A SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDY ON MULTILINGUALISM: A DOMAIN ANALYSIS PERSPECTIVE

Javid Fereidoni

Language Department
Faculty of Medicine, Urmia Medical Science University, Urmia, Iran

1. INTRODUCTION

Language as a social and cultural phenomenon cannot be studied without the social context in which communication takes place. The way society members choose varieties of a language or switch toward another code can determine the influence of social factors on language choice.

> Under society one may be concerned with dyadic encounters, small group interaction, large group functioning, the articulation of social classes and sectors, contacts and contrast between entire nations, etc. Furthermore, each of these social groupings may be examined with respect to heterogeneity of composition, permeability of group barriers, status-role pattern, context of interaction, norm-restrictiveness and stability. (Fishman, 1968:5)

Language serves as an appropriate medium of interaction for society and society is a matrix in which the language is emerged so they have very close relationships. The terms bilingualism, diaglossia, polyglossia, language shift, language choice can indicate that in certain conditions different varieties of language are used .

Iran as a multilingual society is a suitable community in which the different varieties of language are used to serve different functions.West Azarbayjan, one of the Iranian provinces, is a good representative of multilingualism in Iran. In the following sections, the characteristics of this province in which the present study is carried out are presented.

This study was carried out in Azarbayjan-e Qharbi. It borders Iraq and Turky on the west, northwest and Azarbayjan Republic (former USSR) on the north. The population consists mainly of Turks, together with Kurds and Armenians. The Kurds are few in number and inhabit the area from the Aras River on the North to near Khoy on the South. the Armenians are thinly scattered in the northern west. Most of the population are Shi'ite Muslims. Orumiyeh is the center of the province. Three languages are spoken in Orumiyeh. As mentioned earlier, three ethnic and linguistic populations (Armenians, Kurds, and Turks) are living in the city who speak Armenian, Kurdish, and Turksih respectively. "Armenians have had a prolonged relationship with Iranians from the age of first immigration of Aryans to Iran. Nowadays, Armenian language is full of Ashkany and Pahlavi terms" (Rajabnia, 1978/1357:3).

Armenian language which forms a separate branch of the western group of Indo-European languages, is the mother tongue of Turkish Armenians and of the Armenians. The New Encyclopedia Britanica (1996:683) declares that "Armenian immigrants and refugees have taken their language with them all over Asia minor and the Middle East and from there to many European countries. Armenian is probably spoken by about 5500000 people". Nowadays, 8451 Armenians are living in Urban areas of Orumiyeh.

2. DISCUSSION

A total sample of 408 subjects participated in this study. The basis of sampling was stratified random selection, i.e., three groups of different ethnicities were chosen randomly. Each ethnic group consisted of 136 subjects with some subgroups. The criteria for selecting the subgroups were as follows:
1) **Five Age Groups:** These subgroups comprised children (under 10), youngsters (11 to 16), the young (17 to 25), middle age (26 to 65), and the old (over 65). The basis of the above age classification was the 1370 population report published by the census center of Azarbayjan-e Gharbi.

2) **Five Educational Groups:** These subgroups comprised illiterate individuals, primary school, guidance school. high school, and university groups. The basis of this educational classification was the educational levels applied by the Ministry of Education in Iran.
3) **Two sex groups:** These were the male and female subgroups.
The following tables present the frequency of subjects for each age, sex, and educational levels in each sample.

Table 1. The frequency and percentage of subjects according to their age, level of educartion, and sex in Armenian sample.

Age	Freq.	%	Educ.	Freq.	%	Sex	Freq.	%
-10	14	10.3	Illitrate	20	14.7	Male	73	53.7
11-16	15	11.0	Primary	48	35.3	Female	63	46.3
17-25	20	14.7	Guidanc e	23	16.9			
26-65	68	50.0	High Sch.	33	24.3			
65-	19	14.0	Universit y	12	8.8			

A questionnaire based on Parasher's model with some cultural adjustments and additions was used in this study. It consisted of 42 questions, 6 questions for each of seven domains equally. Domains are taken to be constellations of factors such as location, topic, and participants. Topic refers to the subject one is talking about. Location refers to the place where the speaker talks, and participant refers to the persons to whom one is talking.

The questions were ranged from informal to formal as the domains were ranged in the same way. Questions 1 to 6, 7 to 12, 13 to 18, 19 to 24, 25 to 30, 31 to 36, and 37 to 42 pertained to the domains of family, religion, friendship, neighborhood, transaction, education, and government and employment respectively.

The population structure of Orumiyeh consists of three ethnic and linguistic groups: Turks, Kurds, and Armenians. The Armenian questionnaire had three choices: 1) Persian, 2) Turkish, and 3) Armenian. Each choice had four frequencies to be ticked by the subjects: (a) always, (b) often (c) sometimes, and (d) never to show the frequency use of the code.

The subjects were selected on the basis of stratified matrix. An attempt was made to have the same conditions for all subjects, so the questions were read by the field-workers for illiterate people and recorded their answers on the questionnaire. Consequently the raw data obtained from all the subjects show the real frequency use of the languages.

The data of this study were originally 150 questionnaires for each ethnic and linguistic sample. However, due to some practical restrictions such as the lack of experience of the respondents, on the one hand and the problems of administering these questionnaires to them in remote areas on the other, the number was reduced to 136 for each population.

After the questionnaires were distributed they were gathered, and were submitted to a statistical analysis. The method was to codify the adverbs of frequencies answered by the subjects. This was to say "always" was assigned a number of 3, "often" a number of 2, "sometimes", 1, and "never", 0. The numbers assigned were counted for each individual domain of every subject. In the next step, the total numbers were counted for each domain of the group or subgroups related. Therefore, for the domain of family, for example, two numbers were obtained for Turks and three numbers for Kurds and Armenians.

The variables of age, level of education, and the gender of the subjects were codified in numbers. Each question had three language choices regarding Armenian and Kurdish population, and two language choices for Turkish speaking people. Moreover, each language choice had a four-point scale to give numerical value to the questionnaire. The adverbs of frequency of "always (3)", "often (2)", "sometime" (1), and "never" (0) were used to define this four-point scale operationally.

To find out how often a language was used, a four-point scale was used to determine the frequency use of every code. The adverbs of frequency were the medium to indicate the frequency of each code and the total codes given to each domain functioned as the raw data. People's choice of language in different social contexts was determined in relation to their level of education, age sex, etc.

Hatch and Farhadi(1982) have pointed out that t-test is probably the most-widely used statistical test that measure whether the means of sets of scores from two samples are statistically significant. Armenians and Kurds had three language choices so a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to see whether there was any difference between the mean of language use or not. A Scheffe test was used to determine the exact point of difference, if there was any.

Finally, for the variables of age groups, levels of education and sex with their interaction with language choice there existed two independent variables with different levels, so a two-way ANOVA was applied.

3. RESULTS

The results of the Armenian sample are offered in four different parts. First, the descriptive statistics of different domains and all the groups are presented. Second, the results of the test of analysis of variance applied to show the relationship of the three languages in different domains in the third section, the effect of age on language choice is shown in the fourth section, the results of the ANOVA test, examining the effect of level of education on language choice are reported. The final section presents the results of the ANOVA test, checking the effect of sex on language choice.

As it was mentioned earlier, this study incorporated seven domains, i.e., family, religion, friendship, neighborhood, transaction, education, and government and employment. In what follows, the descriptive statistics concerning the above domains are presented. Table 2 shows the means related to the three languages in the seven domains under study.

Table 2. Means of the three language of Persian, Turkish, and Armenian for Armenian sample in different domains.

language domain	Persian	Turkish	Armenian
Fam.	.30	.13	17.46
Rel.	.01	.03	17.84
Nbhd.	5.33	5.83	4.76
Friend.	4.89	3.85	6.90
Trans.	6.83	8.69	.70
Educ.	13.80	.77	2.19
Gov & Empl.	11.47	5.70	.11

As the table shows, in the domain of family, the mean obtained for the Armenian language is greater than the other two languages. Concerning the domain of religion, the mean of Armenian language is greater too. In the domain of neighborhood from the high mean to the low the order is Turkish, Persian, and Armenian. In the domain of friendship the mean of Armenian is greater. Then, come Persian and Turkish.

In the transaction domain, the mean of Turkish language is greater than the other two. But in the domain of education the mean of Persian is greater than those of Armenian and Turkish languages. In the domain of government and employment, the mean obtained for Persian language is greater than the other two languages.
The following table shows the means obtained from the groups of different ages.

Table 3. Means of the three languages with respect to different age groups related to Armenian sample

language age	Persian	Turkish	Armenian
under 10	4.69	.39	8.58
10-16	6.75	.54	7.58
17-25	6.84	1.33	7.10
26-60	3.73	3.91	6.66
over 60	1.74	5.60	6.75

According to the table, in the under-10 group the mean of the Armenian language is greater than those of the other two languages. Also, in the 10-16 group the mean of the Armenian is greater than those of the other two languages. In 17-25 group the mean of the Armenian is greater than those of the other languages.

In the two groups of 26-60 and over 60 the mean of Armenian is greater than those of the other two. The following table presents the means of the three languages obtained from different educational groups.

Table 4. Means of the three languages with respect to the five educational groups related to the Armenian Sample

language education	Persian	Turkish	Armenian
Illiterate	2.24	2.36	8.04
Primary sch.	2.89	4.42	6.76
guidance sch.	5.12	1.84	7.48
high sch.	5.94	2.42	6.75
University	7.80	2.55	6.39

According to Table 4, the mean of the Armenian language in illiterate group is greater than those of the other two. In the primary school, guidance school, and high school levels of education, the mean of Armenian language is still greater than that of Persian and that of Turkish. But in the university level of education the mean obtained for the Persian language is greater than those of Armenian and Turkish.
The following table shows the means of the three languages obtained from the two sex groups.

Table 5. Means of the three languages with respect to the two sex groups related to Armenian sample

language sex	Persian	Turkish	Armenian
Female	4.40	2.40	7.06
Male	4.27	3.77	7.01

As it is clear from the table, in both male and female groups, mean of Armenian language is greater than those of the two languages of Persian and Turkish.

A) *Domain of Family:* To observe whether there was any statistically significant relationship between the means of the three languages on the domain of family, a test of analysis of variance was conducted. The effect of the domain of family on the mean number of the three languages is significant ($F=3258.39$, $p<.01$). To see the exact point of difference we must use a Scheffe test. Scheffe test according to Hatch and Farhadi (1982) is a kind of post hoc comparison and when there is a difference among the levels of independent variables, the test allows us to see exactly where the difference occurs. In this domain, Scheffe test shows that the exact difference is between Armenian language and the two others. But the difference between Persian and Turkish is not statistically significant

B) *Domain of Religion:* To see whether there was any statistically significant difference between the mean numbers of the three languages in this domain, again a test of ANOVA was conducted. The difference between the mean numbers of the three languages is statistically significant. The Scheffe test indicates that the exact point of difference

is between Armenian and the other two languages. Furthermore, it shows that there is no significant difference between the means of Persian and Turkish languages.

C) *Domain of Friendship:* Another test of ANOVA was run to see whether there was any difference between the means of the three languages in the domain of friendship. The difference between the mean numbers of the three languages is significant at the .01 level. ($F=16.64$, $p<.01$). Scheffe test indicates that the difference between the mean number of Armenian with two other languages is significant But there is no significant difference between the means of Persian and Turkish.

D) *Domain of Neighborhood:* Test of ANOVA was applied to see whether there was a significant difference between the means of three languages in the domain of neighborhood or not. The difference between the means of the three languages in the domain of neighborhood is not statistically significant ($F= 1.35$, $.2591>.05$). Scheffe test showed that no two groups are significantly different at the 0.05 level.

E) *Domain of Transaction:* A test of analysis of variance was applied to see the effect of the domain of transaction on the mean numbers of the three languages. The effect of the domain of transaction on the mean numbers of the three languages is statistically significant. Scheffe test tells us that the difference is between the means of Armenian and Turkish and also between Persian and Turkish as well as Persian and Armenian, i.e., the mean numbers of all the three languages are statistically different from one another.

Domain of Education: As mentioned in chapter three the subjects of this domain are filtered. It means that the mean number of the languages of those subjects who are students of school or university were submitted to statistical analysis.

To see the effect of this domain on the means of the three languages an ANOVA test was conducted. The effect of the domain of education on the mean numbers of the three languages is significant. The Scheffe test shows that the difference is significant between Persian and the other two languages, but not between Turkish and Armenian languages.

G) *Domain of Government and Employment:* In this domain only the mean numbers of those subjects who were employees or workers as officials were taken into consideration.

To see whether there was a significant difference between the mean numbers of the three languages affected by the domain of government and education, an analysis of variance test was applied. The difference between the mean numbers of the three languages is significant ($F=18.60$, $p<.01$). The Scheffe test shows that the difference is between all of the three languages.

Table 6 shows the results of the two-way ANOVA that measured the effect of the type of language and sex on the mean numbers of the three languages in Armenian sample.

Table 6. Analysis of variance of the effect of the type of language and sex on the mean numbers of the three languages of the Armenian sample

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Sig. of F
Main effects	8004.73	6	1334.12	34.75	0.000
LANGUAGE	7937.82	2	3968.91	103.38	*0.000
AGE	66.90	4	16.72	0.43	0.783
Two-way Interactions Language Age	5834.03	8	729.25	18.99	*0.000
Total	122903.41	2855	43.04		
**p<.01					

As the table shows the effect of the kind of language on the mean numbers of the three languages is significant, but the effect of age on the mean numbers of the three languages is not significant ($F=.43$, $.783>.05$). However, the effect of language type and sex on the mean numbers of the three languages is significant ($F=18.99$, $p<.01$).

To observe the effect of different educational levels and language type on the mean numbers of the three languages, a two-way ANOVA test was applied. Table 7 shows the results.

Table 7. Analysis of Variance of the effect of the type of language and level of education on the mean numbers of the three languages related to the Armenian sample

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Sig. of F
Main effects	8286.22	6	1381.03	35.45	0.000
LANGUAGE	7937.82	2	3968.91	101.89	*0.000
AGE	348.39	4	87.10	2.23	0.063
Two-way Interactions Language Age	3958.27	8	494.78	12.70	*0.000
Total	122903.41	2855	43.04		
**p<.01					

The table shows that the effect of language type on the mean numbers of the three languages is significant (F=101.89, p<.01), but the effect of education on the mean numbers of the three languages is not significant (F=2.23, .06>.05). But the effect of two factors of education and language type on the mean numbers of the three languages is significant at .01 level.

Table 8 reports the results of the two-way ANOVA which was applied to measure the effect of sex and language type on the means of the three languages.

Table 8. Analysis of variance of the effect of sex and language type on the means of the three languages of the Armenian sample

Source	SS	df	MS	F	Sig. of F
Main effects	8046.92	3	2682.30	66.75	0.000
LANGUAGE	109.09	1	109.09	2.71	*0.100
AGE	7937.82	2	3968.91	98.77	0.000
Two-way Interactions Language Age	341.53	2	170.76	4.25	*0.014
Total	122903.41	2855	43.04		
*p<.05					

The table indicates that the effect of sex on the mean numbers of the three languages is not significant (F=2.71, 0.10>.05), but the effect of language type on the mean numbers of three languages is significant. The interaction of the factors, sex and language type, on the mean numbers of the three languages is significant (F=4.25, .014<.05). It means that comparing the two sexes of male and female the difference between the mean numbers of languages is not statistically significant, but in each sex the difference between the mean numbers of the three languages is significant.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In this study, the researcher conducted a domain analysis of Orumiyeh linguistic societies to find out which of the three languages of Persian, Turkish, Kurdish and/or Armenian were dominant in each of the social domains. The social domains were adopted from Parashers' (1979) Model, according to which each social context was defined in terms of seven domains as follows: Family, Religion, Friendship, Neighborhood, Transaction, Education, and Government and Employment. Due to the fact that Orumiyeh population comprises three ethnic and linguistic subgroups, three languages can be heard in Orumiyeh. Turkish is mainly the language of the areas settled by Turks. Orumiyeh is a point in case. Persian is the official and governmental language. Furthermore, Kurdish and Armenian are used as the mother tongues. Thus, these people are naturally able to speak the three languages mentioned. In this study the researcher looks for the exact use of each of the three languages in different social domains. Put it differently the question was which language is dominant in each of the seven domains. After dividing the whole population of Orumiyeh into three populations of Armenian, Kurdish and Turkish, the researcher wants to find out whether variables of age, sex and education levels have any effect on language choice in each populations separately or not, i.e., for example, whether being highly educated or being an illiterate determines the choice of Persian or Turkish and/or Kurdish or Armenian for communication or not.

Since people are living in specified places as language groups, attempts were made to have a representative sample of subjects by referring to their places and selecting the subjects quite randomly in terms of the above-mentioned social parameters. The subjects were chosen from five age levels according to Iran Census Center: under 10 as children, between 10 to 16 as youngster, 17 to 25 as young, 26 to 65 as middle aged, and over 65 as old. They were ranged along an educational scale of five levels: no education at all, elementary school, guidance school, high school, and college education.

Since the study was limited to Turkish as spoken in Orumiyeh, all of the subjects were chosen from Orumiyeh itself not the surrounding towns and villages. After collecting the data, the researcher put the data under different statistical procedures. The investigator hypothesized that as moving from informal domains into formal ones, the use of Persian language increases and also as level of education increases, the use of the more prestigious language, i.e., Persian increases. Moreover, the researcher put forward that sex must have an effect on language choice, and as people become older they use their mother tongue much more. The results showed that in Armenian population, Armenian is the dominant language in the domain of Family, religion, and friendship. In the domain of neighborhood, there is no statistically significant difference between the use of these three languages. In the domain of education and government and employment, however, Persian is the dominant language, and finally, in the domain of transaction Turkish is used most.

Regarding age, as the people become older, the use of Turkish increases and the use of Armenian decreases. But for Persian, up to a certain age, Persian is used more and after that its use declines. As for education, the more the people are educated, the more they use Persian. But regarding Turkish language they used it more up to a certain age. And after that it is used less and less. And finally concerning sex, females use Persian more than males, and they use Turkish less. The use of Armenian is almost the same for the two sex groups. It is worth mentioning that all age, education, and sex groups use Armenian more than the other two languages.

It spite of the fact that the language of the community is Turkish, it is not the dominant language in this domain. It can be due to the fact that some of these Armenians do not know Turkish and some others tend to use Persian which is considered a more prestigious language. In the domain transaction the difference between the mean number of the three languages is statistically significant ($F= 85.15$, $p< .01$). It means that Turkish is a dominant language in the domain of transaction and Armenian and Persian are the two next languages in terms of order.

The language of the community is Turkish, therefore, naturally in different situations like buying and selling, going to doctors and asking for an address, they prefer to speak Turkish rather than the other two. In the domains of education, government and employment the difference between the mean number of the three languages is statistically significant ($F= 290.84$, $p<.01$; $F= 18.00$, $p<.01$). It shows that Persian is dominant in these two formal domains. As it is clear, Persian is the language of instruction in educational settings of Iran. Naturally, Armenians prefer to use the most natural and formal language in the mentioned domains. As it was told before Armenians are a minority ethnic group in Orumiyeh. Therefore, there are not many Armenian employees in different official contexts. So, Armenian is the language which is used with the least frequency The present study attempt to test the hypothesis that as one moves from the more informal domains (social setting) e.g., the family, to the more formal domains e.g., Education & Government, in each of three populations, the use of formal language, i.e., Persian increases, and the use of the informal language i.e., the mother tongue decreases.

The present study attempted to test the hypothesis that in each of the populations, moving from much informal domains (social settings) such as Family, into that of mach more formal domains (as education & Government), the use of formal language (Persian) increases, consequently the use of the mother tongue(informal language) declines.

This investigation, demonstrated that as for Armenian population, The mother tongue(Armenian) was dominant in most of the informal situations such as Family, Religion and Friendship. In transitional domains such as Transaction and Neighborhood, Turkish was dominant. Finally in more formal situations such as educational institutions and offices, It was Persian Language which stands out dominant. in the domains of government and employment.

REFERENCES

Fasold. R.W. (1984). *The sociolinguistics of society.* Oxford: Basil Blackwel.

Ferguson. C.A.(1959) Diglossia, *Word, 15*, 325-40.

Ferguson. C.A. (1971) *Language structure and language use.* Stanford: Stanford university press.

Fishman J.A. (1972) *Advances in the sociology of language.* 2 vols. The Hague; Mouton.

Fishman,J.A.(1968).*Reading in the Sociology of Language.* Hague:Mouton.

Hatch,E. & Farhadi, H.(1982). *Research Design and Statistics.* Rowely, Mass: Newbury House.

Holmes.J. (1993). *Introduction to sociolinguistics.* New York; Longman.

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

Iranian Center for Statistics(1991). *The Census of Population and Housing* (The Census of 1991). Tehran: The Publication of the Iranian Center foe Statistics.

Labov, W. (1978). *Sociolinguistic patterns.* Oxford; Basil Blackwell.

Parasher.S.N. (1980) Mother Tongue - English Diglossia; A case study of Educated Indian Biliguals'use. *Anthropological Linguistics, 22*, 151-68.

Rajabnia, m. (1978) *Armenians.* Tehran: markaz -e - Asnade -e- Farhangi.

University of Chicago (1996). *The New Encyclopedia Britanica,* Vol.1, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Wardhaugh, R. (1986). *An Introduction to sociolingusstics.* Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.