Domain Analysis and Language Use:
An Investigation of Kermani Zoroastrian Community Language

Farshid Najar Homayounfar[1], Masoud Sharififar[2] iD

[1]*Corresponding author*, Instructor, Department of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Shahid Bahobar University of Kerman, Kerman, Iran, Email: farshid_nhomayounfar@uk.ac.ir

[2]Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Shahid Bahonar University of Kerman, Kerman, Iran, Email: m.sharifi@uk.ac.ir

Abstract

This paper discusses the use of Persian in comparison with Dari, a dialect of Persian language used in Kerman, one of the cities of Kerman Province located in southeast Iran. It is based on a random selection of 47 subjects from different sex, age, and occupational groups of Zoroastrian people with different levels of education in seven domains, i.e. family, friendship, neighborhood, transaction, education, government, and employment. In this study, the subjects were asked to determine which language they use in different domains on Likert's 4-point scale. After collecting the data by the use of a questionnaire with 30 situations in the seven domains and analyzing them, the researcher concluded that there is a Persian-Dari diglossia in Zoroastrian speech community in which Dari functions as the Low language whereas Persian is the High one. As a matter of fact, Dari has been restricted to family domain and the young generation has lost it to a large extent.

Keywords: diaglossia, Zoroastrian, Dari, Persian

1. Introduction

The role of language in society has attracted the attention of many investigators such as linguists, anthropologists, and sociologists for many decades. They consider language as a social factor not independent of society. Wardhaugh (1986), for instance, has defined language as "what the members of a particular society speak" (p. 1). According to him, language may have different forms and functions in society. Sometimes, it is difficult to describe it because the knowledge that people have of the language they speak is much more than their grammatical knowledge of that language. This knowledge is what everyone who speaks a language possesses and also some kind of shared knowledge that enables speakers of that language to understand sentences they have never heard before.

Sociologists have also defined the sociology of language as a speech community. It was redefined not as a community that shares the same language but a group of people who communicate with each other by using one language or several languages (Stern, 1991). In many speech communities, two different dialects may have different functions in the same language. One dialect, for instance, may be used for educational or official purposes whereas the other may be used in more formal situations (Stern, 1991). It can be said that languages or dialects are not usually spoken exactly in the same way. Sometimes, one dialect or language may be more dominant than another. In Longman Dictionary, it is described as follows:

For a country or region where more than one language or dialect is used, this means that one of them is more important than the other(s). A language may become the dominant language because it has more prestige (higher STATUS) in the country, is favored by the government, and /or has the largest number of speakers (p.201). There are also communities in which a language is spoken by most people whereas another language is used only by a small part of the population. Such kind of situations like Zoroastrians speaking Dari exist in Kerman.

The present study is, in fact, an attempt to investigate the language use of Zoroastrian people in this city. Less than 1500 Zoroastrian families live in Kerman. Some of these families still speak Dari dialect in different domains such as family gatherings, and try to maintain it as their ethnic language (Boroumand Saeed, 1984). The young generation of the Zoroastrian community, however, has lost this language to a great extent. Other inhabitants of Kerman are mostly Muslim and speak Persian. Persian as the national language is dominant and used in all domains. Dari, on the other hand, as the language of a minority group has been restricted to the family domain. Consequently, Zorastrians have gradually become less proficient in it. Dari, however, has been maintained well in Yazd. Such language maintenance may be due to the greater number of Zoroastrian people living in this city or it may be related to the fact that they highly value it as their ethnic language (Boroumand Saeed, 1984).

The objective of this study is to discover which language-Dari or Persian-is mostly used in which social domains among Zoroastrians. Language choice in different domains can be influenced

by age, level of education, sex, and so on. This study is based on the hypothesis that Zoroastrian speakers use Dari in informal domains such as family domain or friendship groups and use Persian in more formal domains like governmental sectors or educational domains. Such research may be significant as a source of data for those who want to investigate the importance of this language and are interested in doing some research on cultural and historical values.

2. Literature Review

According to Holmes (2001), sociologists' interest lies in the study of the relationship between language and society. In other words, they want to know why people speak differently in different social contexts. As a matter of fact, a language exists in a number of varieties. Yule (1985) has argued that every language has more than one variety. This variation in speech is an important aspect of speakers' daily life in different regional and social communities. In fact, different situations, interests, or social roles demand different uses of language. Different concepts such as register, style, and domain are used to show such functional variants within one language (Stern, 1991).

A variety may be greater than a single language. Hudson (1980) believed that language, dialect, and register can be widely considered as different types of language variety. He culturally made a distinction between language and dialect. According to him, a language is larger and more prestigious. It is larger because it contains more items than a dialect. In the case of Dari, it can be said that it contains different dialects. In Yazd, for instance, Dari, as shown in Tables 1 and 2, is spoken with different pronunciations in different regions. Such variations, however, do not exist in Kerman. The dialect used in this city is somehow different from those spoken in Yazd.

On the other hand, Stward (as brought in Stem, 1991) has distinguished one language from another by listing four socio-historical attributes, i.e., Historicity, Standardization, Validity, and Homogeneity.

In terms of two languages, i.e., Persian and Dari, historicity cannot make a distinction between them because the two languages do not have an independent history. One way to see the relationship between them is by looking at the original form of their words. Considering the following examples, one can see that there are some common features between Dari and Persian:

Old Persian (Achaemenian)	Middle Persian	Modern Persian
radiy [rædɪ]	rad [ræd]	ray [ræj]

So it can be said that Dari is the changed form of Old Persian (Achaemenian) and has much more in common with Middle Persian (Sassanian) than New Persian.

2.1. Domain

Fishman (brought by Platt 1977) defined domain as "classes of situations for more precisely classes of congruent situations, i.e., situations in which individuals interact in appropriate role relationships with each other, in appropriate locales for these role relationships and discuss topics appropriate to their role relationships." (p.368)

According to Platt (1977), in most communities, certain domains such as family, friendship, etc. are related to the most common social relationships. These domains can be ranged from more public to more private or in other words, from the most informal to the most formal situations.

Likewise, Parasher (1980) in his study of domain analysis considered 350 educated people between the age of 25 to 45. He determined peoples' language use in seven domains, i.e., Family, Friendship, Neighborhood, Transaction, Education, Government, and Employment. To collect data, he first used the observation technique; then, he tried to check the validity of data through questionnaires administrated after the interviews. The subjects were asked to say which language or languages they used in each of those seven situations. The domains ranged from informal to formal situations. Parasher (ibid) concluded that most subjects used their mother tongue in the family domain.

Domain analysis is, on the other hand, associated with diglossia, i.e., in a diglossic community, the lower variety is the one being used at home and the higher one is the language used in formal situations (Parasher, 1980).

2.2. Diglossia

Holmes (2001) has defined diglossia in both a narrow sense and a much broader sense. In its narrow sense, it has three important criteria: (1) using two distinct varieties of the same language in the community by regarding one as a high variety and another as the low one, (2) using each variety for quite distinct functions, and (3) not using H variety in everyday conversations. He stated that in an Arabic-speaking diglossic community, for instance, the language used in mosques, universities, or schools is standard Arabic, a variety quite different from the local or low variety. Diglossia in its broader sense is generalized to situations where two languages are used for different functions in a community.

In terms of different functions of H and L varieties, Ferguson (mentioned by Wardhaugh, 1986) stated that each variety is used in different situations, i.e., one cannot use an H variety in conditions appropriate for the use of L variety, e.g. for addressing a servant, one cannot use an H variety whereas for writing a serious work of literature, a high variety is more appropriate. He also defined 4 situations of Arabic, Swiss German, Haitian, and Greek to show the major characteristics of the diglossic phenomenon. All these languages contain a high and a low variety. In Haiti, for

instance, there is a standard French (H) variety and a Haitian Creole (L) variety. So, he concluded that diglossia is not ephemeral but a constant social and linguistic phenomenon.

On the other hand, comparing diglossia with bilingualism, Fishman as stated by Platt (1977) defined diglossia as a characteristic of speech communities and bilingualism as the characteristic of individuals. He demonstrated these concepts in a matrix in order to show the possibilities existing in a speech community:

(1)Both Diglossia & Bilingualism

(2)Bilingualism without Diglossia

(3)Diglossia without Bilingualism

(4)Neither Bilingualism Nor Diglossia

In the case of Dari, and Persian, Dari can be considered as the L variety used in informal situations whereas Persian an H variety appropriate in more formal domains in Zoroastrian speech communities.

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

The sample for this investigation comprised 47 participants randomly selected from the Zoroastrian community with different occupations, ages, and sex (24 male and 23 female, aged between 11 and 40). They were defined in terms of manageable variables of age, sex, and level of education, i.e., they were selected from four age groups: under 11, 11-19, and over 40 years old and they were ranged along an educational scale of five levels: no education at all, primary, guidance, high school, and college education. There was actually no access to participants under 11 years old as well as participants with no education. As a whole, participants can be categorized into three groups:

1. Subjects of 11-19 years old with primary, guidance, and high school education. Only one subject had a college education in this group.
2. Subjects of 20-39 years old with guidance, high school, and college education.
3. Subjects over 40 years old with primary, high school, and college education.

3.2. Materials

Data were collected through a questionnaire consisting of 30 situations representing seven domains, i.e., Family, Friendship, Neighborhood, Transaction, Education, Government & Employment domain. The domains ranged from informal to formal situations. Questions 1-6 were related to the family domain; 7-11 to the friendship domain; 12-14 to the neighborhood domain; 15-19 to the transaction domain; 20-23 to the education domain; and 24-30 to government & employment domains. Each question (situation) had two alternatives: Dari & Persian and each

alternative consisted of four levels of frequency as Always, Often, Sometimes & Never to indicate the frequency of the selection of each of the two languages in a given domain by participants.

3.3. Data Collection Procedure

The subjects were presented with a questionnaire containing 30 situations and were asked to determine the languages they actually used in different situations. Domains ranged from informal to formal in the questionnaire. A 4-point scale was used to rate the subjects' responses, i.e., 4= Always, 3=Often, 2=Sometimes, and 0=Never. Then, the scores were put together to see how often each language was used in each domain. Some Zoroastrian respondents were also interviewed for the collection of more information about their language use.

3.4. Results

Three Tables are designed in terms of age, sex, and level of education. In Table 1, the four age levels are horizontally ranged from under 11 to over 40 years old along one side and the seven domains on the other side. A similar table, Table 2, is designed for the level of education, but instead of the age levels, it comprises the range of five levels of education. In Table 3, the two sexes are presented on one side and seven domains on the other side. The scores of all situations included in each domain are put together and then they are inserted in the three Tables. If the total score of the language is larger than that of another reported in a domain, that language is considered dominant. Therefore, it can be said that the total score of Dari is higher than that of Persian and consequently, it is dominant in the family domain. The data are presented in the following Tables:

Table 1

Age

Age Dom	Persian				Dari			
	Under 11	11-19	20-39	Over 40	Under 11	11-19	20-39	Over 40
Family	24 23	18	9	14 20	0	21	24	24 17
	16 16	20	20	20 3	4	3	0	24 2
	13	24	24	24 16	13	0	21	2 17
	16	24	3	7 3	4	0	20	0 21
	24	24	24	20 0	0	0	24	14 24
	24	0	16	23 0	0	20	20	24 24
	4	20	13	15 16	4	3	0	3 24
	11	4	0		4	16	20	2 16
	23					24	24	
						10	24	
Total	194	243		181	29	274		238

Domain										
Friendship	20	15	4	9	15	0	13	9	15	2
	20	20	18	12	12	0	0	0	16	10
	19	20	20	16	16	4	0	4	2	17
	20	16	14	20	3	0	0	7	0	20
	20	20	9	7	15	0	0	7	9	16
	20	16	9	4	3	0	2	0	16	11
	12	20	20	20	4	5	0	0	0	14
	15	6	20		15	2	12	13	2	
	17	6	16			0	12	17	15	
	20	14				0	16	19		
	20					0				
Total	203	297		171		11	131		165	
Neighborhood	12	12	12	5	11	0	3	3	6	3
	12	12	12	16	10	0	0	0	4	3
	12	12	12	12	12	0	0	0	0	0
	10	12	12	12	8	0	0	0	0	4
	12	12	12	4	8	0	0	4	5	6
	11	12	3	12	12	0	0	0	0	4
	5	12	12	12	12	0	0.	0	0	0
	11	6	12	12	12	4	3	3	0	0
	12	11	12			0	4	4		
	12		12			0	0	4		
	12					0				
Total	121	224		170		4	28		35	
Transaction	20	20	20	20	20	0	7	5	0	5
	20	20	20	19	20	0	0	0	5	0
	20	20	20	17	20	0	0	0	8	0
	20	20	20	20	20	0	0	0	0	7
	20	20	20	20	20	0	0	0	0	7
	20	20	19	16	14	0	0	0	2	2
	20	20	20	20	20	0	0	0	0	5
	20	11	20	20		0	3	5	0	6
	20	20	20			0	5	12		
	20		19			0	0	0		
	20		20			0				
Total	220	481		310		0	37		47	
Education	16	16	16	16	16	0	0	5	2	4
	16	16	16	16	12		0	4	4	0
	16	16	16	12	16		0	0	0	0
	16	16	16	16	16		0	0	0	6
	16	16	16	16	12		0	3	0	0
	16	16	15	16	0		0	0	0	0
	16	16	16	16	16		0	0	0	0
	16	16	16	16	0		0	0	0	0
	16	16	16				0	4		
	16		16				0	0		
	16						0			
Total	176	303		212		0	12		16	
Government	20	20	20	19	20	0	0	5	2	5
	12	20	20	19	20		0	0	2	0
	20	20	20	20	20		0	0	0	0
	16	20	20	20	8		0	6	0	3
	20	20	19	20	8		0	0	0	2
	20	20	19	20	0		0	0	0	0
	16	11	20	20	20		0	0	0	0
	9	4	20	20			0	5	0	0
	15	0	20				0	0		
	3		20				2	2		
	0									
Total	151	333		254		0	20		14	

Employment	8		8	8	0	3	0	2	2
	8		8	8		0	2	1	0
	8		8	8		0	0	0	0
	8		8	8		0	0	0	2
	8		8	4		0	0	0	4
	8		8	0		0	3	0	4
	7		8	4	4	0	0	0	1
	7					0	2		
	4				1	0			
	4								
Total	78		147	112	0	15	16		

Table 2

Education

Educ / Dom	Persian							Dari					
	Illiterate	Primary	Guidance	High school		College		Illiterate	Primary	Guidance	High school	College	
Family		3	9	23	16	0	24	24	24	24	4	24	0
		0	24	15	3	14	24	24	6	17	17	24	0
		0	24	0	16	20	24	24	0	20	21	2	0
		16	13	20	0	24	20	16	24	3	20	0	2
		23	0	4	24	0	0	0	24	16	0	24	24
		16		24	16	20	20	0		0	20	3	10
				16	11	7	24			4	4	14	0
				13	23	18	3			3	6	21	21
						20	0					3	20
												0	24
													4
Total		58	70	224		262		88	78	167		222	
Friendship		0	6	15	3	9	20	20	12	2	0	15	0
		3	20	12	15	12	20	16	0	15	10	16	0
		4	20	16	20	16	16	11	0	2	17	2	2
		15	14	20	20	20	20	14	17	0	0	0	16
		20	7	6	16	7	16	0	19	12	0	9	9
		20		20	15	4	4	0		0	13	16	0
				20	17	20	18			0	2	0	4
				19		15	20			4	0	13	7
				20		9	14					0	7
							9					0	5
Total		62	67	254		276		61	48	77		121	
Neighborhood		8	11	12	12	5	12	6	4	0	2	6	0
		12	12	11	8	16	12	4	0	3	0	4	0
		12	11	12	12	12	12	0	0	0	4	0	3
		12	12	12	12	12	12	0	4	0	0	0	0
		12	12	6	12	4	10	0	4	3	0	5	3
		12		12	11	12	12	0		0	3	0	0
				12	12	12	12			0	0	0	0
				12		12	12			0	0	3	0
						3	12					0	4
							12					0	4
Total		68	58	178		211		10	12	15		32	

Transaction	20	20	20	20	20	20	7	5	0	0	0	0
	14	20	19	20	19	20	2	0	5	0	5	0
	20	20	20	20	17	20	0	0	0	7	8	0
	20	19	20	20	20	20	0	12	0	0	0	0
	20	20	11	20	20	20	0	0	3	0	0	5
	20		20	20	16	20	0		0	5	2	0
			20	20	20	20			0	0	0	0
			20		20	20			0	0	7	0
			20		20	20					0	0
					19	20					0	0
Total	114	99	310		391		9	17	20		19	
Education	12	16	16	16	16	16	0	5	0	0	2	0
	0	16	16	16	16	16	0	0	4	0	4	0
	16	16	16	16	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	16	16	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0
	16	16	16	16	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	4
	16		16	16	16	16	0		0	0	0	0
			16	16	16	16			0	0	0	0
			16	16	16	15			0	0	4	3
					16	16			0		0	0
						16					0	0
Total	60	64	256		311		0	5	4		22	
Government	8	4	20	16	19	20	2	2	0	0	2	0
	0	0	20	20	19	20	0	0	0	0	2	0
	20	20	20	8	20	20	0	0	0	3	0	0
	0	0	20	20	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
	15	20	11	20	20	20	0	2	3	0	0	5
	3		20	20	20	20	0		0	0	0	0
			12	16	20	20			0	2	0	0
			20	9	0	19			0	3	0	6
					20	20					0	0
					20	20					0	0
Total	46	44	272		514		2	4	11		15	
Employment	4	4	8	8	8	8	0	6	0	0	2	0
	0	8	8	8	8	8	0	0	2	2	1	0
	8	8	8	8	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
	4	4	8	8	8	8	0	1	0	0	0	0
	4	8	4	8	8	8	0	0	4	2	0	2
	4		8	8	8	8	0		0	0	0	0
			8	7	8	8			0	0	0	0
			8	7	8	7			0	0	3	0
					8	8					0	3
					8						0	0
Total	24	32	122		159		0	7	10		11	

Table 3

Gender

Dom Lang.	Male							Female						
	Family	Friendship	Neighborhood	Transaction	Education	Government	Employment	Family	Friendship	Neighborhood	Transaction	Education	Government	Employment
Persian	0	9	5	20	16	19	8	20	16	10	20	12	20	8
	14	12	16	19	16	19	8	3	3	12	20	16	20	8
	20	16	12	17	12	20	8	16	15	8	20	16	8	8
	24	29	12	20	16	20	8	3	0	8	20	12	8	4
	0	7	9	20	16	20	8	0	3	12	14	0	0	0
	20	4	12	16	16	20	8	0	4	12	20	16	20	8
	7	20	12	20	16	20	8	16	15	12	20	0	0	4
	23	15	12	20	16	20	8	0	4	12	20	16	20	8
	15	12	11	19	16	20	8	20	18	12	20	16	20	8
	13	15	12	20	16	0	8	24	20	12	20	16	20	8
	20	20	12	20	16	20	8	0	14	12	20	16	20	8

24	20	12	20	16	20	8	3	9	12	20	15	19	8
24	16	12	20	16	20	8	0	9	3	19	16	19	7
24	20	12	20	16	20	8	0	20	12	20	16	20	8
0	16	12	20	16	20	8	24	20	12	20	16	20	8
20	20	12	20	16	20	8	16	16	12	20	16	20	8
4	6	6	11	16	11	8	13	14	12	19	0	0	4
4	6	11	20	16	4	8	0	7	12	20	16	20	8
24	20	12	20	16	20	4	4	12	5	20	16	20	8
16	20	12	20	16	12	4	11	15	11	20	16	16	7
13	19	12	20	16	20		23	17	12	20	16	9	7
16	20	10	20	16	16		23	20	12	20	16	15	4
24	20	12	20	16	0		16	20	12	20	16	3	4
24	20	11	20	16	20								
				16									
Total 383	373	266	462	380	401	136	235	291	249	452	311	337	153

Dari

24	15	6	0	2	2	2	2	2	3	0	0	0	0
24	16	4	5	4	2	1	17	10	0	0	0	0	0
2	2	0	8	0	0	0	21	17	4	7	6	3	2
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	20	6	7	0	2	4
24	9	5	0	0	0	0	24	16	4	2	0	0	4
3	16	0	2	0	0	0	24	11	0	5	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	14	0	6	0	0	1
0	2	0	0	0	0	0	24	16	0	0	0	0	0
21	15	3	5	4	5	2	10	9	3	5	4	5	2
3	13	3	7	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	4	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	7	0	0	3	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	7	4	0	0	0	3
20	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	13	3	5	4	0	2
24	12	3	3	3	3	4	24	17	4	12	0	0	0
0	12	4	5	2	2	0	24	19	4	0	0	2	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	0	0	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0		4	2	0	0	0	2	0
4	4	0	0	0	0		6	0	0	0	0	3	0
6	0	2	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0									
					0								
Total 205	118	30	35	15	14	12	329	189	39	49	17	17	18

According to the above Tables, we can specify which language has been mostly chosen in each domain. The total scores of each language in each domain can be summarized as follow:

"Age Group"

		11-19	20-39	over 40
Family domain	Persian	194	243	181
	Dari	29	274	238
Freindship domain	Persian	203	297	171
	Dari	11	131	165
Neigbourhood domain	Persian	121	224	170
	Dari	4	28	35
Transaction domain	Persian	220	481	310
	Dari	0	37	47
Education domain	Persian	176	303	212
	Dari	0	12	16
Government domain	Persian	151	333	254
	Dari	0	20	14
Employment domain	Persian	78	147	112
	Dari	0	15	16

"Education Levels"

		Primary	Guidance	High school	College
Family domain	Persian	58	70	224	262
	Dari	88	78	164	222
Freindship domain	Persian	62	67	254	276
	Dari	61	48	77	121
Neigbourhood domain	Persian	68	58	178	211
	Dari	10	12	15	32
Transaction domain	Persian	114	99	310	391
	Dari	9	17	20	19
Education domain	Persian	60	64	256	311
	Dari	0	5	4	22
Government domain	Persian	46	44	272	514
	Dari	2	4	11	15
Employment domain	Persian	24	32	122	159
	Dari	0	7	10	11

"Gender"

Family Domain	Persian	Male	383
		Female	235
	Dari	Male	205
		Female	205
Friendship Domain	Persian	Male	373
		Female	291
	Dari	Male	118
		Female	189
Neigbourhood Domain	Persian	Male	266
		Female	249
	Dari	Male	30
		Female	39
Transaction Domain	Persian	Male	462
		Female	452
	Dari	Male	35
		Female	49
Education Domain	Persian	Male	380
		Female	311
	Dari	Male	15
		Female	17
Government Domain	Persian	Male	401
		Female	337
	Dari	Male	14
		Female	17
Employment Domain	Persian	Male	136
		Female	153
	Dari	Male	12
		Female	18

These Tables also provide us with useful pieces of information to see if the four independent variables, namely, age, level of education, gender, and seven social domains have any influence on the total scores of Dari and Persian.

4. Discussion

After analyzing the data and having all the necessary information, one can see that Dari is the dominant language in the family domain. This result is in agreement with our earlier hypothesis,

that is, Dari is used in informal domains such as family or friendship domains and Persian in more formal domains. As a matter of fact, using Dari in formal domains depends on whether or not the person to whom they are talking speaks Dari.

In terms of the influence of age as an independent variable on the choice of language in different domains, the amount of using Dari by subjects varies from the greatest use of this language by over 40-year-old subjects and the least use of it by subjects in the range of 11-19 years old. So, the latter uses Dari only in interactions with grandparents and Persian in almost all domains. Subjects in the range of 20-39 years old use Persian when speaking with their children in all domains and speak Dari while interacting with their parents and sometimes with their spouses. Therefore, only over 40-year-old subjects have maintained this language very well. So, it can be concluded that age has a great influence on the choice of language.

Comparing the total scores of Dari and that of Persian across the level of education shows that Dari is used more by subjects with a college education. It is because the age of subjects with a college education is mostly in the range of 20-39 and over 40-year old, whereas subjects in other levels of education were 11-19 years old and as it was cited before, 40-year-old subjects have maintained this language very well.

With regard to gender, there is a clear difference between males and females in the choice of language in a given domain. Women have maintained this language better than men. An interesting finding in connection with these two sexes is the fact that women use Dari when interacting with other women whereas they prefer to use Persian when speaking with men. Comparing the scores of males and females in Table 5 shows that women have maintained this language better than men.

4.1. Family Domain

Parasher (1980) thought of this domain as the most important one in bilingual societies and considered the mother tongue as the most dominant language in this domain. Dari is also dominant in the family domain but the amount of using it by subjects varies within different situations. The interaction with grandparents is the greatest among the other situations such as interacting with brothers or sisters. Children speak Persian with their parents, sisters, and brothers in all cases. Only old members of a family still use Dari in all situations at home even while speaking with the youngest members of the family.

4.2. Friendship Domain

As data analysis shows, Dari is used in limited cases in this domain and is actually restricted to adult interactions. If we consider formality and informality, the friendship domain will be more formal than the family domain, and consequently Persian would be dominant in the friendship

domain. Besides, the use of Dari in this domain depends on whether the interlocutors speak this language or not.

4.3. Neighborhood Domain

In this domain, Persian was found to be more dominant. The neighborhood domain is not very different from the friendship domain. Adults use Dari when interacting with their neighbors and again the important factor governing the subjects' language choice is whether or not the person to whom they are talking speaks Dari. However, this domain is more formal than friendship and Persian is the dominant language.

4.4. Transaction Domain

The findings show that Persian is dominant in this domain too. Different situations such as bargaining at shops, ordering food at a restaurant, and talking to the doctor are involved in the transaction domain in which the language choice is based on both the location of interaction and interlocutors.

4.5. Education, Government, and Employment Domains

In all these three domains, Persian is dominant. As a matter of fact, the dominance of Dari decreases as formality increases. In the case of Dari, it cannot be said which domain is more formal. As data analysis shows the difference among them is not significant, i.e., the difference is not large enough to conclude which domain, i.e., Education, Government, and Employment, is more formal. Government domain, however, can be considered the most formal one among the seven social domains.

5. Conclusion

Based on the results investigated in this study, one can conclude that the Zoroastrian speech community is a diglossic one in Kerman in which Persian functions as the high variety and Dari as the low variety. Besides, considering the scale of formality and informality, one can see that Dari is used in informal domains whereas Persian is employed in more formal domains. In the case of Dari, the most informal domain is the domain of family and the most formal one is the government domain.

As a matter of fact, there is a trend among Zoroastrian people towards the use of Persian. It may be due to the existence of similarities between the two languages. A great number of Persian words are used in Dari with somehow the same pronunciation. However, Persian is now widely used in the Zoroastrian community in Kerman and Zoroastrian people as the speakers of this language have lost their proficiency in it. In Yazd, however, Zoroastrian people have maintained this language very well. So, a research that can be suggested to be done is a study that investigates the language use of the Zoroastrian community in this city.

References

Boroumand Saeed, J. (1984). *Lexical changes in Persian Language*. Toos Publication.

Fromkin, V. (2007). *An introduction to language* (8th ed.). Thomson Higher Education.

Holmes, J. (2001). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Longman.

Hudson, R. A. (1980). *Sociolinguistics. Cambridge* University Press.

Parasher, S. V. (1980). Mother tongue-English diglossia: A case study of educated Indian bilinguals' language use. *Anthropological Linguistics, 22*(4), 151-68.

Platt, J. T. (1977). A model for polyglossia and multilingualism (with special reference to Singapore and Malaysia). *Language in Society, 6*(3), 361-78.

Radford, A. (2009).*Linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics* (2nd ed.). Longman Group.

Stern, H. H. (1991). *Fundamental concepts of language teachin*g (7th Ed.). Oxford University Press.

Wardhaugh, R. (1986). *An introduction to eociolinguistics*. Basil Blackwell, Inc.

Yule, G. (1985). *The study of language*. Cambridge University Press.