

THE LINK BETWEEN THE LEVEL OF FORGIVENESS AND NATIONALISM IN  
ARMENIANS AND THE LEVEL OF SOCIAL DISTANCE THEY FEEL TOWARDS  
TURKS AND AZERBAIJANIS

Elizabeth Ter-Sahakyan

M. A. in Psychology - Emphasis Counselling

Haigazian University

2014

THE LINK BETWEEN THE LEVEL OF FORGIVENESS AND NATIONALISM IN  
ARMENIANS AND THE LEVEL OF SOCIAL DISTANCE THEY FEEL TOWARDS  
TURKS AND AZERBAIJANIS

Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences in Partial Fulfilment of  
the Requirements of Haigazian University for the Degree of Master of Arts

Beirut, Lebanon

June 2014

## THESIS RELEASE FORM

I, Elizabeth Ter-Sahakyan,

- ☐ authorize Haigazian University to supply copies of my thesis to libraries or individuals upon request.
  
- ☐ do not authorize Haigazian University to supply copies of my thesis to libraries or individuals for a period of two years starting with the date of the thesis defence.

THE LINK BETWEEN THE LEVEL OF FORGIVENESS AND NATIONALISM IN  
ARMENIANS AND THE LEVEL OF SOCIAL DISTANCE THEY FEEL TOWARDS  
TURKS AND AZERBAIJANIS

The members of the Committee approve the M.A. thesis of Elizabeth Ter-Sahakyan

Approved by:

Dr. Hanine Hout, Ed.D, Advisor

---

Dr. Marwan Gharzeddine, Ph.D, Reader

---

Dr. Antranig Dakessian, Ph.D, Reader

---

Copyright© 2014

This document is copyrighted material. Under copyright law, no parts of this document may  
be reproduced without the expressed permission of the author.

---

## DEDICATION

I dedicate this research paper to the Armenian people all over the world for their ability to survive and thrive despite incredible circumstances and to keep their faith alive over the centuries.

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thank:

My family, particularly, my mother: Marine. Without her continuous unconditional support and encouragement I would have never been able to come, stay in Lebanon and achieve this goal.

Rev. Dr. Levon Bardakjian, my pastor: for his belief in me, for always encouraging me to continue my education and go after what I want. My Haigazian adventure would not have started without him and his family being present in my life.

Dr. Hanine Hout: for believing in me so strongly. Due to her, I had faith in success of this research and have confidence for many future challenges of life. The priceless inspiration and guidance I got from her had a lifelong impact on me.

Dr. Marwan Gharzeddine: for taking me on an unforgettable journey through the world of psychology and for all the help and support I got from him.

Dr. David Tawil: for passing me his valuable knowledge and his contribution to this paper.

The community of the Near East School of Theology (NEST): for hosting me, protecting me and being my family during my stay in Lebanon. NEST is a part of my life now.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
List of Tables.....	iv
Abstract.....	v
Chapter 1: Introduction	
Background of the Study.....	1
The problem Statement.....	4
The Significance and Implications of the Study.....	6
Overview of the Methodology.....	8
Limitations of the Study.....	8
Definitions of the Key Terms.....	9
Chapter 2: Literature Review	
Social Distance.....	10
Social Distance and Forgiveness.....	10
Social distance and Nationalism.....	13
Conflict and Conflict Resolution.....	14
Chapter 3: Method	
Participants.....	20



Materials.....	21
Procedure.....	23
Chapter 4: Results	
Reliability Testing.....	25
Hypothesis Testing.....	26
Chapter 5: Discussion	
Summary and Discussion of Results.....	30
Implications of the research.....	32
Limitations.....	34
Future Suggestions.....	34
Conclusion.....	35
References.....	37
Appendices	
Appendix A: Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS).....	42
Appendix B: Nationalism Scale.....	44
Appendix C: Bogardus Social Distance Scale.....	46
Appendix D: The translated Armenian scales.....	47

## List of Tables

Table 1: Cronbach's Alpha for the Nationalism Scale and HFS.....	25
Table 2: Correlation Matrix for Forgiveness, Nationalism and Social Distance towards Azerbaijanis.....	27
Table 3: Independent Samples T test for Social Distance between Azerbaijanis & Turks.....	28

## Abstract

This study explored the link between the level of forgiveness and nationalism in Armenians as individual traits and the level of social distance they feel towards Turkish and Azerbaijani people among 163 Armenians in Yerevan, Armenia. The study relied on a self-report method, where participants provided demographic information, and filled in three questionnaires: The Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS), a Nationalistic Attitude Scale and the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. The results were analyzed by using a correlation and a t-test. Results showed that forgiveness in Armenians as an individual trait correlated negatively with social distance with the Azerbaijanis but not the Turks. With regards to nationalism the study showed that nationalism correlated positively with social distance with the Azerbaijanis but not the Turks. In addition, this study revealed that if the variables of forgiveness and nationalism are excluded, the social distance among Armenians is higher towards the Azerbaijanis than towards Turks. The information obtained by this research equipped us with some psychological knowledge on which to base future professional training and counselling services in the area of national trauma and hostility recovery.

The link between the level of forgiveness and nationalism in Armenians and the level of social distance they feel towards Turks and Azerbaijanis

It is a known fact that Armenians have political/historical conflicts with the Turkish and the Azerbaijani people. However, to view such conflicts and disagreements between the Armenians on the one hand and the Azerbaijanis and Turks on the other, through a one sided lens is unacceptable by all means. It is, after all, an international crisis as the conflict is between three states and nations, namely Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Turkey. Moreover, reducing it to a conflict of people and ethnicities is to exclude important aspects of it, such as, intricate politics and geographical locations. Having clarified that, the author would like to emphasize that this paper viewed only the psychological aspects of these conflicts.

### Background of the Study

The concept of forgiveness, nationalism and social distance, the three main variables of this study, are discussed in the proceeding paragraphs. This study attempts to investigate the relationship between the level of forgiveness and nationalism as individual traits in Armenians in Armenia and the level of social distance they keep with the Turkish and the Azerbaijani people.

The concept of forgiveness is discussed first.

An article by Dr. Otto F. von Feigenblatt, that discusses the meaning of forgiveness and reconciliation, gives a brief, but a thorough analysis of the concept of forgiveness by approaching it from different perspectives including psychology, religion, philosophy and culture. The author discusses different elements of the concept, such as, the possibility of

forgiveness, the desirability of forgiveness, the nature and the function of forgiveness in individual and social relations. According to von Feigenblatt (2013) forgiveness is a controversial concept. Mental health professionals in the West emphasize the intrapersonal aspects of forgiveness. Referring to Hook et al. (2008) and Thomas-Cottingham (2004) the author states that the secular understanding of forgiveness has been mainly formed by the field of psychology, the focus of which is the individual and his wellbeing. Hence, according to the author, the process of forgiveness is a practice within the individual. Moreover, von Feigenblatt (2013) clarifies that psychologists consider forgiveness and reconciliation as two different concepts, while theologians, philosophers and social scientists talk about the link between forgiveness and reconciliation in conjunction with certain relational factors. For instance, according to von Feigenblatt (2013):

A Catholic Priest may hold a view of forgiveness that is inherently connected to religion while a psychologist may view forgiveness as an individual process that helps a client improve his or her mental health. Furthermore, a political scientist, who is focused on reconstructing his/her civil society in the aftermath of the conflict, would probably view forgiveness as a necessary step to achieve his/her goal (Grodsky, 2009; Minear, 1991) whereas for a philosopher, the act of forgiveness would be more important for the offender than for the victim since it signifies his/her intention to become moral again by joining the moral community. (von Feigenblatt, 2013, p. 1)

There is also a relation between culture and forgiveness. Culture plays a role in understanding forgiveness:

cultures with individualistic values look at forgiveness differently than collectivistic cultures. The difference is that in collectivistic cultures forgiveness is more relational, other-oriented phenomenon and for those people group goals are more important than personal ones. In individualistic cultures forgiveness is individual and is considered to be a choice of the individual (*von Feigenblatt, 2013*).

As mentioned in the first paragraph, nationalism is the second independent variable of the current study and thus is discussed next. First the concept “nation” will be defined. Anthony Smith’s definition of nation is “named and self-defined human communities whose members cultivate shared myths, memories, symbols, values, traditions, reside in and identify with a historical homeland, create and disseminate a distinctive public culture, and observe shared customs and common laws” (*Smith 2008, p. 19*). As to “nationalism”, it is defined as “devotion to the interests or culture of one’s nation, the belief that nations will benefit from acting independently rather than collectively, emphasizing national rather than international goals and the aspirations for national independence in a country under foreign domination” (*The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 2003*). In summary, nationalism reflects the desire of a given population to unite the political and national units (*Gellner 1983*).

Social distance, the dependent variable of this study, is the last concept defined. Sociologist Emory Bogardus states that “Social distance, or the lack of fellow-feeling and understanding, continues to exist after spatial distances have been eliminated” (*Bogardus, 1926, p. 40*). He talks about social distance as the degree of sympathetic understanding that exists between two persons or between a person and a group, personal distance, or personal-group distance (*Bogardus, 1933*).

## The problem statement

In the study by Cehajic et al. (2008), the authors tried to find out the antecedents and consequences of the Bosniak Muslims' forgiveness towards the Serbs for the atrocities of 1992 and 1995 in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Their main goal was to see what factors foster forgiveness towards transgressors. Cehajic et al. (2008) report that factors such positive contact with Serbs, identification with fellow Bosniaks as one group, identification with Serbs as a common group leaving in the same country, empathy for and trust in Serbs, perceived heterogeneity of the transgressor group (not all the Serbs are the same), were all positively related to forgiveness towards Serbs and less social distance with them. The same way, in the study by Wohl and Branscombe (2005) a high level of forgiveness in Jews was related to a reduced social distance towards their aggressors, the Germans. However, discussing the factors that can bring forgiveness and reconciliation, the Cehajic et al. (2008) stated:

An initial tendency to forgive the perpetrator group might be a significant point of departure for processes such as trust , empathy , outgroup variability , and contact to occur in the first place . Therefore , a next plausible suggestion would be to test the effects of one's general proneness to forgive on specific type of intergroup forgiveness . (*Cehajic et al., 2008, p. 363*)

And indeed, it's hard to deny that some people are just forgiving by nature (can forgive without any antecedents) and the others are not. The healing process has much to do with the ability to forgive and when the victimized party is engaged in the process of forgiveness,

“which may not even involve any contact with the perpetrator, than there is a psychological relief; giving up of a burden” (*Staub, 2003, p.273*). Based on all above mentioned, the first prediction of this study was that:

H1: There is a Negative Correlation between the forgiveness scale scores and the scale scores of the social distance with the Turks and the Azerbaijani people.

Referring to the Social Identity Theory by Tajfel and Turner (1986) Cehajic et al. (2008) pinpoints the link that exists between “people’s identification with the ingroup and the tendency to positively differentiate the ingroup from outgroups in terms of judgments, attitudes, and behavior, especially in circumstances when that identity is threatened in some way” (*Cehajic et al, 2008, p. 354-355*). Thus, it is not surprising that in their study Wohl and Branscombe (2005) demonstrated that when the Jewish participants were to think about themselves as human beings (there is no identification with the ingroup) and not as Jews (identification with the ingroup), their attitude towards the responsible forces for Holocaust was more forgiving and less condemning. Based on the above stated theory and findings of Wohl and Branscombe (2005), the second prediction of this study was that:

H2: There is a positive correlation between the nationalistic scale scores and the scores of the social distance with Turkish and Azerbaijani people.

According to Bloomfield et al. (2003), there is no standard timing approach for the reconciliation process, since each stage in the process, such as, the stage to achieve peaceful coexistence, a stage for trust and a stage for empathy, requires a different time frame that reflects its uniqueness as a stage. The same applies when the four major steps of the reconciliation policy (healing, justice, truth-telling and reparation) are implemented after a certain conflict. However “in the immediate aftermath of a civil war or of an inhuman regime, victims are too preoccupied with their own distress to develop trust and empathy in a



hurry” (*Bloomfield et al. p. 32*). Having in mind that Armenia –Azerbaijan conflict is more current and farther from being history, than the conflict with Turkey, the third prediction of this study was that:

H3: Social Distance scores among the Armenians are higher towards the Azerbaijanis than towards the Turkish people.

The significance and implications of the study

The following paragraphs explain the significance and implications of this study in the field of psychological counselling.

Taking into account the social and political dimensions of the Armenian-Turkish and the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict, the main focus of this study was the social and human factor of the issue, which has not been researched enough. It’s worth to mention, that this study did not go into the factors such as the legal recognition of the Armenian Genocide by Turkey or the resolution of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict that could have played a role in that process. As mentioned before, the main focus of this study was to learn more about some of the psychological factors of the Armenian conflict with the Turkish and Azerbaijani people. It’s hard for the author to argue with Zekiyan (2010), who claims that in order for the “hating” nation to be cleansed from the collective memory one has to come clean with his history. Such a process could be possible only when there is empirical information about the psychological factors that hinder it. The factors such as Turkey accepting and compensating for the genocide and the resolution of the Nagorno-Karabakh could probably lessen the social distance that Armenians keep towards Turkish and Azerbaijani people, but should they be the only variables considered in these conflicts? Could not the level of forgiveness and

nationalism, both as individual traits in Armenians be also considered as two major elements in understanding the reasons behind this social distance? Here lies the importance of this study. The information obtained by this research could equip us with some psychological knowledge on which to base future professional training and counselling services in the area of national trauma and hostility recovery. Such psychological initiatives could hopefully lessen the social distance towards the perceived aggressors. Furthermore, some authors with Turkish family names link the Armenian identity and the aim of existence for many Armenians with their Genocide recognition cause. For instance, Altinbas (2010) concluded in his article by saying that “what makes an Armenian an Armenian today is their hopes for recognition of genocide and compensation” (*p. 187*). Another author Cevik-Ersaydt (2011) said that “contrary to the dispersed population the Armenian Diaspora continues to thrive as a strong ethnic identity. This could be linked to the presence of an enemy “Turk” image in which all bad images are projected” (*p. 93*). This research will help to see that though there is collective memory and demands among Armenians in regard to Turkish and Azerbaijani people, the presence or absence of a social distance that an Armenian would keep with the members of discussed nations might be correlated with the individual trait forgiveness and nationalistic attitude level. Also, clinical implication of this data could be claimed to support the theory mentioned earlier in this paper, where forgiveness is viewed as an individual process in which the person lets go of anger towards the offender in order to regain mental health despite of the event itself (*von Feigenblatt, 2013*). This theory gains more weight when you take into consideration the fact that the other side, Turkey, as a state, does not admit committing Genocide. So the basic question is: forgiving someone who is not accepting his guilt?<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Some Turkish intellectuals such as historian and sociologist Taner Akçam and Turkish novelist, screenwriter, academic and recipient of the 2006 Nobel Prize in literature Orhan Pamuk acknowledge and openly discuss the Armenian Genocide.

## Overview of Methodology

The study was conducted in Yerevan, Armenia. This is a quantitative research which included co-relational analyses and T-Test in checking the hypotheses and interpreting the obtained data. Three self-administered tools were used to collect data for this research: The Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS) (2005), the Nationalistic Attitude Scale (2001) and the Bogardus Social Distance Scale (1925). All three scales were translated from English to Armenian and then back translated to English. A pilot study was also conducted to obtain the reliabilities of the translated scales. In order to control any possible response biases, the 163 participants: 123 females and 40 males between 18 and 66 years old were asked to fill in the questionnaires anonymously. A convenient sample was used. Before handing in the questionnaires, the full consent of each participant was obtained. The researcher was present during the administration of the questionnaires to explain the purpose of the study and answer the questions of the participants.

## Limitations of the study

One of the limitations in this research includes reducing the international conflict into a conflict of one state and people with other two states and peoples. There are many more parties involved than mentioned in this paper. These parties might have a role in how Armenians perceive their conflict with the Turkish and the Azerbaijanis and how they act. Additionally, concerns over the sample populations used could be addressed: female participants noticeably outweighed males; furthermore, the sample did not include

participants from the rural areas and other cities of Armenia, except for the capital Yerevan. Moreover, Diaspora Armenians were not included in this study.

### Definitions of the Key Terms

Conflict: “process in which one party perceives that its interests are being opposed or negatively affected by another party” (Wall et al., 1995, p. 517).

Forgiveness: “the framing of a perceived transgression such that one’s responses to the transgressor, transgression, and sequel of the transgression are transformed from negative to neutral or positive” (Thompson et al, 2005, p. 318)

Nationalism: “devotion to the interests or culture of one’s nation, the belief that nations will benefit from acting independently rather than collectively, emphasizing national rather than international goals and the aspirations for national independence in a country under foreign domination” (*The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 2003*).

Social distance: “the degree of sympathetic understanding that exists between two persons or between a person and a group” (Bogardus, 1933, p. 268).

## Chapter Two

### Literature Review

The purpose of this chapter is to present research that has been published in relation to the current study. The Introduction chapter has already included an overview of literature. In this chapter, however, a more elaborated and related literature is summarized.

#### Social Distance

Sociologist Emory Bogardus states that “Social distance, or the lack of fellow-feeling and understanding, continues to exist after spatial distances have been eliminated” (*Bogardus, 1926, p. 40*). He talks about social distance as the degree of sympathetic understanding that exists between two persons or between a person and a group, personal distance, or personal-group distance (*Bogardus, 1933*).

#### Social Distance and Forgiveness

In the forward of his book “My Life in the PLO: The inside Story of the Palestinian Struggle” Shafiq al-Hout (2011) claims that any nation that goes through the tragedy of uprooting; loosing homeland, and survives to pass on the memory, is left to live with scars that are hard and impossible to ignore and forget. In her article called “Forgive and Forget”, Moore (2009) states that from 1990s, scientists started to show interest and explore psychological, neurological, and physiological effects of forgiveness by asking victims to imagine forgiving their transgressors and asking transgressors to imagine asking victims for

forgiveness. According to the same article, in those studies forgiving behaviour was linked with better overall health and people who adopted the forgiving behaviour reported a decrease in grief, anger, anxiety and other psychosocial as well as physiological problems. An article by Dr. Otto F. von Feigenblatt, that discusses the meaning of forgiveness and reconciliation, gives a brief, but a thorough analysis of the concept of forgiveness by approaching it from different perspectives including psychology, religion, philosophy and culture. The author discusses different elements of the concept, such as, the possibility of forgiveness, the desirability of forgiveness, the nature and the function of forgiveness in individual and social relations. According to von Feigenblatt (2013) forgiveness is a controversial concept. Mental health professionals in the West emphasize the intrapersonal aspects of forgiveness. There the secular understanding of forgiveness has been mainly formed by the field of psychology, continues he, referring to Hook at al. (2008) and Thomas-Cottingham (2004), the focus of which is the individual and his wellbeing. Hence, according to the author, the process of forgiveness is a practice within the individual. Moreover, von Feigenblatt (2013) clarifies that psychologists consider forgiveness and reconciliation as two different concepts, while theologians, philosophers and social scientists talk about the link between forgiveness and reconciliation in conjunction with certain relational factors. According to von Feigenblatt (2013):

A Catholic Priest may hold a view of forgiveness that is inherently connected to religion while a psychologist may view forgiveness as an individual process that helps a client improve his or her mental health. Furthermore, a political scientist, who is focused on reconstructing his/her civil society in the aftermath of the conflict, would probably view forgiveness as a necessary step to achieve his/her goal (Grodsky, 2009;

Miner, 1991) whereas for a philosopher, the act of forgiveness would be more important for the offender than for the victim since it signifies his/her intention to become moral again by joining the moral community. (*von Feigenblatt, 2013, p. 1*)

There is also a relation between culture and forgiveness. Culture plays a role in understanding forgiveness: cultures with individualistic values look at forgiveness differently than collectivistic cultures. The difference is that in collectivistic cultures forgiveness is more relational, other-oriented phenomenon and for those people group goals are more important than personal ones. In individualistic cultures forgiveness is individual and is considered to be a choice of the individual (*von Feigenblatt, 2013*).

As to the relation between forgiveness and social distance among conflicting nations, in the study by Cehajic et al (2008), the authors tried to find out the antecedents and consequences of the Bosniak Muslims' forgiveness towards the Serbs for the atrocities of 1992 and 1995 in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Their main goal was to see what factors foster forgiveness towards transgressors. Cehajic et al. (2008) report that factors such positive contact with Serbs, identification with fellow Bosniaks as one group, identification with Serbs as a common group leaving in the same country, empathy for and trust in Serbs, perceived heterogeneity of the transgressor group (not all the Serbs are the same), were all positively related to forgiveness towards Serbs and less social distance with them. The same way, in a study by Wohl and Branscombe (2005) a high level of forgiveness in Jews was related to a reduced social distance towards their aggressors, the Germans. The healing process has much to do with the ability to forgive and when the victimized party is engaged in the process of forgiveness, "which may not even involve any contact with the perpetrator, than there is a psychological relief; giving up of a burden" (*Staub, 2003, p.273*). In

conclusion, based on the above discussed literature, the current study predicted a negative correlation between social distance and forgiveness with the Turks as well as the Azerbaijani people.

### Social distance and Nationalism

Anthony Smith's definition of nation is "named and self-defined human communities whose members cultivate shared myths, memories, symbols, values, traditions, reside in and identify with a historical homeland, create and disseminate a distinctive public culture, and observe shared customs and common laws" (Smith 2008, p. 19). As to "nationalism", it is defined, as mentioned previously, as "devotion to the interests or culture of one's nation, the belief that nations will benefit from acting independently rather than collectively, emphasizing national rather than international goals and the aspirations for national independence in a country under foreign domination" (*The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 2003). In summary, nationalism reflects the desire of a given population to unite the political and national units (Gellner 1983).

Regarding the link between nationalism and social distance among conflicting nations it is to be said that referring to the Social Identity Theory by Tajfel and Turner (1986), Cehajic et al. (2008) pinpoints the link that exists between "people's identification with the ingroup and the tendency to positively differentiate the ingroup from outgroups in terms of judgments, attitudes, and behaviour, especially in circumstances, when that identity is threatened in some way" (Cehajic et al, 2008, p. 354-355). Thus, it is not surprising that in their study, Wohl and Branscombe (2005), demonstrated that when the Jewish participants were to think about themselves as human beings (there is no identification with the ingroup)



and not as Jews (identification with the ingroup), their attitude towards the responsible forces for Holocaust was more forgiving and less condemning. In conclusion, based on the above discussed literature by Wohl and Branscombe (2005), the current study predicted a positive association between nationalism and social distance with the Turkish and Azerbaijani people.

### Conflict and Conflict Resolution

A central element that encompasses all the above discussed variables of this study, namely, social distance, nationalism and forgiveness, is the concept of conflict. In his book called “The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes”, Morton Deutsch offers an all-inclusive assimilation of available knowledge that discusses the dynamics of conflict, collaboration, as well as conflict resolution (*Kochan, 1974*). According to Farr (1975), Deutsch is a prominent social psychologist whose life work is to theorise and empirically study conflict resolution. Hence, his works summarize his theoretical and empirical work in this field. It is worth mentioning that the main point of Deutsch’s works is his emphasis on the conditions that lead conflicting parties to develop either a cooperative or a competitive relationship, while both options are, in fact, possible. Since conflict is considered to be a fact of social life, Deutsch’s main question is how to make that conflict productive or how to prevent it from being destructive in the first place (Farr, 1975). In his book, Deutsch (1973) does not underestimate the importance of the objective characteristics of a conflict. However, these characteristics are not the only factors that determine whether the conflict will be productive or destructive. According to Deutsch, conflicts can be held in destructive or constructive ways, despite the unfavourable or favourable objective conditions or circumstances. One of the features of the destructive conflict resolutions, states Deutsch, is

the tendency to expand and escalate, which results from the conjunction of three interrelated processes, which are the competition and attempt to win the conflict, misperception and biased perception and the commitment which is due to pressures for cognitive and social consistency. All of these result in actions and reactions that intensify conflict. According to Deutsch (1973) there are also factors that can hinder the development of conflict escalation. These are: cooperative bonds, cross-cutting identifications, common allegiances and memberships, conflict limiting values, institutions, procedures and groups, and the salience and significance of the cost of the escalating conflict. Deutsch (1973) concludes that if these conflict restricting factors are not there, then destructive conflict expands. Nevertheless he emphasizes that the existence of such factors is not a guarantee by itself as misjudgement and the pressures may make it difficult to keep a conflict a constructive one. The constructive conflict resolution, on the other hand, involves creative thinking, which includes three key psychological elements: motivation to solve the problem, the development of the conditions that permit the reformulation of the problem and the availability of diverse ideas that can be combined into novel and varied patterns. Deutsch (1973) defines cooperative problem solving a process where conflict is viewed as a common problem in which the conflicting parties have the joint interest of meeting a mutually satisfactory solution. There are a number of reasons he says why a cooperative process is likely to lead to productive conflict resolution: Cooperative processes aid open and honest communication, the recognition of the legitimacy of the each other's interests and of the necessity to search for a solution is encouraged and it leads to a trusting friendly attitude. Finally, according to Deutsch (1973), there are some other factors which determine constructiveness or destructiveness of the conflict, which are: conflict size, centrality, rigidity and number of issues involved and their interconnectedness, the consensus on issue importance and the degree to which the conflict is acknowledged.

## The Conflict with the Turks

There are numerous academic articles, books and studies that are written on the Turkish Armenian relationships before and after the Armenian Genocide of 1915 under the Ottoman rule<sup>2</sup>. Some of these sources say that “during all this phase, the relations between the Armenians and Turks were branded by the awful shock of the Genocide, even if they seem now, through the last two decades, in virtue of some gradual, though very slow developments, to come out from the deadlock in which they were and are still in larger proportions entrapped” (Zekiyan, 2010, p. 368). Meanwhile, sources like Vidlickova (2012) state that throughout history, no perfect relations existed between Armenia and Turkey, other sources such Zekiyan (2010) claim that before the Genocide, despite some discrimination and persecution by some Muslim subjects, Armenians had enough trust and opportunities in social life, culture, art, finance, politics, etc. In other words, the relations with the Ottoman Empire government and people at the early phases of Ottoman Empire were on the satisfactory level. But almost all agree that after the massacres, “Talat and his cronies in the leading cadres of the “Union and Progress” have become the symbols for Turkish identity for many Armenians” (Zekiyan, 2010, p. 372). Phrasing it differently, there is a consensus among many scholars that trauma, mutual stereotypes, mistrust and conflict signify the Armenians’ state of mind following the events of 1915.

---

2 According to the Armenian Genocide Museum & Institute (AGMI) non-profit organization based in Yerevan, Armenia official website “the atrocities committed against the Armenian people of the Ottoman Empire during WWI are defined as the Armenian Genocide”, “those massacres were perpetrated throughout different regions of the Ottoman Empire by the Young Turkish Government which was in power at the time” and “there were an estimated two million Armenians living in the Ottoman Empire on the eve of WWI. Approximately one and a half million Armenians perished between 1915 and 1923. Another half million found shelter abroad” ([http://www.genocide-museum.am/eng/armenian\\_genocide.php](http://www.genocide-museum.am/eng/armenian_genocide.php)).

## The Conflict with the Azerbaijanis

As many believe “...the roots of the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict can be traced...to the USSR policy of “granting” territories within one country to another population. In other words, the Soviet rulers established the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region, which was populated mainly by native Armenians at the time, inside the Soviet Azerbaijan, in the 1920s” (Cengel, 2013, p. 58). Cengel (2013) states that the war for Karabakh began in 1988 and ended in a truce in 1994, leaving the Armenians in control of the mountainous Nagorno-Karabakh, which is now autonomous, and some surrounding Azerbaijani territories. The same author also verifies that as a result of the war, around thirty thousand people died and around a million people became refugees. Overall, political details, history and geography of this region are very complicated and complex matters. Both countries have their claims and arguments. However, needless to say that despite international involvement and dialogs the conflict is far from closure as “each year more than two dozen people are killed by snipers on either side of the border in a conflict that remains “frozen,” with no permanent peace agreement in sight” (Cengel, 2013, p. 58). As Cengel (2013) justifiably reflected in her article, recognizing or mentioning of certain autonomous territories, that are either controlled by Armenia or Azerbaijan as an official Armenian or Azerbaijani territory, could be enough incentive to renew the fighting between the two parties. It is important to note here that in Armenia, many people do not have problems spending their vacation in Antalya or consuming Turkish products as the battle for the recognition of the Genocide is going on with a relative peaceful set of mind. However, with Azerbaijan the case is different. Among civilians from both sides severe hatred, hostility and desire for revenge still exist. One may

see a cyber-war going on and teenagers and youth of both sides having very subjective, emotional, unconstructive and offensive heated discussions/dialogs with each other.

### The link between these two conflicts

The existence of a link between these two conflicts was needed to be clarified at this point in order to justify the involvement of both conflicts in this study. First, if you start chatting with any regular Armenian on this topic in Armenia, he will immediately start to tell (even sing) his story about the many territories that were lost to Turkey and Azerbaijan. Second, he/she will start telling you about how both, Turkish and Azerbaijanis have committed ethnic killings of Armenians during the Ottoman Empire, and in the Armenian side of Sumgait, and other regions of Azerbaijan, in 1988. Also, among many Armenians, Azerbaijanis are referred to not only as Azeri, but also as Turks. Writing about her impression from her recent visit to Armenia, journalist and author Katya Cengel says: “No Armenian city is complete without a Mount Ararat hotel or restaurant, and no Armenian home is considered fully furnished without a picture or painting of the famed peak. Yet Mount Ararat was lost to the Armenians nearly a hundred years ago during the genocide, and it now lies in Turkey” (Cengel, 2013, p. 60). Finally, on the official level, the relatedness of these two conflicts is also a fact as stated by Cengel (2013): “In 1993, Turkey closed its border with Armenia, making resolution of the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh a prerequisite for normalization of relations. Diplomatic relations have been strained ever since.” (p. 59) In the same way, Marc Champion (2009) reporting on the negotiations between Turkey and Armenia on restoring diplomatic relations and reopening the border, states that Turkey closed its border with Armenia in 1993 to protest Armenia’s “occupation” of Nagorno-Karabakh.

Despite of the mentioned overlapping parts between both conflicts, which are the perception similarities of Armenians about “Turks/Azerbaijanis” and political interaction Armenian-Azeri and the Armenian-Turkish, the two conflicts are not the same.

According to Bloomfield et al. (2003), there is no standard timing approach for the reconciliation process, since each stage in the process, such as, the stage to achieve peaceful coexistence, a stage for trust and a stage for empathy, requires a different time frame that reflects its uniqueness as a stage. The same applies when the four major steps of the reconciliation policy (healing, justice, truth-telling and reparation) are implemented after a certain conflict. However “in the immediate aftermath of a civil war or of an inhuman regime, victims are too preoccupied with their own distress to develop trust and empathy in a hurry” (*Bloomfield et al. p. 32*).

In conclusion, and based on all the above discussed review of literature, the following three hypotheses were predicted:

H1: There is a Negative Correlation between the forgiveness scale scores and the scale scores of the social distance with the Turks and the Azerbaijani people.

H2: There is a positive correlation between the nationalistic scale scores and the scores of the social distance with Turkish and Azerbaijani people.

H3: Social Distance scores among the Armenians are higher towards the Azerbaijanis than towards Turkish people.

## Chapter Three

### Method

The current research studied the link between the level of forgiveness and nationalism in Armenians and the level of social distance they feel towards Turks and Azerbaijanis. The participants provided their demographic information: gender, age, education and filled in the three questionnaires assessing the Armenians' forgiveness level, nationalism level and the level social distance they keep with the Turkish people and the Azerbaijani people.

This chapter provides information about the instruments used, the participants and the data collection and analysis process.

#### Participants

The participants were workers from the Malatya market, members of the youth group of the Evangelical Church of Yerevan, students from Yerevan Medical Institute after Mehrabyan and students from the American University of Armenia.

A convenient sample of 163 participants was used: 123 females and 40 males. The age range for the participants in the study was between 18 and 66 years old. The pilot study was conducted with the same population. The participants were 10 workers from the Malatya market, 10 members of the youth group of the Evangelical Church of Yerevan, 5 students from Yerevan Medical Institute after Mehrabyan and 5 students from the American University of Armenia. Overall, together with the pilot study, 203 participants took part in the research. To preserve confidentiality the participants were asked not to mention their name or institution in the demographic data.

## Materials

Self-administered three questionnaires were used to collect data for this research. The participants were given a three page leaflet including demographic information input on the first page of the questionnaire and the three instruments of the study.

The Forgiveness Scale: Forgiveness was measured using the Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS) by Thompson et al. (2005). According to HFS's authors the definition of forgiveness on which the scale is based on is as follows:

The framing of a perceived transgression such that one's responses to the transgressor, transgression, and sequel of the transgression are transformed from negative to neutral or positive. The source of a transgression, and therefore the object of forgiveness, may be oneself, another person or persons, or a situation that one views as being beyond anyone's control (e.g., an illness, "fate" or a natural disaster). (*Thompson et al., 2005, p. 318*)

Hence, the HFS has 3 subscales with six items each which assess forgiveness of self, forgiveness of others and forgiveness of situations beyond control. The items of the scales that assess forgiveness of others and forgiveness of situations beyond control are reverse-coded. Responses are given on a 7-point scale "Almost Always False of Me", "More Often False of Me", "More Often True of Me", "Almost Always True of Me". It has four answers, and halves, which are between the two answers, 2, 4, 6 (*Thompson et al., 2005*). The scale



has been used in numerous studies and publications. For the numerous citations and abstracts for articles and other publications in which the HFS has been used see the official website of HFS) which also states that the Heartland Forgiveness Scale has been used in many cultures and translated into many languages. The authors, Thompson et al (2005) conducted and presented Cronbach's Alpha for three studies in which the HFS was used, namely, 0.86; 0.87; and 0.87, indicating acceptable test-retest reliability.

The Nationalism Scale: Nationalistic attitude was measured with a 17-item Likert-type scale used by Bojan Todosijević (2001) in his study of nationalistic attitudes in Hungary and Yugoslavia. The scale has six possible responses: strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree, agree, and strongly agree. The score range is between 17 (all 1s) and 102 (all 6s). Item responses are summed to create a total score. The answers are coded in the way that lower numbers mean stronger agreement to nationalistic statements: 17 (minimally nationalistic) to 102 (maximally nationalistic) (*Todosijević, 2001*).

The Social Distance Scale: The respondents' attitude (social distance) towards Turkish and Azerbaijani people was measured with "The Bogardus Social Distance Scale" as "the most popular utilization of this conception can be found in the Bogardus Social Distance Scale, devised by Emory S. Bogardus (1925)" (Karakayali, 2009, p. 540). The scale was created by Emory Bogardus. He measured the willingness of people to participate in social relations with other kinds of people (*Bogardus, 1925*). Between 1920 and 1977 the scale was used to measure social distance reactions of urban Americans towards different races and racial distance changes in the United States. In 2005 (*Parrillo & Donoghue, 2005*) a new national study was designed to measure the level of acceptance that Americans feel towards

members of the most common ethnic groups in the United States. The scale asks the extent to which the respondent would be accepting of each group (a score of 1.00 for a group is taken to indicate no social distance and a score of seven indicates no social relationship). The items of the Bogardus scale gives 7 options of the relationships into which a respondent might be willing to enter with a member of the certain group: relative, friend, neighbour, co-worker, citizen, visitor to our country, no communication. It is assumed that if you are willing to accept one of the options suggested by the scale, then you are willing to accept all those that precede it on the list and are less intense<sup>3</sup> (*Bogardus, 1933*).

### Procedure

The above mentioned three self-administered tools were used to collect data for this research: The Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS) (*Thompson et al., 2005*), the Nationalistic Attitude Scale (*Todosijević, 2001*) and the Bogardus Social Distance Scale (*Bogardus 1925*). All the three scales were translated from English into Eastern Armenian by the author. She took the responsibility to do it herself as she has a BA in translation. Furthermore, to check the accuracy of translations, a back translation into the original language, English, was done by an independent translator, who did not see the original text. First a pilot study was conducted to obtain the reliabilities of the translated scales and reliability coefficient, Cronbach's alpha was calculated for each scale with SPSS. In order to control any possible response biases, the 163 participants: 123 females and 40 males between 18 and 66 years old were asked to fill in the questionnaires anonymously. A convenient sample was used. Before handing in the questionnaires, the full consent of each participant was obtained. The

---

<sup>3</sup> You should look at the options from down: "Would exclude from my country" (7.00) to up "As close relatives by marriage" (score 1.00).

researcher was present during the administration of the questionnaires to explain the purpose of the study and answer the questions of the participants. Data management and analysis were performed using SPSS. To identify the relationship between the dependent variable of social distance and the independent variable of forgiveness a two tailed Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated. The same procedure was done in the case of dependent variable of social distance social distance and independent variable of nationalism. To analyze the difference between the social distance towards Azerbaijani and Turkish people, a T-Test was conducted.

## Chapter Four

### Results

#### Reliability Testing

As mentioned previously in this paper, this research data were collected by three instruments: The Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS) (2005), Likert-type Nationalistic attitude scale used by Bojan Todosijević (2001) and “The Bogardus Social Distance Scale” (1925). The internal reliability for each scale and subscale was calculated. The results are the following: Nationalism Scale, 0.80; Heartland Forgiveness Scale, 0.70. There were two HFS subscales that had low reliabilities. However, since the total reliability of the scale was in an acceptable range, the two lower reliabilities were not given much significance (see Table 1).

Table 1

*Cronbach's Alpha for the Nationalism Scale and HFS*

Scale	Previous Cronbach's alpha	Current Cronbach's alpha
HFS Scale: Nationalism	Not available	.80
HFS – Total	.86; .87	.70
HFS - Forgiveness Self	.75; .76; .72	.51
HFS - Forgiveness Other	.78; .79; .81	.35
HFS – Forgiveness Situation	.79; .77; .82	.48

## Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1: There is a Negative Correlation between the forgiveness scale scores and the scale scores of the social distance with the Turks and the Azerbaijani people.

To test the relationships between the levels of forgiveness as an individual trait (independent variable) in Armenians and the social distance they keep with the Turkish and the Azerbaijani people (dependant variable), a Pearson product correlation analysis was conducted. Hypothesis one was partly confirmed: it was found that the higher the trait forgiveness in Armenians, the less is the social distance with the Azerbaijanis, but not with the Turks. The correlation between the total HFS scores and Social Distance Scale is negative: -0.19 and significant at the 0.01 level (see table 2).

Table 2

*Correlation Matrix for Forgiveness, Nationalism and Social Distance towards Azerbaijanis*

		Social Distance
Forgive others		-0.20**
		0.01
		163
Forgive situation	Pearson Correlation	-0.21**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.01
	N	163
Total forgiveness	Pearson Correlation	-0.19**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.01
	N	163
Nationalism	Pearson Correlation	0.25**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.00
	N	163
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).		

Hypothesis 2: There is a positive correlation between the nationalistic scale scores and the scores of the social distance with Turkish and Azerbaijani people.

To test the relationships between the level of nationalism as an individual trait (independent variable) in Armenians and the level of social distance they keep with the Turkish and the Azerbaijani people (dependant variable), a Pearson product correlation analysis was conducted. Hypothesis 2 was also confirmed partly: the correlation between the Nationalistic Scale scores and the Social Distance Scale scores was significant in case of the Azerbaijanis, but not the Turks. The more the nationalistic level in Armenians, the more social distance they keep with Azerbaijani people, but not with the Turkish people. The correlation is positive: 0.25 and significant at the 0.01 level (see table 2).

Hypothesis 3: Social Distance scores among the Armenians are higher towards the Azerbaijanis than towards Turkish people.

To calculate whether there is difference between the level of social distance Armenians keep towards Turkish and Azerbaijani people a T-Test was conducted. The Azerbaijanis ( $M = 6.675$ ,  $SD = 0.777$ ) and the Turks ( $M = 6.123$ ,  $SD = 1.241$ ) differed significantly with respect to social distance,  $t(162) = 7.47$ ,  $p < .01$ . Hypothesis 3 was confirmed: overall, the social distance towards Azerbaijanis was found to be higher than towards Turks (see Table 3).

Table 3

*Independent Samples T test for Social Distance between Azerbaijanis & Turks*

Paired Samples Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Standard Error Mean
Azerbaijani	163	6.675	0.777	0.06
Turkish	163	6.123	1.241	0.10

Paired Samples Correlations

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Azerbaijanis & Turks	163	0.65	0.00

Paired Samples Test

Paired Differences								
	Mean	Std.	Std. Error	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig.
	Mean							(2-tailed)
Azerbaijanis -Turks	0.55	0.94	0.07	0.41	0.70	7.47	162	0.00



## Chapter Five

### Discussion

The purpose of the current study was to examine the link between the level of forgiveness and nationalism in Armenians and the level of social distance they feel towards Turks and Azerbaijanis. The following chapter provides discussion of the findings, practical implications of the current findings, limitations of this study and suggestions for future research.

One of the aims of this study was to explore the relationships between the level of forgiveness in Armenians and the level of social distance they feel towards Turks and Azerbaijanis. It was predicted that Armenians who have a higher forgiveness as an individual trait would report to keep less social distance with the Turks and Azerbaijanis. Stated differently, a negative correlation was expected between the forgiveness level and the reported social distance. As shown in the results chapter, Armenians with higher forgiveness in fact keep less social distance with Azerbaijani people, however, not with the Turkish. One possible explanation for this observed difference may be the fact that in the first case there is some kind of equality between both parties involved, namely, armed “war” whereas in the second case there is a one sided “Genocide”. Armenians with high trait of forgiveness might find it easier to forgive the people who lost and gained the way they did, than to forgive people who are perceived as the ones that gained and did not lose. During the war with Azerbaijan, both the Armenians and the Azerbaijanis suffered, whether in terms of human loss or the loss of land. De Waal (2010) verifies that during the war, around 20,000 people died and more than a million were displaced on both sides. While during the Genocide, Armenians were massacred and their homeland and much more was taken from

them. Therefore, one can assume that the Turkish people are perceived by the Armenians as unpunished aggressors. No sense of equality can be applied in this case.

This study also explored the link between the level of nationalism in Armenians and the level of social distance they feel towards Turks and Azerbaijanis. It was predicted that Armenians who have a higher nationalism as an individual trait would report higher social distance with the Turks and Azerbaijanis. In other words a positive correlation between nationalism level and social distance level was expected. As with the first independent variable, which was the forgiveness as an individual trait in Armenians, here also, the prediction was confirmed partly. The results showed that Armenians with higher nationalism keep more social distance with the Azerbaijani people. But in case of the Turkish, the level of nationalism was not significantly correlated with the social distance that Armenians keep towards them. One explanation of this finding could be the fact that currently, alongside the actual fighting between the parties involved, there has always been a “cultural war” going on. In other words, Azerbaijan is internationally accusing Armenia of plagiarizing their cultural heritage such as music, literature, carpets and cuisine. In his article that he titled “Azerbaijan Vows to Take on Armenian “Cuisine Plagiarism”” Yigal Schleifer (2013) refers to Azerbaijan’s Chief of the National Security Ministry's office, Major General Farhad Vakhobov who had claimed that Armenians took not only Azerbaijani lands, destroyed cultural and historical monuments in the occupied territories, but also Azerbaijani culture: folklore, gastronomy, music, presenting it as their own. Thus, a highly nationalistic Armenian could perceive these cultural accusations as an offence to his/her identity and, hence, keep a physical distance from the people of the other nation. It can be assumed that nationalism takes a more important role when there is more than human or land loss; the person’s own identity is on the stand. This could be considered as an identity threat situation in which

Armenians feel that the group they identify themselves with have been evaluated as occupiers and culture plagiarizers. Baker (2012) in explaining Tajfel and Turner's theory of social identity of 1986, states that individuals, once they identify themselves with a certain group, they try maintaining positive attitudes and feelings towards them. However, if these positive perceptions are seriously challenged, then they start associating the other group with as a sense of threat and negative emotions (Walton & Cohen, 2007).

Another aim of this research was to see if the time frame of the conflict can bring a significant difference in social distance towards Turkish and Azerbaijani people, without taking into account the variables for forgiveness and nationalism. It was predicted that Armenians would report to keep higher social distance with the Turks and Azerbaijanis. This hypothesis was confirmed, meaning that overall Armenians have higher social distance towards Azerbaijanis than Turks. One of the reasons for this finding has already been discussed previously: the “newness” of the conflict with Azerbaijan, and being the eyewitness of the death, the presence of thousands of refugees, etc. Another factor could be the “peer pressure”: everyone around you hates Azerbaijan, so should you; everyone has genocide claims, but travels to Turkey for vacation and wears Turkish clothes, so should you. It is believed that members of groups who share common identity feel pressure to conform to norms accepted in their group, even when it means going against their own beliefs or attitudes (*Harrington, 2003*).

### Implications of the research

The findings of the current study could provide important practical implications for clinical practitioners and psychological counsellors, whose area of interest is conflict

resolution as well as psychological health of people who have hatred and negative feelings towards perceived aggressors of their nation or country.

Twice in this paper, it was stated that:

Forgiveness is viewed as an important individual process in which the person let's go of anger and bad feelings towards the offender in order to regain mental health . The goal is the elimination of the emotional externalities of the offense , not to deal with the event itself . This makes the process an internal exercise , which can succeed regardless of the actions of the offender or of the wider community. (von Feigenblatt, 2013, p. 1)

Having this statement in mind, we will consider the Turkey situation first. Since Turkey does not admit committing the Genocide, will the Armenians with high trait of “forgiving” still forgive the other party that does not accept his guilt? As we discussed before, the results did not show a significant negative correlation between forgiveness and social distance regarding the Turks but only regarding the Azerbaijanis. So, based on this study the answer would be no: the results of this research show that while discussing forgiveness, one should take into consideration not only the individual trait of forgiveness, but the nature of the conflict as well. In this case, being an enemy with a nation (i.e., Turkey) that initiated a one-sided aggression, described as genocide by many international sources, on defenceless people, could not be equated with being at war with another nation in which the conflict is considered of mutual nature and, hence, more equal on different political and social levels. The same applies to the nationalism level. The counselling and reconciliation process will have

different directions based not only on the individual's level of forgiveness and nationalism, but also on the nature and background of the conflict.

### Limitations

One of the limitations in this research includes reducing the international conflict into a conflict of three states and peoples. There are much more parties involved than mentioned in this paper. Other parties are involved in this conflict, which may have a role in how Armenians perceive their conflict with the Turkish and the Azerbaijani people and act accordingly. After all, a lot of politics is involved in these delicate matters. As Alica Vidlickova (2012) puts it, international organizations have a great impact on the public as well as politics. By right usage of tools they influence some amount of people, political groups and parties. It is also important to mention that powerful states such as France, Russia and the United States have their own interest and major role in this play (de Waal, 2010).

Additionally, concerns over the sample populations used could be addressed: females noticeably outweighed males 123/40; furthermore, the sample did not include participants from the rural areas and other cities of Armenia, except for the capital Yerevan. Armenians leaving outside Armenia were also not included in the sample.

### Future Suggestions

It is suggested to do the same study in Nagorno-Karabakh and also with the Diaspora Armenians. If this study were to take place in the Armenian Diaspora, some findings might be different. For instance, it is possible that there will be no difference in people's attitudes

towards the Turks and the Azerbaijanis. There is even a possibility that the third hypothesis of the current study could be stated and confirmed in the opposite manner: “Social Distance scores among the Armenians will be higher towards the Turkish people than towards Azerbaijanis”. Being in Lebanon and Syria, the author has observed that many Diaspora Armenians are reared to hate Turkey with such a fervour that is not very common among Armenians from Armenia. Armenians hate Azerbaijan with the same fervour, however. As mentioned above, Armenians in Armenia do not have problems using Turkish products, while in Diaspora, it’s a big issue.

## Conclusion

Some authors with Turkish family names link the Armenian identity and the aim of existence for many Armenians with their Genocide recognition cause:

What makes an Armenian an Armenian today is their hopes for recognition of genocide and compensation. What happens if the only aim of living for an Armenian is destroyed ? Armenians would fall into an identity crisis and would start asking again “who they are”, “ what to live for ” etc ”; “ Armenian existence in the psychological sense is completely dependent on Turkish hostility (Altınbaş , 2010 , p. 187 ; 190 ) .

Another author writes the following:

Contrary to the dispersed population the Armenian Diaspora continues to thrive as a strong ethnic identity . This could be linked to the presence of an enemy “ Turk ” image in which all bad images are projected . This is due to the need to have “ enemies ” for sustaining the identity and in-group cohesion ... youth , who are raised with feelings of enmity , can pose a threat for the future of the Turkish-Armenian relations. (Çevik-Ersaydı, 2011, p. 93)

This research does not give a satisfactory response to such claims, but it helps to see that though there is a collective memory and demands among the Armenians in regards to the Turkish and the Azerbaijani people, the presence or absence of a social distance that an Armenian would keep with the members of discussed nations can be related with the trait of forgiveness, the nationalistic attitude level and the time factor.

## References

- Al-Hout, S. (2011). *My life in the PLO the inside story of the Palestinian struggle*. London: Pluto Press.
- Altınbaş, D. (2010). Discussing the Probability of Turkish-Armenian Integration by. Making Comparison to the European Case. *Review of Armenian Studies*, (22), 171-202.
- Baker, C. A. (2012). Social Identity Theory and Biblical Interpretation. *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 42(3), 129-138.
- Bloomfield D., Barnes T & Huyse L. (2003). *Reconciliation after Violent Conflict. A Handbook. International IDEA Handbook Series, Stockholm: IDEA.*
- Bogardus, E. S. (1925). Measuring Social Distances. *Journal of Applied Sociology* 9, 299-308
- Bogardus, E. S. (1926). Social Distance in the City. *Proceedings and Publications of the American Sociological Society*, 20, 40–46.
- Bogardus, E. S. (1933). A Social Distance Scale. *Sociology and Social Research*, 17, 265-271.



- Cehajic S., Brown R. & Castano E. (2008). Forgive and Forget? Antecedents and Consequences of Intergroup Forgiveness in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Political Psychology*, 29 (3), 351-367.
- Cengel, K. (2013). Dispatch from Armenia. *World Affairs*, 176(3), 57-63.
- Çevik-Ersaydi, B. (2011). The Armenian Diaspora and the Need for the Other. *Journal of Gazi Academic View*, 5(9), 93-107.
- Champion, M. (2009). Turkey and Armenia Pave Way for Historic Accords. *Wall Street Journal - Eastern Edition*. p. A7.
- de Waal, T. (2010). Remaking the Nagorno-Karabakh Peace Process. *Survival* (00396338), 52(4), 159-176.
- Deutsch M. (1973). *The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes*. New Haven CT, Yale University Press.
- Farr, R. M. (1975). *The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes* (Book). *Journal Of Occupational Psychology*, 48(2), 135-136.
- Harrington, E. R. (2003). The Social Psychology of Hatred. *Journal of Hate Studies*, 3(1), 49-82.
- Gellner, E. (1983), *Nations and Nationalism*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Karakayali, N. (2009). "Social Distance and Affective Orientations." *Sociological Forum*, 23 (3), 538–562.

Kochan, T. A. (1974). The Resolution of Conflict Constructive and Destructive Processes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19(2), 268-271

Moore, J. (2009). Forgive and Forget. *Current*, (512), 31-34.

Nationalist (n.d.). (2003). *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition*. Retrieved from <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/nationalist>.

Parrillo, V. N., & Donoghue, C. (2005). Updating the Bogardus social distance studies: a new national survey. *Social Science Journal*, 42(2), 257-271.

Schleifer, Y. (2013). Azerbaijan Vows to Take on Armenian "Cuisine Plagiarism" Retrieved from <http://www.eurasianet.org/node/66412>

Smith, A. (2008). *The Cultural Foundations of Nations: Hierarchy, Covenant, and Republic*, Oxford. Blackwell Publishing.

Staub E. (2003). "Healing and Reconciliation" in *Confronting the Armenian Genocide. Looking Backward Moving Forward*, Richard G, Hovannisian (ed.). Transaction Publishers. New Brunswick and London.

Thompson, L. Y., Snyder, C. R., Hoffman, L., Michael, S. T., Rasmussen, H. N., Billings, L. S., Heinze, L., Neufeld, J. E., Shorey, H. S., Roberts, J. C., & Roberts, D. E. (2005). Dispositional forgiveness of self, others, and situations. *Journal of Personality*, 73, 313-359

Todosijević, B. (2001). Dimensions of Nationalism: Structure of Nationalist Attitudes in Hungary and Yugoslavia. *Central European Political Science Review*, 2 (6), 170-186.

Vidlickova, A. (2012). Turkish-Armenian Relations and the Issue of the Recognition of the claims of the Armenian genocide. *Alternatives Turkish Journal of International Relations*, 11(1), 1-16.

von Feigenblatt, O. F. (2013). Forgiveness and Culture: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue. *Journal of History & Social Sciences*, 4 (1), 1-4.

Wall, J. A., & Callister, R. R. (1995). Conflict and its management. *Journal of Management*, 21, 515-558.

Walton, G. M., & Cohen, G. L. (2007). A Question of Belonging: Race, Social Fit, and Achievement. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 92(1), 82-96.

Wohl, M. J. A., & Branscombe, N. R. (2005). Forgiveness and collective guilt assignment to historical perpetrator groups depend on level of social category inclusiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 288–303.

Zekiyan, B. (2010). Armenian-Turkish Relations in the Framework of Turkish and Armenian Scholarships. *Iran & The Caucasus*, 14(2), 367-385.

## Appendix A

### Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS)

Directions: In the course of our lives negative things may occur because of our own actions, the actions of others, or circumstances beyond our control. For some time after these events, we may have negative thoughts or feelings about ourselves, others, or the situation. Think about how you typically respond to such negative events. Next to each of the following items write the number (from the 7-point scale below) that best describes how you typically respond to the type of negative situation described. There are no right or wrong answers. Please be as open as possible in your answers.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost Always		More Often		More Often		Almost Always
False of Me		False of Me		True of Me		True of Me

- \_\_\_ 1. Although I feel bad at first when I mess up, over time I can give myself some slack.
- \_\_\_ 2. I hold grudges against myself for negative things I've done.
- \_\_\_ 3. Learning from bad things that I've done helps me get over them.
- \_\_\_ 4. It is really hard for me to accept myself once I've messed up.
- \_\_\_ 5. With time I am understanding of myself for mistakes I've made.
- \_\_\_ 6. I don't stop criticizing myself for negative things I've felt, thought, said, or done.
- \_\_\_ 7. I continue to punish a person who has done something that I think is wrong.
- \_\_\_ 8. With time I am understanding of others for the mistakes they've made.
- \_\_\_ 9. I continue to be hard on others who have hurt me.

\_\_\_\_ 10. Although others have hurt me in the past, I have eventually been able to see them as good people.

\_\_\_\_ 11. If others mistreat me, I continue to think badly of them.

\_\_\_\_ 12. When someone disappoints me, I can eventually move past it.

\_\_\_\_ 13. When things go wrong for reasons that can't be controlled, I get stuck in negative thoughts about it.

\_\_\_\_ 14. With time I can be understanding of bad circumstances in my life.

\_\_\_\_ 15. If I am disappointed by uncontrollable circumstances in my life, I continue to think negatively about them.

\_\_\_\_ 16. I eventually make peace with bad situations in my life.

\_\_\_\_ 17. It's really hard for me to accept negative situations that aren't anybody's fault.

\_\_\_\_ 18. Eventually I let go of negative thoughts about bad circumstances that are beyond anyone's control.

## Appendix B

### Nationalism Scale

Directions: Next to each of the following items write the number (from the 6-point scale below) that best describes your attitude towards the certain item.

1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Somewhat disagree,  
4 – Somewhat agree, 5 – Agree, 6 – Strongly agree

1. It is nonsense that all nations are equal. Some peoples are more, some less honorable ---
2. To be without a nation is like to be without a family ---
3. It is not good to be too open towards other nations ---
4. Every nation should live in its own state ---
5. Nationally mixed marriages are determined to failure ---
6. An important thing children should learn in schools is to love their nation ---
7. Feeling of national attachment is one of the most valuable feelings one could ever experience ---
8. One should be reserved and cautious towards other nations, even when they appear to be friendly ---
9. One should respect his nation and its tradition ---
10. All great deeds are inspired by the national feelings ---
11. In our country our nation should be privileged regarding the employment---
12. One's most important characteristics come from his nationality---
13. One's destiny equals with the nation's destiny ---

14. Renewal of our national ideals is our most important task ---
15. Putting our nation above others is nothing evil; it is just an expression of love for our people---
16. One should always put national interests above the personal ones ---
17. National majorities should always have more political rights than minorities ---



## Appendix C

### Bogardus Social Distance Scale

#### INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Remember to give your *first* feeling reactions in every case.
2. Give your reactions to Turkish people. Do not give your reactions to the best or the worst members that you have known, but think of the picture or stereotype that you have of the whole group.
3. On the line below place the number which represents the degree of closeness (smallest number) personally acceptable to you with members of each group.

*How would you feel about having members of the groups listed below?*

#### CLOSER

1. As close kin by marriage
2. In my club as personal friends
3. On my street as neighbors
4. Working alongside me in my job
5. As citizens in my country
6. As visitors only to my country
7. I'd exclude them from my country

#### DISTANT

Turks-----

Azerbaijani -----

## Appendix D

### The translated Armenian scales

#### Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS)

ՄԵՌ \_\_\_\_\_ ՏԱՐԻՔ \_\_\_\_\_ ԿՐԹՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ \_\_\_\_\_

Գնահատիր, թե որքանով ես համաձայն ստորև նշված 17

արտահայտություններից յուրաքանչյուրի հետ:

Ամենին համաձայն չեմ – 1    Համաձայն չեմ – 2    Որոշ չափով համաձայն չեմ – 3

Մասամբ համաձայն եմ – 4    Համաձայն եմ – 5    Լիովին համաձայն եմ – 6

1. Անմտություն է բոլոր ազգերը հավասար համարել: Որոշ ժողովուրդներ արժանի են ավելի շատ հարգանքի, քան մյուսները: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Առանց ազգի լինելը, նման է առանց ընտանիքի լինելուն: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Լավ չէ շատ բաց լինել օտար ազգերի նկատմամբ: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Ամեն ազգ պետք է ապրի իր պետության մեջ: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Նույն ազգին չպատկանող մարդկանց խառն ամուսնությունները դատապարտված են անհաջողության: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Կարևոր է, որ երեխաները դպրոցում սովորեն սիրել իրենց ազգը: \_\_\_\_\_

7. Ազգի հետ կապվածությունը ամենից արժեքավոր զգացմունքներից մեկն է,  
որ մարդ կարող է երբևէ ունենալ: \_\_\_\_\_
8. Պետք է շրջահայաց և զգույշ լինել ուրիշ ազգությունների նկատմամբ,  
նույնիսկ, երբ նրանք ընկերային են երևում: \_\_\_\_\_
9. Պետք է հարգել քո ազգն ու ազգային ավանդույթները: \_\_\_\_\_
10. Բոլոր մեծ գործերը ոգեշնչված են ազգային զգացումներով: \_\_\_\_\_
11. Մեր երկրում աշխատանքի տեղավորման առավելությունը պետք է տրվի  
մեր ազգի ներկայացուցիչներին: \_\_\_\_\_
12. Մարդու ամենակարևոր հատկությունները հիմնականում գալիս են նրա  
ազգությունից: \_\_\_\_\_
13. Անհատի ճակատագիրը հավասար է իր ազգի ճակատագրին: \_\_\_\_\_
14. Ազգային գաղափարները վերականգնելը մեր ամենակարևոր  
գործն է: \_\_\_\_\_
15. Քո ազգը բոլոր ազգերից վեր դասելը չարիք չէ, այլ քո ժողովրդի  
հանդեպ սիրո արտահայտություն է: \_\_\_\_\_
16. Միշտ պետք է ազգային շահերը վեր դասել անձնականից: \_\_\_\_\_
17. Ազգային մեծամասնությունները պետք է ավելի շատ քաղաքական  
իրավունքներ ունենան, քան փոքրամասնությունները: \_\_\_\_\_

ԸՆԴՀԱՆՈՒՐ \_\_\_\_\_

### Nationalism Scale

Մեր կյանքում բացասական բաներ են տեղի ունենում մեր պատճառով,  
 ուրիշների պատճառով կամ մեր վերահսկողությունից դուրս գտնվող  
 պարագաների պատճառով:

Գնահատիր, թե սովորաբար ինչպես ես արձագանքում ստորև նշված 18  
 բացասական իրավիճակների ժամանակ:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
Գրեթե երբեք այդպես չէ	Հաճախ այդպես չէ	Հաճախ այդպես է	Գրեթե միշտ այդպես է			

1. Հակառակ, որ սկզբում ինձ վատ են զգում, երբ սխալվում եմ, բայց  
 ժամանակի հետ կարողանում եմ որոշ չափով ներել ինքս ինձ: ----
2. Միշտ ասում եմ ինձ իմ գործած բացասական արարքների համար: ----
3. Իմ գործած վատ արարքներից դասեր քաղելն օգնում է ինձ հաղթահարել  
 դրանք: ----
4. Ինձ համար իրապես դժվար է ընդունել ինքս ինձ, երբ ես սխալվում եմ: ----
5. Ժամանակի ընթացքում ըմբռնումով եմ մոտենում իմ գործած սխալներին: ----
6. Չեմ դադարում ինքս ինձ քննադատել իմ բացասական զգացածներիս,  
 մտածածներիս, ասածներիս և արածներիս համար: ----
7. Շարունակում եմ պատժել այն մարդուն, ով իմ կարծիքով սխալ բան է արել: ----

8. Ժամանակի ընթացքում ըմբռնումով եմ մոտենում այլ մարդկանց

սխալներին: ----

9. Շարունակում եմ խիստ լինել այն մարդկանց հանդեպ, ովքեր ցավ են

պատճառել ինձ: ----

10. Հակառակ, որ մարդիկ ինձ ցավ են պատճառել անցյալում, ես, վերջ ի վերջո,

կարողացել եմ նրանց լավ մարդ համարել: ----

11. Եթե ուրիշներն ինձ հետ վատ են վարվում, ես շարունակում եմ վատ ձևով

մտածել նրանց մասին: ---

12. Երբ մեկը հիասթափեցնում է ինձ, ի վերջո կարողանում եմ հաղթահարել այդ

զգացումը: ----

13. Երբ գործերը վատ են ընթանում և վերահսկել չեմ կարող, ես լցվում եմ

բացասական մտքերով: ----

14. Ժամանակի ընթացքում սկսում եմ ըմբռնումով մոտենալ կյանքիս վատ

պարագաներին: ----

15. Եթե հիասթափվում եմ կյանքիս մեջ իմ վերահսկողությունից դուրս գտնվող

պարագաներից, շարունակում եմ բացասական մտածել այդ պարագաների

մասին: ----

16. Ի վերջո՝ հաշտվում եմ իմ կյանքի վատ պարագաների հետ: ----

17. Ինձ համար իրապես դժվար է ընդունել բացասական իրավիճակները,

որոնցում ոչ ոք մեղավոր չէ: ----

18. Ի վերջո՝ հաղթահարում եմ մարդկային վերահսկողությունից դուրս գտնվող  
վատ պարագաների մասին բացասական մտքերը: ---

ԸՆԴՀԱՆՈՒՐ \_\_\_\_\_

### Bogardus Social Distance Scale

1. Պատասխանիր առաջին զգացումով:
2. Ստորև նշված ազգությունների դիմաց դիր այն տարբերակի նիշը, որը բնութագրում է այդ ազգին պատկանող մարդկանց մոտիկանալու քեզ համար ընդունելի չափը: (Մի հիմնվիր մեկ այդ ազգությունների հետ ունեցած շփման հետևանքով ձևավորված տպավորության վրա:  
Պատասխանիր այդ ազգի մասին քո մտքում եղած ընդհանուր պատկերը հիշելով):

Քո վերաբերմունքը հետևյալ ազգությունների նկատմամբ`

Թուրքեր -----

Ադրբեջանցիներ-----

1. որպես մոտ ազգական` ամուսնական կապի արդյունքում
2. որպես ինձ հետ նույն ակումբ հաճախող լավ ընկերներ
3. որպես նույն թաղում ապրող դրացիներ
4. որպես իմ կողքին աշխատող գործընկերներ
5. որպես իմ երկրի քաղաքացիներ
6. միայն որպես իմ երկրի հյուրեր
7. չեմ ցանկանում, որ նրանք լինեն իմ երկրում