաների դասագրքերը հրատարակելու եվ հանրակրթության պետական չափորոշիչի դասագրքերի համապատասխանության գնահատման առարկայական հանձնաժողովների ձեվավորման կարգը հաստատելու մասին, 21.08.2009

## **Azerbaijan**

- ❖ Education Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan, December 10, 2002
- ❖ Azerbaijani Textbook Policy, Approved by the executive order Nr.33 of 23 January, 2006, (<http://edu.gov.az>)
- ❖ Azerbaijani Textbook Assessment Criteria, Approved by the executive order on 08.01.2009, (<http://edu.gov.az>)
- ❖ General Education Concept (National Curriculum) in Azerbaijan Republic, Approved by decree n 233 issued by Cabinet of Ministers of the Azerbaijan Republic on October 30, 2006
- ❖ Methodological guidelines for working with the text during history lessons 5-11 grades
- ❖ Teaching Aid “The role of libraries in the education of children in the spirit of patriotism”, 2008, Sumgait, Central Library: Methodological Department
- ❖ Assessment Concepts for the general education system of the Azerbaijan Republic, decree of the cabinet of ministries of the Azerbaijan republic on approval of the assessment concepts for the general education system of the Azerbaijan republic, Prime Minister of the Republic of Azerbaijan, Baku, January 13, 2009, N. 9, [edu.gov.az](http://edu.gov.az)

## **SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE**

### **1. Gender**

- Male
- Female

### **2. Age**

- Below 18
- 18-25
- 25-30
- 30-40
- 41-60
- Above 60

### **3. Residence**

- Capital city
- Other city
- Village

### **4. Level of Education**

- Kindergarten
- Secondary school
- High School
- Vocational school
- Bachelor
- Master
- Doctorate
- None
- Other\_\_\_\_\_

### **5. Occupation**

- Public sector
- Private sector
- NGO (Non-governmental Organization)
- Self-employed
- Student
- Unemployed
- Other\_\_\_\_\_

### **6. Have you received education in Azerbaijan? (If you have left school during this period, write in “other”)**

- Yes
- No
- Other\_\_\_\_\_

### **7. Your medium grade in school?**

- Bad
- Satisfactory

- Medium
- Good
- Excellent

**8. Your medium grade on national history in school?**

- Bad
- Satisfactory
- Medium
- Good
- Excellent

*Please, indicate to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 indicates that you totally disagree and 5 indicates that you totally agree*

- I remember what I have learnt in school on history of Azerbaijan/Armenia
- I know the history of my country very well
- My current knowledge of history of my country is from what I acquired in school
- We were learning history of Azerbaijan/Armenia through textbooks in school
- Our history teacher was giving additional information except of the textbook text
- We were required to memorize the content of the history textbook by heart
- We were analyzing and debating the content of each topic in the textbook
- I have read other books about history of Azerbaijan/Armenia, besides my history textbook
- I have watched other national history programs or films, besides my history textbook
- Besides school, I have learnt history of my country from my family
- I want to learn more about specific events in our history or delve into more detail
- I have never searched for other sources to learn more about the history of my country
- I believe in what was/is taught in school
- I have confidence in our education system

**9. Where have you first learnt about the Nagorno Karabakh conflict?**

- From my family
- From my friends and acquaintances
- In school
- At university
- Mass media
- No single source, rather a combination of all of the above
- I don't remember
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**10. Where have you first learnt about Armenia and Armenians/Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis from?**

- From my family
- From my friends and acquaintances
- In school
- At university
- Mass Media
- No single source, rather a combination of all of the above
- I don't remember

- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**11. When have you first learnt about Armenia and Armenians/ Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis?**

- In pre-school period
- During my school period
- After graduating the school
- I don't remember

**12. What was your first impression about Armenia and Armenians/ Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis? (Indicate all possible answers)**

- I don't know Armenians/Azerbaijanis or about Armenia/Azerbaijan that well
- They are a nation like us
- Positive impression
- They are our neighbors
- They are the ones that we have conflict with
- They are our enemies
- They are the ones that we should be wary of
- They are the ones that we should protect our motherland
- I am indifferent about Armenia and Armenians/Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis

**13. Has the way you feel about Armenia and Armenians/Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis changed over time?**

- Yes
- A little
- Neutral
- Not much
- No

**14. If yes, why have it changed? (Indicate all possible answers)**

- I got more knowledge
- I met an Armenian/Azerbaijani and knowing him/her changed the way I feel
- The way I see things changed
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**15. Have you ever met or talked to an Armenian/Azerbaijani?**

- Yes, I have met an Armenian/Azerbaijani
- Yes, I have talked to an Armenian/Azerbaijani
- Both
- None

**16. If yes, where have you met or talked to an Armenian/Azerbaijani?**

- During an international event
- During my tourist trip
- My friend/acquaintance introduced me
- We were neighbors
- We have talked by phone
- We have talked via Internet
- I don't remember

**17. Has your opinion about Armenians changed after knowing an Armenian/Azerbaijani?**

- Yes
- A little
- Neutral
- Not much
- No

**18. Would you like to meet and know an Armenian/Azerbaijani?**

- Yes
- A little
- Neutral
- Not much
- No

**19. Why would you like to meet and know an Armenian/Azerbaijani?**

- To know if I have a right opinion or not
- To establish business relations
- You should know well your enemy
- To harm him/her
- There is no exact reason
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**20. If you meet an Armenian/Azerbaijani, what will be your attitude? (Indicate all possible answers)**

- It would be interesting to know him/her
- I will be indifferent
- I think we will become friends
- If he/she treats me well, I will also treat him/her well
- I will not trust any Armenian/Azerbaijani
- I will be cautious
- I will dislike him/her
- I will beat or kill him
- It depends on what kind of person he/she will be

**21. If you know and like someone, but later find out that he/she is an Armenian/Azerbaijani, how will that change your attitude? (Indicate all possible answers)**

- I will like him/her even more
- I will start to not trust him/her anymore
- I will start to be cautious
- I will start to dislike him/her
- It will not make any difference for me
- It depends on the relations we have had before
- To know him/her will become more interesting

**22. If you choose friends of a foreign origin, which nationality would you rather exclude? (Indicate all possible answers)**

- Georgian
- Armenian/Azerbaijani
- Turk

- Russian
- Jew
- Chinese
- It depends on his/her personal qualities
- All of above
- None

**23. Have you or your parents had a neighbor or close Armenian/Azerbaijani family friend?**

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

**24. If yes, would you like to communicate with them?**

- Yes
- A little
- Neutral
- Not so much
- No

**25. If no, why not?**

- The relations of our state do not allow
- I don't trust Armenians/Azerbaijanis any more
- Much time have passed
- I am not sure they remember me
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**26. Today, would you live next door to an Armenian/Azerbaijani?**

- Yes
- No
- Yes, if abroad
- Yes, if in Azerbaijan/Armenia
- I don't know

**27. Would you work with an Armenian/Azerbaijani?**

- Yes
- No
- It depends on person
- I don't know

**28. Would you marry an Armenian/Azerbaijani if you fall in love with him/her?**

- Yes
- No
- I would never love an Armenian/Azerbaijani
- If I love him/her I will
- I don't know

**29. Do you think you have enemies yourself?**

- Yes
- A little

- Neutral
- Not much
- No
- I don't know

**30. If yes, who are they? (Rank the answers, starting from the answers more important for you)**

- Those who deceive me personally
- Those who cause pain to my nation
- Those who try to take advantage of my kindness
- Those who are rude to me
- Those who have once cheated on me
- Those who don't like me
- Those who hate me
- Those who consider me as their enemy

**31. Do you think your state has enemies?**

- Yes
- No

**32. If yes, who are they? (Rank the answers, starting from the answers more important for you)**

- Those who are a threat to the state
- Those who act against the state's interests
- Those who would not support our nation or our development
- Those who have a different religion
- Those who we have had a war with
- Those who we have a war with now
- Those who have caused damage to our country in past
- Those who consider us their enemy

**33. What do you think should be done to your enemies? (Indicate all possible answers)**

- God will punish them
- We should negotiate and find common solution
- We should compromise
- We should fight against them
- We should kill them
- One day they will be our friends
- We should protect our nation from them

**34. Do you think Armenia and Armenians/Azerbaijan and Azerbaijanis are a threat to your country?**

- Yes
- No

**35. Do you consider Armenia/Azerbaijan an enemy country?**

- Yes
- No



**36. Do you think Armenians/Azerbaijanis consider Azerbaijanis/Armenians their enemy?**

- Yes
- No

**37. Do you think Armenians/Azerbaijanis hate Azerbaijanis/Armenians?**

- Yes
- A little
- Neutral
- Not much
- No

**38. If you were sure that Armenians/Azerbaijanis do not hate Azerbaijanis/Armenians and treat them well, will your attitude change?**

- Yes
- A little
- Neutral
- Not much
- No

**39. Do you want the hatred between Armenians and Azerbaijanis to be eliminated?**

- Yes
- A little
- Neutral
- Not much
- No
- There is no hatred

**40. Do you think Armenians and Azerbaijanis would be able to coexist without conflict?**

- Yes
- A little
- Neutral
- Not much
- No

**41. What is the right way to stop the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan? (multiple response)**

- To win the war
- To destroy the enemy
- To compromise
- To find mutually acceptable solutions
- To follow the advice of international mediators
- To forget everything and live in peace
- To establish committees to find the historical truth
- To follow current state policies