A CASE OF A CONTEXTUALIZED VARIETY OF ENGLISH : ENGLISH IN THE THAI CONTEXT

Pornpimol Limtong

OBJECTIVES

The spread of English around the world and among speakers of other languages and cultures has resulted in a divergence from English native varieties. According to Strevens (1982), there are now nearly seven hundred million speakers of English, of whom only three hundred million are native speakers of one of the following varieties: British, American, Canadian, Australian, and New Zealand. While a Thai native perceives that his language belongs to him, due to the spread of English worldwide, Strevens (1982 : 420) suggests that a native speaker of English can no longer claim he owns the English language. This worldwide use of English has drawn the attention of researchers in such fields as sociolinguistics, linguistic typology, psycholinguistics, ethnography of communication, and applied linguistics. In addition, it has become the special interest of applied linguists who specialize in the area of teaching and learning English as a second or foreign language. English, which is used by the Thai people as a foreign language, has recently gained wide acceptance as an international language in Thailand. Knowledge of English is often the means for academic achievement and upward mobility. A detailed study of the use of English in Thailand, therefore, needs no justification.

This study seeks to provide an explicit analysis of a ' performance variety ' of English as used in Thailand by the Thai people. It is an examination of the linguistic and sociolinguistic characteristics of English in the Thai context, where English serves a vital role as an **additional** language. The ways in which English is patterned and organized support the concept of ' Thainess ', i.e., Thai English with its unique characteristics. The ' deviations ' at different levels in what has been termed here ' Thai English ' are explained in terms of social and cultural transfers from the native language. It is further claimed that such **Thainess** in English can be best understood in the Thai context of situation where English is being used. The discussion, therefore, includes shared rules of speaking and interpretations of speech performance, shared attitudes regarding language forms and uses, and shared sociocultural understandings with regard to Thai norms and values in Thai settings.

It is evident that English in Thailand has been acculturated and as a result, various innovations have taken place. These innovations can be exemplified by linguistic strategies that include translation, shifts, and hybridization.

THE STUDY OF LANGUAGE IN ITS CONTEXT : CONTEXTUALIZATION

The methodology and approach for the analysis in this study is based on the Firthian framework of ' context of situation ' (See Kachru 1981). Within this framework, formal and functional characteristics of Thai English are investigated and analyzed. In this study, the following processes will be discussed and illustrated with reference to the use of English in Thailand.

1) Transfer of Context: The transfer of the ' element ' of certain contexts from C_1 and L_1 to L_2. Distinctions may be made in terms of the participants in various situations. For example, in **The Politician,** when a villager talked to the youngest son of his em-

ployer who was 6 years old, he referred to the boy as " The son of the Sky " (PL:70). It is the difference of social stratifications that governs language use.

2) Lexico - Grammatical Transfer: This includes lexical transfer as well as translation and shifts, for example, **kuti** ' monk's building ', and **chiwan** ' monk's robe '.

3) Thai English Collocations : These include typical Thai collocations of English such as **bus pier** ' bus terminal ', and **minor wife** ' a mistress '.

These transfer processes and Thai English collocations are evident throughout Thai English texts.

SOCIOLINGUISTIC STUDIES OF VARIATION

According to Bright (1966 : 11), the aim of sociolinguistics is :

> to show a systematic co - variance of linguistic and social structure--and perhaps to show a causal relationship in one direction or the other.

Labov (1972a) seeks to account for the distribution of language differences throughout a society in terms of the age, sex, education, occupation, and ethnic membership of the speaker he studies. Such studies show the correlation of linguistic variables with demographic data. As a result, idiosyncratic uses of the individual speaker and indications of his group affiliations are revealed. Labov (1972a, 1972b) also suggests that it is meaningless to study language out of its social context; therefore, variation studies are based upon linguistic theories incorporated within a broader social base. Sociolinguistics, thus, provides the theoretical framework and methodology which expands the range of linguistics beyond the sentence toward grammars of ' speaker - hearer ' interaction, identified as priorities of linguistics by Chomsky (1965). A single chosen informant, therefore, is not capable of providing a sufficient amount of data of general description for an entire language. Hence, social and cultural information are considered extra-linguistic factors, something beyond the linguistic horizon.

Sociolinguists believe that descriptive problems can be resolved more satisfactorily by means of systematic observations of natural speech behavior rather than by intuitive judgement. Moreover, observational inadequacy can be identified more quickly and with greater precision.

CHOMSKIAN LINGUISTICS AND SOCIOLINGUISTICS

For the past two decades, Chomsky's **Syntactic Structures** (1957) has made a great impact on the language sciences. Sociolinguistics helps us to understand man and society not only vis-a-vis the functions of language varieties but their unique characteristics as well.

Sociolinguists such as Labov (1972b) and Bailey (1973) have demonstrated that what earlier linguists had considered ' irregularity ' or ' free variation ' in linguistic behavior or as acting in an internally very inconsistent and unpredictable manner, can be found to show regular and predictable statistical patterns in language use. For example, a New Yorker will sometimes say ' guard ' with /r/ and sometimes without. Or he might say ' beard ' the same way as ' bad '. It was found that this variation was neither free nor random, but determined by extra - linguistic factors, in a quite predictable way, depending on the speaker's social class, age, and sex. Sociolinguists are, therefore, able to accurately correlate linguistic features with social class.

ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNICATION AND SOCIOLINGUISTICS

According to Hymes (1962), we should accept language as a socially situated cultural form, while at the same time recognize the necessity to analyze the code and the cognitive process of its speakers and hearers. Therefore, a language and its variations are best understood when the habits, customs, and subject matters of thought embodied in the language are well known. In all cases, patterned variations can be related to aspects of the social structures or value and belief systems within the respective cultures. The recognition of non - native varieties of English has resulted from the careful observation of language use which implies that language must be considered a part of the ' meaning system ' in which it functions, and related to the contexts in which it is used.

Under the Firthian concept of ' context of situation ', human participants, their behavior, the objects involved, the words used--all of which can be identified as environmental features--are relevant to the interpretation of a particular communicative act. Context of situation, then, " establishes the rules of appropriateness for the behavior of participants in a lan-

guage event on the basis of who they are, where they are, and why they have come together, and gives meaning to that behavior " (Savignon 1983 : 303). For Firth, meaning is deeply embedded in the living process of people maintaining themselves in society. Hence, it is this process which results in the ' newness' or the ' non-nativeness ' in non-native Englishes; and therefore, language as a communicative system cannot be divorced from its social functioning, which requires heterogeneity for a range of situation types and functions.

STUDIES OF VARIATION

Before describing the varieties of English, I shall discuss current approaches to description of variation, a phenomenon of linguistic change which results in numerous varieties.

Bell (1976 : 32 - 34) offers the following definitions :

> Variables may be distinguished from variants. A variable is an ' consistency of disagreement that a particular from the language may exhibit from an abstract standard ', while a variant is a ' specific value of a variable '.

He continues :

> in addition to having formal values, variables can have different values associated with them.

According to Labov (1972b), there are three types of linguistic variables: **indicators, markers,** and **stereotypes.** Indicators are indexical values correlated with the socio-economic class membership or other demographic characteristics of the users. Markers, like indicators, have indexical values, and are subject to stylistic variation; that is, subject to use or non - use by the same speaker in his ' casual ' or ' careful ' styles. Stereotypes do not relate to social factors but are subject to stylistic shifting. They based on views and demonstrate the norms of speech which may be quite at variance with the actual facts based on recollections of speech habits. These three linguistic variables can be clarified in the table below (Bell 1976 : 33) :

Sociolinguistic Variables

Type	Social Stratification	Style Shifting
Indicator	+	-
Marker	+	+
Stereotype	–	+

These variables are motivated internally as well as externally, and are realized as ' allophonic variations '. They are termed: dialect, register, and style. Nineteenth - century linguists (e.g., Baugh 1951; de Saussure 1962) were concerned with the internal sources of variation. Sound change resulted from the influence of one single sound or a group of sounds. That is, X becomes Y in the environment of Z, (X $\longrightarrow$ Y/Z). As Martinet says (quoted in Bell 1976 : 34) " items which resisted inclusion in their systems were termed ' irregularities ' or ' loans ' and the whole system would be dubbed a ' mixed dialect '. " There are, however, other kinds of variation, even in phonology, which linguists have found difficult to include in phonological models, and, thus, have been viewed as external to the code in which they occur. External sources of variation are considered to be ' inter - personal ', ' intra - personal ' and ' inherent variation ', all of which will be discussed as follows (Bell 1976).

a) Inter - personal variations have some correlations with the age, sex, geographical or social prominence of the user. Ideally, a precise specification of the characteristics of a user would correlate perfectly with the choices he makes. In practice, a sociolinguist is more concerned with generalizations about the common use of a group as a collection of individuals showing similar norms than with individual member use.

b) Intra - personal variations, on the other hand, depend on conditioning factors such as the ' formality ' or ' informality ' of the situation. Such variations are stylistic rather than dialectal.

c) Inherent variation plays another role in linguistic change. Labov (1963), however, argues that ' inherent variation ' is unpredictable; and therefore, should be discounted. Nonetheless, the inherent variability of language must be considered as true variation to allow for individual freedom of choice.

VARIETIES OF ENGLISH

I shall now outline how ' varieties ' of English have been described in previous sociolinguistic studies. The existence of variation and heterogeneous linguistic structure is not to be denied. Investigation on the actual speech used in specific speech communities shows that heterogeneity is the normal situation and is the natural rule; it is the fundamental condition of linguistic change (Weinreich et al., 1968). Sociolinguistic studies have shown that variation in speech is a systematic rule - governed behavior.

AN OVERVIEW

' English ', as Quirk & Greenbaum (1973:1) argue, is " a common core or nucleus which is realized only in the different forms of the language that we actually hear or read. " The common core, as explained by Quirk & Greenbaum, excludes variation due to region, education, special standing, medium, attitude and interference. Regional variation for Quirk is something comparable to dialect which marks varieties according to region. Quirk (1981) elaborates variation in terms of ' educated speech ', which tends to be given the additional prestige of the learned professions, political parties, the press, law courts and governmental agencies and uneducated speech as well.

Varieties are also due to interference and transfer. ' Interference ' (Albert & Obler 1978), as used in psychology, is a phenomenon that occurs when acquired behavior is applied to a situation which requires a completely new style or pattern of behavior. In the pedagogical sense and in language learning, it has also been referred to as ' negative transfer ' (Corder 1971). In linguistic literature, ' interference ' is characterized as a trace left by someone's native language upon the additional language he has acquired, or vice versa. For example, a Thai might say, " I am here since Friday, " thus imposing Thai grammatical usage on English.

THE USE OF ENGLISH

The use of English for international communication has increased dramatically during the past four decades. Moreover, English continues to be used for intranational communication in many countries of the world. Thus, the possibilities for variations in the English language tend to expand in proportion to the increases in its new users and new uses. Noss (1983 : 1) feels that " no other international language, past or present, has exhibited more variation, in linguistic and sociolinguistic terms, than English now does, while at the same time maintaining its status as a vehicle for effective worldwide communication in many different domains. "

The spread of English has created new varieties which can be termed " non-native varieties " (Kachru 1982a, 1982b, 1983a) in the sense that they are used for intranational and international communication by non-native speakers of English as a second language. For example, English in South Asia has been institutionalized and shows distinct characteristics of " South Asianess " (Kachru 1982a, 1982b, 1983a) as a result of the acculturation of a Western language in the linguistically and culturally pluralistic context of the subcontinent.

Non-native varieties of English, however, have been viewed essentially in terms of ' deviations ' by some researchers (Trudgill & Hannah 1982). Detailed analyses of non - native English varieties such as Malaysian English, African English, Singaporean English, Philippine English, and Indian English have all supported the idea that these ' non-native Englishes ' deviate from the norms of the English native speakers and can be considered ' deviations ', and not ' mistakes '. " Deviations " refer to (Kachru 1982a:25) :

> the linguistic and cultural nativization of a variety of English. Nativization is the result of the new ' unEnglish ' linguistic and cultural setting in which English is used as a tool of communication.....and this new setting determines the deviation in the language use. Therefore, each variety differs from the native varieties spoken in Britain, the United States, Canada or Australia.

A ' mistake ' is different from a deviation. The term is normally used in the literature on language acquisition. Corder (1974) defines a ' mistake ' as a performance failure that is likely to occur when the speaker is tired, nervous, or in some sort of situation of stress or uncertainty or when the speaker is absorbed in a non - linguistic activity. A mistake, then, is unacceptable and can occur in both native and additional languages.

Deviation in language use is one of the context - determined linguistic innovations which are productive and pragmatically essential, and, therefore, a part of a specific variety. Deviations also have a role according to Firth's context of situation; that is, they are context - bound, and culturally governed.

The fact that there are many varieties of English implies that it is considered the language of ' cross-cultural ' and ' cross-national ' understanding (Kachru & Quirk 1981 : xiv). English is used by over 700 million people around the world and, thus, comes close to being a universal language. The spread of English has resulted in the fact that non-native speakers now outnumber native speakers of English. This fact then implies that bilingualism in English is continually growing.

NATIVE VARIETIES OF ENGLISH

The term ' native variety of English ' implies its counterpart, the ' non-native variety of English.. '

The native variety of English refers to English naturally acquired as the native language or mother tongue through formal education. As Wong (1982: 264) defines it, the native English variety is :

> the complete system of English in all its complexity and richness that is available to the native speaker, whether British, American, Canadian, Australian, or other. This is the variety of English found in native speaker contexts all over the world, from Canada and the United States to Britain, Australia and New Zealand. It is also the variety of English in which most scientific, technical, literary, and academic work is carried on.

NON - NATIVE VARIETIES OF ENGLISH

The non-native variety of English, on the other hand, refers to the English language which is not a native language although it has widespread use for administrative, commercial, and other international purposes. The term non-native variety includes the institutionalized varieties established as second languages, and/or as lingua francas. For example, in Africa, India, and the Philippines, English has developed ' marked varieties ' in terms of its formal and functional characteristics for intranational purposes. That is, the non-native speakers adopt models of English for their own use. As Ferguson puts it (1982:viii) :

> I refer to the spread of languages as lingua francas, or as **added** components within the existing repertoires, or as complete replacements for other languages; in all these cases the spreading language shows variation related in complex ways to the earlier language competences of the new uses.

Some English-using communities require the use of their language for contact with the external world, for communication with other individuals and communities, for access to science and to other international mediums for which English is a vehicle. These international needs constitute the major requirement for English in certain countries such as Japan, Turkey, China, and Thailand. English in these countries has never been institutionalized and, therefore, varieties of English in these countries can be viewed as performance varieties. Other English-using communities, however, require the English language not only for international uses, but also for intranational purposes : for use by large populations within the community, e.g., Singapore, India, Malaysia, and African countries, where English has been institutionalized.

VARIETIES WITHIN THE NON - NATIVE VARIETIES

Non-native varieties can be divided into two categories: the performance varieties and the institutionalized varieties.

1. Performance Varieties

The performance varieties include those varieties which are used as foreign languages. Kachru (1982a) observes that the performance varieties of English have a highly restricted functional range in specific contexts, for example, those of tourism, commerce, and other international transactions.

2. Institutionalized Varieties

Institutionalized varieties always start as performance varieties. Their development and institutionalization depend on time factors, extension of use, expansion of users, emotional attachment of the users, functional importance and sociolinguistic status (see Kachru 1982d).

CHARACTERISTICS OF NON - NATIVE INSTITUTIONALIZED VARIETIES

Non-native institutionalized varieties of English share the following main characteristics :

a) Extended range of uses in the sociolinguistic context of a nation;

b) Extended register and style range;

c) Recognized registers and styles as products of the process of nativization; and

d) A nativized body of English literature with formal and contextual characteristics that mark it local.

FUNCTIONAL USES OF NON - NATIVE VARIETIES

In defining and differentiating the non-native varieties of English, it is essential to use a graded series or cline in terms of proficiency in English and in its functional uses in the sociolinguistic context. In

other words, within the framework of user and uses, one has to take into account the nature of participants, the hierarchy of roles, and the cline of intelligibility.

The institutionalized varieties of non-native English can be arranged along a lectal continuum. Platt (1975) suggests a lectal scale ranging from basilect, the lowest, point, to acrolect, the highest point, with mesolect as the central point. This continuum is to be functional. We, then, can also have a cline in performance, varying form ' educated ' or ' standard ' to ' pidginized ' or ' broken ' varieties, which prove to be varieties within a variety as those in native varieties of English.

The instrumental function entails the use of English as a medium of learning at various levels in the educational system of the country, and as a tool for upward mobility.

The regulative function entails the use of English in those contexts in which language is used to regulate conduct, for instance, the legal and administrative systems.

The interpersonal function is performed, as Kachru (1982a:42) puts it, in two senses: first, as " a link language between speakers of various (often mutually unintelligible) languages and dialects in linguistically and culturally pluralistic societies "; and second, by providing " a code which symbolizes modernization and elitism. "

The imaginative/innovative function refers to the use of English in various literary genres. In this function, the non-native users of English have shown great creativity in using the English language in ' un-English ' contexts (Kachru 1982a).

As non-native varieties of English have extended ' range ' of uses in the sociolinguistic context of a nation, the functional uses of these varieties have been extended as well. The extension of range means the extension of the language, e.g., English, into various cultural, social, educational, and commercial contexts--the wider the range, the greater the variety of uses. Range of a variety has a great impact on the degree of nativization of a variety of English as well.

The range and the functions of English, in addition to the period during which the society has been exposed to bilingualism in English, are related to the degree of nativization. The greater the number of functions, and the longer the period, the more nativized the variety becomes. The manifestations of this nativization result in the ' acculturation of English '.

' Thai English ' which I have claimed to be a non - native English variety, implies the degree of intelligibility. As unfamiliar to the native speakers as some lexis and grammar of Thai English may seem, this non - native variety can be understood when it is studied within the Thai context. Native speakers of English may find that Thai English deviates from their native varieties. Provided with a sociolinguistic explanation, these deviations are acceptable and intelligible within the context of the use of English in Thailand.

INTELLIGIBILITY

Intelligibility is an essential function of all linguistic communication. The question still remains: intelligible to whom, in which contexts and for which participants. In non - native varieties of English, **deviation** has a system of its own. An example of patterned deviance in Indian English is the replacement of English alveolar stops, (t) and (d), by retroflex counterparts. This common substitution is one of the major stereotyping characteristics of the ' Indian accent ' in English. Deviations in phonology, however, generally seem to be more readily tolerated than deviations in lexis or grammar.

The term ' degree of intelligibility ' refers to the extent to which one is understandable. Indeed there is a cline of intelligibility (Kachru 1976, 1982a; Nelson 1982; Smith 1983) according to the linguistic proficiency of the participants and their specific roles in a given situation. Moreover, a speaker may switch within his range of verbal repertoire to meet varying communicational needs. Kachru (1982a:49) elucidates that " intelligibility of the institutionalized non - native varieties of English forms a cline. Some speakers are more intelligible than are others, the variables being education, role, region, etc. " Furthermore, intelligibility presumes different participants, people who may not be from the same speech community or speech fellowship, or even simply individual speakers of the same variety. Intelligibility, therefore, varies according to certain prameters within the context of the situation.

Nelson (1982) notes that the degree to which the participants find one another ' intelligible ' is determined by the extent to which the interlocuters share a cultural background, as well as the extent to which

their languages share phonological and grammatical features. The following greeting by a Chinese, ' Have you eaten rice yet? ', is perfectly understood by a Thai whose diet mainly consists of rice as well.

Degree of intelligibility, therefore, indicates the likelihood that an utterance will be interpretated in its intended sense by the speaker. A meaningful definition of ' being intelligible ' would have to include both linguistic and social aspects of **competence.**

People are generally required to use their knowledge of the language system in order to achieve their communicative purposes. That is to say, we are generally called upon to produce instances of language use. We do not simply manifest the abstract system of the language, but we, at the same time, realize it as meaningful communicative behavior. Hence, **usage** and **use** are aspects of performance. While usage makes evident the extent to which the language user demonstrates his knowledge of linguistic rules, use is another aspect of performance which makes evident the extent to which the language user demonstrates his ability to use his knowledge of linguistic rules for **effective communication.**

In normal circumstances, linguistic performance involves the simultaneous manifestation of the language system as **usage** and its realization as **use.** We can separate one from the other by merely adjusting the focus of our attention. This study primarily focuses on language **use;** therefore, I will filter out irregularities of usage.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE THAINESS IN THAI ENGLISH

" Thainess " in Thai English constitutes characteristics of the Thai English variety resulting from the process of contextualization. In the Firthian sense, the context of situation is a part of the process of contextualization which can be referred to as the context of culture (Kachru 1981). Certain context - specific features are, therefore, a process of contextualization which makes it possible for linguists to capture and analyze the non - native varieties of English as in Bokamba's (1981) study of African English and, especially, in Kachru's (1983a) study of Indian English.

In this study, I shall use terms such as **transfer, shift,** and **hybridization** to describe the Thainess in Thai English writings and to explain deviations and innovations of Thai English in the Thai contaxt.

TRANSFER

The process of transfer refers to the transfer of elements of a certain context, i.e., the context of L_1 (C_1) to L_2. Kachru (1983a:101) states that transfer may involve " the transfer of certain contextual units which may be non-belonging elements of the culture of L_2, " for example, the caste system in India or religious taboos and the like.

In this section, the transfer of Thai contextual units will be discussed. Such transfers show notions of superiority and inferiority, language use by the Royal family and commoners, monks and lay disciples, and social and religious taboos. These transfers of linguistic elements appear in all Thai English texts.

TRANSFER OF CULTURAL AND SOCIAL NOTIONS

The process of transfer includes linguistic items which are essentially socially determined, speech functions, address, greeting, curses, and other such items. Consider, for example, the greeting in L_1 which appears in L_2 context.

> Swadi, where are you going, Jai? *(LT:9)*
>
> Where are you going? Have you eaten yet? (Jd:30)
>
> How are you doing? Is your work all right? (Jd:41)

These interrogative constructions are greetings in Thai and the speakers do not expect to receive an answer. The person spoken to does not feel that his or her privacy has been disturbed.

Another type of transfer is the transfer of social role and social status. Social status is also a part of the sociolinguistic rules in Thai, which have been vividly portrayed in Thai texts. Consider the status of the Royal family and the commoners of the Thai society in the following examples.

> His Majesty will proceed to present the robes to monks by himself at five important royal temples. For the other royal temples, various official units and suitably deemed private organizations may be honoured to present the royal robes on the king's behalf.
>
> (BC : 136)

" How handsome and pretty their Royal Highness are and they acted as if we are their relatives; I can even hear His Majesty call the old woman who sat beside me ' grandmother '. They are very kind, " Father said.

(LT : 121)

Another incident showing the importance of social status comes from **Little Things.** The King, the Lord of Life, is considered to have the highest status. Nonetheless, when he talks to an old lady farmer (a speck of dust underfoot), as in the following example, the King did not use the special vocabulary reserved for members of the Royal family. Instead, he used the kinship term, thus, showing ingroupness and respect for the old lady. The villagers, or the King's subjects, were speechless and ' overwhelmed with gladness '.

" And the King talked to me. Oh, my hair is still standing up, " Mother said.

" I even heard him call the old woman who sat beside me ' grandmother '. " Father said.

(LT : 126)

Another aspect which reveals this transfer is religious notions. Almost 90 percent of the Thai people are Buddhists. Thus, Buddhism plays an important role in the daily lives of the Thai people. Therefore, one has to be aware of the basic concepts of Buddhist philosophy in order to understand the use of Thai English in such contexts.

Buddhist philosophical teachings, as an integral part of Thai life, appear in Thai English writings: **the web of suffering** (ML : 33), **the fruit of merit** (LT : 145), **the food offering during Phan sa** (LT : 90), **the double life** (BO : 53), and **a branch and not a tree of life** (Jd : 23). In explanation of the above, ' The food offering during Phanse ' or. ' Lent ' is considered ' the fruit of merit ' for the person who offers the food to the monks. And when a Thai has ' the double life ' he simply wants to say that he studies during the day and works at night or vice versa. ' The double life ' can be ' the tree of life ' for someone, and it can be ' a branch and not a tree of life ' for others. This means that a significant incident in one's life can be insignificant to others.

As a rule, a commoner has to use another set of linguistic and sociolinguistic features to converse or to refer to members of the Royal family. Pretentious words are normally found in the discourse relating to members of the Royal family :

The Royal meritorious performance on Magapuja falls in February.

(BP : Jan 23, 84)

His Majesty will proceed to offer royal homage and pay obeisance to the former Chakri kings at the Deubinan Castle of Grand Palace.

(BC : 136)

Even among the members of the Royal family, there are several different ranks so that each rank is referred to by different titles and strategies of pronominal usage, i.e., Prince, Princess, Pra Ong Chao, Mom Chao, Mom Rajawong (M.R.), and Mom Luang (M.L.). These transfers are illustrated in all forms of Thai discourse; for example,

Princess Chulaphorn	M.R. Kukrit
M.R. Benjapha	M.L. Boonlua

TRANSFER OF FORMAL ITEMS

Formal items can be transferred from L_1 to L_2 on all grammatical levels: sentences, clauses, phrases, fixed collocations, and meanings. Consider the following items transferred from L_1 to L_2, which still maintain the same meaning, social rank and status as in L1 : **minor wife** ' a mistress '; **a tea house** ' a brothel '; **the man's old spirit** ' the sexual drive '; **the ordinary train** ' the local train '; **mini - bus** ' a non - government bus '; **a two - rowed bus** ' a mini pick - up used as a Thai mini bus '; **a stop over meal** ' a quick meal during a break '; **personally prepared food** ' food prepared on order '; **a small room** ' a restroom '; **no hand restaurant** ' a restaurant with hostesses '; **remarried** ' marry an ex - husband ', and finally, an expression like, **Let's go eat air** ' go for a walk '.

The transfer of meaning from Thai kinship terms will convey one of four different meanings: affection or intimacy, respect, familiarity and acquaintance, and kinship. Terms such as **sister, brother, uncle, aunt, grandfather,** and **grandmother** can have extended meanings as terms of respect even though the interlocutors are not related to each other. These terms of respect and collocations are part of the Thai culture that is unfamiliar to native English speakers. However, for Thai speakers *of English, kinship terms are re-*quired and necessary not only to snow respect but to mark the speakers ' good manners. To avoid the ambiguous reference of the kinship terms ɔ iŋ or thɛ̂ɛ ' real ' is added in the Thai discourse. In this manner, one would be making reference to blood relatives.

This process is carried over into English. That is to say, the adjective ' real ' is added. " A real brother ' or ' a real sister ', therefore, denotes native speakers of English applying those terms in the Thai English context.

TRANSLATION

Translation from Thai into English is very common as we have seen in the above examples. It is quite noticeable in addition to accent or phonological interference from L_1 to L_2. Translation occurs consciously when a Thai speaker cannot find any equivalent items to convey an effective semantic interpretation. Sometimes the process occurs unintentionally when a speaker carries aspects of social concepts of L_1 to L_2. Word for word translation is quite frequent in Thai English. Consider the following illustrations.

> It is common to a mind drawing inward.
> (ML : 87)
>
> A cardinal wrong deprived him of his Bhikkuhood.
> (ML : 95)

Another example is an excerpt taken from Thirabutana's, **Little Things.** The author carries over into English the linguistic patterns and literary habits of her narrative Thai prose. In the following example, the discourse was composed through what has been termed the " spiral thought process " of a typical Thai writer (Palmer 1983) such as:

> The fifteenth day of the waxing moon in the sixth lunar month, which was this month, May, was Buddha's birthday; thirty-five years later he knew **the truth of lives** (Enlightenment) and eighty years later (from his birthday) he was dead. These three events happened to fall on the same date. We all went to the temple with lit candles and incense sticks and flowers. Afterwards we put all the candles, incense sticks and the flowers on the outside of the temple and went to listen to the preaching at the sala. We children would sit behind our mother and unconsciously fall asleep at last.
> (My brackets; LT : 49)

This is a story-telling style which appears in Thai writing. It seems ambiguous and wordy. However, it is clearly an example of Thai writing transferred into English. Such a discourse, thus, constitutes the Thainess in Thai English.

Translation is needed as an explanation for the preceding Thai words. A Thai user of English extends the NP constituent by rephrasing it through the application of apposition and repetition. Consider for example, the following :

> The Kuti, Bhikkus ' living place, were wet all over. (Ml : 92)
>
> When it was completed, a board bearing the name ' Ban Song Samai ', ' Modern Home ' was nailed to the front. (LT : 103)
>
> Today is Khao Phansa Buddhist Lent. (LT : 104)
>
> Father went to repair tiang ña, the little raised hut in the field. (BO : 7)
>
> I like som tam, shredded salad, very very much. (LT : 12)

From the various types of translation from Thai English texts presented, it has been clear that in a language contact, translation may be of the following two types: rank - bound and rank - changed.

Rank - bound translation refers to the formal items of L_1 which are translated at the same ' rank ' into L_2. For example, the word phrase in L_1, nâa nɯ̂a has been translated into L_2 as ' meaty face '; a Thai adverbial phrase is still an adverbial phrase when being translated into English, such as, phɯ̂a lɛ̂ɛk kàp ŋən, ' to exchange your honour for money '; and the clause araɹ kɯɯ araɹ ' what is what ', is also a clausal construction in English.

Rank - changed translation refers to the formal items of L_1 translated at different ranks into L_2 which can be a higher or lower rank, e.g., Thai sentences being reduced to a noun or a noun phrase, respectively: wan khâw phansǎa to ' Lent '; khâaw màɹ plaa man to ' newlyweds '. The reverse pattern still holds. For example, a noun in L_1 becomes a noun phrase or a clause in L2: takhian becomes ' Mother Holy Wood ', and ɹaa hɔ̌m becomes ' a tonic for your heart ' or ' a heart tonic to sniff ' (ML;PL). In essence, then, users of English pattern the English structure upon that of their native language. The translation involves both the application of agreement rules in the native language and the translation of the native discourse into English sentences. These few illustrative extracts show that translation in Thai English is very common. It is intelligible in the Thai context.

At the discourse level, this type of writing can be considered as " transcreated style ". The Thai way of life and Thai way of thinking are also projected here in Thai English writings also.

SHIFTS

Shift is a type of adaptation. According to Kachru (1966, 1983a), shifts can be distinguished from translation in the sense that a shift does not establish formal equivalence. The motivation for the shift is that the contextual unit in English, L_2, demands a formal item. The ' new ' formation, as Kachru (1983a: 107) describes it, " may be an adaptation of an L_2 item or may provide the source for an elaborate adaptation. " His example, **may the vessel of your life never float on the sea of existence,** shows the adaptation from L_1, **tera bera gark ho.** Shifts may sometimes involve the shift of fixed collocations or idioms and expressions of L_1.

In Thai writings, the use of proverbs, old sayings, similes, and metaphors is very common, and can be considered as a distinct part of the Thai style. Therefore, it is unavoidable for Thai English writers to shift this Thai style to English. Total semantic interpretation with regard to Thai culture is preserved in the compositional structure of Thai English. Examples of shifts from old Thai sayings are given below.

Prevention is better than cure.

(LT : 83)

' Be cautious. '

(Prevention is the best medicine.)

I don't want to put lice into my head.

(Jd : 103)

' I don't want to get involved in that matter. '

(Wash your hands of the matter.)

Such a desire brings on a train of its friends and relatives of anger, delusion and the like.

(ML : 223)

' Such a desire brings all kinds of misfortune. '

(It opens Pandora's box.)

Furthermore, shifts occur at both the clause and sentential levels. Sometimes they can be referred to as the micro-level of translation which is concerned with the constituent parts of the discourse. Another type of common shift is called ' calque ' (Kachru 1983a). Calques are items which have L_2 phonology and grammar but have been assigned by the contextual meaning from L_1. Calques, therefore, are illustrations of semantic transfer. Calques may result in ' register confusion ' or formal collocational deviation from the L_2 norm. For example, the writer Chart Kobjitti has translated the items khon (person) and sòkkapròk (dirty) by using ' dirty person ' in the same contextual unit in that khon sòkkapròk refers to a person who commits some wrongdoing according to Buddhist philosophy. In English, ' dirty person ' refers to a person who is ' an obscene fox ' or ' a dirty old man '. The English semantic interpretation for ' dirty ' implies moral judgement in that a dirty person may cheat in a card game or be very tricky in the basketball game. Another example is ' the sound of the lunch bell from the wat (temple) ' 6 LT), which means 11 o'clock in the morning. Calques conveying time in Thai English are : the sound of the first tram bell (5 a.m.); the sound of the lunch bell (11 a.m.); at the fire of the navy cannon (12 p.m.); since their father's time (in ancient time). The concept of time length during the night is expressed in relation to cultural activities.

The following examples from various texts all reflect Thai superstitions: ' sit in front of the fire ' or ' her lying-in by the fire ' (treatment for the woman who had just delivered a child with some herbs by the fire); ' the Holy Mother Wood ' or ' the Takien Wood ' (a female ghost); and ' Pigsty Floor board ' (a plank from the pig pen used for protecting the new-born child from evil or the female ghost who might come for the child's organs). The following illustrations also belong to this type of shift: ' bonfire ceremony ' (ceremony held each year for the primitive Thai-made rocket), ' dark influence ' (crime, e.g. for protection money). ' sparrow house ' (a small and tiny house, e.g., in the slum), ' vegetable drug ' (herb), and ' itching weeds ' (poisonous plants).

Shifts can, therefore, result in contextual ambiguity for native English speakers. However, this register confusion can avoided by the use of ' ordinary ' English words, i.e., 11 o'clock, 5 a.m. and so on. Thai English writers, by contrast, might feel that these ' ordinary ' words do not provide any ' nice flavor and taste ' in their discourse for the readers.

Shift in collocations are also evident in Thai English. This kind of shift refers to how word building in L_1 has been shifted to L2. The collocation is a replacement for a word or an expression in L1. For

example, **turned a blind eye to it** means ' overlook, ignore '. Also, **Follow-the-rocket-trail ceremony** is the ceremony held the day after the **bonfire ceremony. A mobile water bed** is a result of sarcastic writing: it refers to a car stalled because of the heavy floods in Bangkok. ' A mobile water bed ' is a good example of lexical innovation showing its imaginative function of the language.

LEXICAL BORROWING

Lexical borrowing is the transfer of Thai lexical items into Thai English. Lexical borrowing differs from shifts and loan translation in that shift is an adaptation, a compromising form of an underlying formal item from Thai. Loan translation, on the other hand, involves a formal equivalence between Thai and Thai English. Lexical borrowing is needed when there is a lack of lexical items and lexical gap in L_2 which have the same semantic interpretation as those in L_1. The following examples are lexical borrowings which appear in Thai English texts.

Tiles for the Royal Family Members

Thai Items	**Glossary**
Chao Fa	Prince
Chao Fa Ying	Princess
Mom Chao or M.C.	the Highest Lord
Mom Rachawong or M.R.	the Lower Lord
Mom Luang or M.L.	the Lowest Lord

(**Mom** is the shortened form for all the lords.)

Social Positions

Thai Items	**Glossary**
Thid	A man who has been ordained as a monk
Kruu	A teacher
Archarn	A teacher, usually in colleges
Luang Pi	A monk older than the speaker
Luang Po	A learned monk much older than the speaker
Luang Ta	An aged monk
Maha	A title for the monk with a certain certificate from the Buddhist College
Kamnan	A chief in a village
Puu Yai	A chief in a small community

In addition to these items, there are a number of special lexical items that are associated with the following categories: food, transportation, denomination, district, musical instruments, religious objects and activities, animals, types of buildings, social activities, storage containers, and clothing.

Thai lexical borrowings in Thai English have transferred semantic features from Thai; however, they have been assigned English grammatical features. That is to say, they can be inflected as English items. For example, singular nouns become plural when suffixed with **-s,** as in **kuti, kutis** ' monks ' building '; **pasin, *pasins*** ' *Thai female skirt* '; **sala, salas** ' *covered shelter with a roof and floor but no walls* '; **pinto, pintos** ' a stack of containers with a portable handle '; and **rai, rais** ' 2/5 acre '. Nouns can also take the possessive morpheme **'s,** e.g., **kruu's** ' of the teacher '; **Luang Ta's Chiwan** ' A robe of an aged monk ', and so on. Moreover, a noun can become a verb as well, e.g., **ramwong** ' a kind of Thai folk dance ', **to ramwong** ' to perform a ramwong '.

HYBRIDIZATION

Hybridization is a process of compound formation. A hybridized item refers to a lexicel item which is comprised of two or more elements having at least one item from Thai and the other from English. Hybridized items, as identified by Kachru (1983a : 153), can be in an open or closed system. The open set refers to hybridized items which form a new meaning. The closed set shows morphological forms taken from one language and affixed to a word of another language. In Thai, for example, there are no plural affixes, and therefore, affixing grammatical or derivational morphemes onto the lexical item is in violation of Thai grammatical rules.

LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY

Changes in languages take place continuously. That is, most of the languages of the world have undergone changes of varying degree depending upon the use of the languages in various domains of social activity and by different social groups. Historical linguists explain the process of linguistic change through the various major and minor processes of sound change (Hockett 1958). Sturtevant (1961) has outlined a concise theory of the spread of language changes which consistently views this process in its social dimension.

Linguistic changes are the result of assimilation, analogy, borrowing, fusion, contamination, and any

number of other processes in which the language system interacts with the sociological, psychological and physiological characteristics of individuals or social groups. Changes are of two types: 1) those changes which vanish quickly and 2) those changes which have been so widely spread that new forms are derived (Labov 1972b). Linguistic change, therefore, is a common occurrence due to various factors. Some changes can be explained linguistically, for example, /p/ becomes [b] between two vowels, that is, p→ b/V____V. Changes in Thai English such as /ow/ →/o/, /st/ → /s/ as in **toes** ' toast ', denote language changes found on the phonological level.

Several of these changes, however, have taken place due to social factors such as the educational, social, or economic status of different Thai social groups.

At the lexical level, users of Thai English may shift and switch English lexical items, e.g., the English kinship terms **cousin** and **brother,** depending upon social context, situation, and participants. When an educated Thai English speaker of a higher social status introduces his or her cousin to others of the same social class in a formal social situation, **cousin** is normally used. The same speaker, however, may prefer the term **brother** when introducing the same cousin to his or her close friends in an informal gathering. In studying non-native varieties of English, therefore, one can view language changes which reflect different types of assimilation and adaptations according to the rules of the native language of the users, L_1, as well as the social structure of the society, C_1.

Religious involvement is also a significant factor in the linguistic changes recognizable in Thai English. One can find several English items in the linguistic behavior of Buddhist Thai English speakers such as **rice giving merit** (ML : 23) ' the offer of food to monks in the morning '. In addition, **the processions of the candles** (LT : 19) depicts the ' procession of lay disciples with lighted candles in their hands walking clockwise around the temple on the night of Khao Phansa or Buddhist Lent. '

As language is considered a social phenomenon, it is necessary to investigate the changes taking place in language on the basis of the social factors pertaining to Thai society. The study of linguistic change, therefore, should take into account the various social and linguistic parameters responsible for all the changes in the English used by Thais.

CONCLUSION

The characteristics of Thainess in Thai English as discussed can be termed ' Thai English characteristics '. These Thai English characteristics result from Thai sociocultural factors, i.e., social role, status, and stratification of the Thai cultural system. Hence, apart from the linguistic or grammatical rules, there are sociocultural factors which constitute the sociolinguistic rules of Thai English. Thai culture, thus, has been transmitted through the process of transfer, shift, and translation into Thai English. It is Thai culture that denotes people in Thailand as Thai, and, accordingly, the English language used in the Thai community is Thai English.

ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations refer to the citations from Thai - English writing used in this study. They are as follows :

BC Thailand: Tourist Organization of Thailand. 1983. *Rattanakosin Bicentenial Life and People in Commemoration of Bangkok 200 years.* Bangkok : Thai Government Press.

BO Pramoj, Tipyavadi. 1983. *Before the Buds Have Opened.* Bangkok : Duang Prateep Foundation Press.

BP *The Bangkok Post.* Bangkok.

Jd Kobchitti, Chart. 1983. *The Judgement.* Bangkok : Ruen Kaew Press.

LT Thirabutana, Prajuab. 1973. *Little Thing.* London : Collins Clear - Type Press.

ML Buddhasukh, Siri. 1978. *My Life.* Bangkok : Bangkok Printing Press.

NR **The Nation Review.** Bangkok.

SK **Sakulthai** (in Thai). Bangkok.

SS **Satrisarn** (in Thai). Bangkok.

REFERENCES

Albert, M.L. and Obler, L.K. 1978. *The Bilingual Brain : Neuropsychological and Neurolinguistic Aspects of Bilingualism.* New York : Academic Press.

Bailey, C.J.N. 1973. *Linguistic Theory and the Study of Variation.* Washington D.C.

Bell, R.T. 1976. *Sociolinguistics : Goals, Approaches and Problems.* London : Batsford.

Bokamba, E.G. 1981. The Africanization of English. In Kachru (ed.), *The Other Tongue,* Urbana : University of Illinois Press, 77 - 98.

Bright, William. 1966. Social dialect and language history. *Current Anthropology.* I(5 - 6) : 423 - 24.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge : MIT Press.

Corder, S. Pit. 1971. Idiosyncratic dialects and error analysis. *International Review of Applied Linguistics.* 9, 2 : 147 - 159.

_____. 1974. Error analysis, interlanguage and second language acquisition. *Language Teaching and Linguistics : Abstracts.* 8 : 201 - 218.

Ferguson, C.A. 1982. *Language Structure and Language Use.* Stanford.

Hockett, C.F. 1958. *A Course in Modern Linguistics.* New York.

Hymes, Dell. 1962. The ethnography of speaking. In Gladevin, T. and Sturtevant, W.C. (eds.) *Anthropology and Human Behavior.* Cambridge.

Kachru, Braj. B. 1966. Indian English: A study in contextualization. In Bazell et al. (eds.), *In Memory of J.R. Firth.* London: Longman, 258 - 287.

_____. 1976. Models of English for the Third World: White man's linguistic burden, or language pragmatics? *TESOL Quarterly* 10 (2) : 221 - 239.

_____. 1981. The pragmatics of non-native varieties of English. In Smith, L.E. (ed.) *English for Cross-Cultural Communication.* New York : St. Martin's Press, 15 - 39.

Kachru, Braj B. 1982a. The bilingual linguistic repertoire. In Hartford, B. (ed.) *Issues in International Bilingual Education : The Role of the Vernacular.* New York : Plenum Press, 25 - 52.

_____. 1982b. Meaning in duration. In Kachru (ed.), *The Other Tongue.* Urbana : University of Illinois Press, 325 - 350.

_____. 1982c. Models for non - native Englished. In Kachru (ed.), *The Other Tongue.* Urbana : University of Illinois Press, 31 - 57.

_____. 1982d. *English Across Cultures.* Urbana : University of Illinois Press.

_____. 1983a. *The Indianization of English : The English Language in India.* Delhi : Oxford University Press.

_____. 1983b. Meaning in duration towards understanding non - native English texts. In Noss (ed.), *Varieties of English in Southeast Asia.* Singapore : SEAMO Regional Language Centre, 20 - 49.

Labov, William. 1963. The social motivation of a sound change. *Word,* 19, 272 - 309.

_____. 1972a. Rules for ritual insults. In Sundow (ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction.* New York : Free Press 120 - 169.

_____. 1972b. *Sociolinguistic Patterns.* Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvania Press.

Nelson, C. 1982. Intelligibility and non - native varieties of English. In Kachru, *The Other Tongue.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 58 - 76.

Noss, R.B. (ed.) 1983. *Varieties of English in Southeast Asia.* Anthology Series II. Singapore : SEAMO Regional Language Centre.

Platt, J.T. 1975. *The Social Significance of Speech : An Introduction to and Workbook in Sociolinguistics.* Amsterdam : North - Holland Publishing Company.

Quirk, R. 1981. International Communication and the concept of nuclear English. In Smith (ed.), *English for Cross Cultural Communication.* New York : St. Martin's Press, 151 - 165.

Quirk, Randolph and Greenbaum, Sidney. 1973. *A University Grammar of English.* London: Longman Group Ltd.

Savignon, Sandra J. 1983. *Communicative Competence : Theory and Classroom Practice, Texts and Contexts in Second Language Learning.* Reading : Addeson - Wesley Publishing Company.

Smith, L. E. (ed.) 1983. *Reading English as an International Language.* Oxford : Pergaman Press.

Strevens, P. 1982. World English and the world's Englishes--or, whose language is it anyway? *Journal of the Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts* 5311 (CXXX) : 418 - 431.

Sturtevant, E.H. 1961. *Linguistic Change.* Chicago : University of Chicago Press.

Trudgill, P. and Hannah, J. 1982. *International English.* Suffolk : The Chaucer Press.

Weinreich, Uriel, Labov, W. and Herzog. 1968. Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. In Lehman, W.P. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Texas Conference on Historical Linguistics.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 97 - 195.

Wong, Irene F.H. 1982. Native-speaker English for the Third World today? In Pride, J.B. (ed.), *New-Englishes.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 261 - 286.