

Speaking Tinglish for Professional Communication: A Reflection of Thai English Used by Tour Guides along the Andaman Sea

Pairote Bennui

*Department of Western Languages
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Thaksin University (TSU), Songkhla
Corresponding author: pairote1977@hotmail.com*

Abstract

The local identity of English emerges when non-native speakers express the language different from Standard English. Currently, the term ‘a Thai variety of English’ seems to be marginalized because of the controversial notion of ‘Thai English’. Moreover, many Thais use ‘Tinglish’ or broken English, rather than correct English. However, such ‘rotten English’ is structured for professional communication and implies a range of Thai English. This is evident in the features of spoken English by Thai tour guides in provinces along the Andaman Sea. This study aims to examine Tinglish or the basilectal variety of Thai English used in tourism spoken discourses and the tour guides’ views towards the use of this lectal variety using an integrated framework based on World Englishes by Kachru (1983; 1985; 2005) and the lectal varieties of New Englishes by Platt et al. (1984). It appears that the Thai tour guides demonstrated their unique linguistic features of Tinglish through meaningful and communicative expressions that contribute to a Thai identity of English.

Keywords: Thai English; Tinglish; the basilectal variety; Thai tour guides

Introduction

The English spoken by Thais has been questionable in terms of effectiveness as it is full of idiosyncrasies. Standard English is spoken by a few Thais while broken English is commonly used throughout the country. This mirrors a dark phenomenon of English in Thailand; the term ‘Thai English’ is viewed as only ‘Tinglish’ or colloquial English of Thais. Though Tinglish has been criticized, it is a vital linguistic tool employed by Thais for professional communication. As tourism is a significant channel of boosting the national income of Thailand, English serves its functional contributions. Obviously, several Thai tour guides, who are major representatives of operating tourism programs, express Tinglish in sounds, words, sentences, and styles influenced by Thai structure to interact with foreigners. This feature suits the term ‘the basilectal variety’ of Thai English. This merits attention for analysis.

Indeed, ‘Thai English’ has been studied regarding its Tinglish form and beyond. Tsow (2006) and Wattanaboon (2002) similarly illustrate the linguistic features of Tinglish such as “Good morning, ja” and “hot peter” (hospital). Meanwhile, Prasithrathsint (1999) attempts to present the highest variety or ‘the acrolectal variety’ of Thai English by mentioning ‘good English’ by Thais or ‘Standard Thai English’ by acceptable users that can be modeled for many other Thais. In light of career path, studies in Thai English are based on the language used by students and teachers (Tuaychareon, 2003), literary writers (Bennui, 2013; Chutisilp, 1984; Watkhaolarm, 2005), researchers (Kongsuwanakun, 2005), and journalists (Pingkarawat, 2002; Trakulkasemsuk, 2007). No studies focused on Thai English used by tour guides; previous studies found emphasized only tour guides’ English language ability and language functions (Boongarin, 2007; Phongsrisai, 2007) and language contact (Seeha-Umpai, 1987). In these studies, the tour guides were from Bangkok and the north; no studies were conducted with tour guides from the south. This brings interest in a study on Tinglish demonstrated by tour guides in the provinces along the Andaman Sea, namely Phuket, Krabi, and Pang-nga, which are considered the tourism hubs in the region. Thus, this study aims to examine the English used by the Thai tour guides in the three provinces to describe their Tinglish features at the phonological, morphological, syntactic,

and discourse levels. Moreover, it elicits their views on using this level of Thai English to support such linguistic features.

Theoretical Framework

The features of Tinglish constructed by the tour guides were investigated using a framework that combines Kachru's (1983; 1985; 2005) and Platt et al.'s (1984) models.

Kachru's (1983) contextualization concerns lexical transfer, translation, shifts, and calques. This notion also yields 'lexical innovation' of Englishes: single items (shifts and loan translation) and hybrid items. Moreover, Kachru (1983) constructs the paradigm 'code-mixing' which contains the following five strategies: (i) *Unit insertion* involves the insertion of a grammatical unit beyond a word such as noun phrases in a sentence from another language; (ii) *Unit hybridization* refers to the use of code-mixing within a unit such as a compound verb; (iii) *Sentence insertion* concerns an addition of a sentence of a language different from that of the discourse to the form of either embedded or conjoined sentences; (iv) *Idiom and collocation insertion* means the process of mixing proverbs and idioms of a language in a discourse of another language; and (v) *Inflection attachment and reduplication* is the attachment of inflectional units of a language to a word in another language and an insertion of reduplicating items in a language into the expression of another language.

The paradigms 'contextualization', 'lexical innovation', and 'code-mixing' later ground the popular model 'concentric circles of English' (Kachru, 1985). This model categorizes the English used in native varieties through 'the inner circle', in a second language context, especially in post-colonial societies or 'the outer circle', and in a foreign language setting or 'the expanding circle'. Kachru (1985) proposes four labels regarding the linguistic features of World Englishes to support the model. Firstly, codification means there should be lexical entries from Englishes into dictionaries, and the local variety of English should be accepted for societal, pedagogical, and professional functions. Secondly, Englishes features should become 'allowable deviations' or innovation. The degree and function of such deviations consist of three varieties of Englishes:

(i) *educated variety (acrolectal)* or the native-like English; (ii) *semi-educated variety (mesolect)* or the moderate English level; and (iii) *bazaar variety (basilect)* or broken English. Thirdly, de-Englishization involves the acculturation of English in a new context, concerning nativized discourse strategies, registers, and speech acts. Finally, *the non-native bilingual's creativity* is seen in creative literature, media, and international uses in social interaction.

While Kachru (1983;1985) theorizes World Englishes, Platt et al. (1984) construct *lectal varieties of New Englishes* based on the concept of '*Post-Creole Continuum*' as a phenomenon of Pidgin and Creole of English. The post-Creole continuum can be divided into three hierarchical levels – *acrolect*, *mesolect*, and *basilect*. Mesolect users are the largest in societies of New Englishes. Indeed, the acrolect and mesolect varieties are considered 'New Englishes' such as Singapore English. Nevertheless, the basilect variety has been controversial because it is the lowest one such as Singlish.

New Englishes is divided into three types. Type 1 refers to New Englishes in post-colonies such as Indian English. Type 2 concerns English-based pidgin such as Nigerian English. Type 3 involves English-based creoles. Further, four other types of New Englishes are provided. Firstly, native varieties other than British English refer to American English, Australian English, New Zealand English, Canadian English, and South African English. Secondly, the newer Englishes of the British Isles includes English in Ireland, Wales and Scotland. Thirdly, immigrant English means English used by immigrants with vernaculars in Britain, USA, and Australia. Lastly, foreign English involves English used as a foreign language, especially in Europe and Asia (Platt et al., 1984).

Platt et al. (1984) also provide linguistic features of New Englishes to support this theory. Phonologically, new accents include the way vowels and consonants in English are uttered by the users different from those in British English and varieties of 'new Englishes'. This level also relates 'new tunes on an old language'; spoken discourse is constructed by speech rhythms, discourse intonation, and L1 particles. Syntactically, the morpho-grammatical aspects of English influenced by the users' vernaculars are of plurality, quantifiers, and word order, among others. This extends to 'new ways of saying it' which concerns the grammatical elements of English utterances grounded by L1 structures

such as expressions of time and question tags. Morphologically, a formation of new words and new meanings includes loanwords, coinages, shifts, idioms, and repetitions. Stylistically, spoken and written texts demonstrate new formal and casual styles, code-mixing, and communication strategies which require non-Anglo cultural and pragmatic conventions. Pedagogically, this theory concerns attitudes towards the use of the acrolectal variety for functional and educational purposes.

English in Thailand is not mentioned in Kachru's (1985) model, but it meets the final circle. This is obvious in Kachru's (2005) concentric circles of Asian Englishes that English in Thailand seems to be another variety of the expanding circle. Further, those four labels of Englishes in the outer circle are possibly found in Thai English. Although English in Thailand is not positioned according to Platt et al. (1984), it should be grounded in the other type of New Englishes, particularly 'foreign English'. The two approaches point out the English features by non-native speakers. This study follows Kachru's (1983; 1985; 2005) studies in presenting the features of Thai English as a World Englishes variety as well as Platt et al.'s (1984) work to examine the basilectal variety of Thai English as a New Englishes type. This will lead to an interpretation of the 'Tinglish' used by tour guides.

Methodology

The methodology covers the samples, instruments, data collection, and data analysis.

Samples

Out of the 4,333 licensed Thai tour guides in Phuket, Krabi, and Pang-nga (Department of Tourism, 2014), this study employed a small number of tour guides, specifically 12 informants, using the snowball sample or chain referral technique via the tour guides' friends and associations and a set of the following criteria: (i) English-speaking Thai guides; (ii) possess tour guide license; (iii) can be a freelance guide or permanent staff working for certain agencies registered in the Tourism Authority of Thailand; and (iv) have at least one year working experience in island and sea trips. The demographic data of the 12 tour guides from 12 tour agencies in the area are listed below.

Table 1 The Tour Guides' Background Information

No	Tour Guide	Gender	Age	Highest Educational Level	Year(s) of Working Experience	Ability in Speaking Foreign Languages	Trips/Tour Programs	Tour Agency's Name
1	Guide A	Male	47	Grade 12	20	English and Spanish	PhiPhi Islands (Krabi)	Ao Nang Orchid
2	Guide B	Male	27	Bachelor's Degree	6	English	PhiPhi Islands (Krabi)	Chokpaisan Andaman Sea
3	Guide C	Male	37	Grade 12	3	English	Ao Thalane (Krabi)	Sea Kayak Krabi
4	Guide D	Male	34	Bachelor's Degree	10	English and Chinese	Ao Thalane (Krabi)	For Friends Travels & Tour
5	Guide E	Male	37	Bachelor's Degree	3	English	Similan Islands (Pang-nga)	Similan Pro Dive
6	Guide F	Male	28	Grade 12	5	English	Similan Islands (Pang-nga)	Check-in Andaman
7	Guide G	Male	48	High Vocational Certificate	20	English, Malay, Italian, German, French, Spanish and Chinese	James Bond Islands (Pang-nga)	Phuket Raina Tour
8	Guide H	Male	32	Bachelor's Degree	8	English	James Bond Islands (Pang-nga)	Phuket Sunny Infinity Tour
9	Guide I	Male	39	Bachelor's Degree	10	English, Chinese and Russian	Racha Island (Phuket)	Raya Father Tour
10	Guide J	Female	25	Bachelor's Degree	2	English and Malay	Racha-Coral Islands (Phuket)	Golden Region Travel
11	Guide K	Female	35	Bachelor's Degree	10	English and Chinese	Racha-Coral Islands (Phuket)	Choksomboon Tour
12	Guide L	Male	34	Bachelor's Degree	5	English and Japanese	Racha Islands (Phuket)	Raya Princess Tour

According to Table 1, the samples were composed of 10 male tour guides while there were only 2 females. Moreover, the participants aged between 25 and 48 years. Further, the majority of the samples obtained Bachelor's Degree while only three finished senior high schools and only one graduated with a diploma level. Additionally, the samples' working experience as licensed tour guides ranged from 2 – 20 years. As this research study requires only English-speaking Thai tour guides, it appears that all the samples could use English. Additionally, the samples had been working in different tour agencies that provided six different tour programs of the seas and islands of the three provinces. These tour agencies were registered in the Tourism Authority of Thailand.

Instruments

There were three instruments used in this study. First of all, the 4GB UX series digital voice recorder was used to record the guides' spoken English data while they were working on sea travel programs. Further, a transcription of the spoken English data consisted of 12 files of the transcription organized based on the selected tour guides, and it was used for analyzing the guides' Tinglish. Moreover, the observation notes were taken while the researcher was on the boat or after the day trip to assess the guides' lectal variety of Thai English. Finally, the semi-structured interview (see **Appendix**) provided a set of questions with three parts – the guides' background information, their views on their spoken English ability, and their views on the use of Thai English.

Data Collection

The process of sampling the language was conducted via three assistants and the 12 tour guides using the researcher's direct call. Further, the researcher played three roles - a tourist, an observer, and an assistant who followed the tour guides in every step. The tour guides were asked to wear the audio-tape recorder around their neck so that their spoken English would be easily recorded. The researcher gathered data from the Krabi trips from 20 – 23 October, 2014. The trip to Pang-nga and Phuket operated from December 28, 2014 to January 4, 2015. After this, the 12 files of the transcription were categorized into phonology, lexis, syntax, discourse, and perspectives.

Data Analysis

The categories of raw data in the transcription of the tour guides' spoken English and in the semi-structured interview were synthesized and analyzed using textual analysis. The 12 tour guides' linguistic and attitudinal features were justified regarding the lowest level of Thai English. For Thai English phonology, lexicon, and grammar, the British English dictionary, namely the 'online Oxford University dictionaries' (2016) was used to determine whether the observed language items used by the tour guides adhered to the Standard English ones. However, the guides' Thai English discourse patterns would be justified by the researcher himself, considering the notion of Thai English in discourse and culture (Bennui, 2013) as a significant reference. These analyzed data were described by interpreting them with the previous studies that combine Kachru's (1983; 1985) and Platt et al.'s (1984) frameworks. This interpretation led to a discussion of Tinglish used in the tourism context.

Discussion on Features of Tinglish Used by the Guides

There appeared to be eight tour guides whose oral English fell into the basilectal variety while the rest were using the mesolectal variety. The eight tour guides, namely *Guides B, C, D, G, H, I, K* and *L*, demonstrated more Tinglish than the correct English. These guides showed unique linguistic and attitudinal features of Tinglish according to the previous studies and the framework.

Tinglish Phonological Features

The tour guides simplified their oral English with Thai phonological elements at the two levels – segmental and suprasegmental.

The Segmental Level

Tour guides pronounced English consonant and vowel sounds in a Thai way as they got used to doing it. First of all, they articulated the initial consonant clusters that indicate Thai English. The most outstanding is the sound /θr/. This is evident in the following examples:

- (1) ..they come here about two or tree (three) nights. (Guide B)

- (2) ...please two or tree (three),... (Guide D)
- (3) One, two, tree (three), four, right...(Guide G)
- (4) Are you tree (three) people ..? (Guide H)
- (5) Until tree (three) o'clock,.... (Guide I)
- (6) Ca va?. Tree (three) person. (Guide K)

The tour guides simplified the sound /θr/ in a Thai way, namely the sound /tr/, because of difficulty in uttering the sound /θ/, which appears only in English but not in Thai (Timyam, 2012, 9). However, they could pronounce at least this sound by not uttering only the sound /t/ though most Thais face problems with the retroflex sound. Indeed, the retroflex was ignored by Guide I who attempted to pronounce the word ‘tractor’ but it was realized as /'taktə/.

In light of final consonant clusters, the tour guides simplified the sound /bl/ for the word ‘problem’; it was pronounced as /pr/ or “prompram”. Interestingly, the consonant cluster sounds /kt/, /ft/, and /kst/ for the words ‘direk’, ‘left’, and ‘next’ uttered by Guides C, D, H, and K, respectively appeared to be similar as if the sound /t/ was missing. For Thai phonetics, the sound /t/ is not indicated when it is clustered. Further, the consonant sound /nd/ for the words ‘behind’ and ‘island’ was simplified by Guides C, D, G, and L, who did not demonstrate the sound /d/. Next, the sound /sk/ for the words ‘ask’ and ‘masks’ was uttered without the sound /s/ by Guides H, K, and L. Further, the lateral sound /l/ was difficult to pronounce for Guides B and H when it combined the final sounds /f/, /d/, and /p/, for the words ‘yourself’, ‘old’, and ‘help’ which were absent. This reflects what Kachru and Nelson (2006, 37) found that “some speakers of Expanding Circle varieties do not distinguish between /l/ and /r/”. Finally, the final sounds /dʒ/ and /tʃ/ disappeared when they combined the sound /n/ for the words ‘orange’ and ‘lunch’. These features parallel the statement “final consonant clusters are simplified in most East and Southeast Asian varieties of English” (Kachru & Nelson, 2006, 37-38).

For other single consonants, the most salient simplified sounds could be the fricatives. Eight tour guides substituted the sounds /w/, /b/, and /f/ for the words ‘have’ (hab), ‘cave’ (caf  ), ‘seven-eleven’ (sewen-elewen)

which are found in Thai; the sound /v/ for the first and final positions is not found in Thai phonetic elements. Moreover, the sound /ð/ for the words ‘there’, ‘than’, and ‘then’ was uniquely realized as the sound /d/ by six guides while the sound /s/ for the word ‘because’ was mostly replaced by the sound /t/ and slightly substituted by the sound /d/. Though the sound /s/ is found in Thai, especially in the initial position of the word, the final position for all words is still pronounced as the sound /d/. Another outstanding sound falls into the nasal /ŋ/, the word ‘belonging’, which also appears in Thai, but six guides got used to pronouncing the sound /g/ as /k/ as they had learnt English as a foreign language.

These features are supported by Tuaychareon’s (2003) study that Thai English speakers face difficulty in uttering the final position of the English fricatives, namely /θ, ð, v, s, f, ʃ, h, z/. Further, the tour guides’ substitution of the sounds /v/ and /ð/ for /w/ and /d/ yields Sripracha’s (2005) study that Chulalongkorn University students showed their Thai English consonant sounds when communicating with National University of Singapore students; they substituted the sound /w/ for /v/ and /d/ for /ð/. Thus, the plosives and laterals which are problematic for Tinglish speakers, namely [s, k,g, b, v, ʃ] and the final positions of the words like [al, or] (Tsow, 2006), are evident in this study.

For vowels, the tour guides simplified their articulation of monophthongs, diphthongs, and triphthongs. First of all, the monophthong /ɪ/ for the words ‘village’ and ‘luggage’ was simplified as the diphthong /eɪ/ by Guides C and K, respectively. Moreover, the monophthong /ə/ for the words ‘ocean’ and ‘ancient’ were diphthongized by Guides B and C. Then, some short vowels were uttered longer; the vowel /e/ for the word ‘then’ was realized as /æ/ by Guide L. Last, the vowel sound /a:/ for the words ‘arm’ and ‘afternoon’ was similarly enunciated as /h/ in Thai by Guides D and H. For diphthongs, Guide B made the vowel /aɪ/ for the word ‘lime’ longer than it is by pronouncing as /a:/ according to Thai accent. The diphthong /aɪ/ for the word ‘finally’ was articulated as shorter for /i/ by Guide G. Further, the production of the diphthong /eɪ/ for the words ‘earthquake’ and ‘painting’ by Guides C and D was similar in that it was altered into the monophthong /æ/, which was uttered longer. Likewise, the diphthong /oʊ/ for the word ‘only’ was enunciated by Guide I

as a longer monophthong /ɔ:/. Additionally, the triphthong /auə/ for the word ‘hour’ was articulated as the diphthong /uə/ by only Guides G and L. Overall, this feature parallels Kachru and Nelson’ (2006) views that almost all Outer and Expanding Circle speakers of English prefer to simplify the diphthongs and triphthongs of British English.

The Suprasegmental Level

The tour guides simplified their stress in four types. Firstly, they did not stress the words ‘America’, ‘captain’, ‘ice-cream’, and ‘chocolate’. This is pointed out by Rogers (2013) who found that Thai English speakers equally stressed all syllables of the word such as ‘con-ti-nue’ (continue). Secondly, they emphasized all the syllables of the words ‘separate’ and ‘centimeter’. Thirdly, they stressed the middle syllable of the word ‘company’. Finally, they emphasized the final syllable of the words ‘popular’ and ‘banana (boat)’. This also meets Roger’s (2013) study that Thai English speakers also shifted stress different from Standard English such as the final syllable of the word ‘para’graph’ (‘paragraph). Further, the tour guides outstandingly adjusted Thai tones for uttering English words in the following expressions:

- (7) You see.. Just nature oil. (Guide C)
- (8) Water, water water water krab water. (Guide D)
- (9) Don’t worry (Guide H)
- (10) Can give some tip here to our captain (kaptan)? (Guide K)
- (11) ...we include equipment for snorkeling, ... (Guide K)

As Thai language has five tones with their phonetic symbol – middle, low (`), falling (^), high ('), and rising (ˇ) (Timyam, 2012, 23), these tour guides marked their English pronunciation with mainly the falling tone in the second syllable – the words ‘nature’ /nei ˇtʃə/, ‘water’ /wɔ: ^tə/, and ‘worry’ /wʌ ^ri/. Meanwhile, they labeled the middle tone for all syllables and the high tone for only the third syllable, for the words ‘captain’/kʌptən/ and ‘equipment’/ikwɪp mēnt/, respectively.

The existing Thai English phonological elements yield the notion of ‘new accents’ proposed by Platt et al.’s (1984). The sound /l/ which was

replaced by the sound /r/ for the word ‘robby’ (lobby) by Guide B is also faced by East African and Hong Kong English speakers who replaced the word ‘light’ for ‘right’. Moreover, the final consonant clusters /nd/ and /st/ were not released, especially for the words ‘islān’ (island) by Guides C, G, and K and ‘foris’ (forest) by Guide H. This new accent also appears in Ghanaian English, with the words ‘pas’ (past) and ‘ten’ (tend) and Singapore English, the words ‘jus’ (just) and ‘frien’ (friend). Further, Guide I replaced the vowel /a:/ for /ə/ when pronouncing the word ‘water’; this word was realized as /'wɔ:ta:/, not /'wɔ:tə/. Similarly, the articulation of the word ‘visitor’ was realized as /visita/, not /'vizitə/ (Platt et al., 1984, 35-44).

The Tinglish pronunciation of the Thai tour guides indicates the notion of ‘new tunes on an old language (English)’. This is evident in ‘Thai tunes on English words, especially through ‘stress’. Guides B and H uttered the stress of the words ‘popular’ as /pɒpjɒ:’la/ and ‘banana’ as /ba na:’na/; the final syllables of the words were emphasized though the Standard English emphasis is on the second syllables. This way of stress is similarly seen in Singapore English such as the word ‘educated’. Besides, some English words pronounced by the tour guides were adjusted by Thai tones, that is, ‘worry’ /wʌ̄’ri/, and ‘equipment’ /ɪkwip mén̄t/. It is difficult for the Thai tonal adjustments of the English words to be similar with other New Englishes. However, only the word ‘father’ pronounced as /fā’da/ with the tone adjustment of Nigerian Pidgin English could be similar in terms of the low tone (Platt et al., 1984, 134-135).

Tinglish Morphological Features

The tour guides demonstrated six types of Thai English words – loanwords, loan translation, coinages, hybridization, acronym, and clipping.

Loanwords

Loanwords are the borrowing of indigenous lexicons in English texts because certain equivalent terms are not available or local items convey more socio-cultural senses of the context than English ones. Only Guide I used a few loans from Thai when speaking English, that is, ‘Tom Yam Kung’ and ‘Muay Thai’. These two words are Thai English lexicons found in an online

forum (Mathias, 2011, 9).

Loan Translation

As there are no certain words on Thai culture and tourism contexts in English, the tour guides translated local words into English to ensure the foreigners' understanding. There appeared to be 26 English words translated from Thai. Some are shown below.

(12) ...Or pie for many long tailed boats. (*Guide D*)
(13) We started boxing. Thai boxing, Muay Thai. (*Guide I*)

Besides, many other words are *bamboo island*, *house village*, *wallet money*, *a chocolate water*, *sea gypsy people*, *the mountain around*, *monkey massage*, *long island*, *monkey taxi boat*, *monkey temple*, *coca cola water*, *pregnant island*, and *parrot bird*, etc. The two other words – ‘hand phone’ and ‘the parking driver’ – are different in that they are adapted translation. Meanwhile, the former ones represent the way the tour guides translated all ranks of the words for their full equivalents.

Only the word ‘long-tailed boat’ used by Guide C is found in the Macquarie Dictionary (Butler, 1996, 1999a, 1999b). Another word ‘Muay Thai’ is regarded as Thai English lexicon found in an Australian English dictionary and the British English dictionary (Bennui, 2015). Moreover, the word ‘Muay Thai’ obviously becomes a Thai English word as it is also seen in Thai English literature (Watthaolarm, 2005). The significance of this word is in line with a study by Bennui and Hashim (2013) who found the word ‘chock muay’, another informal version of Thai boxing, in Thai English fiction.

Coinages

Coinages refer to new words which are coined because a connection between new words and any existing words in vernaculars or translation cannot be established. They may be derived from the names of people and places, or trademarks for products (Low & Brown, 2005). In this study, the words ‘James Bond Island’ and ‘James Bond Rock’ are the most significant because the popular Hollywood film ‘James Bond 007: The Man with the Golden Gun (1974) is the basis for this coining. The location where

the film was shot was on the islands along Pang-nga bay. Further, the words ‘*Chang Beer*’ and ‘*Poompui*’ represent their trademarks. The former is not translated as ‘*Elephant Beer*’ because of its branding in Thai. Meanwhile, the latter, namely the classic brand of Thai canned fish, was used by Guide K because the banana boat’s shape is similar to the picture of the fish used in such a brand’s packaging. These two lexicons of trademarks are similar to the word ‘*coca cola*’ found in Thai English fiction (Bennui & Hashim, 2013) because they could be grouped under the same category of the popular brand in Thailand.

Hybridization

Hybridization is a lexical process in which morphological items of at least two different languages are combined. The tour guides used only three items – *long tailed Makkha* or “a long tailed monkey named ‘Makkha’” (Guides C and D), *small lanta island* or ‘an island in Krabi’ (Guide D), and *Tom Yam Seafood* or ‘seafood Thai soup’ (Guide I). The first and second words are similar in that Thai proper nouns as heads combine English modifiers. Meanwhile, the last word mirrors its Tinglish because it is structured according to Thai lexical construction; the correct version should be ‘Seafood Tom Yam’. In this regard, only the words “long-tailed Makkha” and “Tom Yam Seafood” are similarly structured as the word “blue-eyed farang” which is lexical creativity in Thai English fiction explored by Bennui and Hashim (2013, 153). Those hybridized items are subsequently based on Thai items as heads modified by English adjectives as well as English items as heads modified by Thai nouns

Acronyms

Acronyms mean abbreviated items of long English words in which meaning is grounded in Thai socio-cultural elements. There appeared to be only two items – ‘CSB’ (Chok Somboon Tour) and ‘RP’ (Raya Princess) – used by Guides K and L, respectively. These words taken from the names of the tour agencies where the two tour guides are working show a mixture of Thai and English words.

Clipping

Clipping concerns a lexical strategy used to shorten long words. The words ‘sewen-elewen’ (seven-eleven shop) and ‘James Bond’ (James Bond Islands) are the most frequent clipped items used by Guides B, D, and I as well as Guides D, G, and H, respectively. Other words are ‘sewen’ (seven-eleven shop), ‘mobile’ (mobile phone), and ‘Bank’ (Bank note). These words reflect English clipped items used in Thai society. Indeed, the word ‘sewen’ is also the branding of the popular convenience store in Thailand. If compared to another variety of English, the word ‘hand phone’ is a Malaysian English word (Kuang & Hashim, 2007, 49).

Only Kachru’s (1983) three lexical types under the notion of ‘contextualization’, lexical transfer, translation, and shift, are found in this study. The first type is called ‘loanword’ in this study. The word ‘Tom Yam Kung’ is transferred from a Thai cultural culinary item. The second type has several instances such as ‘bamboo island’, ‘long tail boat’, ‘Gypsy cemetery cave’, ‘mountain around’, ‘Thai boxing’, ‘parrot bird’, and ‘dragon prawn’, etc. Only the word ‘mountain around’ shows its equivalents in L1 (Thai) and L2 (English) at all ranks: the item ‘mountain’ is equal to ‘khao’ and the item ‘around’ is equal to ‘wong’ in Thai. Meanwhile, the rest of the words are translated in the way that the English head follows its modifier. Further, the third type is found in some words, namely ‘open air condition’ and ‘pregnant island’. These words’ semantic elements in Thai are adapted when translated in English. Secondly, the guides’ use of Thai-English hybrids parallel Kachru’s (1983) lexical innovation. The two words ‘long tailed makkha’ and ‘Tom Yam Seafood’ are structured regarding the open set type of lexical innovation – a non-English item (Thai) as a head + an English modifier as well as a non-English item (Thai) as a modifier + an English item as a head, respectively.

The tour guides’ Tinglish words are observed in Kachru’s (1985) work. Firstly, the words ‘Tom Yam Kung’ and ‘long tailed boat’ are codified as lexical entries in the Australian and British English dictionaries as Thai English words (Bennui, 2015). Secondly, Kachru’s (1985) lectal range is manifested in this study, namely ‘bazaar variety’ (basilectal variety).

Nevertheless, only one of the four lexical innovations found is ‘hybridization’ which has been discussed according to Kachru (1983). Thirdly, the de-Englishized style could be seen in the notion of register. All the words found in loanwords, hybrid, coinage, loan translation, acronyms, and clipping are considered specific lexicons used in a Thai tourism setting. This is a way to disseminate lexical innovations for the Thai tourism register to World Englishes users. Finally, the notion of non-native bilinguals’ creativity is evident; the Thai tour guides had social interactions with both local and foreign tourists during the trips through the use of Thai and English. For lexicons, all the existing categories mirror the tour guides’ ability in borrowing, combining, translating, coining, shortening, and abbreviating English and Thai words to create ‘Thai English words’.

Platt et al.’s (1984, 90-94) notion of ‘new words and new meaning’ is obvious. First of all, loanwords often used in New Englishes must be ‘stabilized words’ which are used by most speakers of certain varieties. Popular items are based on culinary, shopping, clothing, housing, gardening, and traditional festival functions. Only the first function appears in this study. From the loanword category, there is only ‘Tom Yam Kung’. Under the loan translation, there are ‘coca cola water’ and ‘syrup joot’ (juice). Under hybridization, there is only the word ‘Tom Yam Seafood’. Regarding coinage, there are ‘Chang beer’ and ‘poompui’. Moreover, Platt et al. (1984, 97) somewhat put ‘loan translation’ under ‘coinages’ with the statement that “some of the coinages are word-for-word translation from the background languages”. This is evident in the word ‘poor money’ in East African English that means ‘money for the poor’. Following this pattern of lexical translation, this study reveals the relevant loanword, ‘wallet money’.

Tinglish Syntactic Features

The tour guides simplified their expressions with six grammatical patterns – literal translation, overgeneralization, omission, reduction, restructuring, and progressive verb forms. These patterns are adapted from Low and Brown’ (2005) and Wong’s (1983) studies in Singapore and Malaysian English.

Literal Translation

The tour guides demonstrated their direct translation from Thai into English sentences in many aspects – *negation, have, same same, noun/adjective modifiers, prepositions, phrases*, and clauses. etc. Some illustrations are discussed.

(14) After lunch we go to Bamboo island before we came back over here again. (*Guide B*)

(15) Because before in Thailand no have the gas no have electric for small vinlate (village). (*Guide C*)

(16) Ao this means the bay but same same like Ao Nang Ao Rai Lay. (*Guide D*)

(17) See o'clock, we leave from Raya island. (*Guide L*)

Thai grammar influences the tour guides' English expressions from 14-17. Guide B knew that the adverb 'before' means 'gon' in Thai. However, in the context of this sentence the use of this adverb seems not to completely reflect its English sense; this results in more Thai sentence. The Standard English one should be "*After lunch we will go to Bamboo Island first. Then we will come back over here again*". This expression could be compared to the expression produced by a Thai English speaker in Hawaii – "I went to the Emsville clinic before" (Sukwiwat, 1983: 202-203). These two Thai English speakers intended to use the adverb 'first', but they were more familiar with the adverb 'before' as it means 'ก่อน' in Thai. The senses of 'first' and 'before' are usually equivalent to the Thai adverb 'ก่อน', resulting in their English translation. Guide C replaced the form 'no have' for its expletive 'there is (was)' due to its equivalence of the Thai pattern, namely 'mai' (no) 'mee' (have); the Standard English sentence should be "...*there were no gas and electricity ...*" Here, the form 'no have the gas' is similar to the negation pattern of 'no+verb' by Indian English Pidgin (IPE) users (Mehrota, 1997). Further, Guide D used the popular colloquial phrase of Thai English 'same same' to complete his translation which should be "Ao means the bay but it is the same as Ao Nang...." This is supported by Kravanja (2011, 75) that the phrase 'same same, but different', which means

‘equality and difference’, is often used in conversations between Thai vendors and foreign customers. Finally, Guide L got used to expressing the form ‘leave’ that is followed by the preposition ‘from’ which means ‘chaak’ in Thai, so such preposition should be deleted in its Standard English form.

Overgeneralization

Overgeneralization refers to the misuse and overuse of L2 grammatical elements. Aspects of misuse consist of subject-verb agreement, main verbs, expletives, past tenses, and prepositions. For instance, in the expression (18) “*But actually the dolphin stay at the open sea*” (*Guide H*), the underlined verb did not change its form regarding the present simple tense. This is caused by the speaker’s thought patterns in Thai in which verb forms are not marked according to tenses. This expression is similar to that in Philippine English “The parents, together with the association president, has met with student leaders” (Dayag, 2012, 96). The Thai English and Philippine English speakers here do not point out subject-verb agreement. For overuse, the most outstanding examples are (19) “*You see somebody they live inside,...*” (*Guide B*) and (20) “*After our team we finis (finish) snorkeling*” (*Guide K*). This overuse of the pronouns ‘they’ and ‘we’ affects the form of the main verbs, and they are similar with the spoken language feature in Thai in which the speakers often repeat the pronoun as the subject of the sentence. This mirrors an expression in China English, namely “I’m the youngest one in my family, so I think my parents, they have no interest in...on...in...me” due to the use of ‘subject pronoun copying’ (Zichang, 2010, 290).

Omission

Omission concerns a lack of main elements in sentences such as the copula be and object pronouns. There appeared to be six types of omission produced by the tour guides – main verbs, expletives, auxiliaries, suffix ‘-s’, subjects, and infinitives. The expression (21) “*Somewhere shallow somewhere deep.*” (*Guide B*) shows the omission of the main verb influenced by the Thai structure; the verb-be is not required here. Moreover, the expression

(22) “[^]Not the grand canyon with the rock” (Guide C) and (23) “from the main land to the Muslim village [^]very far” (Guide H) are similar and different. Guide C tried to use the form ‘not’ to express this utterance while Guide H did not show any indicator of the omission. However, both yield the Thai structure in which the expletive form ‘it is’ is not needed in this context. Further, the expression (24) “Now, no crocodile, only mosquito” (Guide D) is the null sentence (an expletive omission) expressed by the tour guide, is similar to that in Singapore English in which many locals often miss subjects and verb-be in their utterances (Low & Brown, 2005).

Reduction

Reduction concerns particular missing grammatical elements and a creation of a newer and much shorter sentence form regarding the ‘tense system’ with the existing meaning. For example, Malaysian English speakers often reduce the auxiliary ‘can’ by reversing modality and subjects in either interrogatives or affirmatives like ‘You can drive ah?’ (Can you drive a car?) (Wong, 1983). Reduction used by the guides appears in three forms – ‘no’, ‘no need’, and ‘already’. The sentence (25) “*If someone no need to take the toilet at the Raya Island, can jump to the sea*” (Guide K) shows that the reduction of the form ‘no need’ from ‘don’t (doesn’t need) reflects its Thai structure. The form ‘no need’ is directly ordered and meaningful regarding the Thai pattern of ‘no’ (mai) and ‘need’ (champen). This ‘no need’ aspect yields an example of reduction in Malaysian English “So you don’t ask...so you no need to ask again” (Morais, 199, 101-102). Another expression (26) “*We have two people booking already*” (Guide I) demonstrates reduction by deleting the auxiliary ‘have’ and moving the adverb ‘already’ to the end of the sentences.

Restructuring

Restructuring refers to a simplifying process in which complicated grammar points are reformed with the remaining meaning. The first aspect is that the direct object is placed at the beginning of sentences and followed by its subject and main verb. In this study, the expression (27) “*Your bag, you don’t need to bring*” (Guide C) indicates the place of the direct object of the

sentence in the position of subject to realize its importance when the tourists were informed. This changed object is meaningfully ordered in Thai grammar. This expression is also similar to that of the Malaysian English used by a character in K.S Maniam's Ratamuni (1994) - "My son I have now" (Cesarano, 2000, 66-67). Another is restructuring a sentence with indefinite subjects. For instance, the expression (28) "*Do you know why the people say the James Bond Island?...*" (Guide H) sounds Thai English since the pattern 'the people say' is usually performed by interlanguage users as it is in their L1 expression. Guide H restructured this expression as it is in Thai in which 'people say' is often used.

Progressive verb forms

Progressive verb forms concern the dynamic use of stative verbs. For example, the verbs 'see' and 'love' are followed by the progressive verb form '-ing'. Such verbs infringe Standard English grammars but they respond to World Englishes users' functional uses influenced by their L1 grammar patterns. The tour guides rarely formed stative verbs for their progressive use. Only one expression (29) "*When you look about the picture, you are understanding*" (Guide I) shows that a dynamic use of the underlined verb in Thai /kamlang khaochai/ is acceptable. This verb form is also similar to an utterance by a Pakistani English speaker - "I am seeing the sky from here" (Rahman, 1990, 54).

These syntactic features are observed in only Platt et al.'s (1984, 118-121) work. First of all, the theme 'new ways of saying it' could be connected to the omission of the expletive 'it is' by the guide. To illustrate, an expression found in Hong Kong English "That mean (it is) very competitive y'know" is similar to the expression by Guide C "(It is) Not the grand canyon with rock". Moreover, the term '*focusing and emphasizing*' is to support a grammatical simplification in New Englishes which falls into the overgeneralization and restructuring categories in this study. This term firstly refers to 'pronoun copying'. It is illustrated in expressions in Bangladeshi English such as "People they don't have that sort of belief now". This undergoes the expression (30)

which overuses the pronouns uttered by the tour guides “*Crocodile* they die. Maybe they have more crocodile” (Guide C). Further, an utterance in Singapore English “*Certain medicine* we don’(t) stock in our dispensary” and in this study (31) “*Life jacket*, you can take to the beas (beach)” (Guide K) are parallel as their objects are placed at the subject position of the sentences. Additionally, the time expression is added under the theme of ‘new ways of saying it’. The word ‘before’ expressed by Malaysian and Singapore English shopkeepers “*Before* sell at dis price can, now cannot already...” is obvious in the expression (32) literally translated by Guide G, “Someone in the back side, before you don’t have the jacket,...” Here, the word ‘before’ used above could refer to ‘before this’.

Tinglish Stylistic Features

The tour guides’ English conveys four salient features of discourse styles of Tinglish – code-mixing, code-switching, discourse particles, and repetition.

Code-mixing (CM)

CM concerns the embedment of linguistic units - affixes, words, phrases and clauses - in two different grammatical systems within the same sentence and speech event. It excludes loans (Tay, 1993). The tour guides mixed Thai words and phrases in their English expressions. Some inserted Thai items and translated them in English while some did not use translation. This is evident in the following example:

(33)

Tourist: Oh.

Guide: You can sit on the chair. Sunbath, *Ron*.

Guide: *Sawasdee Krab*. Good evening. Er, somebody tired? Tired? Escuse (Excuse) me. Now we are come back to main land, PhuketAfter this, you are direct your hotel...Take your belongking....You check it first... I hope you enjoy today. Khobkhun krab. Thank you very much.Khobkhun krab. This island have many calling, Racha Yai or Raya Yai. (Guide I)

Guide I mainly mixed the adjective phrase ‘ron’ (hot) while the rest of the mixing were noun phrases of Thai greetings, namely ‘Sawasdee’ (hello) and ‘khobkhun’ (thanks) which are familiar to foreign tourists. This is also similar to the expression ‘Khobkhun krab’ mixed by Thai speakers in the internet chat room because it shows the politeness of Thai identity in English expressions (Yiamkhamnuan, 2011). Further, the mixing of the proper noun of the island named ‘Raya Yai’ might not be problematic to foreigners as it is the tourist destination of the trip. This extract provides both translation and non-translation of mixed items.

Code-Switching (CS)

CS arises when a language or a code is altered to another with the production of full clauses and sentences in each language across sentence boundaries (Tay, 1993). Similar to code-mixing, the tour guides used code-switching with translation and non-translation strategies. This is evident in the following extracts:

(34)

Guide: Yes, Limestone Mountain, limestone...On this place about 80 percent boat come from Phuket 20 percent come from Krabi because the people they know Phuket before Krabi. Maybe in the next 10 year Krabi same like a Phuket now. Trongninakrab trongchoodnikhaoriakwa lagoon nahachachaipenthiloblomkhongchaopramongpramansib Percentpithi laewchameekhonthirodchaktsunamikrab. (Guide B)

Guide B switched from English into Thai. He indirectly translated all items into Thai, but he had just detailed his description in English into more Thai explanation for the benefit of the local tourists. This phenomenon matches the use of code-switching from Hindi to English with translation by the protagonists in a famous Bollywood movie ‘Slumdog Millionaire’ (David & DeAlwis, 2010) to make other viewers understand such Hindi expressions.

(35)

Guide: At here no monkey krab. Low tide, yes. Namkamlangchiewtonnee
Tourist: Luekpramankimet.

Guide: Pramanhamet. No shark is here. Madam? Madam? Triple run, triple run! Triple turn?. Mairootuaeek suetuama maiao canoe (*Guide H*)

English-Thai and Thai-English code-switching by Guide H arose because he was talking to local and foreign interlocutors at the same time. Though translation was not used here, the Thai expressions inserted were related to the content of the English expressions.

Discourse particles

Discourse particles refer to the use of L1 particles in English spoken texts to reduce the speakers' feeling of hostility. The tour guides used six Thai particles: "na, krab, ha, na krab, na ha, and lah". In the expression (36) "*Excuse me, excuse me. Anybody go to PiPi island? Morning, wait for long na*" (Guide B), the guide got used to ending their Thai expressions with this particle to soften his English speaking to the local and foreign tourists and show his politeness to them. In this regard, the particles 'na' and 'krab' here are similarly used by Thai characters speaking colloquial English in Thai English fictions (Bennui & Hashim, 2014). Another expression (37) "*Veg na. One veg and non-veg lah...How lah?....*" (Guide G) shows that the particle 'lah' was used in the Thai context though it has been popularly used by Malaysian and Singaporean speakers (Hashim & Tan, 2012).

Repetition

Repetition means the way words, phrases, clauses, and sentences are repeated by the speakers for certain effects on the listeners. This is seen in the following expressions:

(38)

"...My guest right now, everyone life jacket! Follow me krab, everyone. Life jacket krab, you see? This way krab this way. Life jacket, get on. This way krab this way. So you get on your life jacket ...This way life jacket krab. ...You have the the the a mobile, number..." (Guide H).

The noun phrase ‘this way’ was hurriedly repeated. Further, the final repetition of the article ‘the’ might be caused by the guide’s stuttering in Thai, affecting his English expressions. Interestingly, the repetition of the word ‘this’ could also yield the repetition style in Singapore English by using the phrases ‘this, that, here, and there’ (Mian-Lian & Platt, 1993, 182).

(39)

Please follow on time, please follow on time. Understand? Ya, thank you. Everyone can look the photo, na. Look the photo because we come back,.. Everyone, look the photo! Please follow me. ...But please follow and on time. Please follow and on time, alright...The next we go to the main land.The next we go to the main land (Guide G)

The repeated sentences in item 39 were parallel and done twice or thrice. This guide’s speech style was easy for the tourists to follow the instruction as it was full of short sentences.

Both Kachru’s (1983) and Platt et al.’s (1984) works on Englishes discourses could be observed. First of all, Kachru’s (1983) code-mixing somewhat covers both code-mixing and code-switching used by the Thai tour guides. The first type of code-mixing - ‘unit insertion’ of verb phrases and noun phrases in non-English - is common in this study. Many guides mixed the noun phrase ‘Sawasdee’ at the beginning of the trip and the verb phrase ‘khobkhun’ at the end of the trip. Then, a partial aspect of the fifth type “insertion of reduplication” is found in the expression “Name ‘Ao Tha Lane’, ‘Ao Tha Lane’. A-O. Ao this means...” by Guide D who mixed a reduplicating item. For the third type, ‘the insertion of sentences’ (Kachru, 1983) could be linked to code-switching. In this study, code-switching with translation yields this type of code-switching because embedded, conjoined or apposition sentences in vernaculars are inserted in English texts such as the expression “Look like the map in Thailand, *mueanpaentipratetThaimaikrab* Thai map krab” by Guide D who used appositive sentences between Thai and English sentences. Further, discourse particles are discussed by Platt et al. (1984) regarding the theme ‘new tunes on an old language’ due to their phonological variation. They are grouped into the discourse category in this study, however,

because of their syntactic, semantic and cultural effects on the textual communication with the tourists. Normally, New Englishes speakers add discourse particles in English and vernaculars due to their mood and attitudes. The common discourse particle used in colloquial Singapore English that is also found in this study is ‘lah’, which is based on the Southern Chinese dialects, as seen in the expression “come with us *lah!*” which shows the speaker’s persuasion. This yields an utterance “You see. How *lah?* If you never try, you never know...” (Guide G). Finally, the ‘repetition’ used by the guides partially asserts Platt et al.’s (1984) theory, which refers to the repetition of words according to the notion of ‘new words and new meaning’. Repetition is used in New Englishes because of the speakers’ intense feelings. Though repetition in this study appears at the discourse level because the tour guides’ oral English affects the tourists’ reaction, it still requires this theory. An expression by Guide C “It’s ok...Slowly, slowly. Water water...” parallels an utterance in Malaysian English “You watch TV until *late late* – no wonder cannot get up!” since they repeat adverbs (Platt et al., 1984, 114-115).

The Tour Guides’ Views about their Use of Thai English

The tour guides’ general views on English usage were revealed prior to their perspectives of Thai English. All eight tour guides started learning English in their primary education. Majority of them had opportunities to take English courses at the university level. All revealed that studying English through formal education was insufficient to work as tour guides, so they learnt English with foreign tourists when working. Further, they used English at work and could speak the language moderately because they needed more practice. Meanwhile, only Guides C and G admitted that they did not speak good English because it was not their mother tongue. All understood that their English accents were local, but their foreign tourists mostly comprehended their oral English. In the meantime, Guides B, D, I and L revealed that they had problems communicating with Indian tourists because of Indian English whereas only Guides H and K were struggling when speaking with English tourists due to the British English accent

The eight tour guides had known the term ‘Thai English’ in general when foreign tourists mentioned the Thai way of speaking English. Moreover, five of them defined ‘Thai English’ positively as another way of speaking English with Thai accents, so they viewed that this variety is commonly used by Thais, including them. However, Guides C, I, and L stated that Thai English was defined as ‘broken English’ which should not be used by any tour guides, but they sometimes used this type of English. Only Guide G showed that he used more Singapore English, specifically Singlish, than Thai English because he had been working with Singaporean tourists. Among them, Guide B strongly supported his Thai identity in speaking English with foreign tourists as it depicted the Thai way of life through the use of English. Likewise, Guides H and L confidently agreed that they used Thai English because of their southern Thai accents influencing their oral English.

The guides generally understood ‘Thai English’. Moreover, all viewed that a number of Thai tour guides use three levels of Thai English, depending on their English ability and professional experiences with world class tour agencies. When they heard those who used the acrolectal variety, all would like to reach that level. They also felt neutral for those who speak the mesolectal variety. However, they sympathized with the basilectal variety users who needed more practice. Guides B, C, D, H, and I agreed that they used the lowest variety because their oral English was full of ungrammatical sentences and mispronunciations. Nevertheless, Guides G, K and L viewed themselves as users of the mesolectal variety because most foreign tourists understood their spoken English. From the linguistic features of the eight tour guides’ Thai English, they were all Tinglish users, however.

Further, almost all the tour guides thought Thai tour guides had to speak perfect English as native speakers to reach the higher level of Thai English and to enhance their work success. In contrast, Guide H viewed that Thai tour guides should use English with Thai cultural uniqueness.

In summary, three of the tour guides viewed Thai English as only Tinglish, and the two of them eventually thought they could speak English beyond ‘Tinglish’ which is the mesolectal variety. Meanwhile, five guides accepted their linguistic competence which falls into Tinglish. Surprisingly,

two of these five tour guides, Guides B and H, perceived that Thai English is meaningful to their profession and indicates Thai identity. This perspective yields Buripakdi's (2012) study that only one of the 20 Thai English creative writers realized the term 'Thai English' as another variety that mirrors a discourse of Thai identity in English. The rest of them marginalized Thai English as a weak form and stated that their English did not imply Thai English.

These views also support the framework. In the 1980s, Kachru's (1985) Englishes had been controversial. Likewise, Platt et al. (1984) found that speakers of New Englishes then, in the 1980s, were reluctant to accept that New Englishes exists. In this study, the majority of the tour guides felt that speaking English as native speakers should be the model for Thai tourist guides, however. A few tour guides were proud of their Thai identity of English when communicating with foreigners; six of them agreed that they used Tinglish. Although many agreed that they have been speaking Thai English, they were reluctant to take pride in presenting Thai English to foreign tourists. These views are similar to those in the 1980s according to Kachru (1985) and Platt et al. (1984); English-speaking Thai tour guides are not confident about the significance of Thai English in their careers.

Conclusion

Tinglish has shown its powerful linguistic form as used by the Thai tour guides along the Andaman Sea for international communication. Evidently, the discussion on Tinglish in this study has implied 13 salient aspects of linguistic and attitudinal features that contribute to Thai English used in the context of tourism – (i) Thai contextualization of English words; (ii) codified Thai English words; (iii) lexical innovation; (iv) de-Englishized lexical style; (v) new English words with novel meanings; (vi) new accents of Thai English sounds; (vii) new tunes on Thai English sounds; (viii) new (Thai) ways of saying English; (xi) mixing-switching styles; (x) similarities with other varieties of Englishes; (xi) Pidgin English; (xii) distinctiveness of Thainess; and (xiii) partial acceptance of Thai English for functional use. All represent a special type of Thai English used in a tourism setting.

Acknowledgement

The researcher would like to thank TSU's Research and Development Institute for funding this study.

Appendix

Semi-Structured Interview

Part I: General/Background Information

1. How old are you?
2. What is your educational background?
3. How many languages can you speak?
4. How long have you been working as a licensed guide?
5. How long have you been working for this tour agency?
6. Is your agency famous? How is it famous? In what way? Awards? Popularity?

Part II: Views on Spoken English Ability

1. Where did you learn or improve your spoken English?
2. How often do you speak English?
3. Do you think you can speak English well? Why?
4. Do you think you have good accents?
5. Do you think foreign tourists understand your oral communication in English?
6. Are there any foreigners who did not understand your speaking English?

Part III: Views on Thai English

1. Do you know the term 'Thai English'? How?
2. What do you mean by 'Thai English'?
3. Do you think you speak 'Thai English' for your job? Why or why not?
4. As many Thais in different careers use Thai English, what do you think about Thai tour guides speak Thai English?
5. As 'Thai English' can have three levels – high (acrolect), middle (mesolect), and low (basilect), in what level of Thai English do you think you are speaking/using when communicating with foreign tourists? Why?
6. Is it necessary for Thai guides to speak perfect English as native speakers? Why or why not?
7. When you hear other Thai tour guides speak English – higher level or middle level or lower level, what do you think about this?

References

Bennui, P. (2013). *Linguistic Creativity in Thai English Fiction*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Bennui, P., & Hashim, A. (2013). Lexical Creativity in Thai English Fiction. *Kritika Kultura*, 21/22, 132-163.

Bennui, P., & Hashim, A. (2014). Stylistic Creativity in Thai English Fiction. *Asian Englishes*, 16(2), 80-100.

Bennui, P. (2015). Thai Words in English Dictionaries. *ASEAN Journal of Education*, 1(1), 149-173.

Boongarin, G. (2007). *The Proficiency in Using English for Communication of Thai Tourist Guides in Chiang Mai*. MA Thesis. Burapha University, Chonburi, Thailand.

Buripakdi, A. (2012). On Professional Writing: Thai Writer's Views on their English. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22(2), 245-264.

Butler, S. (1996). World English in an Asian Context: The Macquarie Dictionary Project. *World Englishes*, 15(3), 347-357.

Butler, S. (1999a). A View on Standards in South-East Asia. *World Englishes*, 18(2), 187-198.

Butler, S. (1999b). The Needs of Dictionary Users in South-East Asia. In *English is an Asian Language: The Thai Context* (M. Newbrook., ed.) pp. 80-94. New South Wales: The Macquarie Library.

Cesarano, G. (2000). *Ethnolectal and Sociolectal Creativity in Malaysian Literature with the Reference to the Work of K.S. Maniam*. M.ESL. Dissertation, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Chutisilp, P. (1984). A Sociolinguistic Study of an Additional Language: English in Thailand. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign, United States of America.

David, M. K., & DeAlwis, C. (2010). Learning from Movies – 'Slumdog Millionaire' and Language Awareness'. *Language in India*, 10, 16-26, Retrieved on December 24, 2016 from <http://www.languageinindia.com/july2010/mayadavidmovieslumdog.html>.

Dayag, D. T. (2012). Philippine English. In *English in Southeast Asia: Features, Policy and Language in Use* (E.L. Low and Azirah Hashim, eds.) pp. 91-99. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Department of Tourism. (2014). *Bureau of Tourism Business and Guide Registration*. Retrieved on September 23, 2014, from <http://www.tourism.go.th/subweb/content/6>

Hashim, A., & Tan, R. (2012). Malaysian English. In *English in Southeast Asia: Features, Policy and Language in Use* (E.L. Low and Azirah Hashim, eds.) pp. 55-74. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kachru, B. B. (1983). *Indianization of English: The English Language in India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, Codification and Sociolinguistic Realism: The English Language in the outer circle. In *English in the World: Teaching Learning of Language and Literature* (R. Quirk and H.G. Widdowson, eds.) pp. 11-36. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, B. B. (2005). *Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian Contexts*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Kongsuwanakul, K. (2005). *Characteristic Features in English Acknowledgements Written by Thai Graduates: Indicators for Thai English*. MA Thesis, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Kravanja, B. (2011). Same Same, but Different: An Inquiry into Paradise Imagery of Tourism Industry and Tourist Practices. *Ethno Antropo Zoom*, 9, 73-107, Retrieved on December 17, 2016 from <http://etno.pmf.ukim.mk/index.php/eaz/article/view/8>.

Kuang, T. S., & Hashim, A. (2007). Malaysian English. In *World Englishes and Miscommunication* (N. Michiko, ed.) pp. 45-57. Tokyo: Waseda University Press.

Low, E. L., & Brown, A. (2005). *English in Singapore: An introduction*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.

Mathias, P. (2011). Lexical innovation and the use of English in Thai contexts on Internet forums. *BU Academic Review*, 10(1), 8-13, Retrieved January 6, 2017 from http://www.bu.ac.th/knowledgecenter/epaper/jan_june2011/pdf/pdf_02.pdf.

Mehrota, R. R. (1997). Negation in Indian Pidgin English. *English Today*, 13(2), 45-49.

Mian-Lian, H., & Platt, J. (1993). *Dynamics of a Contact Continuum: Singapore English*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Morais, E. (1997). Talking in English but Thinking Like a Malaysian: Insights from a Car Assembly Plant. In *English is an Asian Language: The Malaysian Context* (Mohd Said, H. and N. Keat Siew, eds.) pp. 90-106. Kuala Lumpur and New South Wales: Persatuan Bahasa Moden Malaysia and The Macquarie Library.

Oxford University. (2016). *Online Oxford Dictionaries*. Retrieved on November 20, 2016, from www.oxforddictionaries.com

Phongsrisai, R. (2007). *Awareness of Language Ability and Language Confidence of Thai Tour Guides in Bangkok*. MA Thesis, Uttaradit Rajabhat University, Uttaradit, Thailand.

Pingkarawat, N. (2002). Cohesive Features in Documentary Articles from English Newspapers in Thailand and in America. *Asian Englishes*, 5(2), 24-43.

Platt, J., Weber, H., & Ho, M. L. (1984). *The New Englishes*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Prasithrathasint, A. (1999). What is 'Good English' for Thais? In *English as an Asian Language: The Thai Context* (M. Newbrook, ed.) pp. 64-70. New South Wales: The Macquarie Library.

Rahman, T. (1990). *Pakistani English: The Linguistic Description of a Non-Native Variety of English*. Islamabad: National Institute of Pakistani Studies, Quaid-Azam University.

Rogers, U. (2013). *Thai English as a Variety*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Arizona State University, Arizona, United States of America.

Seeha-Umpai, A. (1987). *Language Use of the Tourist Guide: Thai-English Code-Switching*. MA Thesis, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Sripracha, T. (2005). *Intelligibility of English Speech between Singaporean and Thai English Speakers MA Thesis*, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Sukwiwat, M. (1983). Interpreting the Thai Variety of English: A Functional Approach. In *Varieties of English in Southeast Asia* (R.B. Noss, ed.) pp. 190-210. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Tay, M. W. (1993). *The English Language in Singapore: Issues and Development*. Singapore: UniPress, Centre for the Arts.

Timyam, N. (2012). *A Comparative Study of English and Thai: An Introduction*. Bangkok: Kasetsart University Press.

Trakulkasemsuk, W. (2007). *A Comparative Analysis of English Feature Articles in Magazines Published in Thailand and Britain: Linguistic Perspectives*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Tsow, S. (2006, November 4-10). *A Discourse in Tinglish*. *Phuket Gazette*. Retrieved on on January 17, 2017, from www.phuketgazette.net/digitalgazette3/index.asp

Tuaychareon, P. (2003). Reflections on Thai English. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 21(2), 47-65.

Watkhaoalarm, P. (2005). Think in Thai, Write in English: Thainess in Thai English Literatures. *World Englishes*, 24(2), 145-158.

Wattanaboon, J. (2002, September 2). *Languishing language*. The Nation. Retrieved on November 20, 2016, from www.nationmultimedia.com

Wong, I. F. H. (1983). Simplification features in the structure of colloquial Malaysian English. In *Varieties of English in Southeast Asia* (R.B. Noss, ed.) pp. 125-149. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Yiamkhamnuan, J. (2011). The Mixing of Thai and English: Communicative Strategies in Internet Chat Rooms. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 32(3), 478-492.

Zichang, X. (2010). Chinese English: A Future Power? In *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*. (A. Kirkpatrick, ed.) pp. 282-298. London: Routledge.

