

## Code Switching in Thai Society: Four Decades of Research

PATCHARIN KANGKHA

*School of Languages, Literacies & Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia*  
patcharin\_40@hotmail.com

TENGKU SEPORA TENGKU MAHADI

*School of Languages, Literacies & Translation, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia*  
tsepora@usm.my

### ABSTRACT

*In this paper, the historical developments of different research paradigms and approaches adopted in the studies of Thai English Code Switching (TECS) are critically reviewed. It also critically reflects on future developments of the field deriving from the three positions of TECS in Thai contexts defined as the Emergence, Exploration and Extension periods, along with their major contributions which have been investigated for nearly four decades. Presently, Thai society has inevitably been involved in bilingual and multilingual activities and communities because of the globalisation, internationalisation, and mobilisation, particularly, in the educational systems. Thus, translanguaging such as TECS performed by bilinguals, multilinguals or even monolinguals, has always appeared in different modes of communication. Therefore, there is now a need to underpin the studies of TECS by investigating the Thai variety of English (TE) through TECS features by means of applying the World Englishes Approach propagated by Kachru (1983). This is because the seven paradigms classified in this approach are found to lead to a practical and comprehensible explanation of the TE which exists in Thailand for a long period of time. However, it is still claimed to be in the period of development. Therefore, Kachru's seven paradigms of World Englishes towards the present or future research of TECS are highlighted in this paper.*

*Keywords: bilingual/multilingual, linguistic creativity, Thai English Code Switching (TECS); trans-languaging, Thai varieties of English, World Englishes Approach*

### INTRODUCTION

The spread of the use of English in Asia and ASEAN is mainly through educational systems (Bolton, 2012; Kirkpatrick, 2012), and English is known as the lingua franca because it serves both the global and local functions. Additionally, English in Asia and ASEAN zones is as a result of different historical inputs (e.g., the prevalence of British English in South Asia but American English in the Philippines). Therefore, the complex interactions among the background of languages and learner varieties of English consist of many different levels of second-language competence. Hence, like the English in India, Singapore or Malaysia, the knowledge of language historical background can help English users to better understand the learners' varieties of English (Mehmood, Ramzan, & Ayesha Sadiq, 2014). Likewise, Crystal (2003, p. 23) pointed out that the English used outside the Inner Circle (i.e. the Outer Circle and Expanding Circle) is adapted to the "Cultural Mindset" of the people who have chosen to use it. However, the linguistic description of English is mostly based on the standard variety of English (e.g., British English and American

English), which is the institutionalised variety accepted by the educated speakers of the language. It is used in a formal written style, whereas speaking is prescriptively considered the norm variety of the English language (Hymes, 2005).

During the 1970s, the sociolinguistics theories began to look into the other varieties of English observed among the L1 speakers of English and the other varieties spoken by the non-native speakers in the Outer Circle and Expanding Circle (Kachru, 1985). These other varieties refer to the spoken Englishes respectively to the Outer Circle (ESL) and Expanding Circle (EFL) speakers. However, the English varieties chosen to be taught in schools are the standard varieties i.e. British English, American English, Australian English, New Zealand English and so on. In contrast, the discussions at present have begun addressing the issues of Standard English in relation to English language learning and teaching. For instance, Thai, Korean, Vietnamese, Swedish and Danish are unlike other indigenous languages in which they are learned and used to interact with their native speakers in a limited range of contexts (Acar, 2008). However, English has been used to interact not only with native speakers, but also with non-native speakers who are the majority of English users globally.

Presently, most of us are part of bilingual and multilingual societies. Generally, regardless of the form of communication, translanguaging like code switching (CS) and code mixing (CM) is the act performed by bilinguals or multilinguals with the aim of accessing different linguistic features or various modes of what are described as autonomous languages in order to maximize their communicative potential (Garcia, 2014). In attempting to achieve the communication goals, the CS phenomenon has been widely promoted, and the linguistic creativity and variety are evident in various circumstances. As a consequence, various CS studies have over the years been carried out globally, but their focus has shifted to the varieties of English. A diachronic change has recently been the focus of CS (Boztepe, 2002), which means it is a historical account of a belief that English has a rich history for over a millennium. At the same time, the description of a language in a snapshot at one point in time is known as synchronical change (Mair and Leech, 2006). One has to assess the average sentence length, automated readability index, lexical density and lexical richness in the two major English language varieties, British and American (Štajner & Mitkov, 2011). However, the nature of CS itself is underpinned by social functions or sociolinguistics and motivation factors, i.e., psycholinguistics (Boztepe, 2002; Nilep, 2006). Moreover, Weinreich (1963) believed that it only in broad psychological and sociocultural settings that the effects of bilingualism can be best understood. Meanwhile, the linguistic creativity of CS has slightly been recovered in terms of a grammatical code that has reportedly influenced the discourse interaction (Boztepe, 2002).

Additionally, Pennycook (2010) opined that the practice of language from the local contexts and practices can be the focus of future research looking into the English usage in Thailand by considering different (re)sources such as businesses, education systems, media, and tourism industries. It would be interesting to also examine data from different regions of Thailand to see how local Thai varieties play their roles in the English language in those areas. There is also a possibility that the Thai English could be developed into another nativised variety in Southeast Asia (Watkhaolarm, 2005). At the same time, the linguistic appropriateness, features, innovation, functions, motivation, and Thai varieties of English still exist in such contexts (Bennui, 2013; Jindapitak & Teo, 2011; 2012). Hence, the studies of TECS within Thai contexts have been properly encompassed by the TE features and linguistic creativity as the TECS phenomenon has developed new conventions of thoughts, customs and code of practices with more hybridised, institutionalised or dehegemonised ideas and practices (Widdowson, 1994) in Thai educational

systems within national and local contexts and standards in their own right (Crystal, 2000; Kirkpatrick, 2007; Jenkin, 2000; Seidlhofer, 2006). These have been brought about by the internationalisation, globalisation, and mobilisation spreading out in all Thai social spheres. Thus, the linguistic features of TECS regarding the lexico-semantic and discourse levels in terms of TE can reasonably share some common features of these varieties, and one should acknowledge these developments. Furthermore, the non-standard features in new Thai varieties of English can have a number of sources which may overlap to either a greater or lesser extent. It is a clear desideratum, and the investigations on the TECS remaining in situ, if possible, can supply clues about how features become established in emerging varieties and can offer documentation of early steps which are perhaps attested to at later stages in more established varieties.

## REVIEW OF THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENTS OF AND APPROACHES TO TECS

The TECS studies can be viewed in two main categories, namely the academic and non-academic ones. The former is situated within the organisations where people always exchange their thoughts, beliefs, ideas and other related knowledge. This setting can be organised for learning in both formal and informal settings to transfer knowledge that could work well in their lives. In contrast, the non-academic setting involves people learning in their home, market, shopping malls, and other environments. Non-academically, it concerns real life situations such as in markets, shopping malls, movie theatres, daily small talks in coffee shops, and so on, which do not involve academic activities (Leander, Phillips, and Taylor 2010). Furthermore, the non-academic setting provides better information than prepared activities in classrooms with restriction of rules and limited sources (Steinberg, Brown, and Dornbusch, 1997).

In the last four decades, the studies of CS in terms of social functions have flourished, and many famous linguists, namely Benson (2001), Blom and Gumperz (1972), Grosjean (2001), Myers-Scotton (1993), Poplack (1981), and Rampton (1995) have produced great works. In addition, many language pairs were tested in their studies such as French-German, Swahili-English, Spanish-English, Chinese-English, Kriol-Gurindi, Dutch/Moroccan Arabic, Japanese-English, Hindi-English, and others. Similarly, studies on pairs of TECS have also flourished, especially by Thai and foreign researchers (e.g. Chanseawrassamee, 2009; Janhom, 2011; Kunarawong (2013), and Sanprasert Snodin, 2014), using various approaches and perspectives. The period of these studies can be categorised into three phases based on their chronology:

### THE EMERGENCE OF THAI ENGLISH CODE SWITCHING (1975-1992)

The TECS studies during 1975-1992, approximately had five pioneer works to identify the various perceptions of CS. Surawan (1975) was the first Thai researcher who was interested in investigating TECS. Subsequently, some researchers officially recorded TECS, namely Warrie (1977), Chutisilp (1984), Masavisut, Sukwiwat, and Wongmontha, (1986), and Siiha-umphai (1987). The TECS in the earlier stage varied according to the researchers' perceptions. Surawan (1975), Warrie (1977), and Siiha-umphai (1987) paid attention to TECS of the spoken discourse to analyse the phonological or lexical interference in TECS, the influential factors in TECS, the formal characteristics in TECS, and the participants' background towards frequencies of TECS. Meanwhile, Chutisilp (1984) and Masavisut et al. (1986) focused their studies on the use of Thai

English in written discourse to identify how individuals can better understand the use of TECS related to the contextualization and Thainess which refer to the ways that Thais differentiate themselves from everyone else globally.

#### THE EXPLORATION OF THAI ENGLISH CODE SWITCHING (1993-2003)

During 1993-2003, many Thai researchers turned their focus on TECS with various perspectives. The following examples widely accepted their influence on their studies in this field; Rukthamyong (1995), Thitiwattana (1996), Wongpanitcharoen (1997), Manepong (1997), Thaatlek (1998), Boonkongsaen (1999), Dandee (2002), Kanadpon (2002) and Suratdecha (2003). It can be concluded that TECS is a sociolinguistic base owing to the fact that interlocutor, location, subject matter, gender and educational background including the relationship of social factors in various domains influence TECS. The characters of TECS in a specific community were interpreted by Rukthamyong (1995), Wongpanitcharoen (1997), and Kanadpon (2002). The community attitudes were identified by Thitiwattana (1996), Manepong (1997), Thaatlek (1998), and Boonkongsaen (1999). In contrast, Dandee (2002), and Suratdecha (2003) had fully opted to study the social factors.

#### THE EXTENSION OF THAI ENGLISH CODE SWITCHING (2004-2014)

During 2004-2014, TECS studies seemed to be flourishing. The important factors causing this trend in this field of study were the bilingual community, internationalization, globalization and the social media literacy (Watkhaolarm, 2005). A considerable number of studies were undertaken by Thais and foreigners with linguistic or non-linguistic background such as Suraratdecha (2005), Chaiwichaian (2007), Chanseawrassamee (2009), Janhom (2011), Yiamkhammuan (2011), Seargent, Tagg, and Ngampramuan (2012), Kunarawong (2013), and Sanprasert Snodin (2014). The TECS in this period can be classified into two main settings: academic and nonacademic settings. The former was suggested by Chaiwichaian (2007), while the latter concerning non-academic events was suggested by Suraratdecha (2005), Chanseawrassamee (2009), Janhom (2011), Yiamkhammuan (2011), Seargent, Tagg, and Ngampramuan (2012), and Sanprasert Snodin (2014). However, it is noted that studies in TECS are moving towards both spoken and written aspects, as investigated in media communication and online sources. However, TECS in the academic setting seems to be gradually declining because many early studies seemed to have worked with the assumption that functional categories were stable, valid categories of classroom speech and that analysts could reliably assign utterances to each category (Lin, 2008; 2013).

#### REFLECTIONS OF TECS STUDIES AND THEIR MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Most of the previous studies on TECS surveyed in the three periods emphasised on their forms and meanings or grammatical and functional aspects as highlighted by Suraratdecha (2005); Chaiwichaian (2007), Trakulkasemsuk (2007); Pingkarawat (2009); Chanseawrassamee (2009). Upon comprehensively reviewing the literature, it was found that TECS used both standard and nonstandard English grammatical structures, the TECS creates a wider range of lexicon and

discourse styles to represent a TE. Moreover, the variations of English studies in Asia tend to set a focus on the switcher's proficiency, region, and ethics. The CS is natural for any variety of language which displayed further variation based on region, education, subject matter and so on. This idea is supported by Kachru (1983), Hosali (1984), Shastri (1988), and Verma (1980). Notwithstanding, the functional coding approach in earlier studies involved a great deal of sociolinguistic interpretive work on the part of the coder. This interpretive work was, however, not made explicit but taken for granted in the form of final frequency counts of L1 and L2 distributed across different functional categories.

The knowledge in sociolinguistics and academic spoken discourse in Thai society added more values to understand Thais and Thainess. Furthermore, English is put into the status, functions, features and sociolinguistics contexts of development and requires nurturing new generations of young researchers who keep abreast of the current developments in their respective countries. It is also challenging to clarify the meaning of TECS by studying the use of English lexis, morphology, and discourse styles in linguistic variations in Thai cultural context and in selected Thai English spoken and written texts. In other words, a TECS study will portray non-native features of English in Thailand through the Thai creative ability to acculturate English elements into Thai linguistic and sociocultural patterns.

Just as interactional sociolinguistics and ethnography of communication have provided the most useful analytic tools for researching and understanding TECS in different settings in Thai society, their concepts and methods have been drawn upon for TECS code-switching. For instance, the most frequently and fruitfully used one is code-switching as contextualisation cues (Gumperz, 1984) to signal a shift in the frame or footing (Goffman, 1974) of the current interaction (Adendorff, 1993). Not surprisingly, all three periods used practical and well-known linguistic theorists' approaches such as Marked and Unmarked Code Switching (Myers-Scotton, 1998), Markedness Model (Myers-Scotton, 1993; 1998), Conversational Approach (Gumperz, 1982) and Matrix Language Frame Model (Myers-Scotton, 1998; 2000). The TECS researchers have not introduced Kachru's World Englishes Approach (Kachru, 1983a) to investigate the linguistic variety of TE because it is not widely accepted nor recommended by the Office of the Royal Society of Thailand. TE can only be claimed in the spoken texts, and it takes time to develop and be accepted as written texts. Moreover, TE in written texts will be recorded and will be regulated by the Office of the Royal Society of Thailand. For the label TE, Glass (2009), Watkhaolarm (2005), and Lim and Gisborne (2011) were the earliest researchers to mention TE in the World Englishes literature, but no studies have actually examined TE in terms of its linguistic typology since. In addition, Rogers (2013) may have been the first to linguistically consider TE in the context of Thailand with an assumption of TE users' use of English in informal communication since more Thais use English in their daily interactions. However, such a case has not been directly studied towards the TECS.

### KACHRU (1983) TOWARDS WORLD ENGLISHES APPROACHES

The term World Englishes was coined by Braj Kachru in 1985, the founding father of the discipline "World Englishes" (Kachru, 1992; Jenkins, 2003). By definition, World Englishes (in the plural form) refers to "kinds of English" that are spoken by any English speakers in the world (Schneider, 2011, p. 29). Kachru's rationale for introducing this term is not only to stress diversity in language use at present but also to insinuate that nobody has ownership over the English language. English belongs to everyone who uses it (Smith, 1985), and anyone speaking English is presumed to have

equal status (Bennui, 2013). There is no such thing as one English variety that is better than the other. Nor should one variety be a norm-setter for the others to follow. It was in line with such a view, the label “World Englishes” was introduced. However, the term was criticised for being misleading since “World” here refers only to “non-native varieties of English”, and it excludes the native English varieties as a whole (Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008; Hickey, 2004). Kachru’s seven paradigms of World Englishes highlight the approach of TECS studies. Each one is described below.

#### MODELS OF NON-NATIVE ENGLISHES

Non-native varieties of English have developed through three phases. First, the recognition phase which indicates that the local variety is more accepted as the norm and pedagogical model. When the local variety is recognised, local people who continue to speak the imported variety are seen as outsiders. Second, the coexistence of local and imported varieties phase relates to the wider expansion of bilingualism in English despite a slow development of different varieties due to the local speakers’ reluctance such as in the case of “Indianised English.” (Kachru, 1983a, p. 30-40) Finally, the non-recognition phase shows that some native varieties receive higher status and are considered as a pedagogical model. Local speakers of English strive to speak the exonormative variety, while insulting those who speak only the local variety (Kachru, 1983a; Kirkpatrick, 2007).

There are two types of non-native Englishes according to their range of use, the first of which is the institutionalised variety. They include those in which English is used as a second, transplanted, integrative and instrumental, and intranational and international language. This type has an extended register and style range, a process of nativisation of the registers and styles in formal and contextual terms, and a body of new English literature. The institutionalised variety is concerned with (a) the length of time in use, (b) the extension of use, (c) the emotional attachment of L2 users with the variety, (d) the functional importance, and (e) the sociolinguistic status. Second is the performance varieties, which include non-native varieties in which English is used as a foreign, nontransplanted, instrumental, and international language, so their functional range is restricted to tourism, commerce, and transactions.

#### CONTEXTUALIZATION AND LEXICAL INNOVATION

Kachru (1983b) proposed contextualisation and lexical innovation as a framework for analysing New Englishes. The term “contextualisation” was used to analyse the contextualisation of Indian English (IE) from creative writing, regarding the four types of lexico-grammatical transfer. Such types are lexical transfer (loans), translation (established equivalent items of L1-L2), shift (an adaptation of items in L1 into L2), and calques (rank-bound translation). Other types of transfer are collocations and speech functions. For lexical innovation, only its two types from South Asian (SA) Englishes were mentioned by Kachru (1983b): single items (shifts and loan translation) and hybrid items. The latter type is highlighted as the major representative of a lexical innovation. Two sets of hybridisation are found, namely the open set and the closed set.

#### THREE CONCENTRIC CIRCLES OF ENGLISH

Kachru (1985, 1992a) proposed three concentric circles to present the spread, types, acquisition patterns, and functions of English in the world. The three circles illustrate the diffusion of English from the native countries to non-native English throughout a portion of the population. First, the Inner Circle refers to the traditional cultural and linguistic bases of English. The English language travelled from Great Britain to the US, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. English in these countries is called the native varieties of English. This circle is called norm-provider. Traditionally, the British variety was accepted as the oldest model. Then, the American model became an alternative model. These two models provide native norms to Australian, Canadian, and New Zealand English. Second, the Outer Circle involves the earlier phases of the spread of English and its recognition in non-native contexts; hence it is called the institutionalised varieties of English in Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and the South Pacific that have passed through the extended period of colonisation. The major features of this circle are that (a) English is only one of two or more codes in the linguistic repertoire of bilinguals or multilinguals, and (b) English has acquired a vital status in the language policies of most of those multilinguals. This circle deserves the term “norm-developing” as the regional norms based on the exonormative and endonormative norms are constructed. Their regional norms have been developing since being implanted by the British or American English models in the colonial period. Third, the Expanding Circle involves the regions where the performance varieties are used. English here lacks the official status, so it is used as an international language. However, English users in this circle appear in a larger number than in other circles such as those in China, Russia, and Indonesia. This circle yields the term “norm-dependent” since English users here strongly rely on the native English models as their local norms which have not yet emerged (Kachru, 1985; Jenkins, 2003).

#### BILINGUALS’ CREATIVITY AND CONTACT LITERATURE

The framework on bilinguals’ creativity and contact literature (Kachru, 1986, 1987) are categorised into four features of the linguistic and literary creativity of a bilingual writer. First, the processes used in this creativity result from local, cultural, and stylistic strategies that cannot be judged with one norm from one literary and cultural tradition. Second, the process of nativisation and acculturation of texts requires an altered context of the situation for the language. Third, the bilinguals’ creativity emerges as two or more linguistic codes are shaped. The new code must be contextualised in light of the novelty language use. Finally, this creativity appears in a distinct context of situation, as seen in a formal mixture of different underlying language designs, and in a creation of cultural, aesthetic, societal, and literary canons.

#### CULTURAL CONTACT AND LITERARY CREATIVITY IN A MULTILINGUAL SOCIETY

Contact literature in a multilingual community is outstanding in that its main components are an integration of linguistic and cultural contacts. Kachru (1992b: 150-154) provided “the trimodal approach to diversity” in which three areas, namely linguistics, sociolinguistics, and literature, are interrelated. The linguistic area contains (a) register development; (b) resource for “mixing,” “switching,” and formal innovations at each linguistic level; and (c) discourse strategies, and discourse structure in light of units like paragraphing and punctuations. The sociolinguistic area consists of (a) conventions in the use of speech acts as well as modes of references and address; (b)

strategies in persuasion, apology and anger; and (c) expansion of style range marking levels of modernisation, education, and mobility. The literary area comprises (a) new literary genres; (b) expansion of the genre such as sonnet and blank verse; (c) expansion of the thematic range; (d) resource for ideological shift such as the progressive writers' movement; and (e) mathematics function. All these elements are found in Indian English literature and local literature in Indian languages with Englishisation. In this regard, code-mixing is highlighted to serve as the notions of convergence and creativity in a contact area like India. Indian English writings provide the interface between English and Indian languages such as the mixing of Hindi and Punjabi loans in English sentences. This makes English a part of the local repertoire of literature and cultures; English and other vernaculars are similarly structured in literary creativity. The notions of identity and cultural awareness emerge in this framework. Contact literature, like a historical novel, conveys the use of English as a medium to express identity and cultural awakening via heritages, glory, and civilization of non-Anglo nations to westernisation. Additionally, four terms that are paradigms of contact and multilingual societies are hidden in contact literature: (a) codes as a repertoire (languages, varieties, and styles); (b) the repertoire of religious identities in styles; (c) identity manipulation (style shifts for non-native identity); and (d) code dynamics (ethnic, caste, and social roles of languages and varieties).

#### TRANSCULTURAL CREATIVITY IN WORLD ENGLISHES AND LITERARY CANONS

The nativisation of rhetorical strategies in the bilinguals' creativity and contact literature is extended to an analysis of "transcultural creativity" as representing the process of translation, transfer, and transcreation as powerful stylistic tools (Kachru, 1995, p. 296). In this paradigm, the transcreational process plays a significant role in literary creativity in the "mother tongue" (national literature translated in English) and in the "other tongue" (World literature written in English).

Kachru (1995) theorised transcultural creativity with three types of crossover in relation to their key concepts adopted from Smith's (1992) work. First, the crossover within a speech fellowship refers to the members of a speech fellowship who share underlying sociocultural resources. The linguistic resources of such members may be different although they show mutual intelligibility. In varieties of English, a number of lexical items are not problematic in decoding the denotative meaning, but one still needs to comprehend the extended meaning, which involves crossovers in literary texts. Second, the crossover within speech communities sharing identical literary, cultural, and religious canons is found in the case between the Dravidian south and the Indo-Aryan north in India in which languages are divergent, but the underlying cultural identity is convergent. This is evident in the processes of Sanskritisation, Persianisation, and Englishisation in this region via literary and religious discourses. This type meets the term "comprehensibility" or a comprehension of a text with a variety of English within the situational context of another variety. One needs to comprehend the connotative meaning of certain English expressions. This concept focuses more on cultural and religious meanings of non-native English items. Lastly, the crossover within speech communities, which are culturally, sociolinguistically, and linguistically divergent, refers to non-native English speakers with distinctive cultural, linguistic and literary canons. This type yields the notion of "interpretability." One is required to interpret the contextualisation of the text in which the source language is structured. This appears in a new interpretation or an addition of commentaries to translations of sacred texts such as the Bible and the Bhagawad Gita, and so forth. To achieve interpretability, one must establish the relationship of a text within an appropriate context –



language as a component of culture. In World Englishes literature, this stage means reincarnating English into the local culture.

#### NATIVISATION OF MANTRA AS IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION IN ANGLOPHONE ENGLISHES

In literary studies, the notion of “mantra” concerns messages and mythology. Nativising mantra in World Englishes indicates distinctiveness in linguistic, literary, and ideological creativity of a bilingual writer. Anglophone Englishes refer to the varieties of English in the Anglophone region of Asia. Speakers of Anglophone Englishes are of three groups – L1 users (Australia and New Zealand), L2 users (India and Singapore), and FL users (Korea and China). Asia has now become the largest region of English users, so the term “Anglophone Englishes” is deemed more appropriate than “Asian Englishes.”

The nativisation of mantra requires three linguistic processes for identity construction; (a) locating the bilingual’s creativity within the contexts of linguistic and cultural pluralism that feature such speech communities, (b) treating the linguistic construction as a cohesive text representing structural, discourse, and cultural hybridity, and (c) distinguishing the bilingual’s competence in the light of a linguistic repertoire bearing certain relations to textual structure. Mantra can be referred to as a *medium*. It covers political and social constructions of language. Evidently, postcolonial literary writers nativise messages to respond to the coloniser’s linguistic medium; thus, an ideology of English by non-native writers is constructed. Moreover, a mantra includes philosophical and spiritual constructions. This nativisation appears in the use of Sanskritised or Arabic English sentence patterns in sacred texts in contact literature to bridge linguistic and cultural boundaries between English and vernaculars. This also helps organise the identity of non-native users (Kachru, 2003). In brief, the nativisation of mantra is a new paradigm for studying the way a non-native English user constructs his or her ideology to empower linguistic, literary, and cultural creativity in Anglophone Englishes.

In applying the Kachruvian Approach towards World Approach to investigate TE through a TECS analysis at the lexico-semantic and discourse levels which are detailed in the following:

First of all, Kachru’s contextualisation and lexical innovation (1983b), innovation typology (1985) and nativisation of cohesion and cohesiveness (1986;1987) provide salient concepts of certain overlapping (sub) categories of lexical creativity in contact literature that contribute towards a non-native variety of English – ***loanwords, loan translation, collocations, modes of addressing and referencing and hybridisation***. In this regard, the concepts of nativisation in the light of lexicon by Kachru (1986;1987) are to be comparatively intended to prove TECS with the existence of Thai English vocabulary. Moreover, Kachru’s transcultural creativity (1995) in which the first and second types of cultural crossover named ‘intelligibility’ and ‘comprehensibility’ present denotative and connotative meanings, respectively, of the lexical units used in the World Englishes literature is manifestation of the powerful literary discourse of the non-Anglo identity in English. Whether the findings from the above categories of lexical creativity meet the concepts of such two types of transcultural creativity has yet to be examined.

Secondly, discourse creativity in Thai English spoken texts is ‘indicative features of Thai English literary discourse. Six discourse categories adapted from the previous studies - ***nativisation of context, nativisation of rhetorical strategies, nativisation of mantra, code-mixing and code-switching, colloquial variety of English, and discourse styles*** – are analysed and discussed with the

main use of the Kachruvian framework (1986;1987) on *contextual and rhetorical nativisation*, as well as the *linguistic realisation of thought patterns*. The first and second categories are indeed adopted from these frameworks because they are used by several previous researchers. Moreover, the third category is intentionally adapted from the ‘nativising mantra’ framework (Kachru, 2003, p. 55-71). It is challenging for this adaptation to study religious and magical discourses in World Englishes literature due to its novelty. In this way, the fourth category provides a range of concepts that parallel with what Kachru (1992b) highlights in his *multilingual code-repertoire in literary and cultural contact* framework (1992b), that is, code-mixing brings the interface between convergence and creativity in contact literature. In addition, Kachru’s *transcultural creativity* (1995) is considered to investigate if the second and third types of intercultural crossover in the textual level identified as ‘comprehensibility’ and ‘interpretability’ with ritualistic discourses and sacred texts of Buddhism respectively are embedded in the findings from the above categories.

## KEY TERMS INVOLVED IN TECS STUDY

### BILINGUALISM

Bilingualism refers to the use of an individual’s mother tongue language (L1) and target or foreign language (L2) and shows that both languages have an influence on the function of one another, and possibly on the cognitive function outside of language. Hence, bilinguals are those whose exposure to two languages began at an early age. The definition, however, may vary slightly depending on the studies being carried out and their sample selection processes. Several definitions have been reported in the literature for bilingualism. For example, it can refer to individuals who are learners of another language irrespective of proficiency, or individuals that are equally proficient in both languages (Canagarajah, 2006; Cogo, 2009).

### MULTILINGUALISM

Multilingualism refers to the use of more than one language either by an individual speaker or by a community of speakers. Sometimes, multilinguals use the elements of multiple languages when conversing with each other and they outnumber monolingual speakers from the entire population of the world (Burhanudeen, 2003; Jenkins, 2003). Multilingualism is becoming a social phenomenon governed by the needs of globalisation and cultural openness due to the ease of access to information facilitated by the Internet (Ayeomoni, 2006); individuals’ exposure to multiple languages is becoming increasingly frequent, thereby promoting a need to acquire additional languages. It means that multilingualism involves switching between different languages freely, depending on what is available in their linguistic repertoire.

### VARIETIES OF ENGLISH

Varieties of English refer to the English derived from the parent variety which penetrated other non-native English countries “Varieties of English” emerged. English has become so widespread

that the varieties are considered sufficient to be institutionalised and regarded as varieties of English in their own right, rather than being considered as stages on the way to more native-like English. The varieties of English have six different types, each of which can have general sub-varieties: regional or “dialects”, educational and social standing or “sociolects”, subject matter or “registers”, medium or “mode of discourse”, attitude or “style”, and interference or “second language varieties, pidgins, and creoles” (Doshi & En-Huey, 2006, p. 38). Varieties of English are termed as non-native varieties rather than native ones. Such varieties have their sub-varieties and linguistic forms that are different from native English. This term results from the notion of ‘Englishes’ that symbolises “variation in form and function, use in linguistically and culturally distinct contexts, and a range of variety in literary creativity” (Kachru, 2006, p. 69). The term focuses on the existence of English as a world language among users with different mother tongues and local cultures.

#### ENGLISH AS A LINGUA FRANCA (ELF)

The notion of ELF is used in the Outer and Expanding Circles community, where non-native English speakers communicate with each other. Moreover, ELF is not an autonomous variety of English but the situational use of the language among bilinguals or multilingual speakers. In fact, ELF is a broad term that comprises all kinds of communication among the bilingual users in the Outer and Expanding Circles, such as local realisation, extensive use of accommodation strategies, and code-switching. In addition, this notion ignores native-English speaker norms because ELF users with different mother tongues aim for communicative achievement. Examples of ELF are apparent in the English uses of EU and ASEAN nations (Cogo, 2008).

#### THAI ENGLISH CODE SWITCHING (TECS)

TECS is the alternating use of Thai and English varieties within the same conversation, utterance, or discourse which can occur in the speech of individuals and group participants. The TECS also refers to the phenomenon in which a bilingual or multilingual speaker shifts from the English language to the Thai language or from the Thai language to the English language in the course of a conversation. TECS takes place when a speaker uses the Thai language and then switches to English and vice versa. Both intra-sentential and inter-sentential levels are employed by TECS switchers. TECS switchers may use Thai or other Thai language dialects (Nuer, Isan, Tai and Yawi, and so on).

#### TRANSLANGUAGING

The term translanguaging is a relatively recent one used in line with code-switching in the literature. Translanguaging is similar to code-switching in that it refers to multilingual speakers’ going back and forth between languages in a natural manner. However, it began as a pedagogical practice, where the language mode of input and output in Welsh bilingual classrooms was deliberately switched (Williams, 2002). By means of strategic classroom language planning that combines two or more languages in a systematic way within the same learning activity,

translanguaging seeks to assist multilingual speakers in making meaning, shaping experiences, and gaining deeper understandings and knowledge of the languages in use and even the content that is being taught (Cenoz & Gorter, 2011; Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012; Williams, 2002). García (2009) extended the scope of translanguaging to refer to processes that involve multiple discursive practices, where students incorporate the language practices of school into their own linguistic repertoire freely and flexibly. The act of translanguaging is expected to create a social space for multilingual speakers “by bringing together different dimensions of their personal history, experience, and environment, their attitudes, beliefs and performance” (Wei, 2011, p. 1223). The languages are, thus, utilized flexibly and strategically so that classroom participants are able to experience and benefit from the permeability of learning across languages.

### RECENT DEVELOPEMNETS IN TECS STUDIES

In this section, we shall survey studies that hint at a slightly different angle and studies that start to draw on research approaches from diverse fields such as non-native varieties of English, with the shift from a focus on native English to the regional usage of the language that can be seen. For example, in the contexts of Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean. However, it has not resulted in a fast-growing body of knowledge in English varieties in Thailand. Many empirical studies on English in Thailand have focused on ELT, second or foreign language acquisition, translation, discourse and communication, as well as Anglophone literary and cultural criticisms. Only a limited number of studies have examined the sociolinguistic and varieties aspects of the TECS development in Thailand. The notion of linguistic creativity and linguistic variety have been quite familiar to Thai scholars of English studies. This is because native-English varieties such as British and American English have been prioritised in the Thai university curricula. It is crucial to contribute to the increasing knowledge in the sociolinguistic field by pointing out the importance of TECS as assimilation and the existence of TE within academic or non-academic settings in the Expanding Circle.

Additionally, Kachru (1983) explains the variations of English based on proficiency, region and ethics. The switcher’s proficiency variation becomes more crucial than that on the regional or the ethnical variations. A person who has no knowledge or little knowledge of the English language could not switch languages properly. There are also some individuals whose competence in English is near-native; thus, highly educated speakers and less well educated speakers show variations in their English. Regional variation coincides with the regional language and the ethnic variation cuts across regional language or dialect boundaries. Meanwhile, few studies on the sociolinguistic aspects and the varieties of the TECS development in Thailand have been conducted. Among them are Kannaovakun (2003), Yiamkhammuan (2011), and Ngampramuan (2012). Furthermore, studies on TECS during the Extension of TECS (2004-2014) tended to move towards spoken and written expressions in mass media and in other cyber source interactions. It can be observed that TECS studies are gradually moving away from academic settings. Therefore, the notions of linguistic creativity, functions, and varieties within an academic context have been quite familiar to Thai scholars of English studies because the standard of British and American English has been prioritised in Thai university curricula for a long time. However, Thai societies have moved to bilingual and multilingual communities particularly, in the educational systems.

## FUTURE DIRECTIONS FOR TECS RESEARCHES

This study is significant because it may help enable policy makers recognise that TECS/TE occurs at all levels of education and must be given the attention that it deserves. It will also serve as a reference point for future research into language changes or shifts in Thailand i.e. large scale of TECS/TE population. The emerging Asian English varieties in Asia have arisen as a result of the current spread of English and local government policies on English communication in the world today. For instance, Singapore English (Lim, 2004; Lim & Gisborne, 2011; Platt, Weber, & Ho, 1984) has emerged as the result of the spread of English and their government policies towards English communication. This article shows that TE may, to some extent, follow Singapore in making TE more known to the public in the future.

In order to make TE more nativised, spoken and written characteristics of English must display a wider range of the acrolectal or standard levels. Nonetheless, evidence of the written and spoken texts indicates that TECS is still following either British or American English. Once Thai English drifts from the Expanding Circle to the Inner Circle and becomes recognised as native English, Thai English may continue to develop. Therefore, studies on TECS should focus more on the local variety and should be developed by Thai users for the Thai society. This is because English has been extensively used in the country, serving interpersonal, regulative, imaginative, and institutional functions. Buripakdi (2012b), Jindapitak (2013), and Jindapitak and Teo (2012) agreed that the notion of linguistic appropriateness, attainability, and adaptation should be set as the pedagogical goal for which language learners can realistically aspire. Thailand is in the context of ASEAN, where English is used as a working lingua franca for international communication among 600 million individuals from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Therefore, it is important to raise awareness of the local varieties of English and concentration of ASEAN or regional discourses so that learners can negotiate the cultures and pragmatic norms relevant to the people in the region rather than to the people in the Inner Circle.

## REFERENCES

- Acar, A. (2008). *Standards and competence in English as an international language pedagogy*. Evaluation of the EFL Materials Taught at Iranian High Schools, 199.
- Ayeomoni, M.O. (2006) Code-switching and code-mixing: style of language use in childhood in Yoruba speech community. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 15(1), 90–99. Retrieved from [http:// www.njas.helsinki.fi/pdf-files/vol15num1/ayeomoni.pdf](http://www.njas.helsinki.fi/pdf-files/vol15num1/ayeomoni.pdf)
- Baker, C. 2006. *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism (4th edition)*. Multilingual Matters.
- Bennui, P. (2013). Some Syntactic Innovations in New Literatures in English. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 5(5), 208-224.
- Benson, E. J. (2001). The neglected early history of codeswitching research in the United States. *Language & Communication*, 21(1), 23-36.

- Bolton, K. (2012). World Englishes and Asian Englishes: A survey of the field. In *English as an international language in Asia: Implications for language education* (pp. 13-26). Springer Netherlands.
- Boriboon, P. (2011). Language, Ideology and Domination: Problems of English Language Teaching in Thailand and Solutions. *Songklanakarin Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 17(6), 23-59
- Boztepe, E. (2003). Issues in code-switching: competing theories and models. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), 1-27.
- Buripakdi, A. (2012). The marginalized positions of Thai professional writers on the global hegemony of English. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 22(1), 41-60.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). Negotiating the local in English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 197-218.
- Cenoz, J. and D. Gorter. 2011. 'Focus on Multilingualism: A Study of Trilingual Writing,' *The Modern Language Journal* 95(3), 56–369
- Chanseawrassamee, S., & Shin, S. J. (2009). Participant-and discourse-related code-switching by Thai-English bilingual adolescents.
- Cogo, A. (2008). English as a lingua franca: Form follows function. *English Today*, 24(3), 58-61. doi: 10.1017/S0266078408000308
- Cogo, A. (2009). Accommodating difference in ELF conversation In A. Mauranen & E. Ranta (Eds.), *English as a lingua franca: studies and findings* (pp. 254-273). Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Crystal, D., & Crystal, H. (2000). *Words on Words: Quotations about Language and languages*. University of Chicago Press.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Doshi, A. & En-Huey, J. C. (2006). Syntactic variations in English essays written by Chinese Malaysian ESL learners. In Zuraidah Mohd. Don (Ed.), *English in a globalised environment: Investigating an emerging variety of English* (pp. 33-54). Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century*. Blackwell.
- García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Implications for language, bilingualism and education*. Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Pivot.
- Glass, T. (2009). Why Thais write to other Thais in English. *World Englishes*, 28(4), 532-543.
- Goffman, E. 1974. *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Gumperz, J. J., & Cook-Gumperz, J. (2006). Interactional sociolinguistics in the study of schooling. *STUDIES IN INTERACTIONAL SOCIOLINGUISTICS*, 25 (50).
- Janhom, W. (2011). *English-Thai Code-Mixing* in Thai health magazine (Unpublished Master's Independent Study). School of Business English for International Communication, Srinakharinwirot University
- Jenkins, J. (2000). *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, J. (2003). *World Englishes: A resource book for students*. Psychology Press.
- Jindapitak, N. (2013). The politics of Standard English: An exploration of Thai tertiary English learners' perceptions of the notion of Standard English. *Asian Social Science*, 9 (5), 118.
- Jindapitak, N., & Teo, A. (2012). Thai tertiary English majors' attitudes towards and awareness of world Englishes. *Journal of English Studies*, 7, 74-116.

- Hickey, S., & Mohan, G. (Eds.). (2004). *Participation, from tyranny to transformation? Exploring new approaches to participation in development*. London; New York: ZED Books; Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hymes, D. (2005). *Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life: Toward a Descriptive Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Kachru, B. B. (1983a). The bilingual's creativity: discursal and stylistic strategies in contact literatures in English. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, 13(2), 37-55.
- Kachru, B. B. (2005). *Asian Englishes: Beyond the canon*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kachru, B. B. (1985). Institutionalized second language varieties. In S. Greenbaum. ed. *The English language today*. Pergamon Press. 211-226.
- Kachru, B. B. (1992). World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources. *Language teaching*, 25(01), 1-14
- Kachru, B.B. (1995). Transcultural creativity in world Englishes and literary canons. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principles & practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 271-287). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian contexts* (Vol. 1). Hong Kong University Press.
- Kanadpon, W. (2000). *A study of the English-Thai code-mixing at GMITR Electronics Co., Ltd: A case study*. (Master's project) Graduate School King Mongkut's Institute of Technology North Bangkok.
- Kannaovakun, P. (2003). *The mixing of English and Thai in Thai television programs: Characteristics, attitudes, perception, and motivations*. Pattani: Prince of Songkla University, Pattati Campus.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2007). *World Englishes paperback with audio CD: Implications for international communication and English language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2012). English in ASEAN: implications for regional multilingualism. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 33(4), 331-344.
- Kunarawong, P. (2014). Thai-English code mixing and code switching in cosmopolitan magazine. *NIDA Journal of Language and Communication*, 19(22), 30-57.
- Leander, K., Phillips, N. & Taylor, K. (2010) The changing social spaces of learning: mapping new mobilities, *Review of Educational Research*, 34(1), 329–394.
- Lewis, G., B. Jones, and C. Baker. (2012a ) 'Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond,' *Educational Research and Evaluation* 18 /7: 641-654.
- Li, W. (2011). Moment analysis and translanguaging space: Discursive construction of identities by multilingual Chinese youth in Britain. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 1222–1235.
- Lim, L. L. S., & Gisborne, N. (2011). The typology of Asian Englishes: Setting the agenda. In L. Lim & N. Gisborne, (Eds.), *The typology of Asian Englishes*. London: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Lin, A. M. (2008). Code- Switching in the Classroom: Research Paradigms and Approaches. In *Encyclopedia of language and education* (pp. 3464-3477). Springer US.
- Lin, A. (2013). Classroom code-switching: Three decades of research. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4(1), 195-218.
- Mair, Christian & Leech, Geoffrey N. (2006) Current changes in English syntax. In *Handbook of English Linguistics*, Bas Aarts & April McMahon (eds), 318–342. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Mehmood, Waqar Ahmed, Muhammad Ramzan, Ayesha Sadiq, S. (2014). Englishization of Urdu. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science Research*. Retrieved from <https://socialscienceresearch.org/index.php/GJHSS/article/view/1175>.
- Mesthrie, R., & Bhatt, R. M. (2008). *World Englishes: The study of new linguistic varieties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (Eds.). (1998). *Codes and consequences: Choosing linguistic varieties*. Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C., & Jake, J. (2000). Four types of morpheme: evidence from aphasia, code switching, and second-language acquisition. *Linguistics*, 38(6; ISSU 370), 1053-1100.
- Nilep, C. (2006). "Code switching" in sociocultural linguistics. *Colorado Research in Linguistics*, 19, 1-22.
- Pennycook, A. (2010). *Language as a local practice*. Routledge.
- Rukthamyong, C. (1995). *Language in use by medical doctor: Thai/English code mixing*. (Unpublished MA thesis). Thammasat University (in Thai).
- Seidlhofer, B. (2006). *English as a Lingua Franca in the expanding circle: What it isn't*. In Rubdy & Saraceni (eds.), 40–50.
- Snodin, N. S. (2014). English naming and code- mixing in Thai mass media. *World Englishes*, 33(1), 100-111.
- Steinberg, L., Brown, B. B., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1997). *Beyond the classroom: Why school reform has failed and what parents need to do*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Suraratdecha, S. (2005). *Thai-English codeswitching: A Hawaii case study* (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation), University of Hawaii.
- Surawan, P. (1975). *The speech of Thai student in the U.S.A: With reference to linguistics interference and variation* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Faculty of Graduate School. University of Texas at Austin.
- Thaalek, S. (1998). *Bangkokian multilingualism sociolinguistic and language teaching*. (Edited by Sandra Lee McKay & Nancy H., Hanberger, (pp. 47-70). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Yiamkhamnuan, J. (2011). *The mixing of Thai and English: Communicative strategies in Internet chat rooms* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Prince of Songkla University, Trang Campus.
- Watkhaolarm, P. (2005). *Think in Thai, write in English: Thainess in Thai English literature*. *World Englishes*, 24(2), 145-158.
- Weinreich, U. (1963). *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL quarterly*, 28(2), 377-389.