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OBJECTIVES:

This study aimed to investigate the language use and attitudes of the Kachok speakers in order to assess the vitality of the Kachok language. This was done by using an orally administered sociolinguistic survey instrument.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the languages used by the Kachok speakers in different domains?
2. What are the attitudes of Kachok speakers toward their own language and the other languages they speak?
3. Does it appear likely that Kachok speakers of the next generations will continue to use their language?
METHODOLOGY:

The primary instruments used in this study included the five sociolinguistic questionnaires (SLQs), informal interviews, and observations. The five sociolinguistic questionnaires for Individual, Group, Christian Leaders, Teachers, and Village Leaders were orally administered to interview the respondents in nine Kachok villages.

The individual SLQ was administered in four villages in which 12 subjects were investigated in each village. The group interview had four persons in each group and was administered in nine villages. The seven village leaders were interviewed as knowledgeable insiders of the Kachok villages. Three Christian leaders were asked regarding the church domain. A total of 12 teachers were interviewed both in formal schools and community literacy classes. One Khmer language assistant and three Kachok interpreters helped in gathering the data.

The respondents for individual SLQ and group interviews were born and grew up in the Kachok area. Kachok is their first language spoken with parents who are both ethnically Kachok. Males and females were also interviewed with ages ranged from 17 to 35 for the young people group and 36 years old and above for the old people group.

The results of five sociolinguistic questionnaires were analyzed to assess the vitality of the Kachok language by applying the two models: The UNESCO Nine Factors on Language Vitality and Endangerment (2003) and Fishman’s (1991) Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS).
FINDINGS:

1. Languages Used by the Kachok Speakers in Different Domains

Home

- All respondents claimed that Kachok language is spoken in nine Kachok villages, exclusively used by the Kachok people at home when communicating with grandparents, parents, children, grandchildren, and siblings. They use their own language purely in their homes except when the spouse is a non-Kachok speaker.

- As reported, Kachok is the language that the Kachok children learn to speak first. In all nine villages, all the children speak their language clearly and fluently. Kachok is generally used by the children at home and in the community except when they are in schools where Khmer language is the medium of education.

- Most Kachok speakers marry within their language group, although parents have ‘no problem’ if their children marry into another ethnic group as long as they continue to speak Kachok with them and with their children at home. In cases of intermarriages, the language spoken at home is determined by the location where they settle. If a Kachok marries a non-Kachok speaker and lives outside the Kachok area, the language of that village is used.

- Based on Fishman’s (1991) GIDS, the Kachok language is at stage 6 in which the language is currently used and maintained at home with children.
Friendship

- Results show that Kachok people use their own language when talking with Kachok friends in their village. However, they use the language of their non-Kachok friends who do not understand the Kachok language.

- As reported, some respondents do not visit other non-Kachok villages, do not have non-Kachok friends, and cannot speak any languages except Kachok.

Social/Public Domain – weddings, funerals, village meetings, and market

- The respondents reported that Kachok is used in the religious ceremonies – weddings and funerals – otherwise Khmer is used when non-Kachok speakers are present in these social gatherings.

- At village meetings, respondents reported that Kachok is used exclusively, otherwise Khmer is used when there are other ethnic groups present in the meetings.

- The river and spring well are public places for bathing, drinking, and washing where the Kachok people of all ages use their own language when they communicate with each other.

- The market is located outside of the Kachok area. As reported, more men travel occasionally than women. Some Kachok people have not gone to market, hence, have not experienced talking with the vendors.
• The Kachok speakers who can speak and understand Khmer, Jarai, Tampuan, Krung, and Lao use the language of the vendors when talking to them.

• The Kachok who do not speak nor understand other languages need a Kachok interpreter when talking with the vendors.

Religious Domain – Christian churches in three Kachok villages

• The Kachok Christians use both Khmer and Jarai Bibles. The Jarai Bible is written in Jarai script from Vietnam. However, there are estimates of only 250 Kachok Christians in all Kachok villages, so contact through church domain is not so big.

• As reported, Kachok is the language used by the people in the church when praying, preaching, during fellowship, and in giving announcements. They use Khmer and Jarai when reading the liturgy and the Scriptures.

• The Christian leaders expressed their desire to have a Bible and hymnbooks in Kachok language. They believe that if this concern is addressed, Kachok language vitality in the church domain would improve.
Neighboring Language Groups

- The Kachok-speaking community is not as large as the Jarai, Tampuan, and Kreung-speaking communities surrounding Kachok. Some Kachok speak these neighboring languages outside of the Kachok area or when the speakers of these language groups visit the Kachok villages.

- The level of bilingualism/multilingualism among Kachok speakers indicates that men could speak other languages more than women. Men travel to non-Kachok speaking areas more than women and use the language of the villages they visit and the language of the people they meet.

- Contact with other language groups appear to be infrequent with some Kachok speakers. However, Kachok who can speak other languages sometimes do not use the Kachok language when they are outside of the Kachok area.

School (formal and non-formal)

- Only a few Kachok children are able to go to school where they start to learn Khmer at the age of 10 to 12 years old. Khmer is the medium of instruction in both non-formal and formal schools. Educational materials are written in the Khmer language. The teachers want to learn and teach Kachok if materials are available.
• The Kachok children use their language when they play together, but Khmer is used when playing with other ethnic pupils. They speak Kachok outside the classroom.

• The teachers in the formal school are non-Kachok speakers and do not speak Kachok with the students, while in literacy classes, all teachers are Kachok except one Kreung teacher in Nay village. The teachers encourage their students to speak Khmer inside the classroom.

• As reported, some Kachok children can speak Khmer, particularly those who are able to go to school, aged 10 years old and above. The children below eight years old who do not go to school cannot speak Khmer nor the other neighboring languages.

2. Attitudes of Kachok Speakers toward their own Language

• Generally, Kachok people have a highly positive attitude toward their own language. The young people and adults are proud to use their language in different situations and are not ashamed to speak their language even when around non-Kachok speakers.

• Many of the adults in the Kachok villages do not know how to read and write, but they want to learn how, especially in their own language. Every respondent interviewed expressed his interest in developing the Kachok language, either for use in education in both formal and non-formal settings and in preserving his own language.
• The respondents share their desire to learn how to read and write their own language, and they want to see their language promoted. The findings also indicate that Kachok people would like to see written materials produced in their own language.

• The village leaders, church leaders, individuals, and teachers in both formal and non-formal schools expressed enthusiasm in learning to read and write in the Kachok language.

2.1 Attitudes of Kachok Speakers toward the other Languages they Speak

• Kachok speakers have a positive attitude towards the neighboring languages. They use other languages outside of the Kachok area or when talking with the non-Kachok speakers.

• Although Kachok people are proud of their own language, they value the Khmer language as the national language and as a lingua franca used in the area.

• Some Kachok speakers use other languages in particular situations in which the dominant languages are frequently used such as in the market, with non-Kachok friends, and when they are outside of the Kachok area. None of the Kachok people interviewed gave any hint of a negative attitude toward any neighboring languages.

• It was also observed that the majority of the women could not speak Khmer well as only a few of them were able to respond in Khmer during the interview. Likewise, the Khmer interpreter noted
that some women were not proficient in Khmer, although a few of them could speak a little of the neighboring language.

3. Assessing Language Vitality using UNESCO’s Nine Factors in Language Vitality and Endangerment and Fishman’s GIDS Models

- The answers to the questionnaire related to UNESCO’s factor 1 (Intergenerational language transmission scale - 5 points: [Safe]: The language is spoken by all generations) showed that Kachok is the language used by the children and adults at home and in the community. The respondents claimed that their language will continue to be used by the future generations.

- All respondents believed that the children will use Kachok when they grow up. The opinion of everyone asked is that no one from the community has shifted from speaking Kachok in favor of some other languages. Additionally, no respondents feel that their language would one day cease to exist.

- The UNESCO’s nine factors revealed that Kachok language is weak on some factors but very strong in other areas. The evaluation shows that if language development is addressed for the Kachok people group, the language will be preserved and most likely be maintained for the next generations.

- The GIDS evaluation showed that Kachok is at stage six in which the language is used in intergenerational context - the language will survive and even thrive with a solid foundation if Kachok people
continue to use their language and pass it on to the next generation.
The GIDS indicates that the Kachok language is active and exclusively used at home with children, parents, grandparents, spouses, and siblings. The language is transmitted from parents to children. The parents want their children to continue using their language into the future.

CONCLUSIONS:
The following conclusions are drawn from the findings of the study:

1. Results of this study indicate that the Kachok language is very dynamic and mainly used at home with parents, grandparents, spouse, children, grandchildren, and siblings.

2. Kachok children are learning their language naturally in an intergenerational context. The Kachok language appears to be at a safe stage in terms of degree of endangerment since it is spoken by all ages at home and in the community.

3. Some Kachok people tend to accommodate other neighboring languages when the dominant languages are used in particular occasions especially in the market, and when communicating with persons who do not speak and understand their own language. The Kachok who speak these neighboring languages still value their language.

4. Kachok language is actively used in community activities like village meetings, religious ceremonies, weddings, and funerals. It is also the
language used in church except for the Bible and hymnbooks which are written in Jarai and Khmer.

5. Kachok people have a strong positive attitude toward their language. It is reflected in their desire to learn how to read and write in their own language and their desire to have written materials available in their own language. Generally, the positive attitude toward learning the language and the Kachok literacy is a positive factor for future language vitality.

6. Kachok speakers have positive attitudes toward other languages since these languages are also important for communication outside of their own villages.

7. Although the Kachok community is relatively small compared with other neighboring language groups, the Kachok people appear to have been able to preserve their language, despite being surrounded by these larger groups; hence, their desire to see their language promoted and preserved is evident.

8. The respondents’ claim that 20 years hence their language will still be used and spoken by the future generations serves as an indicator of a strong language vitality at present.

9. Based on the responses to the questionnaires, informal interviews and observations made during the fieldwork, the findings indicate that the Kachok language is dynamic and essential for the native speakers themselves.
10. The UNESCO’s Nine Factors and Fishman’s GIDS assessment provide evidence to indicate that the Kachok language is currently vital. This conclusion is based mainly on Kachok language use and attitudes.

11. There are good indicators of healthy language vitality among the Kachok people. The patterns of language use point to a healthy use of the Kachok language in each of the nine villages. Additionally, Kachok people indicate strong attitudes toward their own language.

12. Evidences point to a strong language vitality of Kachok at present. The Kachok language will continually be maintained if the Kachok people themselves continue to value and speak their own language at home and in the community and to pass it on to the next future generations.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are suggested:

1. Further sociolinguistic research in several areas is necessary. Other indicators of language vitality would also help assess the Kachok language vitality, i.e bilingualism, language policy for the minority languages, language proficiency, land tenure, and economic sustainability.

2. Since some Kachok people speak two or more neighboring languages - Khmer, Jarai, Tampuan, Kreung, Kavet, Brao, and Lao, language proficiency testing would be essential to measure the oral proficiency level of the Kachok people towards these languages.
3. Testing the level of bilingualism/multilingualism in neighboring languages among Kachok speakers would further clarify the issues of language use in other domains.

4. The findings of this survey could be further validated by a researcher staying longer in the village and spending more time for observation, informal conversations and participation in the lives of the Kachok people and their activities. This would provide more opportunities to observe language use and attitudes of the people to verify the questionnaire results. A longer ethnographic study is therefore, recommended.

5. Since the intergenerational transmission of Kachok is very strong, language development in terms of orthography development, followed by literacy programs, is strongly suggested to help maintain and preserve the Kachok language.

6. Since informal interviews revealed that Kachok or Lamam or Romam people live in the border of Vietnam and Cambodia, it would be desirable to survey the area – to get the population of the Kachok people live there, identify the language situation, and compare the data with this study.

7. Concerning methodology, data gathering could have been more natural if the questionnaires were administered in the Kachok language to help the Kachok respondents understand the questions better. However, non-Kachok researchers should undergo one to two years of intensive training before undertaking a similar study.
8. It is suggested that an explicit language policy for minority people groups be implemented to help strengthen the vitality of minority languages and to sustain the vernacular literature of the ethnic groups.
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MGA LAYUNIN:

Pangunahing Layunin

Layunin ng pag-aaral na ito na masuri ang atityud at paggamit ng Kachok ng mga nagsasalita nito tungo sa pagsusuri ng pagiging matatag ng wikang Kachok. Isinakatuparan ito sa pamamagitan ng pagtatanong gamit ang instrumento ng sosyolinggwistik surbey.

Mga Tiyak na Layunin

Ang pag-aaral na ito ay partikular na nakatuon sa sumusunod na mga tanong:

1. Anong mga wika ang ginagamit ng mga Kachok sa iba’t ibang larangan?
2. Ano ang mga palagay ng mga gumagamit ng wikang Kachok tungo sa kanilang sariling wika at sa iba pang wikang kanilang ginagamit?
3. May katiyakan ba na ipagpapatuloy ng mga susunod na henerasyon ng mga taong gumagamit ng wikang Kachok ang paggamit ng kanilang sariling wika?
PAMARAAN:

Kabilang sa mga pangunahing instrumentong ginamit sa pag-aaral na ito ay ang limang listahan ng mga katanungan o sociolinguistic questionnaires (SLQs), mga di pormal na pakikipanayam at pagmamasid. Ang limang listahan ng mga tanong - indibidwal, grupo, mga tagapangunang Kristyano, mga Guro at Pinuno ng mga taga-nayon - ay kinalaman sa siyam na nayon sa Kachok.


Ang mga taga-responde para sa indibidwal na SLQ at mga pakikipanayam na grupo ay ipinanganak at lumaki sa nayon ng Kachok. Kachok ang kanilang unang salitang ginamit na siya ring ginamit ng kanilang mga magulang na talagang mga Kachok. Ang mga kalahakin na kababaihan na kinapanayam ay sa pagitan ng edad na 17 hanggang 35 para sa grupo ng kabataan, at 36 pataas para sa grupo ng mga nakakatanda.

**KINALABASAN NG PAG-AARAL:**

1. **Mga Wikang Ginamit ng mga Kachok sa Iba’t Ibang Larangan**

**Tahanan**


- Ang Kachok ay kadalasang ginagamit ng mga bata sa kanilang mga tahanan at sa kanilang komunidad maliban lamang kung sila ay nasa paaralan kung saan ang wikang Khmer ang ginagamit sa pagtuturo.

- Karamihan sa mga gumagamit ng salitang Kachok ay nakakapag-asawa ng taga-kanila rin, bagamat ang mga magulang ay sang-ayon

Pakikipagkaibigan


- Ayon sa pag-aaral, ilan sa mga tumugon ay hindi bumibisita sa ibang mga nayon, walang kaibigan mula sa ibang lugar maliban sa kaibigan nilang mga taga-Kachok, at hindi rin nakakapagsalita ng ibang wika maliban sa Kachok.
Larangang Pampubliko – mga kasal, mga libing, mga pagtitipon ng nayon, mga pagpupulong ng nayon, at pamilyahan

• Ang Kachok ay ginagamit sa mga seremonyang pangrelihiyon, kasal, at libing, maliban kung may hindi taga-Kachok sa mga pagtitipong ito, ang wikang Khmer ang kanilang ginagamit.

• Sa mga pagtitipon ng nayon, iniulat ng mga tumugon sa katanungan na ang Kachok ay partikular na ginagamit, maliban kung ang ibang etnikong grupo ay kabilang sa pagpupulong; sa ganitong pagkakataon ang wikang Khmer ang siyang ginagamit.

• Ang ilog at ang balon ng bukal ay pampublikong lugar-paliguan, pinagkukunan ng inumin at labahan ng mga taga-Kachok, anuman ang kanilang edad, ginagamit nila ang kanilang sariling wika kapag sila’y nag-uusap.

• Ang pamilyahan ay matatagpuan sa labas ng Kachok. Ayon sa pag-aaral, mas marami sa mga kalalakihan ang naglalakbay paminsan-minsan kaysa sa mga kababaihan. Ang ilang taga-Kachok ay hindi pumupunta sa pamilyahan, dahil dito wala silang karanasang makipag-usap sa mga nagtitinda.

• Karamihan sa mga naiulat ay ang paggamit ng wika ng mga nagtitinda kapag sila ay nag-uusap. Sa mga gumagamit ng Kachok na nakakapagsalita at nakakaintindi ng Khmer, Jarai, Tampuan, Krung, at Lao, ginagamit nila ang mga wikang ito kung ang mga nagtitinda ay nakikipag-usap sa kanila.
• Ang mga taga-Kachok na hindi nakakapagsalita at nakakaintindi ng ibang wika ay kailangan ng interpreter o tagasalin ng ibang wika na taga-Kachok sa tuwing nakikipag-usap sa mga nagtitinda.

Larangang Pangrelihiyon – Ang mga Simbahang Kristyano sa Tatlong Nayon ng Kachok


• Ayon sa pag-uulat, ang wikang Kachok ang siyang ginagamit ng mga tao sa simbahan sa kanilang pananalangin, pangangaral, pakikisalamuha at pagbibigay ng mga anunsyo. Ginagamit nila ang Khmer at Jarai sa tuwing binabasa ang Liturhiya at ang mga Kasulatan.

• Ipinabatid ng mga tagapangunang Kristyano ang kanilang pagnanais na magkaroon ng Bibliya at mga imnaryo sa wikang Kachok. Naniwala sila na kung ang pangangailangang ito ay matutugunan, ang kahalagahan ng wikang Kachok sa larangang pangsimbahan ay dapat nang isulong.
Mga Katabing mga Grupo na Iba ang Wika


- Batay sa antas ng paggamit ng maraming wika ng mga taga-Kachok, mas maraming kalalaki ang nakakapagsalita ng ibang wika kay sa mga kababaihan. Mas madalas maglakbay ang mga kalalaki kay sa kababaihan sa mga lugar na hindi ginagamit ang wikang Kachok at ginagamit nila ang wika ng nayon na kanilang pinupuntahan. O di kay’a’y kung ano ang wika ng kanilang nakikilala.

Paaralan (ormal at di pormal)

- Kakaunti lamang sa mga batang Kachok ang nakakapasok sa paaralan at nag-uumpisa nilang natutunan ang Khmer sa edad na 10 hanggang 12 taong gulong. Ang Khmer ang siyang ginagamit sa pagtuturo sa parehong pormal at di pormal na paaralan at ang mga
gamit sa pagtuturo ay nakasulat sa wikang Khmer. Nais ng mga
guro na matutunan at maituro ang Kachok kung mayroon lamang
silang materyal na pwedeng gamitin.

- Ginagamit ng mga batang taga-Kachok ang kanilang wika kung
  sila’y naglalaro kasama ang batang taga-kanila ngunit Khmer
  naman kung kasama nilang naglalaro ang mga batang kamag-aral
  mula sa ibang lahi at ang mga batang hindi nakakapagsalita ng
  Kachok. Sa labas ng kanilang klase ginagamit nila ang wikang
  Kachok.

- Ang mga guro mula sa pormal na paaralan ay hindi
  nakakapagsalita ng Kachok at hindi rin gumagamit ng wikang ito
  sa kanilang mga tinuturuan. Sa mga klase kung saan ang pagtuturo
  ng pagbabasa at pagsulat ay ginagawa, lahat ng mga guro ay taga-
  Kachok maliban sa isang Kreung mula sa nayon ng Nay.
  Hinihikayat ng mga guro ang kanilang mga mag-aaral na gamitin
  ang wikang Khmer sa loob ng kanilang silid-aralan.

- Nakakapagsalita ang mga batang taga-Kachok ng wikang Khmer,
  partikular ang mga nakakapasok sa paaralan, ang edad ay sampu
  pataas. Ang mga batang walo pababa ay hindi nakakapag-aral at
  hindi rin nakakapagsalita sa wikang Khmer maging ang iba pang
  wika sa paligid nila.
2. Pagpapalagay ng mga Gumagamit ng Wikang Kachok sa Kanilang Sariling Wika

- Sa pangkalahatan, mataas at positibo ang pagpapalagay ng mga taga-Kachok sa kanilang wika. Ipinagmamapuri ng mga kabataan at ng mga nakatatanda ang pagsamantala ng kanilang wika sa iba’t ibang sitwasyon at hindi nila ikinahihina ang kanilang wika kahit na sila napapaligiran ng mga taong hindi gumagamit ng wikang Kachok.

- Dagdag pa rito, karamihan sa mga nakatatanda sa mga nayon ng Kachok ay hindi marunong magbasa at magsulat, ngunit nais nilang matuto lalo na sa kanilang sariling wika. Bawat isang tumugon sa panayam ay nagpabatid ng kanilang interes na mapaunlad ang wikang Kachok, ito man ay para sa paggamit nito sa pormal at di pormal na edukasyon at sa pagpapanatili ng kanilang sariling wika.

- Ang mga tumugon sa panayam ay nagsalita sa kanilang pagnanais na matutong magbasa at magsulat sa Kachok at nais nilang ito ay mapaunlad. Ipinapakita rin sa mga natuklasan na nais ng mga taga-Kachok na magkaroon ng mga bagay na maari nilang gamitin na nakasulat sa kanilang sariling wika.

- Ang mga pinuno ng mga nayon, ang mga tagapanguna ng simbahan, mga indibidwal, mga guro sa parehong pormal at di
ormal na paaralan ay nagpahayag ng kanilang kasabikan na matutong magbasa at magsulat sa wikang Kachok.

2.1 Mga Pagpapalagay ng mga Gumagamit ng Wikang Kachok sa Iba Pang Wikang Kanilang Ginagamit


- Bagama’t ipinagmamalaki ng mga taga-Kachok ang kanilang sariling wika, positibo naman ang kanilang pagtanaw sa ibang mga wikang kanilang ginagamit. Pinapahalagahan nila ang Khmer na kanilang pambansang wika at bilang wikang kanilang ginagamit sa pakikipag-ugnayan sa mga tao sa kanilang paligid.

- Ang ilang mga gumagamit ng wikang Kachok ay nagbibigay daan din sa paggamit ng iba pang wika lalo na kung sila ay nasa partikular na sitwasyon tulad sa pamilihan, kapag kausap nila ang mga kaibigang hindi taga-Kachok, at kung sila ay nasa labas ng lugar ng mga taga-Kachok. Sa lahat ng mga taga-Kachok na
nakapanayam, wala ni isa sa kanila ang may negatibong pagpapalagay sa alinman sa mga wika nasa paligid nila.

- Naobserbahan din na karamihan ng mga kababaihan ay hindi nakakapagsalita ng wikang Khmer pagkat kakaunti lamang ang nakakasagot sa wikang Khmer sa panayam. Gayundin, napansin ng Khmer interpreter, na hindi sila masyadong mahusay sa paggamit ng wikang Khmer, kahit na nakakapagsalita sila ng kaunti mula sa mga wika nasa paligid nila.


- Ang mga sagot sa listahan ng mga katanungan ugnay sa UNESCO’s factor 1 (Intergenerational language transmission scale - 5 points: [Safe]: The language is spoken by all generations) ay nagpakita na ang wikang Kachok ay siyang ginagamit ng mga bata at matanda sa kanilang tahanan. Sinabi ng mga tumugon sa katanungan na ang kanilang wika ay gagamitin pa rin ng mga susunod na henerasyon.

- Naniniwala ang lahat ng mga tumugon sa katanungan na gagamitin pa rin ng mga bata ang wikang Kachok kapag sila’y lumaki na. Ayon sa mga tinanong, walang taga-Kachok ang nagpalit ng kanilang wika upang paboran ang ibang mga wika. Dagdag pa rito,
wala ni isa sa mga tumugon sa katanungan ang nakaramdam na ang kanilang wika ay mawawalan na ng gagamit.

• Mataas ang pagpapahalaga ng mga taga-Kachok sa kanilang sariling wika. Matindi ang kanilang pagnanais na mapanatili ang paggamit ng kanilang wika ng mga susunod pang henerasyon.

• Ipinakita ng UNESCO’s nine factors na ang wikang Kachok ay mahina sa ibang aspeto ngunit malakas naman sa ibang bahagi. Ipinakita ng pagsusuri na kung ang pagpapaunlad ay ipinabatid sa mga grupo ng mga taga-Kachok, mapapangalagaan at mapanatili ito sa mga susunod na henerasyon.

• Ipinakita sa mga pagsusuri gamit ang GIDS na ang Kachok ay nasa ika-anim na antas kung saan ang wika ay ginagamit sa konteksto ng pagsasalinlahi – ang wika ay maililigtas at mapapaulad pa nito ang isang matibay na pundasyon, kung ang mga taga-Kachok ay magpapatuloy sa paggamit ng kanilang sariling wika at ipapasa ito sa mga susunod na henerasyon. Tinukoy rin ng GIDS na ang wikang Kachok ay aktibo at ginagamit sa tahanan ng mga anak, magulang, lolo at lola, asawa, at magkakapatid. Ang wikang ito ay ipinapasa mula sa magulang tungo sa mga anak. Nais ng mga magulang na patuloy na gamitin ng kanilang mga anak ang kanilang wika sa mga susunod pang panahon.
KONKLUSYON:

Narito ang mga konklusyon batay sa pag-aaral:

1. Ipinakita ng resulta ng pag-aaral na ito na ang wikang Kachok ay aktibo at kalimitang ginagamit sa tahanan ng mga magulang, lolo at lola, asawa, anak, apo, at magkakapatid.


3. Ginagamit ng ilan sa mga taga-Kachok ang ibang wika na nasa paligid nila kung ang wikang iyon ay ginagamit ng mas nakararami sa mga partikular na okasyon tulad ng na pamilihan, kapag nakikipag-usap sa mga taong hindi nakakapagsalita o nakakaintindi ng kanilang wika.

4. Aktibong ginagamit ng komunidad ang wikang Kachok sa kanilang mga gawain tulad ng mga pagpupulong, seremonyang pang-relihiyon, mga kasal, at libing. Ito rin ang wikang ginagamit sa kanilang simbahan maliban sa pagbasa ng Biblia at mga imnaryo na nakasulat sa wikang Jarai at Khmer.

5. Ang mga taga-Kachok ay may matibay at positibong pagpapalagay sa kanilang wika. Ito ay nakikita sa kanilang pagnanais na matutong magbasa at magsulat sa kanilang sariling wika at ang magkaroon ng mga bagay na maari nilang gamitin na nakasulat sa kanilang wika.


8. Batay sa mga di-pormal na pakikipanayan at obserbasyon na ginawa sa pag-aaral, ang wikang Kachok ay ginagamit ng mga tao anuman ang edad sa mga tahanan at komunidad. Ipinabatid ng mga taga-Kachok ang kanilang pagnanais na maisulong at mapanatili ang kanilang wika.


10. May positibong indikasyon ng kasiglahan ng wika sa mga Kachok. Ang sinunsundan ng paggamit ng wika ay patungo sa malusog na paggamit ng wikang Kachok sa bawat siyam na nayon na binisita. Dagdag pa nito, nagsapakita ng matatag na pagpapalagay ang mga Kachok para sa kanilang sariling wika.

**MGA REKOMENDASYON:**

Batay sa ginawang pag-aaral, ang mga sumusunod na rekomendasyon ay iminumungkahi:

1. Mahalaga ang patuloy na pag-aaral sa larangan ng sociolinguistics tulad ng iba pang indikasyon ng katatagan ng wika ay makakatulong din sa pagsusuri ng kahalagahan ng wikang Kachok, tulad ang paggamit ng dalawang wika o bilingualism, polisiya para sa wika ng mga maliit na grupo na gumagamit ng kanilang wika, kahusayan sa wika, pananatili sa isang lugar, at kakayahang pagsustento sa ekonomiya.


3. Ang pagbibigay ng pagsusulit sa lebel ng paggamit ng dalawa o higit pang mga wika sa mga karatig nayon ng mga gumagamit ng wikang Kachok ay
patuloy na magbibigay linaw sa mga isyung may kinalaman sa paggamit ng wika at sa iba pang mga larangan.

4. Ang mga resulta ng pag-aaral na ito ay mas lalo pang mapagtitibay ng tagapagsasaliksik sa pamamagitan ng pagbibigay ng mas marami pang oras ng pananatili sa nayon para sa mas mahabang panahon ng pagmamasid, mga di pormal na pakikipag-ugnayan at pakikisalamuha sa mga taga-Kachok sa kanilang pang-araw-araw na gawain. Magbibigay ito ng mas marami pang oportunidad upang makapagmasid sa paggamit ng wika at pagpapalagay ng mga taga-rito kaugnay sa kanilang wika at mabibigyang linaw din ang resulta ng mga listahan ng mga katanungan. Ganon pa man, iminumungkahi ang isang mahabang pag-aaral kaugnay sa etnografia.

5. Dahil ang pagpasa sa salinlahi ng taga-Kachok ay napakatatag, ang pagpapaunlad ng wika sa larangan ng ortografia, kasunod ng mga programang nagtuturo ng pagbabasa at pagsusulat ay mainam na iminumungkahi upang matulungan magamit at mapanatili ang wikang Kachok.


8. Iminumungkahi na magkaroon ng lantarang polisiya para sa mga minorya upang matulungan silang mapagtibay ang kahalagahan ng wikang ginagamit ng ilan at upang maipagpatuloy ang literatura ng ibang mga grupong etniko sa sarili nilang wika.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Commune Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>International Cooperation Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEV</td>
<td>Indicators of Ethnolinguistic Vitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLQ</td>
<td>Individual Sociolinguistic Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIDS</td>
<td>Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>Government Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWC</td>
<td>Language of Wider Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>First language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Second language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEYS</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Mother-tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEAG</td>
<td>Mainland Southeast Asia Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Government Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAID</td>
<td>Research and Instrument Design Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDE</td>
<td>Ratanakiri Integrated Development Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLS</td>
<td>Reversing Language Shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Southeast Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIL</td>
<td>Summer Institute of Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLQ</td>
<td>Sociolinguistic Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNESCO - United Nations Educational, Scientific, & Cultural Organization

VC - Village Chief

R - Region

X - Language Speaker

Y - Other language
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CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction


Languages can become endangered and even extinct. Research indicates that half of the world languages are already in a state of endangerment. In fact, several experts from the United Nations Educational, Scientific, & Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Ad Hoc Expert Group (Brenzinger, M., Dwyer, A., de Graaf, T., Grinevald, C., Krauss, M., Miyaoka, O., Ostler, N., Sakiyama, O., Villalon, M., Yamamoto, A., & Zepeda, O., 2003), in an International Expert Meeting as part of the program on ‘Safeguarding of Endangered Languages’ have mentioned that “at least 50 percent of the world’s more than 6000 languages are losing speakers. We
estimate that 90 percent of the languages may be replaced by dominant languages by
the end of the twenty-first century” (2003, p. 3).

Similarly, Tehan and Nahhas (2007) state that out of the 6000 languages in the
world, 50 to 90 percent of endangered languages will become extinct aside from the
number of the existing dialects. Additionally, Mesthrie, Swann, Deumert, and Leap
(2000) affirm that out of these 6000 languages in the world today, many are
themselves in stages of endangerment and extinction (Bloomfield, 1927; Denison,
The potential loss of these languages still exists and many are under threat. Hence,
there is an imperative need for language documentation, new policy initiatives, and
new materials to enhance the vitality of these languages. The cultural heritage,
identity, and population size of people speaking these endangered languages have
been decreasing in the ethnolinguistic diversity in the world.

Several of these possible endangered languages may be found in Asia. Gordon
(2005) documents a number of languages that have already become extinct for
different reasons. To illustrate, India has thirteen extinct languages like the Ahom and
Pali. The former is now used only in religious rituals, while the latter is used as the
literary language of the Buddhist scripture. Vietnam has one extinct language called
Tay Boi, a Vietnamese pidgin French used for major ports by French and Indo-China.
Nepal has three extinct languages: the Dura, whose members of the community now
use Nepali; Kusanda, whose descendants do not speak the language except for three
speakers; and Waling, whose members of the ethnic group now speak Bantawa. In the
Philippines, Headland (2003) states that thirty-plus Philippine Negrito or Agta languages are nearly extinct. This minority people group now uses the predominant languages in the neighboring area.

Each language is unique. People's identity and culture are intimately tied to their language. Nevertheless, everyone can accept that languages can be endangered and that if things go their natural course, languages will go extinct. The researcher, along with many other linguists and policy makers, asserts that something needs to be done in order to prevent the extinction of endangered languages. These claims are justified because of the high value of cultural identity, of which language is a part, and because people are asking for help to preserve their languages and cultures.

Landweer (cited in Crystal, 2000) points out four reasons why professionals should pay attention to these languages. According to her, it is professionally appropriate for sociolinguists, linguists, and anthropologists to care about endangered languages (2003). She states:

First, the study of all languages, regardless of size, serves to maintain a viable linguistic ecosystem. The study serves to preserve a record of the diversity of language forms and the interrelationships between them. Second, such a study functions as a means of recording the unique history of ethnic populations, as language is both the medium for and part of the message of their being. Thirdly, it also contributes to the corpus of human knowledge by documenting the unique understanding of the world and its systems from the worldviews of those studied. And finally, languages are interesting in and of themselves and invite study just because they exist (p. 3).

For extinct languages, it is obvious that there can be no way to revive them. However, there are still strong possibilities to preserve the endangered languages by way of doing research, archiving, repository system, and through language
development. That is why it is important to do a language survey of these small-sized population languages to determine the language vitality, use, and attitudes of the speakers toward their own language.

The result of not using the first language can be the loss of the mother tongue because of reduced language use, reduction of speakers, and loss of self-esteem. In the case of the speakers of the Northern Subanen in Southern Mindanao, Philippines, they used to hide their identity as Subanen when they were in towns or cities because the dominant language speakers use the term “Subanen” as a derogatory address for the Northern Subanen. However, because of language development, their language has now become a valuable part of their identity.

In the Cambodian setting, there are also endangered languages in the Bahnaric language cluster particularly the Mel, Thmon, and Khaon. Some of these language groups may have hundreds or thousands of speakers, but, their children no longer learn and use their languages. Most speakers have shifted to using Khmer, the national language in place of their local mother tongue. Speakers of these endangered languages have now assimilated the Khmer language and culture [International Cooperation Cambodia (ICC) survey, 2006]. In contrast, a language with only a few speakers might be considered very much alive if it is the primary language of a community, and is the first language of the children in that community.

For the Pearic language cluster, the researcher, with the help of four Cambodian nationals, interviewed the Saoch people regarding their language situation. After the war in 1975-79 during Polpot’s regime, the Saoch people migrated
from the mountain to their present village, situated 100 meters away from the national highway of Veal Renh, Kampong Som Province. Today, the Saoch people no longer use their own language. They have already assimilated with the Khmer language and culture since their village is surrounded by Khmer speakers. In fact, their village leader is not Saoch but a native Khmer speaker. The four Cambodian nationals who helped in the interview mentioned that the Saoch people cannot be identified as Saoch anymore when they speak the Khmer language (Magaspag, 2004).

The Suy people group is also part of the Pearic language family. The researcher and two Cambodian nationals also interviewed majority of the Suy people in Kampong Speu Province. The Suy expressed their main concern about how to preserve their tradition and language. They are aware that their language is becoming endangered since the new generation is no longer speaking their own language. One village leader said that this issue had been discussed in a 3-day national forum represented by the indigenous communities from 14 provinces in Cambodia (Magaspag, 2004). The minority people groups, with the help of Non-Government Organizations (NGOs), hosted the annual forum. During that forum, the following sentiments surfaced:

Some of our indigenous peoples have lost some parts of our traditions. Some of us no longer speak our mother tongue languages. We are concerned about the loss of our culture and language that results from a lack of education and information that are appropriate to our languages. We want Khmer language education but also request education and management systems that respect and strengthen our culture and language. (From an email: Statement by Indigenous People made in Trang village, September 9-12, 2004).
The Kachok people groups in Cambodia expressed the same sentiment. Therefore, it is important to understand their language situation and take into consideration their sentiment in order to preserve their language, identity, and cultural heritage for the future generation.

In this study, Kachok was chosen because nothing was known about the Kachok people and their language. The present study provided information about the Kachok people and their language situation that would help ICC determine the needs for language development for the Kachok people in the future. In addition, the present structure of ICC in the province through the Ratanakiri Integrated Development Education (RIDE) project and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports (MOEYS) is an access to expand the work for the Kachok people group.

1.2 Background of the Study

The term Kachok (pronounced [Kacoʔ]) as used in this study refers to both the people and their language. Alternate names and spellings are: Kaco, Kaco', Kacoq, Kacok, Kancho and Kachah. Some Kachok people can speak Tampuan, Jarai, Kreung, Kavet, Brao, Lao, Vietnamese, and Khmer – the neighboring languages closest to the Kachok villages. Some Kachok Christians can speak and write in the Jarai language from Vietnam. However, some women cannot understand Khmer.

Kachok is a member of the large Bahnaric language family (Map 1), whose members include at least 30 distinct languages spoken by approximately 700,000
people, mostly hill-tribes, living in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos (Sidwell, 2004). The Ethnologue (Gordon, 2005) lists Kachok as a member of the Central Bahnaric subgroup (Map 2), while another linguist, Sidwell (2004), lists Kachok as a member of the North Bahnaric group (Map 3). Similarly, Gregerson, observed that the language would probably best be identified as North Bahnaric - related to languages in nearby Vietnam, (personal communication, January 30, 2007).
Map 1: The Languages of Cambodia (SIL 2003)
Map 2: Kachok as part of Central Bahnaric language cluster according to Ethnologue (2005)
Map 3: Kachok as part of North Bahnaric according to Sidwell (2004)
All Kachok villages are situated in the Andoung Meas (អណូ ងមស) district relatively close to one another, with the exception of Kaoh Peak village that is in the Veun Sai (វឺនែស) district. Some Kachok speakers are multilingual. They can speak a little of neighboring languages in the area. Because they are multilingual and have a low population, there is no guarantee that the Kachok language will continue to be used in the next generation. In parts of northern Ratanakiri where the Kachok live, Lao is most likely used more than Khmer as a Language of Wider Communication (LWC). The area is very diverse, both ethnically and linguistically, and the Kachok learn “larger” languages such as Khmer and Lao, as well as the languages of the other groups around them. Overall, most Kachok people do not attend school past the first few grades.

Currently, Kachok does not have an orthography or literature. Since there are only nine (9) Kachok villages in Cambodia surrounded by other language groups, it is reasonable to be concerned about the production of the vernacular literature to enhance the vitality and preservation of the language. Zepeda & Hill in Dorian (1994, p. 800) emphasized that “each language still spoken is fundamental to the personal, social, and spiritual identity of its speakers. They know that without these languages they would be less than they are, and they are engaged in the most urgent struggle to protect their linguistic heritage.”

The Kachok people live in the jungles, hills, and mountains in small separated villages. They make their living through traditional ways of cultivation and through
hunting and collecting fruits from the forest. Some of them are concentrated on fertile land and practice swidden “slash and burn” agriculture in the surrounding valleys. Some of them, living along the Sesan River, rely on rice and vegetable farming, fishing, and forest-based subsistence for their livelihood.

1.3 Conceptual Framework

The study assessed the vitality of the Kachok language. Two different perspectives were applied to the survey data.

First, the UNESCO AD Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages (Brenzinger et al., 2003) proposed nine factors that determine language vitality or death. These factors are designed to describe the vitality of languages. Six factors aim to evaluate a language’s vitality and state of endangerment, while the other two assess language attitudes. One other factor evaluates the urgency of documentation. The UNESCO’s Nine Factors in Language Vitality and Endangerment indicates the degrees of endangerment caused by:

1. Intergenerational language transmission scale ‘speaker population’;
2. Absolute number of speakers;
3. Proportion of speakers within the total reference population;
4. Shifts in domains of language use: ‘Domains and functions’;
5. Response to new domains and media: ‘New domains and media accepted by the endangered language’;
7. Governmental and institutional language attitudes and policies, including official status and use: ‘official attitudes toward language’;

8. Community members’ attitudes toward their own language: ‘community members’ attitudes toward language;

9. Type and quality of documentation: ‘Language documentation’.

Second, Fishman (1991) proposes his Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS) as it has been used in language development and language endangerment. The GIDS is used to assess the vitality and endangerment of a language. It is designed as an indicator of the amount of disruption in the transmission of a language from one generation to another and the contribution of that disruption to the ongoing language shift process. The eight stages of GIDS are summarized below from the most endangered stage (stage 8) through the less endangered stages:

8. Only few elderly people speak the language.

7. Most speakers are beyond childbearing age and use the language actively.

6. All ages speak the language at home and in the community. Children are learning the language with the people at home.

5. Language is used in literacy at home, in school, and in the community.

4. Language is used in education in combination with the official language.

3. Language is used in workplaces of the larger society outside the community.
2. Language is used in lower governmental services and mass media.

1. Language is used at upper governmental levels and mass media.
Figure 1: A Schematic Diagram Showing the Conceptual Framework of the Study
1.4 Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to investigate the language use and attitudes of the Kachok speakers in order to assess the vitality of the Kachok language. This was done by using an orally administered sociolinguistic survey instrument.

Specifically, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1. What are the languages used by the Kachok speakers in different domains?

2. What are the attitudes of Kachok speakers toward their own language and the other languages they speak?

3. Does it appear likely that Kachok speakers of the next generations will continue to use their language?

1.5 The Significance of the Study

No published studies have been done yet for Kachok. This study will be the first known sociolinguistic research regarding the vitality of the Kachok language.

This study assessed the vitality of the Kachok language by investigating the language use and attitudes of its speakers. The findings of this study shall be the basis to assess the need for language development and documentation of the language profile of the Kachok. It is hoped that this study will help the Kachok speakers of Cambodia become aware of the need for promoting and preserving their ethnolinguistic identity. Since this is the first sociolinguistic research done for Kachok, the result of this study will serve as a benchmark of information on the status
of the Kachok language. Probing into the vitality of Kachok with the use of UNESCO’s Nine Factors in Vitality and Endangerment and Fishman’s GIDS, the result will guide the Cambodian government and non-government organizations in their future language planning, policy, and programs.

In addition, since it is primarily for language planners to determine the status of a language, whether or not it exists, this study will serve as a scientific basis for Kachok language vitality for future linguists and researchers who will do the next step in language development.

Furthermore, this study is a positive response to the sentiments and clamor of the Cambodian indigenous people for the preservation of their vernacular language and cultural heritage. Such sentiments and clamor surfaced at the annual language forum hosted by the NGOs.

Finally, the results will be used for a descriptive study by the researcher and other individuals and for the language development program being undertaken under the auspices of the International Cooperation for Cambodia (ICC) to which the researcher is presently connected.

1.6 Scope and Delimitation of the Study

The study was designed to assess the language vitality of the Kachok language in Ratanakiri province, Cambodia. It primarily focused only on language use and attitudes as indicators of language vitality by using the UNESCO’s Nine Factors in Language Vitality and Endangerment and Fishman’s GIDS. The target area was in nine Kachok villages in Andoung Meas and Veun Sai districts. This study was done
by assessing language use and attitudes of the Kachok people toward their own language and the other languages they speak. Data for this study were collected through orally administered questionnaires, observations, and informal interviews.

This study did not include other factors in assessing language vitality such as government language policy, language proficiency, language shift, and bilingualism/multilingualism.

1.7 Definition of Terms

The following key terms are described as used in the study.

_Bahnaric family_ - commonly recognized as one of the principal branches of the broader Mon-Khmer or Austro-Asiatic family, which includes Khmer, Vietnamese and numerous minority languages of Southeast Asia (Sidwell, 2000, p. 2).

_Dialect_ - a language which (1) is highly similar to at least one other language; (2) has no other language included within it regionally as a distinct part; and (3) has no officially normalized writing system, pronunciation, lexicon, or syntax (Lingualinks Library, 1996-2002). It also refers to speech varieties which are linguistically similar enough to be intelligible to speakers of a related variety (Blair, 1990, p. 2).

_Domains_ - are social factors that are involved with location, topic, and participants. Family is an example of a typical domain in which a speaker is talking to another member of a family about everyday topics. That speaker is said to be in the family domain (Fasold, 1984).
The study investigates language use by different generations in the domains of family, neighboring language groups, friendships, village meetings, school, market, and religion.

*Endangered language* - refers to a language which is on the path of extinction. A language is endangered when its speakers cease to use it in an increasingly reduced number of communicative domains, and cease to pass it on from one generation to the next. That is, there are no new speakers, either adults or children (UNESCO, 2003, p. 3).

*Ethnic group* - refers to a group of people of the same race having a common national or distinctive culture.

The Kachok ethnic group in Cambodia is the focus of this study.

*Ethnic identity* - the sum total of feelings on the part of group members about those values, symbols, and common histories that identify them as a distinct group (Royce, 1982, p. 18).

*First language (L1)* - refers to the first language that a person speaks and understands best. It is also called a person’s native language. It is the language that the child first used to speak with his parents.

*Kachok* - the name of the ethnic minority people and a language spoken by a people group in Ratanakiri, Cambodia. Alternate names and spellings are: Kaco, Kaco', Kacoq, Kacok, Kancho, and Kachah.
Khmer - refers to both the people and national language of Cambodia.

The study used the Khmer language for sociolinguistic questionnaires.

It is also the language used to interview the Kachok informants and for translation when the Kachok being interviewed is unable to speak and understand the Khmer language.

Language attitudes - a perception or a view that a person holds toward the various speech varieties which are known to that individual. It can be assessed as either positive or negative (Blair, 1990).

The study surveyed the attitudes of the Kachok speakers toward their own language and other neighboring languages they speak to assess the vitality of the Kachok language.

Language development - refers to the kind of applied linguistic and sociolinguistic activities that are designed to increase the domains of use of a language, whether a majority language or minority language, whether safe or endangered (Suwilai & Malone, 2003, p. 2).

The study is to assess the vitality of the Kachok language. One of its purposes is to identify the needs for vernacular language development.

Language of Wider Communication (LWC) - a language which the majority of the people use in the influential domains such as school, government offices, market, mass media, etc. It is also the language that people usually use to speak with other ethnic groups.
Language maintenance - refers to the collective decision to continue using the language or the languages traditionally used (Fasold, 1984, p. 213).

Language proficiency - the ability of an individual to speak or perform in an acquired language (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Language proficiency).

Proficiency is used to indicate the degree to which a language can be used effectively in face to face interaction.

Language use - refers to what people may be observed actually doing with language (Khubchandani, 1983, p. 40). The language that a person or community chooses to use in different situations or domains.

The study investigated the language use of the Kachok people in different age categories in the domains of the family, friendships, neighborhoods, market, school, village meetings, and religious ceremonies.

Language vitality - the extent of how a language is used at home and in the community. The speakers ideally have a strong value and are proud to use their language in different situations. The speakers know to what extent their language will continue to be used and which social domains their language is to be supported.

The study surveyed language use in different domains and the attitudes of the Kachok speakers to assess the vitality of the Kachok language. The language is considered vital because the speakers continue to use their language at home and in the community without any institutional
support. The speakers perceive that their language will still exist in the next generations.

*Minority Language* - a language spoken by a small group or number of people, and which usually does not have an official status or government recognition in the country or countries where the language is spoken.

*Multilingual(ism)* - is the ability to use more than two languages, separately or in various measures of code-mixing for different purposes.

*Reversing Language Shift* - a phenomenon that indicates returning not only to the mother tongue, but also using the language for other functions that were once implemented in that language but were subsequently lost to it, e.g., regaining lingua franca functions, regaining religious functions, or regaining governmental functions (Fishman, 1999, p. 3).

*Second Language (L2)* - is a second or other language that a person has learned and spoken next to his/her first or mother tongue language.

*Vernacular Language* - refers to a language which is the mother tongue of a group which is socially or politically dominated by another group speaking a different language. The language of a minority in one country is not considered as a vernacular if it is an official language in another country (UNESCO, 1968).

In this study, Kachok is a vernacular language which has not been standardized or does not have an official status.
Vitality Assessment - refers to the process of determining the amount of life a particular language has.

The study investigates factors related to language use and attitudes of the Kachok speakers in order to assess the vitality of their language.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter discusses a selective review of the conceptual research literature and studies on language vitality assessment, endangerment, and preservation. It is divided into three sections: Models, Framework, and Perspectives on Assessing Language Vitality; Studies on Language Vitality, Use, and Attitudes; and Cambodia Studies.

2.1 Conceptual Literature: Models, Framework, and Perspectives on Assessing Language Vitality

Survey on language vitality helps to determine the need for language development. Dying languages may not be the target of this language development, although research is needed in order to record their unique features and increase the world’s knowledge of language.

Several scholars have developed theories, framework, and conceptual models for assessing the vitality and endangerment of a language. Fishman (1991) proposes his Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS) for the use of language development and language endangerment research. Fishman (1999, p. 4) emphasizes that “the GID scale separates those languages in which most speakers are already beyond childbearing age (and they require special treatment) from those in which young adults are still available as mother tongue speakers”. According to Tehan and
Nahhas (cited in Fishman, 1991), “The GIDS is designed as an indicator of the amount of disruption in the transmission of a language from one generation to another and the contribution of that disruption to the ongoing language shift process” (p. 4).

Table 1 is a summary of GIDS that Tehan and Nahhas (2007, p. 4) used for Mpi language in Thailand. According to them, the descriptions of GIDS summary are “a distillation and expansion of Suwilai and Malone’s (2003, p. 2) reformulations of Fishman’s various statements”, beginning with the most endangered stage (stage 8) and progressing through the less endangered stages. Kindell (cited in Fishman, 1991) states that in “an eight-stage intergenerational disruption scale, the most threatened languages are those used only (1) by socially isolated old folks, (2) by a socially integrated population beyond child-bearing age, (3) only orally, with no literacy” (2009).
Table 1: GIDS Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 8</td>
<td>So few (usually elderly) speakers of the language are available that the community needs to reestablish language norms; often the expertise of outsiders is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 7</td>
<td>The older generation (those beyond child bearing age) uses the language but children are not using it; the language is still spoken in the home and integrated somewhat into the family domain; however, the disruption is occurring between the child-bearing generation and the latest generation of children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6</td>
<td>Language and identity socialization of children takes place in home and community; children are learning the language naturally in an intergenerational context; <strong>this is the threshold level for language maintenance, the level at which small languages continue to survive and even thrive</strong> (cf. Lewis, 1996:8; Fishman, 1991:92).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>Language is used in a vital socio-cultural way in the community, socialization involves extensive literacy, usually including non-formal local language schooling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Local language is used in children’s formal education in conjunction with the national or official language; the language is used in both the core (intimate) domains of the community and in the less intimate domains of primary education and literacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Local language is used in workplaces of the larger society, beyond normal local level boundaries, where specialized language skills are not needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Lower governmental services and local mass media are open to the local language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Local language is used at the upper governmental level (although perhaps not exclusively).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Karan (1996) introduced another model, ‘The Perceived Benefit Model’ of language shift. This is designed to describe and understand the language shift dynamics and patterns, and assess future language vitality. According to him:

The perceived benefit model provides a new avenue into the study of language vitality assessment. Present and future language use patterns in any community can be interpreted as the aggregate of the
motivations plus the opportunities. This being the case, the data that are needed for assessments of future language vitality are (1) the present and projected motivations and (2) the present and projected opportunities to learn and use the language (p. 71).

Karan (2000, p. 73) recommends data needed for assessing future language vitality. They are:

1. present language use motivations;
2. projected future language use motivations;
3. present opportunities to learn and use the language;
4. projected future opportunities to learn and use the language.

Based on Karan’s (1996) ‘Perceived Benefit Model’, he concludes that a survey tool is needed to gather data in the present language use motivational structure in the community. This data shows the motivational variation within the community. With this, Karan and Stalder (2000) recommended a tool for gathering language motivation data and approaches for collecting data on the communicative, economic, social, and religious language-related motivations. They provide a methodology which gathers:

1. data on the differing language use motivations present in a community;
2. data from individuals, as the model is based on individual’s motivation;
3. data from a sample of the community which represents the population;
4. data in such a way that motivational variation across sub-sections of the community can be studied;
5. data from a large number of subjects, so that motivational variation studies can be done; and
6. provides tools which are not too difficult to use.

An example of one of the pairs of questions (economic motivations) is: What languages are important for getting money? How important: very important or a bit important?

In March 2003, the UNESCO organized an International Expert Meeting on ‘Safeguarding of Endangered Languages’ to reinforce its role in supporting the world’s endangered languages and cultural diversity. The UNESCO Expert Group (Brenzinger et al., 2003) proposed a framework which uses nine factors of vitality and endangerment as tool for assessing language endangerment. According to the group, the framework “is designed to assist language communities, linguists, educators, and administrators (including local and national governments and international organizations) in finding ways to enhance the vitality of the threatened languages”.

Meanwhile, Lewis (2005) in his article “Towards a Categorization of Endangerment of the World’s Languages” evaluates the proposed UNESCO’s framework by examining a sample of the world’s 100 languages from the Ethnologue (Grimes, 2000). He made recommendations for the UNESCO’s proposal for language vitality and endangerment (pp. 28-29).
The following chart is an adaptation of the UNESCO Expert Group’s proposed framework, as reviewed and stated by Lewis (2005).

**Table 2- Factor 1: Intergenerational Language Transmission Scale**  
(Brenzinger, Yamamoto, et al., 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Speaker Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The language is used by all ages, from children up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The language is used by some children in all domains; it is used by all children in limited domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitively endangered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The language is used mostly by the parental generation and up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely endangered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The language is used mostly by the grandparental generation and up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically endangered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The language is used mostly by very few speakers, of great-grandparental generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>There exists no speaker.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group in their original report did not provide ranking scale for factor 2 in the ‘absolute number of speakers’. Lewis (2005) explains that “the Group clearly states that absolute population numbers alone are not enough to provide any clear indication of the relative endangerment of the language. Yet, a smaller group is likely to be under greater pressure than a larger group”. However, Tehan and Nahhas (2007) provide the rating scale for factor 2 in the absolute number of speakers that is possible for language communities in Southeast Asia. The UNESCO’s nine factors have been adapted to look into the vitality of Mpi language in Thailand (Tehan & Nahhas, 2007), which they adapted from Lewis (2005).
Table 3 - Factor 2: Absolute Number of Speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Absolute number of speakers</th>
<th>These figures were taken from Tehan and Nahhas (2007). According to them, “no point scale was associated with this factor in the original report. For the present paper, the following scale was employed:”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>less than 1000—0 points; 1000-3000—1 point; 3000-6000—2 points; 6000-10,000—3 points; 10,000-50,000—4 points; 50,000-100,00—5 points; 100,000 plus—6 points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 - Factor 3: Proportion of Speakers within the Total Reference Group
(Brenzinger, Yamamoto, et al., 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Proportion of Speakers Within the Total Reference Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All speak the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsafe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nearly all speak the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitively endangered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A majority speak the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely endangered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A minority speak the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically endangered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very few speak the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None speaks the language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 - Factor 4: Loss of Existing Language Domains  
(Brenzinger, Yamamoto, et al., 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Domains and Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universal use</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The language is used in all domains and for all functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual parity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Two or more languages may be used in most social domains and for most functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwindling domains</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The language is in home domains and for many functions, but the dominant language begins to penetrate even home domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited or formal domains</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The language is used in limited social domains and for several functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly limited domains</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The language is used only in a very restricted domains and for a very few functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The language is not used in any domain and for any function.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 - Factor 5: Response to New Domains and Media  
(Brenzinger, Yamamoto, et al., 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Endangerment</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Domains and Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The language is used in all new domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robust/active</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The language is used in most new domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The language is used in many domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The language is used in some new domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The language is used only in a few new domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The language is not used in any new domains.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 - Factor 6: Materials for Language Education and Literacy
(Brenzinger, Yamamoto, et al., 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Accessibility of Written Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There is an established orthography, literacy tradition with grammars, dictionaries, texts, literature, and everyday media. Writing in the language is used in administration and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Written materials exist, and at school, children are developing literacy in the language. Writing in the language is not used in administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Written materials exist and children may be exposed to the written form at school. Literacy is not promoted through print media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Written materials exist, but they may only be useful for some members of the community; and for others, they may have a symbolic significance. Literacy education in the language is not a part of the school curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A practical orthography is known to the community and some material is being written.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No orthography available to the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 - Factor 7: Governmental and Institutional Language Attitudes and Policies
(Brenzinger, Yamamoto, et al., 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Support</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Official Attitudes Toward Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All languages are protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Minority languages are protected primarily as the language of the private domains. The use of the language is prestigious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive assimilation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No explicit policy exists for minority languages; the dominant language prevails in the public domain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active assimilation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Government encourages assimilation to the dominant language. There is no protection for minority languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced assimilation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The dominant language is the sole official language, while non-dominant languages are neither recognized nor protected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Minority languages are prohibited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 - Factor 8: Community Member’s Attitudes toward their Own Language  
(Brenzinger, Yamamoto, et al., 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Community Members’ Attitudes toward Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>All</em> members value their language and wish to see it promoted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Most</em> members support language maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Many</em> members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Only a few</em> members support language maintenance; others are indifferent or may even support language loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td><em>No one cares</em> if the language is lost; all prefer to use a dominant language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 - Factor 9: Amount and Quality of Documentation  
(Brenzinger, Yamamoto, et al., 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Documentation</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Language Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Superlative</em></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>There are comprehensive grammars and dictionaries, extensive texts; constant flow of language materials. Abundant annotated high quality audio and video recordings exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Good</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>There is one good grammar and a number of adequate grammars, dictionaries, texts, literature, and occasionally-updated everyday media; adequate annotated high-quality audio and video recordings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fair</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>There may be an adequate grammar or sufficient amount of grammars, dictionaries, and texts, but no everyday media; audio and video recordings may exist in varying quality or degree of annotation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fragmentary</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>There are some grammatical sketches, word-lists, and texts useful for limited linguistic research but with inadequate coverage. Audio and video recordings may exist in varying quality, with or without any annotation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Inadequate</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Only a few grammatical sketches, short wordlists, and fragmentary texts. Audio and video recordings do not exist, are of unusable quality, or are completely un-annotated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Undocumented</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No material exists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The UNESCO suggests that, "taken together, these nine factors are useful for characterizing a language’s overall sociolinguistic situation. No single factor alone can be used to assess a language’s vitality or its need for documentation” (Brenzinger et al., 2003, p. 7).

Since language endangerment and loss of the world’s linguistic diversity is a serious concern, Crystal (2000) in his book ‘Language Death’ proposes six prerequisites for promoting language revitalization. According to him, the six prerequisites are the “progress towards the goal of language being used in the home and neighborhood as a tool of intergenerational communication” (p. 130). He points out that for a real progress in language vitality, several elements need to be in place (p. 102), namely:

a.) the language group is “interested in obtaining help with a positive attitude towards language rescue”,
b.) “a positive political climate, committed to the preservation of ethnic identity and cultural rights”, and
c.) the involvement of professionals to help in language selection, recording, analysis, and teaching.

Crystal’s six prerequisites for language revitalization states that an endangered language will progress if its speakers … (pp. 130-141):

1. increase their prestige within the dominant community.
2. increase their wealth relative to the dominant community.
3. increase their legitimate power in the eyes of the dominant community.
4. have a strong presence in the educational system.

5. can write their language down.

6. can make use of electronic technology.

Meanwhile, in *The Ethnologue* (Gordon ed., 2005), languages are classified according to their status with reduction in the number of speakers in stages determined by their ages. *The Ethnologue* describes a particular language as:

1. Critically endangered – very few remaining elder speakers are at 70 years old and above, members of the great-grandparent generation.

2. Severely endangered – speakers are at 40 years old and above, members of the grandparent generation.

3. Endangered - speakers are at 20 years old and above, members of the parent generation.

4. Eroding – adults and children are speakers of the language but other children do not speak and use it.

5. Stable but threatened – very few remaining adults and children speak the language.

6. Safe – language is not endangered. Children and all speakers in the speech community are learning the language and are expected to use it in the future.
2.2 Research Literature

2.2.1 Studies in Language Vitality, Use, and Attitudes

Much study has been done to assess language vitality. The perspective for such studies has a wide range of focus and purposes. Some of these studies are on language choice or language use, language attitudes, language maintenance, multilingualism, language proficiency, language shift, and ethnolinguistic identity. In this study, the researcher primarily focused on language use and attitudes as indicators of language vitality.

Fishman (1964, 1965, & 1968) introduced one way of examining language choice or language use by proposing institutional contexts called domains which he described as a constellation of factors such as location, topic and participants. Typical domains, Fishman suggests, include family, friendship, neighborhood, market, religion, school, work, and government. The dominant language used by the majority of speakers in a particular domain is more likely to be appropriate, thus, will be adopted by the other speakers in order to assimilate themselves in the group.

In her Ph.D thesis entitled “A Melanesian Perspective on Mechanism of Language Maintenance and Shift: Case Studies from Papua New Guinea”, Landweer (2006) provides eight ‘indicators of ethnolinguistic vitality’ for an endangered language to track the evidences of relative language vitality:

1. External contact
2. Domains of language use
3. Frequency and type of code switching

4. Population and group dynamics

5. Distribution of speakers within their own social network

6. Social outlook

7. Language prestige

8. Access to a stable and acceptable economic base.

Landweer explains that “the indicators are evidences or symptoms as it were of relative language health gathered through observations and interviews made in the speech communities and with speakers of the languages” (p. 213).

Landweer’s study ‘documents the life and death processes of natural languages in Papua New Guinea and calls attention to the need for study of language vitality issues in Melanesia’. The purposes of the study are: “To provide an overview of the country of Papua New Guinea, a Melanesian state encompassing 75% of the Pacific’s languages; to profile her linguistic characteristics both with sweeping brush strokes that characterize the country…and to provide a socio historical profile of both the country and Cape Vogel region that has contributed to the continuing endemic multilingualism that characterizes her people-covering topics of language use in the pacification process, within missionization, and development” (p. 69).

On the other hand, Lewis’ (2000) gives insights for assessing ethnolinguistic vitality by measuring solidarity and power. He states that:

Language attitude data should be analyzed not only for what they can tell us about positive or negative attitudes towards L1 and L2 (or Ln) but also for what they indicate about the group’s orientation towards
power and solidarity. As useful as it is to know if people like their language and think it is beautiful, we need to keep in mind that languages, like any cultural symbol, are part of a larger semiotic system. We need to discover what associations L1 has with other symbols of power and/or solidarity. This same kind of analysis needs to be done for each of the linguistic varieties in the community’s repertoire (pp. 96-97).

A survey on assessing language vitality with language use and attitudes as part of interviews was done for Western and Eastern Lawa language groups in Thailand (Nahhas, 2007). Nahhas suggests two language vitality factors: indicative and predictive. “Each factor is classified as ‘positive,’ ‘negative,’ or ‘unclear’. The interpretation of the classification differs between indicative and predictive factors, depending on whether the factor is related to current or future language vitality” (pp. 38-39).

Another study that Nahhas (2007) conducted was a sociolinguistic survey among the Mpi speakers in Thailand. He investigated factors related to language vitality such as: language use, attitudes, ethnolinguistic identity, and self-reported bilingual proficiency to assess the need for vernacular literature in the Mpi language. Sociolinguistic questionnaires, observation, and informal interviews were used to answer the research questions. Findings show that Mpi is in critical situation. Something has to be done to preserve the language.

One major study on language use patterns is Gal’s study (1979) in Oberwart, Austria. Gal did a study in a community of people who were bilingual in Hungarian and German. For data collection, Gal used primary methods on participant
observation and interview. Gal found clear patterns of language choice using a contingency table. Age was a significant factor in predicting the use of German than Hungarian. Language shift is in progress when younger people are using German in domains where the older people use Hungarian.

Another large-scale sociolinguistic survey with modern survey techniques was a survey of language use of Himachal Pradesh, a small state in India. Misra and Dua (1980) conducted a comprehensive study of the highly complex multilingual situation with a challenging problem in the formulation of goals and objectives, collecting and processing the data involving multiple linguistic and social variables. Findings of the Himachal Pradesh sociolinguistic survey revealed diverse facts about dialects and languages, about their use in different social domains and respondents’ proficiency. The results provide a number of perspectives for looking at the complex language situation of the state.

Likewise, in India, Krueger (1986) did a survey on the language attitudes and use in a multilingual setting among the Gujarati speakers in India. The study aimed to determine the adequacy of Hindi, Urdu, or English for communications at a deep and personal level. He designed the attitude test with the following categories:

1. Domains of language use
2. Propriety of language use
3. Attitudes toward the languages of Gujarati, Hindi, Urdu, and English
4. Attitudes toward speakers of Gujarati, Hindi, Urdu, and English
The survey results concluded that native Gujarati speakers have negative attitudes towards Urdu. Hindi and English were acceptable for use. However, Gujarati language was the language of choice for religious and other domains in village and governmental levels.

A sociolinguistic survey on language use and attitudes among the Sipacapa language in Guatemala was done by Kindberg (2006). Language use and attitudes were described to assess the language vitality and translation need viability in Sipacapa. Age, gender, and religious persuasion were factors used in this survey with eighty respondents in different locations. The survey revealed that Sipakapenses have high respect for their vernacular language and still want to learn and use their own language.

Potter et al. conducted another sociolinguistic survey in Papua New Guinea in 2003 among the Ambakich language group. One of the goals of the survey was to determine whether a language development project is necessary for the Ambakich language. Language use and attitudes were also part of the interviews to determine the language vitality of the Ambakich. The results revealed that Ambakich has low vitality and language development projects would not be viable (Potter, Lambrecht, Aleman, Janzen, Ohoa, & Corbalan, 2003, p. 1).

Anonby, S and S (2004) on their report on Xokleng language maintenance in Santa Catarina, Brazil, conducted a language survey on language use, attitudes, and bilingualism to assess the vitality of the Xokleng language. The goal of this survey was to determine if the Xokleng language was still being maintained and if a
language development program was needed. The survey methods used were observation and questionnaires. The findings prove that the Xokleng have a positive attitude towards their own language. As observed, the speakers above 35 years old usually speak Xokleng to each other, while speakers under 35 years old usually speak to each other in Portuguese.

Another study using the concept of domains in language choice was the study of Parasher (1980), in which self-reported data were collected to determine the language use of the speakers in two cities in India. Veltman (1991) did a similar study on domains in language use, as related to language shift among North American minorities in the United States.

Meanwhile, Sebastian (1982) suggests three possible approaches to analyze language attitudes. First, the content analysis of community behavior in which language maintenance and shift are examined based on analyses of laws and policies concerning the use of a language in the different domains. Second, the application of the direct measure technique by using a questionnaire and personal interviews regarding language attitudes of the speakers – their language choice, desire to learn the language, and evaluation of language policies. Third, an indirect method in which the subjects are asked about their attitudes toward their language.

Similarly, a study on endangered languages and reversing language shift was done in the Mpi language in Thailand. Tehen and Nahhas (2007) assessed the language vitality of Mpi using three different models:
1. Fishman’s (1991) Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS);

2. Crystal’s (2000) language revitalization prerequisites; and


These three models were used to evaluate the reports and observations made in the interviews. Using the three models, the results indicated that Mpi language is endangered.

In Africa, Hasselbring (2000, p. 62) applied Fishman’s GIDS to assess the language vitality of the Boteti Subdistrict in Botswana. The survey found that Tswana is the most vital language used in lower governmental services and mass media. It is followed by Herero in which the literacy classes take place at homes. However, !Goro, //Gana, Kalanga, Kua, and Najwa are all in stage 6 - the threshold level for language maintenance in which the language is able to survive and even thrive (Fishman, 1991, p. 92). These five languages are used by all ages of speakers at home without institutional support. For youth and children, the languages that show some signs of language loss are //Gana, Kalanga, and Najwa. Serious signs of losing vitality were found in Yeyi and Danisi because children and young adults do not often use nor speak their language. Lastly, Teti is the least vital language with a very few elderly speakers.

In the Philippine setting, most of the studies were concerned about language shift, proficiency, language policy, language use, and attitude in a multilingual
setting, as they are important indicators to assess the language vitality of a language group.

The survey by Quakenbush (1989) looked into language use and proficiency of the Agutaynen speakers in a multilingual setting in Northern Palawan province. For data collections, he used personal observation and he interviewed 180 respondents using a questionnaire. Four respondent variables were used: sex, age, education, and location of residence. Patterns of language use among Agutaynens are relatively uniform concerning the four variables. Findings revealed the Agutaynen speech community use four languages – Agutaynen, Cuyonon, Tagalog, and English at varying degrees of proficiency. The study found that Agutaynen is the vernacular language at home and with other Agutaynens. Cuyonon, the vernacular of a neighboring language group, has served as a regional lingua franca. Both Tagalog, which is the Philippine national language, and English as an official language, are used extensively as languages of instruction. The younger generation usually uses Tagalog while the older generation reports greater use of Cuyonon.

The pioneering first large scale language survey done by Otanes and Sibayan (1969) in the Philippines focused on language attitudes using questionnaires on language use and the degree of dialect variation in six languages. This initial report contains the most important data on language attitudes and use, and provides an overall picture of the language situation. The language survey involved 2,379 householders (parents), 1,577 adolescents, 194 printers and publishers, 130 radio station operators, and 2,342 teachers in 254 communities scattered in 21 regions.
throughout the Philippines. The study in particular, looked into the respondents’ preferred language in the education domain. The study indicated that Pilipino (the official term for the national language) was emerging as a new lingua franca and that English was a very prestigious and much-preferred language within the academic circle.

The study emphasizes that the choice of language in school is likely dependent on the language perceived as a requisite for success in particular occupations, status in the community, and for achieving national identity. The survey thus indirectly examined the prestige of a language by showing how useful it is in a given prestigious occupation (p. 111).

The survey indicated that most householders and teachers spoke a vernacular language when speaking to most people, except when conversing with teachers and doctors (pp. 54-55). In the exceptional case, householders used a particular Philippine language while teachers used a combination of mainly Philippine languages.

The study further revealed most Filipinos’ preference of a vernacular language over the national language as a medium of instruction. However, many tend to accept bilingual setups in which rigorous and technical subjects were taught in English, while the less rigorous and technical ones were taught in Pilipino (1969, p. 172).

Based on Otanes and Sibayan’s (1969) survey results, Sibayan (1975) elaborated significant findings in his report entitled “Survey of Language Use and Attitudes towards Language in the Philippines”. He categorizes the results of the
survey according to: The languages people use; language and the schools; the usefulness of a language; and language and certain types of mass media. Findings imply that all respondents interviewed learned a Philippine language as their first language (L1), though, majority of Filipinos are either bilingual in Philippine languages or have obtained English as a second language (L2). The majority of the parents and teachers preferred English as the medium of instruction in school. However, in occupation, the respondents believed that knowledge of English alone would not make a person successful. Formal education is required and one has to be bilingual in English and Pilipino. In non-Tagalog areas, one must also know the local language. The respondents preferred to use English, Pilipino and local languages in mass media depending on the programs they watched or to which they listened. In general, Sibayan (1975) concludes that, “English, Pilipino, and the vernaculars could all contribute their share to the advancement of the Filipinos”.

Fabregas' (1981) micro study of language in Calasiao and Dagupan in Pangasinan focused on the domains of occupation. Fabregas administered questionnaires to 30 professional, semi-professional and nonprofessional respondents. To verify the gathered data, the language use of 15 respondents was observed via tape recording as checked against self-reported data regardless of the category of work. The finding shows that the professionals and semi-professionals use English frequently. Other semi-professionals use Filipino next to Pangasinan.

In a similar sociolinguistic survey, Dumaran (1980) studied language use, shift, and perceptions of 1,005 urban and rural, native and migrant respondents in
Dagupan City, Pangasinan. Data gathered verified the validity of self-report data through a market transaction count. The study revealed that Pangasinan is commonly used at home, community, church, and other social functions. English or Filipino is used by the informants in work and school domains in the urban areas. In the rural areas, Pangasinan is used in most domains.

Another study was conducted by Mendoza (1978) who investigated the language use and attitudes of speakers in the province of Surigao del Sur by conducting a macro study of the entire province using a questionnaire as well as a macro study of a specific community thru participant observation. Mendoza's work investigated what languages are: (1) used most and least frequently when speaking, reading, and writing; and (2) used in various domains such as home, party, church, school, and workplace. The research indicated that relevant languages used were English, Pilipino, and Cebuano.

Fuentes and Mojica (1999) also studied the language attitudes of selected Filipino bilingual students toward the use of Filipino and English. Respondents were asked about their attitudes toward English and Filipino: 1) as a whole group; 2) according to gender; and 3) as media of instruction. The over-all results of this study seemed to favor the country’s aim of making the Philippines a bilingual nation whose people can speak both the mother tongue and the second language with fluency (pp. 50-55).

Walton et al. (2003) conducted a sociolinguistic survey among the Itneg language in the province of Abra, Philippines. They investigated language use,
language viability, language attitudes, and potential for community involvement in the Itneg dialect areas of Abra. Questions asked probed the data related to research questions about the viability, the degree of the endangerment and the attitude of people towards their language. The finding shows that the six dialect areas of Itneg where testing and interviews occurred are viable language communities. However, it seems that Inlaod, Moyadan and Banao dialects are less viable than Binongan, Maeng, and Masadiit. Itneg speakers have positive attitudes towards their language. Most of them appreciate, use, and value their Itneg dialect.

The primary method the scholars and researchers usually use in doing surveys is the questionnaires and interviews. According to Agheyisi and Fishman (1970), social scientists extensively use questionnaires and interviews for gathering self-reported data. These methods of collecting data are tested in several studies in language use, attitudes, language vitality, language shift, bilingualism, language proficiency, language maintenance, and language policy (Otanes & Sibayan, 1969; Mendoza, 1978; Gal, 1979; Dumaran, 1980; Fabregas, 1981; Quakenbush, 1986; Krueger, 1986; Fishman, 1991; Fuentes & Mojica, 1999; Potter et al., 2003; Anonby, 2004; Markowski, 2005; Mann & Markowski, 2005; Kindberg, 2006; ICC survey, 2006; Tehan & Nahhas, 2007; and Nahhas, 2007).
2.2.2 Cambodia Studies

There is not much sociolinguistic study done in Cambodia. The Kachok study is partly similar to a few previous sociolinguistic surveys of other language groups in Cambodia about language vitality, use, and attitudes.

In October 2006, this researcher, with the ICC language survey team, participated in a survey of Bahnaric language cluster in thirty villages in two provinces of Mondulkiri and Kratie, Kingdom of Cambodia. The main purpose of the survey was to get a broad overview of the current sociolinguistic situations in these two provinces. Language vitality was part of the secondary purpose of the survey, a vital factor that should be considered for future language development needs, though, this survey did not measure the vitality of each language. Results of interview responses show that some of the Bahnaric groups are still using their own language while the rest of the languages are now assimilated to Khmer and Bunong languages. Further study is desirable to determine if the language is really vital and language development is necessary (ICC survey, 2006).

A rapid appraisal survey, done by Mann and Markowski (2005), was on Kuy dialects spoken in different villages in Cambodia. The survey aimed to gain a broad overview of the dialects and basic sociolinguistic factors among the Kuy speakers. One of the purposes of the survey was to identify the salient attitudes held among Kuy in Cambodia. Language vitality is part of the survey. The result indicated that, in some areas, the Kuy speakers have positive attitudes towards their own language
while in other areas which are closer to major roads where Khmer is dominantly used, the Kuy speakers expressed negative attitudes towards their own language. Regarding language vitality, the two Kuy varieties have low vitality while the other two have high vitality.

In addition, “A Comparative Study of Kuy Varieties in Cambodia” was the master’s thesis of Markowski (2005). Part of her studies was analyzing sociolinguistic data on language use and vitality. The two main varieties of Kuy, Kuy Ntua and Kuy Ntra, were reported to be more secure. The children still use the language varieties. In fact, these were the languages of choice in home domains. However, the two Kuy varieties, Kuy Mla and Kuy Mai, appeared to be less in use. According to Markowski, speakers of all Kuy varieties used Khmer language more often than Kuy such as at the market, funerals, and meetings, though sometimes both Kuy and Khmer were used.

There has not been much research done on the Kachok language. In August 2001, Gerard Diffloth elicited a wordlist from some Kachok people in the Andoung Meas district. However, this list is not yet available for public consumption. In the past, some linguists thought Kachok to be very similar to Tampuan language but the two languages can be assumed to be mutually unintelligible based on their low lexical similarity. The Kachok wordlist elicited by the ICC survey team from Veun Sai province in November 2006 was only about 50% similar to a Tampuan wordlist.

The aforementioned surveys provided the researcher with information on language use and attitudes, sufficient to assess Kachok language vitality. In particular,
the models for assessing language vitality helped the researcher choose the appropriate model to be used particularly focusing on language use and attitudes. Some researchers used one of these models to assess language vitality by using language domains only and others used language proficiency, language maintenance, and ethnonymic identity to measure language vitality. In this study, the researcher employed the model used on the Mpi language based on the UNESCO’s nine factors in language vitality and endangerment. The questionnaires and interviews used in this study of language vitality, use, and attitudes have been taken from the Research and Instrument Design Tool (RAID) which the Mainland Southeast Asia Group (MSEAG) is using as standard format (cf Figure 2, p. 63).
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design, the setting of the study, site selection, instruments, the informants, and data analysis and interpretation.

3.1 Research Design

This study is a descriptive research and is part of the language survey work in which the researcher is presently involved. According to Blair (1990, pp. 2-3), “Surveys, by their nature, tend to be descriptive than theoretical... Where these theoretical concerns are of importance to the field researcher, an attempt is made to describe some of the issues involved.” Several sociolinguistic surveys were done by applying a descriptive method (Potter et.al, 2003; Anonby, 2004; Kindberg, 2006; Nahhas, 2007; Dawkins & Kirkland, 2008; etc.). In these surveys, the results were based on analyzing the data by describing the responses from the sociolinguistic questionnaires, some with personal interviews and observations.

In this study, the sociolinguistic description of the status of the Kachok language was undertaken adopting the UNESCO’s Nine Factors in Language Vitality and Endangerment (Brenzinger et al., 2003) and Fishman’s GIDS (Fishman, 1991) to assess the language vitality of Kachok, particularly on language use in several domains and on the attitudes of its speakers. In order to study the trend in language use, the following domains were chosen: family/home, friendships, church, market,
village religious ceremonies, village meetings, neighboring language groups, and school. The language attitudes of the Kachok speakers towards their own language and other languages they speak were also investigated. In addition, informal interviews and observations were employed to confirm the responses from questionnaires. Then, all data were analyzed to find out the language vitality of the Kachok language. Quota sampling was used to select subjects for the Individual SLQ and for the Group Interviews, with age and gender as desired samples for Kachok survey.

The survey was conducted in nine Kachok villages surrounded by the dominant languages in the area such as Jarai, Tampuan, Lao, Krung, Khmer, and Brao.

3.2 The Setting

Cambodia is located on the Indochinese Peninsula, bordered by Vietnam to the south and east, Laos to the north, Thailand to north and west, and the Gulf of Thailand to the west and south (Map 4). Ratanakiri province is in the northeastern province of Cambodia, located approximately 600 kilometers from Phnom Penh, the capital of Cambodia. Ratanakiri covers 11,052 kilometers with mountainous and plain areas, bordered by Laos to the north, southern Vietnam to the east, and Stung Treng and Mondulkiri provinces of Cambodia to the west and south, respectively. The province is mostly covered with forest, though commercial logging since 1980 has significantly reduced old-growth forest. The Kachok people inhabit Ratanakiri province.
The total population of Ratanakiri is 111,403. The indigenous ethnic minorities comprise more than 80% of the population of this remote province: Tampuan (25.23%), Jarai (20.57%), Kreung (19.89%), Brao (8.74%), Kachok (3.75%), Kavet (3.65%), Bunong (0.24%), and Lun (0.20%). About 13 percent of the population is Khmer. The Kachok number about 3,365 [Table 11 - taken from the village chiefs (vc) and commune chiefs (cc)] and live in nine (9) villages in the district of Andoung Meas and one village in Veun Sai district. The language, culture,
and livelihood systems of these ethnic minorities are significantly different from those of the lowland people (Mac Andrew, 2001).

**Table 11: Population of Kachok People (taken from the VC and CC during a background research, 2006)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th># of individuals (children and adults)</th>
<th>Commune</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Upper Kachut</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>Nhang</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lower Kachut</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Nhang</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nay</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Nhang</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Talao</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Big Kanat</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>Talao</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Small Kanat</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Talao</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kak</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Talao</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tanong</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Talao</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Talao</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Talao</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>Veun Sai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,365</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Talao has not been surveyed as only 7 Kachok people live there.*
The province consists of nine districts: Andoung Meas, Barkeo, Ta Veang, O Chum, Lum Phat, Kon Mum, Banlung, Ou Yadao, and Veun Sai (Map 5). The Kachok people dwell in nine (9) villages, eight of which are in Andoung Meas district, along with one village in Veun Sai district (Ministry of Interior, Royal Government of Cambodia, 2006).
Andoung Meas is composed of three communes: Malik, Nhang, and Talao, with the Kachok villages located in the following three villages in Nhang commune: Upper Kachut, Lower Kachut, and Nay. There are six (6) Kachok villages in Talao commune: Big Kanat, Small Kanat, In, Tanong, Kak, and Talao. The village of Kaoh Peak can be found in Kaoh Peak commune, Veun Sai district. Small Kanat is the village closest to the provincial capital of Banlung lying northeast of about two hours away in dry season. It is accessible by car or motorbike. Villages located on the further bank of the Sesan River can be reached by boat and then by foot, or by ferrying a motorbike across the river.

The Sesan and Srepok rivers flowing from Vietnam cross the territory from east to west and join the Sekong River, a tributary of the Mekong River - one of the longest rivers in the world. The Mekong River connects Stung Treng to the southern provinces of Cambodia and in the north to Laos (Mac Andrew, 2001). This river connection plays a strategic role in communications and trade. This river is also one option of traveling by boat to the neighboring villages of Ou Yadao, Andoung Meas, Ta Veang, and Veun Sai districts.

During the rainy season (June to October) travel to remote villages is more difficult, as roads are not passable by car or motorbike. During November to February the weather is relatively cooler. Hot season is from March to April. The temperature in Ratanakiri ranges from 20 degrees to 35 degrees Celsius.

The National Center for Malaria categorizes the region as a serious malaria zone. Health services to the villagers remain problematic.
3.2.1 Religion and Belief System of the Kachok

Most Kachok people practice a traditional religion that spiritually influences their lives and agricultural practices. They practice many rituals and taboos during various ceremonies. During some week-long village sacrifice ceremonies, entrance to the village is prohibited, and those present in the village are forbidden to leave once the ceremony has begun. One should respect this traditional belief and behave accordingly; otherwise, they will be fined - to pay money or an animal. A tree branch hanging in front of the village entrance or house is a sign for not entering or leaving the village. In case of village epidemics, the Kachok people construct icons designed to frighten away the spirits whom they believe to inflict sickness (Health Unlimited, 1995).

3.2.2 History

Ratanakiri's indigenous groups live autonomously due to the province's physical isolation from Phnom Penh. During a trip to Kaoh Peak village in November 2006, the commune chief reported that the Kachok in the area lived isolated and far away from the eight Kachok villages in Andoung Meas. The people in eight Kachok villages live separately in one district, except in the village of In which used to be a part of Kaoh Peak in Veun Sai. At some point in the recent past, the Kachok came from the same place and later had a war or sharp dispute, causing some to separate and form their own village.
The village chief in the village of In mentioned that the Lamam is the same with Romam who used to be the Kachok people. They lived in the border of Vietnam. Some Kachok people in In, Kak, Upper Kachut, and Tanong villages validated this report. One Kachok in In village mentioned that he once visited his Lamam relative in the Vietnam border. There is a need to validate if the Lamam still exists.

The Kachok are a relatively small group, and little has been researched on their language or culture. The rest of their history or their origin is unknown to outsiders.

3.3 Site Selection

Kachok people live in nine (9) villages in two districts of Ratanakiri province. Eight villages are in Andoung Meas district: Lower Kachut, Upper Kachut, Nay, In, Tanong, Kak, Talao, Big Kanat, and Small Kanat. In Veun Sai district, the Kachok people are located in Kaoh Peak village. The Dialect Perceptions Group Interview was conducted in the 9 villages (Map 6) while the Village Leader Questionnaire was administered in 7 of the villages; Upper Kachut and Lower Kachut villages share just one village chief, as do the villages of Big Kanat and Small Kanat. The School Teacher Interview was conducted in all villages that have a school. The Individual Sociolinguistic Questionnaire was administered in just four villages chosen because they are not mixed with other ethnic groups, having larger populations than other Kachok villages, located far from each other, and reportedly having distinct accents. Talao village has not been visited, since the majority of the villagers are Lao, and
only seven Kachok people live there. Lao is the common language used in this village.

Map 6: Kachok Villages in Ratanakiri
As shown in Table 12, five SLQs were used to gather data related to the research questions. All Kachok villages were visited during the fieldwork.

**Table 12: Villages Visited and Number of People Responding to Questionnaires**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Christian Leader SLQ</th>
<th>Group Interview</th>
<th>Individual SLQ</th>
<th>Teacher Interview</th>
<th>Village Leader SLQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Upper Kachut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lower Kachut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Big Kanat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Small Kanat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kak</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tanong</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Talao</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Andoung Meas Proper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Talao and Andong Meas district were not included in the site selection, but teachers were interviewed because some Kachok children attended school in these places. In dialect perceptions group interview, a group of four persons were interviewed in each of the nine villages. Seven (7) village leaders were interviewed since two villages, Big and Small Kanat, and Upper and Lower Kachut shared the same village leaders. Individual SLQ was administered in four villages where 12
subjects were interviewed in each of these four villages. Three (3) Christian leaders were interviewed during the 2-week Bible training in Banlung, capital of Ratanakiri province. These Christian leaders came from different Kachok villages reported as Christian communities.

3.4 Instruments

In this study, the sociolinguistic questionnaire (SLQ) is the primary tool which was orally administered to collect data relevant to the research questions. The questionnaire represents a direct method of study in which subjects respond to direct questions regarding their behavior, attitudes, and opinions as opposed to indirect methods which are designed to keep subject from being investigated (Fasold, 1984). The questionnaires are open ended, consisting of the following: Dialect perceptions group, village leader, teacher, individual, and church leader (see subsections of 3.5 for details). In addition, observations and informal interviews were likewise used to confirm responses to the SLQ.

In the previous research of Bahnaric language cluster in two provinces of Cambodia, the researcher gained experience in data collection as well as the development and administration of language use and attitudes questionnaires and learned to identify a number of sociolinguistics factors which can be indicators of language vitality. These factors are also attested in the literature on language vitality issues (see related literature for more details).

The researcher developed the SLQ used in this study by collecting language use and attitude questionnaires previously used for sociolinguistic surveys in
Cambodia and other situations in Mainland Southeast Asia (MSEA). Some of these surveys include: Dawkins & Kirkland, 2008; Nahhas, 2007; ICC survey, 2006; and Mann & Markowski, 2005. The researcher also benefited from the many-experienced language surveyors, particularly on language use and attitude questionnaire already used on Cambodian languages and cultural context (ICC survey, 2006).

The majority of the questions were taken from Research and Instrument Design Tool (RAID) developed by Nahhas, Kelsall, and Mann (2006) of Payap University Survey Unit, Payap University Linguistics Institute, Thailand. This tool is an attempt to provide suggestions, in outline form, for common survey purposes, goals and research questions, along with possible probes that help answer the research questions. According to Nahhas et al., 2006, the RAID was adapted from Douglas Boone’s (SIL) adaptation of “The Ladder of Abstraction” (De Vaus’, 1986). The “steps” of the ladder are described in the Procedures of Language Survey Modules used for training SIL language surveyors around the world. The steps are slightly re-ordered and, for each step, many possibilities are given. Many of the probes contained in RAID were adapted in Showalter, 1991. These resulting SLQs have been pilot tested in Central Thai and Northern Thai, and revised accordingly. They have been used in the Mpi survey, the Lawa survey, and some surveys of Karennic languages in Thailand. The RAID is only an outline that can be modified depending on the context relevant to language and culture of a people group being studied.
**Purpose 1:** [“Need”] Assess the NEED for vernacular literature development among the X people within region R.

(part of outline deleted)

**Goal 3:** Evaluate the vitality of language X in region R.

“Vitality is the extent to which a language serves the needs of its speakers. When a language loses important, meaningful or useful functions in a community, it loses vitality.” – LinguaLinks Library glossary of sociolinguistic terms

**Research Question 1:** Does it appear likely that variety/language X will continue to be spoken by future generation(s)?

**Concept 1:** Proficiency of children in X language

**Indicator 1 [Criteria]:** Children's proficiency in X

**Instrument 1:** Individual SLQ

**Probe 1:** See Children speak well or not

**Indicator 2 [Criteria]:** Opportunities to learn X

**Indicator 3 [Criteria]:**

**Instrument 1:** Individual SLQ

**Probe 1:** Language taught by parents

**Probe 2:** Language taught by parents (mixed marriages)

(part of outline deleted)

**Concept 2:** Bilingual proficiency

(part of outline deleted)

**Concept 3:** Domains of Language Use

**Indicator 1 [Criteria]:** Language choice in domains

**Instrument 1:** Individual SLQ

**Probe 1:** Domains of language use

**Indicator 2 [Criteria]:** Language use by children

[An Insider might not really know about the children if they don’t have any... Also, since this is such an important thing to get right, it might be better to get more than just one person’s opinion on this.]

**Instrument 1:** Individual SLQ

**Probe 1:** Children's first language

**Probe 2:** Children's language of play

**Probe 3:** Children other languages learned before school

**Probe 4:** Children other languages learned after school

Figure 2: Part of Raid Outline (from Nahhas, Kelsall, and Mann, 2006)
In the digital version the probes are in linked files with underlined blue words which can be opened when it is clicked. For example, if probe 1 is clicked the question below will appear.

1. What language do [X] children in this village speak first?

Figure 3: Probe from RAID for concept 3, indicator 2, instrument 1 and probe 1

The example question as seen in Figure 3 is just one sample of the questions that the researcher used for the SLQs. It is in the linked file of probe 1(Figure 3) ‘children’s first language’. X stands for Kachok people. Each probe contains a list of questions that appear when it is clicked in a digital version.

The probe is only part of RAID, which MSEAG is using for language survey. This is a standard format to help the researcher formulate the survey purposes, goals, research questions, and sociolinguistic questionnaires to answer the research questions. Some parts of the outline were deleted, since the researcher selected only parts of this outline that were applicable to this study. The researcher, with the help of the language survey colleagues and Khmer language assistants, formulated the rest of the questions. The questionnaire was first written in English, and then translated into Khmer language. The Khmer language assistant edited the researcher’s Khmer translation of the SLQs.

The questionnaire was tested with the Khmer speakers to ensure that the questions were clear and easy to understand. “Other times the questions on the questionnaire have to be quite radically modified. In either case, the list of questions
should be thoroughly checked with the native speaker of the vernacular before it is pilot tested” (Blaire, 1990, p. 99). After testing the questions with the Khmer speakers, the researcher and the language assistant pilot tested the questionnaire with the Kachok village chiefs and other speakers of the Kachok language in the Kachok area. Most of the Kachok village chiefs could speak and understand Khmer well but some Kachok speakers could not. The Kachok language interpreters were fluent in Khmer and were able to elaborate the questions needing clarification by those who could not speak and understand the Khmer language. After the questionnaire was pilot tested, only few modifications were done to ensure the relevance of the questions particularly to this study (Blaire, 1990. p. 103; Boehm, 1997; Nahhas, 2007). Some questions were difficult to understand by the Kachok speakers who could speak and understand Khmer. The researcher, with the help of a Khmer language assistant, simplified the questions to make them more specific and apt, and to enable the Kachok speakers to visualize situations that fit the questions.

3.5 Administration of SLQ and Data Collection

The five SLQs were administered in 9 Kachok villages using Khmer or Kachok language. The research assistant, a Khmer speaker (Cambodian national) was trained to appropriately administer the questionnaires. Along with the Kachok language interpreters, she helped the researcher and the ICC language survey colleagues administer the questionnaires all throughout the survey. These Kachok interpreters are native Kachok speakers who speak well and understand both Kachok
and Khmer. They translated all responses in Kachok into Khmer so that the researcher and the survey team could record them.

The questionnaires were asked in Khmer language and translated orally into Kachok by the Kachok interpreters in case the subject did not understand the Khmer language. Some of the questions like, “What language do the children in this village learn to speak first?” were asked in the individual, Christian leader, group, and village leader SLQs. This is to validate the commonality of the answers to a specific SLQ. All responses related or not related to the questions were recorded at the back of SLQs sheets or in a bound data notebook. All responses in Khmer or Kachok were translated into English and finally entered into the excel worksheet.

The following are the five sociolinguistic questionnaires:

**3.5.1 Individual Sociolinguistic Questionnaire**

In four of the nine villages, individual villagers were selected for interview, using quota sampling with age and gender as desired sample (c.f. Table 13, p. 71). Their answers were especially important in providing a picture of language vitality and language attitudes.

**3.5.2 Village Leader Sociolinguistic Questionnaire**

In each of seven villages, the village leader was interviewed concerning the language situation of the village. In his absence, another Kachok leader - the commune chief, deputy leader of the village, or someone else knowledgeable about the Kachok people and their language was interviewed instead.
3.5.3 School Teacher Questionnaire

In every village that has formal and/or non-formal schools, a teacher at the primary school and/or a literacy teacher were interviewed. This aided in gaining insights into language vitality, children’s language use, and interest in language development.

3.5.4 Dialect Perceptions Group Questionnaire

In each of the nine (9) villages, two men and two women based on the sample size (c.f. Table 14, p. 71) were interviewed together as a group. People who have had contact with other Kachok villages were the target subjects. They were asked questions regarding similarities and differences between the way Kachok is spoken in their village and the way Kachok is spoken in other villages.

3.5.5 Christian Leader Questionnaire

Taking the opportunity during the 12-day Bible School training held in Banlung, the provincial capital of Ratanakiri, the researcher administered the SLQ to three Kachok Christian leaders. Many minority Christian leaders in Ratanakiri attended including Kachok leaders from three Kachok villages.

3.5.6 Informal Interviews and Observations

Observations and responses to the informal interviews that are relevant to the research questions were noted in a bound data notebook all throughout the fieldwork. Personal observation was useful in validating language use data and observing which
languages were used in particular domains. Informal interviews and observations were used to confirm the responses in SLQs. The evaluation of vitality of the language was also based on informal interviews and observation of language use and attitudes of the Kachok speakers.

Observation is a natural, indirect way to learn about people's behaviour. Throughout the fieldwork, this researcher and her team observed language use, social interaction, and other cultural experiences. The team spent time with people in their villages, observing language use during everyday activities.

3.6 Subject and Interpreter Selection

3.6.1 Screening criteria for the subject

For the Dialect Perceptions Group Interview, subject was chosen based on these criteria:

1. Kachok is his mother tongue language.
2. Both parents are Kachok and spoke Kachok with the subject when he was a child.
3. The person must be within the age range of 17 up to 60.
4. The person must have grown up and currently lives in the village which the researcher has surveyed.
For the Individual Sociolinguistic Questionnaire, the subject was chosen based on these criteria:

1. Kachok is his first language.
2. Both parents are Kachok and spoke Kachok with the subject when he was child.
3. The person must be within the age range of 17 up to 60.
4. The person grew up and currently lives in the village which the researcher has surveyed.

3.6.2 Screening criteria for the Kachok Interpreter

For choosing the language interpreter, the criteria are as follows:

1. Kachok is his first language.
2. Ethnically Kachok, that is, both parents are Kachok.
3. The person understands and speaks clearly both Kachok and Khmer.
4. The person must have the time and willingness to cooperate as language interpreter.
5. The person grew up and currently lives in the Kachok area surveyed by the researcher.
3.6.3 Sampling Design

The goal of this study was to obtain a desired sample for each of the five SLQs. For the Individual SLQ, quota sampling was used with age and gender as desired sample for Kachok survey. The age categories were 17-35 years old for the young group, and 36 years old and above for the old people (Table 13). A sample size of 12 subjects was interviewed in each of the four villages for a total of 48 subjects. They represented young people, parents, and grandparents. Teachers were interviewed in all schools that Kachok people attended. In Kaoh Peak, three teachers were interviewed, three in the Andoung Meas district, and one literacy teacher each from the other villages. As shown in Table 14, four subjects were interviewed for the Dialect Perceptions Group in each of the nine villages with the same categories of ISLQ. Only three Kachok Christian leaders from three Kachok villages were indentified and interviewed. Out of nine villages, seven village chiefs were interviewed as two villages shared the same village leader.

In summary, 106 subjects were interviewed using five SLQs. The resulting sample of 106 interviews is taken to be representative of the Kachok population as a whole.
Table 13: Individual SLQ Sample Size by Age and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young (17-35)</td>
<td>Old (36 up)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Dialect Perceptions Group Interview Sample Size by Age and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young (17-35)</td>
<td>Old (36 up)</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Data Analysis

This study used a descriptive analysis of the data using the UNESCO’s Nine Factors and Fishman’s GIDS based on the five SLQs’ results. The data from the SLQs were analysed based on respondents’ responses on language use in different domains and attitudes toward the Kachok language. The criteria for answering the three research questions are shown in the following five sub-sections. The first two research questions are important indicators that give information to answer the third research question.
In this section, for each research question, the following are described:

- The instruments that were used to answer the research question.
- The criteria by which the results were used to answer the research question.

3.7.1 Language Use by Domains

What are the languages used by the Kachok speakers in different domains?

Questions 39-42 from the Christian Leader SLQ (c.f. Appendix 5, pp. 198-199); questions 36-41 from the Individual SLQ (c.f. Appendix 3, pp. 184-186); questions 30-34 from Dialect Perceptions Group Interview (c.f. Appendix 2, pp. 174-177); and questions 21 and 23 from Teacher SLQ (c.f. Appendix 1, pp. 167-168) were used to answer this research question. No quantitative criteria were used for this research question. All responses were assessed qualitatively.

3.7.2 Attitudes toward Kachok and other Languages

What are the attitudes of Kachok speakers toward their own language and other languages they speak?

Questions 24, 29-32, 44-52 from Christian Leader SLQ (c.f. Appendix 5, pp. 196-201); questions 23, 28-35, 41-51 and 55 from ISLQ (c.f. Appendix 3, pp. 183-189); questions 22-24, 29-40 from Dialect Perceptions Group Interview (c.f. Appendix 2, pp. 172-181); questions 20-26, 31 from Teacher SLQ (c.f. Appendix 1, pp. 167-169); and questions 24, 35-41 from Village Leader SLQ (c.f. Appendix 4, pp.
191-194) were used to answer the research question. No quantitative criteria were used for this research question. All responses were assessed qualitatively.

### 3.7.3 Language Vitality

**Does it appear likely that Kachok speakers of the next generations will continue to use their language?**

Research questions one and two are part of research question three. Additionally, question 44 from ISLQ (c.f. Appendix 3, p. 187) and 29 from TSLQ (c.f. Appendix 1, p. 169) helped determine the vitality of the Kachok language. Aside from language use and attitudes, other sociolinguistic factors that are associated with language vitality were measured in this study by using the UNESCO nine factors and Fishman’s GIDS – contact with other ethnic groups, ethnolinguistic identity, ethnolinguistic makeup of villages, geographical distribution, and population.

In sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2, survey results for each of the UNESCO’s nine language vitality factors and Fishman’s GIDS are described individually for every village that was surveyed and then summarized collectively.

Additionally, this study applied two methods that Nahhas (2007) used in measuring the language vitality of the Mpi language in Thailand as mentioned in Section 2.2. The first of these is the “indicative” language vitality factor which refers to the language use at home and with children. This factor is related to current vitality. According to Nahhas, this factor “defines the most basic form of strong language vitality: people are using the language at home and passing it on to their children”. The second is the ‘predictive’ factor that is not essential at present but is
predictive of future trends in vitality. Nahhas (2007, p. 7) emphasized, “If many of these ‘predictive’ factors are negative, then language vitality can be said to be threatened in the future. For example, even if the present generation of children is fluent in the mother-tongue, negative language attitudes toward language maintenance could lead to this fluency not being passed on to the next generation”. The results for the indicative and predictive language vitality factors are summarized in Section 4.3.3 and Section 4.3.4 respectively.
3.8 Summary

Figure 4 shows the steps conducted during the fieldwork to investigate the language use by domains and attitudes of the Kachok speakers toward their own language and other languages they speak in order to assess the vitality of the Kachok language. See appendix 7 for a detailed flowchart of the language survey process.

Figure 4: Flowchart of the Fieldwork Process
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter presents the discussion of the data divided into three major sections: Language Use by Domains, Language Attitudes toward Kachok and other Languages Spoken, and Language Vitality.

4.1 Language Use by Domains

The first research question on language use in different domains assumes that the choices people make concerning language use reveal development towards language maintenance that to some extent reveals the vitality of the language. Table 15 shows the language use responses for each domain of communication for the ISLQ research sample in four villages – Kaoh Peak, In, Upper Kachut, and Big Kanat. Questions were open-ended and answers were unrestricted as respondents were allowed to give any language they thought of as an answer. They were asked about the language use in the following situations:

1) Home - a) parents, b) grandparents, c) siblings, d) spouse, e) children, f) grandchildren

2) Friendship – a) Kachok friends in their village and other villages, b) non-Kachok friends in their village and other villages.

3) Social and public domains – a) market, b) village ceremonies, funerals, weddings, and c) village meetings.

4) Religious domain – Christian church in the Kachok villages.
5) Neighboring language groups – a) Jarai, b) Kreung, c) Lao, d) Khmer, e) Tampuan, f) Brao, and g) Khavet.

The abbreviated symbols in vertical columns (i.e., Kc, J, Kr, L, Kh, T, B, Kv, etc.,) signify the languages that Kachok people used in the different domains.

4.1.1 Language Use at Home

Table 15 shows the language used by the Kachok speakers at home when speaking with parents, grandparents, siblings, spouse, children, and grandchildren. The respondents claim to use their own language purely in their homes except when a spouse is a non-Kachok speaker.

Table 15: Frequency of Language Use at Home by Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Use</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48=100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### b. Grandparents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>Kc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48=100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### c. Siblings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>Kc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48=100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### d. Spouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>Kc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh peak</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>45=94%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### e. Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>Kc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koah Peak</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>45=94%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. Grandchildren

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= Kachok, J= Jarai, Kr= Kreung, L= Lao, Kh= Khmer, T= Tampuan
B= Brao, Kv= Khavet, N/A= Not Applicable (single/unmarried no children, no grandchildren)

As shown in Table 15, Kachok is used 100% by all subjects at home with parents, grandparents, and siblings. Out of 48 subjects, 45 or 95% of the subjects answered that they used ‘Kachok’ with spouse at home. One of them used ‘Kachok and Khmer’ when talking with his non-Kachok spouse and children. The three respondents answered ‘N/A’ as they were single or unmarried and do not have children. Likewise, 18 respondents do not have grandchildren yet. It is noted that some subjects gave more than one response, as they used more than one language in a particular domain. In the Kachok situation, it is common for the parents, children, grandparents, grandchildren, siblings, in-laws, and other relatives (uncles, aunts, and cousins from all degrees) to live together under one roof. As reported, members of a Kachok household only speak Kachok to each other.
Occasionally, the survey team joined meals with some Kachok families during the fieldwork. It was observed that the Kachok people use their own language when talking with their children, parents, grandparents, and siblings at home.

For marriage patterns and language choices as shown in Table 15, some respondents gave more than one response. As reported, intermarriage with other ethnic groups is common among the Kachok people although the majority of them marry within their language group. Individual SLQ question 36 and Group interview questions 32 and 33 provide answers about the language used by the Kachok speakers when they marry a non-Kachok speaker (see Appendix 1. pp. 176-177, 184). In some cases of intermarriages, Kachok is used at home but sometimes the language of the non-Kachok spouse is mixed with Kachok when they talk to each other and with their children. In Table 15, only two respondents in two villages answered that they use both Kachok language and the language of the spouse at home. In the village of In, a Kachok-and-Khmer couple uses both Kachok and Khmer when talking to their children and grandchildren. However, in Upper Kachut, a Kachok-and-Jarai couple uses both Kachok and Jarai when talking to each other, but uses only Kachok with their children. For unmarried persons, some domains were not applicable to them (i.e., ‘with spouse’, ‘children’, and ‘grandchildren’).

Mixed language is used when Kachok people intermarry with other ethnic groups like the Jarai, Tampuan, Kreung, and Khmer. They speak Kachok and the language of the non-Kachok spouse with children and other members of the family at home.
Results also show that Kachok and non-Kachok couples use the language of the village where they live. For example, when a Jarai man marries a Kachok woman and they live in a Kachok village, the Jarai husband will learn the Kachok language of the wife and will speak Kachok with her and with their children. Similarly, when a Kachok man marries a Jarai woman and they live in a Jarai village, Jarai will be the language at home.

In addition, the survey team stayed at the house of the Kachok leader during the fieldwork. The Kachok leader, whose wife is a Vietnamese, presently lives in Andoung Meas district. During the team’s stay it was noted that their language at home is a mix of Khmer, Kachok, and Vietnamese. The children spoke Vietnamese, Khmer and Kachok. They spoke Khmer with the team members, but used Kachok when they talked to the Kachok interpreters. Various people who came to the Kachok leader’s house use their own language when talking with the Kachok leader. Khmer language is spoken most of the time, but Kachok is used when talking with the Kachok people.

4.1.2 Language Use in Friendship

The table below shows the language used by the Kachok speakers when speaking with friends in their village and in other villages, and also with non-Kachok friends in their village and outside of the Kachok village.
Table 16: Frequency of Language Use in Friendship by Village

a. Kachok friend in the village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Village</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48=100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Kachok friend in other Kachok villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Village</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47=98%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. Non-Kachok friend in the village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10=21%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TL= the language of friends, N/A=(cannot speak and understand their language, have not met or seen this people group)

d. Non-Kachok friend in other non-Kachok villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>TL</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2=4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19=40%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 also indicates the languages that the Kachok speakers use with their friends. Results show that the Kachok people use their own language (100%) when talking with Kachok friends in their village. However, they use the language of their non-Kachok friends (40%) who do not understand the Kachok language. However,
three subjects in Kaoh Peak and In villages reported that they use Kachok, Jarai, Lao, and Kreung when speaking to non-Kachok friends in other villages. The ‘N/A’ or ‘not applicable’ indicates that these respondents have no Kachok friends in other villages except in their own village. Few of them mentioned that they do not go to other villages and have not met some of these people groups. For their non-Kachok friends in their village and other villages, some subjects responded “Kachok” but majority of them reported using ‘Jarai’, ‘Kreung’, ‘Lao’, ‘Tampuan’, ‘Khavet’, ‘Khmer’, and ‘Brao’ if their friends are from these language groups. Some subjects responded “their language” (TL), meaning their friends’ language, when talking to their non-Kachok friends.

4.1.3 Language Use in Social/Public Domain

The market is located outside of the Kachok area. Table 17 shows the languages used by the Kachok speakers when communicating with the vendors and people at the market.
Table 17: Frequency of Language Use in the Market by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Village</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A= do not go to the market/ have not met the vendors

The majority of the subjects reported using the language of the vendors when talking to them. However, forty-two respondents (88%) remarked that they speak Khmer with the vendors and other people in the market. The N/A indicates that the three subjects do not go to the market, hence, have not experienced talking with the sellers. Only one subject responded that he could not speak any language except Kachok. When he goes to the market, he asks other Kachok speakers who can speak the language of the vendor to interpret for him. On the other hand, with occasional non-Kachok peddlers who use the Khmer language with the Kachok people in the community, the Kachok who can speak Khmer uses Khmer language with the peddlers as well.

Table 18 shows the languages that the Kachok people use during the village ceremonies, funerals, weddings, and village meetings.
Table 18: Frequency of Language Use at the Village Ceremonies, Funerals, and Weddings by Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48=100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In village ceremonies, weddings, and funerals, all subjects (100%) responded they normally use ‘Kachok’, except when there is a non-Kachok speaker present. According to three subjects, they use the national language ‘Khmer’ when there are other ethnic groups joining the occasion. In the village of In, one respondent gave two answers, using Kachok as well as Khmer.

During a trip to Kaoh Peak village, attended by most men and only a few women, they used Kachok language at the ceremony and during conversations.
Table 19: Frequency of Language Use at Village Meetings by Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At village meetings, respondents reported that Kachok is used solely (100%) except when there are other ethnic groups present in the meetings; otherwise, Khmer is used. Kachok is the language used when disseminating information orally to the whole village. Four respondents gave more than two answers, Kachok and Khmer.

The river is also a public place for Kachok where villagers wash clothes and dishes, bathe, and get drinking water. It was observed that children and adults use Kachok language when talking with each other. Further, in some villages, at the spring well where villagers fetch water and bathe, it was also observed that both young and old Kachok people use their own language.

4.1.4 Languages Used with Neighboring Language Groups

Some Kachok people interviewed are able to communicate well using the neighboring languages in the area such as Jarai, Tampuan, Kreung, Khmer, Lao,
Khavet, and Brao. However, no proficiency testing has been done to assess the bilingual/multilingual ability of the Kachok speakers toward these languages.

Table 20: Frequency of Language Used with Neighboring Groups by Village

**a. Jarai**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9=19%</strong></td>
<td><strong>33=69%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b. Tampuan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3=6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>42=88%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### c. Brao

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### d. Khavet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90
### e. Kreung

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20=42%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17=35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### f. Khmer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40=83%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
g. Lao

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Kc</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>Kr</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>Kh</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Kv</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of language of the neighboring groups depends on the location of the Kachok village closest to this ethnic group. With other ethnic groups - Jarai, Tampuan, Brao, Khavet, Kreung, Khmer, and Lao, the majority of the subjects reported that they often use the language of the person with whom they are talking. As shown in Table 20, the majority (88%) use Tampuan with Tampuan speakers, followed by Khmer (83%) with Khmer speakers. In Upper Kachut, the majority of the respondents could speak Jarai, while Tampuan is the language used by the majority in Kanat village. Kreung is the language used by the respondents in Kaoh Peak, and Lao is used by the majority in the village of In. However, some subjects answered ‘N/A’ as they cannot speak and understand other neighboring languages, and others have not encountered any other ethnic groups.

Based on observations, the Kachok interpreters also talked to each other in Kachok and with the other Kachok people who were just sitting down and listening to
the interviews. They only used other languages when talking with other ethnic people. However, some of them who could not speak other languages used Kachok when talking to the other ethnic groups.

It was also observed that the majority of the women could not speak Khmer well. During the interview, only a few women were able to respond in Khmer. Likewise, our Khmer interpreter noted that some women were not proficient in Khmer, although a few of them could speak a little of the neighboring language.

4.1.5 Language Use in Religious Domain

Table 21 shows the languages that the Kachok speakers use in different situations in the Christian church domain. Only three church leaders were interviewed from Upper Kachut, Lower Kachut, and Nay villages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Upper Kachut</th>
<th>Lower Kachut</th>
<th>Nay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kc</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church with other ethnic groups attendees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading the liturgy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Scriptures</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving announcements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate prayer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private prayer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 summarizes the languages used in the church domain based on interviews during two-week Bible training in Banlung, Ratanakiri. As shown in the table, Upper Kachut and Nay villages use Kachok, Jarai, and Khmer in all the church’s activities. On the other hand, Lower Kachut uses only Kachok and Jarai. However, Kachok is the predominant language used in preaching, giving announcements, and in corporate and private prayers by the people in the three villages. As reported, there are more than 250 Kachok Christians in the area. Other ethnic groups close to these three Kachok villages also attend the church. Since Kachok is an oral language without orthography, the people in the church use the
Bible and hymnbooks written in Khmer and Jarai from Vietnam. The Kachok people learn to read and write the Jarai language in order to understand the Jarai Bible.

4.1.6 Language Use in Schools and in the Community by the Kachok

Children

In this study, it is important to determine the language children use at home and in all situations. The vitality of a language is reflected in children’s use of it and its continuing use in the next generations. Therefore, parents have a significant role in teaching their children to speak their own language. Parents must pass on the language to their children to ensure its continuity.

Tables 22, 23, and 24 describe the language used by the children. Forty-eight individuals, three Christian leaders, and seven village leaders unanimously reported that Kachok is the language that Kachok children learn to speak first. In all villages visited, apparently Kachok is used from the time children learn to speak until adulthood. The parents spoke Kachok to their children at home and in the community.

Table 22: Frequency of the Number of Kachok Children who speak their own Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLQs</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISLQ</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSLQ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSLQ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58=100%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the results of the three SLQs, all children speak Kachok in all Kachok villages. As reported, there is no Kachok child who cannot speak Kachok.

Table 23: Frequency of the Number of Kachok Children who do not speak Kachok

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 48 respondents reported that all children in their villages speak Kachok clearly and fluently. As a mother aptly answered, “They are Kachok so they speak Kachok like us.”

Table 24: Children’s Language of Play by Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Kachok</th>
<th>Khmer</th>
<th>Other languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 (little only)</td>
<td>1 (little only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (little only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1 (little only)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48=100%</td>
<td>3 (little only)</td>
<td>2 (little only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 48 respondents mentioned that children in their village use Kachok language when they play together. Only three persons added that sometimes children speak both Kachok and a little of Khmer language while two persons said that children speak Kachok with a little of other neighboring languages.
In some Kachok villages, this researcher and the language assistant observed the language that some Kachok children used when playing on the street, taking a bath, and fetching water at the river or well. This researcher tried to talk with them in Khmer but they answered back in Kachok. It was perceived that children are sometimes not confident or are embarrassed when using other languages aside from their own language when talking with other non-Kachok speakers.

Tables 25 and 26 describe the languages that Kachok children use in both formal and non-formal schools. Twelve teachers were interviewed in nine schools where Kachok students attend. Non-formal schools are handled by native speakers of Kachok except for one teacher in Nay village who is Kreung but can speak and understand Kachok well. Both young people and adults attend the literacy classes, where Khmer is the medium of instruction and Kachok is not taught and used in formal nor non-formal schools. In these settings, educational materials are written in Khmer language, and teachers prefer that their students speak Khmer inside the classroom.
Table 25: Youngest Children’s Language of Play in School by Village according to Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Kachok</th>
<th>Khmer</th>
<th>Other languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nay</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanong</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kak</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Kachut</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
<td>Most w/ Kachok kids</td>
<td>Most w/ other kids</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talao</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Little of Lao</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26: Older Children’s Language of Play in School by Village according to Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Kachok</th>
<th>Khmer</th>
<th>Other languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nay</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanong</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kak</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Teacher wants Khmer</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Kachut</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
<td>Most w/ Kachok kids</td>
<td>Most w/ other kids</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talao</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Some Lao</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In schools, the interviews with both formal and non-formal teachers show that both young and old Kachok children use a mix of Khmer and Kachok when they play together (Tables 25 and 26). Table 25 shows that the younger Kachok children mostly use Kachok and a little Khmer, while the older Kachok children (Table 26) use some Kachok and Khmer. According to the teachers, although they want the children to speak in Khmer in school, the Kachok children use their own language when they play with other Kachok pupils. They only use Khmer when playing with non-Kachok classmates. In Talao village which is dominated with Lao speakers, some children in school mix Kachok with Khmer and Lao languages at play.

In Andoung Meas district, only a few Kachok children attend formal school because of the distance of the school from the district center. Also, the children help their parents in the farm and the parents have no money to send their children to school. Some Kachok children do not like to go to school because they cannot speak Khmer. Teachers in Andoung Meas district and Talao village are all Khmer while Kaoh Peak has one Khmer and two Lao teachers. They do not speak Kachok and do not teach Kachok traditions and customs. As reported, all the students in the school in Kaoh Peak are Kachok.
Table 27: Language Use (Khmer) before Children start School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Yes (all)</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes (few)</th>
<th>Yes (some)</th>
<th>Other languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24=50%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4=8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14=29%</strong></td>
<td><strong>7=15%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1=2%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27 shows responses about children speaking Khmer before they start school. Some respondents gave more than one answer. As reported, 50% of Kachok children already know how to speak Khmer before they start school, although they are not very fluent in it. Fourteen respondents (29%) answered that only few children could speak Khmer before they start school. In Kaoh Peak village, Veun Sai district, the children are not influenced much by other languages because of the absence of non-Kachok school children and because of the geographical location, that is, the village is across the river from the Kreung village and other language groups. However, in Andoung Meas district, the Kachok villages - Upper Kachut, Lower Kachut, and In - are close to Jarai, Tampuan, and Lao language groups. In the village of In, four respondents reported that only few children speak Khmer, and one speaks Lao before he starts school.
Table 28: Children’s Other Acquired Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Khmer</th>
<th>Kreung</th>
<th>Jarai</th>
<th>Tampuan</th>
<th>Lao</th>
<th>Brao</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43=90%</td>
<td>4=8%</td>
<td>15=31%</td>
<td>11=23%</td>
<td>13=27%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28 indicates that Kachok children learn to speak other languages at the age of 10-12 years old, after they have already started school. Also, the children learn to speak other languages depending on their location. The majority of the children in four villages have learned Khmer (90%) in school. As, reported, some children in the village of In speak Lao, while children in Kaoh Peak speak Kreung, Tampuan, and Lao. All respondents in Kachut village reported that the children could speak Jarai and Khmer, with only a few who speak Tampuan. In Big Kanat, a few children speak Jarai and Tampuan.

In summary, the data on language use strongly suggest that Kachok is used almost exclusively in domains within the Kachok-speaking community including the home. The only exceptions are the school domain where Khmer is the medium of instruction, and in the public domain where Kachok speakers must communicate in Khmer, the trade language or the dominant language used in the market. As reported, outsiders have no proficiency in the Kachok language except for some ethnic groups married to Kachok speakers.
4.2 Language Attitudes

In this section, the data answer the research question, “What are the attitudes of Kachok speakers toward their own language and other languages they speak?” Language attitudes of a specific people group are difficult to assess directly (see example, Agheyisi and Fishman 1970). Language attitudes, to some extent, may be regarded as either a mental construct or a behavioral construct. To attempt such an investigation, a series of questions was included in the SLQ that examined the respondents’ opinions of what language they learned to speak first and what language they spoke the most or best. Other questions regarding their attitudes towards Kachok and other languages they speak were also asked. Their answers serve as a guide to determine the extent to which they consider their language prestigious and their attitude towards the other languages they speak.

4.2.1 Attitudes toward Kachok Language

The present study determined the attitude of the Kachok speakers toward their own vernacular language according to the framework introduced by the UNESCO Expert Group on Endangered Languages (2003) and Fishman (1991). Kachok people speak their language from childhood until adulthood. They speak their language in any domain, as long as those present could understand it. The Kachok speakers’ responses as shown in the Tables 29, 30, and 31 indicate their attitudes toward their own language.
Table 29: Language Spoken First as a Child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLQs</th>
<th>Kachok</th>
<th>Khmer</th>
<th>Neighboring languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSLQ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSLQ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (Tampuan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSLQ</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLQ</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93=99%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SLQ= Sociolinguistic Questionnaire; C= Christian leader, V= Village leader, G= Group, I= Individual

Four SLQs were administered concerning Kachok attitudes towards their own language. The respondents were three Christian leaders, seven village leaders, thirty-six respondents from group interviews, and forty-eight other individuals. Results in Table 29 show that Kachok is the language that the respondents spoke first as a child. Out of 94 respondents from four SLQs, only one person answered a different language, as he is a Tampuan speaker who is a leader of Tanong village.

All respondents answered “Kachok” as the language they speak best, except for the Tampuan village leader in Tanong. The majority of the respondents commented that Kachok is their best language because it is their original or mother tongue. Some of them added that although they speak other neighboring languages, they speak Kachok best, it being their ancestral language, which they did not want to lose.

The three Christian leaders from Nay, Upper Kachut, and Lower Kachut who were interviewed individually and separately in Banlung, Ratanakiri, answered...
“Kachok” as the language they speak best, because they are Kachok, and Kachok is their own language, the language that they have been speaking since childhood.

The 36 respondents who were interviewed in groups of four in nine villages also responded that “Kachok” is the language they speak best. Additionally, all 48 respondents who were interviewed in Upper Kachut, Kaoh Peak, In, and Big Kanat also gave the same response to the language that they speak best.

Table 30: Language Spoken the Most by Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Kachok</th>
<th>Jarai</th>
<th>Khmer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44=92%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown on Table 30, out of 48 respondents, 44 (92%) people answered “Kachok” as the language they use the most. However, in Upper Kachut, Jarai is the language used the most by two respondents and Khmer by one respondent. One respondent in the village of In reported Khmer as the language he speaks the most.

Seven village leaders who were asked the same question all answered “Kachok”. According to them, all the people in their village speak Kachok except for the Khmer people who are married to Kachoks and live in their village. The other non-Kachok people in their village speak Kachok well.
All forty-eight respondents reported that there were no Kachok people who did not use the Kachok language. Some respondents offered the following reasons for speaking Kachok:

- “Because we don’t want to lose our own language.”
- “We have spoken Kachok since we were born.”
- “We are Kachok, we need to speak Kachok.”
- “That is our language.”
- “We will speak Kachok forever.”
- “If we throw away our language, we throw away our being Kachok.”
- “We don’t speak any language well except Kachok.”
- “We are here and so we speak Kachok all together”

All 48 (100%) respondents indicate that the young people are proud to use their own language. In four villages, all respondents answered that Kachok is their original language and the language of their village. They claimed that not only are the young people proud of their own language, but also the rest of the Kachok speakers. Some reasons given were:

- “Because we are Kachok.”
- “That is our own and original language.”
- “That has been our language since the time of our great grandfathers.”
- “This is a Kachok village so we speak Kachok.”
• “We are Kachok people so we speak Kachok.”
• “We love our own language.”

Table 31: A Kachok’s Feeling when overheard speaking Kachok by a Non-Kachok Person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Not happy</th>
<th>Feel all right</th>
<th>As usual or natural</th>
<th>Change to their language</th>
<th>Continue speaking Kachok</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3=6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37=77%</td>
<td>5=10%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of 48 respondents, 37 (77%) answered that they ‘feel all right’ or it is ‘not a problem’ when non-Kachok person overhears them speaking Kachok. According to them, they continue speaking Kachok and do not change to a different language, nor stop speaking. Some of the respondents answered ‘that’s usual or natural’ (10%), ‘I’m happy they can understand my language’ (6%). Only one person said, ‘I will stop speaking if they cannot understand Kachok and I will speak their language’. A few commented, ‘I will continue speaking Kachok because this is my own language and I am not ashamed of it’.

During fieldwork, a Kachok leader whose wife is a Vietnamese generously accommodated the survey team at his house in Andoung Meas district, which is close to the Kachok villages. An informal interview with him revealed that other language groups in the area have likewise no negative attitude toward the Kachok people. He
said that the Kachok people are fairly treated like the other people groups. According to him, there is no racial discrimination against Kachok or against any other neighboring language group.

In Big Kanat village, a 25-year old Kachok woman married to a Khmer speaker from Kampong Thom province was interviewed. The couple lived in Kampong Thom province for four years after they got married, and then they went back to live in Kanat village. The wife said, “I don't want to live in Kampong Thom province because I don't want to lose my Kachok language. That is the reason why I want to live in my village. My husband likes to live here, too.” In Kampong Thom, she and their children only learned to speak a little of the Khmer language. During the interview, she stated her desire to continue using her language. She wanted the same for her children. Her husband who learned to speak Kachok expressed no problem with speaking Kachok with his family and the Kachok people in the village.

A Kachok old man in Upper Kachut village mentioned that he wanted his children and grandchildren to continue using the Kachok language. He added that he wants his language and traditions to be preserved and used by the future generations.

The interviews with Kachok speakers indicated a strong positive attitude toward maintaining the Kachok language. Each interviewee claimed that all Kachok people speak the language and that when Kachok people intermarry with other neighboring people groups, Kachok is often spoken by the children at home. The findings show that Kachok is the first and best language spoken and used by the Kachok people.
4.2.2 Attitudes toward Learning the Kachok Language

In the Kachok areas, all government schools and literacy classes use Khmer as their medium of education, since Kachok has no orthography yet. A part of the questionnaire asked Kachok people of their interest in having vernacular materials, to which they expressed a desire to have them so they can learn to read and write in their language.

When asked if they wanted to be able to read and write Kachok, all respondents answered positively, adding the following reasons:

- “I want to know my own language.”
- “So I won’t forget Kachok in the future.”
- “I want to learn my ancestral language.”
- “Our old people don’t know but I want the new generation to learn.”
- “I want to see my language written.”
- “For the future of my grandchildren.”
- “In order for people to go forward and do something else.”
- “I’m old and I don’t have enough time to learn but I will encourage my children.”

All respondents in four villages wanted to read and write in Kachok language. Two respondents answered positively and said that since they are already old they would encourage their children instead to learn to read and write Kachok. One respondent expressed that he doesn’t have the time to learn as he works and lives in a farm far away from the schools.
The seven village leaders unanimously answered “yes”, and gave the following comments:

- “Yes! We will be glad. The old and young people want to learn, too.”
- “No problem, if they make a Kachok script, they want to learn it.”

The three Christian leaders gave the same positive answer when asked the same question. Although they were open to the use of Jarai and Khmer Bible and hymnbooks in the church in the absence of these in Kachok, they expressed a longing to have the Bible written in their own language.

All village leaders agreed that Kachok people should be able to read and write in their own language. One village leader said, “Yes, we will be glad. That is necessary for the people in the village.” The Tampuan village leader in Tanong also wanted to encourage the people in his village to learn Kachok. According to him, he and his family are one in their desire to learn Kachok.

The three Christian leaders gave a resounding “yes” to the same question. For them, it is good for the children not only to learn to read and write the Kachok language, but also to have a Bible written in Kachok.

Kachok and non-Kachok teachers from formal and non-formal schools showed a positive attitude towards Kachok educational materials for teaching Kachok children. Non-Kachok teachers in Kaoh Peak formal school commented, “Yes, we want to use a Kachok book in the school if it is available.” Likewise, the non-Kachok teachers in Andoung Meas formal school opined, “Yes, that will be good for Kachok children.”
Additionally, the ISLQ interview revealed that only eight respondents finished grades 1 and 2, mostly during Polpot’s regime while a few attended literacy classes in the village. Out of 48 respondents, only 11 can read and write some Khmer, Jarai, and Lao, while only five persons can read and write Khmer, and four, a little of Jarai and Khmer. The two who can read and write Jarai are church members who studied the Jarai Bible in Vietnam.

**Table 32: Suggested Topics to be written in Kachok Language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Kaoh Peak</th>
<th>Upper Kachut</th>
<th>Big kanat</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About daily life, health, family, making a living</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books for the purpose of language preservation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and culture of Kachok</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folktales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songbook</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphabet book / Books for teaching children and adults</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different kinds of books: history, health, alphabet books, agriculture, etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                                             | 15 | 15        | 17           | 15        |         |

Table 32 shows varied answers to the question on the topics they would like written in Kachok language. The five most preferred topics are the following:
different kinds of books - history, health, alphabet books, agriculture, etc.; about daily life, health, family, making a living; alphabet book/books for teaching children and adults; history and culture of Kachok; and folktales. The majority of the Kachok respondents interviewed said that, although they never went to school to study, they desire to learn to read and write in the Kachok language. According to them, they want to see learning materials written in Kachok.

Similarly, a Kachok literacy teacher in Kanat village who was trained at the teachers’ training held at ICC from 2003-2006 mentioned that he wanted to teach Kachok because he knew that Kachok people also want to learn it.

A literacy teacher in Nay, a Kreung speaker married to a Kachok woman in Nay village, stated during the interview that it is good for Kachok children to learn the Khmer language because they need to speak it when they look for a job outside the Kachok village, when they are in the market, and when they talk with other ethnic groups. Nevertheless, he said that it would be better if the children also learn their own language. He indicated a willingness to teach in the Kachok language if the alphabet and educational materials are available. The government teachers in Andoung Meas district also expressed the same interest.

In the Bible school training in Banlung - Ratanakiri province, the three church leaders who were asked informally about their church’s situation expressed that it is difficult for the Kachok people to learn the Jarai Bible in Vietnamese. They expressed their desire to have the Bible and church songs written in their own language.
These findings reveal that there is clearly a strong sense of identity and ownership of the Kachok vernacular language. Almost all of the respondents feel the importance of maintaining and preserving their language.

### 4.2.3 Attitudes toward Other Languages

Some Kachok people are multilingual, speaking other languages such as Jarai, Tampuan, Khmer, Lao, Kreung, and Brao of the neighboring language groups. The following discussion indicates the attitudes of the Kachok speakers toward other languages they speak.

#### Table 33: Second Languages Spoken Best by Village

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>In Kaoh Peak</th>
<th>Upper Kachut</th>
<th>Big Kanat</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kachok</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarai</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampuan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kreung</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brao</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kavet</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings reveal that some respondents can speak a second language. Table 33 shows that the first three second languages they speak best are Jarai, Tampuan,
and Khmer. In Upper Kachut and In villages, most of the subjects reported that Jarai is their second best language, while Tampuan is the second best of Kanat village. In Kaoh Peak, the respondents’ second language is diverse. Village-wise, four of the 12 respondents said that Kreung is their second best language. In the village of In, the total number of responses adds up to more than the sample size since some subjects gave more than one answer. As reported, Kachok people have no negative attitude toward the second languages they speak.

Kachok Christians appear to have no negative attitude toward other languages. They use Jarai and Khmer Bibles and hymns in the church. Some of them speak the neighboring languages such as Jarai, Khmer, and Tampuan, and show no negative attitude toward these languages.

In summary, Kachok people have a positive attitude towards other languages they speak. Some respondents are proud they can speak the neighboring languages, although these other people groups cannot speak the Kachok language.

4.2.3.1 Contact with Other Languages through Travel

Some Kachok people learn to speak the second languages through contact with other ethnic groups, such as when non-Kachok speakers visit Kachok areas, when Kachok speakers travel to non-Kachok villages or market, when Kachok people marry from other ethnic groups, and when they use church materials.

Travel to non-Kachok speaking areas is a common source of contact with other languages, which contributes to increased levels of bilingualism or multilingualism. Kachok people have an opportunity to learn other languages, or
improve their proficiency in other neighboring languages depending on their location. Kreung was often mentioned as the language used when Kachok people travel to Veun Sai district area. Tampuan is used when travelling in neighboring villages of Kanat, Tanong, and Kak, while Jarai is often used when travelling near Lower and Upper Kachut, In, and Nay villages. However, no language proficiency testing has been done among the Kachok people. Information of this nature is acquired using questionnaires, interviews, and observation.

As reported, more men travel occasionally than women. They travel outside the Kachok areas for various reasons: visiting relatives; selling gongs in exchange for buffalo; looking for jobs, tobacco, medicine, hot chili peppers, and rice; borrowing money; buying products in the market; and attending weddings and funerals.

Another influence of language contact with other language groups is through intermarriages. Some Kachok are married to Jarai, Tampuan, and Khmer people. Some of them live in the Kachok villages if the wife is Kachok, and some outside of the Kachok villages if the wife is a non-Kachok.

Meanwhile, non-Kachok traders who sell products in the Kachok villages use the Khmer language when trading with the Kachok people. Some Kachok people practice commerce and trade through the barter system. Instead of using money to buy wares, they exchange their goods such as root crops, vegetables, fruits, fish, rice, and others. Normally, the Kachok who can speak Khmer uses Khmer language with the traders; otherwise, someone would translate to Khmer when a Kachok speaker cannot speak nor understand the Khmer language.
Khmer is appreciated as the national language as it is important for Kachok people when they travel outside their areas. Besides, Khmer is widely spoken and is highly esteemed. Both Khmer and Jarai languages are also highly valued, being the languages used by the Kachok Christians in the church. Khmer and Lao are also valued as predominant market languages used in Veun Sai district, while Jarai, Khmer, Lao, and Tampuan, in Andoung Meas district.

In some Kachok villages like Upper Kachut, Nay, Tanong, Kak, and Big Kanat, only a few children go to school because of the distance. As a result, Kachok children have less contact with other children from other language groups.

Few Kachok people live outside the Kachok village. It was mentioned that only four Kachok speakers are currently living in Banlung – the town capital of Ratanakiri province. Two are high school students, while two are working - one of them with the government in Banlung. Also, two Kachok speakers are married to non-Kachok in Stung Treng Province. No Kachok speakers studies in Phnom Penh, the capital city of Cambodia. During the interview, it was mentioned that one senator in Cambodia is a Kachok speaker from Kaoh Peak village, Veun Sai district. This information needs to be validated, though.

The village chief in the village of In mentioned that the Lamam is the same with Romam who used to be the Kachok people. The Kachok Deputy District Leader and other Kachok people themselves have confirmed this. According to them, ‘Romam’ is for formal use, and ‘Lamam’ is for informal use. Based on the interview, ‘Romam’ is a formal Kachok clan name. This information has been validated, as one
of my interpreters and some interview subjects are ‘Romam’. Some of them are married to other ethnic groups like the Jarai, Tampuan, and so on. At present, the clan name ‘Romam’ is spread out in some ethnic groups.

There are Lamam people who live in the border of Vietnam. Some Kachok people in Kak, In, Upper Kachut, and Tanong villages attest to this report. One Kachok in In village mentioned that he once visited his Lamam relative in the Vietnam border. He said that the Lamam in Vietnam are Kachok, as people normally call them, not Lamam. Lamam and Kachok are listed separately in the Ethnologue (Gordon, 2005) as part of the Bahnaric language family. The findings reveal the presence of other Kachok speakers in the Vietnam – Cambodia border.

The Kachok speakers appear to have no negative attitude toward using other languages when they travel to non-Kachok areas. Kachok people speak the language used in the market, the language of the traders, and the language of friends in other villages. Although some Kachok speakers are multilingual, there seems to be no language shift in the Kachok speech community. The Kachok people who can speak the neighboring languages show an indication of language accommodation, that is, they only use other languages in the situations or domains where the Kachok language is not used. Similarly, Quakenbush (1989) emphasizes that “In a multilingual setting where language groups are of markedly different social status, the group on ‘bottom’ will accommodate to the group on ‘top’ by using the group’s first language in face-to-face interaction, regardless of other components of the social situation such as role relationship, location, formality, etc.”
4.2.3.2 Attitudes toward Intermarriages

Attitude toward intermarriages can also be an indicator of language maintenance and possibility of language loss. Possibility of language loss may happen when the Kachok people marry other ethnic groups, live outside the Kachok village, or use the language of the village where they live. Nonetheless, only a few Kachok are married to other language groups who live outside the Kachok villages.

Table 34: Parents’ Feelings when Children Marry Someone of another Language Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Not happy</th>
<th>It’s usual</th>
<th>Angry</th>
<th>Skip/No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Kachut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>9=19%</strong></td>
<td><strong>31=65%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34 shows that out of 48 subjects, 31 or 65% said it is usual for them if their children marry non-Kachok speakers. Only nine or 19% mentioned that they will not be happy. The one who said he will be angry reasoned that since his family does not speak other languages except Kachok, they cannot communicate with their sons/daughters-in-law. Some respondents agreed to allow their children to marry persons from other ethnic groups if the non-Kachok spouse will learn to speak Kachok and use it at home and with the children. The following reasons were offered by the respondents:

- “If they love each other.”
• “That’s their decision.”

• “I want my children to marry Kachok.”

• “My children cannot speak other languages except Kachok.”

• “I can’t speak other languages. I want my son- or daughters- in-law to speak Kachok with me.”

In summary, the positive attitude toward Kachok is reflected in the fact that subjects interviewed are proud to use their own language even in the presence of other dominant language groups. They are not ashamed to use their language. Further, the subjects confidently said that even the young people are proud to use their language. They want to protect their identity as a group with their own language or mother tongue. Most of the respondents want to learn to read and write their language. They also want their children to learn Kachok and continue to use it in the future.

Notably, the Kachok people express a positive attitude towards other languages they speak. They use these other languages when speaking with non-Kachok people, trading in the market with non-Kachok vendors, or visiting other non-Kachok villages. Also, they do not see it as a problem if their children marry non-Kachok speakers. The respondents recognize the importance of using other languages for communication in places outside Kachok.

Kachok people generally use their own language at home and in the community, express positive attitude towards their own language, and are confident their children will continue to use Kachok more than any other neighboring languages.
in the next generation. All respondents interviewed express interest in learning to read and write in their own language. According to them, they want to preserve their language, culture, and heritage.

4.3 Language Vitality

In this study, results of research questions 1 and 2 provide answers to the last question on the possibility of Kachok speakers of the next generations to continue using their language.

In addition, individual questionnaire and interviews with teachers were used to probe into the use of the Kachok language by future generations.

All ISLQ respondents believed that the Kachok children, 20 years from now, will continue to use the Kachok language. They supported their prediction with the following reasons:

- “Of course. They are Kachok.”
- “They will not forget their own language.”
- “They will still speak Kachok, even though they are with many Khmer speakers and can speak Khmer.”
- “Of course, until forever.”
- “Yes, that is our language and they will speak it forever.”

When a follow-up question was asked on how they feel about the possibility that the Kachok language will be spoken by the next generations, a resounding ‘yes’ was given accompanied by the following comments:
• “I feel happy.”
• “Happy. They will speak Kachok forever.”
• “Of course, the Kachok people will speak our own language forever.”
• “Happy. It is important for them to remember their own language.”
• “I expect the children will speak Kachok, not any other language.”
• “Happy. It is the language of our ancestors. We will continue to use it.”
• “They must speak Kachok; it is very important.”

The 12 teacher interviewees from formal and non-formal schools came from nine villages. The literacy class is part of the non-formal education initiated by the non-government organizations (NGOs) in collaboration with the government where students and teachers are Kachok speakers except one Kreung teacher in Nay village.

Interview results in Table 35 point that out of nine villages, teachers from non-formal schools in six villages answered “yes” to the question. Teachers in Nay and In villages answered, “maybe” probably because the village of In is very close to Talao village, and students in school are mixed with Lao, Khmer, and Kachok speakers. All non-Kachok teachers from formal schools answered, “No, they can speak Khmer more than Kachok because the language used in school is Khmer, but they can still use Kachok if they like.”
Table 35: Frequency of the Number of Children who will still Speak Kachok 20 Years Hence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Kanat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Kachut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talao</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6=50%</td>
<td>2=17%</td>
<td>4=33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following additional comments about the question came from the teachers:

- “They can speak Khmer a lot more than Kachok.”
- “They will speak Khmer because the teachers want the students to speak in Khmer. But still they can speak their own language if they want.”
- “They will speak Kachok forever.”
- “Some speak Khmer but they can speak Kachok, too.”

The non-Kachok teachers in Kaoh Peak and Andoung Meas district formal schools stated that the Kachok children will eventually speak Khmer in the future because Khmer is the medium of instruction in school and teachers expect them to speak Khmer. However, two non-Kachok teachers in Andoung Meas added that the
Kachok children will speak Khmer but they can speak Kachok whenever they want outside the classroom.

On the other hand, all Kachok teachers in Khmer literacy classes except for one Kreung teacher in Nay village replied, “Yes, the children will speak Kachok language forever.” Notably all Kachok teachers completely agreed that the children will speak Kachok in the next generations.

Additionally, not all teachers except the one in Kak village taught Kachok traditions and customs in the classroom. According to the teacher in Kak, he taught Kachok religion and village ceremonies like post-harvest of the rice field. Moreover, when the teachers were asked about the value of having teaching materials in Kachok, all of them answered positively. Both non-formal and formal school teachers were willing to teach the children Kachok materials, if available.

4.3.1 The UNESCO’s Nine Factors Applied to Kachok

Findings on language use and attitudes are used to assess the language vitality of the Kachok by using the UNESCO’s Nine Factors in Language Vitality and Endangerment as adapted by Tehan and Nahhas (2007). For each factor, a scale from 0 to 5 is used to evaluate the vitality and endangerment of the Kachok language. As stated in Table 3, the rating points for factor 2 in the absolute number of speakers were provided by Tehan and Nahhas (2007) to supply the working system with values that seem possible for language communities in Southeast Asia. The rating system for each factor given by that the UNESCO’s Expert Group is discussed below:
Factor 1: Intergenerational language transmission scale - 5 points: Safe: The language is spoken by all generations.

Interview results indicate that Kachok is the language that all subjects speak best. As reported in nine villages, all Kachok people of all ages, from children to adults, speak the Kachok language. It is the language used at home and in the community (village meetings, church, religious ceremonies, funerals, etc.). All house church activities are also conducted in Kachok, except for the reading of the Jarai and Khmer Bibles. Kachok language is actively used in most domains except in the market and school where Khmer and other neighboring languages (i.e. Jarai, Lao, and Tampuan) are used. However, only a few Kachok children attend school and they are not proficient in Khmer. Some children below 10-12 years old cannot speak Khmer and the neighboring languages.

Factor 2: Absolute number of speakers - 2 points: 3,382 people.

Local census figures obtained from village and commune leaders from nine Kachok villages indicate that Kaoh Peak village has the biggest population. They comprise one third of the total Kachok population in all of Ratanakiri. Data obtained from the Ministry of Planning, Ratanakiri province, validated this information. During the interview, the respondents mentioned that although the Kachok population is small, both young and old are proud of being Kachok and speak their own language.
Factor 3: Proportion of speakers within the total reference group (the Kachok) –

5 points: Safe: All speak the language.

Based on the interview results, all Kachok people in nine villages - men, women, children, the middle aged, and old people - speak their own language. They report that there is no variation between young and old people in the way that they speak Kachok. Although some Kachok people can speak the neighboring language, they still use the Kachok language in their daily routine. Inter-marriage with other ethnicity is normal for the Kachok. Those who married people from other ethnic groups and who remain in Kachok village speak the Kachok language, but those who moved outside the Kachok villages speak the language of the village where they reside.

Factor 4: Loss of existing language domains - 4 points: Multilingual parity: Two or more languages may be used in most social domains and for most functions.

Kachok language is not used in only two domains - school and the market. In school, Khmer is the medium of instruction. Teachers are usually Khmer speakers and are unable to speak the Kachok language. The children who are able to go to a government school can speak a little of Khmer which they use when playing with other ethnic groups. But they speak Kachok when playing with other Kachok students and when outside the classroom. In the market, Khmer, Jarai, Tampuan, Kreung, and Lao are used. In Andoung Meas market there are only two Kachok vendors. The market is outside the Kachok area where Kachok people speak the language of the vendors. However, there are some Kachok, mostly women, who cannot speak any of
these languages; hence, someone else interprets for them when they trade with non-Kachok vendors.

**Factor 5: Response to new domains and media - 1 point: Minimal: The language is used in only a few new domains.**

In this study, the church is considered a new domain for Kachok people since there was no Christian church in the Kachok villages before. In an interview with three Christian leaders from Lower Kachut, Upper Kachut, and Nay villages during a two-week Bible training in Banlung, Ratanakiri, they mentioned that the Kachok language is used in house churches, specifically in preaching, giving announcements, getting together or fellowship, reading the liturgy, and praying corporately and privately. In villages where there is a church, the Kachok use the Jarai Bible from Vietnam. Normally, it takes one year for the Kachok people to learn the Jarai script in order to read the Jarai Bible. As reported, there are more than 250 Christians in the Kachok villages. These Kachok Christians do not seem to show negative attitude towards the use of the Jarai Bible written in Vietnamese. According to the three Christian leaders, some Kachok villages have no Christian churches yet.

**Factor 6: Materials for language education and literacy - 0 point: No orthography available to the community.**

Presently, there is no system for writing the Kachok language. Questionnaire responses show that the Kachok people wanted education and literacy materials available in their community. The children use Khmer education materials in school, as well as the adults in non-formal education in the community. All Kachok
interviewees wanted to read and write Kachok, and use education materials in their own language.

The Kachok people and other ethnic groups who go to church wanted the Bible in their own language. Many of them do not understand the Jarai Bible and songbooks from Vietnam which they use in church.

Factor 7: Governmental and institutional language attitudes and policies - 3 points: Passive assimilation: No explicit policy exists for minority languages; the dominant language prevails in the public domain.

The Cambodian government has no explicit language policy that seeks to strengthen or preserve the languages of the minority speakers in the country. Khmer language is the Language of Wider Communication (LWC) and the dominant language used in the public domain. However, the Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) facilitate an annual national forum which provides a platform for ethnic people groups to express their sentiments regarding education and the preservation of the ethnic minority languages, culture, and traditions. This national forum is represented by the indigenous communities from 14 provinces in Cambodia, with participation of some government sectors (Magaspag, 2004).

Factor 8: Community member’s attitudes toward their own language - 5 points: All members value their language and wish to see it promoted.

All subjects interviewed indicated their desire for the Kachok language to be promoted in the community, that is, that it be spoken by all Kachok people in the community and in other new domains like in schools and literacy classes. They also
wanted to integrate their language, culture and tradition in the school curriculum to keep their traditional dances and music. Interviewees responded that Kachok is their best language among the languages they speak and it is their preferred language. Furthermore, Kachok is the first language spoken by the children. Kachok people and especially the youth are proud to continue using their language even into the future. Also, they wanted to learn how to read and write in their own language. Overall, the interviewees expressed this positive attitude toward the Kachok language.

Factor 9: Type and quality of documentation - 1 point: Inadequate: Only a few grammatical sketches, short wordlists, and fragmentary texts. Audio and video recordings do not exist, are of unusable quality, or are completely un-annotated.

There is little documentation of the Kachok language, but there is one unpublished short wordlist by Diffloth and Gregerson (2003). There are no orthography, grammatical sketches, and fragmentary texts available.

4.3.1.1 Evaluation of Kachok according to UNESCO’s Nine Factors

Considering the UNESCO’s nine factors, three factors indicated weak language vitality among the Kachok. Factor 2 has only 2 points due to a small number of speakers. A small population community might be at risk. However, there are smaller language groups in Asia which have been revived and preserved through intervention of language development programs, which teach people how to read and write, and use their own language at home and community. These language groups started to value, preserve, and maintain their language heritage.
Factor 5 indicates 1 point only since Kachok language is not used in media and in many new domains. Factor 7 has 3 points as no explicit language policy exists for the ethnic minority languages in the country at present. The dominant language is the language of interaction in the public domains and minority languages do not enjoy high prestige. Khmer is used in education, government and institutional services, economic and social domains.

Factors 6 and 9 indicate 1 point for orthography and documentations. Kachok is an oral language with no orthography done yet. Since factor 1 (the language is spoken by all generations) is already attained, orthography and literacy program could be a valuable support. An orthography could be started followed by literacy education and material production for use in literacy classes in the villages. It could also be integrated in the formal school’s curriculum for Kachok students. There is only one Kachok short wordlist but it is not yet published. If these needs are addressed, these weak indicators would be in progress. Since teachers are willing to teach if Kachok materials are available, this would help the younger generations maintain the Kachok language in the future.

The total points indicate that Kachok language is not endangered. Factor 1 has a score of 5 points which highlights the use of the language in all generations from children to adults. Factor 2 has only 2 points, a score which indicates a small number of Kachok speakers but signifies that all speakers use their own language, emphasized in Factor 3. Kachok has 4 points for Factor 4 which indicates that the language is not used in some domains such as schools and market, which recounts to Factor 5 as the
language is only used in few domains (1 point). Kachok has only 1 point for Factor 6 which suggests the need for language development since Kachok has no orthography at present. Kachok has 3 points for Factor 7 which reinforces the need for explicit language policy for the ethnic minority people group. For Factor 8, Kachok has 5 points which emphasizes strong and positive attitudes of the Kachok speakers toward their own language. Factor 9 has 1 point which implies the need for various types and quality of documentation.

4.3.1.2 Evaluation of Kachok and other Languages according to UNESCO’s Nine Factors

The UNESCO’s Nine Factors are applied to Kachok language in comparison with other Bhanaric languages in Ratanakiri – Khmer, Tampuan, and Kreung. In addition, the three indigenous languages were also compared with the Khmer, which is the national language of Cambodia. An SIL colleague who is presently working with these people groups in Ratanakiri province provided the data for Tampuan and Kreung while another SIL linguist provided data for the Khmer language.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Kachok</th>
<th>Tampuan</th>
<th>Kreung</th>
<th>Khmer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intergenerational language transmission scale</td>
<td>5 points: Safe: The language is spoken by all generations.</td>
<td>5 points: Safe: The language is spoken by all generations.</td>
<td>5 points: Safe: The language is spoken by all generations.</td>
<td>5 points: Safe: The language is spoken by all generations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Absolute number of speakers</td>
<td>2 points: 3,382 people.</td>
<td>4 points: 31,088 people.</td>
<td>4 points: 18,442 people.</td>
<td>6 points: 14,494,293 people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proportion of speakers within the total reference group (the Kachok)</td>
<td>5 points: Safe: All speak the language.</td>
<td>5 points: Safe: All speak the language.</td>
<td>5 points: Safe: All speak the language.</td>
<td>5 points: Safe: All speak the language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Loss of existing language domains</td>
<td>4 points: Multilingual parity: Two or more languages maybe used in most social domains and for most functions.</td>
<td>5 The language is used in all domains and for all functions.</td>
<td>5 The language is used in all domains and for all functions.</td>
<td>5 points: The language is used in all domains and for all functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Response to new domains and media</td>
<td>1 point: Minimal: The language is used in only a few new domains.</td>
<td>4 points: Robust/active: The language is in most new domains.</td>
<td>4 points: Robust/active: The language is in most new domains.</td>
<td>5 points: The language is used in all new domains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Materials for language education and literacy</td>
<td>0 point: No orthography available to the community.</td>
<td>3 points: Written materials exist and children may be exposed to</td>
<td>3 points: Written materials exist and children may be exposed to</td>
<td>5 points: There is an established orthography, literacy tradition with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Governmental and institutional language attitudes and policies</td>
<td>the written form at school. Literacy is not promoted through print media.</td>
<td>the written form at school. Literacy is not promoted through print media.</td>
<td>grammars, dictionaries, texts, literature, and everyday media. Writing in the language is used in administration and education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Community member’s attitudes toward their own language</td>
<td>3 points: Passive assimilation: No explicit policy exists for minority languages; the dominant language prevails in the public domain.</td>
<td>3 points: Passive assimilation: No explicit policy exists for minority languages; the dominant language prevails in the public domain.</td>
<td>5 points: All languages are protected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Type and quality of documentation</td>
<td>5 points: All members value their language and wish to see it promoted.</td>
<td>4 points: Most members support language maintenance.</td>
<td>4 points: Most members support language maintenance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 points: Inadequate: Only a few grammatical sketches, short wordlists, and fragmentary texts. Audio and video recordings do not exist, are of unusable quality.</td>
<td>2 points: Inadequate: Only a few grammatical sketches, short wordlists, and fragmentary texts. Audio and video recordings do not exist, are of unusable quality.</td>
<td>4 points: There are comprehensive grammars and dictionaries, extensive texts; constant flow of language materials. Abundant annotated high quality audio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 36 shows that Khmer, the national language of Cambodia, has the strongest language vitality. It is used in different domains with institutional support from lower and upper governmental levels. Khmer is the Language of Wider Communication (LWC) and the lingua franca as well as the medium of education and mass media. Kreung and Tampuan are also dominant languages used in the province where Kachok is located. Some Kachok speakers, especially those who are located in Andoung Meas district, can speak the Tampuan language while Kreung is another language that some Kachok speakers use in Kaoh Peak, Veun Sai district. Language development for Tampuan and Kreung has already been established with on-going literacy classes in some villages. The local speakers use educational materials in these two languages. However, these vernacular materials are not yet used in formal schools and in print media. All the literacy teachers are local speakers of Tampuan and Kreung. Government support is somewhat passive, as there is no explicit policy for minority languages yet. Khmer language is used in the wider public domains.

On the other hand, Kachok language development has not yet been started. As stated, the medium of instruction in all local literacy classes is Khmer. As shown in the table above, Kachok has the lowest score compared with other three languages in Ratanakiri, Cambodia. The absence of language education and literacy, mass media, and documentations has affected the score for Kachok language vitality.
assessments, hence, this area, language development for Kachok, can be tapped to strengthen the language vitality assessment of Kachok.

4.3.2 The Fishman’s GIDS Applied to Kachok

In his book, *Reversing Language Shift*, Fishman proposed the Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS) which indicates the vitality and endangerment of a language. This scale has eight stages, from the weakest to the strongest state of an endangered language.

According to Tehan and Nahhas (cited in Fishman, 1991), in order “to move a language from stage 7 to stage 4, one must first move it to stage 6, and only after attaining stage 6 can stages 5 and 4 be addressed”. Table 37 shows how the Fishman’s GIDS is applied to Kachok to evaluate its language vitality.
Table 37: Evaluation of Kachok According to Fishman’s GIDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Kachok Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 8</td>
<td>Only a few elderly speakers speak the language.</td>
<td>The situation of Kachok is not at this level. Kachok has many elderly speakers at home and in the Kachok community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 7</td>
<td>The older generation uses the language but children are not using it.</td>
<td>Kachok is not at this level. The Kachok older generation uses the language as well as the children. People at all ages use their vernacular language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6</td>
<td>Language and identity socialization of children takes place in home and community; children are learning the language naturally in an intergenerational context</td>
<td>The Kachok situation is at this level. People of all ages speak the Kachok language. The children are learning their language naturally as it is transmitted from the older to the younger generation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>Language is used in the community which involves extensive literacy.</td>
<td>Kachok is not at this level. Kachok language is actively used at home and in the community, except that there is no writing system and the language is not used in extensive literacy. Kachok is an oral language at present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Local language is used in children’s formal education in conjunction with the national or official language.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Local language is used in workplace of larger society, beyond normal L1 boundaries.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Local language is used in governmental services and mass media.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Local language is used at the upper governmental level.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the findings from the SLQs and personal interviews, Kachok is at stage 6, a critical level in which speakers of all ages maintain their own language (Fishman, 1991). A language could be on the sixth level if it is spoken across two
generations, indicating that young children speak their own language. Fishman explains that it is at this level that most languages considered to have vitality are located. In the case of Kachok, the children are learning the language naturally as it is transmitted from the adults to the younger generations. The Kachok children learned to speak their language from their parents at home and use it in different occasions.

Additionally, Fishman emphasizes that:

It is precisely because stage 6 is such a crucial stage, the stage of the daily intergenerational, informal oral interaction that requires full appreciation and extra-careful attention. The core of this stage is the family (although, given demographic concentration, a community of families can be envisaged). The family is an unexpendable bulwark of Reversing Language Shift (RLS). The family has a natural boundary that serves as bulwark against outside pressures, customs, and influences. Its association with intimacy and privacy gives it both a psychological and sociological strength that makes it peculiarly resistant to outside competition and substitution. Although it is true that in modern, urban environments the family has lost much of the socialization power that it once had and much of its ability to close itself off from noxious influences, it is, nevertheless, the most common and inescapable basis of mother tongue transmission, bonding, use, and stabilization (1991, p. 94).

Kachok is not applicable from stages 5 down to 1. Kachok language is dynamic, being used at home and in the community, but has yet to be written and used in extensive literacy. As it is, Kachok is an oral language without orthography at present. Neither is it used in mass media nor in any governmental service.

In summary, using Fishman’s GIDS and UNESCO’s Nine Factors in Language Vitality and Endangerment, Kachok language is considered vital at present. As evidenced by interview results and personal observations during fieldwork, Kachok has high points in terms of intergenerational language transmission as all
generations use and speak it. Language use and attitudes of the Kachok speakers show that their language is vital at home and in the community even without existing institutional support. Tehan and Nahhas (2007) applied these two models to assess the vitality of the Mpi language in Thailand (see Section 2.2). The results indicated that the Mpi is definitely endangered using these two models as most of the Mpi speakers are shifting to the use of Northern Thai and Central Thai languages. One Mpi village is at the stage 8 of Fishman’s GIDS as only few elderly speakers used the language, while the other village is at the stage 7 as the older generation use the language but the children are not using it.

Based on the UNESCO’s Nine Factors in Language Vitality and Endangerment, Kachok is at the stage where the language would survive as it used by the speakers themselves at home from older to younger generations. Intergenerational transmission is showing much success for the Kachok people in Cambodia at present, resulting in the children learning the language naturally in an intergenerational context.

4.3.3 Indicative Factors of Kachok Language Vitality

Language use at home and with children is described to current vitality. This situation defines the most basic form of strong language vitality: people are using the language at home and passing it on to their children.

Language Use at Home and with Children

Questions about domains of language use were administered using the five sociolinguistic questionnaires as mentioned in Section 4.1. These questions are
important in order to understand which language is used in a given situation, particularly when members of different age and gender groups use Kachok or other neighboring languages. In the case of Kachok, it is apparent that the mother tongue is used at home with children and adults (Table 15). Based on the interviews as shown in Table 27, it is evident that Kachok is the first and best language for Kachok speakers. Although some are married to members of other ethnic groups, they still use the Kachok language with their children at home and in the community when they decide to stay in the Kachok village.

The five SLQ results that are relevant to language use at home and with children are the following:

• All subjects reported that only Kachok is the language used by children when speaking with their parents, grandparents, and siblings.

• Parents teach and speak Kachok when the subject is a child.

• The majority of the children cannot speak Khmer before they start school.

• Both young and older children use Kachok when playing with other Kachok children in school. They use Khmer when playing with other ethnic pupils. In addition, they use their own language outside the classroom.

• Kachok is the language of play in the Kachok community.

• Almost every married subject is married to a Kachok person who speaks Kachok as his first language.
Some respondents, though they are married to non-Kachok speakers, want to speak Kachok with their children at home.

All the leaders in the nine villages want their children to continue to speak Kachok.

As reported, only Kachok is the language that subjects exclusively use at home with the Kachok family.

All subjects reported that Kachok parents in their village speak Kachok to their children. Even for intermarriages, the parents speak Kachok to their children who stay in the Kachok village. Only two subjects mentioned that the non-Kachok spouse mixed Kachok with their own language when speaking with their children and grandchildren.

The above results show that the mother tongue is still the primary language at home. Both personal interviews and observation during fieldwork also reveal the same results. People of all ages speak Kachok at home and in the community. Kachok is currently the language used and maintained at home with children. This is a positive factor with respect to current language vitality.

4.3.4 Predictive Factors of Kachok Language Vitality

There are also other factors that are not essential in the short term, but are, rather, predictive of future trends in vitality. If many of these “predictive” factors are in the negative, then language vitality can be said to be threatened in the future. To illustrate, even if the present generation of children is fluent in the mother tongue,
negative language attitudes toward language maintenance could also lead to this fluency not being passed on to the next generation.

4.3.4.1 Language Attitudes

In the five sociolinguistic questionnaires used to identify the language attitudes of the Kachok speakers towards their own language, results reveal a strong sense of identity and pride of the Kachok people towards their own language. They are not embarrassed to speak Kachok even in the presence of other ethnic groups and Khmer people. The five SLQ results that are relevant to language attitudes of the Kachok people are the following:

- The Kachok people want to learn to read and write in their own language.
- They continue speaking in Kachok even though other people groups hear them talk in their own language.
- They will not be happy if the children discontinue the use of the Kachok language in the future.
- There is no problem for parents if their children marry into another ethnic group as long as they continue to speak Kachok with them and with their children at home.
- There are no Kachok children and adults who have stopped speaking Kachok in the village.
• Some respondents who cannot speak other languages use the Kachok language in the market and ask the help of Kachok interpreters when talking with non-Kachok vendors.

• All teachers interviewed both in government schools and literacy classes express interest to have Kachok educational materials available for the Kachok children in school.

• The Kachok church leaders want to have the Bible and hymnbooks written in Kachok language.

• The majority of the respondents said that they use the language of non-Kachok friends when talking with them, not because they are ashamed of their language but because their non-Kachok friends cannot understand the Kachok language. They speak in Kachok if their non-Kachok friends can understand the language.

• Kachok people use other languages as an indication of language accommodation.

• All respondents speak pure Kachok in the village, not mixed.

• All respondents want to preserve their own language and heritage. They want to pass these to the next generation.

These results imply a positive attitude toward the Kachok language, a positive factor toward future language vitality.

Respondents gave positive thoughts about the advantages of learning their own language citing several reasons: the importance of their Kachok history and
traditions written in their own language, benefits for the children, benefits for teaching Kachok, and for language and cultural preservation. Of those who responded to the question on whether they would like to be able to read in Kachok, most answered they wanted to read history in Kachok, while others wanted school books, and books about daily life.

On the whole, the positive attitude toward the Kachok literacy by Kachok people is a positive factor for future language vitality.

4.3.4.2 Language Contact

A major source of language contact that influences language vitality is the school environment. In Kaoh Peak village, there is a primary school up to grade 6 where all the students are Kachok. This is a positive factor for language vitality since the children have no contact with other languages other than Khmer, which is the medium of education. However, in Andoung Meas district, only 12 Kachok students attend school. The majority of the students are Khmer and Jarai speakers. The rest of the minority students are Tampuan and Lao. The Kachok students are in close contact with these students from other language groups.

All Kachok villages have literacy classes where all students and teachers are Kachok except for one teacher in Nay village. This situation is also a positive factor for language vitality since the students have no contacts with other language groups so they speak Kachok with each other.

None of the Kachok villages has a high school and non-farming jobs are limited. Only four Kachok persons moved out from the village to study in high school
in Banlung. As reported, only two Kachok persons work outside the Kachok area. During their time away, however, they almost exclusively speak Khmer. However, they speak Kachok when they return to the Kachok village.

To summarize, for most Kachok children, contact with other languages through education does not occur until they are about 11 or 12 years old (grade 7), and even then, Kachok children remain the overwhelming majority through grade 9. After grade school, only a few of them are able to go to high school. Eventually, the majority of them get married at the age of 12-15 years old. While a few move out of the Kachok area to study or work, they usually go back to their home village and speak their own language.

### 4.3.4.3 Language Use in the Community

Almost every subject reported speaking only Kachok with their Kachok friends and with Kachok people at the village ceremonies, weddings, and funerals. Only a few subjects reported speaking Kachok with their non-Kachok friends because they do not know the language of their non-Kachok friends. Majority of them, however, reported speaking the neighboring languages with non-Kachok people at the market and outside the Kachok area and during instances when non-Kachok speakers are involved in conversations.

The majority of the respondents mentioned that even when non-Kachok people are present, Kachok people speak Kachok with each other, even though they can speak other languages.
The predominant use of Kachok in the community is a positive factor with respect to future language vitality.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

5.1 Summary of the Kachok Language Survey

Kachok is one of the minority languages of Ratanakiri, Cambodia, surrounded by the dominant languages such as Jarai, Tampuan, Kreung, Brao, Lao, and Khmer. Some native Kachok speakers have become multilingual as they learn these neighboring languages through inter-marriages with this ethnic groups and when they are in the situation in which these languages are dominantly used in domains such as in the market, school, and when talking with friends who cannot speak their own language. This situation has given rise to a query as to whether or not the Kachok language is still vital.

This descriptive study was an attempt to assess the Kachok language vitality mainly focusing on language use and attitudes of the Kachok speakers. The study aimed to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the languages used by the Kachok speakers in different domains?
2. What are the attitudes of Kachok speakers toward their own language and the other languages they speak?

3. Does it appear likely that Kachok speakers of the next generations will continue to use their language?

The instruments used in this study included the five sociolinguistic questionnaires, informal interviews, and observations. The five sociolinguistic questionnaires - Individual, Group, Christian Leaders, Teachers, and Village Leaders were orally administered to interview the respondents in nine Kachok villages located in Andoung Meas and Veun Sai districts: Kaoh Peak, Upper Kachut, Lower Kachut, Nay, In, Big Kanat, Small Kanat, Kak, and Tanong.

The individual SLQ was administered in four villages in which 12 subjects were interviewed in each village. The group interview was administered in nine villages with four persons in each group. The seven village leaders were interviewed as knowledgeable insiders of the Kachok villages. Three Christian leaders from Nay, Upper Kachut, and Lower Kachut villages were interviewed regarding the church domain. A total of 12 teachers were interviewed both in formal schools and community literacy classes. One Khmer language assistant and three Kachok interpreters helped in gathering the data.

The results of five sociolinguistic questionnaires were analyzed to assess the vitality of the Kachok language by applying the two models: The UNESCO’s Nine Factors on Language Vitality and Endangerment and Fishman’s Graded
Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS). Indicative and predictive factors for language vitality were also described for the Kachok language situation.

5.2 Findings of the Study

5.2.1 Languages Used by the Kachok Speakers in Different Domains

Home

- All respondents claimed that Kachok language is spoken in nine Kachok villages, exclusively used by the Kachok people at home when communicating with grandparents, parents, children, grandchildren, and siblings. They use their own language purely in their homes except when the spouse is a non-Kachok speaker.

- As reported, Kachok is the language that the Kachok children learn to speak first. In all nine villages, the children speak their language clearly and fluently. There are no children who do not speak Kachok. Kachok is generally used by the children at home and in the community except when they are in schools where Khmer language is the medium of education.

- Most Kachok speakers marry within their language group, although parents have no problem if their children marry into another ethnic group, as long as they continue to speak Kachok with them and with their children at home. In cases of intermarriages, the language spoken at home is determined by the location where they settle. If a Kachok
marries a non-Kachok speaker and lives outside the Kachok area, the language of that village is used. For Kachok, they usually settle at the mother’s village.

- Based on Fishman (1991) GIDS, the Kachok language is at stage 6 in which the language is currently used and maintained at home with children which show a positive factor with respect to current language vitality.

Friendship

- Results show that Kachok people use their own language when talking with Kachok friends in their village. However, they use the language of their non-Kachok friends who do not understand the Kachok language.

- As reported, some respondents do not visit other non-Kachok villages, do not have non-Kachok friends, and cannot speak any languages except Kachok.

Social/Public Domain – weddings, funerals, village meetings, and market

- The respondents reported that Kachok is used in the religious ceremonies – weddings and funerals - otherwise Khmer is used when non-Kachok speakers are present in these social gatherings.

- At village meetings, respondents reported that Kachok is used exclusively, otherwise Khmer is used when there are other ethnic groups present in the meetings.
• The river and spring well are public places for bathing, drinking, and washing where the Kachok people of all ages use their own language when they communicate with each other.

• The market is located outside of the Kachok area. As reported, more men travel occasionally than women. Some Kachok have not gone to market, hence, have not experienced talking with the vendors.

• The Kachok speakers who can speak and understand Khmer, Jarai, Tampuan, Krung, and Lao use the language of the vendors when talking to them.

• The Kachok who do not speak nor understand other languages need a Kachok interpreter when talking with the vendors.

Religious Domain – Christian churches in three Kachok villages

• The Kachok Christians use both Khmer and Jarai Bibles. The Jarai Bible is written in Jarai script from Vietnam. However, there are estimates of only 250 Kachok Christians in all Kachok villages, so contact through church domain is not so big enough.

• As reported, Kachok is the language used by the people in the church when praying, preaching, during fellowship, and in giving announcements. They use Khmer and Jarai when reading the liturgy and Scriptures.

• The Christian leaders expressed their desire to have Bible and hymnbooks in Kachok language. They believe that if this concern is
addressed, Kachok language vitality in church domain would be in progress.

**Neighboring Language Groups**

- The Kachok-speaking community is not as large as the Jarai, Tampuan, and Kreung-speaking communities surrounding Kachok. Some Kachok speak these neighboring languages outside of the Kachok area or when the speakers of these language groups visit the Kachok villages.

- The level of bilingualism/multilingualism among Kachok speakers indicates that men could speak other languages more than women. Men traveled more than women to non-Kachok speaking areas and use the language of the villages they visit and the language of the people they meet.

- Contact with other language groups appear to be infrequent with some Kachok speakers. However, Kachok who can speak other languages sometimes, do not use the Kachok language when they are outside of the Kachok area.

**School (formal and non-formal)**

- Only a few Kachok children are able to go to school where they start to learn Khmer at the age of 10 to 12 years old. Khmer is the medium of instruction in both non-formal and formal schools. Educational
materials are written in Khmer language. The teachers want to learn and teach Kachok if materials are available.

- The Kachok children use their language when they play together but Khmer is used when playing with other ethnic pupils. They speak Kachok outside the classroom.

- The teachers in the formal school are non-Kachok speakers and do not speak Kachok with the students, while in literacy classes, all teachers are Kachok except of one Kreung teacher in Nay village. The teachers encourage their students to speak Khmer inside the classroom.

- Kachok is the language used by the Kachok children when playing together with other Kachok pupils, but they use Khmer when playing with non-Kachok classmates. As reported, some Kachok children can speak Khmer, particularly those who are able to go to school, aged above 10 years old. The children below 8 years old who do not go to school cannot speak Khmer nor the other neighboring languages.

5.2.2 Attitudes of Kachok Speakers toward their own Language

- Generally, Kachok people have a highly positive attitude toward their own language. The young people and adults are proud to use their language in different situations and are not ashamed to speak their language even when the non-Kachok speakers surround them.
• Additionally, many of the adults in the Kachok villages do not know how to read and write, but they want to learn how, especially in their own language. Every respondent interviewed expressed his interest in developing the Kachok language, either for use in education in both formal and non-formal settings and for the preservation of his own language.

• The respondents share their desire to learn how to read and write their own language and want to see the language promoted. The findings also indicate that Kachok people would like to see written materials produced in their own language.

• The village leaders, church leaders, individuals, and teachers in both formal and non-formal schools expressed enthusiasm in learning to read and write the Kachok language.

5.2.3 Attitudes of Kachok Speakers toward other Languages they Speak

• Kachok is a sparsely-populated area with 3,365 inhabitants. Larger neighboring language groups in the area dominate the small population of Kachok people. Some Kachok speakers can speak Jarai, Tampuan, Khmer, Kreung, Brao, Kavet, and Lao, depending on their location to these language groups. They use these languages outside of the Kachok area or when talking with these language speakers.
Although Kachok people are proud of their own language, they have positive attitudes toward other languages they speak. They value the Khmer language as the national language and a lingua franca used in the area.

Some Kachok speakers accommodate other languages when they are in particular situations in which the dominant languages are frequently used such as in the market, with non-Kachok friends, and when they are outside of the Kachok area. None of the Kachok people interviewed gave any hint of a negative attitude toward any neighboring languages.

It was also observed that the majority of the women could not speak Khmer well as only a few of them were able to respond in Khmer during the interview. Likewise, the Khmer interpreter noted that some women were not proficient in Khmer, although a few of them could speak a little of the neighboring language.

5.2.4 Assessing Language Vitality using the UNESCO’s Nine Factors in Language Vitality and Endangerment and Fishman’s GIDS Models

The answers to the questionnaire related to UNESCO’s factor 1 (Intergenerational language transmission scale - 5 points: [Safe]: The language is spoken by all generations) showed that Kachok is the language used by the children and adults at home and in the
community. The respondents claimed that their language will continue to be used by the future generations.

- All respondents believe that the children will use Kachok when they grow up. The opinion of everyone asked is that no one from the community has shifted from speaking Kachok in favor of some other languages. Additionally, no respondents feel that their language would one day cease to exist.

- Kachok people have a high regard for their language. They have a strong desire to preserve the use of their language subsequently by the future generations.

- The UNESCO’s nine factors reveal that Kachok language is weak on some factors but very strong in other areas. The evaluation shows that if language development is addressed for Kachok people group, the language will be preserved and most likely be maintained in the next generations.

- The GIDS evaluations show that Kachok is at stage six in which the language is used in the intergenerational context - the language will survive and even thrive in a solid foundation if Kachok people will continue to use their language and pass it on to the next generation. The GIDS indicates that the Kachok language is active and exclusively used at home with children, parents, grandparents, spouses, and siblings. The language is transmitted from parents to children. The
parents want their children to continue using their language into the future.

5.3 Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn from the findings of the study:

1. Results in this study indicate that the Kachok language is very dynamic and mainly used at home with parents, grandparents, spouse, children, grandchildren, and siblings.

2. Kachok children are learning their language naturally in an intergenerational context. The Kachok language appears to be at a safe stage in terms of degree of endangerment since it is spoken by all ages at home and in the community.

3. Some Kachok people tend to accommodate other neighboring languages when the dominant languages are used in particular occasions especially at the market, and when communicating with persons who do not speak nor understand their own language. The Kachok who speak these neighboring languages still value their language.

4. Kachok language is actively used in community activities like village meetings, religious ceremonies, weddings, and funerals. It is also the language used in church except for the Bible and hymnbooks which are written in Jarai and Khmer.

5. Concerning language attitudes, it appears that Kachok people have a strong positive attitude toward their language. It is reflected in their desire to learn how to read and write in their own language and their desire to have written
materials available in their own language. Generally, the positive attitude toward learning the language and the Kachok literacy is a positive factor for future language vitality.

6. Kachok speakers have positive attitudes toward other languages since these languages are also important for communication outside of their own villages.

7. Although Kachok community is relatively small compared with other neighboring language groups such as Jarai, Tampuan, and Kreung, Kachok people appear to have been able to preserve their language, despite being surrounded by these larger groups; hence, their desire to see their language promoted and preserved is evident.

8. The Kachok who are speaking these neighboring languages still value their language as the best language they are using, though they seem to hold no negative attitude towards other languages they speak.

9. The respondents’ claim that in 20 years hence their language will still be used and spoken by the future generations serves as an indicator of strong language vitality at present.

10. Based on the questionnaire responses, informal interviews, and observations made during the fieldwork, the findings indicate that the Kachok language is dynamic and essential for the native speakers themselves.

11. The UNESCO’s Nine Factors and Fishman’s GIDS assessment provide evidence to indicate that the Kachok language is currently vital. This conclusion is based mainly on Kachok language use and attitudes.
12. There are good indications of healthy language vitality among the Kachok people. The patterns of language use point to a healthy use of the Kachok language in each of the nine villages that have been visited. Additionally, Kachok people indicate strong attitudes toward their own language.

13. Evidences point to a strong language vitality of Kachok at present. The Kachok language will continually be maintained if the Kachok people themselves will continue to value and speak their own language at home and in the community and to pass it on to the next future generations.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are suggested:

1. Further sociolinguistic research in several areas is necessary. Other indicators of language vitality would also help assess the Kachok language vitality, i.e bilingualism, language policy for the minority languages, language proficiency, land tenure, and economic sustainability.

2. Since some Kachok people speak two or more neighboring languages - Khmer, Jarai, Tampuan, Kreung, Kavet, Brao, and Lao - language proficiency testing would be essential to measure the proficiency level of the Kachok people towards these languages.

3. Testing the level of bilingualism/multilingualism in neighboring languages among Kachok speakers would further clarify the issues of language use in other domains.
4. The findings of this survey could be further validated by a researcher staying longer in the village and spending more time for observation, informal conversations, and participation in the lives of the Kachok people and their activities. This would provide more opportunities to observe language use and attitudes of the people to verify the questionnaire results. A longer ethnographic study is, therefore, recommended.

5. Since the intergenerational transmission of Kachok is very strong, language development, in terms of orthography development followed by literacy programs, is strongly suggested to help maintain and preserve the Kachok language.

6. Since informal interviews revealed that Kachok or Lamam or Romam people live in the border of Vietnam and Cambodia, it would be desirable to survey the area – to get the population of the Kachok people who live there, identify the language situation, and compare the data with this study.

7. Concerning methodology, data gathering could have been more natural if the questionnaires were administered in the Kachok language to help the Kachok respondents understand the questions better. However, non-Kachok researchers should undergo one to two years of intensive training before undertaking similar studies.

8. It is suggested that an explicit language policy for minority people groups be implemented to help strengthen the vitality of minority languages and to sustain the vernacular literature of the ethnic groups.
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APPENDIX 1 The Teacher Questionnaire

1. Questionnaire Number  េលខ សំនួរ
2. Survey  សទង់ មតិ
3. Interview Location  កែន្លងសំភសន៌
4. Interviewer Name  អនកែន្លងសំភសន៌
5. Date  ែថង ែខ ឆន ំ
6. Language of Elicitation  ភំឈរបើសំ្របសួរ
7. Language of Response  ភំឈរប់េឆ្លើយ
8. Interpreter Name (if needed)  អនកបកែ្រប
9. Comments  បែរបល់

Bio-data of Teacher(s):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Name</td>
<td>ទូរសំសួរបើសួរ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Age</td>
<td>ប្រុស</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Gender</td>
<td>(អ្នក)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Teach which grade</td>
<td>បែរង្វាន់រោះមតិ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Taught how long</td>
<td>បែរង្វាន់រោះមតិប៉ុនម នឆន ំប៉ុនម?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Ethnicity</td>
<td>ជនជតិមោឃ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Languages spoken</td>
<td>និយយភំឈរបើសំណួរបើសួរ?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. What villages are the students from?  សិស្សទំងេនះមកពីភូមិខ្លះ
a. What is the percentage of students from each ethnic group? ប៉ុន្តែយ៉ាងណា ភិបាកពីភេយនិថ្ងការពារជនជាតិមួយៗ?

b. Khmer ភ្លើងភ្លឺជាតិ
c. Jarai ភ្លើងភ្លឺជាតិ
d. Brao ភ្លើងភ្លឺជាតិ
e. Tampuen ភ្លើងភ្លឺជាតិ
f. Krueng ភ្លើងភ្លឺជាតិ
g. Lao ភ្លើងភ្លឺជាតិ
h. Khavet ភ្លើងភ្លឺជាតិ
i. Other ភ្លើងភ្លឺផងដែងទៀត

18. If you compare the abilities of kids from each ethnic group when they first start school, what differences are there? បើអនុប្រយ័ត្តប្រឈមការដំបូងពីពេលពីររយៈពេលឆ្អេះមុនឃើញ មានកំណើតរៀងរាល់មិនមាន។

19. Is Kachok language (or any tribal language) taught or used in this school? ការបង្កាន់ភាសាវិទ្យាសាស្ត្រភាសារទូទៅមានមិនមាន។

20. Do the ethnic groups split up to play or do they play together? ភិបាកពីភេយនិថ្ងការពារជនជាតិមួយៗថ្លៃមុនឃើញ រស់មើលរៀងរាល់មិនមាន។

21. When the youngest kids are playing, what languages do they speak? ប្រឈមការដ្យាសម្រាប់តុងពីភេយនិថ្ងការពារជនជាតិមួយៗ ភាសាអ្វីខ្លះ?
22. Does the teacher minds if the kids speak Kachok, or do they want the kids to speak Khmer?
តើយ៉ងេម៉ចែដរចំេពះ្រគូៗេបើសិសنةេយយភេេីេននិយយែខមរ? បើពួកគត់ចង់េននិយយែខមរបនេ?”

23. When the older children play, what languages do they speak?
បើសិសធំៗពួកគត់ចង់េយេគនិយយែខមរបនេ?”

24. When the Kachok children start school, can they speak any Khmer or other languages?
កនិយយភេេធំៗរបញ្ចូលកូនក់េជំេសិសនិយយែខមរឬភេេលខ្លះេបនេ?”

25. At about what grade are the Kachok children good at speaking Khmer?
តើថនិយយភេេធំៗរបញ្ចូលកូនក់េជំេសិសនិយយែខមរបនេ?”

26. At about what grade are the Kachok children good at Khmer reading/writing?
តើថនិយយភេេធំៗរបញ្ចូលកូនក់េជំេសិសនិយយែខមរបនេ?”

27. Where do the teachers at this school come from?
តើ្រគូៗេននិយយែខមរេនិយយែខមរសម្រាប់េសិសថនិយយភេេយេរៀនំេរៀនេជំេសិសណេ?

a. Where do the teachers live while they are here?
តើ្រគូៗេនិយយែខមរេនិយយែខមរសម្រាប់េសិសថនិយយភេេយេរៀនំេរៀនេជំេសិសណេ?

b. Can the Khmer teachers speak any Kachok?
តើ្រគូៗេនិយយែខមរេចះនិយយែខមរសម្រាប់េសិសថនិយយភេេយេរៀនំេរៀនេជំេសិសណេ?
28. What do students usually do after they stop studying/graduate? What percentages?

a. Is there a difference between what male and female students do?

b. Where do students from this village continue their studies?

29. In 20 years, do you think that Kachok children in this village will still be speaking Kachok?

30. Do you teach about Kachok traditions and customs?

31. Is there any value to having educational materials available for teaching children in Kachok?
32. If answer is “Yes”, what kinds of materials would you like to see in Kachok? For what grades? Why?

33. Other comments from the teacher ។

ដំណើរការប្រការប្រសិនបើកនឹងស្ថិតឯកជន។
APPENDIX 2 Dialect Perceptions Group Questionnaire

1. Questionnaire Number មេលខ សំនួរ
2. Survey សទង់ មតិ
3. Interview Location កែន្លងសំភសន៌
4. Interviewer Name ម៉ូ: សំភសន៌
5. Date ដៃ: ថៃ: ឆន ំ
6. Language of Elicitation ភាគ សំញប់សួរ
7. Language of Response ភាគ ឆ្លើយ
8. Interpreter Name (if needed) ម៉ូ:សំភសន៌បកែរ
9. Comments ម៉យបល់
10.
Background Information (for each person in group)

11. What is your name? តើអនកឈម អ្វី?

12. (Gender) (ភទ)

13. How old are you? តើអនកយុប៉ុនម ន

14. Are you married? អនកេរៀបករេហើយឬ នួន

15. How many children do you have? តើអនកមនកូនប៉ុនម ននក់

16. Where were you born? តើអនកេកើតេនភូមិ ។
17. Where did you grow up? 
ទីកូនក្លាយបន្ទាត់ឬពីណា? 

18. Where do you live now? (have them write in Khmer too) 
ទីដែលស្ថិតរស់នៅបច្ចុប្បន្ន? 

19. How many years have you lived here/there? 
ទីដែលធ្វើប្រសើរប្រុងត្រឹមត្រូវប្រាប់សម្រាប់? 

20. What grade have you completed? 
ទីដែលប្រញាប់រក្សាទុកទីតាំងស្ថិតធម៌? 

21. What is your work? 
ទីដែលធ្វើការ? 

22. What language did you speak first as a child? 
ក្លាយរក្សាមើនគោលគោលគោលបានប្រយុត្តិប្រយុត្តិ? 

23. What other languages do you speak? 
ទីដែលប្រញាប់រក្សាមើនគោលគោលគោលបានប្រយុត្តិ? 

24. Which language do you speak best? 
ប្រយុត្តិប្រយុត្តិប្រយុត្តិប្រយុត្តិប្រយុត្តិប្រយុត្តិប្រយុត្តិប្រយុត្តិប្រយុត្តិ? 
  a. 2nd best? 
  ស្ងាមានបាន? 
  b. 3rd best, etc.? 
  ស្ងាមានបាន? 

25. What is your father’s ethnicity? 
ទីដែលប្រញាប់រក្សាជាតិឈ្មោះ?
26. What is your father’s first language?
តើអនកបាននិយយភាពខ្លះតិចជាដែលដែលរាងកាយបាន?

27. What is your mother’s ethnicity?
តើម្តេយរបស់អនកជនជតិអ្វី?

28. What is your mother’s first language?
តើម្តេយអនកនិយយភាពអ្វី?

Contact

29. Do people from this village travel to other Kachok villages?
តើជនជតិកចក់េនកនងភូមិេនះមនេធ្វើដំេណើ រេនភូមិកចក់េផƞងេទៀត ឬេទៀត

a. What types of people go? (men, women, young, old, etc)
មនុស្លបេភទǁ(មនុស្លបេភទ)|

b. Do very many go, or just a few?
គេទទីេនះក្នុងនោះទិចតួច ឬឬទិចតួច

c. Why do they go? (market, religious festival, sports, wedding, funeral, etc.)
គតុអ្វីេនះហតុលកទីេនះ(ផ្◌។ារ បុណយ បុណយ សព បុណយករ បុណយសព)

d. How often do they go?
គេទទីេនះមនេធ្វើដំេណើប៉នមនេធ្វើដំេណើដែលយកប៉ន

e. When they speak Kachok, do they have any trouble understanding each other?
គេទទីេនះមនេធ្វើដំេណើកាត់រងការលក់រងការសម្រាប់េទៀត
f. Do they have to change the way they speak Kachok to communicate?

Do they have to change the way they speak Kachok to communicate?
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30. Do people from other Kachok villages ever come here?
h. Do they have to change the way they speak Kachok to communicate?
ទឹកដែលសេចក្តីនោះព្រះឬយសារមនុស្សមនុស្សកាលដោយមនុស្សកាលក្រុងសម្រួលមិនខ្លាំង?

31. In this village, when Kachok people travel to the non-Kachok-speaking area, where do they usually go?
នឹងក្នុងភូមិនេះ,នេះពលជនជតិកចក់ធ្វើដំណើរភូមិដលមិននិយយកចក់តើនេះនឹងទំនក់ទំនងគនឬទំនភ្នាក់សម្រួលមិនសេចក្តីរបស់ឯកចំណុះជាមួយឯកចំណុះគេសើរសិក្បាម៉េចំណុះ? 

a. What types of people go? (men, women, young, old, etc)
មនុស្សទី់បេសបុស (របុសបុសបុសបុសបុសបុស) 

b. Do very many go, or just a few?
ទំនក់ទំនងឯកចំណុះឬទំនក់ទំនងតិចតួច? 

c. Why do they go? (market, religious festival, sports, wedding, funeral, etc.)

d. How often do they go?
ទំនក់ទំនងឯកចំណុះឬទំនភ្នាក់សម្រួលមិនសេចក្តីរបស់ឯកចំណុះ? 

e. What people live there?
ក្នុងភូមិនេះគ្មានជនជតិជាអ្វី? 

f. What language do the people in those villages speak?
ទឹកដែលសេចក្តីនោះព្រះឬយសារមនុស្សមនុស្សកាលដោយមនុស្សកាលក្រុងសម្រួលមិនខ្លាំង? 

g. What language do the Kachok use with people in those villages?
ទឹកដែលសេចក្តីនោះព្រះឬយសារមនុស្សមនុស្សកាលដោយមនុស្សកាលក្រុងសម្រួលមិនខ្លាំង?
32. Do people from other non-Kachok villages ever come here?
តើជនជាតិពីផ្សេងទៀតមកទីនេះទេ?

a. From what villages/people groups?
េងប្រែអ្វីពីភូមិរុកុមារកុមក្នុងសារ

b. What types of people come? (men, women, young, old, etc.)
េតើអនកមកប៉ុន្តែ្របុសតូន្តែ្រសីក្◌មេ◌ងចស់

33. In this village, when a Kachok woman gets married, who does she usually marry? A Kachok man or one with a different ethnicity?
កនុងភូមិនេះកនុងពេលរីបករបាន ប្រុសមកការទេជាអ្នកជាតិទៀតឬអ្នកជាតិ្រសញ្ចីសរុបទេ?

a. From this village? What other villages?
ឬឬភូមិនេះឬភូមិ្រសញ្ចីសរុប?
b. What language do they speak to each other?
តំបន់ឈើភាសារឿន។

c. What language do they teach their children?
តំបន់ឈើភាសារឿនកុមារ។

34. In this village, when a Kachok man gets married, who does he usually marry? Another Kachok person or one with a different ethnicity?
កនុងភូមិនេះបុរសរឿនឆ្លង់សង្គ្រោះមនុស្សកាលណាមួយក្នុងក្នុងក្នុងក្នុង ឬមនុស្សមួយដែលមានជនជាតិដែលខ្លះទេ?

a. From this village? What other villages?
កនុងភូមិនេះឬភូមិផ្សេងៗ?

b. What language do they speak to each other?
តំបន់ឈើភាសារឿន។

c. What language do they teach to their children?
តំបន់ឈើភាសារឿនកុមារ។

Dialect Perceptions

35. Does everyone in your village speak Kachok about the same way?
តំបន់ភាសាកុមារនៅក្នុងភូមិនេះនូវភាសារឿនគឺជាងគឺជាងនេះឬខ្លះទេ?

ដែលមានឈើដែលភាសារឿនក្នុងក្នុងក្នុងក្នុងក្នុងដែលអាចបញ្ហាជាមួយក្នុងក្នុងក្នុងក្នុងក្នុងអាចបញ្ហានេះឬខ្លះទេ។
36. What are the names of other villages that speak Kachok the same way as here?
ទំនើប៉ុន្តែឈ្មោះភូមិចូលសេវាសម្រាប់ការនិយមបំផុតអំពីការរុញខ្លះទីនេះ។

37. What are the names of other villages that speak Kachok a little differently from here, but you can understand each other?
ទំនើប៉ុន្តែឈ្មោះភូមិចូលសេវាសម្រាប់ការនិយមស្រួយបំផុតពីទីនេះប៉ុណ្ណែតើអំពីខ្លួនកើតត្រូវបានដឹង

a. For the most part, when you talk with them, do you understand everything or some things, or nothing at all?
ការដើរដោយសុវត្ថិភាពប្រាប់ខ្លួនឯងបើសូមប្រាប់ខ្លួនឯងតើអំពីខ្លួនកើតត្រូវបានដឹងពីទីនេះប៉ុណ្ណែតើអំពីខ្លួនកើតត្រូវបានដឹងអំពីខ្លួនឯង

b. (if “some things” or “nothing at all”) How are the language here and their language different?
បើតើអំពីខ្លួនឯងបើសូមប្រាប់ខ្លួនឯងតើអំពីខ្លួនឯងបើសូមប្រាប់ខ្លួនឯងតើអំពីខ្លួនឯងបើសូមប្រាប់ខ្លួនឯងតើអំពីខ្លួនឯង

(Use: (some things?) = តើអំពីខ្លួនឯងបើសូមប្រាប់ខ្លួនឯងតើអំពីខ្លួនឯង)

If they don’t answer)

For example… How are the sounds different? How are the words different? Is it faster/slower?

What things do you think are different? Can you explain?

If they don’t answer)

What things do you think are different? Can you explain?

For example… How are the sounds different? How are the words different? Is it faster/slower?

What things do you think are different? Can you explain?

Do you often talk with people from there?

When you speak with people from one of those villages what language do you use with each other?
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1. (If they answer “Kachok” (but do not specify the variety):
   1. Do you each just speak your own style of Kachok or do either of you have to change the way you speak?

ii. (if they have to change) Who changes?
   1. (if they have to change) What style of Kachok do they change to?

iii. [If they answer something other than Kachok:]

iv. Why don’t you speak to them in Kachok?

38. Are there any villages that speak Kachok very differently from here, so different that you have trouble understanding each other?

   a. (If yes), what are the names of those villages that speak Kachok very differently?

b. For the most part, when you talk with them, do you understand everything or some things, or nothing at all?

   េតើមនភូមិេទៀតែដលនិយយភេ្រព្យប្តូរេទនិយយកចក់្របេភទេ្រចើនេពលេគនិយយជមួយេគ
   េតើអនកយល់ទំងអស់តិចតួចឬមិនយល់េôះ។
c. (if “some things” or “nothing at all”) How are the language here and their language different?

(បើមានសេចក្ដីសង្ខេបឬ អ្នកឈ្នះប្រការ ដែលភាពយន្តថ្មីមានយ៉ាងដ៏ធំបំផុត?)

ដើម្បីភាពយន្តថ្មីមានយ៉ាងដ៏ធំបំផុតជាមួយនឹងភាពយន្តថ្មីមានយ៉ាងដ៏ធំបំផុតទីមួយទាំងអស់គឺជាមួយភាពយន្តថ្មីមានយ៉ាងដ៏ធំបំផុត?


d. (if they don’t answer) For example… How are the sounds different? How are the words different? Is it faster/slower?

(បើបម្រើនយ៉ាងល្អិត៖) ប្រសិទ្ធិនេះមានភាពយន្តថ្មីមានយ៉ាងដ៏ធំបំផុតមានយ៉ាងដ៏ធំបំផុត? ភាពយន្តថ្មីមានយ៉ាងដ៏ធំបំផុតញឹងៗប្រសិទ្ធិប្រសិទ្ធិ? តាមចំណុចឬតាមការប្រសិទ្ធិ?


e. Do you often talk with people from there?

(អ្នកច្រើនបានជាមួយមនុសញ្ចាតិក្នុងទីនោះមិនទេមិនទេ?)

f. When you speak with people from one of those villages what language do you use with each other?

(យ៉ាងណាស់នៅក្នុងទីមួយនេះមនុសញ្ចាតិតាមចំណុចសំរាប់សំរាប់មនុសញ្ចាតិម៉ៃ្វើដោយគ្នា?)


d. (if they have to change) Who changes?

(បើមានការប្រការជាមួយការប្រការទូទៅ៖)

(i. (if they have to change) What style of Kachok do they change to?  (បើមានការប្រការជាមួយការប្រការទូទៅ៖)
ii. [If they answer something other than Kachok:] (បើមិននិយយកចក់)

iii. Why don’t you speak to them in Kachok?
   (េហតុអ្វីអនកមិននិយយេគកចក់េគគឺ)

40. In what village do you think Kachok is spoken most purely? Why?
   (តើភូមិǁែដលនិយយកចក់សុទធេតយយតិតួកលយើង? េហតុអ្វី)
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APPENDIX 3 Kachok Individual Questionnaire

1. Questionnaire Number េលខ សំនួរ
2. Survey សទង់ 
3. Interview Location កែន្លងសំភសន៌ 
4. Interviewer Name េឈម សំភសន៌ 
5. Date ខែ ថ្ងៃ ឆ្នាំ 
6. Language of Elicitation ភាសាគើសំផ្លូវប់ 
7. Language of Response ភាសាពើសំឆ្លើយ 
8. Interpreter Name (if needed) េឈម បកែ្រប 
9. Comments បញ្ហាសម្រាប់ 

Background Information

10. What is your name? ប្រការអ្វីជាកូនឯក្តិតូចខ្លះ?

11. (Gender) ភទ (បុរស/ស្រី)

12. How old are you? តើអនកេយុប៉ុនមនិតូចខ្លះ?

13. Are you married? តើអនកេរៀបករេហើយឬខ្លះ?

14. How many children do you have? តើអនកមនកូនប៉ុនមនកូនមានទឹកប់ឬ?

15. Where were you born? តើអនកេកើតនៅភូមិiliation?

16. Where did you grow up? តើអនកេបនធំពីវិញមកឬ?
17. Where do you live now? (have them write in Khmer too)
ដែលអនកជនជតិសុីធានស្រស់េនះ 

18. How many years have you lived here/there?
ដែលអនករស់េនទីេនះ/ទីេនះប៉ុនម នឆន ំេហើយ?

19. What grade have you completed?
ដែលអនកេរៀន្រតឹមថន ក់ទីប៉ុនម ន

20. What is your work?
ដែលអនកធ្វីករអ្វី

21. What language did you speak first as a child?
ដែលអនកឫយយដំបូងែដលអនកេចះនិយយ

22. What other languages do you speak?
ដែលអនកេចះនិយយភǖ្លេផƞងេទៀតែដលឬេត

23. Which language do you speak best?
ដែលអនកនិយយភǖ្លេបនល្អជងេគ
i. 2nd best? ភំឃឺត
ii. 3rd best, etc.? ភំឃឺត

24. What is your father’s ethnicity?
ដែលឪពុករបស់អនកជនជតិអ្វី

25. What is your father’s first language?
ដែលភំឃឺតរបស់ឪពុកអនកជភǖ្លេដែលអនក

26. What is your mother’s ethnicity?
ដែលម្ត យរបស់អនកជនជតិអ្វី
27. What is your mother’s first language?
ទំនិញ័រតិនិយយភាពរុក្ការម្តយអនក?

**Children’s Language**

28. In this village, what language do Kachok children learn to speak first?
ទំនិញ័រតិនិយយភាពភាពរុក្ការម្តយអនក?

29. In this village, do all the Kachok children speak Kachok?
ទំនិញ័រតិនិយយភាពភាពរុក្ការម្តយអនក?

30. Do you think there are any Kachok children in this village who do not speak Kachok clearly?
ទំនិញ័រតិនិយយភាពភាពរុក្ការម្តយអនក?

31. What language do children speak when they play together?
ទំនិញ័រតិនិយយភាពភាពរុក្ការម្តយអនក?

32. Do the children know how to speak Khmer before they start school?
ទំនិញ័រតិនិយយភាពភាពរុក្ការម្តយអនក?

33. What other languages do children know/learn how to speak?
ទំនិញ័រតិនិយយភាពភាពរុក្ការម្តយអនក?

34. Where do they learn to speak those languages?
ទំនិញ័រតិនិយយភាពភាពរុក្ការម្តយអនក?

35. What age do children start knowing how to speak those languages?
ទំនិញ័រតិនិយយភាពភាពរុក្ការម្តយអនក?

36. If a Kachok person is married to one with another ethnicity, what language do they use with their children?
ទំនិញ័រតិនិយយភាពភាពរុក្ការម្តយអនក?
Domains of Language Use

37. Now we’re going to ask you some questions about what language you use in certain situations.

38. What language do you use:

   a. with your parents?
      ឈ្មោះម្តូលម្តសេចក្តីមានប្រឈស្មារ

   b. with your grandparents?
      ឈ្មោះសម្រាប់ពាោន

   c. siblings?
      ឈ្មោះបងប្អូនបងប្អូន

   d. spouse?
      ឈ្មោះបង្កើត

   e. children?
      ឈ្មោះថត

   f. grandchildren?
      ឈ្មោះម៉ូន

39. Kachok friends in this village? Other villages?
    ឈ្មោះកះរឥកក្រុមក្រុមឈ្មោះប្រេងសេចក្តីនៅភូមិនេះ? ក្រុមក្រុមជាងភូមិនេះ?

40. Non-Kachok friends in this village? Other villages?
    ឈ្មោះកះរឥកក្រុមរឿងគ្នាសេចក្តីនៅភូមិនេះ? ក្រុមក្រុមជាងភូមិនេះ?
a. at the market?  
េនផ្គាក់?  

b. at a village meeting?  
េនកែន្លង្របជុំកនុងភូមិ?  

c. during religious ceremonies, funerals, weddings?  
េនកែន្លងបុណយៀសន បុណយសព ពិធីេរៀបករ?  

d. with Jarai people?  
ជនជតិចǍយ?  

e. with Tampuan people?  
ជនជតិទុំពួន?  

f. with Brao people?  
ជនជតិ្របវ?  

g. with Khavet people?  
ជនជតិកǏត?  

h. with Kreung people?  
ជនជតិ្រកឹង?  

i. with Khmer people?  
ជនជតិែខមរ?  

j. with Lao people?  
ជនជតិទបវ?  

41. Overall, which language do you use the most?  
កនុងចំេនមភǒទំងអស់ េតើភǒǁអនកេ្របើេ្រចើនជងេគ?
Atitudes Toward Kachok

42. Are the young people proud of speaking Kachok? Why?
ទុឬយុវជនពញចិត្តនិយយភពាណាំប្រការបាន? បេរៀរ?</p>

43. Are there Kachok people who don’t use Kachok language anymore?
ទុឬមនជនជតិកចក់ឬេទុឬមនឳយយភពាណាំប្រការបាន?</p>

a. (if yes) How do you feel about that?
បើមនិយយបនបេរៀរ</p>

b. (if no) Why?
បើមិននិយយបន</p>

44. 20 years from now, do you think the children of this village will be able to speak Kachok?
( NOTE: We want to know about those who will be children in 20 years’ time, so they are not yet born.)
ទុឬអនកគិតថេកមងៗែដលេកើតេន២០ឆនាពញចិត្តនិយយភពាណាំប្រការកបជេបយទប?</p>

a. (if yes) How do you feel about that?
បើមនិយយបន, បេរៀរ</p>

b. (if no) Why?
បើមិននិយយបន</p>

45. If a non-Kachok person overhears you speaking Kachok, how do you feel?
ទុឬមនអនកមនែតនិយយភពាណាំប្រការកបជេបយទប?</p>

a. Do you continue in Kachok, change to a different language, or stop speaking?
បេរៀរចិត្តនិយយភពាណាំប្រការបាន? បេរៀរចិត្តនិយយភពាណាំប្រការបាន? បេរៀរចិត្តនិយយភពាណាំប្រការបាន?
46. What parts of being Kachok would you like to see your children continue? (For example: customs, dress, house style, food, language, festivals, religion, etc. Note if you have to give examples.)

Why?

47. If your children marry someone who does not speak your language, how would you feel?

Attitudes Toward other Languages

48. Is it common in this village for people to marry someone who doesn’t speak your language?

a. How do you feel about that?

b. Why?
Literacy

49. In which language can you read and write?
តើអនកចំណាត់ថ្នាក់ជំនួយអនកបានដឹងនិងសរុបជភាសាទើបឬជភាសាសម្រាប់កិច្ចប្រជុំរបស់អ្នក?

50. Do you want to be able to read and write Kachok?
តើអនកចង់េចះនិងសរេសរភាសាខ្មែរកជំនាញកើតេទួលឬទេ?

Why?
ហតុអ្វី?

51. What kinds of things would you like to have written in your language?
តើអ្វីខ្លះែដលអនកចង់យកមកសរេសរជភាសាខ្មែរឬអនេះបាន?

Dialect Perceptions

52. Do all Kachok people speak Kachok the same way or do some villages have different accents?
តើជនជតិកចក់ទំងអស់និយយភាសាខ្មែរដូចគនឬមនភូមិេផƞងនិយយសំេលងខុសគន?

53. Do you understand everything or just some things?
តើអនកចំណាត់ថ្នាក់ជំនួយអនកបានដឹងអ្វីទំងអស់ែដលេគនិយយឬតមួយចំនួន?

54. Where is Kachok spoken the best?
តើេនភូមិេគនិយយភាសាខ្មែរបនល្អជងេគ?

55. Are there any villages that do not speak Kachok very well, not clearly, not fluently? What villages?
តើមនភូមិេផƞងនិយយភាសាខ្មែរមិនល្អមិនចបស់និងមិនពីេANTLRម្ដីបានទេ? ភូមិអ្វី?

56. Which Kachok village is most important? Why is it important?
តើភូមិកចក់មួយែដលសំខន់ជងេគ? ហតុអ្វីភូមិនេះេសំខន់អ្វី?
### APPENDIX 4  Kachok Village Leader Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Number</th>
<th>មលខ សំនួរ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>សទង់មតិ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Location</td>
<td>កែន្លងសំភសនឹ៍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer Name</td>
<td>េឈមអនកសំភសនឹ៍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>ៃថងេខ ឆនំ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Elicitation</td>
<td>ភេ្របើសំǍប់សួរ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Response</td>
<td>ភǒាសំANTLRបើេឆ្លើយ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter Name (if needed)</td>
<td>េឈម អនកបកែ្រប</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>េយបល់</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Background Information

10. What is your name?
   េតើអនកេឈម ះអ្វី

11. (Gender).
   (ំេឈន)  

12. How old are you?
   េតើអនកេយុប៉ុនម ន

13. Are you married?
   េតើអនកេរៀបករេហើយឬេន

14. How many children do you have?
   េតើអនកមនកូនប៉ុនម ននក់

15. Where were you born?
   េតើអនកេកើតេនភូមិǁ
16. Where did you grow up?
តើអនកបនធំេឡើងេនឯǁ?

17. Where do you live now? (have them write in Khmer too)
តើអនករស់េនឯǁពលេនះ?

18. How many years have you lived here/there?
តើអនករស់េនទីេនះ/ទីេនះប៉ុនម នឆន ំេហើយ?

19. What grade have you completed?
តើអនកេរៀន្រតឹមថន ក់ទីប៉ុនម ន?

20. What is your work?
តើអនកធ្វីករអ្វី?

21. What language did you speak first as a child?
តើភǖនិយយដំបូងែដលអនកេចះនិយយដំបូងេគ?

22. What other languages do you speak?
តើអនកេចះនិយយភǖនិយយអ្វីេផƞងេទៀតែដលឬេត?

23. Which language do you speak best?
បនល្អជងេគ តើភǖនិយយបានេពនេយ្យជន ឬរបស់អនកនិយយ
មួយរបស់អនក?
2nd best? ភាសាជំនាន់ទី២
3rd best, etc.? ភាសាជំនាន់ទី៣

24. What is your father’s ethnicity?
តើឪពុករបស់អនកជនជតិអ្វី?

25. What is your father’s first language?
តើភាសាតីកនាដែលអនកេចះនិយយដំបូងេគអនកអេពេក?

26. What is your mother’s ethnicity?
27. What is your mother’s first language?
តើម្តយរបស់អនកជនជតិអ្វី?

28. What is the official name of this village? (Village, Commune, District, Province) (have them write in Khmer too)
តើភូមិេនះជផ្លូវករេឈម ះអ្វី (ឃុំអ្វី និងេខត្តេឈម ះអ្វី?

29. What do the people who live here call this village? What does that name mean?
តើ្របជជនែដលរស់េនភូមិេនះថយ៉ងេម៉ច េតើេឈម ះភូមិេនះមនន័យដូចេម្តច?

30. What do the outsiders call this village?
តើអនកភូមិេផƞងេទៀតេȄភូមិេនះថយ៉ងេម៉ច?

a. Who calls it that?
តើសប័តុណាម៉ាសុំឈឺរបប៉ុងណាម៉ាសុំឈឺ?

b. What does that name mean?
តើនៅក្នុងប្រទីសប្រយោជន៍ប្រយោជន៍ប្រយោជន៍?

c. Do people in this village like that name?
តើប្រទីសប្រយោជន៍ប្រយោជន៍ប្រយោជន៍ប្រយោជន៍ប្រយោជន៍ប្រយោជន៍ប្រយោជន៍ប្រយោជន៍ប្រយោជន៍ប្រយោជន៍?

31. What is the total number of people in this village (adults and children)? What people group? How many total individuals and families from each people group?

32. Have Kachok people lived in this village long?

33. Where did they come from before they lived here?
   a. When did they move here?
   b. Why did they move here?

34. In this village, which language is spoken most?

35. What language do the children in your village learn to speak first?

36. Can all of the people in your village speak Kachok?

37. What other languages can people in your village speak?

38. What kinds of people can speak each of those languages? (men/women, young/old, intermarriage, etc.)

39. What kind of work do people in this village do?
40. Is there a school in this village?
ដើម្បីការសាមញ្ញៃឈឺជីវិត

i. If so, to what level?
បើចាប់ត្រូវ គឺចែងរបស់បំណុល?

ii. If not, where do children from this village go to school?
បើគ្នាចាប់ត្រូវ កើតមន់របស់រឿងដែលការការ់ដែល?

41. Do you think it would be good for Kachok people to be able to read and write their own language?
តើអនកគិតថល្អេទេបើជនជតិកចក់េចះៈនិងសរេសរភ្នាក់ការី?
APPENDIX 5  Kachok Christian Leader Questionnaire

1. Questionnaire Number េលខ សំនួរ
2. Survey សទង់មតិ
3. Interview Location កែន្លងសំភសន៌
4. Interviewer Name េឈម សំភសន៌
5. Date ខេី ខេ ឆន៍
6. Language of Elicitation ភេ្របើសំǍប់សួរ
7. Language of Response ភǒប់េឆ្លើយ
8. Interpreter Name (if needed) េឈម បកែ្រប
9. Comments មបានប

Background Information

10. What is your name? កើតេនភូមិǁ អនកេឈម ះអ្វី?
11. (Gender)  (ភទ)
12. How old are you? កើតេនភូមិǁ អនកេយុប៉ុនម ន
13. Are you married? អនកេរៀបករេហើយឬេន
14. How many children do you have? អនកមនកូនប៉ុនម ននក់
15. Where were you born? អនកេកើតេនភូមិǁ
16. Where did you grow up?
ដោយសូមអោយបង្កើតជាសូមបានហើយជួយយើង។

17. Where do you live now? (have them write in Khmer too)
ដោយសូមអោយបង្កើតជាសូមបានហើយជួយយើង។

18. How many years have you lived here/there?
ដោយសូមអោយបង្កើតជាសូមបានហើយជួយយើង។

19. What grade have you completed?
ដោយសូមអោយបង្កើតជាសូមបានហើយជួយយើង។

20. What is your work? Where? (village name)
ដោយសូមអោយបង្កើតជាសូមបានហើយជួយយើង។

21. What language did you speak first as a child?
ដោយសូមអោយបង្កើតជាសូមបានហើយជួយយើង។

22. What other languages do you speak?
ដោយសូមអោយបង្កើតជាសូមបានហើយជួយយើង។

23. Which language do you speak best?
ដោយសូមអោយបង្កើតជាសូមបានហើយជួយយើង។

24. What is your father’s ethnicity?
ដោយសូមអោយបង្កើតជាសូមបានហើយជួយយើង។

25. What is your father’s first language?
ដោយសូមអោយបង្កើតជាសូមបានហើយជួយយើង។
26. What is your mother’s ethnicity?
ទិ្របស់អនកជនជតិអ្វី?

27. What is your mother’s first language?
ទិ្របស់ម្ត យអនកជភǒកំេនើតរបស់ម្ត យរបស់អនកជនជតិអ្វី?

28. In (village______) which language is spoken most?
ដូចជា (ភូមិ______) េ្រចើនគំនិយយភǒអ្វី?

29. What language do the children in (village______) learn to speak first?
ដូចជា (ភូមិ______) និយយភǒអ្វីមុនេគ េ្រចើននិយយបន?

30. Can all of the people in (village______) speak Kachok?
ដូចជា (ភូមិ______) េគនិយយភǒកចក់បនែដរឬេទ?

31. What other languages can people in (village______) speak?
ដូចជា (ភូមិ______) េពកក់េទៀតែដល្របជជនទំងអស់កនុងនិយយបន?

32. What kinds of people can speak each of those languages? (men, women, old young, etc.)
ដូចជា (មនុសƞែបបǁែដលនិយយភǒទំងេនះ ែបបុស្រសីចស់េកមងចស់)

33. How many Christians are there in (village______)?
ដូចជា (ភូមិ______) មន្រគីេសកិរពះេយស៊ូវែដថ្មីមនរឬេទ?

34. What percentage? (More than half or less than half of total population)
ដូចជា (ភូមិ______) ប៉ុនម នភគរយ(មន្រគីសពក់កǁ្ត លរឺតិចជងពក់កǁ្ត លៃន្របជជនទំងអស់)؟

35. Are there Kachok Christians in other Kachok villages?
ដូចជា (ភូមិរបស់ជនជតិកចក់េផƞងេទៀត េយស៊ូវែដពះេយស៊ូវែដថ្មីមននក់េនកនុងភូមិរបស់ជនជតិកចក់េផƞងេទៀត)?
i. Which villages?
តើភូមិខ្លះ?

ii. How many?
ប៉ុន្មានក់?

iii. Is there a church/house church in (village ______)?
តើេន(ភូមិ______)មន្រកុមជំនុំ/្រពះវិǓរ្រគីǒទ នឬេទ?

iv. If not, where do you meet/go to church?
(បើមន) តើអនកជួបជុំគន េនកែន្លងparity?

36. Do any Kachok people from other Kachok villages go to church in (village ______)?
(បើមន) ភូមិេផƞងៗេទៀតេទ្រពះវិǓរេន(ភូមិ__)ទៀតេទ្រពះវិ្រ្រគីǖរ្រគី។
(បើមន) ភូមិខ្លះ?

37. Do any non-Kachok people go to church in (village _____)?
(បើមន) ភូមិ_____, តើមនជនជតិមកពីកចក់ទៀតេទ្រពះវិ្រ្រគី។
(បើមន) ជនជតិអ្វី?

38. In (village ____), do you have fellowships together with other churches?
(បើករជួបជុំគន ជមួយ្រពះវិ្រ្រគីេណា?)

39. Which churches? (what ethnicity, which village)
(ព្រះវិ្រ្រគីេណា) ភូមិមួយ (ជនជតិអ្វី ភូមិមួយ)?

40. What language do you use together?
តើអនកេ្របើភ្ារ និងគន
41. In (village _____), what language is used most often for… 
ដែល(ភូមិ_______),តែភាសាគឺដែលបានប្រើប្រាស់ឈ្មោះ…

i. preaching  
អធិបបយ្រពះបនទូល

ii. fellowship  
ជួបជុំគន

iii. singing  
សរេសើរ្រពះ%s

iv. reading the liturgy  
ការកមមវិធីថ្វ យបងគំ%

v. reading scriptures  
ការប្រើប្រាស់ភាសា

vi. giving announcements  
ប្រការប្រការ

vii. corporate prayer  
អធិព័ត៌មាន

viii. private prayer  
អធិព័ត៌មានខ្លី

42. What is the language of the Bible used in the church/house church?  
អ្វីដែលប្រើប្រាស់ទើបព្រល់ពានប្រការ/កុមជំនុំ?
43. Can you yourself understand the language of this Bible?
ដើម្បីទាន់អាចយល់ពីភាសាខ្មែរនេះឡើយ?

(if no) Why not? Is this because of the language or God’s Word is hard to understand?
បើមិនយល់ តើហតុអ្វី? ពីភាសាខ្មែរនេះៈ ឬបនទូល្រះពិបកយល់បាន យោងរាក់សេចក្តីបាន?

44. Do the people in your church/house church understand the language of the Bible?
អ្នកក្នុងវិថីក្មេង/នេះមានសុំសរសេរភាសាខ្មែរនេះពីរេលមើសវាច្រៀងទេ?

(if no) Why not? Is this because of the language or God’s Word is hard to understand?
បើមិនយល់ តើហតុអ្វី? ពីភាសាខ្មែរនេះៈ ឬបនទូល្រះពិបកយល់បាន យោងរាក់សេចក្តីបាន?

45. How many people in (village____) know how to read and write Jarai script?
នេះវិញខ្លះមានមនុស្សក្នុងភូមិ____ ដែលមានសុំសរសេរអក្សរជាថានយើងវាច្រៀងបាន?

Who are the people that can read and write? (old/young, men/women, Christian/non-Christian)
ពួកេគជមនុស្សបានសុំសរសេរ? (ស្តើរ/ស្តាយ ម្នាក់/មនុស្ស អន្តេច/មិនអន្តេច)

46. How many people in (village____) know how to read and write Khmer script?
នេះវិញខ្លះមានមនុស្សក្នុងភូមិ____ ដែលមានសុំសរសេរអក្សរខ្មែរវាច្រៀងបាន?

Who are the people that can read and write? (old/young, men/women, Christian/non-Christian)
ពួកេគជមនុស្សបានសុំសរសេរ? (ស្តើរ/ស្តាយ ម្នាក់/មនុស្ស អន្តេច/មិនអន្តេច)
48. Would it be good to be able to read and write the Kachok language?
ទំនិញតែងទេដើម្បីឈើសរេសរមនិងអួរភាសាខ្មែរការងាយដើម្បី?

49. Do you think it would be good to have the Bible in the Kachok language?
តើអនកគិតថាសម័យឈើព្រះគមពីរជភាសាខ្មែរការងាយដើម្បី؟

50. If there were a Kachok alphabet and books, would you yourself want to learn how to read Kachok?
បើអកាំភាសាខ្មែរការងាយដើម្បីឈើជារបស់អ្នកឬមាត់តាមោះដើម្បីឈើជារបស់អ្នក؟

51. Do you think it would be good for children to learn to read and write the Kachok language?
តើអនកគិតថាសម័យមន្រនិងសរេសរជភាសាខ្មែរការងាយដើម្បីប្រាប់ក្នុងអាយុអ្ធសិស្ស？

52. What kinds of things do you think would be good to have written in the Kachok language? (songs/hymns, history, life stories, Kachok folktales, etc.)
តើរបស់អ្វីខ្លះអ្វីព្រះគមពីរសម័យខ្មែរការងាយដើម្បីសរេសរជភាសាខ្មែរការងាយដើម្បី?

(ចំេរៀង/ទំនុកតំេកើង, ូរបវត្តិណាមួយដើម្បី, មន្រសម័យ, អំពីជីវិត, ឬរឿងអំពីជីវិត)

Why? ហតុអ្វី?
APPENDIX 6: Population of Kachok People (taken from the VC and CC during background research 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th># of individuals (children and adults)</th>
<th>Commune</th>
<th>District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Upper Kachut</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>Nhang</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>កជូត</td>
<td>ស្ថាបៈជាតិ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lower Kachut</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Nhang</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>កជូត</td>
<td>ស្ថាបៈជាតិ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nay</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Nhang</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>កជូត</td>
<td>ស្ថាបៈជាតិ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Talao</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>អិន</td>
<td>ស្ថាបៈជាតិ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Big Kanat</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>Talao</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>កាការីៗ</td>
<td>ស្ថាបៈជាតិ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Small Kanat</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Talao</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>កាការីៗ</td>
<td>ស្ថាបៈជាតិ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Kak</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>Talao</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ការាក់</td>
<td>ស្ថាបៈជាតិ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Tanong</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>Talao</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ព្រៃ</td>
<td>ស្ថាបៈជាតិ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Talao</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Talao</td>
<td>Andoung Meas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ព្រៃ</td>
<td>ស្ថាបៈជាតិ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>Kaoh Peak</td>
<td>Veun Sai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>កៃត</td>
<td>វីនែស</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7: Flowchart of the Language Survey Process Used in the Study
Adapted from the survey steps (template), Nahhas, 2005
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Objective: To ask for the permission to do the research on Kachok and Jarai language and culture.

Goal: Want to know the usage of Kachok and Jrai language and culture.

Place: Ouyadav, Andoung Meas and Veunsai District.

Duration: One week (21.11.2006 till 27.11.2006)

Researchers: There are three staff from ICC:

1. Mee-sun PAWLEY  Korean
2. Chitse MAGASPAG  Filipino
3. Julie BARR  American
4. Hub Borin  Krung

According to the above mentioned objective, please would you give permission to ICC to do the research on Kachok and Jarai language and culture.

Respectfully Yours,

Andrew Carson
Ratanakiri Project Manager
Objective: To ask for the continuation of the research on Kachok and Jarai language and culture.

Goal: Want to know the usage of Kachok and Jarai language and culture.

Place: Oyadav, Andoung Meas and Veunsai District.

Duration: Two weeks (January and February 2007)

Researchers: There are six staff from ICC:

1. Ms. Chitse MAGASPAG Filipino
2. Ms. Mee-sun PAWLEY Korean
3. Ms. Julie BARR American
4. Ms. Rachel HURLEY American
5. Ms. SUN Sophea Khmer

According to the above mentioned objective, please would you give the permission to ICC to do the research on Kachok and Charay language and culture.

Respectfully yours,

Andrew Carson
Ratanakiri Project Manager
## Schedule

Research on Kachok and Jarai languages 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24-27 Jan 2007</td>
<td>Research on Kachok in Veunsai</td>
<td>- Chitse MAGASPAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mee-sun PAWLEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Julie BARR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- SUN Sophea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Hurley, Rachel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-13 Feb 2007</td>
<td>Research on Kachok and Jarai in Andoung Meas</td>
<td>- Chitse MAGASPAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mee-sun PAWLEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Julie BARR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- SUN Sophea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-22 Fe 2007</td>
<td>Research on Kachok and Jarai in Andoung Meas and Oyadav</td>
<td>- Chitse MAGASPAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Mee-sun PAWLEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Julie BARR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- SUN Sophea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ការអនុញ្ញាតិការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ក្រុមហ៊ុនអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ក្រុមហ៊ុនអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនុញ្តឹកញាប័ណ្ណអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនុញ្ចើញអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនុញ្ជាន់អំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនុញ្ជាតិអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនុញ្តឹកញាប័ណ្ណអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ក្រុមហ៊ុនអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ក្រុមហ៊ុនអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ក្រុមហ៊ុនអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

កុម្មាន់ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបាល

ការអនិស្តិចអំពីការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍ក្នុងរដ្ឋបា�ல
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ឈុត ឈុត រឿង</th>
<th>នេស្ទារសំរាប់</th>
<th>អ្នកប្រើប្រាស់</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>២៤-តុល. ឯក. ២០០៩</td>
<td>- និយមចុងការបញ្ជាក់ក្នុងមេរីអាណា</td>
<td>- អារី</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>១-សី. ធ. ២០០៩</td>
<td>- និយមចុងការបញ្ជាក់ក្នុងមេរីអាណា</td>
<td>- អារី</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>២២-ធ. កុ. ២០០៩</td>
<td>- និយមចុងការបញ្ជាក់ក្នុងមេរីអាណា</td>
<td>- អារី</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 9: PICTURES

Picture 1: Ratanakiri Province where Kachok is located

Picture 2: The three Kachok language interpreters
Picture 3: Interview with the elderly Kachok speakers

Picture 4: Interview with the village leader
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