

Spring 5-8-2022

Code-Switching: Patterns and Motivations for Thai American Bilingual Speakers

Holly Young

Northern Illinois University, Z1861532@students.niu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/studentengagement-honorscapstones>



Part of the [South and Southeast Asian Languages and Societies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Young, Holly, "Code-Switching: Patterns and Motivations for Thai American Bilingual Speakers" (2022). *Honors Capstones*. 1425.

<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/studentengagement-honorscapstones/1425>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Undergraduate Research & Artistry at Huskie Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Capstones by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact jschumacher@niu.edu.

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

**Code-Switching: Patterns & Motivations for
Thai American Bilingual Speakers**

A Capstone Submitted to the

University Honors Program

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements of the Baccalaureate Degree

With Honors

Department of Anthropology

By

Holly Young

DeKalb, Illinois

May 14, 2022

University Honors Program
Capstone Faculty Approval Page

Capstone Title: “Code-Switching: Patterns & Motivations for Thai American Bilingual Speakers”

Student Name: Holly Young

Faculty Supervisor: Kanjana Thepboriruk

Faculty Approval Signature:



Department of World Languages & Cultures

Date of Approval: 05/08/2022

Date and Venue of Presentation:

- 04/08/2022 – Society for Linguistic Anthropology (SLA) Annual Meeting
- 04/09/2022 – Center for Southeast Asian Studies (CSEAS) Student Conference
- 05/19/2022 – Southeast Asian Linguistics Society (SEALS) Annual Meeting

Check if any of the following apply, and please tell us where and how it was published:

Capstone has been published (Journal/Outlet):

Capstone has been submitted for publication (Journal/Outlet):

Completed Honors Capstone projects may be used for student reference purposes, both electronically and in the Honors Capstone Library (CLB 110).

If you would like to opt out and not have this student’s completed capstone used for reference purposes, please initial here: _____ (Faculty Supervisor)

Abstract

This study examines the structural patterns and social motivations behind Code-Switching (CS) as it is used by English-dominant, bilingual Thai Americans. CS is defined here as an umbrella term that encompasses both intersentential and intrasentential language mixing. For the purpose of this study, bilingual speakers are considered those who use Thai and English in some aspect of their everyday lives, whether talking with friends, family, etc.; native-like fluency in both languages is not necessary. A total of fourteen participants were selected throughout the US using a preliminary biodata survey. Participants were paired based on their language use, age, and place of residence. Each pair then met via Zoom for approximately 1-2 hours to engage in peer-to-peer conversation. The conversations involved two sessions: 1) brief introductions, 2) informal interviews. For the second session, participants were individually sent one question at a time via the chatbox and were asked to “interview” their conversational partner and also answer the question themselves. The questions centered on participants’ own experiences growing up and living as Thai Americans, as well as their opinions on Thai and American culture, in order to elicit potential connections between their styles and motivations for CS and their Thai American identities. Following data collection, methods of analysis consisted of transcribing the conversation recordings and identifying salient structural patterns of CS. This paper focuses on only one pair of participants, Mac and Pearl, as they were found to use the most Thai during their conversation.

Keywords: Code-Switching, Bilingualism, Thai American, Identity

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to examine the structural patterns and social motivations behind Code-Switching as it is used by English-dominant, bilingual Thai Americans. Drawing closely on the work of Heller (1988), Myers-Scotton (1993), and Grosjean (2001, 145), Code-Switching (hereafter, CS) is defined here as a type of language contact phenomena that involves the alternate use of two or more languages in an utterance or conversation. This study uses a broad definition of CS that includes both intersentential and intrasentential (i.e., Code-Mixing) language mixing. Though CS can occur between different registers, dialects, languages, and so on, the definition of CS used in this study focuses specifically on bilingual CS between Thai and English.

Data from the 2019 American Community Survey estimates that there are currently 342,917 people living in the United States who identify as either Thai alone (i.e., single race; 73.3%) or Thai in combination with other race(s) (26.7%). 24% of the Thai population living in the US are US-born, and 76% are foreign born (U.S. Census Bureau, 2019). Of the 318,176 Thai people who are at least five years old, 42% speak English only at home, and the remaining 58% speaking a language other than English (presumably Thai) at home. The highest concentration of Thai people in the US is in Los Angeles, CA with an estimate of 33,000 Thai people (counting people who identify as a single race only). Other cities with high Thai populations are New York City, NY (11,000), Washington, D.C. (10,000), Chicago, IL (8,000), and Dallas, TX (7,000) (Budiman, 2021).

The current scope of research on Thai-English CS is very limited. Previous studies have focused on CS by Thai-dominant speakers in written language in social media (Jitpaisarnwattana, 2014; Chalaemwareel and Rodrigo, 2020) and educational settings (Bennui, 2008; Boonsuk and Ambele, 2019) and scripted spoken language in Thai music (Likhitphongsathorn and Sappapan, 2013; Chairat, 2014) and television shows (Kannaovakun and Gunther, 2003; Papijit, 2013). Existing studies on Thai-English CS in spoken language all focus on scripted language, rather than spontaneous natural language. This study aims to fill the current gap in Thai-English CS research by investigating spontaneous natural language used by English-dominant bilingual speakers.

The definition of bilingualism used in this study follows Grosjean's (2010) definition, which emphasizes language use over fluency. Bilingual speakers are defined here as people who speak at least two languages and use each language in at least one domain of their everyday lives. For instance, a bilingual speaker could be someone who uses Thai at home with family members and English everywhere else. The definition of bilingualism used here emphasizes listening and speaking and does not require proficiency in reading and writing both of a speaker's languages.

The following pages are structured as follows. First, the background and methodology for this study are described in detail. Focusing on just one pair of participants, the results section presents overall trends and particular examples for analysis. Analysis draws largely on three main concepts: 1) Wei and Milroy's (1995) categorization of three Levels of CS, 2) Gumperz's (1982, cited in Woolard 2006) we- vs. they-code dichotomy, and 3) Myers-Scotton's (1993) *Matrix Language Hypothesis*. In the examples provided below, the transliteration of all Thai words is provided in *italics* and followed by the English translation in SMALL CAPS in parentheses. The original Thai text is included in the footnotes below. Thai words are transcribed using the Royal Thai General System of Transcription (Thai Royal Institute, 1999). All translations were completed by me with the aid of my faculty mentor Dr. Kanjana Thepboriruk.

Background

Thai is a Tai-Kra-Dai language in mainland Southeast Asia and Southern China (Gutman and Avanzati 2013; Diller, Edmondson, and Luo 2008). Thai is the official language of the Kingdom of Thailand and is the first language of more than 38.8 million people around the world (Diller and Reynolds 2002; “Thai - Worldwide Distribution”). Both Thai and English use Subject, Verb, Object (SVO) word order. However, unlike English, Thai noun phrases are head-initial, meaning that adjectives are placed after the head nouns. Furthermore, Thai adjectives can be used as the predicate in a sentence. When this occurs, the adjectives are considered intransitive verbs and do not require a copula (Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom 2009, 91). Table 1 below shows two examples of Thai adjectives used as intransitive verbs. Note how neither of these examples includes a separate copula, as it is already included in the adjectives “lazy” and “spicy”. Notice also how these examples contrast with English adjectives, which must be accompanied by a form of the copula “to be” (e.g., “She is smart.”). The third example in Table 1 shows an incorrect use of a Thai copula.

1	Thai	คน	อเมริกัน	ขี้เกียจ	
	Transliteration	khon	amerikan	khikiat	
	Gloss	person	American	lazy	
	Translation	“American people are lazy”			
2	Thai	อาหาร	ไทย	เผ็ด	
	Transliteration	ahan	thai	phet	
	Gloss	food	Thai	spicy	
	Translation	“Thai food is spicy.”			
3	Thai	อาหาร	ไทย	เป็น*	เผ็ด
	Transliteration	ahan	thai	pen	phet
	Gloss	food	Thai	is	spicy
	Translation	“Thai food is spicy.”			

CS is a communicative strategy for conveying linguistic and social information and achieving interactional goals. Commonly cited reasons for CS are listed below in Table 2. A speaker may switch to another language to fill a linguistic need, convey a particular meaning associated with a language or its vocabulary, or discuss a particular topic in the language they are more proficient in or in which it is more appropriate to discuss that topic. CS may also be used to amplify or emphasize a speaker’s message, convey strong emotion such as anger, or maintain continuity between speakers’ turns by continuing the last language used. Additionally, when quoting another person, a speaker may switch to the language the original speaker used.

CS may also be used to achieve interactional goals, including specifying the addressee(s) or excluding someone from the conversation. In some instances, switching to another language may signal a speaker’s personal involvement or detachment from the topic of discussion. At other times, CS is used when giving commands or trying to end an argument, with the use of a particular language amplifying or emphasizing a speaker’s statement (Grosjean 1982, 154). Further interactional goals for CS include raising a speaker’s status, showing expertise or authority, and asserting or negotiating a particular identity. For example, in language communities where English

is not the dominant language, speakers may switch to English in order raise their own status or assert a modern identity (Lee 2006).

Table 2. Common Reasons for Code-Switching
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fill a linguistic need (e.g., a lexical item) • Convey a particular connotation or meaning • Discuss a particular topic • Specify speaker involvement or express detachment from topic • Amplify or emphasize message (to give commands or end an argument) • Convey strong emotion (e.g., anger, excitement) • Continue the last language used (continuity) • Quote someone • Specify addressee • Exclude someone from conversation • Change role of speaker: raise status, show expertise or authority • Negotiate identity (e.g., present a modern identity) • Mark and emphasize group identity, signal solidarity • Establish contrast and signal upcoming change (contextualization cues)
Adapted from Grosjean (1982, 152); Hoffman (1991, 115-116); Gumperz (1976, 1982)

CS may also be used to emphasize group identity and signal solidarity. This is closely related to Gumperz's (1982, cited in Woolard 2006) we- vs. they-code dichotomy. In situations of bilingual CS by ethnic minority groups, Gumperz states that one language is the "we-code" and the other is the "they-code". The we-code (or in-group code) is the language that is associated with solidarity and familiarity. According to Gumperz, this is typically the minority language. The majority language, on the other hand, is typically the they-code (or out-group code), which is associated with more formality and less intimate, personal relations (Gumperz 1982; in Woolard 2006, 76-78). Woolard notes that linguists should avoid making "*a priori* assumptions about which code is the we-code, as it can change across generations, lifespans, and contexts" (Woolard 2006, 78). Indeed, one would expect that Thai—the minority language in the context of the United States—would be the we-code for the participants of this study and that Thai would therefore be used to emphasize group identity and build solidarity between participants. However, as the results later reveal, there are instances in which speakers use Thai as the they-code and English as the we-code.

Another important concept proposed by Gumperz (1976, cited in Auer and Di Luzio 1992) is that of contextualization cues. Contextualization cues are signaling mechanisms used by speakers to establish a context in which the meaning of their utterance(s) can be interpreted (Auer and Di Luzio 1992, 25). Contextualization cues may be nonverbal (e.g., posture, gaze) or verbal. Linguistic variation, including CS, is one major type of verbal contextualization cue. Many contextualization cues are used to establish contrast and signal an upcoming change, such as a change in speaker role. Code-Switching is a meaningful contextualization cue because of both the contrast established through switching languages and the concomitant indexing of the attitudes and values associated with the language being switched to (Auer and Di Luzio 1992, 32-33).

Myer's Scotton's (1993) *Matrix Language Hypothesis* describes the structural constraints that are imposed by one language onto another in instances of bilingual CS. The hypothesis posits the existence of a Matrix language and an Embedded language during instances of CS. The Matrix language is the language that provides more morphemes (i.e., that is used more), and it is typically, though not always, a speaker's first language. The Embedded language, then, provides fewer morphemes (i.e., is used less) and is usually not a speaker's first language. Myers-Scotton states that the Matrix language (hereafter, ML) "projects the morphosyntactic frame for the utterance in question" (1993, 486). In other words, the structure of the ML conditions the way the Embedded language (hereafter, EL) is inserted into the ML. As the participants in this study were all English-dominant bilingual speakers, one would expect English to be the ML and Thai to be the EL during participants' conversations. Moreover, one would expect all instances of Thai-English CS by these English-dominant speakers to follow Myers-Scotton's (1993) *Matrix Language Hypothesis*, with Thai insertions being conditioned by the English language's structure.

Methodology

Participant Recruitment

Participants were recruited via social media (Facebook, Instagram, and Discord) and were not informed about the study's focus on CS. Instead, they were told that the study was designed to learn about their experiences as Thai Americans and their opinions on Thai and American culture (**Appendix A**). The original age group intended for the study was 18-30 years old but was too limiting, so it was extended to anyone over 18 years old. Participants were asked to complete a brief biodata survey via Qualtrics (Qualtrics 2005) (**Appendix B**) to obtain basic demographic information (e.g., age, place of birth, place of residence) and information about their linguistic background. For linguistic background, participants listed which language(s) they regularly used in a number of domains (e.g., at work, stores, home) and quantified the number of hours of media consumed across various modes (i.e., reading, watching, and listening) in Thai and English per week. They also quantified how many hours they spent speaking and writing Thai and English per week.

In total, fifteen people responded to the survey. One respondent did not report using any Thai at all and was not included in the sample group. The fourteen remaining respondents were grouped into seven pairs based on their language use, age, and place of residence. Language use was considered the most important factor when pairing participants together. Participants who had similar language use were paired together so that they would feel comfortable speaking Thai and English as they normally do (i.e., to the same extent). Second, participants' ages were considered when determining pairs. Age-based social hierarchy is very salient in Thai language and culture (Iwasaki and Horie 2000), so participants with similar ages were paired together in order to stimulate peer-to-peer conversation and make participants feel more comfortable during the conversation. The seven pairs had an average age gap of 5.7 years. Finally, participants' places of residence were considered during the pairing process. Efforts were made to pair participants living in the same time zones together for their scheduling convenience. Ultimately, language use and age remained the two most significant factors for determining pairs, and these factors were used to optimize instances of CS during data collection.

Participants

The fourteen participants had an average age of 29 years old. The youngest participant was 21 years old, and the oldest was 48 years old. The seven pairs had an average age gap of 5.7 years, with the smallest gap being one year and the largest gap being eleven years.

In the biodata survey (**Appendix B**), participants were asked which language(s) they used in a variety of domains, in addition to their first language and the language they felt most comfortable using. Choices included Thai, English, Other, and Not Applicable (NA), and participants could choose more than one language for each domain. None of the participants chose only Other for any of the domains. Other was always chosen in combination with English or both Thai and English. Thus, for the purpose of this paper, responses of English and Other are combined with responses of only English in Table 3 below. Responses of Thai, English, and Other are combined with responses of both Thai and English. Table 3 presents the number of participants who chose only Thai, only English, both Thai and English, and NA during the survey questions about their linguistic background. Table 4 presents the average amount of time (in hours) participants reported spending watching, reading, writing, listening to, and speaking Thai and English per week.

	Number of Participants who Responded...			
	Only Thai	Only English	Both Thai and English	NA
First language	7	4	3	0
Most comfortable using	0	7	7	0
At work	0	12	2	0
In the community	0	7	7	0
At stores	0	12	2	0
With friends	0	10	4	0
With sibling(s)	2	6	4	2
With parent(s)	7	0	7	0
At home	2	4	8	0
With children	0	1	1	12
With spouse/partner	0	9	2	3

Activity	Time (in Hours)	
	Thai	English
Watching	1.07	11.27
Reading	0.25	15.13
Writing	0.50	8.67
Listening	1.10	10.33
Speaking	6.13	45.47
Total	9.05	90.87

Tables 3 and 4 above show the clear English-dominance of the fourteen participants. When asked about their first language, half of the participants reported Thai as their first language and

the other half reported either only English (4) or both Thai and English (3) as their first languages. However, when asked about the language(s) they felt most comfortable using, all of the participants chose English (7) or both Thai and English (7). In all of the domains except speaking with parent(s), the majority of participants responded that they used only English or both Thai and English. Table 4 reveals that participants spent, on average, 10 times more hours using English per week than they did Thai.

This paper focuses on one pair of participants, Mac and Pearl (nicknames chosen by the participants), as they exhibited the most CS during their conversation. Mac is a 48-year-old 1.5 generation Thai American whose first language is Thai but who is most comfortable using English. 1.5 generation Americans are people who were born abroad, immigrated to the U.S. when they were between 5 and 18 years old, and grew up in the U.S. (Kim 1999, 29, cited in Suppatkul 2012). Mac reported spending 5 hours speaking Thai and 25 hours speaking English per week. He reported that he typically uses Thai in the community, at home, and with his parents; he uses English at work, in the community, at stores, and with friends. Pearl is 37-year-old second generation Thai American whose first language is Thai and who is most comfortable using Thai and English. Pearl reported spending 5 hours speaking Thai and 50 hours speaking English per week. She reported that she typically uses Thai at home and with her siblings, parents, and children; she uses English or both Thai and English for everything but talking to her parents. She talks to her parents in Thai only.

Data Collection

I met with each pair online via Zoom (Yuan 2011) for approximately 1-2 hours to collect interview data. I started by introducing myself using a bilingual introduction script to prime the participants and show them that they could feel comfortable using Thai throughout the interview (**Appendix C**). The rest of the interview was split into two parts. First, participants were asked to briefly introduce themselves and to rate their Thai speaking ability on a scale of one to five. Participants were asked to rate their Thai speaking ability to help stimulate CS during their conversation, for bilingual speakers usually do not CS unless they are familiar with their conversational partner's linguistic background and attitudes (Gumperz 1977, 8). Both Mac and Pearl rated their Thai speaking ability at 4.5 out of 5.

Second, each participant was sent questions one at a time via the chatbox, alternating between Thai and American content. There were two sets of nearly identical questions, one asking about Thai culture and the other asking about American culture. The questions were designed using the General Ethnicity Questionnaire previously created by Tsai, Ying, and Lee (2000). Pairs of matching Thai and American questions were asked consecutively. For example, the question "Do you celebrate any Thai holidays? If so, how and with whom do you celebrate them?" was followed by "Do you celebrate any American holidays? If so, how and with whom do you celebrate them?" After these two questions, the next question would be a question about American content, followed by one about Thai content. The entire interview followed this pattern. The questions were ordered in this manner so that both participants asked questions about both Thai and American content, rather than splitting the questions so that one participant asked only Thai-focused questions and the other asked only American-focused questions. As the interview progressed, the questions progressed from more surface level content (e.g., holidays, food, travel experience) to

deeper content (e.g., what makes someone Thai/American, how participants self-identify) (**Appendix D**).

Participants were asked to read aloud the question they were sent in the chatbox (i.e., to ask their partner the question). This was done in order to transform the interview into an informal, conversation-like interview between the two participants, rather than a standard interview in which the researcher asks the participants the questions. All questions were written in English, as the study focuses only on oral bilinguals and participants were told that the ability to read Thai was not a prerequisite for participation in the study. Questions that participants already answered before being asked, either in their self-introduction or in response to a different question, were not repeated. For example, many participants talked about where they grew up and their experience (if any) living in Thailand during their self-introduction, so they were not sent the questions about those topics. Participants were also encouraged to ask follow-up questions and to ask for clarification on questions when needed.

Data Analysis

In total, 9 hours and 51 minutes of conversation were recorded from the seven pairs. This paper focuses only on Mac and Pearl's conversation, which lasted one hour and 52 minutes, or 1.866 hours. The interviews were transcribed using the automatic transcription option on Happy Scribe (Assens and Bastié 2017). The initial transcripts generated by Happy Scribe were then manually checked for accuracy, and all instances of Thai were added into the transcript because Happy Scribe only generates monolingual transcripts. The audio recordings were uploaded to Praat (Boersma and Weenink 2022), where each instance of Thai was segmented and labelled with the speaker and topic (i.e., question). Responses to questions about Thai content, such as Thai holidays and food, were considered "Thai" topics; responses to questions about American holidays, food, etc. were considered "American" topics. Total quantities of Thai per speaker and topic were calculated manually. For the purpose of this study, some instances of Thai are not considered CS. These include the proper names of Thai foods, holidays, or places (e.g., temples, restaurants), as well as lakhon (Thai dramas), in isolation. Consider the two examples below.

Pearl (35:51)

(Talking about American holidays) The caveat was we celebrated it, but it was always Thai food. So you had *somtam* (PAPAYA SALAD) *lap* (DICED MEAT SALAD) *khao niao* (STICKY RICE) *mu ping* (GRILLED PORK) *kai ping* (GRILLED CHICKEN).¹ It was never American food. Even Thanksgiving.

Mac (45:04)

(Talking about Thai desserts) The ones you mentioned, *lotchong* (RICE NOODLES IN COCONUT MILK) *thapthimkrop* (WATER CHESTNUTS IN COCONUT MILK) *arai phuak nia* (AND STUFF LIKE THAT),² I really like those, but I also really like...

In the first example, Pearl lists off a number of Thai foods. The only Thai she uses is the names of these foods. In contrast, in the second example, Mac lists two Thai foods but then ends in Thai with *arai phuak nia*, which translates to AND STUFF LIKE THAT. In the analysis, only the latter phrase is considered to be CS, and not the food names.

¹ ส้มตำ ลาบ ข้าวเหนียว หมูปิ้ง ไก่ปิ้ง

² ลอดช่อง ทับทิมกรอบ อะไรพวกนี้

In addition to quantifying the amount of CS per speaker and topic, each instance of CS was categorized into one of three levels. This study's analysis draws on that of Wei and Milroy (1995), which identifies three levels of codeswitching: A, B, and C. Table 5 below shows each of these levels. Level A involves a switch between different speakers' turns. Level B involves an intersentential switch within a single speaker's turn. And Level C, or Code-Mixing, involves an intrasentential switch within a single speaker's turn. After categorizing each instance of CS as Level A, B, or C, the total number of instances of each level of CS per speaker were calculated.

				Level of CS
SPEAKER 1	<i>Language A</i>			No CS
SPEAKER 2	<i>Language A</i>			
SPEAKER 1	<i>Language A</i>			Level A CS
SPEAKER 2	<i>Language B</i>			
SPEAKER 1	Sentence 1	<i>Language B</i>		Level B CS
	Sentence 2	<i>Language A</i>		
	Sentence 3	Constituent 1	<i>Language A</i>	Level C CS
		Constituent 2	<i>Language B</i>	

Adapted from Wei and Milroy (1995)

Results

This analysis focuses on only one pair of participants, Mac and Pearl, as they were found to use the most Thai during their conversation. Their conversation lasted 111.970 minutes, or 1.866 hours. The total amount of time during which Thai was used throughout the conversation was 399.588 seconds, or 6.66 minutes. Pearl spoke considerably more Thai during the conversation than Mac did. She spoke Thai for 322.503 seconds, or 5.375 minutes, while Mac spoke Thai for 77.085 seconds, or 1.285 minutes. Thus, Pearl spoke more than four times as much Thai as Mac did. Table 6 below illustrates the amount (in seconds) of Thai each speaker used throughout the conversation. Table 6 presents the questions in the order that they were discussed during the conversation. Only the questions for which at least one of the speakers code-switched are included in the table. Tables 7.1 and 7.2 present the questions ranked from the highest to lowest amount of Thai used. Table 7.1 shows the data for Pearl, and Table 7.2 shows the data for Mac.

Question		Amount of Thai (in seconds)	
		Pearl	Mac
1	Self-introduction	11.155	0
2	On a scale of 1 to 5 (5 = native-like), how well do you speak Thai? Why do you give yourself that rating?	23.995	38.375
3	Have you ever lived in Thailand? If so, what was your experience like?	50.097	2.704
4	How much (and what kinds of) Thai culture were you exposed to growing up?	10.987	0

5	Do you celebrate any Thai holidays? If so, how and with whom do you celebrate them?	22.250	2.073
6	Do you celebrate any American holidays? If so, how and with whom do you celebrate them?	10.701	3.791
7	What do you think of American food and eating culture? Do you have any favorite American foods?	52.688	6.305
8	What do you think of Thai food and eating culture? Do you have any favorite Thai foods?	48.123	16.167
9	Are there any aspects of Thailand or Thai culture that you really like or dislike?	59.383	7.670
10	Are there any aspects of the US or American culture that you really like or dislike?	6.034	0
11	Do you feel proud and/or patriotic when you think about Thailand?	14.265	0
12	What do you think makes someone Thai?	12.825	0
Total		322.503	77.085

Table 7.1. Questions with the Most CS for Pearl

Question		Amount of Thai (in seconds)
1	Are there any aspects of Thailand or Thai culture that you really like or dislike?	59.383
2	What do you think of American food and eating culture? Do you have any favorite American foods?	52.688
3	Have you ever lived in Thailand? If so, what was your experience like?	50.097
4	What do you think of Thai food and eating culture? Do you have any favorite Thai foods?	48.123
5	On a scale of 1 to 5 (5 = native-like), how well do you speak Thai? Why do you give yourself that rating?	23.995
6	Do you celebrate any Thai holidays? If so, how and with whom do you celebrate them?	22.250
7	Do you feel proud and/or patriotic when you think about Thailand?	14.265
8	What do you think makes someone Thai?	12.825
9	Self-introduction	11.155
10	How much (and what kinds of) Thai culture were you exposed to growing up?	10.987
11	Do you celebrate any American holidays? If so, how and with whom do you celebrate them?	10.701
12	Are there any aspects of the US or American culture that you really like or dislike?	6.034
Total		322.503

Table 7.2. Questions with the Most CS for Mac

Question		Amount of Thai (in seconds)
1	On a scale of 1 to 5 (5 = native-like), how well do you speak Thai? Why do you give yourself that rating?	38.375
2	What do you think of Thai food and eating culture? Do you have any favorite Thai foods?	16.167

3	Are there any aspects of Thailand or Thai culture that you really like or dislike?	7.670
4	What do you think of American food and eating culture? Do you have any favorite American foods?	6.305
5	Do you celebrate any American holidays? If so, how and with whom do you celebrate them?	3.791
6	Have you ever lived in Thailand? If so, what was your experience like?	2.704
7	Do you celebrate any Thai holidays? If so, how and with whom do you celebrate them?	2.073
Total		77.085

For both Mac and Pearl, questions about food, their likes and dislikes of Thai culture, and their own proficiency in speaking Thai rank among the top questions for which they used Thai. While Pearl used Thai when introducing herself and talking about how much Thai culture she was exposed to growing up, her likes and dislikes of American culture, her feelings (or lack thereof) of pride and/or patriotism for Thailand, and what she thinks “makes someone Thai”, Mac did not use Thai for any of these topics. Additionally, there were no topics that only Mac used Thai to talk about. One would expect that participants would use more Thai when answering questions that focused on Thai culture (e.g., food, holidays). The data generally supports this hypothesis, as eight out of the twelve questions for which Pearl used Thai and five out of the seven questions for which Mac used Thai asked about Thailand or the Thai language or culture. Therefore, the majority of CS occurred when discussing Thai content.

In total, there were 79 instances of CS during Mac and Pearl’s conversation. Returning to Wei and Milroy’s (1995) three levels of CS, Mac and Pearl together had the most CS at Level C, with approximately 62 instances of Level C CS. There were 14 instances of Level B CS and only 3 instances of Level A CS. Individually, Mac and Pearl each code-switched the most at Level C, followed by Level B and then Level A. Whereas Pearl had significantly more instances of Level C CS than Level B CS, Mac had comparable amounts of Levels B and C CS. These results are presented below in Table 8.

		Level of CS	Instances of CS			
SPEAKER 1	Language A	No CS	Pearl	Mac	Total	Total %
SPEAKER 2	Language A	No CS				
SPEAKER 1	Language A	Level A CS	2	1	3	3.80
SPEAKER 2	Language B					
SPEAKER 1	Sentence 1	Level B CS	6	8	14	17.72
	Sentence 2					
	Sentence 3					
	Constituent 1	Level C CS	51	11	62	78.48
	Constituent 2					
Total			59	20	79	100

Adapted from Wei and Milroy (1995)

Example 1 below includes all three levels of CS. This excerpt comes from the first half of the interview, when Mac and Pearl were asked to rate their own proficiency in speaking Thai.

Example 1Mac (06:31)

I can get around Bangkok and talk to people in sort of regular everyday language without them knowing. *phut phasa thai dai kap khon thi krungthep ni khao cha mai ru wa wa phom pen khon thi ni tae tha phut rue arai a rueang arai thi man man baep man man yak noi nia khao at cha ru* (WHEN I SPEAK THAI WITH THAI PEOPLE IN BANGKOK, THEY WON'T KNOW THAT I'M FROM HERE [THE US]. BUT IF I TALK OR WHAT-ABOUT SOMETHING THAT'S, LIKE, A LITTLE DIFFICULT, THEY MIGHT KNOW).³ If they're paying attention, they'll be able to tell because eventually I get stuck.

Pearl (07:05)

phuak sap luek luek a (ALL THE DEEP VOCAB),⁴ yeah

Mac (07:08)

khrap luek luek ni yak chai lae doichpho rao mai dai mai dai chai thi ni a khue wa wela wela klap klap pai mueang thai nia man cha khlong khuen reo mak na wela wela ma thi ni nia man cha khoi khoi baep (YEAH, THE DEEP [STUFF] IS DIFFICULT, YEAH, AND ESPECIALLY [WHEN] WE DON'T HAVE A CHANCE TO USE IT HERE. SO WHEN BACK IN THAILAND, IT'LL BECOME MORE FLUENT VERY QUICKLY. WHEN HERE, IT'LL LITTLE BY LITTLE)⁵ erode, right? It just erodes slowly.

First, Level A CS occurs when Pearl starts her turn in Thai after Mac ends his turn in English. In Mac's next turn, he then continues speaking Thai (continuity, see Table 1). Level B CS occurs in Mac's first turn when he switches from English to Thai after his first sentence. Here, Mac switches to Thai to repeat his statement about his ability to "get around" Bangkok using Thai without people knowing he's from the U.S. Finally, Level C CS occurs in Mac's second turn when he switches back to English with the word "erode". Mac's switch here likely served to fill a lexical need, which attests to his earlier statement about the DEEP Thai vocabulary that is difficult for him. Though he could have continued his sentence in Thai, he needed to switch to English in order to fill a linguistic need. This is a common reason for CS (Grosjean 1982; see Table 1).

Example 2 below shows one instance where a switch to Thai is made (by Pearl) to convey a particular connotation or meaning. When talking about how they have to behave when in Thailand, Mac and Pearl agree on the importance of *khwamriaproi* (ORDERLINESS, POLITENESS). In Examples 3 and 4, Pearl switches to Thai when describing her reaction to eating beef for the first time (3) and eating "American stuff" (i.e., food) (4). In both of these examples, Thai is used to express a particular emotion: disgust. In Example 2, Pearl uses Level C CS, and Mac uses Level B CS. Examples 3 and 4 both show Level C CS.

Example 2Mac (16:08)

I get that sense. But you just naturally do it right. You just know not to be, like, demonstrative and loud when you're there, sort of...

Pearl (16:19)

³ พูดภาษาไทยกับคนไทยที่กรุงเทพฯ ๑ นี้เขาจะไม่รู้ว่า ว่าผมเป็นคนที่นี่ แต่ถ้าพูดหรืออะไรอะไรเรื่องอะไรที่มัน มันแบบมันมันยากหน่อยนี่เขาอาจจะรู้

⁴ พวกศัพท์ลึก ๆ อะ

⁵ กรับ ลึก ๆ นี่ยาก ไซ้ และโดยเฉพาะเราไม่ได้ ไม่ได้ใช้ที่นั่นอะ คือว่าเวลา เวลากลับ กลับไปเมืองไทยเนี่ย มันจะคล่องขึ้นเร็วมากนะ เวลา เวลาในที่นี้เนี่ย มันจะค่อย ๆ แบบ

[overlapping] and the level of *riaproi* (ORDERLY/POLITE)⁶

Mac (16:20)

chai tong mi khwamriaproi chai (YEAH, YOU HAVE TO BE ORDERLY/POLITE, YEAH).⁷ Yeah, I definitely feel the same way.

Example 3

Pearl (46:05)

And the first couple of times I tried the beef, I'm like, oh my God, *cha uak* (I'M GOING TO THROW UP).⁸

Example 4

Pearl (51:57)

If I eat this American stuff, I'm like *uan fri* (AUTOMATICALLY FAT).⁹ I'm like, here you go. *ao hai ao hai* (GIVE TO)¹⁰ someone else. I'm like *mai kin mai aroi* (I DON'T EAT. IT'S NOT DELICIOUS),¹¹ yeah.

Another common use of CS by participants was quoting other people (Table 1). This occurred primarily as Level C CS. Example 5 below shows one instance where Pearl switches to Thai to quote her cousins. This excerpt comes from a discussion Mac and Pearl had on Thai food and eating culture. After joking about the small serving sizes of food in Thailand compared to in the United States, Pearl says the following:

Example 5

Pearl (50:21)

I didn't care. My cousins crack on me all the time, like, *cha kin mot ro* (ARE YOU GOING TO EAT IT ALL?).¹² I'm like, watch me.

In this example, Pearl uses Thai when quoting her cousins who live in Thailand and not when quoting her own response (“watch me”). Here, Pearl uses Thai as a tool for distancing or disaligning herself from her Thai cousins. Thai is used as a contextual cue to establish contrast between Pearl, a Thai American who states that she loves food (38:57), and her Thai cousins who “crack” on her “all the time” for eating IT ALL when she visits Thailand.

Here, Pearl uses CS to negotiate her identity as a Thai American—someone who is neither fully Thai nor fully American—and disaligns herself with the Thainess and Thai people in Thailand. While Gumperz's (1982) we- vs. they-code posits that the minority language (in this case, Thai) is typically the we-code and the majority language (in this case, English) is typically the they-code, in this example, the opposite is true. There are other examples, such as Example 1

⁶ เรียบร้อย

⁷ ใช่ ต้องมีความเรียบร้อย ใช่

⁸ จะอ้วก.

⁹ อ้วนฟรี

¹⁰ เอาให้ เอาให้

¹¹ ไม่กิน ไม่อร่อย

¹² จะกินหมดหรือ

above, in which Mac and Pearl use Thai to discuss their similarities and build companionship between one another, between themselves as fellow Thai Americans. However, Example 5 above illustrates that there are also instances in which Thai is used as a distancing tool and a means for negotiating a Thai American identity that is different from a Thai identity.

In contrast to Example 5, Example 6 below illustrates one instance of Thai being used as a way for speakers to align themselves with other Thai people. In this example, Pearl expresses her frustration at being charged admission when she visits historical parks and heritage sites in Thailand. To provide some more context, in Thailand, Thai people are not charged admission to certain historical parks or heritage sites, while foreigners are. In this quote, Pearl describes how the employees at these sites always try to charge her admission because “SHE DOESN’T HAVE A THAI FACE”. This excerpt is drawn from a longer quote in which Pearl is describing her past experiences travelling to Thailand.

Example 6

Pearl (15:59)

Pearl pai thiao thi nai khao ko cha phayayam kep tang chai mai (WHEREVER I TRAVEL, THEY WILL TRY TO CHARGE ADMISSION, RIGHT?)¹³ you know, and Pearl ko baep han pai baep arai wa cha kep thammai rao pen khon thai suan yai khon thai eng khao ko cha baep mong rao baep oe ai ni man na mai chai thai tae man phut phasa thai samniang oke kep di mai di (I LIKE, TURN TO THEM, AND I’M LIKE WHAT THE HELL? WHY WOULD YOU CHARGE ME? I’M THAI. FOR THE MOST PART, THAI PEOPLE WILL LIKE LOOK AT ME, AND THEY’RE LIKE, “SHE DOESN’T HAVE A THAI FACE, BUT SHE CAN SPEAK THAI WITH AN OKAY ACCENT. SHOULD WE CHARGE OR NOT CHARGE HER?”)¹⁴ and then I, you know, I typically just walk past and they’re like okay.

In this example, Pearl again uses Thai to quote Thai people. It’s also important to note that, when quoting the Thai people who are debating whether or not to charge her (AND THEY’RE LIKE, “SHE DOESN’T HAVE A THAI FACE, BUT SHE CAN SPEAK THAI WITH AN OKAY ACCENT. SHOULD WE CHARGE OR SHOULDN’T CHARGE HER?”), Pearl uses the second person pronoun *man*.¹⁵ *man* translates to “it” and is used when referring to animals or inanimate objects, so referring to a person as *man* can be perceived as derogatory. At the same time, *man* can also be used endearingly with people with whom one is close to or older than. In this instance, Pearl uses *man* when quoting how other people refer to her when she is in Thailand. The people she quotes are unnamed and presumably strangers. Therefore, it is more likely that Pearl intends to use *man* derogatorily here, rather than endearingly, to convey her frustration and anger at not being perceived as Thai while in Thailand.

Interestingly, when Pearl describes her own response in this quote (AND I’M LIKE WHAT THE HELL? WHY WOULD YOU CHARGE ME? I’M THAI.), she uses Thai, whereas in Example 5 above, she uses English (“I’m like, watch me.”). In Example 6, Pearl aligns herself with Thai people in Thailand, contending that, akin to the people who attempt to charge her admission, “I’M THAI” too. When aligning herself with the other Thais here, she uses Thai to quote herself, but when contrasting herself with her cousins in Example 5 above, she uses English to quote herself. In Example 5, Thai is the they-code, which Pearl uses to distance herself from other Thai people.

¹³ ไปเที่ยวที่ไหน เขาก็จะพยายามเก็บดั่งคิซ่าไหม

¹⁴ ก็แบบ หันไปแบบ อะไรวะจะเก็บทำไมเราเป็นคนไทย ส่วนใหญ่คนไทยเองเขาก็จะแบบมองเราแบบอ้อ ไอ้มันมันหน้าไม่ใช้ไทยแต่มันพูดภาษาไทยสำเนียงโอเค เก็บดีไม่ดี

¹⁵ มัน

Example 6 instead shows Thai as the we-code, with Pearl using Thai to align herself with other Thai people.

The next two examples, Examples 7 and 8, show instances of Level C CS in which Thai adjectives are lexically inserted into English sentences. Both examples were spoken by Pearl, yet they illustrate different ways of inserting Thai adjectives into English. In Example 7, Pearl compares the flavors of Thai and Filipino food when answering a question about American holidays. In Example 8, Pearl discusses what she likes and dislikes about American culture, noting that Americans that she has “come across” are LAZY.

Example 7

Pearl (37:27)

At least at the Thai parties, you know, you have all the different umami flavors. *phet* (SPICY) *priao* (SOUR) *khem* (SALTY) *wan* (SWEET)¹⁶ versus where Filipino food is just *lian* (GREASY).¹⁷

Example 8

Pearl (01:20:09)

From my own experience, you know, Americans that I've come across [are] *khikiat* (LAZY).¹⁸

In Example 7, Pearl states that “Filipino food **is** just GREASY”, while in Example 8, she simply states that “Americans... [**are**] LAZY”, leaving out the copula verb. Recall that, in the Thai language, adjectives that are used as the predicate in a sentence—as in Examples 7 and 8—are considered intransitive verbs and do not require a copula like in English (Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom 2009, 91). Thus, we get the structure seen in the first two examples in Table 1 above.

Following Myers-Scotton’s (1993) *Matrix Language Hypothesis*, the data show that English was the ML and Thai was the EL throughout Mac and Pearl’s conversation. Therefore, according to Myers-Scotton, the structure of the English language should condition how Thai is inserted into the English sentences. In Example 7 above, Pearl includes the English copula “is” even though the Thai adjective GREASY does not require it. Thus, the English language conditions the way the Thai adjective is used by Pearl. In Example 8, however, the English copula verb “are” is absent. Though the ML (English) should condition how words from the EL (e.g., Thai adjectives) are inserted, in this instance, the Thai structure takes precedence over the English structure. This example therefore does not follow Myers-Scotton’s *Matrix Language Hypothesis*.

Discussion

Very little research has been conducted on Thai-English CS, and the work that has been done has focused on Thai-dominant speakers, whereas this study focuses on English-dominant speakers. For this reason, there is no data on English-dominant Thai-English bilingual speakers to which the findings from this study can be compared. In previous research (Young 2021) conducted last year on Thai celebrities Vuthithorn “Woody” Milintachinda and Lalisa “Lisa” Manoban, as well as earlier studies on scripted CS, including those conducted by Likhithphongsathorn and

¹⁶ เผ็ด เปรี้ยว เข้ม หวาน

¹⁷ เค็ม

¹⁸ ซี้เกียจ

Sappapan (2013) and Chalaemwareel and Rodrigo (2020), Thai-English CS primarily takes the form of lexical insertion of English words or other linguistic items into Thai sentences. In other words, data from previous studies, which have all focused on Thai-dominant speakers, show a clear preference for Level C CS. For example, Woody and Lisa’s styles of CS were characterized by lexical insertion of English verbs (e.g., “pretend”, “focus”) and exclamations (e.g., “Oh my god!”) (Young 2021). The preference for Level C CS also holds true for scripted language. In their study of Thai-English CS in Thai pop songs, Likhitphongsathorn and Sappapan (2013) found that 68.39% of CS instances across 146 songs were Level C CS. The remaining 31.61% of CS instances were Level B CS (p. 498).

The motivations for using CS discussed in the examples with Mac and Pearl above—continuing the last language used, filling a linguistic need, expressing emotion, conveying a particular meaning, quoting someone, asserting or negotiating a particular identity, expressing group identity and solidarity—have been identified by other scholars studying Thai-English CS. In Woody and Lisa’s conversation, for example, Lisa was the first to use English, and Woody then continued in English during his next turn (continuity, see Table 1) (Young 2021). In Chalaemwareel and Rodrigo’s (2020) study of Thai Twitter users written Thai-English CS, 13.33% of survey participants stated that they used English vocabulary because they did not know the Thai meaning or equivalent (i.e., filling a linguistic need) (p. 94). Participants also cited using English to better express emotion (20.00%) and convey a particular meaning (38.18%). Asserting or negotiating a particular identity and expressing group identity and solidarity were present in Woody and Lisa’s conversation. As celebrities, Woody and Lisa used English to assert a modern identity. This finding is also supported by Lee (2006) in her study of the association of English with modernity in Korean television commercials. At the same time, Woody and Lisa’s use of English served as a means of building solidarity and expressing their shared identity as bilingual Thai celebrities who have lived abroad for extensive periods of time (Young 2021).

Unlike Woody and Lisa, the participants in this study did not use English to index a modern identity. None of the participants were famous celebrities, as Woody and Lisa are. Additionally, the participants were all English-dominant, so their conversation was also English-dominant. Akin to Woody and Lisa, the participants in this study used CS to build solidarity and express their shared identity—in this case, a Thai American identity that is neither fully Thai nor fully American. For instance, in Example 1 above, Mac and Pearl emphasize their shared Thai American identity and build solidarity through expressing their shared struggle with DEEP VOCAB.

Despite the significant contribution the present study makes in filling the current gap in the literature on Thai-English CS, this study is not without its limitations. One limitation of this study is the small sample size. The sample size of fourteen participants is certainly not large enough to be able to make generalizations about demographic-based patterns (e.g., based on age or gender). Another possible limitation is the variability in age differences across pairs. One pair had an age difference of only one year, while another (Mac and Pearl) had an 11-year age difference. Though the likelihood of these varying age gaps contributing to differences in the seven pairs’ patterns and motivations for CS is small, it is certainly worth considering, especially given the salience of age-based social hierarchy in the Thai language and culture (Iwasaki and Horie 2000).

The first step for the continuation of this study is to investigate Myers-Scotton’s (1993) *Matrix Language Hypothesis* in more detail, focusing especially on the data from the remaining

six pairs. Further analysis of identity performance and negotiation as it is achieved through participants' Thai-English CS is also necessary to elucidate the connection(s) between language and identity. In analyzing identity, special attention should be paid to the variable use of Thai as the we- vs. they-code. Another interesting direction for this research in the future is a comparative analysis of the different styles (and perhaps motivations) of CS for first, 1.5, and second generation Thai Americans. The current study focused on two speakers: 1) Mac, a 1.5 generation Thai American, and 2) Pearl, a second generation Thai American. Interestingly, Pearl used significantly more Thai during her conversation with Mac, even though she and Mac both rated their Thai speaking abilities at 4.5 out of 5. Finally, comparing the findings presented here with comparable data on Thai-dominant speakers would be illuminating for the study of Thai-English CS; however, as previously mentioned, the current lack of research prevents such a comparison.

Conclusion

This study has examined Thai-English Code-Switching as it is used by English-dominant Thai American bilingual speakers. In particular, this study focused on one pair of participants, Mac and Pearl, who used the most Thai throughout their conversation. During their 111.97 minute long conversation, Mac and Pearl used Thai for a total of 6.66 minutes. Following Wei and Milroy's (1995) classification of three Levels of CS, both Mac and Pearl showed a clear preference for Level C CS (i.e., Code-Mixing), with 78.48% of their 79 instances of CS being Level C CS. Levels B and A CS occurred much less frequently, comprising 17.72% and 3.80% of the total instances of CS, respectively.

Common reasons that the participants in this study code-switched include continuing the last language used (Example 1), filling a linguistic need (Example 1), conveying strong emotion (Examples 3 and 4), expressing a particular meaning associated with Thai vocabulary (Example 2), quoting someone (Examples 5 and 6), asserting or negotiating a particular identity (Examples 1, 5, and 6), and expressing group identity and solidarity (Example 1). Mac and Pearl used Thai to assert their shared Thai American identity and to build solidarity based on their shared experiences. Analyzing the data using Gumperz's (1982, cited in Woolard 2006) we-/they-code dichotomy, though Thai was expected to be the we-code during the conversation, Pearl used Thai as both the we- and they-codes. She used Thai to both distance herself from (Example 5) and align herself with (Example 6) other Thai people.

Examining the structure of the CS itself, English was the dominant language of the conversation, so one would expect instances of Thai to adhere to the English language's structure, according to Myers-Scotton's (1993) *Matrix Language Hypothesis*. However, Pearl varied in her adherence to (Example 7) and challenging of (Example 8) this hypothesis. With Thai adjectives specifically, there were instances in which Pearl's lexical insertion of Thai adjectives into English did not follow the English language structure as one would expect.

In conclusion, the findings from this study illustrate the flexibility of both Gumperz's (1982) we-/they-codes and Myers-Scotton's (1993) *Matrix Language Hypothesis*. Throughout Mac and Pearl's conversation, Pearl used Thai variably in ways that challenged the seemingly fixed nature of these two concepts. This study presents an initial examination of the structural patterns and social and linguistic motivations for Thai-English Code-Switching in spontaneous

natural language. Given the current lack of research on Thai-English CS—and CS by English-dominant speakers specifically—there is still much room for future explorations of the subject.

Acknowledgements

Funding for the completion of this Honors Capstone project and for conference travel was provided by the Enhance Your Education (EYE) Grant from the NIU Honors Program and the Research, Engagement and Academic Diversity (READ) Grant from the NIU Office of Student Engagement and Experiential Learning (OSEEL). Additionally, the completion of this project would not have been possible without the continued support and education funding from the NIU Center for Southeast Asian Studies (CSEAS). Finally, I would like to thank my faculty mentor Dr. Kanjana Thepboriruk in the Department of World Languages and Cultures for guiding and supporting me throughout both my undergraduate career and this research project.

Appendix A: Participant Recruitment Script

Sawatdii kha, my name is Holly Young, and I am an undergraduate student studying anthropology and linguistics at Northern Illinois University. For my senior research project this year, I am conducting research focusing on Thai-American identities and the Thai-American experience. I am seeking Thai-American bilinguals between 18 and 30 years old who use both Thai and English in some aspect of their everyday lives to participate in my study. You do not need native-like proficiency in Thai, nor do you need to be equally fluent in Thai and English to participate. Ability to read and write Thai is also not necessary. Even if you only use Thai with certain people or some of the time, such as talking with family or friends, I encourage you to participate in this study.

After completing a preliminary survey (linked below), you will be paired with another participant and asked to discuss 2-3 preselected topics. The topics will center on your personal experiences, as this study is ultimately about hearing and learning from your experiences. If you volunteer to participate, your conversation will be recorded both visually and audibly. However, the recordings will not be shared with anyone, and your information will remain strictly confidential. Participation in the study will take approximately 60-90 minutes in total via Zoom, but the length of time may vary depending on how long participants choose to spend on each topic. No prior knowledge or preparation is necessary for participation in this study. If you or anyone you know is interested in participating, please fill out the survey below. Feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns via email: hmy631@gmail.com. Thank you! 😊

Appendix B: Biodata Survey

1. Name

ชื่อ นามสกุล

2. Age

อายุ

3. Place of residence

สถานที่อาศัย

▼ Alabama (1) ... Wyoming (52)

4. Place of birth

สถานที่เกิด / บ้านเกิด

- USA สหรัฐฯ (1)
- Thailand ประเทศไทย (2)
- Other อื่น ๆ (Please specify โปรดระบุ) (3)

5. Please select your first language(s)

กรุณาเลือกภาษาแรกของคุณ (เลือกได้มากกว่า 1 ภาษา)

- English ภาษาอังกฤษ (1)
- Thai ภาษาไทย (2)
- Other อื่น ๆ (Please specify โปรดระบุ) (3)

6. Please list any other language(s) you use

กรุณาระบุภาษาอื่น ๆ ที่คุณใช้

7. Please check all that apply

เลือกได้มากกว่าหนึ่งข้อ

	Thai ภาษาไทย	English ภาษาอังกฤษ	Other Language(s) ภาษาอื่น ๆ	Not applicable ไม่เกี่ยวข้อง/ไม่มีคำตอบ
Language(s) you're most comfortable using is/are...ภาษาที่สะดวกที่จะใช้ที่สุดคือ...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
At work you use...ที่ทำงานคุณใช้...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In the community you use... ในชุมชนคุณใช้...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
At the store(s) you use... ที่ร้านค้าคุณใช้...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
With your friends you use... กับเพื่อนคุณใช้...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
With your sibling(s) you use... กับพี่น้องคุณใช้...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
With your parent(s) you use... กับบิดามารดาคุณใช้...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
At home you use... ที่บ้านคุณใช้...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
With your child(ren) you use... กับบุตรคุณใช้...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
With your spouse/partner you use... กับคู่สมรส/คู่รักคุณใช้...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. Please specify the number of hours per week that you...

กรุณาระบุจำนวนชั่วโมงต่อสัปดาห์ที่คุณ...

	Thai ภาษาไทย	English ภาษาอังกฤษ	Other Language(s) ภาษาอื่น ๆ
Watch TV show/movies/lakhon/videoclip ดูรายการ โทรทัศน์/ภาพยนตร์/ละคร/วิดีโอคลิป			
Read documents/news/books/newspapers อ่านเอกสาร/ข่าว/หนังสือ/หนังสือพิมพ์			
Write messages/chat/email/LINE เขียนข้อความ/แชท/อีเมล/ไลน์			
Listen to music/radio/podcasts/news ฟังเพลง/รายการวิทยุ/พอดแคสต์/ข่าว			
Speak พูดคุย			

Appendix C : Bilingual Introduction Script

sawatdikha khun ___[name]___ *kap khun* ___[name]___ *khop khun mak na kha* (HELLO, [NAME] AND [NAME]. THANK YOU SO MUCH)¹⁹ for participating in my project. *chan chue holli kha lae pi ni* (MY NAME IS HOLLY, AND THIS YEAR),²⁰ I am a senior studying at Northern Illinois University *na kha*²¹ Your conversation today will be a part of my undergraduate senior thesis project. *wanni* (TODAY)²² the conversation *cha baeng pen song suan* (WILL BE DIVIDED INTO TWO PARTS).²³ It will be divided into two parts *na kha nueng cha naenam tua eng tham khwam ruchak kan kon* (FIRST, YOU'LL INTRODUCE YOURSELVES, GET TO KNOW EACH OTHER).²⁴ Introduce yourselves, get to know each other first *laeo suan thi song ko cha khuy kan* (AND FOR THE SECOND PART, YOU'LL CHAT)²⁵ about your experiences as Thai Americans and your opinions on Thai and American culture *na kha chan cha song khamtham nai* (I WILL SEND QUESTIONS IN)²⁶ chatbox *thi la khon thi la khamtham* (ONE PERSON AT A TIME, ONE QUESTION AT A TIME).²⁷ I will send you each one question at a time in the chatbox, and please feel free to ask follow-up questions. *pho phrom laeo* (ONCE YOU ARE READY),²⁸ you can signal for the next question, using one of the Zoom reactions. *chai phasa nai ko dai kha thai ko dai angkrit ko dai* (YOU CAN USE WHATEVER LANGUAGE, THAI OR ENGLISH).²⁹ Feel free to use whatever language you want. *mi khamtham mai kha* (DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS?)³⁰ Do you have any questions before we begin?

What name should I use to refer to you in the study? *chue arai ko dai chuelen ko dai chueplom ko dai* (ANY NAME IS FINE, A NICKNAME OR PSEUDONYM).³¹ You can use whatever name you'd like.

So now I'm going to start recording, and then I will ask for your full legal name and your permission to record. Please keep your camera on during the conversation for the sake of your conversational partner. I am going to turn my camera off, but I will be here if you have any questions. The recording will not be shared with anyone else, and I will only be using the audio for analysis. *phrom mai kha* (ARE YOU READY?)³² Are you ready for me to start the recording?

¹⁹ สวัสดีค่ะ คุณ ___[name]___ กับคุณ ___[name]___ ขอบคุณมากนะคะ

²⁰ ฉันชื่อฮอลลี่ค่ะ และปีนี้

²¹ นะคะ (this is a polite ending particle used by female speakers)

²² วันนี้

²³ จะแบ่งเป็นสองส่วน

²⁴ นะคะ หนึ่งใน จะแนะนำตัวเอง ทำความรู้จักกันก่อน

²⁵ แล้วส่วนที่สอง ก็จะคุยกัน

²⁶ นะคะ ฉันจะส่งคำถามใน

²⁷ ทีละคน ทีละคำถาม

²⁸ พร้อมแล้ว

²⁹ ใช้ภาษาไหนก็ได้ค่ะ ไทยก็ได้ อังกฤษก็ได้

³⁰ มีคำถามมั๊ยคะ

³¹ ชื่ออะไรก็ได้ ชื่อเล่นก็ได้ ชื่อปลอมก็ได้

³² พร้อมมั๊ยคะ

Appendix D: Interview Questions³³

Part 1

1. Please introduce yourself.
2. On a scale of 1 to 5 (5 = native-like), how well do you speak Thai? Why do you give yourself that rating?
3. Did you grow up in Thailand or the US? What was your experience growing up like?
4. Have you ever lived in Thailand? If so, what was your experience like?
5. Is there anything else that you want to talk about or ask your partner or me before moving on to the second part?

Part 2

1. How much (and what kinds of) Thai culture were you exposed to growing up?
2. Do you celebrate any Thai holidays? If so, how and with whom do you celebrate them?
3. Do you celebrate any American holidays? If so, how and with whom do you celebrate them?
4. What do you think of American food and eating culture? Do you have any favorite American foods?
5. What do you think of Thai food and eating culture? Do you have any favorite Thai foods?
6. Are there any aspects of Thailand or Thai culture that you really like or dislike?
7. Are there any aspects of the US or American culture that you really like or dislike?
8. Do you feel proud and/or patriotic when you think about the US?
9. Do you feel proud and/or patriotic when you think about Thailand?
10. What do you think makes someone Thai?
11. What do you think makes someone American?
12. How do you identify? Do you identify more closely with Thai culture or American culture?
13. Is there anything else that you want to talk about or ask your partner or me?

³³ Questions were generally sent in this order. Questions were excluded if participants already answered them in the natural flow of the conversation.

References

- Assens, Marc, and André Bastié. "Happy Scribe." 2017.
- Auer, Peter, and Aldo Di Luzio. Chap. 1 in *The Contextualization of Language*, 1-37. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins, 1992.
- Bennui, Pairote. "A study of L1 interference in the writing of Thai EFL students." *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, no. 4 (2008): 72-102.
- Boersma, Paul, and David Weenink. "Praat: doing phonetics by computer." 2022.
- Boonsuk, Yusop, and Eric A. Ambele. "Refusal as a Social Speech Act among Thai EFL University Students." *Arab World English Journal*, no. 10 (2019): 213-224.
- Budiman, Abby. *Thai in the U.S. Fact Sheet*. Pew Research Center. June 16, 2021. <https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/fact-sheet/asian-americans-thai-in-the-u-s/> (accessed April 27, 2022).
- Chairat, Patrapee. "English Code-Mixing and Code-Switching in Thai Songs." *NIDA Journal of Language and Communication* 19, no. 22 (2014): 1-29.
- Chalaemwareel, Kawin, and Russell Rodrigo. "Thai-English Code-Mixing on Twitter in Thailand: Motivations and Impact on English Language Development." *การประชุมทางวิชาการระดับปริญญาตรีด้านมนุษยศาสตร์และสังคมศาสตร์ระดับชาติครั้งที่ 5*. 2020. 87-103.
- Diller, Anthony, Jerry Edmondson, and Yongxian Luo. *The Tai-Kadai Languages*. London: Routledge, 2008.
- Grosjean, Francois. *Bilingual: Life and reality*. Harvard University Press, 2010.
- . *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Gumperz, John J. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Gumperz, John J. "The Sociolinguistic Significance of Conversational Code-Switching." *RELC Journal* 8, no. 2 (1977): 1-34.
- Gutman, Alejandro, and Beatriz Avanzati. *Tai-Kadai Languages*. 2013. <http://www.languagesgulper.com/end/Taikadai.html> (accessed April 27, 2022).
- Heller, Monica. "Introduction." In *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives*, by Monica Heller, 1-24. De Gruyter, Inc., 1988.
- Hoffmann, Charlotte. *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. New York: Longman Inc., 1991.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi, and Preeya Ingkaphirom. *A Reference Grammar of Thai*. New York, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi, and Preeya Ingkaphirom Horie. "Creating speech register in Thai conversation." *Language in Society* 29, no. 4 (2000): 519-554.

- Jitpaisarnwattana, Napat. "Language Choice and Code-Switching Practices among Thai Students: A Case Study." *Proceeding of International Conference on Language and Communication*. 2014. 229-253.
- Kannaovakun, Prathana, and Albert C. Gunther. "The Mixing of English and Thai in Thai Television Programs." *MANUSYA* 6, no. 2 (2003): 66-80.
- Lee, Jamie S. "Linguistic Constructions of Modernity: English Mixing in Korean Television Commercials." *Language in Society* 35 (2006): 59-91.
- Likhitphongsathorn, Teeratorn, and Pattama Sappapan. "Study of English Code-mixing and Code-switching in Thai Pop Songs." n.d.: 494-505.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. "Common and Uncommon Ground: Social and Structural Factors in Codeswitching." *Language in Society* 22, no. 4 (1993): 475-503.
- Papijit, Whralak. "Thai-English code-mixing in Hormone The Series." 2013.
- Qualtrics. "Qualtrics." Provo, Utah, 2005.
- Suppatkul, Panu. "Thai-American Identity: Second-Generation, 1.5-Generation, and Parachut Children in the U.S." *วารสารสังคมวิทยามานุษยวิทยา* 31, no. 2 (July-December 2012): 79-108.
- Thai - Worldwide Distribution*. n.d. <https://www.worlddata.info/languages/thai.php> (accessed April 27, 2022).
- Thai Royal Institute. "การถอดอักษรไทยเป็นอักษรโรมันแบบถ่ายเสียง." January 11, 1999.
- Tsai, Jeanne L., Yu-Wen Ying, and Peter A. Lee. "The Meaning of 'Being Chinese' and 'Being American': Variation among Chinese American Young Adults." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 31, no. 3 (May 2000): 302-32.
- U.S. Census Bureau. "2019 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates Selected Population Profiles, Table S0201." 2019.
- Wei, Li, and Lesley Milroy. "Conversational Code-Switching in a Chinese Community in Britain: A Sequential Analysis." *Journal of Pragmatics* 23, no. 3 (1995): 281-299.
- Woolard, Kathryn A. "Codeswitching." In *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, 73-94. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2006.
- Young, Holly. "Thai-English Code-Mixing & Code-Switching on The Woody Show: 'Your Thai is Getting Better!'" 2021.
- Yuan, Eric. "Zoom." 2011.