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ABSTRACT

Previous reports of Anung have reported the status of language use for Anung in China is severely endangered. The objective of this thesis is to evaluate the vitality of the Anung language in Myanmar. The thesis uses the Extended Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (EGIDS) presented in Lewis and Simons (2010) in order to determine the level of Anung vitality. This research reports patterns of language use, language transmission across generations, and language proficiency across age groups. The study is based on survey questionnaires, interviews with community leaders, and observation conducted in six sites in two townships: Putao Township (district center) and Khonlangphu Township (remote Homeland area). There are 105 respondents for this research. The respondents are divided into three groups: under the age of 20, between the age of 35 and 50 and above the age of 50. The results were also divided into three sub – groups or areas: (1) Khinpang village in Putao township, where many Anung live together (2) the rest of the Putao area where Anung are a minority within Lisu communities, and (3) the homeland area, where Anung people are the majority.

The result of this research indicates that the overall EGIDS score is 6b: Threatened. Anung is not used as much as Lisu inside and outside the home in most locations. However, it is used more frequently in Khinpang than in other areas. Language transmission across generations is disrupted; however, there are still families transmitting Anung to their children. For language proficiency, there are some proficient speakers among younger generations. Nonetheless, the younger they are, the weaker their language proficiency is. Whereas the older they are, the higher their language proficiency is.
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บทคัดย่อ:
รายงานก่อนหน้านี้ได้แสดงสถานะของการใช้ภาษาอะนุงในประเทศจีนว่าอยู่ในระดับภาวะใกล้สูญ วัตถุประสงค์ของวิทยานิพนธ์เล่มนี้คือ เพื่อประเมินผลพลังชีวิตของภาษาอะนุงในประเทศเมียนมาร์ วัตถุประสงค์ของวิทยานิพนธ์เล่มนี้คือ เพื่อเครื่องมือที่ชื่อว่า Extended Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (EGIDS) ซึ่งนำเสนอโดยลูอิสและซิมอนส์ (2010) เพื่อตัดสินระดับพลังชีวิตของภาษาอะนุง งานวิจัยนี้นำเสนอเกี่ยวกับแนวการใช้ภาษา การลำดับภาษาข้ามรุ่นอายุ และสมิทธิภาพทางภาษาข้ามรุ่นอายุ การศึกษานี้ใช้แบบสอบถาม การสัมภาษณ์ผู้ให้ข้อมูล และการสำรวจข้อมูลเก็บข้อมูลมี 6 จุด ตั้งอยู่ในเมือง 2 เมือง ได้แก่ เมืองปูตาโอ (ศูนย์กลางของเขต) และเมืองคันดิงพู (เขตชนบท) งานวิจัยมีผู้ตอบแบบสอบถาม 105 คน แบ่งออกเป็น 3 กลุ่ม ได้แก่ กลุ่มอายุน้อยกว่า 20 ปี กลุ่มอายุระหว่าง 35 ถึง 50 ปี และกลุ่มอายุมากกว่า 50 ปี ผลการวิจัยที่ทำให้แบ่งปัจจัยที่มีผลต่อการตอบแบบสอบถาม ได้ 3 บริเวณ มีแก่ 1) หมู่บ้านคันปัง ในเมืองปูตาโอ มีชาวอะนุงอาศัยอยู่ร่วมกันเป็นจำนวนมาก 2) บริเวณที่อื่น ๆ ในเมืองปูตาโอ มีชาวอะนุงเป็นชนกลุ่มน้อยที่อาศัยอยู่ในชนสูงสิ้น และ 3) เขตถิ่นเกิด มีชาวอะนุงเป็นชนกลุ่มน้อย
ผลการวิจัยสิ้นเปลืองมาโดยแผน EGIS อยู่ที่ระดับ 6b: ถูกคุกคาม ผลการวิจัยสิ้นเปลืองมาโดยแผน EGIS อยู่ที่ระดับ 6b: ถูกคุกคาม กล่าวคือ ในบริเวณที่เป็นจุดเก็บข้อมูลส่วนใหญ่ ภาษาอะนุงไม่ได้ถูกใช้มากเท่ากับภาษาสิ้นทั้งในและนอกบ้านอย่างไรก็ตาม ในเขตเมืองคันปังมีการใช้ภาษาอะนุงมากกว่าบริเวณอื่น ๆ ถึงแม้ว่าจะมีการลำดับภาษาข้ามรุ่นอายุสูง สูงกว่าในบริเวณ ภาษาข้ามรุ่นอายุสูงสุดที่เก็บข้อมูลภาษาอะนุงไปยังรูปสูง ไปยังรูปสูงสุดที่เก็บข้อมูลภาษาอะนุงไปยังรูปสูงสุด ไปยังรูปสูงสุดที่เก็บข้อมูลภาษาอะนุงไปยังรูปสูงสุด
ก็ตาม ยิ่งผู้พูดมีอายุน้อย สมิทธิภาพทางภาษาก็จะยิ่งลดลง และในทางตรงกันข้าม ยิ่งผู้พูดมีอายุมากก็จะยิ่งมีสมิทธิภาพทางภาษาสูงขึ้น
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# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Anung refers to the language that Anung People speak in Myanmar.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Burmese refers to the national or official language in Myanmar, which is used at school, and in mass media in wider communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGIDS</td>
<td>Expanded Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIDS</td>
<td>Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>Interagency Roundtable scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Lisu refers to the language that Lisu people speak in Putao district and is used as wider communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWC</td>
<td>Language of Wider Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Rawang refers to the language that Rawang people speak in Putao district and is used as wider communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ</td>
<td>Research Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Skipped (Respondents who cannot answer question because they do not meet specifications – e.g. they have no children.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLQ</td>
<td>Sociolinguistic Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GLOSSARY

Attrition
Attrition is the loss of a first language by an individual.

Language maintenance
The ability of an individual speaker or speech community to preserve the use of a language or traditional form of a language. (Crystal 1980:214)

Language shift
A community gives up a language completely in favor of another one. The members of the community, when the shift has taken place, have collectively chosen to use a new language where an old one used to be used. (Fasold 1984:213)

Language domains
A context “in which one language variety is more likely to be appropriate than another. Domains are taken to be constellation of factors such as location, topic, and participants.” (Fasold 1984:183)

Language attitudes
A people’s feelings and preferences towards their own language and other speech varieties around them, and what value they place on those languages. (Fasold 1984:148)

Language proficiency
The ability to function competently in one’s native or in a second language, including a sense for appropriate linguistic behavior in a variety of situations. (Bussmann 1996:384)
Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 Rationale
Scholars report that the Anung language is dead or dying (Sun 2009, Sun 2003, Thurgood 2003, Thurgood and Li 2007). Sun Hongkai’s titles sum it up: “Language death under intense contact” (2009) and “The existence and disappearance of Anong” (2003). Sun observes that Lisu has replaced Anung. The status of language use for Anung in China is severely endangered. He mentions that the Anung people use Lisu as a dominant language among themselves. They speak Lisu better than Anung (Sun 2009). The status of Anung language use seems to be very endangered in China.

As a member of the Anung community in Myanmar, the researcher was aware that the Anung community in Myanmar is very concerned about language maintenance. Particularly, the older generation is concerned about language use among younger generation of Anung. Since, as in China, the Anung have been living among the Lisu for many years, the Anung use Lisu as the dominant language among them. It is found that some Anung have shifted to Lisu. In the last thirty years, there have been efforts to strengthen and maintain the Anung language in Myanmar (for instance, having literacy classes during school vacation). Although the Anung literature committee has been trying to maintain Anung for many years, the degree to which the Anung people use their language remains unclear. For this reason, the researcher became interested in questions such as, “Is the Anung language dying in Myanmar or not?” and “Is the Anung language use in Myanmar strong or not?” Such questions provided a stimulus to the researcher to study the vitality of Anung in Myanmar. It is very crucial for the Anung people to know about the current level of their language maintenance. Since the researcher is an Anung, he wanted to do research on the current situation of the Anung language. Sun Hongkai as well as Thurgood and Li researched the Anung language in China and gave a clear picture of its status in that country. No one, however, has surveyed the level of Anung vitality in Myanmar. Therefore, the researcher has chosen this topic for scholarly and personal
reasons. In summary, the following three reasons provide the rationale for this study.

1. Scholars suggest that the Anung have shifted to Lisu in China.
2. The vitality of Anung in Myanmar has not yet been documented.
3. Anung community members, especially the older generation, are concerned about language shift from Anung to Lisu.

1.2 General background

In the following sub-sections, the researcher will discuss the geographical location of Anung speakers in Myanmar. He will also describe the Anung people and population as well as the classification of the Anung language.

1.2.1 Geography

The two main geographical locations of the Anung (Anong) people today are in Myanmar and China. In the northernmost part of Kachin state, Myanmar, the Anung live mainly in Putao Township. Some live in the mountainous subtropical jungles in Putao district: Machangbaw Township, Nawngmun Township, Khonglangphu Township and Myitkyina. Some Anung may also be found living in Tachilek, lower Myanmar, and Thailand. Stephen Morse mentions that the Anung homeland area is in the Achang Valley of Khonglangphu Township in Myanmar, and alongside the Salween valley in China (Morse 1989:241). In China, the Anung live in Fugong County in the Nujiang\(^1\) Lisu Prefecture in Yunnan Province. In the west, there is a border with the Union of Myanmar and in the north, the Tibet autonomous region (Sun 2009:2). Figure 1 Map of Anung in Myanmar and China shows the areas where Anung people live in Myanmar and China.

---

\(^1\) The Nujiang is the Chinese name for the Salween river valley.
1.2.2 People and population

The Myanmar government groups the Anung with the Lisu, even though the Anung language is very different from Lisu. In contrast, Sun reports that in China, Anung is listed as one of four branches under the Nu nationality – the other three being Nusu, Zauzou and Trung. The autonym of Anong is \( [a^{31} \text{ nu}^{35}] \) (Sun 2009:1). LaPolla mentions that Rawang, Dulong\(^2\) and Anong\(^3\) are closely related languages spoken in both China and Myanmar. The Anung\(^4\) language, as it is spoken by Anung living along the lower Nu River valley in China, is closely related to the Kwinpang\(^5\) dialect of Rawang spoken in Myanmar (LaPolla 2003).

The Anung people call themselves Anung or Khopang. Lisu call them Naw pha or Fuch’ey. Rawang call them Kwinpang or Kwinsang. The Ethnologue reports the

---

\(^2\) Dulong is Chinese transcription of Trung.
\(^3\) Anong is used by some scholars.
\(^4\) Anung is used by the researcher in this thesis.
\(^5\) Kwinpang is an alternative name for Anung.
following alternative names for the Anong: “Nung, Annung, Anong, Anoong, Anu, Nu, Lu, Lutzu, Lutze, Kiutze, Khanung, Kwinpang, Khupang, Kwingsang, and Fuch’ye. In addition, Nung (Anong) is different from Nung (Tai family) of Vietnam, Laos, and China and from Chinese Nung (Cantonese) of Vietnam” (Gordon, 2005). In recent times, it has been difficult to obtain accurate population figures for the Anung in Myanmar. In fact, since the Anung are grouped with the Lisu, there has not been a separate census on the Anung in Myanmar. Consequently, the total number of Anung in Myanmar is not known. However, according to Bradley (2007: 393), one estimation of the Anung population in Myanmar would be over 10,000. In 1994, there were 7,200 for the Anung people (400 were speakers of the language) living in China (Sun 2003). Thurgood mentions that approximately 6,500 Anung live mainly on the tablelands on both sides of the Nujiang River in China (Thurgood 2003:1). These tablelands are located in Fugong County in the Nujiang Lisu Autonomous Prefecture of Yunnan Province.

1.2.3 Language family

In regard to linguistic classification, Anung is a Tibeto-Burman belonging to the Nungish language family. Shafer (1955) introduced the term ‘Nungish’, which was used to classify a sub-group of Burmic languages in the Sino-Tibetan language families. Several scholars have classified Anung as a division within Rawang. Robert and Betty Morse, for example, claimed that “approximately five main branches of Rawang may be distinguished, by general names which tend to differentiate the variations of culture and social structure: Ganøng, Nung⁶, Tangsar, Rawang, and Longmi” (Morse and Morse 1966:200). Morse and Morse based their classification on historical background and oral tradition. On the basis of his own data, Stephen Morse later supported Robert and Betty Morse’s (1966) five branches of Rawang division. He used a method of lexical statistics and classified Rawang into five different groups: Ganøng, Anung, Tangsar, Mvtwang, and Longmi (Morse 1989:244). See Figure 2 Rawang classification as below.

---

⁶ The term “Nung” is an exonym for Anung.
In contrast, Bradley used Nungish to refer to a super group of the language family. He broke Nungish into two sub-divisions: Rwang and Gvnøng. Anung co-occurs with Nusu under Gvnøng group but not under Rawang group. He observes that Anung is related to Rawang but it is not a part of Rawang. This means that Anung is a type of Nungish family (Bradley 1997). See Figure 3 A classification of Nungish.

LaPolla states that there are many clans or families under Nung7. There is no a generic name for them. As a result, it is difficult to assign a generic name to these clans, because the names of clans appear to be based on the names of valleys or localities. For example, the Trung are named after the Trung Valley and the Rwang are named after Rwwe wang or ‘middle river,’ which is also called the Mekong River. The Anung are named after Anung remai or ‘Anung River,’ which is also called the Salween River. La Polla has stated that Anung is related to Rawang and Dulong, but that Anung is not a sub-division or part of Rawang. Therefore, he does not classify

---

7 Nung refers to many different tribes of similar culture in the north of Kachin state. The term “Nung” is used by British administration. Here Nung does not refer to Anung.
them as other scholars have, but prefers to use the name “Dulong-Rawang-Anong” (LaPolla 2003). See Figure 4 A cautious classification.
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Figure 4 A cautious classification

1.3 Objectives of the thesis research
The objective of this study is to answer the question: What is the level of language vitality for the Anung (Anong) people in Myanmar?

1.4 Research questions
Prior to data collection, the survey questionnaires were designed to answer a number of research questions that indicate the level of language vitality. These initial research questions are given below. They are organized around the issues of domains of use, language proficiency and language attitude.

1. Domains of use
   i. In which domains do Anung people use Anung?
   ii. In which domains do Anung people use other languages, for example, Lisu, Rawang, and Burmese?

2. Language proficiency
   i. Language repertoire
      a. How does proficiency in Anung compare to proficiency in other languages of the area?
   ii. Generation: Compare language proficiency among generations, particularly children.
      a. How do proficiency levels differ across age groups?
iii. Locations: proficiency in urban versus rural locations.
   a. How do proficiency levels differ between urban and rural areas?

3. Language attitudes
   i. General question: How do Anung speakers feel about the languages they speak?
   ii. Specific questions
      a. What attitudes do Anung people have about where Anung (Anong) should be used?
      b. What attitudes do Anung people have about the future of the language?
      c. What attitudes do Anung people have about vitality?
      d. To what degree do Anung people connect language proficiency to identity? (i.e., how well do you have to speak Anung to really be considered an Anung person?)

After the data for this research had been collected, a new framework for assessing language vitality was produced by Lewis and Simon (2010). Even though the above questions were developed earlier, they address many of the same issues. Furthermore, Lewis and Simons’ *Expanded Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scales (EGIDS)* organize the questions in a way that allows for a measurable vitality score. Lewis and Simons developed five key questions.

Key Question #1: “What is the current identity function of the language?”
Key Question #2: “What is the level of official use?”
Key Question #3: “Are all parents transmitting the language to their children?”
Key Question #4: “What is literacy status of the language?”
Key Question #5: “What is the youngest generation of proficient speakers?”

Following the EGIDS framework (see Figure 5 Extended GIDS Diagnostic Discussion Tree slightly modified from EGIDS (Lewis 2010), only Key Question #1, 3 and 5 are relevant in the case of Anung. Key Question #1 asks whether the Anung people still use the Anung language in the home domain for daily communication. Chapter 4 examines which languages Anung people use in the home and in other domains of everyday communication. Key Question #3 considers whether Anung parents are transmitting the language to their children. Chapter 5 discusses this issue of intergenerational transmission as well as language attitudes about Anung. Key
Question #5 seeks to identify the youngest generation of proficient speakers. Therefore, Chapter 6 compares Anung people’s level of proficiency in four languages (Anung, Lisu, Rawang and Burmese) across generations. The analysis did not compare proficiency in urban versus rural locations.

1.5 Hypotheses

Sun states that “the Anong language in China is a seriously endangered language, soon to become extinct” (Sun 2009:16). Thurgood also states that “Anong is dying; the majority of ethnic Anong no longer speak Anong, most having shifted to Lisu” (Thurgood 2006:51). Sun observes that Anung is completely supplanted by Lisu in China. According to these reports from China, there seems to be no hope for the Anung language. The researcher questioned, however, whether the Anung language in Myanmar is as endangered as Anung in China. The hypothesis of this study was that the language use of Anung in Myanmar would be stronger than that of Anung in China. Furthermore, the researcher hypothesized that because some Anung have shifted to using Lisu, language use would be stronger among the older generation of Anung than among the younger generation.

1.6 Contributions or benefits of the research

There are no studies which document the level of Anung vitality in Myanmar. As a result, the Anung do not know yet about the situation of their language use in their community. The older Anung people, in particular, are very concerned about language maintenance within the community in Myanmar. This study evaluates the strength of Anung language use in Myanmar. In addition, this study contributes information about the situation of Anung language vitality and maintenance. This research can inform other researchers in their studies of language vitality. Furthermore, the result of this study will present the status of language vitality or maintenance to the Anung people and Anung literature committee. Consequently, the Anung community will have the information that they need to determine how they are going to maintain their language. This will encourage the Anung community to realize that they have to make special efforts toward language revitalization for their people in Myanmar.
Chapter 2
Literature Review

2.1 Introduction
Anung belongs to the Tibeto-Burman family of languages. Robert and Betty Morse (1966) suggest that Anung is a division of Rawang. Stephen Morse (1989) also follows Robert and Betty Morse's classification, arguing that Anung is one of the branches of Rawang. Furthermore, he proposes a classification developed by using the Swadesh 100-word list. Bradley (1977) argues that Anung is not a division or part of Rawang. He proposes that Anung is related to Rawang and Anung is a type of Nungish. LaPolla (2003) states that the names “Anung”, “Dulong”, and “Rawang” appear to be based on the name of valleys or localities. As a result, there is no a generic name for them. La Polla concludes that Rawang and Anung are related, but that Anung is not part of Rawang. Rather than Nungish, he prefers to use the term “Dulong-Rawang-Anung” to show their general relationships to one another.

There are two parts involved in the literature review of this chapter. The first part of this chapter examines the findings of scholars who have observed Anung language use, vitality, and maintenance among the Anung in China. The second part of this chapter focuses on the different aspects of measuring language vitality and maintenance, which can inform this study of the Anung people in Myanmar.

2.2 Sun Hongkai’s research among the Anung in China
Sun Hongkai has done most of the research about Anung. He began making preliminary observations on Anung in 1960. Several scholarly works explain what has been observed about Anung: for example, “A Grammar of Anung: Language Death Under Intense Contact” (Sun and Liu 2009), “40 Years of Investigation and Witness on Anung” (Sun 2003). Thurgood and Li also wrote about Sun Hongkai’s findings: “Hainan Cham, Anong and Phan Rang Cham: Three Languages, three social contexts, three patterns of change” (Thurgood 2006), and “Contact and Attrition in Sun Hongkai’s Anong: Complimentary Sources of Change” (Thurgood and Li 2007).
2.2.1 Surveys of Anung in China

Over the course of 40 years, Sun Hungkai went to the Anung region of China six times and surveyed Anung language use. During his survey, he tested Anung by using different kinds of methods. Investigating among young and middle-aged Anung, he collected basic vocabulary words and some grammar examples. Furthermore, he surveyed language use among different age groups. He tried to find out their attitudes toward Anung, and he observed and analyzed the structure of the language. Sun observed that the Anung had basically retained their mother tongue, however, Lisu is used more in their daily lives. Most of the Anung people can speak both Anung and Lisu. A few people are multilingual in Anung, Lisu and Chinese. Some are bilingual or multilingual, but others are not. Almost all the Anung people speak Lisu, and the majority of Anung speak Lisu better than Anung. He points out, “Anung has basically ceased functioning as the main communication tool of the Anung people and has been totally replaced by the Lisu language” (Sun 2003). Furthermore, he observed that changes of vocabulary, phonetics, and grammar have occurred in Anung. A brief description of survey on Anung in China is given below.

The first survey was conducted from September to October 1960. He found a primary school teacher who spoke Anung fluently. Working with this teacher, Sun collected over 2000 words and some sentences. Sun estimated there were 800 Anung speakers at that time. The second fieldwork trip was in April 1965. He collected some examples for certain grammatical structures of Anung. Sun’s third trip took place in April and May of 1983. He collected some additional grammar examples. Based on his investigation, the number of Anung speakers at the time of this trip was estimated to be around 500. During the fourth fieldwork trip, which took place in September of 1987, Sun surveyed language attitudes among young and middle-aged Anung toward their language. He noted grammar and family trees and recorded some long stories. From October through November of 1995, Sun made a fifth trip in which he surveyed several villages. He conducted a survey in Mugujia village. At that time, he found only 410 people could still speak Anung. Sun’s sixth observation trip took place between January and February of 1999. He observed language use in villages, language use among different aged-groups, and language attitudes toward Anung. In addition, he did observation on grammar and language structure. Sun expanded his list of Anung vocabulary from fewer than 3000 to nearly 5000 words.

Sun concluded that since his first survey trip, the Anung had shifted dramatically from their native language to Lisu. In 1960, there were about 4,300 Anung and
approximately 800 (18.6%) of them used Anung as their mother tongue. The 1994 census puts the total Anung population at 7,200. 400 (5.56%) of them used Anung as their mother tongue. Over a period of 30 years, the number of Anung people using the Anung language as their mother tongue decreased by 50%, even though the population almost doubled. In 1995, he found only 62 fluent speakers, all elderly, at Mugujia village in China. He could not find many fluent speakers in any other villages in Fugong County.

2.2.2 Causes of language death

Sun points out, “in terms of diachronic changes, there should not be a lot of change in such a short time, but large scale historical changes may bring such changes about”(Sun 2009:16). He observes that gradual cultural assimilation with surrounding ethnic groups, intermarriage, language attitudes, and language restructuring are the reasons for language attrition. Furthermore, Thurgood argues that the causes of language attrition are primarily because of intense contact with Lisu and secondarily with Chinese. Speaker’s attrition and language restructuring can be singled out as the causes of language death for the Anung.

2.2.2.1 Speaker’s attrition (shift to Lisu)

1) Gradual cultural assimilation to surrounding ethnic groups

Sun mentions that the Anung people migrated to Nujiang from the Qinghai – Tibetan Plateau over 70 generations ago. Other ethnic groups such as Lisu and Bai migrated regularly to the Anung area and then the Anung people had a long period of contact with these groups. Therefore, Anung gave up using of their language and culture in favor of assimilation with these groups.

2) Intermarriage

The Anung people live with the other ethnic groups, especially with the Lisu ethnic group. As a result, they commonly intermarry with Lisu. The Anung people also intermarr with Chinese and Bai. Sun mentions that even though one of the members of an Anung family might marry with someone from another ethnic group, his or her spouse would hardly learn Anung. Sometimes, parents tried to use in Anung at home but their children would still use other languages. Therefore, among these families the Anung children learn other languages first.
3) Language attitude

Sun mentions that three kinds of attitudes can be found in China. First, some leaders and older Anung people have a high view of their language. They said that language is an important part of identity for their ethnic group. If language is lost, many cultural phenomena, historical oral tradition, and the main characteristic of their ethnic group would be lost.

Second, some educated and ordinary people have a low view of their language. Their priority of understanding language is Chinese since this is the national language. “Chinese is most useful, as it can be used all over China”; “Once we have learned to speak and write Chinese, we can become cadres and gain more knowledge of important national issues” ; and “what is said on the radio or television” (Sun 2009:15). They are not really concerned with the extinction of their own language. If language becomes extinct, everyone will speak the same language and there will be no more need for translators. Some Anung people feel that using Chinese and Lisu is more convenient than Anung. This group strongly rejects having any plan for language development.

Third, most leaders, educated and Anung people have indifferent feelings to the disappearance of their mother tongue. They think that it is better to follow a language that they can speak. Since some have shifted to Lisu, it became more convenient with them.

2.2.2.2 Language restructuring (assimilation to Lisu)

Thurgood and Li mention that the majority of Anung have shifted to Lisu, some have shifted to Chinese and a few people have shifted to Bai. Some loanwords from Lisu and Chinese have been used but there is no evidence of using loanwords from Bai. Thurgood and Li report, “the replacement of a great deal of native vocabulary by Lisu and Chinese loanwords, and the fact that even among the most fluent Anung speakers, most Anung speak Lisu better than Anung” (Thurgood and Li 2007:1). There have also been changes in the Anung structures: lexicon, phonology and grammar changes.
Lexical change
Sun reports that finding changes in the Anung lexicon. He mentions that the Anung use loanwords from Lisu and Chinese. The Anung people frequently use Lisu words instead of Anung. In 1960, he collected a basic vocabulary of 2,600 words; of these 130 words, about 5% were loanwords from the Chinese language and 208 words, around 8% were loanwords from the Lisu language. He collected some more new words in 1999 and added to 2,600 words that were collected in 1960 so he had about 4,900 words. This time 391 Chinese loanwords, 8% of the total and 832 Lisu loanwords, 17% of the total were found. 3% increased in Chinese loanwords and 9% increased in Lisu loanwords when compared with the wordlists in 1960 (Sun 2009:124). Sun says, “It is not surprising that there is a higher percentage loans from Lisu than from any other language since the Anong are surrounded by Lisu. They interact with the Lisu on a daily basis whenever they go to the store or when they go to school, and so on” (2009:125).

Phonological change
The adoption of loanwords by the Anung has influenced Anung phonology. Consider complex vowels and nasalized vowels as an example; Anung did not used to have vowel plus glide diphthongs, glide plus vowel diphthongs, and triphthongs however, these sounds are now found in Anung because of borrowing from Chinese. Other nasalized vowels and diphthongs that have been found were never previously found among native Anung words. In his observations of Anung, Sun also discovered the loss of consonant clusters and retroflex consonants, the appearance of laryngealized vowels, the development of the 33 tone, and allophonic variation (Sun 2009:127-132).

Grammatical change
Many changes have also been observed in Anung grammar. Level B semi-fluent speakers do not use the plural marker. Instead, the expression for indicating quantity (e.g. ‘many’) is used. Level A fluent speakers widely used possessive markers with pronouns but level B semi-fluent speakers do not use these possessive markers.

There have also been changes in the numeral system. For example, among Level A can count up to a thousand. Among Level B semi- fluent speakers, some of them can count up to a hundred in Anung, but beyond this, they count only in Lisu. Some of them can count the lower numbers (e.g. 1-10) in Anung whereas they can say all the
numbers in Lisu. In relation to ordinal numbers, the Anung people borrowed the Chinese system because of its simplicity.

Verbs in Anung agree with subject in terms of person and number. Fluent Anung speakers still use agreement marking between person and number. But less fluent speakers will neglect to use the marking system. Level A fluent speakers use a causative prefix with the verb root where as Level B semi-fluent speakers rarely use the causative marker. Level A fluent Anung speakers have many grammatical particles for marking grammatical functions such as possession, causation, instrumentality, location, comparison and definiteness. However, Sun found a lack of particle use among Level B semi-fluent speakers (Sun 2009: 135-141).

Overall, since Sun's period of observation, Anung had been assimilating to Lisu in many ways, and the language of the younger generation is less robust than the language of older generation.

2.3 Theoretical models of measuring the language vitality
In order to measure the vitality of Anung in Myanmar, it is important to select an appropriate model. Direct measurement of language vitality is difficult. Over the past twenty years, linguists have developed a variety of theoretical models for measuring language endangerment, each providing evaluative categories that can help to measure language vitality. There are four different theoretical models for measuring the language vitality. First, Fishman’s GIDS (1991) describes 8 levels for language vitality. Second, the UNESCO Ad Hoc Experts Group on Endangered Languages has laid out several factors relating to language vitality and endangerment (Brenzigner et al 2003). Third, in the Ethnologue, Lewis has set forth several categories for assessing language vitality and endangerment (Lewis 2009). The models are not in conflict and have varying degrees of detail. Finally, the expanded Fishman’s GIDS describes 13 levels of language vitality. Out of these four theoretical frameworks, EGIDS was chosen to be applied to this research as a tool for measuring the level of language vitality in Anung.

2.3.1 Fishman’s Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale
Fishman proposed his Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale as a tool that can measure levels of language vitality. The GIDS uses 8 levels to grade the vitality of given language. Fishman introduced the GIDS as an evaluative framework for
language endangerment nearly two decades ago. The GIDS is perhaps the best-known model for assessing language vitality.

The Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale is described in Chapter 4 of *Reversing Language Shift* (1991:81-120). The GIDS describes levels of language disruption and evaluates language transmission from one generation to another. Any language that falls within the eight levels can be revived. Lewis and Simons mention that GIDS seems to be a general scale. The GIDS does not describe a level that indicates language development or shift, nor does it describe a level that indicates language extinction. It does not address languages that no longer have any living speakers nor talk about beyond the number of 8 at the end of the weak level. The GIDS does not mention languages that are international in scope and are stronger than Level 1. In order to effectively measure language vitality for any language, the GIDS needs to incorporate additional distinctive factors into its framework.

The descriptions of Fishman’s GIDS are shown below in Table 1 Summary of Fishman’s GIDS. The table begins by describing the least endangered stage (Level 1) and ends with the most endangered stage (Level 8). For the original description of GIDS, see Fishman (1991:81-120).
Table 1 Summary of Fishman’s GIDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GIDS</th>
<th>Adapted from Fishman (1991)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The language is used in education, work, mass media, and government at the nationwide level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The language is used for local and regional mass media and governmental services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The language is used for local and regional work by both insiders and outsiders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Literacy in the language is transmitted through education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The language is used orally by all generations and is effectively used in written form throughout the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The language is used orally by all generations and is being learned by children as their first language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The child-bearing generation knows the language well enough to use it with their elders but is not transmitting it to their children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The only remaining speakers of the language are members of the grandparent generation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2 UNESCO language endangerment framework

A UNESCO panel of experts in 2003 (Brenzinger et al 2003) proposed a framework for assessing language vitality status. UNESCO proposes a set of 9 factors that can be analyzed to determine vitality. The most crucial of these factors is intergenerational transmission. UNESCO provides six levels of language vitality. The UNESCO framework explains about more categories at the weaker end of the scale. However, it does not describe the different levels above level 6 on the GIDS scale. All the categories above level 6 are put together and labeled “safe”. UNESCO does not address literacy in its framework. So while on the one hand, the GIDS supplies more detail for the level of languages with strong vitality, UNESCO provides more detail for languages that are either extinct or demonstrate weak vitality. The categories for UNESCO framework is shown below in Table 2 UNESCO framework (UNESCO 2009).
Table 2 UNESCO framework (UNESCO 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of endangerment</th>
<th>Intergenerational Language Transmission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safe</td>
<td>The language is spoken by all generations; intergenerational transmission is uninterrupted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Most children speak the language, but it may be restricted to certain domains (e.g., home).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely endangered</td>
<td>Children no longer learn the language as mother tongue in the home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely endangered</td>
<td>The language is spoken by grandparents and older generations; while the parent generation may understand it, they do not speak it to children or among themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically endangered</td>
<td>The youngest speakers are grandparents and older, and they speak the language partially and infrequently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td>There are no speakers left.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3 Ethnologue language vitality categories

Ethnologue (Lewis 2009) categorizes five levels for the vitality or endangerment of a language. The five levels proposed by Ethnologue focus on the number of first language speakers, as opposed to other factors. The number of speakers corresponding to each level, however, is unclear. Like UNESCO, it does not describe the different levels above level 6 on GIDS. Ethnologue puts all categories above level 6 under the name of “living” and introduces a category called “dormant.” The categories for Ethnologue framework are shown in Table 3 Ethnologue Vitality Categories (Lewis 2009).
Table 3 Ethonologue Vitality Categories (Lewis 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living</td>
<td>Significant population of first-language speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Language Only</td>
<td>Used as second-language only. No first-language users, but may include emerging users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearly Extinct</td>
<td>fewer than 50 speakers or a very small decreasing fraction of an ethnic population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormant</td>
<td>No known remaining speakers, but a population links its ethnic identity to the language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td>No remaining speakers and no population links its ethnic identity to the language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.4 An Expanded GIDS

Lewis and Simons (2010) proposed a clear framework for the assessment of language vitality. The expanded GIDS retains the categories corresponding with Fishman’s GIDS. However, the EGIDS expands Fishman’s original framework to include five additional levels. It can now be used as a theoretical framework for assessing the language vitality of any language in the world. Lewis and Simons divided level 6 on Fishman’s GIDS to create two sub-levels (6a and 6b) on the EGIDS. Similarly, 8a and 8b correspond to level 8 on the Fishman’s GIDS. The level 0, 9, and 10 are new descriptive categories. Lewis and Simon combined elements from all three of the scales GIDS, UNESCO and Ethnologue to create a new scale. Lewis and Simon proposed not only 13 levels of language vitality but also provided the five key questions to outline an approach to measuring language vitality. The researcher feels that EGIDS has more detail and is a better tool for measuring language vitality. Therefore, the researcher prefers to apply EGIDS scale as a standard tool to assess the vitality of Anung language. See Table 4 The levels of Expanded GIDS (Lewis and Simons 2010).
Table 4 The levels of Expanded GIDS (Lewis and Simons 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>LABEL</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNESCO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>The language is used internationally for a broad range of functions.</td>
<td>Safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>The language is used in education work, mass media and government at the nationwide level.</td>
<td>Safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>The language is used for local and regional mass media and governmental services.</td>
<td>Safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>The language is used for local and regional work by both insiders and outsiders.</td>
<td>Safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>Literacy in the language is being transmitted through a system of public education.</td>
<td>Safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>The language is used orally by all generations and is effectively used in written form in parts of the community.</td>
<td>Safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>Vigorous</td>
<td>The language is used orally by all generations and is being learned by children as their first language.</td>
<td>Safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>The language is used orally by all generations but only some of the child-bearing generation are transmitting it to their children.</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Shifting</td>
<td>The child-bearing generation knows the language well enough to use it among themselves but none are transmitting it to their children.</td>
<td>Definitely Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>Moribund</td>
<td>The only remaining active speakers of the language are members of the grandparent generation.</td>
<td>Severely Endangered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The current level of a language can be evaluated by asking a few questions. An overview of a diagram tree (Lewis and Simons 2010) shows how to ask the questions step-by-step for any language. EGIDS uses five key questions to measure language vitality. In EGIDS, more detail is given in describing each level; these details are very helpful in identifying language vitality. Key question number one is used in evaluating the two levels at the bottom of the scale – heritage and historical. The answer to key question number two may be used to see if a language fits within one of four other levels: international, national, regional and trade, which are at the top of the scale. For the key question number three, there are two possible answers: “Yes” or “No”. If the answer is “Yes”, then respondents should proceed to answer question number four. If the answer is “No”, respondents should answer question number five. See Figure 5 Extended GIDS Diagnostic Discussion Tree slightly modified from EGIDS (Lewis 2010). A brief explanation of each key question is mentioned as below.
Figure 5: Extended GIDS Diagnostic Discussion Tree slightly modified from EGIDS (Lewis 2010)
2.3.4.1 Key Question #1: What is the current identity function of the language?
There are four possible answers to question #1: Historical, Heritage, Home, and Vehicular. For the two levels at the bottom of the scale, Historical and Heritage, answering question #1 is sufficient and there is no need to answer the remaining questions.

- Historical – EGIDS Level 10 (Extinct) - There are no remaining language functions and speakers. No group uses the language.
- Heritage – EGIDS Level 9 (Dormant) - There are no remaining L1 speakers but some L2 speakers emerge. The language may be used for a sign, shape or object, which is used to represent something else or it may be used for ceremonial purpose only.
- Home – In the home domain, at least some speak the language in daily communication. At this point, either language shift or language development in progress becomes a crucial factor in order to determine the level of EGIDS. See Key Question #3.
- Vehicular – The language is used to communicate among those speaking different first languages. For the most part, the language shares as a common identity function and culture, and so it is widely used by almost all. When this response is chosen, Key Question #2 must be answered in order to determine the level of EGIDS.

2.3.4.2 Key Question #2: What is the level of official use?
If a language falls under vehicular identity function, Key Question #2 helps to differentiate between the possible EGIDS levels. There are four possible answers, which relate to EGIDS levels 0 through 3 given below.

- International – EGIDS Level 0 (International) – The language is used internationally as a language of business, education or for other purposes.
- National – EGIDS Level 1 (National) - The language is officially used for government, business, education, and other communicative functions at nation-state level.
- Regional – EGIDS Level 2 (Regional) - The language is officially used for government, business, education and other communicative functions at sub-national or regional levels.
• Not Official – EGIDS Level 3 (Trade) - The language is not used for official purposes, but is widely used for business (trade), social and other communicative functions.

2.3.4.3 Key Question #3: Are all parents transmitting the language to their children?
When the answer is Home to key question #1, then key question #3 must be asked. There are two possible answers: “Yes or No”.
• Yes – The language transmission between generations is widespread and strong. If the answer is “Yes,” then Key question #4 must be answered in order to determine if the language is at EGIDS Level 4, 5, or 6a.
• No – The language transmission between generations is disrupted. If the answer is “No,” then Key question #5 must be answered in order to determine if the language is at EGIDS Level 6b, 7, 8a or 8b.

2.3.4.4 Key Question #4: What is the literacy status?
If “Yes” is the answer to Key Question#3, then the language needs to be evaluated in regard to its literacy status within the community in which it is used. There are three possible answers: Institutional, Incipient, and None.
• Institutional – EGIDS Level 4 (Institutional) – Community members are well-trained through an educational system established by an organization or institution. Literacy is acquired through community-based institutions such as churches or cultural organizations, which serve in kind of government institutions.
• Incipient – Incipient – EGIDS Level 5 (Written) - Literacy has been introduced to a community but most community members have not yet acquired literacy through literacy teachers or institutions.
• None – EGIDS Level 6a (Vigorous) – Community members are literate in only second language. They are not yet literate in their first language. Those who are literate people can read and write only in a second language.

2.3.4.5 Key Question #5: What is the youngest generation of proficient speakers?
When the response to the Key Question #3 (language transmission across generations) is “No,” it is necessary to know how far a language has shifted in order
to determine the level of EGIDS. What is a proficient speaker? Lewis mentions that a proficient speaker is “a person who uses the language for full social interaction in a variety of settings”. There are four possible answers to the Key Question #5.

- **Great grandparent** – The youngest proficient speakers of the language are people of the great grandparent’s generation. Language shift happened long ago. This corresponds to Level 8b of EGIDS (Nearly Extinct).
- **Grandparent** – The youngest proficient speakers of the language are of the grandparent’s generation. Language shift is advanced. This corresponds to the Level 8a of EGIDS (Moribund).
- **Parent** – The youngest proficient speakers of the language are adults of child-bearing age. Language shift is in progress. This corresponds to the Level 7 of EGIDS (Shifting).
- **Children** – The youngest proficient speakers of the language are children. Language shift is just beginning. This corresponds to the Level 6b of EGIDS (Threatened).

Using the five Key Questions and the diagnostic decision tree, we may determine where a language sits within the EGIDS scale, and thereby gain insight into its vitality. Furthermore, the five Key Questions identify several important factors that relate to language maintenance, revitalization and language development. These factors are identity, vehicularity, the status of language transmission across generations and the status of literacy.
Chapter 3
Methodology

3.1 Introduction
In this study, the researcher discusses the application of four kinds of sociolinguistic tools.

1) Individual Questionnaire for ordinary village people
2) Knowledgeable Insider Questionnaire for village leaders
3) Personal observations, which include home visits, participation in social activities, and travel-events
4) Video recordings of church services and children at play

The informants’ responses and observations brought out a wealth of data that helped the researcher reach his conclusion in this study. The researcher surveyed six sites in two townships: Putao Township (district center) and Khonglangphu Township (remote Homeland area). Both males and females participated. There were three age categories: under 20, 30 to 50 and over 50.

3.2 Research questionnaire form
In this study, two types of questionnaires were used for eliciting information from respondents: Individual Questionnaires and Knowledgeable Insider Questionnaires. The researcher adapted the questionnaires from the Research Instrument Design Tool (Survey Department, Payap Linguistics Institute) and checked the questionnaires used by the other surveyors, and adapted the most suitable questions to this research. Furthermore, informal observations supplement the Research Questionnaires.

For Individual Sociolinguistic Questionnaires, there are three sections: (i) Domains of use (ii) Language proficiency and (iii) Language attitude. The respondent’s biography is also included. The Sociolinguistic Questionnaire was the main tool applied in this research. All the questions from the (SLQ) can be found in Appendix A and B. The researcher designed measurable questions for each section. The questionnaires were written in both English and Lisu. Most of the respondents used
Lisu as the language of elicitation and response. Most of the time, Lisu was used as a tool of communication for this survey, since it was an LWC between the participant and the researcher. The final SLQ included 82 questions for individuals and 45 questions for knowledgeable insiders.

3.3 Administration of the sociolinguistic questionnaire

The researcher administered the individual sociolinguistic questionnaire to 105 respondents. Every respondent was interviewed at home. The respondents were chosen in order to achieve comparable sample sizes of age and gender. See Table 5. Subject demographics. In total, 105 villagers and 6 village leaders participated in this research. The researcher administered the questionnaires to different age groups. In his plan, the researcher anticipated 18 respondents per site. Thus, for 6 sites, there should have been 108 respondents. In reality, a total of 105 villagers and 6 village leaders participated. One male above the age of 50 at Mulashidi village, one female above the age of 50 at Namthumkhu village and one male between the ages of 35 and 50 at Namdin village were not interviewed for this research. Furthermore, it was difficult to find participants older than 20 and younger than 35, because people in this age group were often away, attending Bible school or college, hunting, or working in gold mines.

Table 5 Subject demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>&lt;20</th>
<th>35-50</th>
<th>&gt;50</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study focuses on areas where the researcher expected to find high Anung vitality. Anung seems to demonstrate high vitality in the Putao and Khonglangphu Townships, particularly in comparison to other places such as Machangbaw, Nawngmun, Myitkyina and lower Myanmar where there seems to be low vitality. The majority of Anung people live in Putao and Khonglangphu Townships. Five villages called Khinpang, Mulashidi, Phamazup, Namdin, and Namthumkhu in Putao and one cluster of two villages (Sirampha and Siwangthong in Khonglangphu) have a higher concentration of the Anung people than other villages or places in Myanmar. In fact, the rest are spread out in various places or villages in the country.
Thus, the researcher chose the villages given below because he believed their vitality would be the highest among the Anung communities in Myanmar.

![Figure 6 Map of Anung in Putao and Khonglangphu Townships](image)

This survey includes five sites in Putao Township.

1) **Khinpang village** is approximately 50% Anung and 50% Lisu. The Anung and Lisu live close together in Khinpang, which is close to downtown Putao Township. In the data analysis, this village was treated as a separate sub-group because it has a significantly higher proportion of Anung residents.

2) **Mulashidi village** is about 20% Anung and 80% Lisu. In this village, which is 7 miles south of Putao along the way to Myitkyina, the Anung households are interspersed with Lisu households.
3) **Phamazup village** is about 20% Anung and 80% Lisu and Anung households are interspersed with Lisu households. Phamazup village is just off the road to Myitkyina, 15 miles south of Putao.

4) **Namdin village** is about 20% Anung and 80% Lisu. Lisu and Anung households are interspersed throughout the village, which is located approximately 10 miles east of Putao.

5) **Namthumkhu village** is approximately 20% Anung and 80% Lisu with Anung households interspersed with Lisu households. It is located 14 miles west of Putao.

In his plan, the researcher anticipated 18 respondents per site. Thus, for 6 sites, there should have been 108 respondents. In reality, a total of 105 villagers and 6 village leaders participated. See Figure 7 Map of Anung in Putao Township.

---

As for the Homeland area, Khonglangphu Township includes only 3 Anung villages. Rimanche is not included for this research because no informants were available. The other two villages in Khonglangphu: (1) Sirampha and (2) Siwangthong are treated as one site. These villages are 18 miles northeast of Khonglangphu town. Since these two villages were small and very close to each other, the researcher combined the responses from them in order to get 18 respondents. Moreover, it is
only a five-minute walk between the two villages and there is a lot of social contact between them. Therefore, it seemed appropriate to the researcher to treat them as one site. Almost all the people living in these two villages are Anung and there are 9 households in each village. There are Anung people living in some other villages in the Khonglangphu Township, but no more than two or three families are Anung in those villages. See Figure 8 Map of Anung in Khonglangphu Township.

3.4 Observations
Observation is a very helpful tool that enables the researcher to obtain more information. By doing observation, the researcher may guess which language will be used in different social settings. This technique does not involve asking respondents directly about themselves.

Observation does not involve asking respondents directly about their attitudes and actions, but it does give the researcher insight into language use patterns at home and outside of the home. The researcher had a chance to observe Anung language use in five ways:
1) Observing their work.
2) Eating with Anung families.
3) Visiting Anung houses.
4) Attending churches.
5) Observing children play.

These are the types of activities that the Anung do regularly.

3.5 Methods of analysis
The researcher read the questions in Lisu and wrote down participants responses in English on answer sheets. After the survey was finished, all the data was typed in Microsoft Excel ©8. Numbers or percentages were calculated by applying a formula in Excel. All the answers of the respondents were written down for each question.

3.6 Methodology evaluation
First, the researcher contacted the Anung literature committee, told them what he was going to do and explained his purpose. After gaining their consent, he went to each village and met the community leaders or village heads. Before administering each instrument, he explained the purpose of his research and asked for verbal consent.

For the Knowledgeable Insider Questionnaire, the researcher selected someone who knew about the background of the village. This was usually one of the older men of the village. For the Individual Sociolinguistic Questionnaire, he selected participants based on their age and gender, with an effort to identify participants from different families. The researcher did not force respondents to give answers quickly. He interviewed respondents when they were free and gave them enough time to answer the questions. Since the researcher used only SLQ questions, this study is based on self-reported information. The researcher believes, however, that the respondents answered the questions to the best of their ability. The self-assessment questionnaire answers usually inform us what people think to be true, or what they want to be true, but it is not considered an objective measure of language vitality. However since the observations of the researcher concurred with the survey results, the data has more validity.

8 Microsoft Excel 2007
3.7 Data analysis

The researcher used EGIDS as a theoretical framework for measuring Anung language vitality. Lewis and Simon developed the Expanded Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale. There are 13 levels: (0) International (1) National (2) Regional (3) Trade (4) Educational (4) Educational (5) Written (6a) Vigorous (6b) Threatened (7) Shifting (8a) Moribund (8b) Nearly Extinct (9) Dormant (10) Extinct. The following are the five key questions included in the EGIDS framework for determining language vitality:

1. What is the current identity function of the language?
2. What is the level of official use?
3. Are all parents transmitting the language to their children?
4. What is the literacy status?
5. What is the youngest generation of proficient speakers?

The answer of these key questions will show the status of language use among the Anung. For this research, the researcher mainly used three key questions: #1, #3, and #5. For Key question #1, the researcher tried to identify what language is used by the Anung inside and outside the home. For key question #3, the researcher tried to answer whether all parents are transmitting the Anung language to their children or not. For key question #5, the researcher tried to identify the youngest generation of the Anung proficient speakers. The data was analyzed by applying EGIDS framework to assess the level of language vitality.

In this study, the researcher followed the flowchart provided by Lewis and Simons’ “Diagnostic Discussion Tree”. See Figure 5 Extended GIDS Diagnostic Discussion Tree slightly modified from EGIDS (Lewis 2010) in section 2.7.1. The answers to the EGIDS questions organize the following chapters. In Chapter 4, the researcher discusses about the domains of use and answers Question #1. Since the answer is “home identity function”, the next question is Key Question #3, which asks, “Are all parents transmitting the language to their children?” This question is answered in Chapter 5 under “Intergenerational Transmission”. Then since there is a break in intergenerational transmission, the next question is Key Question #5, which asks, “What is the youngest generation of proficient speakers?” This question is answered in Chapter 6.
Chapter 4
Language use

4.1 Introduction
This chapter discusses the language use patterns of the Anung people in Myanmar. This section answers the EGIDS Question #1: “What is the current identity function of the language?” To be able to answer this key Question #1, the data is mainly analyzed in terms of language use inside and outside the home. The data shows that age, gender and education do not seem to be very significant factors for this section since most of the informants shifted to Lisu. However, location turns out to be a very crucial factor that shows how the Anung people use language in the different areas both inside and outside the home. Based on their relative concentrations, there are three groups of Anung people in this study: Khinpang, Putao and Homeland.

In the Khinpang village, the population is about 50% Anung and 50% Lisu. However, other ethnic groups such as a few Jingphaw, Rawang, and Kamthi Shan also live in the surrounding villages. The key factor is that Anung houses are clustered together. The number of the Anung population in Khingpang is higher than the number of the Anung population in the homeland area and the number of the Anung population for each of four villages in the Puato Township. It is close to downtown.

In the Putao area, the villages, Mulashidi, Phamazup, Namdin and Namthumkhu have a small number of Anung. The majority of those living in this area are Lisu. It is about 20% Anung and 80% Lisu in the four villages. Anung households are interspersed with Lisu households. Thus, these four villages are grouped as one area because most of the people from each village are Lisu and these four villages are similar in situation and population.

In the Homeland area: there are three villages: Sirampha, Siwangthong, and Rimanche, and they are close to each other, in fact, it takes only 5 minutes to walk between them. These three villages are situated along the main road to reach China border. There are no other ethnic groups within that area, except for a few Lisu and
Tangsar. There are no other villages close to this area. Rimanche is not included in this research because respondents were not available from Rimanche. Sirampha and Siwangthong villages are combined as one area. The main factor for this area is that almost all are Anung but the number of the Anung population is small. Consequently, based on the different community types, the results are separated into three areas: (1) Khinpang (2) Putao, and (3) the Homeland area.

The researcher used a sociolinguistic questionnaire to ask the informants what languages they chose to speak in different social situations, such as in the home and outside the home. The data was separated by research site, and analyzed to find out whether there are significant differences between locations. The data was organized to clarify the language use patterns for the Anung people as given below in Table 6

A summary of language use data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Sub-domains</th>
<th>Interlocutors</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inside the home</td>
<td>With family members</td>
<td>Parents, Grandparents</td>
<td>20&lt;, 35-50, &gt;50</td>
<td>Male and Female</td>
<td>Khinpang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Siblings, Spouses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homeland area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Putao area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anung friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With friends</td>
<td>Non-Anung friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the home</td>
<td>with family members and friends</td>
<td>Parents, Grandparents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Khinpang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Siblings, Spouses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Homeland area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Putao area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official contexts</td>
<td>Classmates, Teachers</td>
<td>20&lt;, 35-50, &gt;50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male and Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church contexts</td>
<td>Funeral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Announcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal contexts</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Language use inside the home

Under this section, there are two sub-domains: 1) talking to family members and 2) non-Anung friends inside the home. Fasold defines a domain as “a context in which one language variety is more likely to be appropriate than another. Domains are taken to be a constellation of factors such as location, topic and participants” (Fasold, 1984:183). There are eight different interlocutors: parents, grandparents, siblings, spouses, children, grandchildren, Anung friends and non-Anung friends. Anung friends are grouped as family members because Anung friends must be Anung and of the same community. Language use inside the home is the main factor for language maintenance. According to David Crystal, “Language maintenance is the ability of an individual speaker or speech community to preserve the use of a language or the traditional form of a language” (David, 1980:214). Therefore, language choice inside the home is one indicator of the current language vitality of the Anung in Myanmar. The more they use their language inside the home, the better their language maintenance will be in the future.

4.2.1 Language use by place

This section presents the data of three areas (Khingpang, Putao and Homeland), each of which has different concentrations of Anung people, and shows what language is used among them. The researcher expected that these areas would be the best to survey the current use of Anung in Myanmar. In fact, the majority of the Anung people live in these areas and the number of Anung people is higher than any other places in Myanmar. In this section, language use data is divided by location in order to show what languages the Anung are choosing in their communities. Here are examples of the kinds of questions the researcher asked.
31. In your house, what language do you usually speak…
   a. …with your parents?
   b. …with your grandparents?
   c. …with your siblings?
   d. (if married)… with your husband/wife
   e. (if have children)…with your children?
   f. (if old and have children) …with your grandchildren?
   g. …with Anung friends in your house?
   h. …with non-Anung friends in your house?

In the following tables, A represents Anung. A/L indicates respondents that mentioned both Anung and Lisu. L represents Lisu. A/L/R means Anung, Lisu, and Rawang. The column labeled S specifies the number of respondents who skipped the question. The language use for these three areas is shown below in Table 7 A summary of language use by location.

---

9 Lisu belongs to Yi-Burmic (Loloish) branch of the Sino-Tibetan family.
Table 7 A summary of language use by location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A/L/R %</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khinpang area (18 subjects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anung friends</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Putao area (69 subjects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anung friends</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>326</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeland area (18 subjects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anung friends</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.1.1 Language use with family members in Khinpang

According to the data, 8 (57%) out of 14 informants reported using Anung with parents. 5 (71%) out of 7 informants reported using Anung with grandparents. 11 (61%) out of 18 informants reported the use of Anung with siblings, and 6 (50%) out of 12 informants reported using Anung with spouses. 6 (55%) out of 11 informants said that the use of Anung with children, 5 (83%) out of 6 informants with grandchildren, and 7 (39%) out of 18 informants with Anung friends.

Four (29%) out of 14 informants reported the use of Anung/Lisu with parents, 3 (17%) out of 18 informants with siblings, 3 (25%) out of 12 informants with spouses, 4 (36%) out of 11 informants with children, 8 (45%) out of 18 informants with Anung friends. No informant responded the use of Anung/Lisu with grandparents and grandchildren.

Two (14%) out of 14 informants responded the use of Lisu with parents. Two (29%) out of 7 informants reported the use of Lisu with grandparents. Four (22%) out of 18 informants reported the use of Lisu with siblings, 2 (17%) out of 12 informants with spouses, 1 (9%) out of 11 informants with children, 1 (17%) out of 6 informants with grandchildren and 3 (17%) out of 18 informants with Anung friends. Only one informant reported using of Anung in combination with Lisu and Rawang.

The use of Anung is above 50% with family members. The use of Anung/Lisu is below 45% with family members. The use of Lisu is below 29% with family members. This shows that in Khinpang in conversations with family members at home, the use of Anung is higher than that of Anung/Lisu, and Lisu. See Table 8 Inside the home: Language use with family member in Khinpang.
Table 8 Inside the home: Language use with family member in Khinpang

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A/L/R</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anung friends</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Total**               | **86**| **48**| **56%**| **22**| **26%**| **15**| **17%**| **1**| **1%**

The results of language use in Khingpang show that the use of Anung is higher than the use of Lisu. However, Lisu is still used in the home domain. It seems that some retain the use of Anung with family members in this village. The data shows that the use of Anung is higher than the use of Anung in combination with Lisu or the use of Lisu. According to the data, an average of 56% of the respondents use Anung, 17% use Lisu, 26% use Anung and Lisu and 1% use Anung, Lisu, and Rawang. See Figure 9 Inside the home: Language use with family members in Khinpang.

When he interviewed the informants during his survey, the researcher observed that most of them could use Anung and even some younger generation answered the questions using Anung. It seems that most of the Anung people in Khinpang speak Anung with family members in the home domain.
4.2.1.2 Language use with family members in the Putao area

This section discusses language use in four villages: Phamazup, Namdin, Namthumkhu, and Mulashidi as one area. The four villages are similar in situation and population of Lisu and Anung of their community. 7 (11%) out of 55 informants reported that they spoke Anung. No informant reported using Anung with grandchildren. 9 (13%) out of 67 informants responded the use of Anung with siblings. 6 (14%) out of 44 informants reported using Anung with spouses, 6 (14%) out of 44 informants with children, and 14 (20%) out of 69 informants with Anung friends.

According to the data, 48 (87%) out of 55 informants reported that they spoke Lisu with parents. 30 (100%) out of 30 informants reported the use of Lisu with grandparents, 57 (91%) out of 67 informants with siblings, 37 (84%) out of 44 informants with spouses, 38 (86%) out of 44 informants with children, 15 (88%) out of 17 informants with grandchildren, and 55 (80%) out of 69 informants with Anung friends at home. One (2%) out of 55 informants reported using Anung in combination with Lisu. Only one informant reported using Anung with siblings, and spouses. See Table 9 Inside the home: Language use with family members in the Putao area.
Table 9 Inside the home: Language use with family members in the Putao area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anung friends</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>326</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>280</strong></td>
<td><strong>87%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data clearly shows that the use of Lisu is above 80% for speaking with grandparents, siblings, spouses, children, grandchildren, and Anung friends. The use of Anung is under 20% with Anung friends and family members. It seems that in the home domain, the use of Lisu is higher than that of Anung. In regard to language use in the home, the Anung in this area seem to strongly prefer Lisu. It is clear that most of the Anung in these four villages in the Putao area do not retain their language. Rather, they seem to be more accustomed to using Lisu at home.

Personal observations confirm these results. Lisu can be heard from house to house. The Anung people in these villages do not live close to each other. They are spread out among the Lisu households and most of the time they have contact with Lisu who live around their houses. As result, Lisu is used more than Anung in the home domains in the Putao area. The researcher hardly heard anyone using Anung in these areas during his survey. Most of the time, he heard Lisu being used with family members. This shows that the Anung people living in these villages have shifted to Lisu. The following figure highlights the mean across all interlocutors: the average of the use of Anung is 13% whereas the use of Lisu is 87%, and the use of Anung in combination with Lisu is only 1%. Lisu is used as a dominant language in the Putao area. See Figure 10 Inside the home: Language use with family members in the Putao area.
4.2.1.3 Language use with family members in the Homeland area

This section discusses the use of language with family members at Sirampha and Siwangthong in the Homeland area. Eight (53%) out of 15 informants reported using Anung with parents and no informant reported using Anung with grandparents. Eight (47%) out of 17 informants reported using Anung with siblings, 5 (45%) out of 11 informants with spouses, 3 (28%) out of 11 informants with children. No informant reported using Anung with grandchildren, and 8 (44%) out of 18 informants reported speaking Anung with Anung friends. The use of Anung is 53% when speaking to parents but when talking to children, the response is 28%. One (7%) out of 15 informants reported using Anung/Lisu with parents. Two (50%) out of 4 informants reported using Anung/Lisu with grandparents, 1(6%) out of 8 informants reported using Anung/Lisu with siblings. No informant reported using Anung/Lisu with spouses, 2 (18%) out of 11 informants reported using both Anung/Lisu with children, 1(50%) out of 2 informants with grandchildren and 3 (17%) out of 18 informants with Anung friends.

The use of Anung in combination with Lisu is 50% with grandparents, and grandchildren whereas below 18% with parents, siblings, spouses, children and Anung friends. Six (40%) out of 15 informants reported using Lisu with parents. Two (50%) out of 4 informants reported using Lisu with grandparents and 8 (47%) out of
17 informants reported using Lisu with siblings. Six (55%) out of 11 informants reported using Lisu with spouses. Six (55%) out of 11 informants reported using Lisu with children, 1 (50%) out of 2 informants with grandchildren and 7 (39%) out of 18 informants with Anung friends. Generally, the use of Anung is below 53%, the use of Anung/Lisu is below 50%, and the use of Lisu is below 55%.

According to the data, it seems that the Anung in the Homeland area have retained the use of their language inside the home with family members. The data also indicates, however, that the use of Lisu is slightly higher than the use of Anung with family members in the home domain. See Table 10 Inside the home: Language use with family members in the Homeland area

Table 10 Inside the home: Language use with family members in the Homeland area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouses</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anung friends</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher visited Siwangthong and Sirampha during his survey. He noticed that some family members from every house visited spoke to him in Anung. Some younger people and women spoke in Lisu but some young people could still speak in Anung. One day, one family from the Homeland area invited the researcher to have dinner. He spoke in Lisu to the family members and then a young girl in the family responded to him in Anung. Then they continued to speak in Anung without switching to Lisu until finishing the conversation with the family members. This incident reflects that some younger people in the Homeland area speak in Anung. The researcher noticed that the use of Lisu is slightly higher than the use of Anung. It is clearly seen that the average of the use of Anung is 41%, the use of Anung/Lisu is 13% and the use of Lisu is 46% with family members in the home domains. Some use Anung with family members at home however, half of the Anung use Lisu with
family members in the home domains. See Figure 11 Inside the home: Language use with family members in the Homeland area.

![Figure 11 Inside the home: Language use with family members in the Homeland area](image)

**4.2.2 Language use with non-Anung friends by place**

The researcher expected that the Anung people would use Anung in combination with Lisu when talking to non-Anung friends inside the home in all places. No informant, however, reported the use of Anung/Lisu with non-Anung friends inside the home. Data describing language use with non-Anung friends inside the home for the three different areas is described below.

**4.2.2.1 Language use with non-Anung friends in Khinpang**

Every informant reported the use of Lisu, and Lisu in combination with Burmese, Rawang, or Kachin. Five (28%) out of 18 informants reported that they spoke Lisu to non-Anung friends. Four (22%) out of 18 informants responded the use of Lisu/Burmese. 2 (11%) out of 18 reported using of Lisu/Rawang. Only one informant reported the use of Lisu/Rawang/Kachin. Four (22%) out of 18 informants reported that they used Lisu/Rawang/Burmese and 2 (11%) out of 18 informants reported the use of Lisu/Rawang/Burmese/Kachin. The data clearly shows that every informant used Lisu with non-Anung friends at home. Since people of different ethnic backgrounds (e.g. Burmese, Rawang, and Jingphaw) live around this area, the Anung in this area often have language contact with non-Anung
people. As a consequence, these Anung often use languages like Burmese, Rawang, Kahcin or Lisu when a non-Anung friend visits their house. As a result, the use of Lisu is higher than the use of other languages with non-Anung friends. No informant reported the use of Anung with non-Anung friends inside the home. In addition, the use of Burmese, Rawang, or Kachin was also reported when talking to non-Anung friends at home. According to the data, Lisu is the most frequently used language when talking to non-Anung friends at home. 5 out of 18 respondents use only Lisu however, 13 respondents also use Lisu in combination with other languages such as Burmese, Rawang or Kachin. Lisu/Burmese and Lisu/Rawang/Burmese is the second most-frequently used language with non-Anung friends at home. See the data shown in Table 11 Inside the home: Language use with non-Anung friends in Khinpang area.

**Table 11 Inside the home: Language use with non-Anung friends in Khinpang area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inside the home</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>L/B</th>
<th>L/R</th>
<th>L/R/K</th>
<th>L/R/B</th>
<th>L/R/B/K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(28%)</td>
<td>(22%)</td>
<td>(11%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td>(22%)</td>
<td>(11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.2.2.2 Language use with non-Anung friends in the Putao area**

This section discusses the use of language with non-Anung friends at four villages: Phamazup, Namdin, Namthumkhru, and Mulashidi in the Putao area. According to the data, 51(86%) out of 59 informants reported the use of Lisu, 16 (27%) out of 69 informants with Lisu/Burmese, only 2 (3%) out of 59 informants with Lisu/Rawang. In their daily lives, the Anung in Putao area often meet Lisu in their village rather than other ethnic groups because they live with Lisu together at the same village. Moreover, most of the non-Anung people who visit them are Lisu. Consequently, the percentage of the use of Lisu is the highest in the Putao area. To summarize, the percentage of the use of Lisu is 86% whereas the percentage of the use of Lisu/Burmese is 27%. Only 2 (3%) informants reported that they spoke in Lisu/Rawang. This shows that Lisu is the most-used language, followed by Lisu/Burmese when talking to non-Anung friends at home.
Table 12 Inside the home: Language use with non-Anung friends by Putao area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inside the home</th>
<th>Putao area (69 subjects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2.3 Language use with non-Anung friends in the Homeland area

In the Homeland area, 17 (94%) out of 18 informants reported that they spoke only Lisu with non-Anung friends. Only one (6%) out of 18 informants reported the use of Lisu/Rawang/Burmese. Almost all informants spoke Lisu with non-Anung friends at home. Although almost all are Anung in this area, the use of Lisu is very high. Almost all informants use Lisu to communicate when someone visits an Anung house in this area because most of the friends are the Lisu people. The use of Lisu is very strong with non-Anung friends at home. The use of Lisu is 94% and the use of Lisu/Rawang/Burmese is 6% when talking to non-Anung friends inside the home. In fact, every guest who comes from surrounding villages or other places speaks Lisu as a common language in this area. See Table 13 Inside the home: Language use with non-Anung friends in Homeland area.

Table 13 Inside the home: Language use with non-Anung friends in Homeland area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inside the home</th>
<th>Homeland area (18 subjects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Anung Friends</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, in all three areas, the use of Lisu is higher with non-Anung friends inside the home.

4.3 Language use outside the home

Under this section, there are four domains: with family members and friends, in official contexts, in church contexts, and in informal contexts. These four domains represent contexts for Anung language use when talking to someone outside the home. Using their mother tongue with family members outside the home would encourage language maintenance. Using other languages in the same context, however, may inhibit language maintenance.
4.3.1 Language use with family members and friends by place

In examining language use with family members and friends outside the home, there are seven types of interlocutors included in the questionnaire: parents, grandparents, siblings, spouses, children, grandchildren, and friends. Language use is assessed in three different areas: Khinpang, Putao and Homeland area. Language use patterns of the three different areas are given below separately. The following questions were used.

32. When you are not in your house, what language do you usually speak...
   i. ...with your parents?
   j. ...with your grandparents?
   k. ...with your siblings?
   l. (if married)... with your husband/wife?
   m. (if have children)...with your children?
   n. (if old and have grandchildren) ...with your grandchildren?
   o. ...with friends?

4.3.1.1 Language use outside the home in Khinpang

According to the data, the use of Anung is above 50% with family members outside the home. In fact, talking with grandchildren in Anung is 83% whereas talking with grandchildren in Lisu is only 17%. No one, however, reported using Anung with friends. The use of Anung in combination with Lisu is below 36% with family members however, no informant reported using Anung/Lisu with grandparents and grand children. 6 (33%) out of 18 informants reported using Anung/Lisu with friends. The use of Lisu is below 36% with family members and 6 (33%) out of 18 informants reported using Lisu with friends. One informant reported using Anung/Lisu/Burmese with friends, one informant reported using Anung/Lisu/Burmese/Rawang with friends and 4 informants reported using Lisu/Burmese with friends. Only one reported using Rawang with a spouse.

The data shows that the use of Anung with family members outside the home is slightly higher than the use of Anung/Lisu or Lisu. In this area, Anung can be heard outside the home. The researcher’s observations confirm the questionnaire results. During his survey, there was a wedding at Khinpang. The researcher noticed that some family members spoke Anung with each other outside the home whereas some
family members did not speak it. It seems that some Anung of this village still speak in Anung with their family members when they are outside the home. Consequently, the use of Anung is higher than the use of Lisu with family members outside the home. Overall, the use of Anung was above 50%, the use of Anung/Lisu was below 22%, and the use of Lisu was below 29% with family members. See Table 14

Outside the home: Language use with family members in Khinpang.

Table 14 Outside the home: Language use with family members in Khinpang

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With family and friends</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A/L/B</th>
<th>A/L/B/R</th>
<th>L/B</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G parents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G children</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1.2 Language use outside the home in the Putao area

When talking to family members and friends outside the home, 6 (11%) out of 54 informants in the Putao area reported that they spoke Anung with parents, no informant with grandparents, 8 (41%) out of 67 informants with siblings, 4 (9%) out of 43 informants with children, 2 (13%) out of 16 informants with grandchildren, no informant with friends. No informant reported using Anung/Lisu with parents, and grandparents, and only one informant reported using Anung/Lisu with siblings, spouses, children, and grandchildren. 4 informants reported using Anung/Lisu with friends.

According to the data, the use of Lisu is very high in this area. The percentage of the use of Lisu with parents, grandparents, siblings, spouses, children, grandchildren and friends is above 81%. Anung use is very low when the Anung talk with family members outside the home. Except for siblings, the percentage of the use of Anung
with family members is below 15%. With friends, the use of Lisu is 88%, the use of Anung/Lisu is 6% and Lisu/Burmese is 6%. The data clearly shows that among the Anung in the Putao area, Lisu is the language of choice when talking with family members outside the home. Anung and Anung/Lisu see very little use outside of the home.

Table 15 Outside the home: Language use with family members in the Putao area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With family and friends</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Putao area (69 subjects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G parents</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G children</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.1.3 Language use outside the home in the Homeland area

When talking to family members and friends outside the home, 8 (53%) out of 15 informants reported that they spoke Anung with parents, 1 (50%) out of 2 informants with grandparents, 8 (50%) out of 16 informants with siblings, 3 (27%) out of 11 informants with children, and 1 (50%) out of 2 informants with grandchildren. No informant reported using Anung with friends. No informant reported using Anung/Lisu with parents, grandparents, and siblings. Only one informant reported using Anung/Lisu with a spouse, one with children, and 3 (17%) out of 18 informants with friends.

Seven (47%) out of 15 informants reported that they spoke Lisu with parents, 2 (50%) out of 4 informants with grandparents, 8 (50%) out of 16 informants with siblings, 6 (55%) out of 11 informants with spouses, 1(50%) out of 2 informants with grandchildren and 15 (83%) out of 18 informants with friends. Only one informant responded the use of Rawang with a spouse.
Table 16 Outside the home: Language use with family members in the Homeland area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With family and friends</th>
<th>Homeland area (18 subjects)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A/L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G parents</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G children</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data shows that the use of Lisu is slightly higher than the use of Anung when talking to family members outside the home. When talking to friends, the use of Lisu is 83% and the use of Anung/Lisu is 17%.

4.3.2 In official contexts by place

The researcher expected that the Anung people would use Burmese or Lisu in official contexts. The official language of Myanmar is Burmese, which is also the language of instruction in schools. Furthermore, some co-workers and government workers are of other ethnic groups such as Burmese, Rawang, Lisu and Jingphaw. Most co-workers and government workers are Lisu and Rawang, though a few Anung are also government workers in these three areas. The data illustrates language use in official contexts for each of the three different areas as described above. Here are examples of how the questions were asked.

#32. When you are not in your house, what language do you usually speak...

h. With classmates
i. With teachers
j. With co-workers
o. With government workers
4.3.2.1 In official contexts in Khinpang

Two (67%) out of 3 informants reported using both Lisu and Burmese with classmates. Two (33%) out of 3 informants reported using Burmese with classmates. Three (100%) out of 3 informants reported using Burmese with teachers. Four (25%) out of 16 informants reported that they spoke both Anung and Lisu with co-workers. Seven (44%) out of 16 informants reported that they spoke Lisu with co-workers and 3 (18%) out of 16 informants reported using Lisu with government workers.

Four (25%) out of 16 informants reported that they spoke Lisu/Burmese with co-workers, 13 (76%) informants with government workers. Only one informant reported using Lisu/Burmese/Rawang when talking to government workers. Those who attend to school use only Burmese with their teachers and Lisu/Burmese with their classmates. See Table 17 Outside the home: Language use in official contexts in Khinpang.

Table 17 Outside the home: Language use in official contexts in Khinpang

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Contexts</th>
<th>Khinpang area (18 Subjects)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>L/B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>L/B/R</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classmates</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data shows that a mixture of Lisu and Burmese is the most frequent language choice and the next frequent choice is Lisu in official contexts. This may be because co-workers and government workers tend to be local people who are the Lisu and other ethnic groups.

4.3.2.2 In official contexts in the Putao area

According to the data, 3 (17%) out of 18 informants in the Putao area reported that they spoke Lisu with classmates. Two (11%) out of 18 informants reported using Lisu with teachers, 63 (94%) out of 67 informants with co-workers, and 49 (75%) out of 65 informants with government workers. Six (33%) out of 18 informants reported using Lisu/Burmese with classmates, 3 (17%) out of 18 informants with
teachers, 2 informants with co-workers and 8 (12%) out of 65 informants with government workers. Nine (50%) out of 18 informants reported that they spoke Burmese with classmates, 13 (89%) out of 18 informants with teachers, 2 (3%) out of 67 informants with co-workers, and 9 (14%) out of 65 informants with government workers.

Table 18 Outside the home: Language use in official contexts in the Putao area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Contexts</th>
<th>Puato area (69 Subjects)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L/B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classmates</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-workers</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of the use of Lisu with co-workers and government workers is above 75% whereas the percentage of the use of Burmese with classmates is 50% and with teachers is 89% respectively. It seems that Lisu is the most used with co-workers and government workers. Burmese is the most used with classmates and teachers. Overall, the use of Lisu is predominant in official contexts.

4.3.2.3 In official contexts in the Homeland area

According to the data, no informant reported the use of Anung with classmates and teachers. It seems that the younger informants are not currently students. Only one informant reported the use of Anung with co-workers. Two (11%) out of 18 informants responded the use of Anung/Lisu with co-workers. No informant reported the use of Anung or Anung/Lisu with government workers. 14 (78%) out of 18 informants responded that they spoke Lisu with co-workers, 11 (65%) out of 17 informants with government workers. Only one informant reported the use of Lisu/Rawang with co-workers, and one informant with government workers. Only one informant reported the use of Lisu/Burmese with government workers and one informant reported the use of Lisu/Burmese/Rawang with government workers.
Table 19 Outside the home: Language use in official contexts in the Homeland area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Contexts</th>
<th>Homeland area (18Subjects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classmates</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-workers</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that Lisu is most commonly used in official contexts. In fact, almost all government workers and co-workers are local people. A few people use Lisu in combination with Burmese or Rawang. However, the use of Lisu in official contexts is predominant.

4.3.3 In Church contexts by place

This section presents data about the language use in church contexts for the three different areas: Khinpang, Putao, and the Homeland area. The Anung were animists before they were introduced to Christianity. After conversion to Christianity, the Lisu writing system was learned first and used at churches and Bible training schools around 1933. All church members used the Lisu Bible and hymnbook at churches. The Rawang people also used the Lisu writing system until around 1960. However, Rawang do not use Lisu anymore at their churches after receiving the Rawang orthography. Some Anung use Rawang but most Anung are still using Lisu at churches since they live with Lisu and worship together at the same churches in the villages. A few Anung people still live among the Rawang. Currently, there is not a separate Anung church in Myanmar. Since Anung and Lisu worship together at the same churches in the villages, Lisu is more convenient to use because they have been using it for a long time in the church. Anung is not considered appropriate to use in churches because not everyone can understand it. Because of this, language use in church contexts may be a determining factor in language maintenance for the Anung in Myanmar. Religious activities may affect to the language choice for Anung because all Anung are Christians. In each village that was visited, there are five worship services per week, which shows that church is a fundamental place for social interaction for the Anung people. For this reason, language use in church
contexts distinctively affects the Anung people; it has the potential to be a place where they have the opportunity to hear and use Anung.

With regard to church contexts, language use was tested by asking what language congregants usually spoke at funerals or church services, and what language was used for preaching, fellowship, singing, announcements, and prayer at their church services. Here are examples of how the questions were asked.

#32. When you are not in your house, what language do you usually speak..
   (l).... at funeral.
   (n)....at church.

#34. At your church, what language is used most often for...
   (a)....preaching
   (b)....fellowship
   (c).....singing
   (d)....giving announcement
   (e)....prayer

4.3.3.1 In Church contexts in Khinpang
There are two churches in Khinpang. There is a church where the majority of church members are Lisu, and most church leaders are Lisu as well. At the other church, the majority of church members are Anung, and church leaders are Anung. There are two evangelical committees, each overseeing one church. The churches are part of the Church of Christ denomination. Most of the evangelical committee members are Lisu. In relation to church contexts, the researcher used question #32 (l) and (n), and asked, “When you are not in your house, what language do you usually speak at funeral and church.

Seven (39%) out of 18 informants reported that they spoke Anung/Lisu at church, 5 (25%) out of 18 informants at funerals. 11(61%) out of 18 informants spoke Lisu at church and 12 (67%) out of 18 informants spoke Lisu at funeral. Only one informant reported the use of Lisu/Burmese at funeral. In Khinpang, some use Anung at church and funerals but still the use of Lisu is higher than the use of Anung. The average of the use of Anung is 33% and the use of Lisu is 64%. It shows that the use of Lisu is higher than the use of Anung at church contexts. Lisu is the predominant language in the church domain. See Table 20 Church domain: Language use at church and funerals in Khinpang.
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The researcher then used questions #34 (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) and asked “At your church, what language is used most often for preaching, fellowship, singing, giving announcements and prayer?”

Only one informant reported using Anung for fellowship, singing, and prayer. 11 (61%) out of 18 informants responded that they used Anung/Lisu for fellowship 10 (56%) out of 18 informants for singing, and 6 (33%) out of 18 informants for prayer. 18 (100%) out of 18 informants reported that they used Lisu for preaching, Six (33%) out of 18 informants used Lisu for fellowship, 2 (11%) out of 18 informants used Lisu for singing, 18 (100%) out of 18 informants used Lisu for announcement, and 4 (22%) out of 18 informants for prayer. Only one informant reported the use of Anung/Lisu/Burmese for singing, and 3 (17%) out of 18 informants for prayer. Only 3 (17%) out of 18 informants reported that they used Anung/Lisu/Rawang for prayer. Only 2 (11%) out of 18 informants reported the use of Lisu/Burmese for singing, and only one informant for prayer.

All the informants responded that only Lisu is used for preaching and announcements at church, since it is a common language for the entire congregation. Anung is not used at all for preaching and announcements. It indicates that the Lisu is mainly used as a dominant language for preaching and announcements at the church. The use of Anung/Lisu is above 56% for fellowship and singing whereas 33% is for prayer. A few informants reported that they use Lisu in combination with Burmese or Rawang. For fellowship, singing and prayer, Anung tends to be used at church in combination with Lisu because most of the church members are Anung; however, only Lisu is used for preaching and announcements. See Table 21 Church domain: Language use in church contexts in Khinpang.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church Contexts</th>
<th>Khinpang (18 Subjects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Table 20 Church domain: Language use at church and funerals in Khinpang.
### Table 21 Church domain: Language use in church contexts in Khinpang

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church domain</th>
<th>Khinpang area (18 subjects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaching</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.3.2 In Church contexts in the Putao area

Four villages in Putao area have churches. Most of them are Church of Christ. The Lisu Evangelical Committee, Church of Christ, controls these churches. However, there is a church called Lisu Assembly of God at Namdin village. At Mulashidi, there are two Lisu Church of Christ churches and a Rawang Church of Christ. Most of the church leaders are Lisu at the Lisu Church of Christ. At these four villages, the majority of church members are Lisu whereas a small number of church members are Anung.

68 (99%) out of 69 informants reported that they spoke Lisu at church whereas only one (1%) out of 69 informants reported the use of Rawang. It seems likely that the use of Rawang could be at Rawang church because Rawang is not used at Lisu Church of Christ. 68 (99%) out of 69 informants reported that they spoke Lisu at funerals and only one informant reported the use of Lisu/Rawang. Almost all informants reported the use of Lisu at church and funerals except only one informant from Mulashidi reported using Rawang, and Lisu in combination with Rawang. The data clearly shows that almost all speak Lisu at church and funeral services in this area. The use of Lisu is 99%. See Table 22 Church domain: Language use in funeral in the Putao area.
Table 22 Church domain: Language use in funeral in the Putao area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church Contexts</th>
<th>Putao area (69 Subjects)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>L/R</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding language use in church contexts, the researcher used question No. 34 (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) and asked “At your church, what language is used most often for preaching, fellowship, singing, giving announcement and prayer?

Only two (3%) out of 69 informants reported that they used Anung/Lisu for fellowship. 12 (17%) out of 69 informants responded that they used Lisu/Burmese for singing. It seems that some used Lisu in combination with Burmese for singing in church services and youth services. Only one informant reported the use of Rawang for preaching, fellowship, singing, announcement, and prayer. 68 (99%) out 69 informants reported the use of Lisu for preaching, 66 (96%) out of 69 informants for fellowship, 56 (81%) out of 69 informants for singing, 68 (99%) out of 69 informants for announcement, and 68 (99%) out of 69 informants for prayer. The data clearly shows that Lisu is the most widely-used language in church contexts in the Putao area. See Table 23 Church domain: Language use in church contexts in the Putao area.

Table 23 Church domain: Language use in church contexts in the Putao area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church domain</th>
<th>Putao area (69 subjects)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>L/B</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preaching</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3.3 In Church contexts in Homeland area

There is a church in Sirampha where most of the church members are Anung, and a church in Siwangthong where almost all church members are Anung. These two churches are under a separate Lisu Evangelical Committee’s control. Most of the leaders at these churches are Anung. The researcher used question #32 (l) and (n), and asked, “When you are not in your house, what language do you usually speak at funerals and at church?

According to the data, 18 (100%) out of 18 informants reported that they spoke Lisu at church. No informant reported that the use of Anung. A few people might use Anung but most of the time they spoke Lisu. Only one informant reported that they spoke Anung/Lisu at funeral services. 16 (89%) out of 18 informants reported that they spoke Lisu at funeral services. Only one informant reported the use of Lisu/Burmese/Rawang at funeral services. According to the data, no informant reported the use of Anung at church whereas all informants reported that they spoke Lisu at church. Only one informant reported the use of Anung/Lisu and one informant reported using Lisu/Burmese/Rawang at funeral services. However, almost all speak Lisu at church and funerals in the homeland area. See Table 24 Church domain: Language use at funeral in Homeland area.

Table 24 Church domain: Language use at funeral in Homeland area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church Contexts</th>
<th>Homeland area (18 Subjects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding language use in church contexts, the researcher used question No. 34 (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) and asked “At your church, what language is used most often for preaching, fellowship, singing, giving announcement and prayer? No informants reported the use of Anung for preaching, announcement, and prayer. Two (11%) out of 18 informants reported the use of Anung/Lisu for fellowship, and 5 (28%) out of 18 informants for singing. 18 (100%) out of 18 informants reported using Lisu for preaching, 16 (33%) out of 18 informants for fellowship, 13 (72%) out of 18 informants for singing and 18 (100%) out of 18 informants for prayer. Most
significantly, all informants reported using Lisu for preaching, fellowship, and prayer even though almost all are Anung in this area. It shows that Lisu is the dominant language in church contexts because all church members understand it. In one example, the researcher had the opportunity to preach in the homeland area during his survey. He was supposed to preach in Anung, but a few Lisu also participated in the church. Therefore, he preached in Lisu, so that everybody would understand. A few people used Anung in combination with Lisu for fellowship and singing. However, Lisu is used the most and it is the dominant language in church contexts in the Homeland area. See Table 25 Church domain: Language use in church contexts in the Homeland area.

Table 25 Church domain: Language use in church contexts in the Homeland area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church domain</th>
<th>Homeland area (18 subjects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaching</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding language use at church and funerals for the three different areas, the use of Lisu is higher than the use of Anung. Only Lisu is used for preaching and announcements in all three areas. The use of Anung in combination with Lisu is found in Khinpang and Homeland area; however, no one uses Anung in combination with Lisu in the Putao area. In fact, most of the church members are Lisu and a small number are Anung in this area.

In relation to Anung use in church contexts, three areas play slightly different roles from each other. In Khinpang, Anung is frequently used for fellowship, singing and prayer in church contexts. In fact, most of the church members in Khinpang are Anung. The number of Anung church members is also higher than the number of Anung church members in the Homeland and Putao areas. Anung is used much more in church in Khinpang than in the Homeland area.
In Homeland area, the data shows that the use of Lisu is very high even though most of the church members in this area are Anung. According to researcher’s observation, the use of Anung in church seems to be spearheaded by the youth. The church in the Homeland area does not have many youth because they are working or studying elsewhere. The data shows that most Anung people in the Homeland area use Lisu more than their mother tongue. Even though Lisu is mainly used, one of the church members in homeland area said that personally he uses the Anung hymnbook in church because the numbering in Anung hymnbook is the same as the numbering in Lisu hymnbook.

Consequently, we see that the concentration of Anung people is one of the key factors affecting language use in the church domain. The greater the concentration of Anung people, the stronger the use of the Anung language is. Overall, the use of Lisu is higher than the use of Anung. Even though the use of Anung in Khingpang is higher than the use of Anung in Puatao and Homeland area, still they use Anung in combination with Lisu. However, the use of Anung is low in these three areas. Actually, all the churches are under the control of Lisu Evangelical Committee. For this reason, all the pastors have to preach in Lisu in the church. Consequently, Lisu is the dominant language in the church contexts and all the congregations in the church understand it.

4.3.4 In informal contexts by place
The Anung people often meet with non-Anung people at markets and village meetings. These are crucial meeting places, where Anung people meet one another or people from other ethnic groups. Consequently, these two places might show what the language choice for the Anung people is. As a result, the researcher chose these data for questionnaires. The researcher used question #32 (k) and (m), and asked “When you are not in your house, what language do you usually speak…at the market or at a village meeting.”

4.3.4.1 In informal contexts in Khinpang
In informal contexts in Khinpang, 3 (17%) out of 18 informants reported that they spoke Lisu at market, 13 (72%) out of 18 informants responded that they spoke Lisu/Burmese at market place, only one informant with the use of Lisu/Rawang. This indicates that at the market place, the use of Lisu/Burmese is most prevalent. In fact, since Khinpang is near downtown, they might use Lisu/Burmese with Lisu
people or other ethnic groups they meet. Five (14%) out of 18 informants reported that they spoke Anung/Lisu at village meetings, 12 (67%) out of 18 informants reported using Lisu at village meetings, only one informant reported using Lisu/Burmese. At market, Lisu/Burmese is used the most and Lisu is the second most. At village meetings, Lisu is used most frequently and Anung/Lisu is the second most. On the average, in informal contexts in this area, Lisu is used most frequently, followed by Lisu/Burmese and Anung/Lisu.

Table 26 Outside the home: Language use in informal contexts in Khinpang area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal Contexts</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>L/B</th>
<th>L/R</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village meeting</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.4.2 In informal contexts in the Putao area

In informal contexts in the Putao area, 52 (75%) out of 69 informants reported speaking Lisu at the market. 14 (20%) out of 69 informants reported speaking Lisu/Burmese and 3 (4%) out of 69 informants reported speaking Lisu/Rawang in the same context. Three informants did not report for village meetings. A few informants reported speaking Burmese/Rawang when they went to marketplace. It is significant that 66 (100%) out of 66 informants reported that they spoke only Lisu at village meetings. All the informants spoke Lisu at village meetings because almost all are Lisu, and they all use Lisu because it is the dominant language in this area. At market, Lisu is used the most and Lisu/Burmese is used the second most. It seems that the use of Lisu is very high in the Putao area.

Table 27 Outside the home: Language use in informal contexts in Putao area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal Contexts</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>L/B</th>
<th>L/R</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village meeting</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.4.3 In informal contexts in the Homeland area

In informal contexts in the homeland area, 15 (83%) out of 18 informants reported that they spoke Lisu at the marketplace, 2 out of 18 informants reported speaking Lisu/Burmese, and only one informant reported speaking Rawang. 16 (100%) out of 16 informants responded that they spoke Lisu at village meeting. It is interesting that no informant reported the use of Anung. At market, the use of Lisu is the most and Lisu/Burmese is the second most. At village meeting, only Lisu is used since everybody understands it. It shows that Lisu is the dominant language for the Anung in this area. See Table 28 Outside the home: Language use in informal contexts in the Homeland area.

Table 28 Outside the home: Language use in informal contexts in the Homeland area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informal Contexts</th>
<th>Homeland area (18 Subjects)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L/B</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village meeting</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4 Conclusion

In conclusion, in regard to language use with family members inside and outside the home in Khinpang, the use of Anung is higher than the use of Lisu. No one used Anung with non-Anung friends at home domain. However, some reported the use of Lisu in combination with Burmese, Rawang, or Kachin with friends. The data clearly shows that the use of Anung inside and outside the home in Khinpang is higher than the use of Anung inside and outside the home in the Homeland and Putao areas. It seems that most of the Anung in Khinpang retain their language with family members inside and outside the home. This may have to do with the fact that the Anung houses in this area are clustered together, so the Anung who live in Khinpang have much more contact with their Anung neighbors from day to day. They therefore have more opportunity to use the Anung language with one another. In contrast, the majority of church members in this area are Anung; however, Lisu is used at church for preaching and announcements. Some, however, use Anung for singing, fellowship, or prayer. It seems like using Anung in these ways in the church is a good way for the Anung in Khinpang to strengthen their language. For language use in official and informal contexts, the use of Lisu/Burmese and Lisu is more common.
In the Putao area, language use is very different from the Khinpang and Homeland areas; the use of Lisu is higher than the use of Anung. The use of Anung is very low in comparison to the use of Anung in the Khinpang and Homeland areas. The data shows that the use of Anung with family members inside and outside the home is under 13% and the use of Lisu is above 80%. It seems that the average use of Lisu is very high when talking to family members inside and outside the home. The data shows that most of Anung did not retain their language. In fact, the population of Anung is small and the majority of people are Lisu. They also live interspersed among Lisu people. Lisu can be heard from house to house and they often have much contact with Lisu who are their neighbors. In church domain, most of members are Lisu, so Lisu is used in churches in this area. They do not use Anung for singing, fellowship, or prayer. The Lisu used as church domain in this area. Likewise, in official and informal contexts, Lisu is more frequently used than other languages, with Lisu/Burmese being the second most used language.

In the Homeland area, language use is slightly different from Khinpang and Putao areas. Even though most people are Anung in the Homeland area, the use of Lisu is still higher than the use of Anung but lower than the use of Anung in the Khinpang area. It seems that in the Homeland area, most people use Lisu is still higher than the use of Anung with family members for inside and outside the home domain. The use of Anung in Homeland area is higher than the use of Anung in Putao area, but lower than the use of Anung in Khinpang area. It seems that most people did not retain Anung at home when talking to family members. In fact, in their daily lives, they have frequent contact with guests who are Lisu and Tangsar (Rawang), and use Lisu as a common language with them. Since this area is situated near the border with China, the Anung in the Homeland area often have guests from other places. When talking with non-Anung visitors, the Anung will almost always speak Lisu with them. In Homeland churches, Lisu is the dominant language. There are very few activities in the church where Anung is used. It seems that most Anung use Lisu, however, as a common language in official or informal contexts.

This data can be used to answer Lewis and Simons’ Key Question #1: What is the current identity function of Anung? In order to answer Key Question #1, the researcher used the RQ #31 (a-h) and asked, “In your house, what language do you usually speak with your parents, your grandparents, your siblings, your spouses, your children, your grandchildren, Anung friends, or non-Anung friends?’ The researcher also used the RQ #32 (i-o) and asked, “When you are not in your house,
what language do you usually speak with family members, in official contexts, in church contexts, and in informal contexts?"

The data shows that Lisu is the dominant language in all three areas in regard to language use outside the home. For the use of language inside the home, the data clearly show that some speak Anung at home. When talking to family members, Anung use differs widely across the three areas. In Khinpang, half (56%) of the informants use Anung. In the Putao area, only 13% of the informants reported using Anung when talking to family members. Finally, in the Homeland area, 41% of informants reported using Anung with family. It shows that the Anung use their language for at least some of their daily oral communication at home. The language use of Anung is given in Table 29 A summary of language use at home domain.

In all three places, at least some Anung use Anung at home. However, the Anung language use is the strongest where Anung are the majority or clustered together, as in Khinpang. In the Putao and Homeland areas, Lisu encroaches on the use of Anung even in the home domain. This is evidence for language shift. Fasold describes language maintenance as a situation in which “the community collectively decides to continue using the language or languages it has traditionally used. When a speech community begins to choose a new language in domains formerly reserved for the old one, it may be a sign that language shift is in progress” (Fasold 1984:213). This pattern is strongest in the Putao area where 87% of home language use is in Lisu. Most Anung households in Myanmar are probably using Lisu and some Anung households are using Anung. This shows that the Anung people use their language at home but not all the Anung people use it.

Table 29 A summary of language use at home domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A/L/R</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khinpang</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putao</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are four possible answers to this question: Historical, Heritage, Home, and Vehicular. Anung is not “vehicular” because it is not a language of wider communication. Anung is not “historical” or “heritage” because there are still L1 speakers who use Anung in the home for daily communication. Lisu is encroaching significantly in the home domain, but currently, the identity function of the Anung language is “home”.
Chapter 5
Intergenerational transmission

5.1 Introduction
The answer to Key Question #1 shows that some Anung people use Anung in the home domain. Since some Anung people use Anung at home, Key Question #3 needs to be asked, “Are all parents transmitting the language to their children?” Although this research does not directly survey children or measure their Anung ability, the response to this question will show some evidence about whether all parents are transmitting the language to their children or not. The result is based on 1) the response of Anung adults to questionnaires and 2) informal observation of children made during the survey trip. To answer Key Question #3, this chapter discusses four questions:

(1) Do parents/grandparents speak Anung to their children?
(2) Do parents/grandparents think their children can speak Anung?
(3) Can parents/grandparents speak Anung to their children?
(4) Can the children use Anung? Do children have adequate opportunities to hear or use Anung?

Fishman states that language maintenance across generations requires intergenerational language transmission. “Without intergenerational mother tongue transmission (or the transmission of a written or spoken second language, if that should be the societal goal) no language maintenance is possible. That which is not transmitted cannot be maintained” (Fishman 1991:113). Furthermore, he describes the most important factor in determining whether a language is passed from an older generation to children, saying, “The mother tongue of the parents is usually and normatively handed on to their children and this is so on a society-wide basis” (Fishman, 1991:355). According to Fishman, language transmission across generations is a very crucial factor for language maintenance. Without the transmission of the mother tongue, language maintenance is not possible. Thus, this chapter investigates whether Anung people are really transmitting their language to future generations.
5.2 Do parents speak Anung to their children?

It is very important to know whether or not parents are really speaking Anung to their children. If all parents transmit Anung to the next generations, it is good for the future of Anung language maintenance. If no parents transmit Anung to the next generation, their language will be endangered. To be able to know about whether parents speak Anung inside the home to their children or not, the researcher used research question #31(e) and asked, “In your house, what language do you usually speak with your children? He then used research question #31(f) and asked, “In your house, what language do you usually speak with your grandchildren?” For language use outside the home, the researcher used research question #32(e) and asked, “When you are not in your house, what language do you usually speak with your children? He then used research question #32(f) and asked, “When you are not in your house, what language do you usually speak with your grandchildren?” For respondents who have no children or grandchildren so the data is excluded. The answers to these kinds of questions are based more on their experiences; they may be able to answer more concretely. Furthermore, the researcher used research question #50 “What Language do most Anung parents use with children?” and #51 “Do Anung parents teach their children other languages?” These kinds of questions give a picture of how each Anung respondent perceives the whole language group’s language transmission practices.

5.2.1 Inside the home: Talking to younger generation

The previous Chapter 4 presents the data on an area-by-area basis. This chapter presents the data on all three areas. It is more helpful because it gives a more nuanced view of Anung language use.

Table 30 Inside the home: Talking to younger generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anung (105 subjects)</th>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only 66 respondents had children and 25 had grandchildren. According to the data, it is clearly seen that the use of Anung is 23%, the use of Anung/Lisu is 9%, and the use of Lisu is 68% with children. The use of Lisu is stronger than the use of Anung with their children at home. For grandchildren, the use of Anung is 28%, the use of
Anung/Lisu is 4%, and the use of Lisu is 68%. This shows that when talking to children and grandchildren in the home domain, the older generation uses more Lisu than Anung. The percentage of those speaking Lisu with children and grandchildren is the same. When parents talk to children and grandchildren, Lisu is the most common, Anung is the second most and Anung/Lisu is the third most inside the home. It shows that most of the older generation transmit Lisu to their children and grandchildren whereas some of the older generation transmit Anung to their children and grandchildren at home. A few people from the older generation transmit Anung/Lisu to their children and grandchildren. Therefore, talking to children and grandchildren in Lisu is stronger than Anung inside the home. See Figure 12 Inside the home: Talking to younger generation.

![Figure 12 Inside the home: Talking to younger generation](image)

### 5.2.2 Outside the home: Talking to younger generation

**Table 31 Outside the home: Talking to younger generation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interlocutor</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Anung</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Lisu</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When talking to children outside the home, the older generation uses Anung 21% of the time, Anung/Lisu 9% of the time, and Lisu 70% of the time. The data shows that
the use of Lisu is the highest with children. When talking to grandchildren outside the home, the use of Anung is 32%, the use of Anung/Lisu with 4%, and the use of Lisu with 64%. The use of Lisu is higher than Anung and Anung/Lisu. It is clearly seen that the use of Lisu is the highest, followed by Anung then by Anung/Lisu. The data shows that the use of Anung is under 32%, the use of Anung/Lisu is below 9% and the use of Lisu is above 64% with both children and grandchildren. It shows that the use of Lisu is much stronger than the use of Anung. Most of the older generation spoke Lisu with their children and grandchildren whereas some older generation spoke Anung with them. It seems that most of the older generation transmit the Lisu language to their children. Some older generation transmit Anung to their children but some parents transmit Anung in combination with Lisu to their children and grandchildren. Language transmission of Anung is weaker than that of Lisu. The percentage of language transmission by older generation for both children and grandchildren is shown in Figure 13 Outside the home: Talking to younger generation.

![Figure 13: Outside the home: Talking to younger generation](image)

For language transmission inside and outside the home, most of the older generation use Lisu rather than Anung. Some older generation use Anung with children and grandchildren whereas most of the older generation use the Lisu with this group. According to the data, it seems that when talking to younger generation, Lisu is used as a dominant language. Some older generation transmit Anung to their younger generation, however; the majority of older generation do not transmit Anung to their children. It shows that Anung is not successfully being transmitted to younger
generation. While some are transmitting the language to younger generation, many are not.

5.2.3 Respondents’ perceptions of community-wide intergenerational transmission

Fishman mentions that transmitting the mother tongue of the parents to their children is society-wide phenomenon. It is very important that a language is passed from older generation to younger generation (see 5.1 introduction). When the researcher used research question #50 and asked, “What language do most Anung parents use with their children?” 88 (84%) out of 105 informants reported the use of Lisu with their children. Only one (0.95%) out of 105 informants reported the use of Anung, and 16 (15%) out of 105 informants responded that typically parents speak both Anung and Lisu to their children. This data shows that Lisu is the dominant language for the Anung people.

When the researcher used research question #51 and asked, “Do Anung parents teach their children other languages? 95 (90%) out of 105 informants reported the teaching of Lisu to their children, 8 (8%) out of 105 informants reported the teaching of Lisu/Burmese, only one (0.95%) out of 105 informant reported the teaching of Lisu/Burmese/Rawang. This shows that the Anung parents frequently teach Lisu to their children, though few parents teach Burmese and Rawang. The Anung people use Lisu with their children more than the Anung language. See Table 32 Respondents’ perceptions of community-wide intergenerational transmission.

When the researcher asked questions directly to individuals, he found that the use of Anung was less than 28% inside the home and less than 32% outside the home. It was still more common to see the Anung teaching Lisu to their children and speaking it with them (see figure 12 and 13). Most parents (90%) teach Lisu to their children. Few parents teach Burmese and Rawang. Generally, the use of Lisu with children and teaching Lisu to children is preferred over Anung.

---

10 “Teach” in this context is understood to be less formal than the English term implies.
Table 32 Respondents’ perceptions of community-wide intergenerational transmission

| #50. What Language do most Anung parents use with children? |
|---------------------------|----|-----|----|
| Total                    | A  | %   | A/L | %  | L  | %  |
|                          | 105| 1   | 16  | 15%| 88 | 84%|

| #51. Do Anung parents teach their children other languages? |
|---------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|
| Total                    | L  | %  | L/B | %  | L/B/R | %  | S |
|                          | 105| 95 | 8   | 8% | 1     | 0.95%| 1 |

5.3 Do they think the children can speak Anung?

For this section, the questions asked informants what they thought of children’s language ability. The questions also asked the informants what they have observed in regard to their children’s language use. Informants were also asked to report on children's language at home and play, and village leaders were asked for their perceptions language use among younger generation. The Individual and Knowledgeable Insider questionnaires for this section are mentioned below.

The Individual questions were as follows:
- #No. 38 “Do you think the Anung children in this village speak Anung well?
- #No. 48 “What language do Anung children in this village usually speak when they play?”
- #No. 49 “(if you have children) which language do your children usually speak at home: Anung or [LWC]?”
- #No. 52 “Do you think most Anung children in this village speak Anung well?”

The Knowledgeable Leaders’ questions:
- #No. 32 “Are there Anung people in this village who can speak Anung, but not very well?
- #No. 33 “Are there Anung people in this village who cannot speak Anung at all?

Questions #38 and #52 are “Yes” or “No” question types. Some informants, however, chose to give the answer “some speak well and some do not” rather than to answer “Yes” or “No”. The researcher noticed that this kind of answer was an important factor for some informants who did not find a “Yes” or “No” answer to questions #38 and #52 to be satisfactory. Thus, this answer is included in the data.
When the researcher used question #38 and asked, “Do you think the [Anung] children in this village speak [Anung] well?” 5 (5%) out of 103 informants reported that they said “Yes”. 69 (67%) out of 103 informants reported that they said “No”. 29 (28%) out of 103 informants reported that they said “some speak well and some do not”. It seems that most informants do not think that Anung children can speak Anung well. Some informants think that some children can speak Anung well and others cannot. However, the majority of informants think that Anung children cannot speak Anung well.

When used research question #52 and asked, “Do you think most Anung children in this village speak Anung well?” 29 informants - mostly young people - could not answer with a “Yes” or “No”. They simply said that they did not know. It seems that they did not have the confidence to answer this question directly. It may have been socially inappropriate to give a “No” answer in this setting. 9 (12%) out of 76 informants reported “Yes”. 66 (64%) out of 76 informants reported “No”. Only one (0.97%) out of 76 informants reported “somewhat.” 66 (64%) informants do not think most children can speak Anung well. So although some did not answer this question, the majority of informants (>64%) responded in the negative whereas the minority (<12%) of informants reported in the affirmative. According to the data, most informants think that most Anung children cannot speak well in Anung. See Table 33 Perceptions of children’s Anung speaking ability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Questionnaire</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#38. Do you think the [Anung] children in this village speak [Anung] well?</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#52. Do you think most Anung children in this village speak Anung well?</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.3.1 Children’s language at home and play
When the researcher used question #48 and asked, “What language do Anung children in this village usually speak when they play?” 2 (2%) out of 105 informants reported that the children use Anung. 4 (4%) out of 105 informants reported that children use Anung/Lisu. 96 (91%) out of 105 informants reported that children use Lisu. 3 (3%) out of 105 informants reported that children use Lisu/Burmese (that is,
Lisu in combination with Burmese) when they play. According to the data, it seems that most Anung children speak Lisu rather than Anung when they play. For example, when the researcher was at the Homeland area, he observed that when children are playing with friends, all the children speak in Lisu. He noticed that no one speaks Anung with friends. They speak Lisu as their mother tongue when they are playing. It shows that children use Lisu as the dominant language when they play. However, children may speak Anung when they play with friends in Khinpang.

When the researcher used research question #49 and asked, “(if you have children) which language do your children usually speak at home: Anung or [LWC]?” 39 out of 105 informants did not answer because they did not have any children. 4 (6%) out of 66 informants reported that their children usually speak Anung. 6 (9%) out of 66 informants reported that their children usually speak Anung in combination with Lisu. 55 (83%) out of 66 informants reported that their children speak Lisu and only one (2%) out of 66 informants reported their children usually speak Lisu/Burmese at home. This shows that most children usually speak Lisu at home rather than Anung. The use of Lisu is higher than the use of Anung at home. However, there are still some Anung children who speak Anung or Anung/Lisu at home. See 5.2.1 (Inside the home: Talking to younger generation). The data shows that most Anung children usually speak Lisu at home. See Table 34 Children’s language at home and play.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Questionnaire</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>L/B</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#48. What language do Anung children in this village usually speak when they play?</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(#49. (if they have children) which language do your children usually speak at home: Anung or [LWC]?</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.3.2 Village leaders’ perceptions of younger generation

When the researcher used research question #32 for knowledgeable leaders and asked, “Are there Anung people in this village who can speak Anung, but not very well?” all six leaders reported that villagers under the age of 30 could speak Anung but not very well. They also reported that some farmers and students could not speak Anung well. Six leaders reported that Anung under the age of 30 speak Lisu
well. Five leaders reported speaking Lisu with villagers under 30 and only one leader uses Anung/Lisu with them.

When the researcher used the research question #33 and asked, “Are there Anung people in this village who cannot speak Anung at all?” all six leaders reported that those under the age of 20 (both male and female) could not speak Anung at all. Those under the age of 20 are students. Six leaders reported that Anung under 20 speak Lisu well and all leaders use only Lisu with them. According to the data, the village leaders' answers indicate that those under the age of 20 could not speak Anung at all.

These leaders cast doubt on the younger generation’s ability to use Anung, but the researcher found that even some people above the age of 30 or older people could not speak Anung very well. When the researcher did interviews with some older people, he used Lisu with them because some older Anung people could not speak Anung very well. It seems that not only those under age of 30 but also some older people cannot speak Anung well. Additionally, the researcher used Anung with some younger generation and found that some of them still could speak Anung well. However, generally the researcher noticed that the majority of Anung speak well in Lisu.

Table 35 Village leaders’ perceptions of younger generation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Questionnaire</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Types of people</td>
<td>language speak well</td>
<td>Using language with them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32. Are there Anung people in this village who can speak Anung, but not very well?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>i. Under age of 30 ii. (Male + Female) iii. Farmer, student</td>
<td>Lisu</td>
<td>Anung/Lisu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33. Are there Anung people in this village who cannot speak Anung at all?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>i. Under age of 20 ii. (Male + Female) iii. Student</td>
<td>Lisu</td>
<td>Lisu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All the six knowledgeable leaders reported that all villagers speak Lisu well. Significantly, no one reported that villagers under the age of 30 speak Anung well. Five of the knowledgeable leaders use Lisu with this demographic whereas only one leader uses Anung/Lisu. It shows that generally most villagers of younger generation speak Lisu. Although the leaders did not mention other age groups, the researcher noticed that some Anung from other age groups are also not speaking Anung well. However, according to the data, it seems that generally all leaders believe that Anung under age of 30 cannot speak Anung very well, and those under age of 20 could not speak. The researcher agrees with the general outline of the leaders’ beliefs. See Table 35 Village leaders’ perceptions of younger generation.

5.4 Can parents speak to their children?
For additional background, see 5.2. Regarding the question of “Do parents speak Anung to the children?” for both inside and outside the home, most of the older generation speak Lisu rather than Anung. Even when they speak Anung to younger generation, their use of Anung is weaker when it compared against their use of Lisu with younger generation. Most of the Anung older generation speak Lisu to younger generation (see 5.3).

With regard to the question of “Do they think children can speak Anung well? Most of the villagers think that Anung children cannot speak Anung well. Therefore, for this section it is important to consider whether parents and grandparents are able to transmit Anung to their children or not. Can parents and grandparents speak Anung to their children? The answer might be “Yes” but only some parents and grandparents speak Anung to the children. Both 5.2 and 5.3 already show that intergenerational transmission has been disrupted but this does not mean that language transmission across generations has ceased altogether. Some parents are transmitting the language to their children.

When the researcher used research question #27 (b) and asked, “What language did he (your father) speak to you when you were a child?” 54 (51%) out of 105 informants said that their fathers spoke Anung, 6 (6%) informants said Anung/Lisu, and 45 (43%) informants reported their fathers using Lisu when they were children. When the researcher used research question #28 (d) and asked, “What language did she (your mother) speak to you when you were a child?” 29 (28%) out of 105 informants said that their mothers spoke Anung to them, 68 (65%) out of 105 informants reported that their mothers spoke Lisu, two reported Anung/Lisu, one
reported hearing Lisu/Rawang, and five reported hearing Rawang when they were children. In summary, mothers used Anung (28%), Lisu (65%), Anung/Lisu (2%), Lisu/Rawang (1%), and Rawang (5%) with their children when they were children.

According to the data, it seems that fathers tended to use more Anung than Lisu with their children, but mothers tended to use more Lisu than Anung with their children. Not all parents were able to transmit Anung to their children. Another way to say this is that when they were children, some of the current generation of parents did not hear Anung from their own parents. Once during his survey, an Anung pastor invited the researcher to stay one night at the pastor's house. So the researcher stayed one night there. The pastor said to him, “Even though I am an Anung, I cannot speak Anung because I did not get a chance to learn Anung from my parents. Now I am only a nominal speaker of Anung.” This shows that some Anung parents could not speak Anung to their children or grandchildren. According to the data, not all parents were able to transmit Anung but some parents were able to transmit Anung to the current generation of parents. It seems that the current generation of parents did not have sufficient opportunity to hear Anung from their parents. The data shows that some parents were able to transmit Anung to the current generation of parents but some were not. In fact, for those grandparents and great-grandparents, it could have been a choice instead of lack of ability since Anung people have been living with Lisu for many years. See Table 36 Language heard while growing-up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Questionnaire</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>L/R</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#27 (d). What language did he (your father) speak to you when you were a child?</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(51%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td>(43%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#28 (d). What language did she (your mother) speak to you when you were a child?</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(28%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(65%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5 Do children have adequate opportunities to hear or use Anung?

Giving children the opportunity to speak their mother tongue in everyday life is one of the key factors for language maintenance in a community. It is very important to
consider that what language is used for children's everyday life. Wolraich says that “An obvious prerequisite for language acquisition is that children must be exposed to the language of their linguistic community” (Wolraich 2003: 190). If language maintenance is the goal, it is very crucial that children have adequate opportunity to use their mother tongue in their everyday lives - at home, at play, at church and at school.

Regarding language use at home, see 5.2.1 (Table 30 Inside the home: Talking to younger generation). The data shows that most of the older generation spoke Lisu to their children and only some older generation spoke Anung to their children. The older generation spoke more Lisu than Anung with their children and grandchildren. The older generation spoke Anung (< 28%), Anung/Lisu (< 9%) and Lisu (68%) to younger generation. See 5.3.1 (Table 34 Children's language at home and play). The data shows that the use of Anung with parents is 6%, Anung/Lisu is 9%, Lisu is 83%, and Lisu/Burmese is 2%. It shows that most of the younger generation did not get the opportunity to use Anung with their parents at home.

Regarding children's language use at play, see 5.3.1 (Table 34 Children’s language at home and play), it appears that most children use Lisu as a common language whereas only a few children use Anung. According to 91% of respondents, children use Lisu when they are playing.

Since virtually all children attend church, the language use pattern of Anung church is relevant. In relation to language use in church contexts, Anung is never the only language being used in church. Even though some reported the use of Anung or some use Anung in combination with Lisu, Lisu is used with greater frequency. It is significant that the use of Lisu is 94% and Lisu/Burmese is 3% in the church contexts in Putao area. The use of Lisu is 92% and the use of Anung/Lisu is 8% for singing and fellowship in the church in Homeland area. No one reported the use of only Anung. See 4.3.3: in church contexts by place. It is also seen that only Lisu is used for preaching and making announcements in the church whereas Anung is not used because it is felt that the Anung language is not appropriate to use in church since most church members do not understand it. A few Anung people use Anung in combination with Burmese or Rawang for fellowship, singing, and prayer in church but most of the Anung people mainly use Lisu in church. The use of Anung in combination with Lisu in Khinpang is higher than the use of Anung with in combination with Lisu in the Putao and the Homeland areas.
There are five worship services in a week at the church in the three areas. Each service takes two hours. Every Sunday, there are Sunday school classes for the children. The frequency and duration of the services show that the church is one of the most important types of social gathering for the Anung people in the villages because they are Christians and live in a Christian area. We can see how language use in church is one of the main factors outside of the home that affect the language use in children’s everyday life.

In regard to language use in school, among the six sites surveyed in this study, there are three primary schools, two middle schools, and one state high school. The Anung children are attending these schools but once they pass primary schools or middle schools, or state high school, they have to attend to another school. When the researcher used research question #40 for knowledgeable leaders and asked, “Do any children go to any other villages/towns for school?” All the leaders reported “Yes”. Those who go to schools in other villages or towns live with their relatives who mostly speak Lisu. Once they start to attend school, Anung children have to learn Burmese because it is the language of instruction at every school in Myanmar. Since most of the students at school are Lisu, Anung children will speak Lisu with Lisu classmates or friends and use Burmese with non-Lisu speakers. It seems that the Anung children do not use Anung with their friends or teachers as they are mostly from other ethnic groups. Therefore, they do not have the chance to use Anung at school. The use of Lisu and Burmese is for schooling life and these languages also become the language of Anung children’s everyday life.

Table 37 Language use result by school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledgeable Leader Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#39 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Primary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Middle schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the researcher used research questions #40, and #41 for individuals and asked, “Do [Anung] children speak any other languages before they start school?” “Do [Anung] children speak any other languages after they start school?” all informants reported that they spoke Lisu before starting school, and they started to use Burmese after starting school. (99%) 104 out of 105 informants said that Anung children spoke Lisu before they started school. Only one (0.95%) said that the Anung children spoke Lisu/Burmese before starting school. (52%) 55 out of 105 informants said that after starting school the Anung children spoke Burmese, (0.95%) only one with Burmese/English, and (47%) 45 with Burmese/Lisu. Anung children become accustomed to using Lisu and Burmese at school. Therefore, schooling is one of the main factors that affect language use among Anung children.

Table 38 Language use for before and after starting school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Questionnaire</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B/E</td>
<td>B/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Do [Anung] children speak any other languages before they start school?</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Do [Anung] children speak any other languages after they start school?</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In relation to language use in children’s everyday life, the children have limited opportunity to use the Anung language at home, play, church, and school.

**5.6 Conclusion**

Thurgood and Li mention that in China, the Anung people have contact primarily with Lisu people. Next to the Lisu, the Anung also have considerable contact with Chinese people. The majority of Anung shifted to using Lisu. Other Anung have shifted to Chinese and still others to Bai. Most Anung in China speak Lisu better than Anung (Thurgood and Li 2007).

Sun Hongkai finds that there are three possible reasons for language attrition of Anung in China: (1) intermarriage, (2) language attitudes, and (3) cultural assimilation (See chapter six). Below, the reasons for language attrition in Myanmar are compared to the reasons for language attrition in China found by Sun Hongkai.
5.6.1 Intermarriage and Intergenerational Transmission

Sun Hongkai observes that intermarriage was one of the main factors for disrupting intergenerational transmission (see Chapter six). He mentions that the Anung people live with other ethnic groups such as Lisu, Bai, and Chinese. Consequently, intermarriage was very common among the Anung people. The Anung people usually intermarry with Lisu. The Anung also intermarry with Bai and Chinese. Since most of the Anung people intermarry with Lisu, it affects language use within the family. Sun mentions that his Anung language consultant as an example. His mother tongue proficiency was a Level A: fluent speaker. At the time of Sun’s report, the consultant had been married with a Lisu woman for 30 years. However, she could only speak Lisu, and she understands a few words of Anung. They had three daughters and a son. The children only could speak Lisu. They had a limited proficiency of Anung like their mother. In the family, they often learn the Lisu language first. Even though their father uses Anung at home, the children still use the Lisu as their primary language (Sun 2009:14).

The researcher agrees that intermarriage may be one of the main factors for the Anung people in Myanmar too. His own family experience illustrates the pattern of intermarriage; the researcher’s grandfather married a Lisu woman, and his father married a Rawang woman. The researcher himself married a Rawang woman. See Table 39 Intermarriage among respondents. It is significant that ethnic identity is only being passed on through sons. Anung identity is always linked to the father’s side or the father’s generation.

Table 39 Intermarriage among respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Questionaire</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#30 (b). What clan is your</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[husband/wife] from?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher used research question #30 (b) and asked, “What clan is your [husband/wife] from? 14 out of 29 male informants said that their wives are Lisu. 10 out of 29 male informants reported being married to an Anung woman. 5 out of 29 male informants reported being married to a Rawang woman. This shows that Anung males most commonly married with Lisu women, followed by Anung and Rawang. Their children are considered Anung, but there is a high likelihood that the children will speak Lisu. 17 out of 28 female informants said that their husbands
are Anung and 10 out of 28 female informants have Lisu husbands. Only one informant reported having a Rawang husband. According to this data, the Anung women marry more frequently with Anung than Lisu. If they marry with an Anung man, their children may learn Anung, but the children of an Anung woman and a Lisu man are not considered as Anung. As in China, intermarriage is common for the Anung people in Myanmar, and this affects language transmission.

When the researcher used research question #36 for leaders and asked, “Is it common for Anung people from this village to marry non-Anung speaking people? 6 leaders from six villages reported “Yes”. Five leaders reported that they intermarry with the Lisu ethnic group. Only one leader reported that they intermarry with Lisu or Rawang people. This shows that the Anung intermarriage with Lisu is a common occurrence. This is unsurprising, as the Anung people in Myanmar have been living with the Lisu ethnic group for many years now.

The researcher also used research question #37 (b) for the Knowledgeable Insider Leaders and asked, “If an [Anung] man from this village marries a [non-Anung] woman, usually what language do their children end up speaking?” 2 (33%) out of 6 leaders reported that their children end up speaking was Anung/Lisu. 3 (50%) out of 6 leaders reported that their children end up speaking was Lisu. Only one (16%) out of 6 leaders reported that their children end up speaking was Anung/Lisu, and Rawang. Then the researcher used question #38 (b) for the knowledgeable leaders and asked, “If an [Anung] woman from this village marries a [non-Anung] man, usually what language do their children end up speaking?” Only one (16%) out of 6 leaders reported that their end up speaking was Anung/Lisu. 5 (83%) out of 6 leaders reported that end up speaking was Lisu. This data suggests that no children end up speaking only Anung; rather, they end up speaking Anung in combination with Lisu. Most Anung children tend to use the Lisu language. Intermarriage with Lisu affects language use for the younger generation in the community with the result that most Anung children end up speaking Lisu. See Table 40 Language children end up speaking.
Table 40 Language children end up speaking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Questionnaire</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>A/L/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#37 (b). (if yes) If an [Anung] man from this village marries a [non-Anung] woman, usually what language do their children end up speaking?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 (33%)</td>
<td>3 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#38 (b). (if yes) If an [Anung] woman from this village marries a [non-Anung] man, usually what language do their children end up speaking?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 (16%)</td>
<td>5 (83%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher also used research question #37 (c) and #38 (c) for leaders and asked, “if an [Anung] man from this village marries a [non-Anung] woman, can they also still speak [Anung]?” and “if an [Anung] woman from this village marries a [non-Anung] man, can they also still speak [Anung]?” There is a discrepancy between the intermarriage data gleaned from the Leader questionnaires and the answers to the same question from the Individual questionnaires. See Table 41 Speaking in Anung.

Table 41 Speaking in Anung

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader Questionnaire</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Some</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#37(c). If an [Anung] man from this village marries a [non-Anung woman], can they also still speak [Anung]?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#38(c). If an [Anung] woman from this village marries a [non-Anung man], can they also still speak [Anung]?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data shows that the Anung still seem to be using the Anung language with non-Anung women or men according to leader’s response. For question #37 (c), only two leaders responded that some can speak Anung. 4 leaders responded “Yes” to question #37 (c) and 6 leaders responded “Yes” to question #38 (c). This data, however, is difficult to interpret because the responses to the Individual questionnaires show that the use of Lisu is higher than the use of Anung. Therefore,
the answer of the intermarriage data from the Leader questionnaires is not consistent with the data from the Individual questionnaires.

Secondly, this question was intended to be a general one, not a specific question for leaders and their families. But in fact, it seems that the leaders may have been thinking of their own families or relatives, who speak Anung well when they answered it. However, the data is unclear, so it cannot be interpreted and the answer to this question is not representative of the entire Anung community. The individuals’ data shows that most Anung people use Lisu thus; it is difficult to interpret the intermarriage data because the data is not clear enough.

Non-Anung wives are not expected to learn Anung because the Anung people often live in mixed communities where the Anung is not used as the dominant language. Consequently, Lisu has become the dominant language among the Anung people since they have been living with the Lisu for many years. Thurgood observes that in China, when one of the family members is not Anung, they do not speak Anung in the family. They use Lisu as the common language among them. They hardly use Anung with the non-Anung (Thurgood 2006: 56). A similar situation can be seen in Myanmar. The researcher personal experience shows that if there is a non-Anung in the family, the family will use Lisu as a common language because everybody understands it.

Generally, when an Anung man marries with a non-Anung woman or an Anung woman get married with a non-Anung man, they use Lisu as a common language. Therefore, it gets harder for sons to learn Anung and pass it on their families. Even if daughters who got married with non-Anung men could have passed the language on to their children, the children are not identified as ethnically Anung since their fathers are from other ethnic groups. The researcher used research question #45 (a) and asked, “What language do you think is more important for being accepted in the community?” Most informants said that being ethnically Anung is more important to them for being accepted in the community. It seems that speaking Anung is not necessary for belonging in Anung community. However, it does not mean that the language is not relevant to be being accepted in the community.

5.6.2 Language attitudes
The questionnaires cannot directly measure language attitudes. Colin states, “attitudes cannot be directly observed. A person’s thoughts, processing system and
feelings are hidden… Attitudes often manage to summarize, explain and predict behavior” (Colin 1992:11). Colin further mentions, “in the life of a language, attitudes to that language appear to be important in language restoration, preservation, decay or death. …. A survey of attitudes provides an indicator of current community thoughts and beliefs, preferences and desires. Attitudes surveys provide social indicators of changing beliefs and the chances of success in policy implementation” (Colin 1992:9). Bradley mentions, “The crucial factor in language maintenance is the attitudes of the speech community concerning their language” (Bradley). Despite the fact that Anung language transmission across generations has been disrupted, the Anung people in Myanmar still report positive attitudes to Anung.

Table 42 Important language for bringing up children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Questionnaire</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A/L</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#45(d). What language do you think is more important for bringing up children?</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>26 (25%)</td>
<td>62 (61%)</td>
<td>14 (14%)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data, 62 (61%) out of 102 informants think that Anung/Lisu is the most important language for bringing up children. 26 (25%) out of 102 informants think that Anung is most, and 14 (14%) out of 102 informants think that Lisu is the most important language for bringing up children. Most of the informants reported that they wanted to use Anung/Lisu in bringing up their children. It shows that they think that both Anung and Lisu are important and have a positive view of both. Although they have a positive attitude to Anung language, actually more Anung are transmitting Lisu to their children. The previous sections 5.4 and 5.6.1 give explanations for this phenomenon. More parents are not able to transmit Anung to their children even though they want to. Children’s lives are filled up with Lisu or Burmese in most social contexts. Intermarriage with Lisu and a preference for speaking the most widely understood language prevents Anung from being transmitted within many homes.

When the researcher used research question #46 and asked, “Do you like to speak Anung in front of people who are not Anung?” Every informant reported only “Yes”. See Table 43 Language attitude to Anung. It shows that they have a positive attitude to their language, and they see Anung as being a prestigious language. They do not have a negative attitude to their language. They said that Anung is their own
language. They do not want their language to be lost. They love their language and want to maintain it. The Anung people have a strongly positive attitude to their language. During survey, for example, when the researcher visited an Anung house in the homeland area, he unintentionally spoke in Lisu with family members. Then a young girl from the family members asked him, “Are you not an Anung? Do not speak in Lisu. You have to speak in Anung.” So the researcher spoke Anung with the family. This anecdote shows that even some younger generation have a positive attitude to their language.

Table 43 Language attitude to Anung

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Questionnaire</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#46. Do you like to speak Anung in front of people who are not Anung?</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1. It is my language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. I love my language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. I am Anung.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. I want to maintain my language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Not to be lost my language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the researcher used the research question #43 and asked, “Twenty years from now, do you think the [Anung] children from this village will be speaking [Anung]?” only five said, “No” but 100 out of 105 informants said, “Yes”. Some said, not only “Yes’ but also that, “We have an orthography. We have literacy programs. If we teach Anung to our children, they will be speaking Anung twenty years from now.” This shows that they believe in the value of teaching literacy and of intergenerational language transmission. According to the data, language transmission has been disrupted. However, language transmission is still occurring for some families. For example, in Khinpang the use of Anung is higher than the use of Lisu inside and outside the home. Chapter 4 shows that of the use of Anung in Khinpang both inside and outside the home is higher than that of Putao and the Homeland area in the same domain. Because the data does not show that language transmission has completely ceased, it is likely that Anung children will be speaking Anung in the future. It could also be analyzed as a desire of theirs that may not be borne out by recent trends in language use, transmission, and proficiency.

The overall use of Lisu, however, is higher than the use of Anung. Language transmission across generations shows that most Anung people pass on Lisu rather than Anung to the younger generation. It can be seen that some Anung are transmitting their mother tongue to their children. Most, however, are transmitting
Lisu to their children. Lisu is stronger than Anung. Nevertheless, the Anung in Myanmar do seem to value their language. The youngest generation, however, might have a different attitude to their language since children were not directly surveyed in this research.

Table 44 Speaking Anung in the future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Questionnaire</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#43. Twenty years from now, do you think the [Anung] children from this village will be speaking [Anung]?</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100 (95%)</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These uniformly positive statements about Anung stand in contrast with Sun Hongkai’s findings about Anung in China. He reported that there are three different attitudes to the Anung. First, some officials and intellectuals are concerned about their language. They believe that every language has distinctive characteristics. If a language is lost, human culture and history is also lost. Second, a few intellectuals and ordinary people support the disappearance of their own language. Many Anung hold attitudes like these toward using Chinese: “Chinese is most useful, as it can be used all over China,” “Once we have learned to speak and write Chinese, we can become cadres and gain more knowledge of important national issues,” and “We can understand easily what is said on the radio or television.” Their attitude toward using Lisu is: “We must learn Lisu because we are surrounded by Lisu speakers, and must speak Lisu on the streets. If we can’t speak Lisu, we can’t go anywhere.” Their attitude toward the imminent extinction of their language is, “it doesn’t really matter. It may even be better if it becomes extinct, as everyone will then speak the same language. It will be much more convenient because we won’t need translators anymore.” These Anung do not even want an Anung writing system. Third, most people - leaders, the educated and ordinary Anung - have indifferent feelings toward the disappearance of their language.

In contrast, the data presented here shows that Anung in Myanmar have a positive attitude to their language. No one expresses negative attitudes toward Anung. They say that Anung is their own language. They say, “I do not want the Anung language to be lost. I love my language.” They believe that they will be speaking Anung in the future. It shows that the disruption of the intergenerational transmission was not because they have negative attitudes to the Anung language.
5.6.3 Cultural assimilation

Sun Hongkai (2009:12-13) mentions that the Anung people migrated from the Qinghai-Tibet Plateau to the area where the Anung people now live over 70 generations ago. According to Anung legend, the three brothers of the family parted ways, going to different areas. Some of Anung moved to the Gongshan area in the north. Because they had no contact with each other for a long time, this group’s language became very different from the Anung people in and around the Fugong area. Later, the Anung people in Gongshan moved to the Dulong River and became the ethnic group that is now called “Trung.” Therefore, the languages spoken by the Anung people in Gongshan area and the Trung are very similar and are considered two dialects of the same language. Some other Anung people moved westwards to Myanmar. During the 1940s to 1950s, the Lisu and Bai ethnic groups gradually moved to the Nujiang area. The Lisu and Bai ethnic groups influenced the Anung people culturally and socially. Therefore, they lost their culture, identity, and language. Cultural assimilation has been continuing (see chapter 6).

Sun Hongkai (2009:13) notes that some of the Anung people moved westwards to Myanmar. This corresponds with Anung oral tradition which says that the Anung people migrated from the area along the Nu River in China. The researcher used question #27 for knowledgeable leaders and asked, “From where did the Anung people of this village migrated?” Five leaders said that they migrated from Khonglangphu area and one leader said that the western side of China. The researcher used research question #27(a) for knowledgeable leaders and asked, “How long have they lived here?” Most leaders said that around 60 years. The researcher then used research question #27(g) for knowledgeable leaders and asked, “Where did they come from before that?” All leaders answered they come from China. There is no doubt that the Anung people migrated from the area along the middle reaches of the Nujiang area in China.

The Anung have lived with the Lisu for many years. Thus, the Anung people had already been assimilated into Lisu language and culture because Lisu were powerful and populous. In Myanmar, the Anung people live interspersed among the Lisu people. The Anung in Myanmar have had social and cultural contact with Lisu for many years, during which Lisu culture and language gradually gained influence in Anung people’s everyday lives. Therefore, the researcher confidently corroborates that cultural assimilation is one of the main factors that has affected intergenerational language transmission in Myanmar.
Chapter 6
Language proficiency

6.1 Introduction
In chapter 5, we saw that the most frequent response to Key Question #3 “Are all parents transmitting the language to their children?” is “No”. Not all parents are transmitting their language to younger generation. It seems that language transmission across generations is disrupted for the Anung people in Myanmar. There are still families, however, with intact language transmission across generations. Since the answer to Key Question #3 is “Not all”, Key Question #5 “What is the youngest generation that has at least some proficient speakers?” needs to be asked. This chapter discusses which generation is the youngest that has some speakers with full proficiency.

To be able to assess the level of language proficiency, the individual questionnaires are analyzed based on different age groups: under the age of 20, between the ages of 35 and 50, and above the age of 50. The result of the data indicates that the youngest generation has at least some proficient speakers. Knowing this will enable us to relate Anung to the EGIDS scale. This chapter gives the answer to Key Question #5. There are four possible answers to Key Question #5 given as below (see chapter two).

**Great grandparent** –The only remaining speakers of the language are elderly and have little opportunity to use the language. For the language, the youngest proficient speakers are of the great grandparent generation. Language shift is very far along. This relates to the Level 8b of EGIDS (Nearly Extinct).

**Grandparent** – The only remaining active speakers of the language are members of the grandparent’s generation. For the language, the youngest proficient speakers are of the grandparent’s generation. Language shift is already advanced. This relates to the Level 8a of EGIDS (Moribund).
**Parent** – The childbearing generation can use the language among themselves but they do not normally transmit it to their children. For the language, the youngest proficient speakers of the language are the adults of childbearing age. Language shift has begun in progress. This relates to the Level 7 of EGIDS (Shifting).

**Children** – The language is used orally by all generations but only some of the childbearing generations are transmitting it to their children. For the language, the youngest proficient speakers are of the children. Language shift is just beginning. This relates to the Level 6b of EGIDS (Threatened).

To be able to ascertain the levels of EGIDS, the data of three different age groups are analyzed separately for their language proficiency. Furthermore, language understanding and speaking competence for three age groups are analyzed.

### 6.2 Criteria for language proficiency

This section discusses the Interagency Language Roundtable’s scale and Sun Hongkai’s research on levels of language proficiency. These two criteria have been adapted to this research in order to be able to assess Anung language proficiency.

#### 6.2.1 Interagency Language Roundtable’s scale

In order to discuss the proficiency of Anung speakers, it is necessary to use a scale for rating proficiency. Therefore, the researcher has adapted the ILR scale because it allows for self-assessment. The Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) is a federal interagency organization of the United States of America that works for the coordination and sharing of information about foreign language research in America. They provide language learners a framework for self-assessment in terms of their speaking, reading and listening proficiency. The Interagency Language Roundtable Skill Level Descriptions are designed to assess the proficiency level for those who are speaking a second or foreign language. The informants were tested for language proficiency based on the different question types for each level. The scale has been standardized at six base levels, ranging from 0 (no functional ability) to 5 (equivalent to an educated native speaker). The six levels for self-assessment of speaking proficiency are given below:
• (S-0) **No functional ability**: At this level, the speakers have no functional ability in language.

• (S-1) **Elementary Proficiency**: At this level, the speakers can provide basic descriptions of places, ask for direction, order meals and give a basic greeting and introduction of themselves.

• (S-2) **Limited Working Proficiency**: At this level, speakers can discuss their experiences with family, familiar topics, job experience, television news, trips, and every day events.

• (S-3) **General Professional Proficiency**: At this level, speakers can engage in specialized, professional discussion, and speak to educated native speakers about social events, cultural topics, or other subjects.

• (S-4) **Advanced Professional Proficiency**: At this level, speakers are able to perform advanced tasks, such as lecturing at a professional meeting, leading different types of discussions (friendly, controversial, collaborative), and speaking without grammatical mistakes.

• (S-5) **Functionally Native Proficiency**: At this level, speakers can use a language with complete flexibility and intuition. They have a degree of language proficiency that is functionally equivalent to that of a well-educated native speaker. Their vocabulary is extensive and precise.

### 6.2.2 A sample method used for language proficiency

In November 1995, Sun Hongkai conducted a survey on the Anung language proficiency at Mugujia Village in China, which has the highest Anung population in comparison to other villages. He interviewed all of the households in the village and every person over the age of 10 years, for a total of 104 informants from 25 households. All the Anung informants were tested for their language proficiency in Anung, Lisu, and Chinese. To assess their language proficiency, Sun Hongkai devised a four-level scheme mainly based on their knowledge of vocabulary. The four levels of language proficiency are as follows: Level A - Fluent speakers, Level B - Semi-fluent speakers, Level C - Limited-fluent speakers and Level D - Non-speakers. The basic criteria for the four levels of language proficiency are described below.

**Level A - Fluent speakers**: Level A speakers are able to engage in everyday conversation. They can describe food production as well as matters pertaining to daily living. They are able to use over 3,000 words.
Level B - Semi-fluent speakers: Level B speakers can engage in everyday conversation, but not very fluently. They are able to use around 1,000 basic words. Level B speakers are better at using another language besides Anung.

Level C - Limited-fluent speakers: Level C speakers are only able to use daily greetings or a few everyday phrases. Thus, they are unable to use Anung to express themselves adequately and completely. Their Anung frequently includes words from their second language. They only use a limited number of Anung vocabulary items, and are unfamiliar with many words in the basic vocabulary. Their pronunciation of Anung is inaccurate. They are much more fluent in another language than in Anung.

Level D - Non-speakers: Level D speakers have essentially lost their mother tongue. Although some can still understand a little, they can no longer speak their mother tongue. In fact, some have completely lost their Anung.

In relation to language proficiency, the results of the data shown below are Sun Honkai’s analysis on language proficiency level for the Anung people in China. Sun’s data is based on 104 respondents. The data mentioned below is adapted from Thurgood (2006).

Table 45 Fluency rates in Anung, Lisu and Chinese adapted from Thurgood (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Anung</th>
<th>Lisu</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level A Fluent</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B Semi-fluent</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C Limited</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level D Non-speakers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62 (59.6%) of all the informants were fluent speakers of Anung (Level A). 19 (18.2%) of all the informants were semi-fluent speakers of Anung (Level B). 14 (13.4%) informants were limited-fluent speakers of Anung (Level C), and 7 (8.8%) informants are non-speakers (Level D). The data shows that many of the Anung in
Mugujia village have retained their mother tongue, but even there, Lisu was the dominant language. Sun also points that there were no fluent speakers left outside of Mugujia village.

In relation to Lisu proficiency, 96 (92.3%) informants were categorized as Level A - Fluent speakers and 8 (7.7%) informants were categorized as Level B - Semi-fluent speakers. There was no one who fell under Levels C and D. Sun mentions that Lisu proficiency was very high even in Mugujia where the majority of Anung people lived. Almost all can speak Lisu and some are better with Lisu than Anung. Furthermore, Sun says that Level B - Semi-fluent speakers in Lisu were older people who usually stayed at home.

Concerning Chinese, 13 (12.5%) informants were Level A speakers. 17 (16.3%) informants were Level B speakers. 19 (18.3%) informants were Level C speakers and 55 (52.9%) informants were Level D speakers. Sun notes that a few Anung people spoke Chinese. These were village leaders, intellectuals, or those who often went out of the village. Fluent Chinese speakers tended to be middle-aged or younger who were attending school. They did not speak standard Chinese but spoke a local Chinese dialect. Those who fell under Level D for Chinese were older people or women.

Sun mentions that Anung conversations could be heard when someone visited an Anung house in Mugujia village, but most of the time Lisu was used. In regard to their mastery of Anung, those who lived around Mugujia villages did not fall under the Level A. In fact, there were no fluent speakers of Anung left in the villages around Mugujia. In these areas, the Anung people lived with Lisu or with other ethnic groups. He estimated that there were about 280 people from around the Mugujia village area who fell under level B. Most of those falling under level B were above the age of 60. Few people from the ages of 50 and 60 could speak their mother tongue. Most of the Anung people outside of Mugujia were Level C and D speakers.

Thurgood (2006) mentions that the older Anung are the last generation to have successfully learned Anung. Sun points that, “Basically, they cannot communicate in their mother tongue. This shows that in these villages, the Anung language has basically ceased functioning as the main communication tool of the Anung people and has been totally replaced by the Lisu language” (Sun 2003).
6.2.3 Sun’s methodology and the indicators of language vitality

Sun Hongkai has done several fieldwork trips among the Anung people in China over the past 40 years to be able to determine the level of Anung language vitality or maintenance. His survey on Anung used many different sociolinguistic tools such as collecting wordlists, grammatical structures, recordings of words, sounds, as well as some texts and stories. Furthermore, he conducted group and individual interviews, and observations. Lastly, he did a sample survey on Anung for their language proficiency level. Although Sun Hongkai made a strong case for severe endangerment of Anung language in China, he did not appeal to a specific framework for measuring language vitality. Sun used many indicators that help the researcher to be able to classify what the level of Anung language vitality could be. Some indicator tools were very important to Sun for assessing language vitality or maintenance in China are described below.

1. The number of basic words used for different proficiency levels: How many vocabulary words does an Anung know and speak in Anung, Lisu, or Chinese? The more they express in their language, the higher their degree of language maintenance. Sun determined that Level A speakers should know about 3000 basic words and Level B speakers should know around 1000 basic words. Sun also determined that Level C speakers would be able to use some common greetings, and that Level D speakers would not be able to speak at all.

2. Comparison of speech community: Sun Hongkai compared Mugujia – a predominantly Anung village - to the villages around Mugujia where Anung live with other ethnic groups. He focused on Mugujia and the surrounding areas because the majority is Anung in Mugujia and it is a more remote area. Almost all the people who live in Mugujia are Anung, with only one household from the Lisu ethnic group. Many Anung people live in the other villages also but those villages have more Lisu households. The main idea of this indicator is that a remote area has less contact with other languages, thus it is a good environment for language maintenance.

3. Language proficiency: the main purpose of this indicator is to determine how many people have language competence in Anung, and to assess comparative proficiencies in different languages. For instance, how many people are fluent in Anung, Lisu, or Chinese? Sun mentions that Anung conversations can be heard
when someone visits an Anung house in Mugujia village, but most of the time the Lisu language is used. The Anung people in China mostly use Lisu. For example, even in Mugujia village, there are 69 fluent speakers in Anung, 96 fluent speakers in Lisu and 13 fluent speakers in Chinese.

4. Language used by age: among the various age groups, which groups are using the language more and which are using it less? The main objective of this indicator is to determine whether a language is used by all ages or not. If all ages use their mother tongue, it is better for language maintenance. Although he did not provide statistical data that analyzed language proficiency by age, he did observe a correlation between age and declining proficiency. Sun reports that people between the ages of 60 to 70 fell under Level B, few people from ages of 50 to 60 are could speak in Anung, and most of the younger generation fell under Levels C, and D.

5. Speakers among the ethnic population: what is the difference in population between speakers and the population in general? The main purpose of this indicator is to determine the difference between the total population of speakers and that of the general population. If the number of speakers is more, it is better for language maintenance. In 1960, there were about 4300 Anung and only about 800 (18.6%) Anung speakers who used their mother tongue. The 1994 census puts the total Anung population at 7200. 400 (5.56%) Anung speakers used their mother tongue. The actual percentage of Anung speakers decreased in number by 50%.

6.3 A comparison of the level of language proficiency
In order to assess Anung proficiency in Myanmar, the researcher adapted self-assessment methods for speaking proficiency. He selected portions of a language proficiency questionnaire developed by the Interagency Language Roundtable. Because the ILR questionnaire was designed to assess the proficiency of a speaker in a second or foreign language, the researcher reworded some questions to be better suited for the context for the Anung people in Myanmar. When the researcher compared ILR’s criteria for the language proficiency with Sun Hongkai’s criteria for the language proficiency, he found that Sun Hongkai’s scale for the levels of language proficiency was more clear. This is because Sun designed his assessment specifically to assess language proficiency in Anung (as a heritage language), Lisu (as a LWC), and Chinese (as the national language) in China. The researcher tested
his informants in Myanmar for their level of language proficiency in Anung (as a heritage language), Lisu, Rawang (as a LWC), and Burmese (as the national language), just as Sun Hongkai tested the Anung people in China. Sun used his informants’ knowledge of vocabulary as a means of assessing their level of language proficiency. For the Anung people in Myanmar, however, the researcher tested the informants by asking different question types, corresponding to the levels of language proficiency. The table below illustrates the relationship between 1) the ILR scale of language proficiency 2) the researcher’s own rubric for language proficiency among the Anung in Myanmar, and 3) Sun Hongkai’s language proficiency scale. See Table 46 A comparison of the levels of language proficiency.

### Table 46 A comparison of the levels of language proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Language proficiency</th>
<th>ILR</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Sun Hongkai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Non-speakers</td>
<td>Non-speakers</td>
<td>Non-speakers</td>
<td>Non-speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elementary-speakers</td>
<td>Elementary-speakers</td>
<td>Limited-speakers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited-working</td>
<td>Limited-fluent speakers</td>
<td>Semi-fluent speakers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>General professional</td>
<td>Semi-fluent speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Advanced professional</td>
<td>Fluent speakers</td>
<td>Fluent speakers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Functionally native speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this thesis, Anung language proficiency is delineated across five levels: Level 0 - Non-speakers, Level 1 - Elementary-speakers, Level 2 - Limited-fluent speakers, Level 3 - Semi-fluent speakers, and Level 4 - Fluent speakers. A variety of Yes/No questions were used to assess proficiency. Levels 1 and 2 tested the informants for their speaking competence, and levels 3 and 4 tested both their listening and speaking competence. The informants were tested for their competence in Anung, Burmese, Lisu and Rawang. The five levels of language proficiency are described below:
**Level 0: Non-speakers**

Level 0 informants are not able to speak in Anung, Lisu, Rawang or Burmese. Some might understand a little (e.g. “Hello, what is your name?”) but they are not able to speak.

**Level 1: Elementary-speakers**

For testing this level, the researcher used question #66 and asked, “Can you buy something in Anung/LWC?” The informants were tested to see how well they could speak in Anung, Lisu, Rawang, and Burmese when asking simple questions, greeting each other and understanding some basic words in a short sentence.

**Level 2: Limited-fluent speakers**

The researcher used the question #67 and asked, “Can you tell about your family in Anung/LWC?” Speakers at this level can give information on matters such as personal information, daily experiences or other topics. They are more fluent in another language besides the one in which they are being tested.

**Level 3: Semi-fluent speakers**

For this level, the researcher used two types of questions based on their listening and speaking proficiency. The researcher used the following:

- Question #68: “Could you use [Anung/LWC] explain to a [Anung/LWC] speaker how to do your job?”
- Question #69: “If you overhear two Anung people speaking Anung in the market can you describe in Anung/LWC what you heard?”
- Question #70: “If you overhear two Lisu people speaking Lisu in the market, can you describe in [Anung/LWC] what you heard?”
- Question #71: “If you overhear two Rawang people speaking Rawang in the market can you describe in [Anung/LWC] what you heard?”

Question #68 tested the informant’s ability to explain about how to do a job to someone in Anung/LWC. Questions #69-71 tested both listening and speaking competence at level 3. For example, Question #69 tested listening comprehension in Anung, but speaking competence in all four languages. Question #70 tested speaking competence in all four languages, but listening comprehension in Lisu. Question #71 also tested speaking competence in all four languages, but listening comprehension in Rawang. There was no question for listening competence in
Burmese because the majority people use Rawang and Lisu public places. This level tested the informant's ability to reproduce what they have heard from other people.

**Level 4: Fluent speakers**

The informants were assigned to Level 4 based on their responses to two types of questions that measured their listening and speaking competence. The researcher used the following questions:

- **Question #72:** “If you go to a funeral conducted in [Lisu] can you describe in [Lisu] what you heard?”
- **Question #73:** “If you go to a funeral conducted in [Rawang] can you describe in [Rawang] what you heard?
- **Question #74:** If you go to a church meeting and they are speaking in [Lisu] can you explain it in [Anung/LWC]?
- **Question #75:** If you go to a church meeting and they are speaking in [Rawang] can you explain it in [Anung/LWC]?

Questions #72 and #73 tested the informants for their listening proficiency in Lisu and Rawang at funeral service and then tested them for their speaking proficiency in Lisu and Rawang. Questions #73, #74, and #75 tested the informants for their listening skill in Lisu and Rawang in a church meeting, and speaking skill in Anung, Burmese, Lisu, and Rawang. There is no question for listening competence in Anung and Burmese because these two languages are not used in church. The questions asked the informants how well they understand at church or at funeral services and how well they are able to reproduce what they have heard from someone in church and at funeral service.

All the respondents said “Yes” to question #72 “If you go to a funeral conducted in [Lisu] can you describe in [Anung/LWC] what you heard?” They also responded in the affirmative to question #74 “If you go to a church meeting and they are speaking in [Lisu] can you explain it in [Anung/LWC]? These two questions are aimed at Level 4: Fluent speakers. Their responses show that their ability in Lisu for listening and speaking is very high. Therefore, to be able to determine the speaking proficiency for Anung, Rawang or Burmese, the researcher tested for Level 1 by question #66, Level 2 with question #67, Level 3 with question #68 and 70, and Level 4 with questions #72 and 74 in this thesis.
6.4 Language proficiency by age

For the Anung people in Myanmar, the researcher interviewed 105 informants from three age groups. The first group consisted of people under the age of 20. The second group consisted of people between the ages of 35 and 50. The third group consisted of people above the age of 50. 36 informants were under the age of 20, 35 informants were between the ages of 35 and 50, and 34 informants for were above the age of 50. The analysis of the proficiency for each group is mentioned below.

6.4.1 Above the age of 50

34 informants (100%) in this category reported speaking Lisu at Level 4. Anung claimed the second highest number of Level 4 speakers with 26 (76%). Rawang takes third place, followed by Burmese.

Few speakers qualified as Level 3: Semi-fluent speakers. Less than 6% were Level 2: Limited-fluent speakers of Anung, Rawang and Burmese. Level 1: Elementary-fluent speakers accounted for less than 15% of all informants. For Level 0: Non-fluent speakers, Burmese was the highest with 19 (56%). Rawang and Anung followed. For Lisu, no one fell into Levels 0 to 3. See Table 47 Language proficiency for above age of 50.

Table 47 Language proficiency for above age of 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Level (4)</th>
<th>Level (3)</th>
<th>Level (2)</th>
<th>Level (1)</th>
<th>Level (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fluent speaker</td>
<td>Semi-fluent speaker</td>
<td>Limited-fluent speaker</td>
<td>Elementary-fluent speaker</td>
<td>Non-fluent speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anung</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26 (76%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>19 (56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisu</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawang</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20 (59%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data, the percentage of Anung proficiency is 76%. Burmese proficiency is 29% Lisu is 100%, and Rawang proficiency is 59%. The percent with Level 4 proficiency in Lisu is the highest. Among older people, there are relatively few who are Level 4 speakers of Burmese, and generally, their proficiency with Anung, Lisu and Rawang is much higher. This may have to do with the fact that
most Anung above the age of 50 have not attended school. Most of them are illiterate. They rarely go out of the village or travel to other places. Even when they go out of the village, they use Lisu to communicate. As a result, most of them cannot speak Burmese well. A few older people who retired from government jobs can speak well. 76% of informants describe themselves as Level 4: Fluent speakers. It seems that most of the older people are retaining their mother tongue. Some older people, however, do not see themselves as being nearly so proficient; the data shows that the 12% of informants identify themselves as Level 0: Non-speakers, 3% identify as Level 1: Elementary-speakers, 3% as Level 2 - Limited speakers and another 6% identify as Level 3: Semi-fluent speakers. This shows that not all older generation are fluent speakers of Anung. On the other hand, all the older generation are Level 4: Fluent speakers of Lisu. No one falls under Levels 0 to 3. It shows that Lisu use is higher than Anung, Burmese and Rawang. Rawang proficiency is higher than Burmese proficiency. In fact, Rawang is a local language and older people often have social contact with Rawang when there are religious festivals, meetings or marriages. To sum up, for those above the age of 50, the Anung are most proficient in Lisu. Anung is the second most spoken language, followed by Rawang then Burmese. See Figure 14 Language proficiency for above the age of 50.

![Figure 14 Language proficiency for above the age of 50](image-url)
6.4.2 Between the ages of 35 and 50

According to the data, the Anung are most proficient in Lisu with 35 (100%) informants identifying themselves as Level 4: Fluent speakers. Burmese has the second highest number of Level 4 speakers with 24 (67%). Burmese is followed by Anung with 18 (51%) fluent speakers, followed by Rawang. No one falls into Levels 0 to 3 for Lisu. Less than 9% of the informants rate themselves as Level 3: Semi-fluent speakers of Anung, Burmese and Rawang.

17% of informants identified themselves as Level 2: Limited-fluent speakers of Anung, and less than 9% of informants identified as Level 2 speakers of Burmese and Rawang. Less than 9% of the participants identified themselves as Level 1 speakers of Anung and Rawang. 14 (40%) participants identified themselves as Level 0: Non-fluent speakers of Rawang, while 7 (20%) put themselves at that same level of Anung proficiency. See Table 48 Language proficiency for between age of 35 and 50.

Table 48 Language proficiency for between age of 35 and 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Level (4)</th>
<th>Level (3)</th>
<th>Level (2)</th>
<th>Level (1)</th>
<th>Level (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fluent speaker</td>
<td>Semi-fluent speaker</td>
<td>Limited-fluent speaker</td>
<td>Elementary-fluent speaker</td>
<td>Non-fluent speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anung</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18 (51%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>6 (17%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>7 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24 (67%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisu</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawang</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16 (46%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>14 (40%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data, the degree of proficiency in Anung and Rawang for this age group is slightly different from the degree of proficiency in Anung and Rawang for those above the age of 50. In comparison to speakers above the age of 50, there are fewer Level 4 speakers among subjects between the ages of 35 and 50. In addition, there are more Level 4 speakers of Burmese in this generation, compared to people above age of 50. The data shows that within this generation, Level 4 proficiency in Anung is 51%, 67% for Burmese, 100% for Lisu, and 46% for Rawang. Some subjects from the middle-aged generation are still Level 3 or under for Anung, Burmese, and Rawang. No one, however, falls into Levels 0 to 3 in terms of Lisu proficiency; 100% of subjects self-identified as being Level 4 speakers. Fluency rates
are highest for Lisu, followed in order by Burmese, Anung, and Rawang. The middle-aged group does seem to be retaining their ability to speak Anung, but their proficiency in Lisu and Burmese is higher. This may have to do with the fact that the middle-aged generation has more contact with other ethnic groups. They often travel away from their villages to hunt, do business, and make money in other places. Consequently, they get more opportunity to communicate with other ethnic groups and use Burmese rather than Anung or Rawang. Furthermore, because most of them have attended school, their proficiency in Burmese is higher than Anung. Overall, the data shows that within this generation, Lisu proficiency is highest, followed in order by Burmese, Anung, and Rawang. See Figure 15 Language proficiency for between the ages of 35 and 50.

![Figure 15 Language proficiency for between the ages of 35 and 50](image)

**6.4.3 Under the age of 20**

In this generation, the data shows that Anung proficiency is lower than Lisu and Burmese. 28% of subjects identify themselves as Level 4 speakers of Anung. Most people of the younger generation, however, are still under Level 3. This indicates that most of the younger generation have lost Anung proficiency. Most of them do not have strong enough language skills to use their mother tongue. They are more fluent speakers in other languages like Lisu and Burmese than in Anung. 83% of participants identify themselves as Level 4 speakers of Burmese, though a few younger people are Level 3 or below. This shows that many Anung youth speak Burmese with better fluency than Anung. This may be due to the fact that most of young Anung have attended school. The younger generation uses Burmese with
friends or other ethnic groups as a common language but 100% of the subjects in this generation also identify themselves as Level 4 speakers of Lisu. 75% of the subjects identified themselves as being Level 0 non-speakers of Rawang, which shows that proficiency in Rawang is very weak. See Table 49 Language proficiency for under age of 20.

Table 49 Language proficiency for under age of 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Level (4)</th>
<th>Level (3)</th>
<th>Level (2)</th>
<th>Level (1)</th>
<th>Level (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fluent speaker</td>
<td>Semi-fluent speaker</td>
<td>Limited-fluent speaker</td>
<td>Elementary-fluent speaker</td>
<td>Non-fluent speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anung</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10 (28%)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
<td>5 (14%)</td>
<td>9 (25%)</td>
<td>11 (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30 (83%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisu</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawang</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6 (17%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
<td>27 (75%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to Anung proficiency, some of those among the younger generation are Level 4 fluent speakers. But most of them fall into Levels 0 to 2. Regarding Burmese proficiency, most of the younger Anung subjects are fluent speakers but a few are Level 2 or under. The data shows that Burmese proficiency is higher than Anung in proficiency. Most people of this generation are Level 0: Non-fluent speakers for Rawang. In fact, Lisu is the dominant language of the younger generation. Burmese is an official language and taught as language of instruction at every school in Myanmar. Since they live with the Lisu, the younger generation of Anung rarely uses Rawang. Instead, most of them use Burmese or Lisu with other ethnic groups. Consequently, Lisu proficiency is highest, followed in order by Burmese, Anung, and Rawang. See Figure 16 Language proficiency for under age of 20.
According to above analysis, Anung under the age of 20 are most proficient in Lisu, followed in order by Burmese. However, the middle-aged generation is more proficient in Anung and Rawang than the younger generation. 28% of Anung youth identified themselves as Level 4 speakers of Anung, but 51% of the middle generation claimed the same level of proficiency. Regarding Burmese proficiency, 83% of younger generation subjects claim Level 4 fluency, and 67% of middle generation subjects do. The younger generation often uses Burmese with friends from other ethnic groups when they meet each other at school or elsewhere. The data shows the proficiency in Burmese for both younger and middle generations is higher than their proficiency in Anung and Rawang.

With 100% of subjects reporting Level 4 fluency, Lisu proficiency for the younger and middle generations is much higher than Anung, Burmese, and Rawang. The Lisu proficiency is the highest because Lisu is the dominant language among the Anung people and they all understand it. Middle generation subjects report having greater proficiency in Rawang than their younger counterparts do. In general, for the younger and middle generations, Lisu proficiency is highest, followed in order by Burmese, Anung and Rawang.

For those above of the age of 50, the status of Anung proficient is different from that of the younger and middle generations. Their proficiency with Anung is higher than their proficiency in Burmese and Rawang. 76% of older generation Anung identify themselves as Level 4 speakers, which is much higher than the reported proficiency of younger and middle generation Anung. It seems that the older generation is
retaining their mother tongue. Some of them, however, are at Level 3 or under, and 4 (17%) reported being Level 0 non-speakers of Anung. Burmese proficiency among older generation subjects is quite different from the level of proficiency among the younger and middle generations. Only 29% of the older generation describe themselves as fluent speakers. Most Anung older generation did not attend school and rarely go out of the village. For a long time, they have had frequent social contact with the Rawang who live in the surrounding villages. They often had religious festivals with Rawang people. For that reason, their Rawang proficiency is higher. However, even for the older generation, Lisu proficiency levels are highest, followed in order by Anung, Rawang, and Burmese.

In conclusion, subjects above the age of 50, are very proficient in Anung but even so, some older generation are not fluent. For the most part, the older generation seems to be retaining their mother tongue however; even their proficiency in Lisu is generally higher than their Anung proficiency. Therefore, their proficiency in Anung takes second place to Lisu, followed in order by Rawang and Burmese.

The younger and middle generations are most proficient in Lisu, followed in order by Burmese, Anung and Rawang. Their Anung proficiency is relatively low, and across all three generations, Lisu proficiency is higher than any other language. Anung proficiency of the younger generations is lower than the proficiency of the older generation. The data shows an inverse relationship between age and proficiency: the younger the speaker, the less likely that he or she will be proficient in Anung. However, Lisu proficiency is the highest for the younger, middle and older generations.

### 6.5 Best language of comprehension

Sun Hongkai mentions that Lisu is the main tool for communication among the Anung in China. They often use Lisu in their daily lives. Lisu is, in fact, the best-understood language for them. They use Lisu as a common language in the family and in the community. Their understanding of Lisu is higher than Anung and Chinese.

For the Anung in Myanmar, the researcher used question #78, #78 (a), #78 (b), and #78 (c) and asked, “Of all the languages you understand, which language do you understand the best, the second best or the third best?” This type of question tries to find out which language is the most dominant for the Anung. The data is analyzed
for three age groups: (1) under the age of 20, (2) between the ages of 35 and 50, and (3) above the age of 50. The level of a person’s language proficiency is based on how much a person understands of a language. A subject’s response to questions regarding language understanding may indicate their level of language proficiency. The data analysis of each group is given below.

6.5.1 Under age of 20
To assess language understanding, the researcher used question #78 and asked, “Of all the languages you understand, which language do you understand the best or the second best or the third best?” 8 out of 36 informants reported understanding Anung/Lisu the best, 27 informants chose Lisu, and only one reported Lisu in combination with Burmese. This shows that the younger Anung understand Lisu the best.

28 out of 36 respondents chose Burmese as their second-best language for comprehension. A few younger generation subjects reported Anung, Anung/Rawang, Burmese/Rawang, or Rawang. Only 2 respondents did not name the second best language for understanding; these, however, ranked Anung in combination with Lisu as the languages they understood best. These two respondents are bilingual and rank their level of understanding as equal in the two languages.

For the third-best language in terms of understanding, 7 out of 36 respondents said Anung, 3 respondents said Anung/Rawang, 2 respondents chose Burmese, and 4 respondents chose Rawang. 20 respondents did not name the third best language for understanding. None of the respondents reported being monolingual. Some of them reported being bilingual in Burmese and Lisu or Anung/Lisu and 4 out of 20 reported being multilingual.
Table 50 Language understanding for subjects under the age of 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>36 subjects for Language understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The best</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second best</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The third best</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One significant observation is that no one named Lisu as their second or third-best language in terms of comprehension. Most respondents named Lisu as the language they understood best, and some named Anung in combination with Lisu or Lisu/Burmese. The number of subjects choosing Lisu, however, is the highest. 8 out of 36 respondents said they best understood Anung in combination with Lisu. 1 out of 36 respondents chose Burmese in combination with Lisu as the best language for understanding.

This shows that Lisu is the most preferred language in terms of understanding. 28 respondents named Burmese is the second best language for understanding, and only a few people named Anung, Anung/Rawang, Anung/Lisu, or Burmese/Rawang. This shows that Burmese is the most common choice as the second-best language in terms of understanding. 20 respondents did not name a third-best language for understanding. Most respondents named their first and second-best languages for understanding, whereas relatively few of them mentioned a third-best language.

Also of note is the fact that no one in this age group reported Burmese and Rawang as the best for understanding. Some respondents ranked Anung as their best language for understanding in combination with Lisu, however, most of ranked Anung as either the second or third-best language for understanding. For the second-best language, the number of respondents choosing Burmese is higher relative to the number choosing Anung and Rawang. Beyond any doubt, the language with the best degree of understanding is Lisu, followed by Burmese and Anung for the younger generations. See Table 50 Language understanding for subjects under the age of 20.
### 6.5.2 Between the ages of 35 and 50

The researcher used the question #78 and asked, “Of all the languages you understand, which language do you understand the best or the second best or the third best?” 8 out of 35 middle generation respondents reported that Anung/Lisu is the best language for understanding. 25 respondents chose Lisu and only two respondents chose Lisu/Rawang. No one named Burmese or Rawang as the best language for understanding. For the second-best language for understanding, 15 out of 35 respondents reported Burmese, 6 respondents chose Anung and a few informants chose Anung/Burmese, Burmese/Rawang or Rawang. No one named Lisu as the second-best language for understanding. 3 respondents did not answer the question regarding the second-best language for understanding. These respondents are monolinguals in Lisu, so they only named Lisu as the best language for understanding. For the third-best language for understanding, 22 respondents declined to name a language. These respondents are not monolingual. They are bilinguals or multilingual. No one named Lisu as the third-best language for language understanding. 3 out of 35 respondents said that for them, the third best language for understanding is Anung. 2 respondents chose Anung/Rawang, 4 respondents chose Burmese, 2 respondents chose Burmese/Rawang, and 2 respondents chose Rawang and their third-best language for understanding.

#### Table 51 Language understanding for between age of 35 and 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>35 subjects for Language understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The best</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second best</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The third best</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data, Anung/Lisu, Lisu, and Lisu/Rawang are the best languages for understanding. Lisu ranks the highest. Anung, Anung/Burmese, Burmese, Burmese/Rawang, and Rawang were chosen as the second best languages for understanding. With 15 respondents choosing Burmese, however, it is seen that Burmese is the most preferred choice for the second-best language for understanding. Some respondents also chose a third-best language for understanding.
No one ranked Burmese and Rawang as their best language for understanding. Some ranked Anung is the best language for understanding, but only in combination with Lisu. Most of them rank Anung as the second or third-best language. It shows that the number of Anung is still lower for the language understanding.

In summary, in terms of languages for comprehension, Lisu is first, followed by Burmese, Anung, and then Rawang. See Table 51 Language understanding for between age of 35 and 50.

6.5.3 Above the age of 50

The researcher used question #78 and asked, “Of all the languages you understand, which language do you understand the best or the second-best or the third-best?” No one chose Burmese or Rawang as their best language for understanding. 15 out of 34 respondents said that Anung and Lisu were the best languages for understanding. Only one respondent chose Anung, and 18 respondents chose Lisu. Lisu was the language most frequently chosen as the most-understood language. For the second best language for understanding, 8 out of 34 respondents reported Anung, 6 respondents chose Burmese and 12 respondents chose Rawang. One respondent chose Anung/Rawang as their second best language for understanding, one respondent chose Burmese/Rawang, and one respondent chose Lisu. 5 respondents declined to name the second best language for understanding. Rawang was the most commonly chosen language in terms of the second-best language for understanding. For the third-best language of understanding, no one chose Lisu. 17 respondents did not name their third best language for understanding.

Table 52 Best language for understanding for subjects above age of 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>34 subjects for Language understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The best</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second best</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The third best</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lisu and code-mixing between Anung/Lisu seem to be the best languages for the older generation in terms of comprehension. 15 respondents ranked Anung/Lisu
equally. Only one respondent named Anung as the best language for comprehension. No one in this generation chose Burmese or Rawang as the best language for understanding.

For the second-best language, 12 respondents chose Rawang and only one respondent chose Burmese in combination with Rawang. Some respondents chose Anung, Burmese, and Lisu as their second-best language for understanding. However, the number who chose Rawang is highest. For the third-best language for understanding, respondents chose Anung, Burmese, and Rawang, but did not choose Lisu. Overall, the data shows that Lisu is ranked highest, Anung in combination with Lisu is ranked second, Rawang is third and Burmese is fourth in terms of language understanding. See Table 52 Best language for understanding for subjects above age of 50.

In summary, the younger and middle generations are very similar for the level of language understanding for Anung, Burmese, Lisu and Rawang. Lisu and Anung are the best for them, but the number who better understand Lisu is higher than that of Anung. Most of them rank Anung as second or third in terms of understanding. No one chose Lisu as a second or third-best language for understanding. For the younger and middle generations, most selected Lisu, followed by Burmese, Anung, and then Rawang.

For the older generation, Lisu and Anung/Lisu are the best languages for understanding; the number preferring Lisu and the number preferring Anung/Lisu are quite similar. In this age group, more chose Rawang as their second-best language of understanding than in the other two groups. The data shows that even in this generation, most subjects chose Lisu as their best language for understanding, followed by Anung in combination with Lisu, then Rawang, and finally Burmese.

Most of those who did not choose a third best language for understanding are bilingual. Three subjects from the younger generation and two subjects from the older generation declined to state their second-best language for comprehension; these subjects were all monolingual in Lisu. Most of the younger and middle generations are bilingual in Burmese and Lisu whereas most of the older generation are bilingual in Anung and Lisu. Overall, for all three age groups, Lisu is ranked as the best language for understanding.
6.6 Best language of production
For this section, the researcher used questions #79, #79(a), #79(b), and #79(c) and asked, “Of all of the languages you speak, which language do you speak the best, the second best or the third best?” Speaking is a central component of language proficiency. Three age groups were asked to tell about the three languages they spoke best. As in the previous sections, the data is analyzed by generation.

6.6.1 Under age of 20
The researcher used question #79 and asked, “Of all of the languages you speak, which language do you speak the best, the second best or the third best?” 8 out of 36 respondents said that they are the best at Anung in combination with Lisu. Only one reported being most proficient in Lisu/Burmese. 27 out of 36 respondents said that they are best at speaking Lisu. For the second best language for speaking, 2 out of 36 respondents chose Anung, 2 respondents chose Anung/Rawang, 29 respondents chose Burmese, and only one chose Rawang. Two respondents declined to choose their second best language for speaking. For their third-best spoken language, 6 out of 36 respondents said Anung, 3 respondents chose Anung/Rawang, 2 respondents chose with Burmese, and 5 others chose Rawang. 20 informants did not choose a third best language.

Table 53 Preferred spoken language for subjects under the age of 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>36 subjects for Language speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The best</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second best</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The third best</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People chose from a variety of languages in choosing their best spoken language, however, the number choosing Lisu was highest. 36 respondents ranked Lisu (in one form or another) as their best language for speaking. No respondent reported Rawang and only one chose Burmese in combination with Lisu. For the second best spoken language, more people chose Burmese than Anung and Lisu. 29 respondents rank Burmese as their second-best spoken language whereas a few respondents
chose Anung and Rawang. Two respondents did not name a second best language for speaking. These two are bilingual in Anung/Lisu. For the third-best spoken language, the number choosing Anung is higher than the number choosing Burmese and Rawang. 20 informants declined to name their third-best spoken language. They are not monolinguals. Most of them chose Burmese as their second-best language and Lisu as their first best. Overall, the number choosing Lisu as their best spoken language is the highest, followed in order by Burmese, then Anung, and then Rawang.

6.6.2 Between the ages of 35 and 50

The researcher used question #79 and asked, “Of all of the languages you speak, which language do you speak the best, the second best or the third best?” 26 out of 35 respondents chose Lisu. Only one respondent chose Anung, while 7 respondents chose Anung/Lisu, and one respondent chose Lisu/Rawang.

For their second-best spoken language, 6 out of 35 respondents said Anung, 2 respondents chose Anung/Burmese, 15 respondents chose Burmese, and 4 respondents chose Burmese/Rawang. Only one respondent chose Lisu, and 4 respondents chose Rawang. 3 respondents declined to name their second-best spoken language. For their third-best spoken language, 3 out of 35 respondents said Anung, 2 respondents said Anung/Rawang, 5 respondents said Burmese, 3 respondents said Burmese/Rawang, and only one respondent said Rawang. 21 respondents declined to name their third-best spoken language.

Table 54 Preferred spoken language for subjects between the ages of 35 and 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>35 subjects for Language speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The best</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second best</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The third best</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data, Lisu and Anung/Lisu are the best spoken languages in this age group, though the majority of respondents rank Lisu as the best language for speaking. No one names Burmese as their best spoken language and only one chose Rawang in combination with Lisu. This shows that Lisu is the most preferred
language for speaking. Some respondents chose Anung as their best spoken language, but most chose Anung as second- and third-best. For the second-best speaking, only one respondent reported Lisu. Some chose Anung and Burmese as their second-best spoken language, however, the number choosing Burmese is higher than the number choosing Anung and Rawang. 3 respondents did not name a second-best language for speaking. They chose only Lisu as their best spoken language. It seems that these respondents are monolingual in Lisu.

The most preferred second language was Burmese. No one chose Lisu for as their third-best spoken language. Some respondents chose Anung, Burmese, and Rawang however, 21 of them did not name a third-best language.

Most of the respondents chose Lisu as their best spoken language and Burmese as their second-best spoken language. Some of them rank Lisu for the first and Anung for the second-best speaking. It seems that some respondents are bilingual in Lisu/Burmese or Lisu/Anung. Some of them are multilingual. Overall, most respondents chose Lisu as their best first language and Burmese as their best second language. Anung and Rawang trail behind in terms of speaking competency.

6.6.3 Above the age of 50
The researcher used question #79 with respondents above the age of 50. Only one out of 34 respondents said Anung was their preferred language for speaking. 15 respondents chose Anung/Lisu and 18 respondents chose Lisu. All respondents chose either Anung or Anung/Lisu, or Lisu. The number choosing Lisu as their best spoken language was higher than the number choosing Anung. No respondents chose Burmese or Rawang.

For their second-best spoken language, 8 out of 34 respondents chose Anung. Only one chose Anung/Rawang. 6 respondents chose Burmese and only one respondent chose Burmese/Rawang. One respondent chose Lisu and 12 respondents chose Rawang. 5 informants did not name a second-best language for speaking. Two of these respondents were monolingual in Lisu and 3 respondents were bilingual in Anung/Lisu.

For their third-best spoken language, 3 respondents chose Anung. Only one respondent chose Anung/Burmese and one respondent chose Anung/Rawang. 5 respondents chose Burmese and 6 respondents with Rawang but only one
respondent with Burmese/Rawang. 17 informants did not name a third best language for speaking. These respondents are bilingual or multilingual.

Table 55 Language speaking for subjects above the age of 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>34 subjects for Language speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The best</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second best</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The third best</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the data, no one in this age group chose Burmese and Rawang as their best spoken language. 15 respondents chose Anung in combination with Lisu as their best spoken language. The number choosing Lisu, however, is higher than the number choosing Anung. The number who chose Anung in combination with Lisu as their best spoken language is still higher than the number who chose Anung as a second- or third-best language. Most of the respondents named Anung in combination with Lisu as their best language for speaking. Some of the respondents named Anung as their second- or third-best spoken language. Only one ranked Lisu as second best for speaking. Some respondents chose Anung, Rawang, and Burmese as their second-best spoken languages. The number who chose Rawang, however, is higher than the number choosing Anung and Rawang. No one named Lisu as their third-best language for speaking. Some respondents, however, did choose Anung, Rawang, and Burmese as their third-best language for speaking.

In conclusion, Anung and Lisu are the best languages for speaking in the older generation. The number preferring Lisu, however, is higher than Anung. For younger and middle generations, all respondents ranked Lisu as the best language for speaking, and almost all older people did the same except one who chose Anung. Some chose Anung in combination with Lisu as the best for speaking. This shows that across generations, most Anung speak Lisu the best. For the younger and middle generations, the number who chose Anung as their best language is lower than the number who sees Anung as a second- or third-best choice. Therefore, Lisu is the most dominant language for speaking, Burmese is the most frequent second-best language, and Anung is the most frequent third-best language.
For the older generation, the number who prefers Anung is higher than the number who views Anung as a second- or third-best language of speaking ability. 15 out of 34 respondents chose Anung in combination with Lisu as their best spoken language. For the younger generation, 8 out of 36 respondents chose Anung in combination with Lisu as their best spoken language. 7 out of 35 middle generation informants did likewise. It seems that the older generation demonstrates a more stable bilingualism in Anung/Lisu but the younger and middle generations have fewer such people. This may have to do with the fact that the younger and middle generations were the first to receive instruction in Burmese at school in this area. Sun’s data does not indicate stable bilingualism in China. Some respondents chose Anung, Rawang, and Burmese as their second-best spoken language. But among the younger and middle generations, the number choosing Burmese is higher than the number choosing Anung and Rawang.

For those above the age of 50, Lisu and Anung in combination with Lisu are most preferred for speaking. The situation regarding the second-best language for speaking, however, is different from the younger and middle generations. The second-best spoken language is Burmese for the younger and middle generations. But the second-best spoken language is Rawang for the older generation. So the situation regarding language understanding and speaking is very similar. For the younger and middle generations, they speak and understand Lisu the best, followed in order by Burmese, Anung and Rawang. For the older generation, they speak and understand Lisu best, followed in order by Anung, Rawang and Burmese.

6.7 Comparisons with Sun Hongkai’s proficiency data
Sun Hongkai interviewed 104 informants from 25 households, living in Mugujia village, where almost all people are Anung. He tested the informants for their level of language proficiency in Anung, Lisu, and Chinese. He created a 4-level rubric by which to grade his informants - Level A: Fluent speakers, Level B: Semi-fluent speakers, Level C: Limited-fluent speakers, and Level D: Non-speakers. Sun’s data for language fluency rates is shown below.
Table 56 Fluency rates in Anung, Lisu and Chinese adapted from Thurgood (2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Level</th>
<th>Anung</th>
<th>Lisu</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level A: Fluent</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B: Semi-fluent</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C: Limited</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level D: Non-speakers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sun did not show a separate table that represents the level of language proficiency for each age group. He shows a chart that represents levels of language proficiency for all different ages. See Table 56 Fluency rates in Anung, Lisu and Chinese adapted from Thurgood (2006). According to his data, 62 (59.6%) out of 104 respondents are fluent speakers in Anung. 19 (18.2%) are level B: Semi-speakers, 14 (13.4%) are level C: Limited-speakers, and 7 (6.7%) are level D: Non-speakers.

Sun concludes that Anung in China seem to be retaining their mother tongue based on Anung proficiency. But their Anung proficiency is lower in comparison to their Lisu proficiency. He reports that 96 (92.3%) out of 104 respondents are level A: Fluent speakers of Lisu, 8 (7.7%) respondents are Level B: Semi-fluent speakers. None of Sun’s informants were Level C or Level D in their Lisu proficiency. Their second-language proficiency in Lisu is higher than their mother tongue proficiency in Anung even in an area where the population of Anung is higher than in other places. Sun mentions that almost all can speak Lisu well. This shows that Lisu use is stronger than Anung.

In relation to Chinese proficiency, 13 (12.5%) of Sun’s subjects were Level A: Fluent speakers, 17 (16.3%) were Level B: Semi-fluent speakers, 19 (18.3%) were Level C: Limited-fluent speakers, and 55 (52.9%) were Level D: Non-speakers. The percentage of fluent Chinese speakers is much lower than Anung or Lisu. Those who rank the Level A: Fluent speakers were typically village leaders, educated people or
those who often travelled outside the village. Young people who attend a primary school were usually semi-fluent speakers. Those who did not speak Chinese tended to be the older people who never go out of the village.

The villages that are located around Mugujia village use Anung but the use of Lisu is higher than the use of Anung because Anung live in mixed communities with Lisu and other ethnic groups. Sun mentions that none of the speakers living around Mugujia were Level A speakers of Anung. Some of them were Level B speakers, but most of these are 60 years of age or older. Most of the Anung people outside of Mugujia were Level C: Limited-fluent speakers or Level D: Non-speakers. Sun states, “Anung has lost its function as the means of communication in those villages, having been completely supplanted by Lisu” (Sun 2009:12). It seems that the loss of Anung is very serious in China. To summarize, Sun observes that proficiency in Lisu is higher than in Anung. Most of the Anung in China speak Lisu better than Anung, and most cannot communicate in their mother tongue. Anung use has largely ceased and has been mostly supplanted by Lisu.

Some of the patterns described for China hold true for Myanmar as well. According to the data, the Anung in China are most proficient in Lisu, followed by Anung and then Chinese. For the Anung in Myanmar, the researcher’s data shows that proficiency in Lisu is higher than the proficiency in Anung and other languages such as Rawang and Burmese. Therefore, both the Anung in China and the Anung in Myanmar are most proficient in Lisu. In China, proficiency in Anung was better than proficiency in the national language. But in Myanmar, the data shows that overall proficiency in Burmese is second to Lisu, followed by Anung and then Rawang. The data of language proficiency for 105 respondents in Myanmar are given below.
Table 57 Proficiency rates in Anung, Burmese, Lisu and Rawang for Anung in Myanmar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Anung</th>
<th></th>
<th>Burmese</th>
<th></th>
<th>Lisu</th>
<th></th>
<th>Rawang</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.4: Fluent speakers</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.3: Semi-fluent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.2: Limited speakers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.1: Elementary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.0: Non-speakers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are significant differences between the two studies that affect interpretations of the proficiency data. First, Sun Hongkai’s 104 respondents were all from one village—the only village where he found fluent speakers of Anung. This means that the proficiency percentages are not representative to the rest of the population of ethnic Anung in China. On the other hand, the Myanmar data is drawn from 6 sites where Anung live. Thus, the data from Myanmar is more generalizeable to the population of ethnic Anung within the country.

Secondly, five of the sites in Myanmar are characterized by a much higher level of development than Sun’s research site in Mugujia. Putao is one of the district capitals in Kachin state, Myanmar. The researcher estimates the population in Putao is about 10,000. Putao is characterized by its large plains. There are many different ethnic groups such as Lisu, Rawang, Jingphaw, and Burmese living in the Putao area. The Burmese language is used in public communication since it is the national language. Therefore, it is a language of wider communication among the people of Myanmar and is used as a tool of communication among the various ethnic groups within Myanmar. In comparison, the situation of Mugujia area in China is different from Putao. The population of Mugujia is smaller than the population of the Putao area. Mugujia is situated in a mountainous area. Most of the people who live this area are Lisu and Anung. Probably, Lisu is used as a LWC for public functions or communications.
6.8 Conclusion

This chapter presents proficiency levels in the relevant languages across generations. It provides a picture of the overall proficiency in Anung and allows proficiency in Anung to be compared with other languages in the Anung people’s repertoire. In addition, it compares proficiency data from Myanmar with the data that has been previously published about Anung in China.

This concluding section applies the proficiency data to the EGIDS framework in an effort to evaluate the level of language vitality for Anung in China. It answers Lewis and Simons’ question #5 “What is the youngest generation that has at least some proficient speakers?” The researcher tested three age groups: under the age of 21 (younger generation), between the ages of 35 and 50 (middle generation), and above age of 50 (older generation). See 6.4.1: Above the age of 50, 6.4.2: Between the ages of 35 and 50, and 6.4.3: Under the age of 20 for proficiency in Anung. For the younger generation, 10 (26%) out of 36 self-identify as fluent speakers of Anung. For the middle generation, 18 (51%) out of 35 self-identify as fluent speakers of Anung. For the older generation, 26 (76%) out of 34 self-identify as fluent speakers of Anung. Anung proficiency across generations is declining. The overall, Anung language proficiency across generations looks more like a situation of ‘shift’ to the more dominant language of Lisu. Anung is second to Lisu for all generations. The data shows that the younger the speaker is, the weaker his or her proficiency in Anung. However, what is primarily in focus for EGIDS is not the level of any individual’s proficiency. This chapter tries to identify the youngest generation that has some speakers who are fully proficient.

What is the youngest of generation that has at least some speakers with full proficiency? The percentage of Anung proficiency for younger generation is 26%. The percentage of Anung proficiency for middle generation is 51% and the percentage of Anung proficiency for older generation is 76%. It shows that all three of these age groups have at least some proficient speakers. Moreover, the data clearly shows that the youngest of generation of Anung in Myanmar has at least some proficiency. To be able to more precisely determine the level of language vitality, specific questions need to be asked. There are four possible answers to Key Question #5, which are Level 6b, 7, 8a, and 8b. Simons and Lewis defined the levels of 6b, 7, 8a, and 8b are mentioned below.
(I) **Level 6b (Threatened):** The language is still used orally within all generations but there is a significant threat to sustainability, particularly a break in transmission to the next generation by a significant portion of the childbearing generation. For the language, the youngest proficient speakers are the children. Language shift is just beginning.

(II) **Level 7 (Shifting):** The child-bearing generation can use the language among themselves but they do not transmit it to their children. For the language, the youngest proficient speakers are of the adults of childbearing age. Language shift is in progress.

(III) **Level 8a (Moribund):** The only remaining active speakers of the language are members of the grandparent generation. For the language, the youngest proficient speakers are of the grandparent generation. Language shift is already advanced.

(IV) **Level 8b (Nearly extinct):** The only remaining speakers of the language are elderly and have little opportunity to use the language. For the language, the youngest proficient speakers are of the great grandparent generation. Language shift has been ongoing for a long time.

The data clearly shows that Anung is used in the home domain in some families. The Khin pang area is a good example for language use, where the use of Anung is higher than the use of Lisu inside and outside the home. Language maintenance in Khin pang is higher than in other areas. Most of the families use Anung at home with family members. Overall, the language transmission across generations has been disrupted. However, this does not mean that Anung language transmission across generations has ceased completely. Most of the parents are not transmitting the language to their children but some still are and the data clearly shows that some members of all three generations use Anung. So, in answer to Lewis and Simons’ key questions #5, it is seen that at least in part, the younger generation is still using Anung. Therefore, the vitality of Anung in Myanmar could be considered level 6b (Threatened) on the EGIDS scale. However, the language proficiency across generations is declining. This shows that Anung is shifting. This answer leads the
researcher to conclude that the Anung language in Myanmar is between level 6b (Threatened) and level 7 (Shifting) on the EGIDS scale.

A comparison of the situation of Anung between China and Myanmar shows that the vitality of Anung in Myanmar is higher than in China.

**In Myanmar:**
- Language transmission across generations is disrupted but still some families are transmitting the language to their children.
- Language transmission across generations has not totally ceased.
- Out of 105 informants 51 (54%) are fluent in Anung. However, they are not the only remaining speakers.
- There are still younger generation speakers in Myanmar.
- In Khinpang, the use of Anung is higher than the use of Lisu both for inside and outside the home.
- Some Anung who spread out among other villages and places are expected to be transmitting the language to their children.

**In China (according to Sun Hongkai):**
- Language transmission across generations seems to have ceased in China.
- The percentage of speakers proficient in Anung is 59.6%.
- In 1995, there were only 62 fluent speakers in China.
- The 62 remaining speakers are above the age of 60 or 70. Sun never mentions younger generation who can speak Anung well.
- Sun does not expect that there are more proficient speakers in other villages or places.
- If a survey were taken now in China, there would likely be fewer than 62 fluent speakers.
- Sun states that Anung has been completely supplanted by Lisu.

In China, there is no doubt that Anung is a severely endangered language because the youngest proficient speakers are grandparents or people above the age of 60. They are the only remaining generation of proficient Anung speakers in China. It is likely that the vitality of Anung in China is level 8a (moribund) or 8b (nearly extinct) on EGIDS scale.
In Myanmar, on the other hand, there are some proficient speakers in each of the three generations. The younger generation in Myanmar is the youngest generation that has at least some speakers with full proficiency in Anung. In Chapter 4, we see that the overall use of Lisu is higher than the use of Anung in the home domain. However, in Khinpang the use of Anung is higher than the use of Lisu at home domain. This shows that there are still some families transmitting the language to their children. Even in the Homeland and Putao areas, some families can be found transmitting the language to their children. In Chapter 5, it is clearly seen that language transmission across generations has not completely ceased. Some Anung families are transmitting the language to younger generation. In Chapter 6, the data clearly shows that the youngest generation having at least some proficient speakers are younger or children. All these prove that some families are still transmitting the language to their children even though the use of Lisu is higher than the use of Anung.
Chapter 7
Summary and Conclusions

7.1 Introduction
This study researched the vitality of Anung in Putao district, Myanmar. The research mainly tried to find out language use patterns across generations, language use patterns for outside and inside the home, and language proficiency patterns across generations in the Anung community. 105 respondents were interviewed by means of Individual Questionnaires and 6 village leaders were surveyed by using Knowledgeable Insider Questionnaires. Furthermore, the researcher integrated his own observations on Anung language use patterns and activities among Anung children. To be able to complete the objective of this study, the researcher analyzed the data gathered by means of the questionnaires. The results have been discussed in Chapter 4, 5, and 6. The researcher composed several questions pertaining to the objective of this study. To be able to answer those questions, the researcher followed the key questions of EGIDS:

Objective 1: What is the level of language vitality for the Anung (Anong) people in Myanmar?
In relation to the objective, the research questions of this study are:

4. Key question #1: “What is the current identity function of the language?
   Specific questions:
   a. In which domains do Anung people use Anung?
   b. In which domains do Anung people use other languages? (Lisu, Rawang, and Burmese)

5. Key question #3: “Are all parents transmitting the language to their children?
   Specific questions:
   a. Do parents/grandparents speak Anung to their children?
   b. Do parents/grandparents think the children can speak Anung?
c. Can parents/grandparents speak to their children?

d. Can the children use Anung? Do children have adequate opportunities to hear or use Anung?

e. Attitudes:
   
   i. What do you think is more important for bringing up children?
   
   ii. Do you like to speak Anung in front of people who are not Anung?
   
   iii. Twenty years from now, do you think the [Anung] children from this village will be speaking [Anung]?

6. Key question #5: “What is the youngest generation with language proficiency?

Specific questions:

a. Language repertoire: How does proficiency in Anung compare to proficiency in other languages of the area?

b. Generation: Compare language proficiency among generations, particularly children.
   
   How do proficiency levels differ across age groups?

c. What is best language of comprehension for understanding and speaking?

d. Locations: Proficiency in the city versus in more remote locations.
   
   How do proficiency levels differ between town and remote area?

The last question in this set is not answered in this thesis. It is difficult to compare between town and remote areas like the Homeland area because the villages in Putao that have many Anung are spread out. There was only one cluster of two villages in the Homeland area. Therefore, this makes it difficult to make a significant comparison between the town and the homeland area in Myanmar.

The responses to the objective of this research are described in 7.2, 7.3, and 7.4 below. In this study, the researcher mainly applied the framework of language assessment designed by Simon and Lewis. To be able to assess the status of the
Anung language, the researcher used three Key Questions #1, 3, and 5. The conclusions for each of three Key Questions are below.

7.2 Key Question #1: “What is the current identity function of the language?”

When talking to family members inside the home, three different areas show that the use of language is slightly different from each other. In Khinpang homes, the use of Anung is higher than the use of Lisu. In the Putao and Homeland areas, however, the use of Lisu in the home is higher than the use of Anung. Overall, the use of Lisu at home is stronger than the use of Anung; however, some still use Anung at home. See Table 7 A summary of language use by location. However, when at home with non-Anung friends, the Anung tend to use Lisu or Lisu in combination with other languages. No one uses Anung with non-Anung friends at home. All use Lisu as the dominant language among them. It shows that the use of Anung with family members and non-Anung speakers inside the home is still weak for the whole community.

Outside the home in the Khinpang area, the use of Anung with family members is higher than the use of Lisu. In the same domain, the use of Anung with family members in the Putao and Homeland areas is lower than the use of Lisu. If the use of Anung in Khinpang is compared to the use of Anung in the Putao and Homeland areas, the use of Anung in Khinpang is higher than the use of Anung in Putao and Homeland areas. In fact, the Anung households in Khinpang are clustered together so they have more contact with neighbors who are Anung families in their daily lives. Anung can often be heard being spoken from house to house in Khinpang. In the Putao area, the use of Anung is very low because the majority of the people in this area are Lisu. Furthermore, Anung live in mixed communities with the Lisu, and thus, they have much more contact with their Lisu neighbors. In the Homeland area, some of the Anung are retaining Anung at home but most of them are using Lisu. Since this area is situated on the way to the China border, the Anung in the Homeland area have more contact with guests who are Lisu and Rawang and frequently use Lisu as a common language with their non-Anung guests.

For official communication, all three areas most commonly use Lisu or Lisu in combination with Burmese. 4 respondents from the Khinpang area reported using
Lisu in combination with Anung. Only one respondent from the Homeland area reported using Anung and no respondents from Putao area use Anung.

In church contexts, only Lisu is used for preaching and announcements in all three areas. In the Khinpang area, some respondents reported using Anung in combination with Lisu for singing, fellowship, and prayer. In the Putao and Homeland areas, a few people use Anung for fellowship and Burmese for singing. Most Anung use Lisu in church contexts. In informal contexts, the use of Lisu in all three areas is higher than any other language. Overall, Lisu is the dominant language for the Anung. Even though Burmese is the national language in Myanmar, in official and informal contexts, Lisu and Burmese are more beneficial to Anung people since all understand Lisu.

In summary, most of the Anung people use Lisu, however, some of the Anung people use Anung in the home domain or outside the home. It seems that the current identity function of the Anung language is at home for the Anung people. However, Anung is not really even the “home language” in many of the Anung homes, where Lisu has become the more dominant language.

7.3 Key question #3 “Are all parents transmitting the language to their children?”

The current identity function of Anung is at home. The data shows that at least some Anung use their language for daily oral communication inside the home domain. Since the answer to Key Question #1 is at home, Key Question #3 needs to be asked, “Are all parents transmitting the language to their children?” In chapter 5, the researcher asked whether or not all parents are transmitting the language to their children. The data shows that not all people of the older generation are talking to the younger generation in Anung but most of the older generation are talking to their children and grandchildren in Lisu both inside and outside the home. The use of Lisu is higher than the use of Anung when talking to younger generation. See Figure 12 Inside the home: Talking to younger generation and Figure 13 Outside the home: Talking to younger generation. The data indicates that the Anung frequently speak Lisu to their children and teach them the language. Most Anung parents use Lisu with their children. Most of the respondents did not think that Anung children speak Anung well. When the children are playing with their friends, Lisu is used as the dominant language among them. They hardly speak Anung at play. Some Anung
from other age groups cannot speak well and some cannot speak Anung at all. All six knowledgeable leaders generally believe that most Anung under the age of 30 cannot speak Anung very well. Fathers transmit the mother tongue to their children rather than mothers. However, not all parents are transmitting the language to their children. The use of Anung in children’s everyday lives is limited in the domains of play, church, and school. The response to the Key Question #3 shows that most parents are not transmitting the language to their children. As a result, Anung is not being successfully transmitted from older generation to younger generation. Language transmission across generations for the Anung has been disrupted in Myanmar. However, language transmission across generations has not completely ceased. Still some families are transmitting the language to their children. Anung families with intact intergenerational transmission can still be found in Myanmar.

There are two possible reasons for language interruption across generations. The first one is intermarriage. In particular, Anung people tend to intermarry with the Lisu ethnic group. Since they have been living in mixed communities with the Lisu and interspersed among the Lisu people for many years, intermarriage is becoming common. The second reason is cultural assimilation. Since the Anung live together with Lisu, Lisu culture and language gradually influences their daily lives. As a result, they become accustomed to using Lisu spontaneously in their social lives. Therefore, they have become accustomed to Lisu language and culture. Concerning language attitudes, the Anung attitude to their mother tongue is very high in Myanmar. They feel that Anung is their own language, that they love their language, and do not want it to be lost. No respondent expressed a negative attitude to the Anung language. Most of them believe that their children will be speaking Anung twenty years from now. They are very much concerned that their language will be lost. This shows that language interruption across generations was not because of negative attitudes toward their language. However, younger generation might hold a different attitude toward Anung because children were not directly interviewed in this research.

7.4 Key question #5 “What is the youngest generation of proficient speakers?”

The response to key question #3 indicated that not all parents are transmitting the Anung language to their children. Therefore, the researcher used key question #5
and asked, “What is the youngest generation that has at least some proficient
speakers?” The response to this question is discussed in chapter 6.

Three different age groups were tested for language proficiency. The results show
differing levels of proficiency between generations. The data shows that the younger
the speaker, the weaker their language proficiency tends to be. The percentage of
proficiency in Anung is 26% for the younger group, 51% for the middle group, and
76% for the older group. All three age groups have high proficiency in Lisu. This
shows that the Anung has shifted to speaking Lisu. Anung proficiency for the older
generation is higher than that of the younger and middle generations. Nevertheless,
even the older generation is more fluent speakers of Lisu than of Anung. Overall,
among the younger and middle-aged generations, Lisu proficiency is the highest,
followed in order by Burmese, Anung, and Rawang. For the older generation, Lisu
proficiency is the highest, followed by Anung, Rawang, and Burmese in that order. It
seems that Anung proficiency is higher with the older generation than with the
younger and middle generations. For language comprehension and production
among the younger and middle generations, Lisu proficiency is the highest, followed
by Burmese, Anung and Rawang in that order. For the older generation, Lisu
proficiency is the highest, followed in order by Anung, Rawang, and then Burmese.
Overall, across generations, Lisu proficiency is the highest, followed in order by
Burmese, Anung, and then Rawang. The older generation seems to be retaining
Anung however; some of them have lost their ability with the language.

The data shows that, overall, Anung proficiency across the three age groups is lower
than Lisu. It also shows that for the younger and middle generations, Anung is being
further pushed out by the national language, Burmese, a weakening that was not
observed in China. Overall proficiency in Anung across generations is declining.
However, this chapter actually addresses the question of which generation has at
least some speakers with full proficiency. The data clearly shows that the youngest
generation that has some speakers with full proficiency.

In summary, the researcher used Key Question #1 and asked, “What is the identity
function of the language?” The identity function of the Anung language is home, as
some Anung still use Anung in the home domain. Then the researcher used (Key
Question #3) and asked, “Are all parents transmitting the language to their
children?” The data shows that not all parents are transmitting the language to their
children. Language transmission across generations has been disrupted.
Intergenerational transmission, however, has not ceased. Some families are transmitting Anung to their children. Then the researcher used (Key Question #5) and asked, “What is the youngest generation that has at least some proficient speakers?” The data shows that the three age groups: older, middle, and younger generations have some speakers with full proficiency. Some families use Anung at home however, the Anung language transmission across generations is disruption. Language proficiency across generations is declining. It shows that the Anung language is shifting. The younger the speaker his or her proficiency is lower. Thus the level of Anung vitality is at level 6a (threatened) or level 7 (shifting) on EGIDS scale.

7.5 Language development and preservation programs in the future
The purpose of EGIDS is solely to measure the level of language vitality. This section presents a discussion about language development efforts among the Anung that may help to explain why the level of vitality in Myanmar is different than the level of vitality in China. It also considers possible development programs that the Anung community may desire to consider given their level of concern about their language. In the following section, a three-part discussion of Anung language development and preservation will be presented. The three parts are: 1) previous Anung language developments (1955-1977), 2) current efforts and 3) language preservation programs in the future.

7.5.1 Previous Anung language development (1955-1977)
An Anung named Samuyi, who studied education in Yangon in 1955, made the first recordings of Anung. He recorded the gospel message and some songs in Anung. After recording, many Anung people heard it and were happy. It was a stimulus to the Anung people to revitalize and develop their language. Because of Samuyi, the seed of creating an Anung orthography was sown in the hearts of many Anung people.

Even though they did not have yet their own writing system, the Anung tried to create a writing system by using Roman alphabets based on their knowledge. In 1957, a pastor, Nocyesa and an elder, Aphuyeq, who lived in Putao, translated Lisu hymn #29 into Anung. The Anung people sang the song at a Christmas celebration in Putao. Later, the Anung people realized that how beautiful it was to use their own
language to praise God. Consequently, they started to have some meetings to discuss Anung language development. In the year of 1965, there was a meeting at Khinpang village in Putao Township. 28 members of Anung literature committee gathered and decided to fulfill two specific purposes: first, to have a collection of Anung history, and second, to create a writing system and to maintain the Anung language. In 1967, Huche Phi, a pastor, tried to create an Anung writing system based on his own knowledge. Unfortunately, the orthography was not successfully used among the Anung people. This writing system could not be used properly because the development of the script was not informed by good linguistic research. As a result, no one uses this writing system any more. In 1977, Dr. Jim Harris, a linguist, was very impressed with Joel Khopang and the Anung community’s dream for creating an Anung orthography. Harris and Khopang worked together and made the Anung orthography.

7.5.2 Current efforts of the Anung Literature Committee
In 1983, from August 12 to 14, twenty older Anung gathered and decided to start a translation on the New Testament. The work of translating the New Testament was begun in 1988. The Anung New Testament included cross-references, maps of the Holy Land and the journeys of the Apostle Paul. The translation of the Anung New Testament was completed on 19 July 1991. In 2003, the Anung hymnbook was distributed to the Anung people as well. In 2006, the translation of the Old Testament was done at the Anung literature office in Putao Township. The Old Testament is now completely translated and ready for print if funding can be secured.

In 1984, the first Anung reader was recorded and distributed in every Anung village in Myanmar. The Anung literature committee published one thousand Anung reader-books. Some gospel songs and traditional folk songs were also recorded. In 1995, several other books such as Anung reader books, Bible storybooks, Anung picture books, and Anung vocabulary books were published. In 1998, the Anung literature committee published children songs, a history of Israel, ten storybooks, and a history of the Anung people, among other titles.

An Anung literacy class was started in January 1983, at Khinpang village in Putao Township. The literacy class is held at least once a year. The Anung literature committee leads the Anung literacy programs. Year after year, there are more Anung learners.
7.5.3 Preservation programs in the future

For the language development, the researcher prefers applying the Sustainable Use Model designed by Lewis and Simon. The Sustainable Use Model indicates not only the level of vitality but also gives an indication of the sustainability of the community’s patterns of language use and maintenance. There are four “Sustainable” levels of language development, namely, Sustainable History, Sustainable Identity, Sustainable Orality, and Sustainable Literacy. For the Anung language, a “Sustainable” level is Sustainable Orality. Once a community identifies its place among the four “Sustainable” levels, a language development program can be designed by using the FAMED conditions that support language sustainability.

The Sustainable Use Model will indicate the current level of the language and the level of the target language. Level 5: Written (Incipient Literacy) and Level 6a: Vigorous (Sustainable Orality) show the target levels and, Level 6b: Threatened shows the current levels. The current and target levels for the Anung language are mentioned below.

Table 58 Sustainable Use Model for Anung Language Development (Identifying the current and target levels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Use</th>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Diglossia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4: Educational (Sustainable Literacy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Written (Incipient Literacy)</td>
<td>Enough literature exists in some domains to exemplify the value of Anung literacy.</td>
<td>There are adequate materials to support vernacular literacy instruction and some members of the community are successfully using them to</td>
<td>Some members of the language community perceive the benefits of reading and writing their local language, but the majority still do not.</td>
<td>Official government policy encourages the development of this language. Official government policy has nothing to say about ethnolinguistic diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Use</td>
<td>Functions</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Diglossia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>teach others to read and write the language.</td>
<td>or language development and thus raises no impediment to the use and development of this language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a: Vigorous (Sustainable Orality)</td>
<td></td>
<td>There is full oral transmission of the vernacular language to all children in the home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b: Threatened</td>
<td>Adequate oral use exists for some domains for which oral use is desired (but not for all)</td>
<td>The language is used orally within all generations but only some of the child-bearing generation are transmitting it to their children in the home.</td>
<td>Members of the child-bearing generation perceive the benefit of using their language orally for some purposes, but others find greater benefit in</td>
<td>Some members of the child-bearing generation use the local language orally for functions that were traditionally reserved for the local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Use</td>
<td>Functions</td>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Diglossia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>shifting to a more dominant language.</td>
<td></td>
<td>language, while others use a more dominant language for many of the same functions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7: Shifting  
8a: Moribund  
8b: Nearly extinct  

9: Dormant (Sustainable Identity)  

10: Extinct (Sustainable History)  
(Forgotten)

**Function:** Some Anung use the Anung language at home, whereas some use Lisu. In both official and informal contexts, in church, and outside the home, they use more Lisu than Anung as it is the dominant language in their area. The Anung have limited opportunities to use Anung outside the home. Many do not have full command of the Anung language. Therefore, adequate oral use at home is a more reasonable objective for the Anung people. Since Lisu is used as the dominant language in church and other contexts, using Anung at home or in the community is a better place for language maintenance. The Anung people have a strong desire to learn their mother tongue. It is possible to start Anung language learning programs at every village so that every Anung family can learn Anung. Anung is the dominant language among the Anung families in Khinpang. The people in Khinpang are successfully speaking in Anung in comparison to Putao area; this is because in
Khinpang, many Anung live together and the Anung population is higher. Another possible place for language development is the Homeland area because almost all who live there are Anung. If an Anung learning class were to be started at every village, the Anung people would use more Anung at home. Such a goal might be achievable for the Anung people.

**Acquisition:** The Anung language is not being successfully passed on across generations. Anung is used within all generations but only some parents are transmitting Anung to their children. Proficiency in Anung is weaker among the younger generation. Not all parents are transmitting the mother tongue to their children. Therefore, the younger generation is unable to learn it adequately. To maintain the Anung language, the children must become more fluent in Anung. They should have opportunity to hear and use in everyday life. But the Anung do not currently have adequate materials for developing literacy and so these materials must be developed. If additional literacy materials – such as picture books, alphabet charts, stories, and Anung songs are produced, the Anung community will benefit from them and will help them to transmit the language in its written and spoken forms to future generations. Adequate materials and opportunities for training can help the Anung people sustain their language by transmitting it across generations.

**Motivation:** The Anung people perceive the benefit of using their language orally for some purposes. Nevertheless, most of the Anung find greater benefit in shifting to a more dominant language. If the Anung community is encouraged to use the Anung Bible personally or in church, to write articles and letters in Anung, to sing using the Anung hymn book at home or in church, to use Anung on the internet, the sustainability of the Anung language will increase.

It is encouraging to note that the Anung community is strongly motivated to continue pursuing language development. Currently, in church, preaching and announcements are done only Lisu. However, some use Anung for prayer, singing, and fellowship. These kinds of activities motivate the Anung, because they see the benefits of using their own language.

In official contexts, Burmese and Lisu are used more because the majority of the people are Lisu and Rawang. As a result, there is a little opportunity to use Anung. Anung people often meet at Anung Literature Committee meetings; this is a place...
where Anung is used and the people have a chance to speak only Anung with the Anung people. It is one of the good places for building language motivation.

**Environment:**
Government policy has nothing to say about Anung language development. There is an Anung literature office in Putao. There are no obstacles for literacy programs or language development programs. Since Anung and Lisu worship together at church, the church environment is one of the issues for the Anung people. Almost all Anung are Christians and are part of the Lisu Evangelical Committee, but among the Anung, there are different types of church environments. The environments fall into the following categories:

- (1) The majority of church members are Lisu and some Anung are parishioners. A pastor, elder or leader can be an Anung person.
- (2) The majority of church members are Anung, and only some are Lisu. A pastor can be a Lisu person.
- (3) Almost all are Anung parishioners and a pastor can be a Anung person.

Generally, the attitude in most churches toward Anung language development (with the goal of full use of Anung in all aspects) is not hostile. Only the Anung community or Anung Literature Committee, however, can facilitate the language to be developed. Yearly, a literacy class is held at the Anung literature committee office in Putao, but from time to time, the class may be held at different villages. There is no hindrance for the Anung language development. Most of the Anung people have a positive attitude toward their language. They say that they do not want the language to be lost and that they love their language. The external and internal environments support the Anung language being developed at a sustainable level.

**Diglossia:**
Some Anung people use their language at home, with their own people, and at meetings in the Anung community. However, others use a more dominant language for the same functions. Since the Anung people often live with the Lisu, they all use Lisu as a common language in church and social contexts. In the Khinpang and Homeland areas, it is more possible to use the Anung language. In fact, most of the church members there are Anung. Some Anung in these areas are still using Anung hymnbooks and Bibles. Some Anung families are living near the Anung literature office. If the Anung language is used in areas such as these, the Anung language will develop a stronger identity.
There are, however, many potential stimuli for Anung language development in
Myanmar. Anung literacy has been taught in Myanmar since 1983. Some Anung
books have already been published. The Anung have positive attitudes toward
Anung. The Anung community is deeply concerned about maintaining their
language. Most of the Anung in Myanmar have a strong desire to learn their
language, saying that they love it, do not want it to be lost, and that they want their
children to speak it. These are some of the factors that illustrate the strong potential
for language development among the Anung in Myanmar.

7.6 Limits of the research
This research focuses on the vitality of Anung in Myanmar. The researcher used only
a questionnaire for both individuals and knowledgeable leaders. Furthermore,
language proficiency was tested only by means of questionnaires; the respondents’
ability to use vocabulary was not tested. All of the results from this research on
language use and language proficiency are based on questionnaires and
observations. The researcher did ask some questions to parents and made
observations on children's language use at home, church and play. Children were
not directly tested, however, because it is difficult to use a questionnaire with them.
It was beyond the scope of this research to attempt to measure vitality using another
approach.

Sun Hongkai has surveyed the vitality of Anung in China since 1960. Therefore, the
researcher did not examine Anung areas in China. He did not discuss the vitality of
Anung in China in this research. Prior to this study, no one had surveyed the vitality
of Anung in Myanmar; for this reason, the researcher mainly focused on areas where
the majority of Anung people live today. Most of the Anung people in Myanmar live
in the Putao and Khonglangphu areas. It seems that there is higher vitality in the
Putao and Khonglangphu areas if these two areas are compared with other areas
such as Myitkyina, lower Myanmar, or other places. Therefore, the researcher did
not include the areas where there was not a concentrated population of Anung
people. Instead, he included the Putao and Khonglangphu areas where the
population of the Anung people is concentrated.

This research covers six sites – five in the Putao area and one in the Khonglangphu
area. It is difficult to make comparisons between the Putao area and the Homeland
area because there are 5 villages in Putao and the Anung people live in these
villages mixed with Lisu. There is only one cluster of two villages in the Homeland
area. Therefore, this makes it difficult to make statistically significant comparisons between the Putao and the Homeland areas.

This study did not involve people above the age of 20 and under the age of 35, because most of the young people in this age group usually go to other places for business, hunting, or making money. As a result, it is difficult to find respondents from this age group in villages.

Another limitation to this research is that the answers given by respondents might be different from what respondents really do in their daily lives. For example, in one case, the answer of the leaders contradicted the individuals' answers (see p. 80, 81). The respondents also might have influenced another respondent to answer some questionnaires in the same way they did. The results of this study were based on 105 individuals and 6 knowledgeable leaders. Among the individuals who participated, 36 respondents were under the age of 20, 35 respondents were between the ages of 35 and 50, and 34 respondents were above the age of 50. One male in the above 50 group from Mulashidee, one female in the above 50 group from Namthumkhu and one male from the 35-50 group were not able to be asked for this research.

7.7 Evaluation of the sociolinguistic questionnaire (SLQ)

Some questionnaires for this research need to be revised for the future use because when the researcher asked the respondents, a few of them were not clear enough to the respondents for them to be able to answer. In this section, some questions from the questionnaires are evaluated. In some cases, the questionnaires mentioned below did not work well.

(Individual Questions)

#45a. being accepted in the community? (Anung, Burmese, Lisu or Rawang)
For this question, most of the responded with their “father's generation” or “lineage” as being the criterion for acceptance in the community. In future research, it would be good to include not only languages but also other identifying factors such as genetic line.

#54. Can you read and write in Anung?
#54a. (If yes) What kinds of things do you read in Anung?
The question asked about Anung Individual’s reading and writing competence in Anung. However, this was a specific question that related to only reading competence. It would be good to ask about writing competence in further research.

#37. (if yes) If an [Anung] man from this village marries a [non-Anung] woman…

#37a. Where do they live? (in [Anung area] or outside)

#38. (if yes) If an [Anung] woman from this village marries a [non-Anung] man…

#38a. Where do they live? (in [Anung area] or outside)
Asking ([Anung area] or or outside) proved unnecessary. When the researcher asked, “Where do they live?” the participants responded with a place name. Since there is not a separate Anung village or Anung area, this kind of question may confuse the respondents.

#38. Do you think the [Anung] children in this village speak [Anung] well?

#52. Do you think most Anung children in this village speak Anung well?
The possible responses to these two question types are “Yes” or “No.” Some respondents gave the answer “some are well or some are not well”. The researcher realized that changing these questions to require a graded response (e.g. “few, some, half, most, or all”) will give the researcher clearer insight into the real language situation.

### 7.8 Suggestions for further research
The measurement of language vitality is a broad area of study. The researcher had limited time to conduct this research and could not survey the Anung people in China. Since the Anung people live in both Myanmar and China, using the same questionnaires or methods, along with tests of speakers’ comprehension and production, would be a profitable direction for further research. A comparative study of Anung language vitality in Myanmar and China would also benefit the Anung people. In Myanmar, the Anung people have had their writing system since 1982. They have the New Testament in Anung however; the Old Testament has not yet been published. It is important to know how well the Anung use their language in terms of their writing and reading skills. Therefore, a survey needs to be conducted in order to assess their literacy skills and determine how well they can read and write in Anung. This research would be beneficial to the Anung people in Myanmar in the future.
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APPENDIX A

INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

1. Interview Number
2. Survey
3. Village Name
4. Interviewer Name
5. Date
6. Language of Elicitation
7. Language of Response
8. Interpreter Name (if needed)
9. Comments (anything unusual or noteworthy about this interview)

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE SUBJECT

10. Gender
11. What is your name?
12. How old are you?
13. Are you married?
14. (if married) Do you have any children?
   a. (if yes) How many?
15. What is your religion?
16. What is your job?
17. Were you able to go to school?
18. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   a. Level
   b. What was the language of instruction at that school?
   c. What school did you go to?
19. What village were you born in?
20. Where do you live now?
21. How many years have you lived here?
22. What do others call your language?
   a. Language name
   b. (if not the same as their own name for the language) Who calls it that?
   c. (if not the same as their own name for the language) Do you like that name?
23. What do you call the people who speak your language?
24. What do others call the people who speak your language?
   a. People name
   b. (if not the same as their own name for their people) Who calls you that?
   c. (if not the same as their own name for their people) Do you like that name?
25. What language did you speak first as a child?
26. Do you speak any other languages?
27. Subject's father
   a. Where was your father born?
   b. What clan is your father born?
   c. What language did your father speak first as a child?
   d. What language did he usually speak to you when you were a child?
28. Subject's mother
   a. Where was you mother born?
   b. What clan is your mother born?
   c. What language did your mother speak first as a child?
   d. What language did she usually speak to you when you were a child?
29. When you were a child, what language did your parents speak to each other?
30. (if married)
   a. Where was your [husband/wife] born?
   b. What clan is your [husband/wife] from?
   c. What language did your [husband/wife] speak first as a child?
DOMAINS OF LANGUAGE USE

31. In your house, what language do you usually speak...
   
   h. ...with your parents?
   i. ...with your grandparents?
   j. ...with your siblings?
   k. (if married) ... with your husband/wife
   l. (if have children)...with your children?
   m. (if old and have children) ...with your grandchildren?
   n. ...with Anung friends in your house?
   o. ...with non-Anung friends in your house?
   p. So, in your house, what language do you use the most?

32. When you are not in your house, what language do you usually speak...

   a. ...with your parents?
   b. ...with your grandparents/
   c. ...with your siblings?
   d. (if married) ...with your spouse?
   e. (if have children)...with your children?
   f. ...with your grandchildren?
   g. ...with friends
   h. (ask if young enough to be in school or university) what languages do you use with classmates at school?
   i. (if go to school...with your teacher?
   j. ...with co-workers?
   k. ...at the market?
   l. ...at a funeral?
   m. ...at a village meeting?
   n. ...at a church?
   o. ...with a government worker?

RELIGIOUS LANGUAGE USE

33. Where do you usually go to church?

   a. Place?

34. At your church, what language is used most often for....
35. What language do you use when you pray on your own?
36. What language of Bible is used most often in your church service?
   a. Which one is used most often (Burmese, Lisu, Rawang, Anung)
   b. Can you understand that Bible?
   c. (if not) Why not?
      i. (if can’t say) Is it because it’s hard to understand the Bible or because it’s hard to understand the language in the Bible?

**LANGUAGE ATTITUDES**

37. Are there [Anung] people in the village who have stopped speaking [Anung]?
   a. Yes or no
   b. (if yes) Why?
   c. (if yes) Do you think this is good or bad?
   d. (if yes) Why?

38. Do you think the [Anung] children in this village speak [Anung] well?
   a. Yes or no
   b. (if no) In what ways do they speak it not well?
   c. (if no) do you think this is good or bad?
   d. (if no) Why?

39. What language do [Anung] children in this village speak first?
40. Do [Anung] children speak any other languages before they start school?
   a. Yes or no
   b. What languages?
41. Do [Anung] children speak any other languages after they start school?
   a. Yes or no
   b. What languages?
42. What language do [Anung] children in the village speak when they play?
a. Language
b. (if not only [Anung]) Do you think this is good or bad?
c. (if not only [Anung]) Why?

43. Twenty years from now, do you think the [Anung] children from this village will be speaking [Anung]?
   a. Yes or no
   b. (if no) Do you think this is good or bad?
   c. (if no) Why?

TO FIND OUT WHY PEOPLE CHOOSE ONE LANGUAGE OVER ANOTHER

44. What language do you think is more important for…Instrumental (family, economic, social)
   a. Living in this village? (Anung, Burmese, Lisu, or Rawang)
   b. Having more chances to make money? (Anung, Burmese, Lisu, or Rawang)
   c. Studying at school? (Anung, Burmese, Lisu, or Rawang)
   d. going shopping? (Anung, Burmese, Lisu, or Rawang)
   e. reading and writing? (Anung, Burmese, Lisu, or Rawang)

45. Integrative (identification as Anung and communication with Anung speakers)
   a. Being accepted in the community?
      (Anung, Burmese, Lisu or Rawang)
   b. Making more friends or knowing more people? (Anung, Burmese, Lisu or Rawang)
   c. Communicating with people of the same age? (Anung, Burmese, Lisu or Rawang)
   d. Bring up children? (Anung, Burmese, Lisu, or Rawang)

TO FIND OUT ATTITUDES ABOUT USING ANUNG IN PUBLIC

46. Do you like to speak Anung in front of people who are not Anung?
   a. Yes or No?
   b. Why/why not?
47. Do you think it is appropriate for Anung speakers to speak Anung at village meetings or at Church?
   a. Yes or No?
   b. Why/ why not?

CHILDERN
48. What language do Anung children in this village usually speak when they play?
49. (if they have children) which language do your children usually speak at home: (Anung or [LWC]?
50. What language do most Anung parents use with their children?
51. Do Anung parents teach their children other languages?
   a. (if yes) What languages?
52. Do you think most Anung children in this village speak Anung well?
   a. (if no) How do you feel about that?
53. Can you read and write in [LWC]?
   a. (if yes) What kinds of things do you read in [LWC]?
   b. (if yes) What kinds of things do you write in [LWC]?
54. Can you read and write in Anung?
   a. (if yes) What kinds of things do you read in Anung?
55. Is there any benefit in being able to read and write Anung?
   a. (if yes) What benefit?
56. Have you (or would you) participate in a literacy class sponsored by the Anung Literature Committee?
   a. (if no) Why not?

MEDIA
57. Do you have printed material in any language at home?
   a. (if no) What kind do you have? (if not mentioned, ask about Bible, hymnbook, books newspapers, magazines, calendar)
   b. (if yes) what languages are they written in?
58. On average how many hours a day do you read?
59. On average how many hours a day do you listen to the radio?
60. On average how many hours a day do you listen to cassettes?
61. On average how many hours a day do you watch TV/video?
62. If more reading material were available in Anung, would you read it?
63. If there were a radio program in Anung, would you listen?
64. If there were cassettes in Anung, would you listen?
65. If there were videos in Anung, would you watch?

**LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY EVALUATION:**

66. Can you buy something in Anung/LWC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67. Can you tell about your family in Anung/LWC?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68. Could you use [Anung/LWC] explain to a [Anung/LWC] speaker how to do your job?

☐ “Explanation given.” Note in your notebook if you have to give the explanation below.

[If they ask, “What do you mean?” say “Can you explain things like the number of siblings You have and in what order they were born, etc., using [LWC]?”]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>a. Anung</th>
<th>b. Lisu</th>
<th>d. Rawang</th>
<th>e. Burmese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69. If you overhear two Anung people speaking Anung in the market, can you describe in [Anung/LWC] what you heard?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>a. Anung</th>
<th>b. Lisu</th>
<th>d. Rawang</th>
<th>e. Burmese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Speaking Comp (Anung)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
70. If you overhear two [Lisu] people speaking [Lisu] in the market, can you describe in [Anung/LWC] what you heard? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Level)</th>
<th>a. Anung</th>
<th>b. Lisu</th>
<th>d. Rawang</th>
<th>e. Burmese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Speaking Comp (LWC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71. If you overhear two [Rawang] people speaking [Rawang] in the market, can you describe in [Anung/LWC] what you heard? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Level)</th>
<th>a. Anung</th>
<th>b. Lisu</th>
<th>d. Rawang</th>
<th>e. Burmese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Speaking Comp (LWC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

72. If you go to a funeral conducted in [Lisu], can you describe in [Anung/LWC] what you heard? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Level)</th>
<th>a. Anung</th>
<th>b. Lisu</th>
<th>c. Rawang</th>
<th>e. Burmese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Speaking Comp (LWC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73. If you go to a funeral conducted in [Rawang], can you describe in [Anung/LWC] what you heard? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Level)</th>
<th>a. Anung</th>
<th>b. Lisu</th>
<th>c. Rawang</th>
<th>e. Burmese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Speaking Comp (LWC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74. If you go to a church meeting and they are speaking in [Lisu], can you explain it in [Anung/LWC]? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Level)</th>
<th>a. Anung</th>
<th>b. Lisu</th>
<th>c. Rawang</th>
<th>d. Burmese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Speaking Comp (LWC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
75. If you go to a church meeting and they are speaking in [Rawang], can you explain it in [Anung/LWC]?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp (LWC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76. Can you understand when the Bible is read in [Anung/LWC]?

Mark None, Some, Half, Most, All

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp (LWC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

77. Can you read and write in [Anung/LWC]?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading/Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

78. Of all the languages you understand, which language do you understand the best?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. the best</th>
<th>b. the second best</th>
<th>c. the third best</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

79. Of all of the languages you speak, which language do you speak the best?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. the best</th>
<th>b. the second best</th>
<th>c. the third best</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

80. Which language do you speak most often?

|----------|---------|-----------|------------|
ETHNOLINGUISTIC IDENTITY

81. How are [Anung] people different from [other] people?

☐ “Examples given.” Note in your notebook if you have to give the “for examples” below.

For example: customs, dress, housing style, food, festivals, religion, or anything else you can think of.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. List answer</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82. What parts of being [Anung] would you like to see your children continue?

☐ “Examples given.” Note in your notebook if you have to give the “for example” below.

For example: customs, dress, housing style, food, language, festivals, religion, or anything else you can think of.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. List answer</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INTERVIEWER OBSERVATION

83. Were there any distractions or interruptions that interfered with the flow of the interview or seemed to influence some of the responses?

84. Did the subject seem to understand the language of elicitation?

85. Did the subject seem shy or confident about expressing his/her opinions?

86. Did the interpreter change any of the questions?

Note what was actually asked.

87. Other observations about the interview?

88. Were there any questions that seemed to work really well? Which questions? Why?

89. Where there any questions that seemed to not work well? Which questions? Why?
APPENDIX B

KNOWLEDGEABLE INSIDER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Interview Number
2. Survey
3. Village Name
4. Interviewer Name
5. Date
6. Language of Elicitation
7. Language of Response
8. Interpreter Name (if needed)
9. Comments (anything unusual or noteworthy about this interview)

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE SUBJECT

10. Gender
11. What is your name?
12. How old are you?
13. Are you married?
14. (if married) do you have any children?
15. What is your religion?
16. What is your job?
17. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
18. In which village were you born?
19. Where did you grow up?
20. Where do you live now?
21. How many years have you lived here?

VILLAGE NAME AND POPULATION

22. What is the official name of this village?
   a. What “district” is it in? [Ask about all the administrative levels.]
23. How many houses are in this village?
24. What is the total number of people in this village? (adults and children)
25. What do the people who live here call this village?
   a. Name
   b. What does that name mean?
26. What do outsiders call this village?
   a. Name
   b. (if not the same as their own name for the village) Who calls it that?
   c. (if not the same as their own name for the village) What does that name mean?
   d. (if not the name as their own name for the village) Do people in this village like the name?

**MIGRATION**

27. From where did the Anung people of this village migrate?
   a. How long have they lived here?
   b. (if they have moved here recently) when they were there, what other groups were they around?
   c. (if they have moved here recently) what languages/varieties were used there?
   d. Why did they move here?
   e. Do people from there ever come here? (if so) why?
   f. Do people from here ever go there? (if so) Why?
   g. Where did they come from before that?

**LANGUAGE AND ETHNIC GROUPS**

28. What language is spoken the most in this village?
   a. Language name
   b. About what percent speak that language?
29. Is this village all Anung people or are there others living here as well?
   a. (if others, too) What groups live here?
   b. (if others, too) About how many houses and people in this village are from each group?
   I. Number of houses for each group
II. Number of people for each group
   
c. Has it always been this way?
   
I. (if no) Which way is it changing…. More Anung people or fewer?

30. If someone from this village meets someone who cannot speak Anung, what language do they use with that person?

31. Are there people in this village who speak only Anung?
   a. (if yes) Which types of people? (e.g. which gender, ages, occupations)

32. Are there Anung people in this village who can speak Anung but not very well?
   a. (if yes) Which types of people? (e.g. which gender, ages, occupations)
   b. (if yes) What language(s) do they speak well?
   b. (if yes) What languages do you use with them?

33. Are there Anung people in this village who cannot speak Anung at all?
   a. (if yes) Which types of people? (e.g. which gender, ages, occupations)
   b. (if yes) What languages do they speak well?
   c. (if yes) What languages do you use with them?

34. What do the people who live in this village call themselves?
   a. People name
   b. What does that name mean?

35. What do others call the people who live in this village?
   a. People name
   b. (if not the same as their own for their people) Who calls you that?
   c. (if not the same as their own name for their people) What does that name mean?
   d. (if not the same as their own name for their people) Do people in this village like that name?

INTERMARRIAGE

36. Is it common for [Anung] people from this village to marry [non – Anung ] speaking people do they marry?
   a. Yes or No
   b. (if yes) what [non – Anung] speaking people do they marry?
37. (if yes) If an [Anung] man from this village marries a [non –Anung] woman…
   a. Where do they live? (in [Anung] area or outside)
   b. Usually, what language do their children end up speaking?
   c. (if not [Anung] can they also still speak [Anung]?
   d. How many men do this: few, some, half, most, or all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>few</th>
<th>some</th>
<th>half</th>
<th>most</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. (if yes) If an [Anung] woman from this village marries a [non –Anung] man…
   a. Where do they live? (in [Anung] area or outside)
   b. Usually, what language do their children end up speaking?
   c. (if not [Anung] Can they also still speak [Anung]?
   d. How many women do this: few, some, half, most, or all?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>few</th>
<th>some</th>
<th>half</th>
<th>most</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDUCATION AND LITERACY RATES

39. Is there a school in this village?
   a. (if yes) What levels are taught in the school?
   b. (if yes) What is the language of instruction?
   c. (if yes) What kind of people (language groups) attend this school?
   d. (if yes) What languages do the school children use with each other?

40. Do any children go to any other villages towns for school?
   a. (if yes) About what proportion of children to elsewhere for school?
   b. (if yes) where?
   c. (if yes) what levels do they go for?
   d. (if yes) what is the language of instruction in that place?
   e. (if yes) What languages do they use with other classmates?

41. About how many grades do most children from this village complete?

42. How many people from this village can read and write in LWC: (1) very few (2) some, (3) half, (4) most, (5) all?
43. How many people from this village can read write in Anung (1) very few, (2) some, (3) half, (4) most, (5) all?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anung</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

44. Which religion is followed by the most people in your village? [Animism, Buddhism, Christianity, etc.]

a. By the 2nd most?
   I. How much of the village follows that religion? (1) most, (2) half, (3) some, (4) very few?

b. By the 3nd most?
   I. How much of the village follows that religion? (1) most, (2) half, (3) some, (4) very few?

c. What sources of power are available in this village? How many houses have each kind? How many houses have each kind?
   __ Government Electricity __ Hydroelectricity __ Solar panels __ Generators __ Wet cells __ Dry cells

**MEDIA**

45.

a. How many radios are in this village?

b. (if they have) What programs do people listen to?

c. (if they have) In what languages?

d. How many cassette players are in this village?

e. (if they have) What kinds of cassettes do people listen to?

f. (if they have) In what language(s)

gh. How many TVs are in this village?

h. How many VCD/DVD machines are in this village?
i. (if they have) What kinds of VCD/DVD do people watch? [music, Karaoke, movies, home recordings]

j. (if they have) In what language(s)?

k. (if they have) How time of day?

l. (if they have) How many times a week?

m. (if they have) What ages gather to watch? [old, middle-age, teenagers, small children, etc]

n. (if they have) About how many people?

o. Where are the tapes/ VCD/ DVD purchased/rented?

p. (if they have) For how much per tape (buy)? Per day (rent)?

q. Are there any local groups that produce tapes or discs?

r. (if yes) How produces them?

s. Are there any other media in this village? (e.g. MP3 players)

**INTERVIEWER OBSERVATIONS**

46. Were there any distractions or interruptions that interfered with the flow of the interview of seemed to influence some of the responses?

47. Did the subject seem to understand the language of elicitation?

48. Did the subject seem shy or fairly confident about expressing his/her opinions?

49. Did the interpreter change any of the questions? Note what was actually asked.

50. Other observations about the interview?

51. Were there any questions that seemed to work really well? Which questions? Why?

52. Were there any questions that seemed to not work well? Which questions? Why
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