

5-1-2010

# Attitudes Toward Hazaragi

Abedin Jamal

*Southern Illinois University Carbondale*, abedinjamal@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/theses>

---

## Recommended Citation

Jamal, Abedin, "Attitudes Toward Hazaragi" (2010). *Theses*. Paper 217.

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact [opensiuc@lib.siu.edu](mailto:opensiuc@lib.siu.edu).

ATTITUDES TOWARD HAZARAGI

by

Abedin Jamal

B.A., Kabul University, Afghanistan, 2006

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Master of Arts Degree

Department of Linguistics  
in the Graduate School  
Southern Illinois University Carbondale  
May 2010

THESIS APPROVAL

ATTITUDES TOWARD HAZARAGI

By

Abedin Jamal

A Thesis Submitted in Partial  
Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of  
Master of Arts  
in the field of Applied Linguistics and TESOL

Approved by:

Dr. Krassimira Charkova, Chair

Dr. Janet Fuller, Co-chair

Dr. Karen Baertsch

Graduate School  
Southern Illinois University Carbondale  
April 5, 2010

## AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Abedin Jamal, for the Master of Arts degree in Applied Linguistics and TESOL,  
presented on 5 April 2010, at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

TITLE: Attitudes Toward Hazaragi

MAJOR PROFESSOR: Dr. Krassimira Charkova

This study examined the attitudes of young educated Hazaras towards Hazaragi, a politically low-prestigious language spoken in Afghanistan. The instrument included a questionnaire made of Attitude questions and Descriptive questions. The respondents expressed their beliefs about the linguistic entity of Hazaragi, desire to maintain Hazaragi, value of Hazaragi, and domains of use of Hazaragi. The results showed that half of the Hazaras who participated in the study considered Hazaragi to be a language whereas the other half did not. The majority of the participants demonstrated a commitment to maintain Hazaragi and to speak Hazaragi. With regards to domains of use, Hazaragi was considered most suitable for casual settings and use with friends. For formal contexts, such as university lectures or a government office, Dari was considered more appropriate. Gender differences were examined through independent t-tests which showed that the attitudes and perceptions of male and female Hazaras did not differ significantly. Although significant gender differences were not found, the male participants had an overall more positive attitude towards Hazaragi than the female participants.

## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to all who believe in freedom and liberty; those who fight ignorance with knowledge and education; those who do their part to make this world a better place for all of us.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank and show my appreciation to all who helped me make this happen: Dr. Krassimira Charkova, my advisor and thesis chair, for her patience, kindness, enthusiasm, motivation and immense knowledge; Dr. Janet Fuller, my thesis co-chair, for her useful and timely suggestions and encouragements, and introducing me to concepts of sociolinguistics; Dr. Karen Baertsch, my thesis committee member, for helping me throughout the two years of studying at SIUC and making me appreciate linguistics; Diane Korando, the secretary of Linguistics Department, for her smile and help with my paperwork; Mohammad Yonus Entezar, my colleague and friend in Kabul, for his help in administering the questionnaire; the subjects who participated in the study; my friends, for their continued encouragement and support; the Fulbright Program for funding my Master's program at SIUC; and last but not the least, my mom for being for me through the ups and downs of life.

Thanks, to all of you!

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ABSTRACT .....	i
DEDICATION .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	iii
LIST OF TABLES .....	v
CHAPTERS	
CHAPTER 1 – Introduction.....	1
CHAPTER 2 – Language Attitude Literature Review .....	26
CHAPTER 3 – Methodology.....	43
CHAPTER 4 – Results.....	51
CHAPTER 5 – Discussion and Conclusion.....	72
REFERENCES .....	82
APPENDICIES	
Appendix A – Instrument.....	89
VITA .....	96

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Table 1 .....	52
Table 2 .....	54
Table 3 .....	55
Table 4 .....	57
Table 5 .....	61
Table 6 .....	62
Table 7 .....	62
Table 8 .....	65
Table 9 .....	67
Table 10 .....	69

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

Afghanistan is a country made up of several different ethnic groups. The four major nationalities are the Pashtuns, the Tajiks, the Hazaras, and the Uzbeks. The Hazaras are the third largest of the ethnic groups who live in regions throughout Afghanistan, although they are mainly concentrated in central Afghanistan called the “Hazarajat” (Mousavi, 1998) or “Hazaristan” (Emadi, 1997; 2000). The Hazaras in Afghanistan are Muslims and the majority of them are Shia, although there are a significant number of Sunni and Isma’ili Hazaras as well.

The Hazaras are the most oppressed people in Afghanistan and they have been persecuted in the last two hundred years by the ruling ethnic Pashtuns on the basis of their ethnicity and religion. The most recent wide scale persecution was during the rule of the Taliban who also were predominately Pashtuns (Lange, Kamalkhani & Baldassar, 2007). As the Hazaras are a Shiite minority in a Sunni dominated country, they have been discriminated against in many ways, and as Monsutti notes (2004) this fact has put the Hazaras into further “political and socio-economic marginalization” (p. 219). In a subsequent article, Monsutti (2005) clearly defines the situation of the Hazaras by saying “Indeed, Hazara identity has been built around the evocation of past injustices and protest against exploitation.” (p. 68).

Since Amir Abdul Rahman Khan (1880-1901), who ruthlessly killed and enslaved the Hazaras starting in the 1890s, the rights of the Hazaras have been systematically abused and neglected. The Hazaras were humiliated, insulted and brutally treated and they were regarded as second class citizens, and even the term *Hazara* had developed

negative connotations (Mousavi, 1998). As a result of all this, Hazaragi, which is considered a “dialect” of Dari (Persian spoken in Afghanistan), was considered a language spoken by low-status people and was the subject of mockery and humiliation. On the other hand, Dari, which is the de facto official language of Afghanistan, has been considered the language of prestige. Educated Hazaras and also the Hazaras who moved to cities mostly speak Dari, rather than Hazaragi. In the post-Taliban era when the Hazaras found an opportunity to be more active in the social life of society, they learned more about their rights and identity. According to author’s observation, now Hazaras speak in Hazaragi when talking to each other, even in the presence of people who used to have a low attitude toward Hazaragi, and they take pride in speaking Hazaragi and being identified as the Hazara. In fact, Hazaragi has become a staple of identity as Hazara for some people.

Due to systematic discrimination toward the Hazaras by the government, the Hazaras were isolated, and as Mousavi (1998) points out with the exception of a few monographic histories of the Hazaras during the last 100 years, no serious studies have been undertaken about the Hazaras and their language. The only descriptive study on Hazaragi, entitled *Hazaragi dialect of Afghan Persian* by Dulling (1973), is merely a preliminary study of Hazaragi as indicated by the author. All of this points to the fact that empirical studies about Hazaragi is nonexistent. The realization of the lack of sociolinguistic research about the status of Hazaragi and how it is perceived by its speakers has become the main motivation for the present study. It aimed to examine the attitudes of young and educated Hazaras, both male and female, toward Hazaragi.

Since it is important to have background knowledge of the Hazaras and Hazaragi to be able to understand attitudes towards Hazaragi, this chapter provides a summary of the main political, social, and linguistic factors that have taken part in shaping the status of Hazaragi and peoples' attitudes toward it.

### 1.1 Origins of the Hazaras

The origin of the Hazaras is widely debated and there are many theories and speculations about their origins. Ferrier (1857, as cited in Mousavi, 1998) believes that the Hazaras are the ancient residents of the region who lived there even during the time of Alexander the Great. There are a significant number of Hazara scholars who also believe the Hazaras have been living in Hazarajat since time immemorial (Emadi, 2002). Bellew (1857, as cited in Emadi, 1997) hypothesizes that the Hazaras are the direct descendents of Gengiz Khan's army that settled in Afghanistan on the basis of their customs and physical features. According to the findings of an international team of geneticists (Travis, 2003), one in twelve men have a Y chromosome in Asia that originated in Mongolia sometime about 1000 years ago. The above is a significant percentage given the size and population of Asia which makes the intermixture of Mongols with other groups highly probable. A few other scholars such as Ivanov (1926), Thesiger (1955) and Dulling (1973) also support the theory of Mongol descendent, but Hazaras being the direct remnant of Genghis Khan's army is debated. Bacon (1951; 1958) also believes that the Hazaras are of Mongolian descent but she refutes the claim that they are the remnant of Genghis Khan's army left behind. Bacon (1951) states that "The region now known as Hazarajat seems to have been peopled chiefly by Chagataians from Transoxiana. Other

Mongols, and some Turks or Turco-Mongols may have joined these Chagataians” (p. 241).

Some scholars believe Hazaras are of a mixed “race.” For example, proponents of a mixed race, Schurmann (1962, as cited in Mousavi, 1998) argues that the Hazaras are of a mixed race of Mongolians and Turks that slowly assimilated with the local population of the region in the later part of the 13<sup>th</sup> Century. Other authors such as Monsutti (2005) and Termikhanov (1980, as cited in Mousavi, 1998) are also in favor of the theory of Hazara being of a mixed origin. As Emadi (1997) points out, based on the history and ethnography of the Hazaras, the claim that they are of a mixed race seems more reasonable.

Some Hazaras have more Mongolian features than others and some even look more like Tajiks. Schurmann (1961, p. 111) mentions of “Irano-Afghanoid” and even “Europeanoid” features that are present among the Hazaras. Overall, the population of Hazarajat and the Hazaras as a whole is far more mixed now than is believed. It seems that the theory of Hazaras as a mixed race is more plausible than the other theories although the Hazaras may have well been the original inhabitants of central Afghanistan. As a mixed race, the Hazaras are the result of intermarriage between Mongols, Turks, Tajiks and other ethnic groups that developed into a separate ethnicity sometime during the 13<sup>th</sup> and the 16<sup>th</sup> Century (Kakar, 1973, as cited in Mousavi, 1998). Also, as the Hazaras have lived in close vicinity with other ethnic groups in Afghanistan, it may have contributed to their race mixture (Kakar, 2006).

Mousavi (1998) gives a thorough conclusion recapturing the discussion of origin of the Hazaras as follows:

“... the Hazaras: a) are one of the oldest inhabitants of the region; b) are of a mixture of races and ethnic groups, of which Changiz Khan and Amir Timur’s Moghol soldiers are but one and relatively recent and that c) Hazara tribal and linguistic structure has been much influenced by all these different peoples (in the same way as the influence of Arabs on their religion and of Farsi on their culture). The ancestors of the Hazaras can be traced back to the Turkic inhabitants of central and eastern Asia, more than 2300 years ago, to the area known today as Hazarajat.” (p. 43)

One thing to bear in mind is that race is a social construct and membership in an ethnic group is not based on physical heredity but on a sense of shared history and culture. Fredrik Barth’s study on ethnicity (1969, as cited in Monsutti, 2004) revealed that the identity of a group is not specified in having a common origin or even having a shared culture, rather, it is a lasting boundary formed and sustained as a result of perpetual social interaction.

Nevertheless, as Ferdinand (1965) points out, the history and origin of the Hazaras is very intricate and more anthropological and ethnographical research should be done in order to describe it with more certainty. Also, the government dominated by the Pashtuns has been actively engaged in rewriting the history in favor of the Pashtuns and has sought to demean the minorities especially the Hazaras in Afghanistan. Bindemann (2002) highlights the effort of some Pashtun authors in the 1940s who were trying to fabricate stories about Pashtuns as original inhabitants of Afghanistan backed by “falsified, pseudo-academic findings” which has become a trend in rewriting the history of Afghanistan and its people.

The etymology of Hazara is also disputed among the scholars. One common interpretation of the word Hazara is the Persian word “Hazar” which means “a thousand,” a replacement for the Mongolian word *minggan* (*ming* in Turkic), “a thousand-man unit of the Mongol army,” which is attributed to a thousand Mongolian soldiers that settled in Hazarajat (Monsutti, 2005; Schurmann, 1961). Emadi (1997) suggests other interesting possible origins of the word “Hazar”, for instance, the existence of one thousand rivers, creeks, and mountains in Hazarajat; or provision of one thousand soldiers to central government; or replacement of one thousand statues that existed before Islam in Hazarajat with one thousand mosques. All of the above are merely speculations.

The theory that the Hazaras are remnants of the Mongol soldiers has been used against the Hazaras to label them as outsiders. As such, they have been treated as the outsiders in their own country and were expected to leave at some point. As Schetter (2005) suggests, Pashtuns tried to rewrite the history of Afghanistan as a Pashtun nation or “Pashtunistan” that covers not only the Pashtun settled areas but the entire region between two natural rivers of Amu Darya (Amu River) and Indus. In this interpretation, Pashtuns are regarded as an indigenous population of the region and the other ethnic groups are deemed as intruders that came at later times. In 2007, the author had a conversation with two Pashtun students in a coffee shop about the Durand Treaty which confirms Schetter’s assertion. They said retrieving the Pashtun populated land on the other side of the Afghan border in Pakistan where the Pashtuns live is crucial in building Pashtun dominance in Afghanistan. According to them, Afghanistan is the land of Pashtuns and the Hazaras along with other ethnics should leave because they are “illegal immigrants” in Afghanistan. In fact, there was a widely circulated phrase during the

Taliban that said "Tajiks to Tajikistan, Uzbeks to Uzbekistan, and Hazaras to *goristan*," the graveyard (Zabriskie, 2008).

## 1.2 The Hazaras Before Abdur Rahman Khan

Hazarajat was independent, for the most part, since its creation as a community united by ethnicity and it remained so until the early part of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century (Emadi, 1997). Hazarajat was ruled autonomously by several Hazara *mir* who were big feudal land owners until the reign of Abdur Rahman Khan. As Bacon (1958) mentions, the Hazaras were a distinct ethnic group until the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> Century. Hazaras' role in the political life of Afghanistan before the 19<sup>th</sup> Century is vague as there is not much literature about them; however, it seems that they were not confined to Hazarajat. In fact, they helped choose the first king of Afghanistan according to Codrington (1944). Before Ahmad Shah Abdali, Afghanistan was called "Khurasan," and it is believed that he changed it to Afghanistan. However, it was under Abdur Rahman that the current boundaries of Afghanistan were outlined and established.

As a feudal society, the Hazara society was comprised of the land owner chiefs, the peasants and the artisans (Emadi, 1997). The clergy who were mainly Sayeds (Sayeds are said to be descendents of the Prophet Mohammad) received religious taxes and endowment from the ruling class and the local people; in return, they legitimized the rule of the Hazara chiefs (called Mir, Beg or Sultan). As Emadi points out, the relationship between Pashtun monarchies and the Hazara chiefs was based on mutual cooperation. The Hazara chiefs had their own army and collected taxes. The chiefs gave taxes annually to the monarchy and provided the monarchy with soldiers in times of war. The

Pashtun monarchs respected the autonomy of the Hazarajat and the exercise of power by Hazara chiefs in their regions. The autonomy of Hazarajat continued until the reign of Abdur Rahman Khan.

### 1.3 Suppression of the Hazaras by Abdur Rahman Khan

As a strategy of building a more powerful central government, Amir Abdur Rahman Khan (1880-1901) attacked the autonomous Hazarajat while supported by the British Government and defeated all the Hazara tribes bringing an end to the autonomy of Hazarajat (Emadi, 1997). He managed to occupy and include Hazarajat into his government in 1893 and in doing so, he killed a number of Hazaras, enslaved others, and forced a large number of them to take refuge in Pakistan and Iran (and even Central Asia) as the Hazaras tried to fight back and defend their sovereignty and autonomy (Emadi, 1997). The Hazaras who fled to Pakistan and settled in Quetta at the end of the 19th Century because of being oppressed by Abdur Rahman Khan (Bindemann, 2002), retained their strong identity as Hazaras. They later provided a refuge for the new wave of Hazara refugees in the end of the 20th Century.

In order to mobilize Pashtuns to fight against the Hazaras, Amir Abdur Rahman Khan encouraged the Sunni religious leaders to wage *jihad* (religious war) against Shiite Hazara and go to Pashtun villages to recruit fighters (Yazdani, 1370, as cited in Emadi, 1997, p. 367). The *fitwa*, the Islamic legal ruling issued by the religious leaders, called the Hazaras “infidels” (Emadi, 2008, p. 138). Thus, Abdur Rahman, who called himself “Amir of the Muslims”, was given the authority to kill, loot and enslave the Hazaras.

Around nine thousand Hazara men and women were sold as slaves in the bazaars of Kabul alone (Ibrahimi, 2009) with thousands of others bought and sold in other cities all over Afghanistan and also British India. As documented by Fayz Mohammad Kateb Hazara in *Siraj al-Twariskh* (as cited in Kakar, 2006, p. 138), the Hazaras were coerced to abandon the Shia sect and join the Sunni sect of Islam. It is even believed that some Shia Hazaras were coerced to convert to the Sunni Islam by the Sunni rulers or they have converted to Sunni Islam willfully as they thought their conversion to the dominant faith would bring them more security and help them avoid persecution based on their religion and political views (Emadi, 1997). However, the majority of the Hazaras bypassed this forced conversion by resorting to *taqiya* (concealment of faith in times of danger and pretending one is following the dominant faith) and started to practice Shia Islam as soon as they could do so without being persecuted. Hazaras have been systemically oppressed and discriminated against since their defeat in 1893 by Abdur Rahman (Emadi, 1997).

Emadi (1997) notes that Abdur Rahman Khan brutally suppressed the Hazaras to teach other ethnic groups in Afghanistan that they would face the same fate should they oppose his rule and rebel against him. He also prepared the way for his son's rule and collected taxes from remote places of Hazarajat. Emadi (2008) adds that the lands of the Hazaras in the depopulated Hazarajat were given to Sunni Pashtun settlers and Hazara feudal landowners were all but gone. Also, some of the Hazaras could no longer afford to live in Hazarajat as their livelihoods were taken. They moved to cities such as Kabul and took underpaid jobs such as porters and unpaid domestic servants. Monsutti (2004, p. 63) writes that "whole swathes of Hazarajat (especially in what is now Urzugan province) were emptied of their population and occupied by Pashtuns." Abdur Rahman also gave

the pasture land of the Hazaras in Hazarajat to Pashtun nomads (Kakar, 2006) which have been a source of conflict between the Hazaras and the Kuchis since then.

#### 1.4 The Hazaras after Abdur Rahman Khan

Abdur Rahman Khan used one ethnic community to fight another and in the case of the Hazaras, he used Pashtun tribes to oppress the Hazaras in Hazarajat (Mousavi, 1998). As a result, there is hostility between the two ethnic groups even today and the Pashtun-ruled governments have always contentiously discriminated against the Hazaras in many ways. To create a “unified country,” Abdur Rahman Khan established Pashtun hegemony in all corners of Afghanistan and forced other ethnic groups to migrate in order to settle their lands with the Pashtuns.

One heritage left behind from Abdur Rahman Khan is the continual conflicts between the Hazaras and the Pashtun nomads, called Kuchis in Afghanistan. The Pashtun nomads were even accompanied by police agents in Hazarajat and their conflict with Hazaras were always resolved in favor of the nomads (Dorrnsoro, 2005). They would go to Hazarajat and seize the land and livestock of the poor Hazara farmers and the Pashtun dominated governments would do nothing to stop it. They even supported the Kuchis by arming them and they have used it as a strategy against the Hazaras. In 2007, the armed Kuchis went to Behsud in the Wardak province and grabbed the land and animals of the Hazaras and caused thousands of people to flee the area losing their houses and properties (Emadi, 2008).

In 1923 King Amanullah Khan, who wanted to modernize Afghanistan, abolished slavery by introducing a new constitution and granted equal rights to all citizens of

Afghanistan (Emadi, 1997). The Hazaras gained more rights under Amanullah Khan and supported him to fight off Habibullah Khan. However, when Nadir Shah took the throne, breaking his promise of reinstating Amanullah Khan, he reversed Amanullah's policies and established more control over the Hazaras. According to Emadi (1997, p. 386) Nadir's administration appointed Pashtun officials in Hazarajat and put much effort into promoting the Pashto language and the Pashtun culture in Hazarajat to boost Pashtun nationalism while at the same time trying to "condemn Hazara culture and history."

According to Emadi (1997), Nadir's policies went to an extreme to erase any historical account or name associated with the Hazaras from state archives. Emadi portrays the situation as follows (1997):

"Although Hazaras were conscripted into the army and employed in civil service departments, they were not promoted beyond the rank of colonels in the army and directors in public offices. In so doing, Nadir debilitated Hazaras authority. He also worked to deprive them of their fundamental rights, allowing Pashtun nomads to gradually occupy Hazaras' land." (p. 368)

The Hazaras rebelled against the central government few times as the Kabul Government pursued its "Pashtunization policy" of virtually everything in the country and the government crushed their rebellion and killed or imprisoned their leaders (Emadi, 1997). Emadi (p. 371) compares the situation of the Hazaras after Abdur Rahman to that of pariahs, "underprivileged politically, socially, economically and culturally." Hazaras were treated as second-class citizens and were subjected to public humiliation. Some of this kind of humiliating treatment continues even until now. Hazaras were called derogatory terms such as *bini puchuq* or *qalfak chapat* (flat-nose), *Hazara-e mushkhur*

(mice-eating Hazara), and even the word “Hazara” developed derogatory connotations. They would say phrases such as *Hazara wa chaklit*, Hazara and chocolate, saying the Hazaras did not deserve anything good. Even the language of Hazaras was subject to this mockery.

For Hazaras, things have never been the same since Abdur Rahman Khan. Modernization of Afghanistan was supposed to help elevate the Hazara population as a very hard-working segment of society. However, the harsh treatment of Hazaras continued and as Emadi (1997) writes, Hazaras took low-paid jobs such as porters and laborers and other jobs that no one else would do. Hazaras were not given government jobs and they were not promoted to higher positions. Some high schools and one university would not admit Hazaras. Hazaras who received higher education were not given government jobs (Emadi, 1997).

#### 1.5 The Hazaras from the Soviet Invasion (1978-1992) to the Taliban era

According to Monsutti (2005), Hazarajat retrieved its old autonomy although it was reduced to a much smaller region after the communist coup that toppled President Daud’s regime. Bindemann (2002) discusses Hazara nationalism taking hold in Pakistan and Afghanistan although Hazara nationalists were labeled “mogholists” and even worse and sometimes killed by the Iranian backed religious leaders who were in favor of Iranian style “pan-Islamism.” Hazara intellectuals and intelligentsia who came into contact with the Hazaras in Quetta became clearer about their goals for the future of Hazaras as a nation in Afghanistan rather than the usual title of Shia.

Among the first group that propagated Hazara nationalism in Afghanistan and especially in Hazarajat was the *Tanzim-e Nasle Naw-e Hazara* (Organization of the New Generation of the Moghol Hazaras) that was established in 1960s based in Quetta, Pakistan (Ibrahimi, 2006). Unlike most other Hazara parties that emphasized the role of Shia Islam as the corner stone of their socio-political strife, the Tanzim focused on the rights of the Hazaras as an ethnic group. They called Hazarajat Hazaristan (Ibrahimi, 2006), the land of Hazaras. As such, Hazaragi became a conductor of Hazara nationalism; thus, the language of Hazaras. The Hazaras who went to exile in Pakistan returned with a new sense of identity as Hazaras being indulged in Hazara nationalism of Quetta type unlike that of Iran that reiterated the role of Shia in every aspect of the people's life.

As Ibrahimi (2009) notes, Hazaras were denied participation in the "Interim Islamic Government" that was supposed to replace the communist regime in Kabul in the end of 1980 by Sunni led resistance groups in Pakistan. This fact was another demonstration of the unjust treatment of the Hazaras. It served as a wakeup call for the many divided Hazara groups that were busy fighting each other and prompted the need for having a united and strong group to have bargaining leverage at the national level in the quest for the rights of the Hazaras (Ibrahimi, 2009). Eventually, all Hazara rival *jihadi* parties came together and formed Hizb-e Wahdat-i Islami (Party of Islamic Unity, 1989), the first alliance of eight Shia parties that was driven by ethnicity, with the mission to claim the right of Hazaras and eliminate the historical prejudice against Hazaras. Bindemann (2002) adds that it was Hazara nationalism that resulted in the creation of Hizb-e Wahdat. The Hazaras became more aware of their identity as the Hazaras and worked for gaining more rights as the Hazaras.

The Hazaras enjoyed more rights and freedom during the communist regime especially during Dr. Najibullah's government than the previous regimes since Abdur Rahman. As Bindemann (2002, pp. 79-80) notes, the constitution of 1987 for the first time stated in article 13 that "Afghanistan is a multi-national state the job of which is to secure the equality, welfare and development of all nationalities and regions." It was the first time that all the nationalities were regarded as equal and the fact was recognized that Afghanistan is made up of multi-ethnics (multi-nationals). Also, it was during this regime that a Hazara, Sultan Ali Kishmand, held the position of premier for the first time in the history of Afghanistan (Bindemann, 2002). Kishmand-Dr. Najib's regime tried to woo the Hazaras by giving Hazarajat a semi-autonomous status provided that they would not side with resistance forces and promised them more rights and religious freedom under the so called national reconciliation program (Naby, 1988). Unfortunately, the Hazaras did not benefit much from a welcoming Kabul regime due to the influence of Iranian-backed Shia armed factions in Hazarajat who were seeking the fall of the Kabul regime.

One strategy pursued with a concentrated effort by the government in the past several decades has been stripping the Hazaras of their identity by replacing the word "Hazara" with the word *ahl-e tashai'u* (the Shiite). Emadi (1997, p. 385) calls this process of changing a national identity with a religious identity as "Shiiazation" whose main objective has been shifting the political rights of the Hazaras to non-Hazara Shias who don't share "a common background with the Hazaras." The non-Hazara Shias don't necessarily have the same interest as the Hazaras; thus, it has been easy for the government to justify representation of the Hazaras in governance by appointing non-Hazara Shias in government posts. For instance, Mohammad Asef Mohseni has always

banked on Hazara support and almost all the foot soldiers of his party of Haraket-e Islami Afghanistan (Islamic Movement of Afghanistan) were Hazara. Mohseni, a Pashtun Shia from Kandahar, has shown time and again that he doesn't care about the rights of the Hazaras by siding with the government's denial of the rights of the Hazaras. Shiiazation of the Hazaras would also inevitably alienate Sunni and Ismaili Hazaras and further disunite the Hazaras as a "nation." Until very recently, Shia Hazaras did not consider Ismaili Hazaras as Hazara (Ferdinand, 1959). Non-Hazara Shias call themselves as other nationals to avoid persecution and discrimination that usually exists against the Hazaras and only refer to them as Hazaras when they need populist Hazara support.

In line with this Shiiazation process, the Sayeds who claim to be descendents of Prophet Mohammad through his daughter and their first Imam (the 4<sup>th</sup> Khalif of Muslims according to Sunnis) have historically taken advantage of the Hazaras. Shias are supposed to pay a tax called *khums* (one fifth of their annual income) to the Sayeds. The Sayeds have used their position and have exploited the Hazaras in many ways. Sometimes even people who weren't Sayeds claimed to be Sayeds to acquire respect and compensation from the Hazaras. As Emadi (2002, p. 84) notes, the Hazaras were told that as the followers of Shia, they don't have "the right to question the authority of the Sayeds." A Sayed man could marry a Hazara woman but the opposite was not allowed. Time and again the Sayeds betrayed the Hazaras and their betrayal of the Hazaras in Afshar resulted in the massacre of thousands of Hazaras.

### 1.6 The Hazara after the success of the Islamic revolution to Taliban

The Hazara Shia groups were finally united under the leadership of Abdul Ali Mazari forging Hizb-e Wahdat-e Islami Afghanistan (Afghanistan Islamic Unity Party). Hizb-e Wahdat had more nationalistic tendencies and was touting the rights of Hazaras and the autonomy of Hazarajat (Dorrnsoro, 2005). Probably this was the very reason Hizb-e Harakat headed by Mohseni did not join this new party. Dorrnsoro (2007, paragraph 18) says Hezb-e Wahdat failed in its endeavor to be recognized as a “full political partner” after the fall of Dr. Najib’s regime and during the Kabul wars of 1992-1996 as a result of anti-Hazara and anti-Shia sentiment and discrimination by other political parties. However, Hezb-e Wahdat did prove that the Hazaras are a reality in Afghanistan and they should be treated as a one of the main four ethnic groups in Afghanistan. Of course, at the end, Hizb-e Wahdat was betrayed by the Taliban and its leader killed, but the pursuit of justice and right of the Hazaras was not stopped at that. It was the effort of Hizb-e Wahdat despite its shortcomings that Hazaras were given political and social recognition, albeit inadequate, in post-Taliban era and in the new elected government.

Dorrnsoro (2007) believes the massacre of Hazaras in Afshar which aimed at ethnic cleansing through atrocities such as rape, execution and body mutilation by Masud’s and Sayyaf’s forces, was a direct result of the Hazaras’ challenging of the ethnic hierarchies that existed before. In other words, Hazaras were always pushed to hold the lowest rank in the ethnic hierarchy and here the Hazaras wanted to claim equality with Pashtuns and Tajiks. Doronsorro (2007) notes that the co-existence of different ethnic groups in Afghanistan was possible because an unequal implicit hierarchy existed. In that

line, if the Hazaras had accepted the hegemony of dominating ethnic groups and did not protest against their suppression, the massacre of Hazaras might have not occurred.

However, struggle for rights has always had a price, and in this case, the Hazaras had to pay for it.

### 1.7 The Hazaras under the rule of Taliban regime

The Hazaras suffered under the Taliban regime more than any other ethnic groups in Afghanistan. The Taliban massacred hundreds of Hazaras in several places including Yakawlang, Mazar Sharif, and Robatak Pass (Human Rights Watch, 2001) which demonstrated their intent of extermination of the Hazaras in Afghanistan. The Taliban regarded the Hazaras as infidels and were trying to use any means to get rid of the Hazaras in Afghanistan. For instance, the Taliban would come at a Hazara house and arrest a male member of the family. They would beat up and retrieve a confession that the Hazara person had a gun under torture. After that, they would take the person to their houses and ask them to show the guns. The Hazara who didn't own any guns, would eventually concede to pay the price of the gun or guns they were forced to confess under torture. This actually happened to several people the author personally knew. The author's two older brothers had to leave Kabul because of the fear of this situation. The Taliban turned a blind eye to burglars in the Hazara areas. They used this situation as a way to intimidate the Hazaras so that they would leave the country. Taking turns at night, we would have to go on the roof and guard our houses. Many of author's relatives had to leave Kabul because of this situation and some of the Hazara areas looked like ghost towns in Kabul at the end of Taliban's rule.

The Taliban fired all Hazaras who worked for the government including my father who worked for the civil defense department of the Ministry of Defense. Most of the Hazaras who could not afford to live in Afghanistan because their livelihoods were taken by the Taliban and they were continually intimidated and threatened by the Taliban left for Pakistan or Iran, especially people in big cities. The Taliban harassed Hazara businesses and would bring all kinds of false charges against Hazara well-to-do families in an attempt to rip them of their wealth. The Taliban banned anything going to Hazarajat and almost brought the whole population to the brink of starvation. I heard stories of people who would eat grass to stay alive in Hazarajat.

#### 1.8 The Hazaras in post-Taliban Afghanistan and the Beginning of a New Era

The fall of Taliban and the US intervention in Afghanistan in 2001 revived the hope in the heart and minds of the Hazaras that they would finally be able to claim their rights after years of being excluded from political representation and treated as second-class citizens (Monsutti, 2005). Hazaras got access to better education only in the last part of the twentieth century as a result of regime change and migration, something that they were denied by the Afghan governments based on their discriminatory policies (Schetter, 2005). Now the Hazaras understood that the only way to make headway in gaining their rightful place as equal citizens in Afghanistan is through education and hard work. Almost all Hazara boys and girls go to school and later to university and have literacy higher than the national average (Larson, 2008). Zabriskie (2008) in his National Geographic article titled *Hazaras: Afghanistan's Outsiders* has made the following

statement, “Set apart by geography and beliefs, oppressed by the Taliban, the Hazara people could be Afghanistan's best hope.”

The Afghanistan constitution ratified in 2004 recognized the Shia jurisprudence, an important demand by the Hazaras who are majority Shia, in cases dealing with Shia followers. The second vice president post was given to a Hazara along with several cabinet positions and seats in both houses of parliament. The Hazaras have finally been represented in the government, albeit a small step toward giving the Hazaras their rightful position in the society, discrimination against them at the work place and society has not ceased. Of course, the fight for rights is an ongoing battle and it will take years before the Hazaras finally claim their rightful status in Afghanistan. Despite of some improvements, the Afghan central government has been reluctant and unwilling to help improve the situation in war and poverty stricken Hazarajat which is considered one of the poorest areas of Afghanistan (Monsutti, 2005).

### 1.9 Population

No census has been administered in Afghanistan to show the population of ethnic groups and as Schetter (2005) puts it, every ethnic group tries to exaggerate their size and downplay the size of other ethnicities in order to gain political advantages over the others. The number given by third parties about the size of an ethnic population is often a rough estimation without an accurate census arithmetic. According to the US Department of State (2001; 2009), the Hazaras make between 10-19% of the total population of Afghanistan. On the other hand, Monsutti (2005) claims the Hazaras constitute about 10% to 24% of the total population of Afghanistan.

According to Emadi (1997), government sponsored Pashtunization of the ethnic groups in Afghanistan have caused many people to conceal their identity as Hazaras. This practice became particularly prevalent when Hazaras wanted to acquire government identification cards. Emadi adds that Hazaras thought concealing their identity would ensure their security. As a matter of fact, my older brother's government issued identification card reads his ethnicity as "Tajik." I have no doubt my father put his ethnicity as "Tajik" to help him avoid persecution and discrimination for being a Hazara in the future and possibly ensure his "security."

Emadi (1997) points out the fact that the younger Hazara generation doesn't know much about their identity as Hazaras and some even believe they are not Hazara, especially those who were of "mixed background." While applying for the state identification card, many Hazaras were told they were not Hazara and asked them to choose another ethnicity. A friend of mine from high school told me about his encounter with an ID card issuing officer in Kabul. When he told the officer he was a Hazara, the officer said that he was not a Hazara, but he must be a Pashtun or a Tajik. My friend insisted that he is a Hazara and the officer in charge finally told him he would write his ethnicity as a Hazara but he should be aware of consequences of having his identity written as a Hazara. Cases such as the above were not isolated, but rather widespread.

### 1.10 The Language of the Hazaras: Hazaragi

Hazaragi is spoken by Hazaras and is considered a dialect of Persian called Dari in Afghanistan (Dulling, 1973). Dulling claims that although Hazaragi is a variation or dialect of Dari, it is "lexically distinct enough to merit their [its] local special name of

Hazaragi” (p. 12). He further writes that “Hazaragi is fairly standard, its only variations – and these infrequent – being in vocabulary” (p. 12). Schurmann (1961) also points out that Hazaragi is distinct from other variants of Persian spoken in Afghanistan since it has very unique forms that don’t exist in Persian and it is somehow simpler than other variants such as Kabuli or Herati Dari. Schurmann adds that Hazaragi has fewer Arabic words than Dari and it has its own dialectal variations like any other language.

In fact, Hazaragi has more pure Persian words than Dari as it has borrowed less in the course of history being in less contact with other languages because of the geography of Hazarajat. Hazaragi is mainly oral and Hazara writers and scholars write in Persian (Emadi, 2000; 2002). Until very recently, there weren’t any written documents in Hazaragi; however, in the last few years, a few written works in Hazaragi have been produced, using the Persian script such as Hazaragi - Dari/Farsi - English glossary by Malistani (1993) and some folktales.

Hazaragi is mutually intelligible with Dari and Dari speakers understand Hazaragi. There are a few phonetic differences between Hazaragi and Dari, both in consonants and vowels. Also, as Dulling (1973) points out, Hazaragi and spoken Dari are grammatically similar with no major differences. Of course, comparing Hazaragi with standard written Dari would be a mistake as the former is an oral variety and the latter a written language that has its own spoken form. The main difference between the two varieties other than lexical differences is phonetic variations and accent. Also, as Dulling indicates, stress is more variable in Hazaragi than in Dari which can occur anywhere in the word in Hazaragi. This often results in accented speech when Hazaras speak Dari.

Mousavi (1998) regards Hazaragi as a dialect of Dari and compares it to the Afrikaans language in South Africa by Dutch settlers as “examples of the same socio-political phenomenon, whereby the permanent settlement of a colonial power in a colony leads to the emergence of a new culture and language” (p. 82). Thus, Mousavi relates to the settlement and intermixture of Mongolian and Turkic people with the locals in Afghanistan forming the Hazaras. Mousavi also claims that Hazaragi is comprised of 80% Persian, 10% Mongolian and 10% of words from other languages. Since there are no detailed studies about Hazaragi, the above percentages are questionable and need verification of how they have been calculated.

However, there is validity in Mousavi’s (1998) view that the gradual settlement of Mongols and Turks in the region known as Hazarajat today and their assimilation with the local population who spoke Dari resulted in the creation of the Hazaragi variety. Dulling (1973) mentions that Mongolian was spoken in the early 16<sup>th</sup> century during the era of Babur in Hazarajat. The presence of Mongolian and Turkish words could be the proof for the above. Even though Dari does have a number of Turkish words in it, Hazaragi is richer in Turkish and Mongolian vocabulary. It doesn’t appear that Hazaragi is a case of Creolization since both its structure and vocabulary comes mainly from Dari.

Thus, Hazaragi came into being as a result of contact between Mongolian, Turkish and Persian in Afghanistan in around the 13<sup>th</sup> Century AD (Dulling 1973). Since the Mongolian and later the Turkish speakers did not know Persian, they started to use their language mixed with whatever they learned from Persian to communicate with the Persian speakers. In the course of time, this trend went on and resulted in the creation of Hazaragi.

Persian has both a classical (or literary) version and a colloquial (or spoken) version. Ferguson (1959, as cited in Jeremias, 1984, p. 1) defines this situation in Persian as a case of 'diglossia' where there is "a mutually exclusive use of two varieties of a language by a speech community in definite functions". If we regard Hazaragi as a dialect of Dari, Hazaragi here also serves as a colloquial variety of Dari. Although some people consider Hazaragi a separate language, Hazaragi as a dialect of Dari is more acceptable. Emadi (2000) also regards Hazaragi as a dialect of Dari that has some vocabulary from Turkic and Mongolian.

However, categorizing language varieties into languages and dialects is not the task of linguists alone. As Beeman (2005, 1) writes, "a language is a dialect with an army;" there are more than linguistic criteria that determine what constitutes a language. Sociopolitical criteria more often affect the definition of a language or a dialect. For instance, some people consider Dari (Persian spoken in Afghanistan) to be a separate language from Tajiki (Persian spoken in Tajistan) and Farsi (Persian spoken in Iran) although the three above varieties are mutually intelligible. According to Beeman (2005), Tajik, Dari and Farsi are 'languages' in the sense that they are being disseminated through institutionalized schooling systems and reference works although they are all considered varieties of Persian in terms of linguistic elements. Nevertheless, some writers consider the above three varieties to be the same language with regional variations (Herawi, 1983 as cited in Mousavi, 1998). Although both Pashto and Dari are the two official languages of Afghanistan, Dari is the de facto national language of Afghanistan (belonging to the Indo-Iranian branch of the Indo-European language family).

Hazaras themselves have different perceptions about Hazaragi. Hazaras with nationalistic tendencies regard Hazaragi as a distinct language, not a dialect of Dari, whereas others strongly reject the idea of Hazaragi being a separate language and call it a dialect of Dari. In line with this perception, Sarabi (2006), a Hazara, strongly criticizes Mousavi (1998) for saying that Hazaragi is an oral variety of Persian with Turkish and Mongolian elements.

“it is surprising that even a scholar like him [Mousavi] who himself is a Hazara might not be aware that Hazaragi is not a language in its own or might be nationalistic factors that arose the keen [that encouraged him] to neglect the facts. As I told and for sure every Hazara knows that their language is the same as Dari speaking people with no difference in grammar, and in written and spoken variants.” (p. 32-33)

The long history of repression of Hazaras made Hazaragi a variety mocked by the larger society as it was spoken by “second-class” citizens. Also, apart from Hazaragi being a non-prestigious variety, some people believed Hazaragi to be merely a ‘broken’ Persian. As I can recall when I was in the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade in a primary school in Kabul, my teacher always told us to speak ‘proper’ Dari and we were scolded for using Hazaragi in school.

Thus, given the socio-political variables that have definitely affected the status of Hazaragi as well as its typological connection to Persian, it is interesting to find how speakers of Hazaragi view the language they speak, as a dialect of Dari or as a fully independent language. It is also interesting to find how frequently they use it, in what situations and contexts they use it and whether they want to maintain it. For this purpose,

it was decided to conduct a survey made of both qualitative and quantitative part with 40 well educated adult speakers of Hazaragi who were living in Kabul. Since no other known studies have been carried out in relation to Hazaragi (at least to my own knowledge), in the next chapter, I will review studies that have examined other low prestigious varieties in countries other than Afghanistan.

## CHAPTER 2

### LANGUAGE ATTITUDE LITERATURE REVIEW

With the advent of language attitude studies in the 1930's, it became clear that language is more than a means of human communication; in fact, language carries a strong social dimension that reveals much about the social and personal traits of an individual (Rodriguez, Cargile & Rich, 2004). As such, when a person speaks, we have different perceptions about the speaker. We make judgments based on his or her accent, tone, rate of speech, pitch and so forth, on top of what is being communicated through the language.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of literature which has examined attitudes toward some language varieties. This subsequent study focuses on attitudes toward Hazaragi, a language variety spoken in Afghanistan. In the context of Afghanistan, Kabuli Dari is considered the standard and prestigious variety whereas Hazaragi is considered a low-status and stigmatized variety. As discussed in Chapter 1, there are no previous attitude studies about Hazaragi that could be used as a background for this study. Therefore, the research framework has been expanded to include studies about other low-status languages, such as African American Vernacular English (AAVE) (Rodriguez et al., 2004) as compared with "standard" or "mainstream" American English. The situation of Hazaragi is somewhat similar to AAVE in a sense that both varieties are examples of low-prestigious and stigmatized varieties. Since African American Vernacular English has gone through the same processes as Hazaragi in becoming stigmatized, it was considered that this study could draw on concepts and findings related to AAVE.

## 2.1 What is language attitude?

The study of language attitudes is an important field of socio-linguistic research. It focuses on “language behaviors” with social ramifications such as accent, speech style, speech rate and code-switching, with accent playing the most important role of all (Cargile, Takai & Rodriguez, 2006; Rodriguez et al., 2004). Burgaski (1990, p. 46) defines attitudes as “linguistic reflections of deep-seated and often only semi-conscious socio-psychological perceptions of a territorial, ethnic or social group by speakers representing other groups.”

As Cargile and Giles (1997) have also observed that language, in addition to communicating messages, information and ideas with other people, carries a personal and social value through linguistic and paralinguistic information about the speaker. It reveals a lot of information about the speaker of which the person might not be aware. As Cargile and Giles note, in the U.S. a person with a British accent might be deemed as “cultured” and “refined” based only on his or her accent, regardless of the existence of those attributes in that person. Cavallaro & Chin (2009) also point out that we judge people on the way they speak and we are judged by the others on the way we speak, whether we approve of it or not. Speech style, choice of words, the way sounds are produced reveal a lot of information about a speaker and his or her background.

Furthermore, as Linn and Pichè (1982) mention, several studies have shown that listeners do judge people on their education, career, intelligence, ethnic identity, and so on based on a very small speech sample. Linn and Pichè talk about the sociolinguists’ argument that spoken language is a way to identify the national or cultural origin of a speaker, and that this affects the attitude of the listeners toward that particular variety of

speech. As a result, as Linn and Pichè write, response to a language variety shows the stereotyped attributes of the people who use that specific variety. A study conducted by Rodriguez et al. (2004) found out that even the strength of a speaker's accent affects the judgment of hearers, and in this case, speakers with strong 'AAVE' accent were rated less favorably in attractiveness and status-possession than speakers with a moderate 'AAVE' accent. In turn, speakers with a moderate 'AAVE' accent were rated lower in attractiveness and status-possession than speakers with "standard" or "mainstream" American English accent.

Cargile et al., (2006) point out that variation in language reveals certain individual and social traits of the speaker to the hearer. For instance, people might be considered less-educated and of a lower social status if they speak a certain variety whereas an individual would be seen as more educated and of a higher social status if they speak another variety. Cargile et al. (2006, p. 443) add that "because such beliefs about language use can bias social interaction, language attitudes represent important communicative phenomena worth understanding." As Adegbiya (2001) notes, the educational functions of a language affect the attitudes towards it, as education determines progress and the ability to be involved in the national level process of society. Since Hazaragi is absent in the educational system as there is no written literature in Hazaragi, its stigmatized status is further enhanced. Its speakers are required to speak the "high" variety, i.e. Dari, in school and other educational and official institutions.

Liebscher and Dailey-O'Cain (2009) argue that attitudes are formed differently as a result of interaction with others based on the situation and social group they are part of.

They also add that the place the speaker comes from also affects the attitude he or she will have toward a particular language variety. Liebscher and Dailey-O’Cain add:

The study of language attitudes-in-interaction begins with the premise that attitudes are not static, i.e. they are not fixed in the minds of individuals and easily retrieved. Instead, they are constructed in interaction through negotiation with interactants, in specific circumstances and with specific interactional intentions. Thus, language attitudes are context dependent in at least two ways: they emerge within the context of the interactional structure, and they are expressed under the influence of the situational context, which includes both larger ideologies present in a culture and the immediate context of the interactants and how they are seen by others. (p. 217)

Shameem (2004) points out that language attitude influences linguistic behavior, which in turn determines whether a certain language variety will be maintained and used by the future generations. As such, maintenance and future use of Hazaragi also depends on how it is perceived by its speakers and others.

Shameem (2004) believes language status is shaped by many factors such as the past, language development, the existence of dictionaries and books in that language, how standard the language is, literacy in the given language, the status of the speakers that the language variety is associated with, whether the language is supported by governmental institutions or not and so on. Shameem also adds that a certain language may also have “high” and “low” varieties, or in other words, standard and non-standard varieties if a situation of diglossia exists in a society where either variety may draw

positive or negative attitudes toward itself. In the case of Hazaragi, it could serve as the “low” variety of the “high” variety which is Dari.

White et al. (1998, p. 61) argued that it is not the language which is “bad” or “ungrammatical,” as AAVE is thought to be by many people, although this has been disproved by linguists. Rather, it is power relations that make a variety gain lower status and be labeled a “bad” or “pejorative” variety. He adds that “Indeed, it is common for powerful members of many cultures to perceive pejoratively the speech of less powerful persons.”

## 2.2 Some common forms of language attitude studies

According to Cavallaro and Chin (2009, p. 143-4), language attitude studies have been conducted in terms of direct and indirect methods in which the direct methods could be organized into two groups: “(1) content analysis of the public treatment of the languages spoken,” and “(2) collection of attitudinal data by directly asking participants their opinions on different languages.” There are several indirect methods that are used to evaluate language attitudes. A very common methodological indirect approach used to examine language attitude through a matched guise test is assessment of “subjective reactions to variations in languages” (Cavallaro & Chin 2009, p. 144). In such tests, the participants rate speakers who were recorded once using a prestigious accent or variety and then low-prestigious accent or variety on attributes such as intelligence, education, honesty, etc. In their study of attitudes toward French and English in Quebec using matched guise method, Lambert et al. (1960) found out that the prestige accent was rated higher in status and attractiveness all across the board than the low-prestige variety.

### 2.3 Identity and language attitude

According to Gudykunst & Schmidt (1987), ethnic identity and language are related in a sense that the use of a language impacts the development of ethnic identity and ethnic identity influences language use and the attitudes towards it. Edwards (1995, p. 125) defines ethnicity as a “sense of group identity deriving from real or perceived common bonds such as language, race or religion.” Baldwin (2001, p. 5) calls language a “political instrument, means, and proof of power.” He adds that language constructs identity whether it is a “private identity” or a “public identity.” As such, one can reveal a lot of information by speaking a certain language even if the language is shared by both interlocutors.

Language attitude studies have also weighed in on the subject of language and identity and they have shown that language is not merely a means of communication but also the representation of identity and social group membership (Komondouros & McEntee-Atalianis, 2007). Komondouros & McEntee-Atalianis (2007, p. 367) add that attitudes are based on “beliefs and values, and that values are often intimately associated with a sense of identity.”

The sense of belonging to a community or a social group gives a “special social identity” to the members of a community or social group (Bresnahan, Ohashi, Nebashi, Liu & Shearman, 2002, p. 172). In the light of this view, this study tries to find if the ability to speak Hazaragi is seen as a requirement or pre-requisite of being a Hazara. In other words, the question that this study tries to answer is whether Hazaragi helps, or is even necessary, to forge Hazara identity. This special social identity identifies and sets apart the members of one social group from other social groups. This identity aspect of a

social group does not allow “others” or “outsiders” who are not members of this community to become part of it. When a person is not part of a particular group and is not allowed to be assimilated within the group, it provides a fertile ground for discrimination and negative attitudes toward such a person or group of people. “Language is the primary transmitter of culture;” as such, the way that a language is regarded is bound by the same cultural processes involved in all types of discrimination between and against people or groups (Gayles & Denerville, 2007, p. 20).

As Rodriguez et al. (2004) concluded, participants had an “in-group bias” toward their own variety. *In-group* refers to a social group a person feels to be part of. In other words, participants rated the variety they spoke as more favorable, showing ethnic preference. Participants rated their respective variety, i.e. AAVE or ASE, more favorably based on an in-group ethnic bias. Hence, there could be the possibility that the participants in the current study would have the in-group bias toward Hazaragi. Nevertheless, since there is no comparison of Hazaragi with another variety, there probably would not be significant in-group bias that would undermine the objectivity of the study.

Most Hazaragi speakers who have lived in big cities can also speak the regional variety of Dari of their location of residence. For instance, Hazaragi speakers who have been in Kabul can speak Kabuli Dari whereas the ones who have been in Herat would speak Herati Dari. The majority of these speakers who haven’t lived most of their lives in big cities have an accent when they speak the respective prestigious variety. Also, some Hazaras who have lived most of their lives in Iran speak Farsi.

If the use of Hazaragi by the Hazaras in a setting where the audience is mainly Hazaras is considered compared to a setting where a Hazara speaker talks to non-Hazaras, different results would probably have been found. Use of Hazaragi, whether as a nationalistic tendency or as a means to enhance “linguistic convergence” demonstrating solidarity (as White et al., 1998, p. 61 put it), will demonstrate their perceived attitude toward their language variety in terms of commitment to a Hazara identity. As opposed to informal settings, use of Hazaragi in a formal or business setting by Hazara speakers with other Hazaras and non-Hazaras would further highlight the status and acceptability of Hazaragi. In business or formal settings, use of the low-status variety would not be a good idea if it is meant to enhance the status of the speaker. As such, Hazaras would hypothetically use the standard variety, i.e. Dari, to converge with the audience in a formal situation especially dealing with the non-Hazaras. This hypothesis, in turn, might not be true as a Hazara person with nationalistic aspirations might still stick to speaking Hazaragi in formal contexts even with non-Hazaras as a way to take pride in his or her identity as a Hazara, a constructed new identity.

### 2.3 Findings of language attitude studies

As Speicher and McMahon (1992) have observed, language varieties or dialects are not considered equal despite the claim linguists make about equality of language varieties in communicating the necessary information. They further say that usually one language variety is deemed appropriate for official purposes in domains such as government, media and education. In this case, that code or variety is given prevalence and superiority over other dialects as a “standard” language variety. The so called

“standard” variety is not chosen because of its superiority over other forms and can convey messages better but rather because of the power and prestige of speakers of that language variety.

Gender is always an important factor in language attitude studies. Labov (1972) believed that the choice between speaking a prestigious or a non-prestigious variety was made based on two notions of “overt prestige<sup>1</sup>” and “covert prestige<sup>2</sup>.” Sociolinguistic studies have found that females are more inclined to favor the prestigious or standard variety or register over the non-prestigious or non-standard variety, i.e. they orient toward overt prestige (e.g. Labov, 1972). On the contrary, males have preferred the non-standard vernacular varieties which tend to carry covert prestige as vernacular varieties are said to imply toughness and masculinity.

According to Abd-El-Jawad (1987, p. 366) speakers of vernacular and stigmatized language varieties usually opt for prestigious forms for several reasons such as: 1) assimilation and integration with the dominant group and “a desire for upward social mobility;” 2) shunning from stigmatization associated with the respective low-status language variety and mockery because of stereotypes; and 3) being accepted and allowed in the social circle of the dominant groups; and 4) to “feel socially secure.”

Ladegaard’s (2000) language attitude finding is in line with the general assessment of language in relation to standard varieties, non-standard varieties, and vernacular varieties. As several studies have shown, standard language varieties are rated higher on status and competence but lower on integrity and social attractiveness.

---

<sup>1</sup> Prestige associated with “standard” or “high” language varieties, often showing class, power, and education.

<sup>2</sup> Prestige associated with vernacular language varieties, often associated with ethnicity, toughness, masculinity, or other traits.

However, vernacular language varieties are usually rated higher on solidarity and social attractiveness but lower on status (Ladegaard, 2000).

Ladegaard's (2000) study on varieties of Danish found that the male subjects had more vernacular features in their language and also had a more positive attitude toward local vernacular than the female subjects. Ladegaard also confirmed that there is sufficient sociolinguistic literature that women opt more for the prestigious and standard variety than their male counterparts. In answering the attitude questionnaire, male (N= 28) and female (N= 25) subjects had very interesting responses in choosing Standard Danish and a non-standard vernacular variety (Ladegaard, 2000). Male subjects indicated that they more likely would not change their language with respect to context and the audience and would opt for the non-standard variety in more places than females whereas the female subjects showed preference for speaking Standard Danish all the time. Nevertheless, neither males nor females accepted the idea of speaking Standard Danish only. Male subjects gave reasons such as solidarity for opting for the vernacular variety whereas female subjects gave reasons such as being understandable, language beauty, job prospects, and not coming across as stupid for choosing Standard Danish.

Wassink (1999) studied the attitudes of Jamaican Creole speakers in a semi-rural community toward Jamaican Creole or Patois. The study utilized a mixed design and had two parts: description questions that examined qualitative data and attitudes questions which elicited quantitative data. The study meant to find out the overt and covert attitudes toward Jamaican Creole. Age, gender, and social class constituted the three independent variables of this attitude study. Age had four levels of 6-12, 13-19, 20-45, and over 46 years. Gender had two levels of males and females. Likewise, social class had two levels

of working and middle class. Fifty-one respondents were selected based on judgment sampling that constituted about 6% of the town's populations. The subjects were chosen from a place where it could represent the typical Jamaican populace.

Responses to description questions revealed that majority of the respondents considered Jamaican Creole to be a language having its own dialectal variations. They mentioned that the difference between English and Jamaican Creole was mainly phonological and lexical. Although English and Jamaican Creole were thought to be related, some of the respondents did not think Patois speakers might be able to understand English without studying it at school. Interestingly, most of the older respondents equated Patois with "slang" or "broken English" whereas the younger ones had more positive attitudes. Moreover, most of the respondents regarded Jamaican Creole more appropriate for informal use; they did not consider it appropriate to be used in formal contexts. Also, the majority of the respondents seemed more welcoming to be addressed in Jamaican Creole rather than speaking it themselves. Furthermore, social class differences did not have an impact on the attitudes toward Jamaican Creole.

The trend in willingness to use Creole despite its associated low-prestige form was indicative of a more positive attitude toward it. Males generally had a more positive attitude towards Jamaican Creole than women, especially younger males. Moreover, females reported fewer social circumstances for using Creole, whereas males especially age group 20-45 were more inclined toward usage of Creole in more settings than females. Younger groups of both genders showed a relatively more positive attitude toward Creole compared to older groups. Wassink (1999) believed that the younger respondents' more positive attitude could be attributed to a recent awareness and

appreciation of cultural heritage which might have led to more positive attitudes of Jamaicans, particularly young ones, toward Jamaican Creole.

Bilaniuk (2003) studied the explicit and implicit attitudes toward language in the post-Soviet era in the Ukraine and the effect of gender in forming attitudes toward Ukrainian, Russian and English. Bilaniuk surveyed and administered a matched guise test to 2000 participants. Respondents showed “ethno-linguistic loyalty,” i.e. respondents of Ukrainian ethnicity supported Ukrainian whereas ethnic Russians supported Russian. However, Ukrainian women rated Russian and English slightly higher than Ukrainian. Ethnically Ukrainian women were more critical of the Ukrainian language than ethnically Ukrainian men. Ukrainian men rated Russian and Ukrainian almost the same. In a sense, ethnic Ukrainians accepted the legitimacy and authority of Russian as a higher language variety although they did not support it as ethnic Russians did. On the other hand, Russians (i.e., people of Russian ethnicity) rated Russian much higher than Ukrainian.

Bilaniuk argued that acceptance of status and prestige of Russian over Ukrainian by women even in the post-Soviet era, when Ukrainian was made the official language of the Ukraine, signifies an orientation toward overt prestige by female respondents as shown in previous studies. It should be mentioned that Russian played the role of the high and prestigious language whereas Ukrainian played the role of the low status language even in the post-Soviet era.

Both male and female respondents rated English higher than Ukrainian, for example in traits such as intelligence, culturedness, authoritativeness and pleasantness. Although the male respondents favored English over Ukrainian, female respondents gave much higher ratings to English than male respondents and strongly associated English

with the above traits as compared to Ukrainian. It was perceived that English had acquired prestige as a high language and was in the process of taking the place of Russian in the Ukraine. As such, women already responded to the shift of status by looking at English as a more cultured, authoritative, intelligent, and pleasant language when compared with their own language, Ukrainian.

Contrary to many studies showing females rating the standard variety higher than the non-standard variety for all traits, Cavallaro and Chin's (2009, p. 151) study of Singapore Standard English (SSE) and Singapore Colloquial English (SCE) or "Singlish" did not bear a statistically significant gender effect. In this study, a group of 75 Singaporean and 17 non-Singaporean participants aged between 19 and 23 were asked to complete a matched guise test on a series of traits such as intelligence, fluency, likability, trustworthiness and honesty. There was no gender interaction in rating Standard Singaporean English as male and female respondents rated the SSE guise similarly. Female participants tended to rate Singapore Colloquial English slightly lower than male participants although the gender difference was not statistically significant.

Also, contrary to findings of the established studies of non-standard languages being rated higher for solidarity as a means of covert prestige, Singaporean Colloquial English, when compared to Singaporean Standard English, was rated lower on all solidarity traits except honesty; the two were rated equally for honesty. As a matter of fact, Standard Singaporean English was rated significantly higher than Singaporean Colloquial English on most of the traits. Cavallaro and Chin (2009) suggested that the government-sponsored "Speak Good English" program may have affected the attitude of

people in Singapore toward Singaporean Colloquial English, making it less popular among most speakers.

Out of all low status possessing languages, AAVE is the most stigmatized non-standard variety of American English that has been researched extensively so far (Cargile, 2002). The traditional attitudes toward African American Vernacular English (AAVE), such as it shows illiteracy and is seen as illogical and poor English, were questioned only at the end of the twentieth century as a result of the work of Black activists and Black identity awareness movements, and social changes and reforms (Speicher and McMahon, 1992). Speicher and McMahon note that people have been familiarized with AAVE through popular culture such as blues, jazz, rap, hip-hop, TV shows, movies and other mediums. Speicher and McMahon (1992) studied the attitudes of educated African Americans coming from different backgrounds towards AAVE. Some of the participants labeled AAVE terms such as “slang,” “street talk,” “jive,” and “non-standard English,” “ghetto language,” and even “idiotic.” Some were more neutral by labeling AAVE as “Black English,” “Afro-American English,” “Blanglish” and “Ebonics.”

In a matched guise study of 120 African American high school students' attitudes toward two guises of “American Standard English” (ASE) and AAVE by Hensley (1972), Standard American English was overall rated significantly higher than AAVE on all traits. Overall, there were 14 traits; friendly, honest, unselfish, considerate of others, has ambition, easy going, loyal, has things in common with you, hard working, lucky, knows what's happening, happy, intelligent, and good looking.

When the traits were taken separately, ASE was rated higher than AAVE in all traits except “*Knows what is happening.*” “Knows what is happening” refers to understanding and knowing the situation that the interlocutors are dealing with. The participants, African American Vernacular English speakers, considered American Standard English to have more in common with than with AAVE. In terms of gender, both male and female speakers of ASE were rated more favorably in most of the traits such as friendliness, honesty and ambition. However, female speakers of AAVE were consistently rated less favorably than male speakers of AAVE. For certain traits, AAVE was judged more acceptable for male AAVE speakers than for female AAVE speakers.

DeStefano (1971) elicited the attitudes of four African American adults in her pilot study and found out that they did not want materials to be written in AAVE for their children contrary to the existing literature by linguists and educators recommending initial use of reading materials in AAVE. Hoover (1978) argues that rejection of written text-book materials in AAVE is not the result of “self-hatred,” as racism does still exist and has had psychological consequences on African Americans. In her study, Hoover (1978) examined the attitudes of parents and community people toward Standard Black English and Vernacular Black English. She gives many reasons why Vernacular Black English received negative evaluation by parents and community as the result of racism in society. Some of the reasons given for rejecting vernacular Black English were things like “needs standard to get a job,” “teachers would be patronizing if they used it,” and so on. However, the reasons given for using Black Standard English included economic incentives, such as “survive in a white world,” and “our way has no meaning to those in control.” The main trend found out by Hoover while interviewing Black parents was a

preference for “standard” as 85% of participants preferred the standard variety to be used in all contexts, whereas the use of the vernacular was dependent on the person, situation, and context.

Linn and Pichè (1982) studied the attitudes of both Black and White adolescents and pre-adolescents in a matched guised study with two guises i.e. AAVE and ASE. The study found that Black subjects rated AAVE more favorably than ASE as compared to White subjects and Black pre-adolescents regarded AAVE more favorably than Black adolescents. In general, AAVE was rated “braver, dumber, a better fighter, and black” and also “more prejudiced and using poorer English.” On the other hand, ASE was regarded as “nicer, smarter, better educated, and using good English.” Additionally, Blacks regarded AAVE as “having more friends, being better liked, and being good looking” whereas Whites rated ASE the same way.

Both Black and White participants rated AAVE higher on physical prowess. Linn and Pichè (1982) argued that physical prowess attributed to Black individuals could be interpreted that that they were less educated since most athletes and fighters were not that successful in school. On the education factor, ASE was rated more favorably both by black and white students. Adolescents, particularly white middle class students made stereotypical judgments more than any other groups. Middle class adolescent black females projected more criticism of AAVE than any other groups examined. Linn and Pichè (1982) suggest that this criticism could be the result of schools’ urge that students use “proper” English as well as female’s preference for “standard” variety as deemed appropriate by the society.

In conclusion, the reviewed literature confirms that gender is an important factor in language attitude studies. Females preferred the prestigious variety as a means of overt prestige. However, males preferred the vernacular variety as a means of covert prestige, showing solidarity and toughness among other things. Only in the case of Singaporean Colloquial English (Cavallaro and Chin, 2009) covert prestige did not exist and males preferred the prestigious variety. African American Vernacular English was also rated lower than American Standard English across the board on most of the traits examined.

Most studies in language attitude have divided the people into categories of gender, age, ethnicity, etc by either by targeting social groups such as the elderly and teenagers or by measuring and filtering out the results for sub-groups (Garret 2001). Likewise, gender, age, education, ethnicity, and urban settlement among other things have also played an important role in this study. The next chapter outlines the methodology that directed the process of data collection and data analysis for this study.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methodology employed in the current study which combines quantitative and qualitative methods of data collection and analyses. As language attitude is an abstract concept, examining it both qualitatively and quantitatively helps to better understand the existing attitudes. The questionnaire for data collection was adapted from Wassink's (1999) study about Jamaican Creole.

#### 3.1 Research Problem

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of young and educated Hazaras, both males and females, toward Hazaragi which has a history of low-prestige as discussed in chapters one and two of this thesis. It examined participants' perceptions about what linguistic entity they consider Hazaragi to be, where it is in use, who its users are, and which domains it is considered appropriate and inappropriate for use.

#### 3.2 Research Question

The social and political changes that post-Taliban era has brought could have affected attitudes to Hazaragi, a language variety generally considered of low prestige. The current study aimed to examine the attitudes of young and educated Hazaras in Kabul about Hazaragi. Specifically, the following research questions guided this investigation:

1. What is the attitude of young and educated Hazaras, both men and women, toward Hazaragi? What do young and educated Hazaras think of Hazaragi in terms of its linguistic entity, status, domains of use, maintenance, and importance as their language variety?
2. Do Hazara men and women have different attitudes toward Hazaragi?

### 3.3 Hypothesis

Hazaras have become more aware of their rights as citizens of Afghanistan and their identity as Hazaras. The hypothesis is that they are willing to hear Hazaragi spoken in places not commonly used before and use Hazaragi with willingness to maintain Hazaragi. Additionally, they have a positive perception of Hazaragi and react positively toward Hazaragi despite its low-status situation.

### 3.4 Participants

As this was a mixed-design research, the selection of subjects was purposeful, not random. Forty subjects were selected to participate in the study based on criterion sampling (Sandelowski, 2000), i.e. age between 20 and 30, and being college or university graduates. Age was delimited to 20 to 30 in order to represent the population of young adults in Kabul who were college students or college graduates. It was made sure that the subjects were all Hazara. From the forty subjects, 20 were female and 20 male. The subjects were all residents of Kabul, and had lived in Kabul at least for the past five years. The reason for this last criterion was to weed out the recent returnees who might have been influenced by the environment of living abroad.

### 3.5 Procedure

As the researcher could not travel to Kabul to gather the data himself, he recruited a colleague in Kabul who helped collect the data. This person is a journalist who was carefully instructed about the procedure and who could be trusted that he would follow the requirements precisely. The data were gathered in the period of three weeks in Kabul. The questionnaires were written both in English and Dari and the subjects filled out the questionnaires in Dari. After having made sure that the participants met the selection criteria (i.e. between 20-30 years old, currently at university or university graduates, of Hazara origin, and having lived in Kabul for the last five years), they were asked to sign a consent letter and then complete the survey.

The participants were told the questionnaires were anonymous and they should not write their names in the questionnaires. The participants were only told that they were participating in a “language attitude” study without giving further information. After the respondents filled out the questionnaires, they were scanned and emailed to the researcher with the consent letters. The respondents were not paid and their participation was totally voluntary.

### 3.6 Research Instrument

The instrument of this study was adapted from a study by Wassink (1999) conducted about attitudes toward Jamaican Creole. As both Jamaican Creole and Hazaragi share a history of low prestige in a general sense, it was appropriate to adapt the instrument Wassink used for her study (See Appendix A). Apart from some modification, a big part of the instrument was a replication of the one used by Wassink. The instrument

was made in the form of a questionnaire and it contained both descriptive and attitude questions, 17 descriptive questions and 24 attitude questions. The descriptive questions were labeled “D1 through D17” and the attitude questions were labeled as “A1 through A24.” The attitude questions formed the quantitative part of the study whereas the descriptive questions formed the qualitative part of the study.

Descriptive questions were meant to elicit respondents’ beliefs about the linguistic attributes and distribution of use of Hazaragi the same way as in Wassink’s (1999) study. More specifically, descriptive questions examined the following themes: a) linguistic entity of Hazaragi, b) phonological and syntactical similarities between Hazaragi and Dari, c) regional variation among Hazaras, d) Hazaragi – Dari mutual intelligibility/non-intelligibility, e) extent of productivity of Hazaragi, f) use in public venues, by the media, and home use and g) respondent’s willingness to use or avoid using Hazaragi in certain situations or places. Descriptive questions were not assigned numerical scores and they were analyzed for common themes based on metalinguistic expressions. For example, the descriptive question D10 “Can someone who only speaks Dari, understand Hazaragi?” was meant to examine the mutual intelligibility of Dari and Hazaragi. Specifically, a “yes” answer was interpreted as Dari and Hazaragi being mutually intelligible, and a “no” response was interpreted as mutual non-intelligibility of the two. The answers then were summed and examined for gender effects and differences. Example (1) and (2) are instances of Descriptive questions.

Example 1 (Variation in Hazaragi):

D7. Do Hazaras who were raised in Kabul speak differently from other Hazaras living elsewhere in Afghanistan?

- i. don't know
- ii. no
- iii. yes (please explain)

Example 2 (Use of Hazaragi):

D16. Of the following groups, circle, all that you think never use Hazaragi?

- i. older people?
- ii. younger people?
- iii. rich people?
- iv. poor people?
- v. people with much schooling?
- vi. people with little schooling?
- vii. men
- viii. women?
- ix. the returnees (people who have lived a few years abroad, and now are back in Afghanistan)
- x. other? Please explain...

Attitude questions, on the other hand, were specifically designed to elicit respondents' attitudes toward Hazaragi. The main focus of attitude questions was to extract explicit evaluation of Hazaragi, including: 1) linguistic entity of Hazaragi, 2) domains of use of Hazaragi, 3) respondents' desire to maintain Hazaragi, and 4) value of Hazaragi as a language variety.

Following Wassink's (1999) method of analyzing the attitude questions, attitude questions were devised to be answered using a binary response such as "true/false" or

“yes/no”, or a continuum response such as “always/sometimes/never”. As such, points on individual attitude questions were weighed so that a higher score would indicate a greater preference for Hazaragi. The binary responses were coded as zero (for a response unfavorable to Hazaragi), or 1 (favorable response to Hazaragi), as seen in Example 3 and 4. Continuum responses were coded on a scale of zero to three (see Example 5).

Example 3 (Yes/No question):

A6. Do you use Hazaragi at home?

- i. (1 point) yes
- ii. (0 point) no

Example 4 (True/False questions):

A5. Hazaragi cannot be used in print, and even if it is used, it will not make sense.

- i. (1 point) false
- ii. (0 point) true

Example 5 (Continuum questions):

A10. Would you prefer that Hazaras spoke

- i. (3 points) just Hazaragi
- ii. (2 points) both Hazaragi and Dari
- iii. (1 point) mostly Dari, but some Hazaragi is OK
- iv. (0 point) just Dari

### 3.7 Variables

This study treated each of the 24 attitude questions as dependent variables in independent t-test analyses. However, for ease of interpretation, the 24 dependent

variables were organized in four related categories: (1) Perceptions of Hazaragi as a language; (2) Desire to maintain Hazaragi; (3) Value of Hazaragi; (4) and Domains of use of Hazaragi. The dependent variables were measured on either binary or continuous scale. The responses to binary questions were scored as 1 (Yes) or 0 (No), while the responses to continuum questions were scored on a scale of 0, 1, 2, or 3. In fact, only attitude questions A10 (on a scale of 0-3) and A11 (on a scale of 0-2) used a continuum scale. Gender served as the independent variable with two levels, male and female participants.

### 3.8 Data Analysis

As mentioned in the previous section, the attitude questions were categorized into 4 categories, following the four main issues of interest: 1. Perception of Hazaragi as a language (A1-A5); 2. Desire to maintain Hazaragi (A6-A9); 3. Value of Hazaragi (A10-A11); and Domains of Use of Hazaragi (A12-A24). Each of the four categories was considered a family of related questions in t-test comparisons between genders. This served as the rationale for the initial alpha level of .05 to be divided by the number of questions in each category in order to reduce the risk of committing a Type I error (Bonferonni adjustment).

Responses to descriptive questions were studied for other specific linguistic properties. Responses to Descriptive questions were tabulated and the percentages were calculated based on the number of responses within each question divided by the total number of participants who answered the question. Then, percentages were used to identify predominant patterns within the sample and/or within gender groups. For

example, descriptive question D5 asked about the dialectal variation of Hazaragi (Do Hazaras from different parts of Afghanistan speak Hazaragi differently from each other?). It had three possible responses as “don’t know,” “no,” and “yes.” A “don’t know” response indicated that the respondent did not have any knowledge about variations in Hazaragi. A “no” response showed that the participant believed there were no dialectal variations in Hazaragi. Furthermore, a “yes” response pointed out that the respondent believed there were variations in Hazaragi. In other words, it indicated that Hazaragi had its own dialects. In case of answering “yes” to D5, participants were also asked to elaborate on their answers. Responses to descriptive questions were also examined and compared for gender differences. For example, descriptive question D17 asked the participants to list the situations they would speak Hazaragi or avoid speaking Hazaragi. Therefore, percentages were calculated for the two options and compared in terms of overall frequency and gender differences.

The next chapter presents the results, first of the quantitative analyses and then of the qualitative analyses. The quantitative part of chapter four summarizes the t-tests results for the attitude questions, whereas the qualitative part reports the results of the descriptive questions.

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

This study aimed to examine the attitude of young and educated Hazaras towards Hazaragi. Specifically, it looked at the difference between the attitudes of males and females towards Hazaragi. The current chapter presents the results of both Attitude Questions and Descriptive Questions consecutively. The Attitude Questions formed the quantitative part of this study and the Descriptive Questions formed the qualitative part of this study. It was decided that a percentage of 70 and higher will be regarded as highly positive, between 50 and 70 as moderately positive, between 25 and 50 as slightly negative and 25 and lower as negative.

#### 4.1 Results for the attitude questions

The purpose of the attitude questions was to examine if gender differences exist in the attitude of Hazaras toward Hazaragi. This study treated each of the 24 quantitative questions as dependent variables in independent t-test analyses. The quantitative questions were categorized into 4 categories, following the four main issues of interest: 1. Perceptions of Hazaragi as a language (A1-A5); 2. Desire to maintain Hazaragi (A6-A9); 3. Value of Hazaragi (A10-A11); and Domains of Use of Hazaragi (A12-A24). Each of the four categories was considered a family of related questions in t-test comparisons between genders. This served as the rationale for the initial alpha level of .05 to be divided by the number of questions in each category in order to reduce the risk of committing a Type I error (Bonferonni adjustments).

For the first set of attitude questions, five independent t-tests were conducted at  $\alpha = .01 (.05/5)$  in order to find out whether male and female subjects had different perceptions of Hazaragi as a language. The results revealed that the male and female perceptions did not differ significantly on any of the five questions related to the issue of Hazaragi as a language (See Table 1).

Table 1

*(1) Perceptions of Hazaragi as a language*

Questions A1 – A5	N		Mean		SD		Mean Difference	df	t	Sig
	M	F	M	F	M	F				
A1: How many languages are spoken in Afghanistan? What would you call them?	20	20	.45	.55	.510	.510	-.100	38	-.620	.539
A2: Can Hazaragi be used to form full sentences and whole conversations?	20	20	1.000	.750	.000	.444	.250*	19.000*	2.517*	.021*
A3: Can someone say anything in Hazaragi which could be said in Dari? Can someone say anything in Dari which could be said in Hazaragi?	20	20	.750	.895	.444	.315	-.145	38	-1.168	.250
A4: Have you ever read anything in Hazaragi?	20	20	.75	.70	.444	.470	.050	38	.346	.731
A5: Hazaragi cannot be used in print, and even if it is used, it will not make sense. Untrue or true?	20	20	.80	.75	.410	.444	.050	38	.370	.714

\* Statistics for equal variances not assumed.

Since each of the five questions was coded on a dichotomous scale of 0 and 1, the group Means for each question actually represent the percentage of people who responded positively. Examining these percentages, it appears that 45% of the male and 55% of the female subjects considered Hazaragi to be a language. In relation to Attitude question 2, 100% of the male and 75% of the female subjects replied that Hazaragi could

be used to form full sentences and to carry out whole conversations. In Attitude question 3, 75% of the male and 90% of the female subjects indicated that Hazaragi could be used for the same purposes and with the same success as Dari.

In response to Attitude question 4, 75% of the male and 70% of the female participants had read something in Hazaragi, and 80% of the male and 75% of the female subjects disagreed with the statement that Hazaragi could not be used in print and if used would make no sense in response to Attitude question 5. In sum, in relation to the first set of 5 attitude questions, the majority of both groups considered Hazaragi to be a language like Dari which could be used for purposes of communication, reading or writing. Although question one did not receive a majority of positive responses, 50% was a considerable high number in favor of Hazaragi as a language.

For the second set of attitude questions, which aimed at finding out whether male and female subjects had different attitudes toward maintaining Hazaragi, four independent t-tests were conducted at  $\alpha = .0125$  ( $.05/4$ ). The results revealed that the males and females' commitment to maintenance of Hazaragi did not differ significantly on any of the four questions related to maintaining Hazaragi (See Table 2).

Table 2

*(2) Desire to maintain Hazaragi*

Questions A6 – A9	N		Mean		SD		Mean Difference	df	t	Sig
	M	F	M	F	M	F				
A6. Do you use Hazaragi at home?	20	20	.95	.85	.224	.366	.100	1.042	1.042	.304
A7. Do you want your children to understand Hazaragi?	20	20	1.00	.85	.000	.366	.150*	19.000*	1.831*	.083*
A8. Do you want your children to speak Hazaragi?	20	20	1.00	.75	.000	.444	.250*	19.000*	2.517*	.021*
A9. Is it valuable to know and speak Hazaragi? In other words, is Hazaragi important in Afghanistan?	20	20	.95	.95	.224	.224	.000	38	.000	1.000

\* *Statistics for equal variances not assumed.*

For the second set of four questions that dealt with “Desire to maintain Hazaragi,” the group Means for each question also represented the percentage of people who gave positive responses as the questions were coded on a binary scale of 0 and 1. It appeared that 95% of the male and 85% of the female showed positive attitude toward use of Hazaragi at home (Attitude question 6). In response to Attitude question 7, 100% of the male and 85% of the female participants indicated that they wanted their children to understand Hazaragi. Furthermore, 100% of the male and 75% of the female responded positively in saying that they wanted their children to speak Hazaragi in response to Attitude question 8. Both male and female respondents had a similar highly positive view (75%) on the importance or value of being able to speak in Hazaragi. In short, all of the second set of Attitude questions (questions 5 to 9) showed rather high positive responses for both groups in terms of maintenance of Hazaragi, concerning the use of Hazaragi at

home, the desire their children to understand and speak Hazaragi, or the overall value and importance of Hazaragi.

The third set of questions contained two items only. Likewise, two independent t-tests were conducted at  $\alpha = .025$  ( $.05/2$ ) to find out whether males and females valued Hazaragi differently. The results revealed that the males and females did not differ significantly on any of the two questions (See Table 3).

Table 3

(3) *Value of Hazaragi*

Questions A10 – A11	N		Mean		SD		Mean Difference	df	t	Sig
	M	F	M	F	M	F				
A10. Would you prefer that Hazaras spoke just Hazaragi, both Hazaragi and Dari, mostly Dari, but some Hazaragi is OK or just Dari?	20	20	1.80	1.90	.410	.718	-.100	38	-.541	.592
A11. Does use of Hazaragi suggest anything to you about a person's character? Positive things, nothing, or negative things? In other words, what kind of person uses Hazaragi?	20	20	1.40	1.40	.598	.598	.000	38	.000	1.000

The third set of questions (Attitude questions 10 and 11) were the only continuum questions with the first coded on a scale of 0 to 3 and the latter asking about the value of Hazaragi on a scale of 0 to 2. In response to Attitude question 10, the means of 1.80 for the male and 1.90 for the female indicated that respondents had a preference for the Hazaras to speak both Hazaragi and Dari. It also showed that none of the groups were in favor of the Hazaras speaking only Dari or speaking only Hazaragi. Therefore, both male and female respondents preferred that the Hazaras spoke mostly Dari and some Hazaragi and were inclined toward the use of both Hazaragi and Dari by the Hazaras. The mean for Attitude question 11, with an equal score of 1.40 for each group, showed that the

respondents were leaning toward saying that Hazaragi showed good things about the character of a speaker. The majority of the respondents thought that use of Hazaragi does not suggest anything bad about a person or does not convey any biases towards the speaker. In sum, the means for question 10 and 11 showed that both male and female respondents gave high positive responses about the use of Hazaragi alongside with Dari and in terms of positive implicatures about the character of the speaker.

Regarding the domains of use of Hazaragi, 13 dependent t-tests were conducted at  $\alpha = .0038$  ( $.05/13$ ) in order to see whether males and females deemed Hazaragi appropriate or inappropriate to be used in certain settings. The results showed that males and females did not have statistically significant difference on any of the 13 questions related to Domains of Use of Hazaragi as seen in Table 4. The fourth set of Attitude questions showed that the use of Hazaragi was mainly limited to friends and casual contexts.

Table 4

*(4) Domains of Use of Hazaragi*

Questions A12 – A24	N		Mean		SD		Mean Difference	df	t	Sig
	M	F	M	F	M	F				
A12. Would you use Hazaragi to describe a news or sports event to a Hazara friend?	20	20	.90	.95	.308	.224	-.050	38	-.588	.560
A13. Would you use Hazaragi to describe a news or sports event to a non-Hazara friend?	20	20	.40	.35	.503	.489	.050	38	.319	.752
A14. Would you use Hazaragi to write a letter to a relative?	20	20	.30	.35	.470	.489	-.050	38	-.330	.744
A15. Would you use Hazaragi to teach a class of teenagers?	20	20	.55	.45	.510	.510	.100	38	.620	.539
A16. Would you use Hazaragi to address a supervisor?	20	20	.45	.40	.510	.503	.050	38	.312	.757
A17. Would you use Hazaragi to answer the telephone?	20	20	.80	.65	.410	.489	.150*	36.881*	1.050*	.300*
A18. Would you use Hazaragi to write an article for the daily newspaper?	20	20	.35	.53	.489	.513	-.176	38	-1.099	.279
A19. Would you use Hazaragi to conduct a job interview?	20	20	.45	.45	.510	.510	.000	38	.000	1.000
A20. Would you consider it appropriate if a friend recounted the lively parts of a TV serial to you in Hazaragi?	20	20	1.00	.95	.000	.224	.050*	19.000*	1.000*	.330*
A21. Would you consider it appropriate if someone who is not Hazara ask you for directions in Hazaragi?	20	20	.55	.65	.510	.489	-.100	38	-.632	.531
A22. Would you consider it appropriate if a lecturer in university lectured in Hazaragi to a class on which both Hazara and non-Hazaras were studying?	20	20	.25	.35	.444	.489	-.100	38	-.677	.503
A23. Would you consider it appropriate if Hazara newscasters speak Hazaragi on TV/radio to an audience of mixed, both Hazaras and non-Hazaras?	20	20	.55	.50	.510	.513	.050	38	.309	.759
A24. Are there places you would speak or avoid speaking Hazaragi?	20	20	.30	.25	.470	.444	.050	38	.346	.731

\* Statistics for equal variances not assumed.

The fourth and last set of 13 attitude questions was coded on a dichotomas scale of 0 and 1; therefore, the means for each question represented the percentage of people who responded positively. Looking at the percentages for Attitude question 12, it is seen that 90% of the male and 95% of the female participants gave highly positive responses in saying that they would use Hazaragi for describing a news or sports event to their Hazara friends. Responses to Attitude question 13 were somewhat negative as only 40% of the male and 35% of the female subjects indicated that they would use Hazaragi to describe a news or sports event to a non-Hazara friend. In relation to attitude question 14, 30% of the male and 35 of the female participants indicated that they would use Hazaragi to write a letter to a relative. Attitude question 15 drew slightly positive responses for males and slightly negative responses for the females as 55% of the male and 45% of the female subjects pointed out that they would use Hazaragi to teach a class of teenagers.

In relation to Attitude question 16, 45% of the male and 40% of the female respondents indicated that they would use Hazaragi to address a supervisor. For answering the telephone in Hazaragi (Attitude question 17), 80% of the male respondents and 65% of the female respondents answered positively. Attitude question 18 drew somewhat negative responses for the males as 35% of the males and 53% of the females said they would use Hazaragi to write an article for the daily newspaper. In response to Attitude question 19, an equal percent of both the male and the female subjects, 45% of each group, said they would use Hazaragi to conduct a job interview. Attitude question 20 received highly positive responses as 100% of the male and 95% of the female subjects considered it appropriate if a friend recounted the lively parts of a TV serial to them in Hazaragi.

In response to Attitude question 21, 55% of the male and 65% of the female subjects gave a slightly positive response deeming it appropriate that someone who is not a Hazara would ask them for directions in Hazaragi. Attitude question 22 elicited a rather negative response as only 25% of the male and 35% of the female respondents considered it appropriate for a university instructor to lecture in Hazaragi to a class mixed of both Hazaras and non-Hazaras. Furthermore, in response to Attitude question 23, 55% of the males and 50% of the females considered it appropriate that the Hazara newscasters spoke Hazaragi on TV or radio to a mixed audience of both Hazaras and non-Hazaras. Finally, Attitude question 24 elicited negative responses as only 30% of the male and 25% of the female respondents said that there were places they would use Hazaragi.

In sum, the fourth set of Attitude questions which studied domains of use of Hazaragi produced mixed results, both positive and negative. Overall, responses were highly positive for use of Hazaragi to describe a news or sports event to a Hazara friend, use of Hazaragi to answer the telephone, and use of Hazaragi for recounting the lively parts of a TV serial to a friend. There were a few slightly positive responses concerning the use of Hazaragi to teach a class of teenagers, the use of Hazaragi for asking directions, and the use of Hazaragi by a newscaster to a mixed audience of Hazaras and non-Hazaras. The rest of the responses were slightly negative, including the use of Hazaragi in different domains. For example, the participants responded negatively for the use of Hazaragi to describe a news or sports event to a non-Hazara friend, to write a letter to a relative, to address a supervisor, to write an article for the daily newspaper, and to conduct an interview. Also, respondents gave negative responses about the use of

Hazaragi as the language of instruction to a college class of Hazara and non-Hazara students and also about its unlimited use at different places.

#### 4.2 Results for Descriptive Question

The descriptive questions were meant to elicit respondents' beliefs about the linguistic attributes and the domains of use of Hazaragi. More specifically, descriptive questions examined the following themes: a) linguistic entity of Hazaragi, b) phonological and syntactic similarities between Hazaragi and Dari, c) regional variation among Hazaras, d) Hazaragi – Dari mutual intelligibility/non-intelligibility, e) extent of productivity of Hazaragi, f) use in public venues, by the media, and home use and g) respondent's willingness to use or avoid using Hazaragi in certain situations or places.

Question D1 in the instrument was divided into two questions in the questionnaire to better elicit whether the participants regarded Hazaragi as a language or a dialect. The respondents had two chances to mention Hazaragi as a language either in response to Question D1a or D1b. Question D1a asked what languages the respondents spoke and it revealed that only 32.5% of the respondents said they spoke Hazaragi (see Table 5). However, 95% of the respondents said that they also spoke Dari and 12.5% spoke Farsi. As seen, an overwhelming majority of the respondents said that they spoke Dari. Also, the fact that a few participants mentioned Farsi as the language they spoke could be attributed to the interchangeability of "Dari" and "Farsi" among some speakers. Moreover, 55% of the respondents said they spoke Pashtu and 42.5% also mentioned English as the language they spoke. In response to question D1b "How many languages are spoken in Afghanistan and what do you call them?," eight male and nine female

participants (overall 30%) said Hazaragi is spoken in Afghanistan, referring to it as a language. The sum of question D1a and D1b showed that altogether 50% of the Hazaras regarded Hazaragi as a language, not a dialect.

Table 5

*Question D1a (What languages do you speak?)*

	Hazaragi	Dari	Farsi	Pashto	Uzbek	Turkmani	English	French
Male	7	18	3	15	2	0	11	1
	35%	90%	15%	75%	10%	0%	55%	5%
Female	6	20	2	7	0	1	6	0
	30%	100%	10%	35%	0%	5%	30%	0%
Totals	13 (32.5%)	38 (95%)	5 (12.5%)	22 (55%)	2 (5%)	1 (2.5%)	17 (42.5%)	1 (2.5%)

Question D2 served as a distracter for question D3, asking the difference between Dari and Farsi. It was used so that the respondents would not make any predictions about the purpose of the question which was interested in whether subjects would identify any difference between Hazaragi and Dari. Question D3 (Table 6) asked whether the difference between Hazaragi and Dari was of accent, vocabulary, grammar or some other kind of difference. Responses to question D3 revealed that the majority of the respondents (65%) reported “accent and vocabulary” as the main difference between Dari and Hazaragi. Three male and one female subject (overall 10%) identified accent as the only difference between Dari and Hazaragi whereas four male and six female subjects (overall 25%) mentioned all “accent, vocabulary and grammar” as the difference between Hazaragi and Dari.

Table 6

*Question D3 (Is the difference between Hazaragi and Dari one of accent, vocabulary, grammar, or is it some other kind of difference?)*

Subject\ topics	No difference	Accent	Accent and Vocabulary	Accent, Vocabulary & grammar	Other
Male	0	3	13	4	0
	0%	15%	65%	20%	0%
Female	0	1	13	6	0
	0%	5%	65%	30%	0%
Total	0 (0%)	4 (10%)	26 (65%)	10 (25%)	0 (0%)

Question D4 (Table 7) was meant to see if the respondents believed there were dialectal differences between Hazaragi spoken in different parts of Afghanistan and also whether they could produce and imitate such dialects. As seen in Table 7, overall 75% of participants confided that they understood the Hazaragi spoken in other provinces and they could speak it too. In other words, it implied that there were either no dialectal differences in Hazaragi spoken in different places of Afghanistan or the difference was not substantial. Only 25% of the respondents said “yes” to question D4; thus, saying that there is actually dialectal variation in Hazaragi. Interestingly, there were some gender differences in answering question D4. More male subjects than female subjects (Male=17 vs. Female= 13) said they understood and spoke Hazaragi spoken in other parts of Afghanistan. Male subjects showed more approval in saying they could speak Hazaragi spoken in other parts of Afghanistan.

Table 7

D4: Are you able to comfortably understand Hazaragi spoken in the provinces other than Kabul? If yes, can you also speak or imitate it?	Subjects	Yes	No
	Male	17	3
	Female	13	7
	Total	30 (75%)	10 (25%)

Question D5 (“Do Hazaras from different parts of Afghanistan speak Hazaragi differently from each other?”) was used to ask whether Hazaragi has its own varieties or not. The majority of the respondents (75%) said “yes” to D5, suggesting that Hazaragi has its own variations (see Table 8). Only one male respondent said “No” to question D5 and five male and four female respondents said they did not have any information about it. Examples of places where Hazaragi is spoken differently were given, such as Hazaragi in Jaghori, Shahrstan and Behsud. A big number of respondents (75%) said that they could speak or imitate Hazaragi spoken in other parts of Afghanistan in response to D4; however, in response to D5, the same number of respondents (75%) said that Hazaras from different parts of Afghanistan speak differently from each other. The question is if the Hazaras from different parts of Afghanistan spoke differently from each other, or spoke a different dialect of Hazaragi, how would such a large number of respondents be able to imitate or speak the different varieties of Hazaragi? One explanation could be the continuous interaction between the Hazaras from different parts of Afghanistan. Also, another explanation could be that the dialectal variations between Hazaragi spoken in different parts of Afghanistan are subtle, making it possible for Hazaragi speakers to speak and imitate Hazaragi spoken in different parts of Afghanistan.

Are the Hazaras the only people who speak Hazaragi? It seemed appropriate to know if there were people other than Hazaras who could speak Hazaragi. In answering question D6, 57.5% of the respondents believed that Hazaras were the only people who spoke Hazaragi (see Table 8). Some of the participants (25%) responded that they had no knowledge about the existence of non-Hazara speakers of Hazaragi. Only a small number of participants (17.5%) said that there were people other than the Hazaras who could

speak Hazaragi. The gender difference in question D6 was very evident as more male subjects than female ones (Male= 15 vs. Female= 8) said that people other than the Hazaras could not speak Hazaragi, whereas more female subjects (Female= 9 vs. Male= 1) reported lack of knowledge about the issue.

In response to question D7, which asked whether the Hazaras raised in Kabul speak differently from the Hazaras living in other provinces (see Table 8), overall 85% of the participants said “yes”, signaling a difference between the speech of Hazaras raised in Kabul and Hazaras from other provinces. More female respondents than male respondents (female= 19; Male=15) saw the difference in the speech of Kabul raised Hazaras. Only 15% of the respondents, which is a rather small percentage, answered that there were no differences in the language of Hazaras raised in Kabul and elsewhere. Male subjects were less aware of language variations and differences than female subjects.

The next question aimed to find out if participants saw any differences in the language of the returnees, especially those who returned from Iran and Pakistan in the past seven years. Overall, 87.5% of the respondents stated that there was a difference between the language of the returnees and the other Hazaras who had been living in Afghanistan (see Question D8, Table 8). Therefore, according to the participants the language of the returnees had been influenced by the environment of their respective host countries. Only 10% of the respondents gave a negative answer to question D8 and one subject did not have information about it. No important gender differences were found in relation to question D8.

Table 8

Questions	Subjects	Don't know	No	Yes
D5: Do Hazaras from different parts of Afghanistan speak Hazaragi differently from each other?	Male	5	1	14
	Female	4	0	16
	Total	9 (22.5%)	1 (2.5%)	30 (75%)
D6: Are there any people other than Hazaras who speak Hazaragi in Afghanistan?	Male	1	15	4
	Female	9	8	3
	Total	10 (25%)	23 (57.5%)	7 (17.5%)
D7: Do Hazaras who were raised in Kabul speak differently from other Hazaras living elsewhere in Afghanistan?	Male	0	5	15
	Female	0	1	19
	Total	0 (0%)	6 (15%)	34 (85%)
D8: Do Hazaras who have returned from Iran and Pakistan in the past seven years speak differently from other Hazaras living in elsewhere in Afghanistan?	Male	0	2	18
	Female	1	2	17
	Total	1 (2.5%)	4 (10%)	35 (87.5%)

Question D9 and D10 dealt with the mutual intelligibility of Dari and Hazaragi.

Responses to question D9 showed that 100% of the participants affirmed the mutual intelligibility between Hazaragi and Dari (Table 9). All of the respondents said that people who could speak only Hazaragi could understand Dari. However, the responses to question D10 were somewhat mixed. More participants (62.5%) said that people who only spoke Dari would not be able to understand Hazaragi, whereas 37.5% of the respondents said people who understood only Dari would actually also understand Hazaragi. The gender difference was subtle as nine male subjects believed Dari speakers would be able to understand Hazaragi versus six female subjects who did so.

Questions D11 to D14 (see Table 9) examined the domains of use of Hazaragi. In response to question D11, which asked whether Hazaragi was used in school or not, a bit over half of the respondents (52.5%) affirmed the usage of Hazaragi in schools. On the other hand, a little less than half of the respondents (47.5%) said Hazaragi was not used in schools. The difference between the number of respondents who said Hazaragi was

used in schools and those who said Hazaragi was not used in schools was too close to make a definite conclusion.

Regarding the use of Hazaragi in non-print media such as TV and radio, 77.5% of the participants confirmed the use of Hazaragi in that domain as more male subjects (17) than female (14) expressed that opinion. The other 22.5% of the respondents said that Hazaragi was not used in the non-print media. However, with regard to the use of Hazaragi in print media, such as newspapers and magazines, 57.5% of the respondents said “no” and 42.5% “yes” to question D13. Given the fact that there is not much written literature available in Hazaragi, it is interesting that almost half of the participants answered the question positively. A similar trend was observed in answer to the next question, D14, where 55% of respondents said that they know of a book written in Hazaragi. Less than half of the respondents (45%) said that they did not know of any books written in Hazaragi. The explanation for the fairly high number of participants who reported use of Hazaragi in print may suggest a positive and improved attitude toward use of Hazaragi in print and will be discussed in the next chapter.

Table 9

Questions	Subjects	Yes	No
D9: Can someone who only speaks Hazaragi, understand Dari?	Male	20	0
	Female	20	0
	Total	40 (100%)	0 (0%)
D10: Can someone who only speaks Dari, understand Hazaragi?	Male	9	11
	Female	6	14
	Total	15 (37.5%)	25 (62.5%)
D11: Is Hazaragi used in school?	Male	10	10
	Female	11	9
	Total	21 (52.5%)	19 (47.5%)
D12: Is Hazaragi used by the non-printed media (TV, radio, etc)?	Male	17	3
	Female	14	6
	Total	31 (77.5%)	9 (22.5%)
D13: Is Hazaragi used by the printed media (newspapers, magazines, etc)?	Male	8	12
	Female	9	11
	Total	17 (42.5%)	23 (57.5%)
D14: Are there any books in Hazaragi that you know of?	Male	12	8
	Female	10	10
	Total	22 (55%)	18 (45%)

Question D15 which was open-ended was used to gauge the subjects' willingness to maintain Hazaragi. It had three parts and asked the participants which age group of their respective family members tended to speak more Hazaragi and with whom. Altogether, 95% of the participants said that the older members of their family would speak Hazaragi more often, mostly with other older people, mostly at home with family and relatives or at private gatherings such as weddings. Some of the subjects also added that their older family members always spoke Hazaragi, no matter what and where. Twelve male respondents said that young people speak Hazaragi, especially with other young people and family members. They also added young people tended to speak Hazaragi more often with older people. Eight male subjects responded that young people don't use Hazaragi and they prefer to use Dari. It was also mentioned that young people

in villages where only Hazaragi is spoken speak more Hazaragi. Similarly, 13 female subjects noted that young people speak Hazaragi mostly with family members and relatives as well as with other Hazaras. Seven female subjects responded that younger Hazaras don't speak Hazaragi often enough. One female respondent noted that young Hazaras show little interest in Hazaragi. Another female respondent noted that young Hazaras speak whatever language is being appropriate for the place and environment such as class or workplace. Several female participants responded that mostly young Hazaras in Hazarajat speak Hazaragi.

For the use of Hazaragi by the subjects at home, 77.5% responded that they use Hazaragi at home with family members, both young and old, and relatives. They emphasized using Hazaragi with older family members and relatives. Only 22.5% did not mention speaking Hazaragi at home or said that they don't speak Hazaragi at all. In view of gender, more male subjects (85%) used Hazaragi at home as compared to 70% of their female counterparts. Based on the respondents' answers to question D15, Hazaragi was considered more appropriate for use with family and relatives and also with other Hazaras.

It was also deemed important to find subjects' perceptions about people who would never use Hazaragi, defined by age, social class, education, gender or whether they have lived outside Afghanistan. Regarding age groups, respondents identified the elderly as the group of people who would never refrain from using Hazaragi (see Table 10), but overall they did not perceive young people as avoiding to use Hazaragi as only 2.5% of the participants indicated that young people would never use Hazaragi. Regarding social class, overall rich people were perceived as likely to never use Hazaragi

than poor people by only 12.5% of the participants. Education elicited more non-use of Hazaragi by well educated people (27.5%) than by people with less education (2.5%). Gender did not elicit any differences, however a sizable number of respondents (55%) pointed that the returnees would never use Hazaragi. Also, 27.5% of respondents said that well-educated people would never use Hazaragi.

Table 10

*D16 (Of the following, who do you think will never use Hazaragi?)*

Subjects\ topics	Older people	Younger people	Rich people	Poor people	Well-Educated people	Less-educated people	Men	Women	The returnees	Others
Male	0	1	4	0	4	1	0	1	10	2*
	0%	5%	20%	0%	20%	5%	0%	5%	50%	10%
Female	0	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	12	0
	0%	0%	5%	0%	35%	0%	0%	0%	60%	0%
Total	0 (0%)	1 (2.5%)	5 (12.5%)	0 (0%)	11 (27.5%)	1 (2.5%)	0 (0%)	1 (2.5%)	22 (55%)	2 (5%)

Question D17 was open-ended and it was divided into two parts to better elicit respondents' feelings about the use and non-use of Hazaragi. D17a asked the respondents to list the situations in which they would like to speak Hazaragi. Only two subjects (one male and one female) said they would not speak Hazaragi outside their homes and one female subject reported that she couldn't speak Hazaragi at all. Overall, 95% of the respondents said that they were using Hazaragi with Hazara friends, with Hazara people in general, when the interlocutor understood Hazaragi, and when it was appropriate. Some also said that they would speak Hazaragi in all situations. One male subject said he would speak Hazaragi for the purpose of enriching it. However, some had reservations. For example, one female respondent said she would not speak Hazaragi if the situation

results in discrimination against her; another female respondent said she would not speak Hazaragi if it would cause disunity [among the people in the larger society].

Question D17b asked the participants to list the places they would *not* speak Hazaragi. Fifteen percent of the participants (4 females and 2 males) responded that they would speak Hazaragi all the time irrespective of the situation. Only two subjects (one male and one female) asserted that they wouldn't speak Hazaragi at all. Overall, 80% of the respondents (32 subjects) listed some places where they would not speak Hazaragi. For example, the majority of the respondents listed governmental and educational venues as places they would not speak Hazaragi. One male subject listed schools, universities, classes and other places where the audience are mostly Dari or Pashto speakers. Subjects also said that they would avoid speaking Hazaragi at events or places which require formality; such as conferences, speeches or official meetings.

Moreover, some participants mentioned that they would not consider speaking Hazaragi in places where the audience either doesn't understand Hazaragi or are not Hazara, for example, places where there is an audience from other tribes such as Pashtuns, Tajiks, and Uzbeks. Some geographical regions such as Kandahar and Panjshir, where non-Hazaras live, were also given as examples of places they would not speak Hazaragi. Two male respondents gave a rather different situation when they wouldn't speak Hazaragi. One subject responded that he wouldn't speak Hazaragi in places where they hate Hazaragi and another wrote that he would not speak Hazaragi "when we are controlled by the enemies of the Hazaras."

In conclusion, the findings of the Descriptive questions showed a trend of the male respondents having a more positive attitude toward Hazaragi than the female

respondents. Half of the respondents called Hazaragi a “language” and the majority of them said Hazaragi had its own dialectal variations, although subtle. Hazaragi and Dari were considered mutually intelligible with differences mainly in accent and vocabulary. The Hazaras were named as the main speakers of Hazaragi. Also, respondents believed that the Hazaras living in Kabul and the returnees spoke Hazaragi differently from the rest of the Hazaras. Most of the respondents believed Hazaragi was an oral language with some usage in writing.

Finally, respondents mentioned that older people use Hazaragi more than any other age groups and also younger people, including the participants, use Hazaragi often with older people and family members. The returnees, educated people, and rich people were mentioned as people who would avoid using Hazaragi to some extent. Finally, Hazaragi was considered appropriate mostly for use at home, with friends and relatives, and with other Hazaras. For formal contexts such as school and work, Dari was deemed appropriate. Chapter Four presented the results of both Attitude questions and Descriptive questions. The findings of this chapter will be further summarized and discussed in the next chapter.

## CHAPTER 5

### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study aimed at examining the attitudes of young and educated Hazaras, both men and women, toward the Hazaragi language. It utilized a questionnaire made up of 24 Attitude questions and 17 Descriptive questions to study the attitudes and perceptions of Hazaras toward Hazaragi. The findings of both Attitude Questions and Descriptive Questions were presented in Chapter Four under Results for Attitude Questions and Results for Descriptive Questions, respectively. The chapter at hand presents a discussion of the major findings both for Attitude questions and Descriptive questions, followed by the limitations of the study, recommendations for future research, and the contribution of this study to the body of literature.

#### 5.1 Discussion

##### *5.1.1 Attitude Questions*

Attitude questions were meant to examine participants' attitudes toward Hazaragi, its use and its maintenance. The statistical analyses of the different attitude questions revealed no significant differences between the male and female subjects. This finding provided evidence in support of the conclusions reported in Cavallaro and Chin (2009) where no significant gender differences were found in relation to Singapore Colloquial English. The first part of the Attitude questions studied the perceptions of the participants toward Hazaragi as a language. Although only half of the participants regarded Hazaragi as a distinct language (instead of considering it a dialect of Dari), the majority of them considered it a linguistic variety that could be used for reading, writing, and listening. It

is possible that the respondents did not understand the difference between “dialect” and “language. Nevertheless, in light of the historical stigmatization of the Hazaras and Hazaragi (Mousavi, 1998), the fact that half of the respondents considered Hazaragi a language shows a tendency towards a positive attitude toward Hazaragi by young educated Hazaras. It further underscores an acceptance of Hazaragi as their “very own” language and a nationalistic sentiment to “have” a language. In other words, they use the language in order to identify their national or cultural origin (Linn & Pichè, 1982).

Concerning the “desire to maintain Hazaragi,” the majority of the respondents for both groups (males and females) showed a commitment to maintain Hazaragi which was in line with the findings of Wassink (1999) of younger people having a more positive attitude towards Jamaican Creole. The respondents said that they use Hazaragi at home, they want their children to understand and speak Hazaragi, and it is valuable to know and speak Hazaragi in Afghanistan. The positive attitude here is a positive sign about the maintenance of Hazaragi as positive attitudes determine maintenance and future use of a language variety (Shameem, 2004). Future generations play an important part in language maintenance. If they stop using a certain language, the language is doomed to die. In the context of this study, it seems that the participants have the commitment to maintain Hazaragi, as far as they are concerned, by using it at home and teaching it to their children. However, negative signs about the maintenance of Hazaragi can be found, too. Older people were considered the main speakers of Hazaragi. If young people do not identify themselves as speakers of Hazaragi, it would endanger language maintenance in the long run. Older people do not play any significant role in language maintenance. Moreover, attitudes toward Hazaragi were more positive among men than women.

Depending on what the gender roles are regarding the language education of children, women's less positive attitude about the language might play a detrimental role in its maintenance over generations. If educated women as future educated mothers do not speak Hazaragi to their children, the future maintenance of Hazaragi would be seriously in jeopardy.

In relation to the value of Hazaragi as a "language," the majority of the respondents wanted the Hazaras to speak both Dari and Hazaragi. It seems that knowledge of Dari was deemed essential for the Hazaras, with things like social mobility playing a pivotal part for speaking the high variety. However, the fact that the respondents wanted the Hazaras to speak both Hazaragi and Dari underscores the importance of knowing Dari. Dari is the language of education and business in Afghanistan, and it is crucial for social mobility (Abd-El-Jawad, 1987). Thus, it is evident that the participants did not want their fellow Hazaras to fall behind by not knowing Dari.

The inclination toward saying that "Hazaragi shows good things about a speaker" indicates solidarity among the respondents and a commitment to a Hazaragi identity through speaking the same language (White et al, 1998). It also points out the confidence the Hazaras have for speaking Hazaragi despite the fact that Hazaragi is perceived pejoratively as a result of power relations by dominant groups (see White et al., 1998). Hazaragi is their "language," so its speakers are perceived positively.

The findings of Attitude questions for domains of use had the same pattern as the findings of Wassink's (1999) study about Jamaican Creole, another low prestigious language. Basically, Hazaragi was considered appropriate in casual contexts and with

friends (in-group) especially with other Hazaras. Hazaragi did not produce positive responses for use in formal contexts and with non-Hazaras (out-group). For example, it was deemed inappropriate if a lecturer in a university lectured in Hazaragi to a mixed class of both Hazaras and non-Hazaras. Education is essential for social mobility and progress (Adegbija, 2001); therefore, absence of Hazaragi in the field of education makes the change of attitude to positive more difficult. However, in casual settings such as the use of Hazaragi to describe a news or sport event to a Hazara friend was considered acceptable. In short, the domains where use of Hazaragi was considered appropriate included mainly informal or casual contexts such as with friends and with other Hazaras. This shows that use of Hazaragi is limited to certain informal settings whereas Dari is the language used in all other cases.

Finally, even though the attitude questions did not produce any significant gender differences, it revealed interesting descriptive trends in terms of gender. Overall, the male participants showed more positive attitude toward Hazaragi than the female participants. Of the 24 Attitude questions, 14 received more positive responses from the male respondents whereas only eight Attitude questions received more positive responses from the female respondents. There were only two questions that did not bear any gender differences as both were rated equally. Since these differences were only descriptive, it is inappropriate to draw conclusions in view of previously reported gender differences (Labov, 1972) as men showing preference for the vernacular versus women showing preference for the standard language. Yet, it should be noted that men had a more positive attitude towards Hazaragi than women.

### *5.1.2 Descriptive Questions*

Descriptive questions were meant to elicit respondents' beliefs about the linguistic attributes and domains of use of Hazaragi. Although 50% of the participants regarded Hazaragi as a language, the majority of the respondents saw the difference between Dari and Hazaragi mainly in accent and vocabulary, confirming Dulling's observations (1973). The majority of the respondents considered Hazaragi and Dari mutually intelligible though some respondents maintained that a person who only speaks Dari may not be able to understand Hazaragi. It could be possible that mutual intelligibility between Dari and Hazaragi is not reciprocal. Almost all of the respondents said that they spoke Dari.

Furthermore, participants believed Hazaragi has its own variations, though subtle. Also, Hazaras being raised in Kabul and the returnees were believed to speak differently from other Hazaras. As the author had witnessed, the Hazaras in Kabul tended to speak Hazaragi heavily influenced by Dari. Likewise, the Hazaras who came from provinces in Kabul tried to speak more like Kabul Dari speakers, sometimes resorting to hypercorrection. In some cases, the Hazaras have stopped speaking Hazaragi in favor of speaking Dari as few participants indicated that they don't speak Hazaragi at all. This choice of prestigious form over vernacular, i.e. Dari over Hazaragi, could be the result of what Abd-El-Jawad (1987) calls shunning from stigmatization associated with the low-status language.

The majority of the participants believed that the rich, the educated and the returnees would never use Hazaragi. People who are exposed to prestigious varieties are more aware of prestige. Since Hazaragi is not a language of prestige, these groups would opt for the prestigious variety i.e. Dari in order to not be seen as less-educated and of a

lower social status (Cargile et al., 2006). The returnees, however, might not speak Hazaragi for a different reason, as they are influenced by the culture and language of their host countries. Their avoidance of the use of Hazaragi might not have anything to do with the low status of Hazaragi although their acquired new “language” and “accent” provide another vessel for demonstrating prestige.

The domains of use of Hazaragi produced mixed results. Although Hazaragi was claimed to be used in contexts such as schools, the number of participants who gave positive responses were not considerable. It seemed that Hazaragi was considered appropriate mostly in spoken rather in written form. Most of the respondents said it was used in the non-printed media such as TV and radio, whereas printed media such as newspapers and magazines were not considered domains of Hazaragi. For casual and informal contexts, such as with friends, family members and other Hazara acquaintances, Hazaragi was seen appropriate to be used. For formal contexts, such as university and work, the majority of respondents considered Hazargi inappropriate to be used. The domains of use of Hazaragi supported Speicher and McMahon’s (1992) statement that languages are not treated equally as only one is considered appropriate for official purposes in domains such as government, media, and education. In sum, the participants considered Hazaragi to be appropriate for casual and personal use, but not for official purposes.

Older people were said to be the main speakers of Hazaragi. The majority of the respondents indicated that their older family members spoke Hazaragi more often than any other age group. They added that younger people would also use some Hazaragi, but mainly with their family members, relatives and friends. Some subjects indicated that

younger Hazaras in Kabul do not speak Hazaragi as much now as they prefer to speak Dari. As stated earlier, maintenance of a language is dependent on continued usage by future generations. If Hazaragi were to be maintained, younger people would speak it and pass it to their children.

Overall, the descriptive questions revealed some interesting observations about gender differences. Other than a few sporadic cases, the male respondents gave consistently more positive responses about the use of Hazaragi. The findings about males' positive attitude toward the vernacular was similar to Ladegaard's (2000). The female participants gave relatively positive responses for Hazaragi in writing and less positive responses for spoken Hazaragi.

## 5.2 Conclusion

This research concludes that the young and educated Hazaras, both males and females, had an overall positive attitude towards Hazaragi. The hypothesis outlined in the methodology section was confirmed for the most part. The respondents were willing to hear Hazaragi and speak Hazaragi in places not commonly used before. All in all, the perceptions of the participants were positive toward Hazaragi.

Although it is inconclusive whether Hazaragi was considered a language or a dialect of Dari, participants thought that it had the full potential of a language having its own dialectal variations. Language is instrumental in constructing identity (Baldwin, 2001); thus, it seems regarding Hazaragi a "language" is part of forming a "Hazara identity." Speaking Hazaragi was seen as part of being a Hazara, at least by half of the participants. Hazaragi was deemed suitable for use at casual and informal contexts such

as with family, relatives, friends, and other Hazaras. For formal settings, Hazaragi was not considered appropriate. Despite their limited usage of Hazaragi in certain domains, the respondents were committed to maintenance and future use of Hazaragi. The study did not find any significant gender differences although the male respondents had an overall more positive attitude towards Hazaragi than the female respondents.

### 5.3 Limitations of the study

This study has several limitations both in terms of instrument and research design. The foremost limitation stems from the fact that the author was not able to administer the instrument himself. The researcher had to rely on the honesty and objectivity of his colleague who administered the questionnaire in Kabul. Instructions for administering the questionnaire were provided but the researcher had no control on how they were followed.

Regarding the instrument, no follow up questions were asked on descriptive questions. It would have helped to clear some ambiguities if the researcher could have interviewed the subjects and asked follow up questions.

Since this study only examined the attitude of young and educated people in Kabul, the results cannot be extrapolated to any other population. Finally, the rather small size of the sample (40 subjects) limits generalizability of this study. Applying the findings of this study to the population of all Hazaras in Kabul or the Hazaras in general will not be appropriate.

It should also be mentioned that it is possible that the subjects responded in a certain way guided by their nationalistic pride of being Hazara. Thus, their views might

have represented ideal rather than existing practices. The participants might have demonstrated in-group biases (Rodriguez, et al., 2004) by thinking it is their “duty” to support Hazaragi rather than showing their real attitudes toward it which may have negatively affected the study. On the other hand, it also is possible that the respondents hid their feelings about Hazaragi as they were uncomfortable to talk about it, trying to save their “image” or “face” as Hazaragi is a stigmatized language.

#### 5.4 Recommendations for future research

The author wasn't able to administer the questionnaire due to problems in terms of distance. For future attitude studies, it would be recommended to use an interview to be able to ask follow up questions. The instrument for this study, both for attitude questions and descriptive questions, could be replicated with some minor modifications to fit an interview format.

Furthermore, this study examined the attitudes of Hazaras towards Hazaragi. Age had only one level, i.e. 20 to 30. For future studies, this study could be replicated with different age groups in order to compare the attitudes of several generations of Hazaras, i.e. preadolescents, adolescents, adults, and older people, towards Hazaragi. Moreover, studying the attitudes of Hazaras using a matched guise study would have revealed more interesting data about the attitudes of Hazaras towards Hazaragi. Also, it would be interesting to study the attitudes of non-Hazaras toward Hazaragi through a matched guise study. Studying the attitudes of other ethnic groups towards Hazaragi and comparing them with that of the Hazaras would provide invaluable sociolinguistic knowledge on Hazaragi.

### 5.5 Contribution of this study

This is the first language attitude study in Afghanistan. In relation to Hazaragi as a language variety, it also served as the first study of its kind. It is hoped it will open doors to more studies about the languages spoken in Afghanistan. It should also encourage more work on Hazaragi and the Hazaras an important member of Afghanistan's society. Also, it should encourage other researchers to study not only Hazaragi but also other existing languages in Afghanistan.

Years of war and internal conflict coupled with bigotry of the rulers have diverted the attention away from academic studies about the languages of Afghanistan. Conflict resolution and nation building have been the focus of attention in Afghanistan in the past several years, whereas languages been neglected. It is hoped that this study would inspire more sociolinguistic research in Afghanistan so that the existing languages would be documented and possibly be saved from eventual death. The people of Afghanistan should learn more about each other by building on common grounds and cherishing their differences. The author believes that nation building and coexistence would be attained only if different ethnic groups acknowledge the differences they have with one another and come into terms with them. If the people of Afghanistan continue to ignore and belittle other people and their languages and cultural values at the expense of advancing their own languages and cultural values, nation building and peace would be more of an illusion. Rather, everyone should be given equal opportunity to promote their own language and cultural values.

## REFERENCES

- Abd-el-Jawad, H. (1987). Cross-dialectal variation in Arabic: competing prestigious forms. *Language in Society*, 16(3), 359-368. doi:10.1017/S0047404500012446.
- Adegbija, E. (2001). Language and attitude change in Sub-Saharan Africa: An overview. *ITL: Review of Applied Linguistics*, 133-134, 271-301. Retrieved September 26, 2009, from MLA International Bibliography database.
- Bacon, E. E. (1951). The inquiry into the history of the Hazara Mongols of Afghanistan. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 7(3) 230-247.
- Bacon, E. E. (1958). *OBOK: A study of social structure in Eurasia*, New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, Inc.
- Baldwin, J. (1997). If black English isn't a language, then tell me, what is?. *Black Scholar*, 27(1), 5.
- Beeman, W. (2005). *Persian, Dari and Tajik in Central Asia*. Washington DC: Brown University.
- Bilaniuk L. (2003). Gender, language attitudes, and language status in Ukraine. *Language in Society*, 32(1):47-78.
- Bindemann, R. (2002). Hazara research and Hazara nationalism 1978-89. In C. Noelle-Karimi, C. Schetter, R. Schlagintweit (Ed.), *Afghanistan – A country without a state?* (pp. 77-85). Frankfurt am Main: IKO.
- Bresnahan, M., Ohashi, R., Nebashi, R., Liu, W., & Shearman, S. (2002). Attitudinal and affective response toward accented English. *Language & Communication*, 22(2), 171-185. doi:10.1016/S0271-5309(01)00025-8.

- Burgaski, R. (1990). The social basis of language conflict and language attitudes. In *Plurilingua: Language Attitudes and Language Conflict*, Peter Nelde (ed.), 41-47. Bonn: Dummler.
- Cargile, A. (2002). Speaker evaluation measures of language attitudes: Evidence of information-processing effects. *Language Awareness, 11*(3), 178-191. doi:10.1080/09658410208667055.
- Cargile, A. C., Takai, J., & Rodriguez, J. I. (2006). Attitudes toward African–American Vernacular English: A US export to Japan? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 27*(6), 443-456.
- Cargile, A., & Giles, H. (1997). Understanding language attitudes: Exploring listener affect and identity. *Language & Communication, 17*(3), 195.
- Cavallaro, F., & Chin, N. (2009). Between status and solidarity in Singapore. *World Englishes, 28*(2), 143-159. doi:10.1111/j.1467-971X.2009.01580.x.
- Codrington, K. de B. (1944). A geographical introduction to the history of Central Asia. *The Geographical Journal, 104*(3/4)73-91.
- DeStefano, J. (1971). Black attitudes toward Black English: A pilot study. *Florida Foreign Language Reporter: Journal of Language and Culture in Education, 9*23-27.
- Dorransoro, G. (2005). *Revolution unending, Afghanistan: 1979 to the Present*, (King, J, Trans.) London: C. Hurst & Co. Ltd. (Original work published 2000).
- Dorransoro, G. (2007). Kabul at war (1992-1996): State, ethnicity and social classes. *South Asia Multidisciplinary Academic Journal*. Retrieved May 25, 2009, from <http://samaj.revues.org/document212.html>.

- Dulling, G.K. (1973). *The Hazaragi dialect of Afghan Persian*, London: Central Asian Research Center.
- Edwards, J. (1995) *Multilingualism*. London: Penguin.
- Emadi, H. (1997). The Hazaras and their role in the process of political transformation in Afghanistan. *Central Asian Survey* 16(3), 363-387. doi: 10.1080/02634939708400997.
- Emadi, H. (2000). Breaking the shackles: Political participation of Hazara women in Afghanistan. *Asian Journal of Women Studies*, 6(1) 143-161.
- Emadi, H. (2002). Struggle for recognition: Hazara Isma'ili women and their role in the public arena in Afghanistan. *AJWS*, 8(2) 76-103.
- Emadi, H. (2008). Modernising one village in Afghanistan. *Contemporary Review*, 290(1689) 137-150.
- Ferdinand, K. (1959). *Preliminary notes on Hazara culture*, Denmark: Bianco Lunos Bogtrykkeri A-S.
- Ferdinand, K. (1965). Ethnographical notes on Chahar Aimak, Hazara, and Mongol. *Acta orientalia*, 28(3-4), 175-204.
- Garrett, P. (2001). Language attitudes and sociolinguistics. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 5(4), 630-631.
- Gayles, J., & Denerville, D. (2007). Counting language: An exercise in stigmatization. *Multicultural Education*, 15(1), 16-22.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Schmidt, K. L. (1987). Language and ethnic identity: An overview and prologue. *Journal of language and Social Psychology*, 6(3-4), 157-170. doi:10.1177/0261927X8763001.

- Hensley, A. (1972). Black high school students' reactions to black speakers of Standard and Black English. *Language Learning*, 22, 253-59.
- Hoare, R. (2001). Research notes: An integrative approach to language attitudes and identity in Brittany. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 5(1), 73-84.
- Hoover, M. (1978). Community Attitudes toward Black English. *Language in Society*, 7(1), 65-87.
- Human Rights Watch News Report on Massacres of Hazaras in Mazar-i Sharif. Retrieved July 10, 2009, from <http://www.hrw.org/en/news/1998/10/31/survivors-describe-taliban>.
- Human Rights Watch Massacre. (2001). *The massacre of Hazaras in Afghanistan*. Retrieved July 10, 2009, from <http://www.hrw.org/legacy/reports/2001/afghanistan/>.
- Ibrahimi, N. (2006). The failure of a clerical proto-state: Hazarajat, 1979-1984. London: Crisis States Research Centre Working Paper no. 6, London School of Economics.
- Ibrahimi, N. (2009). Divide and rule: State penetration in Hazarajat (Afghanistan) from the monarchy to the Taliban. London: Crisis States Research Centre Working Paper no. 42, London School of Economics. Retrieved July 14, 2009, from <http://www.crisisstates.com/download/wp/wpSeries2/WP42.pdf>
- Ivanov, W. (1926). Notes on the ethnography of Khurasan. *The Geographical Journal*, 67(2) 143-158. Retrieved May 28, 2009, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1783140>.

- Jeremiás, É. M. (1984). Diglossia in Persian. *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, Tomus 34*(3-4)271-287.
- Kakar, M. H. (2006). *A political and diplomatic history of Afghanistan 1863-1901*, The Netherlands: Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden.
- Komondouros, M., & McEntee-Atalianis, L. (2007). Language attitudes, shift and the ethnolinguistic vitality of the Greek Orthodox community in Istanbul. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development, 28*(5), 365-384. Retrieved September 26, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Ladegaard, H. (2000). Language attitudes and sociolinguistic behaviour: Exploring attitude-behaviour relations in language. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 4*(2), 214-233. Retrieved September 20, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.
- Lange, C., Kamalkhani, Z., & Loretta B. (2007). Afghan Hazara refugees in Australia: Constructing Australian citizens. *Social Identities, 13*(1) 31-50. doi: 10.1080/13504630601163353.
- Larson, M. (2008, June 17). Hazara people. *The National Geographic*. Retrieved from [http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/geopedia/Hazara\\_People](http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/geopedia/Hazara_People).
- Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2009). Language attitudes in interaction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 13*(2), 195-222. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9841.2009.00404.x.
- Linn, M. D., Piche, G. (1982). Black and white adolescent and preadolescent attitudes toward Black English. *Research in the Teaching of English, 16* (1), 53-69.
- Malistani, A. H. T. (1993). *Hazaragi – Dari/Farsi – English: a preliminary glossary*, Quetta: Sadiq Printing Press.

- Monsutti, A. (2004). Cooperation, remittances, and kinship among the Hazaras. *Iranian Studies*, 37(2) 219-240. doi: 10.1080/0021086042000268183.
- Monsutti, A. (2004). Hazaras ii. History. *Encyclopedia Iranica Online*. Retrieved July 26, 2009, from <http://www.iranica.com/newsite/>.
- Monsutti, A. (2005) *War and migration: Social networks and economic strategies of the Hazaras of Afghanistan*, (P. Camiller, Trans.) Routledge, New York, (Original work published 2004).
- Mousavi, S. A. (1998). *The Hazaras of Afghanistan: An historical, cultural, economic and political study*. UK: Curzon Press.
- Naby, E. (1988). Islam within the Afghan resistance. *Third World Quarterly*, 10(2) 787-805. Retrieved May 28, 2009, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3992667>.
- Rodriguez, J., Cargile, A. & Rich, M. (2004). Reactions to African-American Vernacular English: Do more phonological features matter? *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 28(3), 407-414.
- Sarabi, H. (2006). *Politics and modern history of Hazara sectarian politics in Afghanistan*. MA Thesis, Tufts University. Available online at: <http://fletcher.tufts/research/2006/Sarabi.pdf>
- Schetter, C. (2005). Ethnoscapes, national territorialization, and the Afghan war. *Geopolitics*, 10.
- Schurmann, H. F. (1961). *The Mongols of Afghanistan: An ethnography of the Moghols and related peoples of Afghanistan*, The Netherlands: Mouton & Co, Publishers.
- Shameem, N. (2004). Language attitudes in multilingual primary schools in Fiji. *Language, Culture & Curriculum*, 17(2), 154-172.

- Speicher, B., & McMahon, S. (1992). Some African-American perspectives on Black English Vernacular. *Language in Society*, 21(3), 383-407.  
doi:10.1017/S0047404500015499.
- The CIA World Fact Book. Retrieved July 3, 2009, from  
<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/AF.html>.
- The US State Department. (2001). *Afghanistan*. Retrieved July 2, 2009, from  
<http://www.state.gov/outofdate/bgn/a/10958.htm>.
- The US State Department. (2009). *Background note: Afghanistan*. Retrieved July 2, 2009, from <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/5380.htm>.
- Thesiger, W. (1955). The Hazaras of Central Afghanistan. *The Geographical Journal*, 121(3) 312-319.
- Thweatt, T. (2005). Attitudes towards new Americans in the local press: A critical discourse analysis. *North Dakota Journal of Speech & Theatre*, 18, 25-43.
- Travis, J. (2003). Genghis Khan's legacy? *Science News*, 163(6) 91.
- Wassink, A. B. (1999). Historic low prestige and seeds of change: Attitudes toward Jamaican Creole. *Language in Society*, 28, 57-92.
- Zabriskie, P. (2008, February). The outsiders. *National Geographic*, 114-135. Retrieved July 19, 2009, from <http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/2008/02/afghanistan-hazara/phil-zabriskie-text.html>.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

D# = Description Questions

A# = Attitude Questions

D1, A1. “How many languages are spoken in Afghanistan?” ..... “What would you call them?”

- i. (0 points) Dari, Pashto, Uzbeki, Baluchee or any combination of terms excluding reference to Hazaragi
- ii. (1 point) Hazaragi

D2. Is the difference between Dari and Farsi one of accent, vocabulary, grammar, or is it some other kind of difference? (used as distractor)

- i. no difference
- ii. accent
- iii. accent and vocabulary
- iv. accent, vocabulary, and grammar
- v. other (please explain)

D3. Is the difference between Hazaragi and Dari one of accent, vocabulary, grammar, or is it some other kind of difference?

- i. no difference
- ii. accent
- iii. accent and vocabulary
- iv. accent, vocabulary, and grammar
- v. other (please explain)

D4. Are you able to comfortably understand Hazaragi spoken in the provinces other than Kabul? If yes, can you also speak or imitate it?

- i. (1 point) yes
- ii. (0 point) no

D5. Do Hazaras from different parts of Afghanistan speak Hazaragi differently from each other?

- i. don't know
- ii. no
- iii. yes (please explain)

D6. Are there any people other than Hazaras who speak Hazaragi in Afghanistan?

- i. don't know
- ii. no
- iii. yes (please explain)

D7. Do Hazaras who were raised in Kabul speak differently from other Hazaras living elsewhere in Afghanistan?

- i. don't know
- ii. no
- iii. yes (please explain)

D8. Do Hazaras who have returned from Iran and Pakistan in the past seven years speak differently from other Hazaras living elsewhere in Afghanistan?

- i. don't know
- ii. no
- iii. yes (please explain)

A2. Can Hazaragi be used to form full sentences and whole conversations?

- i. (1 point) yes
- ii. (0 point) no

A3. Can someone say anything in Hazaragi which could be said in Dari? Can someone say anything in Dari which could be said in Hazaragi?

- i. (1 point) yes
- ii. (0 point) no

D9. Can someone who only speaks Hazaragi, understand Dari?

- i. yes
- ii. no

D10. Can someone who only speaks Dari, understand Hazaragi?

- i. yes
- ii. no

D11. Is Hazaragi used in school?

- i. yes
- ii. no

D12. Is Hazaragi used by the non-printed media (TV, radio)?

- i. yes
- ii. no

D13. Is Hazaragi used by the printed media (newspapers, magazines)?

- i. yes
- ii. no

D14. Are there any books in Hazaragi that you know of?

- i. yes
- ii. no

A4. Have you ever read anything in Hazaragi?

- i. (1 point) yes
- ii. (0 point) no

A5. Hazaragi cannot be used in print, and even if it is used, it will not make sense.

- i. (1 point) false
- ii. (0 point) true

A6. Do you use Hazaragi at home?

- i. (1 point) yes
- ii. (0 point) no

A7. Do you want your children to understand Hazaragi?

- i. (1 point) yes
- ii. (0 point) no

A8. Do you want your children to speak Hazaragi?

- i. (1 point) yes
- ii. (0 point) no

A9. Is it valuable to know and speak Hazaragi? By that, I mean, is Hazaragi important in Afghanistan?

- i. (1 point) yes
- ii. (0 point) no

A10. Would you prefer that Hazaras spoke

- i. (3 points) just Hazaragi
- ii. (2 points) Both Hazaragi and Dari
- iii. (1 point) mostly Dari, but some Hazaragi is OK
- iv. (0 point) just Dari

D15. Are there any members of your family more likely to use Hazaragi than others?

- i. Do older people use more? If yes, at what times, with whom?
- ii. Do younger people use more? If yes, at what times, with whom?
- iii. Do you use it more with older/younger family members? If yes, at what times?

D16. Of the following groups, circle, all that you think never uses Hazaragi?

- i. older people?
- ii. younger people?
- iii. rich people?
- iv. poor people?
- v. people with much schooling?
- vi. people with little schooling?
- vii. men
- viii. women?
- ix. the returnees (people who have lived a few years abroad, and now are back in Afghanistan)
- x. other? Please explain...

A11. Does use of Hazaragi suggest anything to you about a person's character? In other words, what kind of person uses Hazaragi?

- i. (2 points) use of Hazaragi suggests positive things to me about a person's character
- ii. (1 point) suggests nothing
- iii. (0 point) use of Hazaragi suggests negative things to me about a person's character

I've noticed that people seem to use Hazaragi sometimes and Dari other times. In fact, I was raised to believe that there are right and wrong places to use it. When would you use Hazaragi?

Would you use it to...

A12... describe a news or sports event to a Hazara friend? (no – 0, yes – 1)

A13... describe a news or sports event to a non-Hazara friend? (no – 0, yes – 1)

A14... write a letter to a relative? (no – 0, yes – 1)

A15... teach a class of teenagers? (no – 0, yes – 1)

A16... address a supervisor? (no – 0, yes – 1)

A17... answer the telephone? (no – 0, yes – 1)

A18... write an article for the daily newspaper? (no – 0, yes – 1)

A19... conduct a job interview? (no – 0, yes – 1)

Would you consider it appropriate if ... in Hazaragi?

A20... a friend recounted the lively parts of a TV serial to you? (no – 0, yes – 1)

A21... someone who is not Hazara ask you for directions? (no – 0, yes – 1)

A22... a lecturer in university lectured in Hazaragi to a class on which both Hazara and non-Hazaras were studying? (no – 0, yes – 1)

A23... Hazara newscasters speak Hazaragi on TV/radio to an audience of mixed, both Hazaras and non-Hazaras? (no – 0, yes – 1)

A24.

- a. Are there places where you are likely to use it?..... (yes – 1)
- b. To avoid using it? ..... (no – 0)

D17.

- a. What situations you would speak in Hazaragi? Please list them.
- b. What places you would not speak in Hazaragi? Please list them.

The instrument is adapted from Wassink, A. B. (1999). Historic low prestige and seeds of change: Attitudes toward Jamaican Creole. *Language in Society*, 28, 57-92