LEXICAL BORROWING IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TOURISM MAGAZINES IN SOUTHERN THAILAND: LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF THAI ENGLISH WORDS AND USERS' PERSPECTIVES

Pairote Bennui

Department of Western Languages, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Thaksin University, Songkhla 90000, Thailand

Corresponding author: pairote1977@hotmail.com

Abstract

Lexical borrowing from non-native English culture partially contributes to the morphological construction of World English words and linguistic diversity. It has been claimed that English words based on Thai are very few because of a lack of Thai-English linguistic and cultural contact in the British/American colonial history. Nevertheless, the power of English in modern Thai media and tourism clearly appears in Thai words borrowed by Thai and foreign writers of tourism magazines because of particular sociolinguistic needs. This study thus aims to analyze and describe the linguistic features of lexical borrowing from Thai in three renowned English language tourism magazines in Phuket and Krabi provinces and Koh Samui district, Surat Thani province, a tourism hub of southern Thailand, to present the magazine editors and writers' views towards Thai lexical borrowing, and to discuss the extent to which the features as well as the editors and writers' perspectives reflect Thai English words. It applies textual analysis, semi-structured interview, and an integrated framework of sociolinguistics and World Englishes. The findings show that the six types of lexical borrowing found, namely loanwords, loan blends, loan shifts, loan creation, pronunciation borrowing, and acronyms, as well as the editors and writers' perceptions provide remarkable linguistic characteristics which mirror an extent of Thai English words in a tourism context.

Introduction

Southern Thailand is distinct from the other regions as it is embraced by the Andaman Sea and Gulf of Thailand with stunning sea and island tourist attractions (Makishima, 2003). This information in English has been spread through media channels. It seems that tourism magazines are available throughout hotels and airports as they are convenient for tourists to consume such information when they spend holidays in the south. In printed media, many linguistic sources and thematic aspects of southern Thai tourism have been disseminated to the wider readership. Such data present local stories which inevitably provide Thai words borrowed into English texts. This would make foreign tourists familiar with Thai language and culture when residing in the south. This lexical formation also highlights a linguistic and cultural interface between Thai and English.

Lexical borrowing is a result of linguistic contact (Hock, 2009). It seems to be implausible that Thai lexicons are lent into English magazines, but there appear to be some Thai words and English words with Thai origins borrowed by magazine editors and writers. This phenomenon is significant for the role of English in Thai society. As Thailand is not a post-British/American colony, English here has not been recognized as a local variety because native English cultural and linguistic norms are the best model (Baker, 2012; Bennui and Hashim, 2014). Thus, linguistic forms of English influenced by Thai are not manifested. Thus, examining lexical sources from Thai in tourism magazines is a vital way to support the presentation of English words based on Thai culture, resulting in the formation of Thai English words mainly used in the southern Thai tourism context.

The present study considers a phenomenon of Thai lexical borrowings in tourism magazines in the south. They have particular linguistic forms and are used because of different factors. Whether they reflect Thai English lexicons is to be clarified. This research thus aims to analyze and describe the linguistic features of Thai lexical borrowings in the magazines, to present the editors and writers' perspectives towards the factors that motivate their borrowing of Thai words, and to discuss the extent to which the features and those views reflect Thai English words.

This study is significant in that it is a pioneer in examining Thai English words in local English magazines. The lexical findings can be taken by the Thai Ministry of Tourism and Sports to disseminate via different media for foreign tourists to learn and use in Thai society. Moreover, the foreign magazine editors and writers who are aware of Thai language and culture should be recognized as they are disseminating *Thainess* to international readers through English words. Additionally, this study will benefit the Thai Ministry of Education, which may take lexical borrowing items in this study to be part of the contents in English textbooks in different educational levels. This will encourage Thai teachers and learners to take pride in their local words nativized in English. Finally, this study will be advantageous for the Office of the Royal Society which will consider the lexical choices of this study as a vital database to be compiled in the Thai English dictionary.

Previous Studies

Previous studies related to this current study appear in two aspects: lexical borrowing in World Englishes and factors that motivate the lexical borrowing.

In light of World Englishes studies in which Thai words are lent into English texts, Chutisilp (1984) firstly analyzed Thainess or Thai English in lexical and stylistic features in literary and non-literary texts in Thai and English by Thai writers and translators. Lexically, she found three types of lexical borrowing in Thai English texts: (i) titles for the royal family members such as *'Chao Fa'* (Prince) and *'Mom Chao'* (the highest lord); (ii) titles for commoners, for instance, '*Khun Ying*' (Lady); and (iii) lexicons of social position, for example, *'Kruu'* (a teacher) and *'Kamnan'* (a chief in a village). These words are called 'Thai lexical borrowings in Thai English' (p.142). Further, Butler (1999) explored Thai English words to complete as a lexical corpus for the Macquarie Dictionary project taken from written sources created by Thais and foreigners. Those words are "minor wife, hill tribe, *farang*, *sanuk, wai, klong*, long-tailed boat, sticky rice, *tuk-tuk*, and *rai*". Similarly, Bolton (2003) found typical words of Thai English in the Macquarie Dictionary database compiled in the Grolier International Dictonary, for instance "*ajarn*, fighting fish, forest monk, *kha, klong, khunying*, minor wife, and *phra*". Likewise, Mathias (2011)

analyzed the vocabulary of English for the Thai context in popular online forums. He found lexical borrowing in the websites, but he calls it 'loanwords' as seen in some words "*ajarn, farang, katoey, khlong, sanuk,* and *tuk-tuk*". In addition, Bennui and Hashim (2013) investigated lexical creativity in Thai English fiction. In this regard, there are two aspects about lexical borrowing found: independent (untranslated words) and dependent (translated words). The former type consists of some words, for instance, "*wat, somtam, farang, panung, soi*, and *baht*", while the latter type embodies the following words "*kwan, tongyip, kratoey, baan*, and *sawatdee*". These studies contribute to Thai identity of English based on lexical borrowing.

In terms of lexical borrowing and its nativization process, some empirical studies are unveiled. First of all, Gao (2001) analyzed two types of lexical nativization of English in the China context in newspapers – loan translations and loan shifts. The two types are influenced by lexical borrowing. The first type is based on Chinese denotations and connotations translated into English such as "special economic zones, class enemy, and tiger paper". Another type appears in some English words in which meanings are extended or reduced into the Chinese context. For instance, the word 'peasants' here means those who are privileged and highly respected in Chinese society. Moreover, Ngula (2014) examined hybridized lexical innovation in Ghanaian English through various spoken and written sources such as radio and television programs as well as newspapers. Particular words representing innovative lexicons and nativization of Ghanaian English are found in different functional domains. For instance, the words '*kayaye* girl' (a young female porter) and '*kasahari* night' (a night of rap music) are grounded in social domains. The words '*mmofra* account' (a bank account for kids) and '*sika* card' (money card) are the monetary domain. Additionally, Rajashantan (2016) investigated nativization of English used by Sri Lankan English writers of Jaffna Tamils. It was found that the stories by the writers present three remarkable lexical aspects of nativization - lexical borrowing, loan translation, and hybridization. For lexical borrowing, there are various words of Tamil culture such as food (*kasakasa* and *kanji*) and clothing (*dhoti* and *saree*). Overall, these three studies show that lexical borrowing is processed through the nativization of English in relation to non-Anglophone culture.

The reasons that motivate the borrowing of English into non-English texts can be seen through the following studies. First, Grant-Russel and Beaudet (1999) revealed five reasons why Anglo-Quebecers (English-speaking Canadians) use lexical borrowing from French. They are (i) an increased bilingualism in the English language community from 1971 to 1986, (ii) casual attitudes towards galliscisms among English speakers, (iii) unilingual French designations for many governmental and institutional realities that French terms appear in many English public and administrative documents, (iv) the increased prestige of French among English speakers, and (v) many socio-cultural terms in French are loaned into English expressions in this area. These factors signify French as a dominant language in Quebec which are naturally borrowed by English Quebecers. Second, Buang et al. (2008) also found five factors that lead to the lexical borrowing from Malay in Singapore colloquial English (SCE): (i) a need of Malay euphemisms for some taboos in SCE, (ii) the equivalence of idiomatic expressions in Malay to an abstract idea in SCE, (iii) the metonymical purpose, (iv) social solidarity and accommodation in conversations by Singaporean interlocutors, and (v) communal interaction for Singaporean interlocutors with different vernaculars. These factors contribute to the motivations for the use of Malay lexical borrowing items in Singapore colloquial English. Last, Rüdiger (2018) examined 74 South Korean students' attitudes towards the use of English loanwords into Korean through an online questionnaire. There are seven reasons ranked according to the students' attitudes towards the English loanwords used in Korean: (i) practical reasons such as convenience and simplicity of use or understanding; (ii) excessive reasons such as displaying intelligence, English competency, and educational entertainment; (iii) cultural, globalizing, historical reasons such as Westernized Korea and the need to convey concepts from global cultures; (iv) habit; (v) mass media, especially through Internet and television; (vi) practices of English; and (vii) influence of time spent abroad. Overall, this study indicates linguistic and non-linguistic factors influencing English lexical borrowing in Korean.

According to all the studies cited, there is neither any study on English magazines in southern Thailand nor factors that motivate the borrowing of Thai words into English texts. Hence, there is a need to conduct this study to bridge this research gap.

Theoretical Framework

The framework combines three aspects of lexical borrowing: types, reasons and motivations, and nativization. Haugen (1953) theorizes three types of lexical borrowing - loanwords, loan blends, and loan shifts. As loanword is assumed as the most significant and widely found type of lexical borrowing in different texts, an analysis of loanwords given by Haugen (1953) is classified with regard to the notion of importation which is about phonological, morphological, and grammatical adaptations. However, this classification illustrates how English loanwords are imported in indigenous languages. Instead, only the concept that "loanwords include all free morphemes which have been imported without other morpheme substitution than the minimally essential inflections" (Haugen, 1950, p.75) is taken in the framework. This yields the notion that 'pure loanwords' have no morphemic substitution. Instead, the present framework considers the semantic aspect of loanwords provided by Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009), who stress 'semantic fields and semantic word classes' such as the physical word, kinship, food and drink, religion and belief, among others. Thai loanwords will be examined via this typology. In short, categories of analyzing loanwords in this study are adapted from Haugen's (1950, 1953) and Haspelmath and Tadmor's (2009) works.

In light of loan blends and loan shifts, Haugen's (1953) categories of analysis are observed and adapted. First of all, the notions of stems, derivatives, and compounds are sub-categories of loanblends. Loanblend stems refer to particular local words in which stems are suffixed by no/less meaning morphemes in English, particularly found in a variant form in dialects. They also cover loans based on a combination between a native term of similar sound or meaning and its English word. Further, loanblend derivatives concern indigenous words which are suffixed by particular English derivational and inflectional morphemes such as '-el', '-en', '-ish', '-s', '-es', '-ing', and '-ment'. These suffixes have a degree of changing the grammatical and semantic elements of existing words. Last, loanblend compounds involve the way words in English or vernaculars are hybridized on the basis of noun plus noun, adjective plus noun, verb plus noun, among others. Loan shifts include creation (loan translation) and extension (semantic shifts). Creation consists of literal

translation (direct arrangement of the model) and approximating translation (arrangement adapted from that of the model). Extension is homophonous (which resembles model only phonetically), homologous (which resembles model phonetically and semantically), and synonymous (which resembles model only semantically).

The other types of lexical borrowing - loan creation, pronunciation borrowing, and acronyms - are highlighted by key scholars. Loan creation or new coinages is based on Polome's (1975) work. It is apparent in the word '*dyanhwa*' in Chinese which refers to 'telephone' grounded in '*dyan*' (electric). Pronunciation borrowing is taken from Anttila's (1989) study. It refers to sound substitution such as when a British English speaker switches into the American pronunciation; the word 'dance' /dɑːns/ in the British accent is pronounced as /dæns/. Further, acronyms are conceptualized in World Englishes by Görlach (1995) via the proposal of word formation in new Englishes. New Englishes words mostly appear in compounding between English and vernaculars, prefixation and suffixation from dialects in English words, backformation, clipping, and acronyms. These five types of new Englishes words are influenced by lexical borrowing as non-English words play crucial roles in word formation. As there are no other sociolinguistics scholars proposing those five categories, Görlach's (1995) framework is employed. Only his acronyms based on vernaculars and nativized in English are adopted.

Undoubtedly Haugen's (1950) taxonomy of lexical borrowing is employed due to its popularity, classical models of linguistic borrowing, and applicability for analyzing various texts. Meanwhile, the other borrowing categories are used because of their specificity which is not found in many other works. Although Polome's (1975) and Anttila's (1989) studies are not adapted into any studies in Thai lexical borrowing, they provide significant implications for lexical innovations shaped by non-English words. Similarly, the category 'acronyms' by Görlach's (1995) is prioritized for new English words in a L2 context, but it can be adapted to the present study which focuses on English in Thailand, namely an EFL context. This is because the lexical data analyzed in English language tourism magazines in southern Thailand are created by not only Thai writers who use ESL rather than EFL but also foreign or native English writers who reside in Thailand.

The description of the categories results in an adapted conceptual framework of these six types of lexical borrowing. They are to be used for a lexical analysis of this study. Thus, they are shown as follows: (i) Loanwords refer to the borrowing process of Thai proper nouns in functional domains into English words; (ii) Loan blends involve a mixture between Thai and English morphological elements or vice versa of stems, derivatives, and compounds; (iii) Loan shifts concern a lexical strategy in which Thai words are directly and approximately translated into English as well as English/Thai words which are semantically shifted; (iv) Loan creation refers to a lexical borrowing process in which new English words are created or coined in a Thai context; (v) Pronunciation borrowing involves Thai words in which phonological elements are borrowed and written in English words; and (vi) Acronyms mean abbreviations in English formed by Thai morphological elements which are Romanized or those in English used in the Thai context.

For reasons and motivations, the main work adopted is that Weinreich (1968) and the others (Field, 2002; Hock, 1986; Polome, 1975; Wong, 1992) on the factors that motivate the lexical borrowing which consist of lexical innovation, designation of new terms, homonymy, social prestige, and taboos, among others. Other factors will also support the attitudinal data analysis of the writers. Weinreich's (1968) work is mainly used as it influences studies by other academicians. Its embedded conceptual ideas are still contemporary and applicable for analyzing linguistic and non-linguistic factors which motivate the borrowing process.

According to Kachru (1981, 1983, 1986), nativization is a phenomenon where linguistic forms of local languages of non-native English speakers are acculturated into the English system. However, such forms grounded in Asian and African cultures are nativized in English, and they emerge into the world of English uses until they become local varieties of English. In this study, the notion of nativization involves 'lexical borrowing' as it is a major linguistic device used by non-native English speakers who attempt to nativize their vernaculars into English. Several words from non-Anglophone contexts occurring in the colonial periods are based on lexical borrowing as the grounding formations. Hence, Thai lexical borrowings are to be examined using this concept.

Research Methods

Methods of this study concern data source, samples and population, instruments, data collection, and data analysis.

The data source here refers to English language magazines on tourism and its related topics published in the south. There are only three major provinces where such printed magazines are currently published, namely Phuket, Krabi, and Surat Thani (Koh Samui). The selection of the data is purposively based. In Krabi, there is only one magazine that covers local stories about tourist places, namely 'Krabi Magazine'. Although Koh Samui has a number of tourism magazines, only the magazine called 'Samui Holiday Magazine' includes thematic aspects about tourist places, life styles, and local culture. Meanwhile, the others focus on specific contents such as dining and real estates. Likewise, Phuket is full of tourism magazines. Only the magazine called 'Phuketindex.com Magazine' is selected as it provides sufficient Thai lexical borrowings, local stories about tourist places, and people's lifestyles. Meanwhile, the others have no editorial pages, and they have not been continually published since April 2016 to March, 2017. List of the selected magazines' issues is shown in **Appendix A.**

Samples and population are key components. The samples refer to specific examples of lexical borrowing items from Thai found in written English in the three magazines named Phuketindex.com Magazine (PM), Krabi Magazine (KM), and Samui Holiday Magazine (SM). Meanwhile, population refers to the magazines' editors and writers who provide their points of view towards the lexical borrowing items.

Particular samples of lexical borrowing were purposively chosen according to the following criteria: First, they can fall into one of the six types: loanwords, loan blends, loan shifts, loan creation, pronunciation borrowing, and acronyms. Second, their linguistic forms can be partially or fully based on either Thai (which includes religious and indigenous languages such as Pali-Sanskrit, Chinese, and Malay) or English words with Thai culture. Last, their frequency appearing in the magazine is not focused.

The editors and writers were selected through the following criteria. Firstly, they are willing to join the interview. Secondly, there should be at least one editor and one writer of each magazine. Thirdly, they can be the same persons, namely both an editor and writer, in case of a few writers of the magazine. Fourthly, they can be either males or females. Fifthly, they can be those whose names or writings were found in the magazines published during April, 2016 - March, 2017 and with a range of Thai lexical borrowings found in their written English. Finally, they can be those who are previously or presently full-time or freelance writers of the magazines.

The selected editors and writers' background information taken from the interview is described below.

Table 1: The Editors' Background Information

Editor	Magazine	Gender	Nationality	Age	Educational Background	Years of Living in Thailand (for foreigners)	Mother Tongue	Years of editing experience
A	PM	Female	Thai	42	Bachelor's Degree	-	Thai	9
B	KM	Male	American	31	Bachelor's Degree	7	English	3
C	SM	Male	British	47	Bachelor's Degree	18	English	5

Referring to Table 1, editors B and C are males as well as native English speakers who have been residing in Thailand for many years. Interestingly, editor A is a woman who is the most experienced proof-reader in English although English is not her mother tongue. Although these editors' age seems to be different, they are similar in that they hold bachelor's degree. Additionally, editors B and C are similar in that they possess only basic skills in Thai listening-speaking.

Table 2: The Writers' Background Information

Writer	Magazine	Gender	Nationality	Age	Educational Background	Years of Living in Thailand (for foreigners)	Mother Tongue	Years of Writing Experience in this Magazine
D	PM	Female	Thai	31	Bachelor's Degree	-	Thai	8
E	PM	Female	Thai	42	Bachelor's Degree	-	Thai	2
F	KM	Female	American	54	High School	12	English	3
G	KM	Female	Russian	28	Bachelor's Degree	6	Russian	1
H	SM	Male	British	60	Bachelor's Degree	15	English	7.3
I	SM	Female	British	52	Bachelor's Degree	8	English	2.6

Table 2 shows that only six writers became participants in the study. Each magazine consists of two writers. The majority of the writers are women and they earned the bacherlor's degree. Further, there are mainly foreign writers while only two writers are Thai. Moreover, their age ranges from 28 to 60. For the foreign writers here, they have been living and working in Thailand for many years, ranging from 6 to 15 years. For the year of writing in the columns in the magazines, all six writers spent a range from 1 to 8 years. As mentioned earlier, they are freelancers of the magazines, so they have their full-time jobs in Thailand.

Research instruments consist of the file of lexical borrowing items and semi-structured interview. The researcher's file used in the Microsoft Word program includes tables with three main categories of lexical borrowing, the excerpts, and their types to be used for the linguistic analysis.

Semi-structured interview (**see Appendix B**) is used for eliciting the editors and writers' views towards lexical borrowing. It carries two types of the questions, one for the editors and one for the writers. Each type was designed by the researcher by reading the theories and studies as well as studying the background information of each magazine which appears in their websites. The

semi-structured interview for the editors consists of five parts of the questions. Part I is about the bio-data. Part II concerns the general background information about the magazine. Part III involves the roles of being an editor. Part IV is related to the reasons and motivations for using lexical borrowing from Thai in written English in the columns of the magazine. This part highlights the aspects of the six types of lexical borrowing and their reflection of lexical innovation. The final part is applicable as it is about the nativization of Thai words or Thai English words. All the questions require flexible answers.

The semi-structured interview for the writers has four parts. Similar to that for the editor, Part I involves the writer's bio-data. Part II focuses on the profession of writing. Part III indicates the number of questions about the motivations and reasons for using lexical borrowing from Thai in their written English. The questions are created based on Weinreich's (1968) work such as the use of translating strategies for the lexical borrowing items, reasons and motivations for using lexical borrowing to designate new concepts for lexical innovations, the symbolization of the lexical borrowing items for social values of English in Thai society, and the use of lexical borrowing for cacophemistic purposes. The final part is views on a reflection of Thai lexical borrowing on the nativization, cultural innovations of English of Thai identity, and Thai English words; and the significance of the lexical borrowing for local and foreign readers and for the language used in the Thai tourism context. All in all, these four parts mainly use open-ended questions.

The interviews were done via face-to-face, Skype, and email interviews, depending on the subjects' convenience and preference. The face-to-face and Skype semi-structured interviews were recorded using the 4GB UX series digital voice recorder, specifically the model 'ICD-UX543F' of the Sony brand.

Prior to the data collection, the researcher contacted the magazines' coordinators. This led to the mailing of the hard copies of the magazines to the researcher in June, 2017. After this, the discourse analytical method for selecting and manually compiling the lexical samples was used. Firstly, each page of the magazines was thoroughly read by the researcher. Secondly, certain Thai lexical borrowings and their contextual message were highlighted and compiled into

the researcher's file. Lastly, they were coded with their sources of the magazines, namely PM, KM, and SM, pagination, and type of lexical borrowing. Compiling the lexical samples to categorize data had been conducted using the Microsoft Word program from July to August of 2017.

For the pilot study, the preliminary lexical borrowing files and the semi-structured interview questions were validated by the language specialist in September, 2017. This proved that all the selected items are indeed lexicons, not phrases, and they convey particular types of lexical borrowing items according to the framework. Further, the interview questions covered all the perspectives towards lexical borrowing and the general background information in Part II; specifically the 'about the magazine' was added.

The interviews with the editors and writers had been conducted from October to December 2017. This procedure is divided into two phases. For phase I, from October 24-25, 2017, the researcher interviewed the editor and the two writers of PM at the office in Phuket through a face-to-face interview using the digital voice recorder. From October 26-27, 2017, the researcher continually interviewed the editor and the writer of KM at the office in Krabi. However, another writer of this magazine could only accommodate an email interview. The researcher sent her the analysis of the language samples and the interview questions on October 27, 2017. On the next day, she sent the researcher her responses. The email contact between the researcher and this writer for more follow-up questions lasted for two weeks after the first day of contact in late October, 2017. For Phase II (November - December, 2017), the SM editor replied to the interview questions through emails, with the researcher's more detailed explanations for some questions. Writer H was only available for the Skype meeting on December 1, 2017, from 7.00-8.00 p.m. Then, on December 15, 2017, only Writer I of SM was interviewed through the face-to-face channel in Koh Samui.

Analyzing the gathered data concerns two aspects. For the first, examining the lexical samples requires a textual analysis. It started by the researcher's in-depth analysis of each item categorized into six types with their abbreviations, namely loanwords (LW), loan blends (LB), loan shifts (LS), loan creation (LC), pronunciation borrowing (PB), and acronyms (AC), based on the

framework. Each item was linguistically discussed. Further, each item's contextual information was also used for this discussion as it can be considered a sociolinguistic factor. The lexical items and the previous studies were discussed. For the second aspect, the data from the interviews were transcribed and synthesized from November - December, 2017. The first and second parts of the interview questions were displayed in the background information of the participants. The rest of the data was discussed using Weinreich's (1968) work on the motivations for lexical borrowing.

These two types of the data were taken to discuss the extent to which the features of lexical borrowing and the editors and writers' views toward the features of Thai English words reflected Kachru's (1981, 1983, 1986) works and other studies on Thai English lexicons.

Linguistic Features of Thai Lexical Borrowing in English Language Tourism Magazines in Southern Thailand

Six types of Thai lexical borrowing in the magazines – loanwords, loan blends, loan shifts, loan creation, pronunciation borrowing, and acronyms – provide specific linguistic features. They are presented and interpreted using the framework and previous studies so that the nativization and reflection of the Thai English words are highlighted.

A. Loanwords

Loanwords are considered the most popular type used by the writers. They are divided according to the functional domains proposed by Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009): physical words (toponyms); food and drinks; clothing and grooming (clothing); the house (housing); agriculture and vegetation (nature, agriculture and tree); quantity (Thai measurement units for quantifying lands); kinship-speech and language (titles and addressing terms); religion and beliefs (cultural festivals, religion and beliefs, art-music-literature-performance); motion (sport); and modern world (medicine), among others.

Moreover, they are based on the emerging domains found by the researcher. The most common domain belongs to toponyms as well as food and drinks. Some remarkable toponyms are illustrated below.

465

Example 1

Nestled on <u>Koh Lanta Yai</u>, this adults-only intimate resort sits on…

(KM, April-May, 2016, p.7)

Example 2

And they all overlook the tiny deserted island of <u>Koh Farn Noi</u>… (*SM, March-April, 2016, p.13)*

Example 3

Phuketindex.com recently took day trip to Banana Beach on nearby <u>Koh Hey</u> (Coral Island).

(PM, February - April, 2017, p.52)

These three instances are the Thai place names in the three provinces. The KM and SM writers similarly use Thai borrowed items of the islands without translation. *Koh Lanta Yai* and *Koh Farn Noi* may be translated as *Big Lanta Island* and *Little Farn Island* respectively. But their hybrid forms are not locally used. In contrast, the word *'Koh Hey'* is provided with its translation as it is also used by the locals and foreigners.

Other words in this domain are "*Koh Lanta, Susan Hoi, Tambol, Amphor, Moo, Kok Tup, Koh Gai, Talay Whak, Ao Nang, Kok Phi Phi, Maenam, Soi, Suvarna Bhumi, Hin Ta Kreng Hin Yai Riem, Muang, Koh Mae Ko*".

In terms of culinary functions, some remarkable words are illustrated below.

Example 4

… spring rolls, chicken satay, <u>pad thai</u> and many more recipes. *(KM, June, 2016, p.16)*

Example 5

Other foodstuffs are already on display, such as <u>tod man pla</u>, or spicy fish cake,…

(SM, May - June, 2016, p.97)

Example 6

… fried shrimp with spicy sauce, <u>som tam</u> (papaya salad), … *(PM, February – April, 2017, p.52)*

Similar to examples 1-3, these loanwords appear in the English texts with and without translation. The term *'pad thai'* is popular among foreign tourists, so its English version is not given. However, the word *'tod man pla'* is a specific menu shown in its translation. Although the word *'som tam'* may be as unique as the word '*pad thai*', its English version is provided to help the foreign tourists understand its meaning.

This domain is full of many other words of Thai cuisines such as *Yam Nuae Yang, Num prik-khung-sod, Hanuman clook fuun, Moo ob arnajak, Koon longka, Tom Yam Koong, Yam Woon Sen, See Kong Moo Yang, Kalamae, Khanom jeen,* and *Jib Nam Cha.*

The other functions are about cultural festivals (*Songkran, Loy Krathong, Noppamas*), titles and addressing terms (*khun, lung, ajarn, nong, kru, Phra Maha)*, art-music-literature-performance (*Ramakhian, Hanuman, Ranaat, Manorah*), religion and beliefs (*mongkon, kuti, Wat, Naga*), sports (*Nak Muay, Muay Thai*), housing (*Hong, Ruen Mai*), clothing (*Fai Mud Yom*), agriculture, nature and tree (*vana, takien*), medicine (*Mor, Ya*), greetings (*Wai, Sawasdee kha*), quantity (*rai, ngan, wah*), and others (*farang, chanote, songthaew*).

Those loanwords found are supported by Haugen (1953) who states that "all free morphemes which have been imported without other morpheme substitution than the minimally essential inflections" (p.75). The majority of the loanwords found are based on the free morphemes imported from mainly Thai and Pali-Sanskrit as well as partially Chinese rather than the bound morphemes. Moreover, all are nouns. Further, Haugen (1953) states that 'importation' involves phonological, morphological, and grammatical adaptation. As Thai is a tonal language, the Thai loanwords found are adjusted into English/Romanized orthographic forms in which tonal markers are not shown to serve the nativization of English. This excludes only the word '*Tambol*' which is transliterated from its Thai final consonant sound /l/ although the correct sound in Thai must be /n/ (*Tambon*). Another word of this exception is *'See Klong Moo Yang'* which is loaned due to the mispronunciation of the consonant cluster /kl/ which must be /kr/ according to many Thais' interference of the retroflex and lateral sounds. Likewise, their Thai morphological elements are assimilated into English forms. Their spelling system is based on the Royal Thai Institute's transliteration. For grammatical adaptation, as the Thai

loanwords found are proper nouns, they are suitably positioned in English phrases, clauses, and sentences as subjects, objects, complements, and modifiers. Some Thai words are found with their translation in the parentheses, but some well-known terms are not translated. Further, some Thai loanwords appear with single/quotation marks while some are written using capitalization so that they can be marked as Thai English words.

Remarkably, many of the loanwords found could reflect their Thai English words because of the sharing of the morphological and semantic features with Thai English also found in previous studies. The words '*Amphor*', '*Moo(ban)*', '*pad Thai*', '*krathong*', '*soi*', '*wat*', '*chanote*', and '*songthaew*' are claimed to be English vocabulary items for the Thai context found in some popular web boards (Mathias, 2011). Further, the words *'wat', 'kuti', 'soi', 'som tam', 'ajarn', 'nong'*, '*kru*', and '*ta*' parallel those found in Thai English fictions (Bennui and Hashim, 2013). Moreover, the words *'Maenam', 'pad thai', 'Tom Yam Koong', 'Songkran', 'Loy Krathong'*, and '*muay Thai*' in this study yield those found in British, American, and Australian English dictionaries (Bennui, 2015). Additionally, the words *'Muang', 'khun', 'ajarn', 'nong'*, and '*phra (maha)*' are found in the Macquarie Dictionary database (Bolton, 2003). Likewise, in this dictionary, some loanwords surveyed by Butler (1999) are seen in this study: *farang, wai, rai*. The word '*nong*' is also found as a lexicon of Thainess in English narratives by Thai students (Singhasak and Methitham, 2016). Besides, the expression '*Sawasdee (kha)*' in this study presents a Thai English word used by tour guides along the Andaman Sea (Bennui, 2017).

Interestingly, the loanwords '*Tambol*' and '*See Klong Moo Yang*' share phonological features with English loanwords of Hadhramic Arabic (HA). This influences the morphological element of this English word. The shape of these two words is similar to the nativization of English loads in HA leads to the adapted sound by the locals as seen in the consonant sound /p/ nativized into /b/ of HA such as the word '*ni:kab*' (knee–cap) (Bahumaid, 2015). The way HA speakers got used to pronouncing the sound /b/ rather than /p/, resulting in the misspelling system of this loanword which can parallel the words '*Tambol*' and '*See Klong Moo Yang*'. The word '*Tambol*' also yields an English loanword in Japanese, namely '*resutoran*' (restaurant), found by Stanlaw (1992) due to the

nativization of English in Japanese in which only the consonant /n/ can end in English loanwords.

B. Loan Blends

Loan blends in this study are divided into three groups according to stems, derivatives, and compounds. In light of loanblend stems, they involve certain items in which local lexicons share a semantic feature with the English one. The stems of the two blended lexical items are semantically shared although they appear in different forms, namely Thai-English and English-Thai. Some interesting examples are discussed.

> Example 7
> Koh Lanta Yai island has long stretches of gleaming white sandy beaches...*(KM, April - May, 2016, p.12)*
> Example 8
> And so it's come about that, in just about every 'round the island' organised tour, the 'Hin Ta' (grandfather rock) and 'Hin Yai' (grandmother rock) rocks have been included... *(SM, March - April, 2017, p.115)*

From examples 7-8, the words '*Koh Lanta Yai* island' and '*Hin Ta* and *Hin Yai* rocks' show their blended semantic stems. The word '*Koh*' is equal to 'island', and the word '*Hin*' means 'rock'. Their lexico-semantic stems of Thai and English are repeated. Indeed, the English words 'island' and 'rocks' can be morphologically left, but they remain as a sociolinguistic need for the foreign tourists' insights and they create a complex hybridity.

The other words of this sub-type include "three headed elephant *Erawan*, demon *mara*, sacred *Wat Tham Klang* temple, *Ao Thalane* Bay, and *Phra Mae Thorani* goddess".

For loanblend derivatives, they concern the way both English derivational morphemes are prefixed and suffixed to Thai morphemes. Some notable examples are shown below.

> Example 9
> For example, if you are Waiing the receptionist at your hotel,... *(KM, July, 2016, p.54)*

Example 10

The company was established in a very short time because we as Phuketians…

(PM, November, 2016 - January, 2017, p.13)

Example 11

This was the era in which more and more 'farangs' (foreigners)…*(SM, March - April, 2016, p.24)*

Based on examples 9-11, the verb '*wai*' is suffixed by the form '-ing'. The word 'Phuketians' is that the form '-ian' and the plural form '-s' are suffixed to the proper noun 'Phuket'. Further, only the form '-s' is attached to the noun '*farang*'. This phenomenon leads to lexico-grammatical innovations. Moreover, the other words of this sub-type are *tuk-tuk*'s, *wai*s, *songthaew*s, *krathong*s, *Koh Samui*an, and *wat*s.

Loanblend compounds are also common. Many examples of this type are constructed mainly in four patterns, namely 'TNEN' (Thai Noun +English Noun as head), 'ENTN' (English Noun + Thai Noun as head), 'EATNEN' (English Adjective + Thai Noun + English Noun), and 'EATN' (English Adjective + Thai Noun). A specific instance of each pattern is discussed.

Example 12 (TNEN)

.…our Front Page story will bring you to become one of Hanuman's playful warriors at Hanuman world. *(PM, August - October, 2016, an editorial page)*

Example 13 (ENTN)

9/37 M.2 North Chaweng rd Koh Samui...*(SM, March - April, 2016, p.87)*

Example 14 (EATNEN)

Only a short songtaew ride from Ao Nang, every Friday evening…*(KM, July, 2016, p.42)*

Example 15 (EATN)

Try traditional Pad Thai or more exotic dishes… *(KM, August - September, 2016, p.53)*

According to examples 12-15, in the word '*Hanuman* world' the English noun 'world' is modified by the Thai noun '*Hanuman*'. This Thai word

is needed here. Without it, this word will be long which can mean "The world of a monkey character in Buddhist and Hindu literature". Although an English version of the word 'Northern *Chaweng*' is not long, namely the northern area of Chaweng, it is not popularly used. This hybrid version is locally used. Meanwhile, 'short *songtaew* ride' is a compound between the Thai and English words '*songthaew*' and ride', which are modified by an English adjective 'short'. Similarly, the word 'traditional *Pad Thai*' shows that the Thai noun '*Pad Thai*' is modified by the English adjective 'traditional'. The other words of these four patterns include "*soi* dogs, *muay Thai* school, *Loi Krathong* festivals, *Ngok-ngam* fairs, *Choo Chee* Salmon" (TNEN), "square *wa*, Lady *Nai Harn*, Southeast *Lanta*, Miss *Noppamas*" (ENTN), "secluded *Tubkheak* beach, existing *Muay Thai* skills" (EATNEN), and "real *Muay,* spicy *Tom Yum*, friendly *Samui*, high *wai,* best *Som Tam*" (EATN).

The other loanblend compounds found are seen in the patterns of "English Adjective + and + English Adjective + Thai Noun" (i.e. blue and yellow *songthaew*) and of "English Adjective + Thai Noun + English Noun" (i.e. quieter *Chaweng Noi* area).

Those loan blends found are discussed via the framework. According to Haugen (1972, p.85), loanblends "show morphemic substitution as well as importation. All substitution involves a certain degree of analysis by the speaker of the model that he is imitating; only such 'hybrids' as involve a discoverable foreign model are included here". It is found that the loanblend stems, loanblend derivatives, and loanblend compounds are based on discoverable or innovative Thai-English/English-Thai hybrids. That is, they are not found in other models/ varieties of English.

Further, the loan blends found are morphemically substituted and imported. Their semantic stems are shared between Thai and English. For instance, the word '*Koh Lanta Yai* Island' shows that the morphemes '*Koh*', '*Lanta*', and '*Yai*' are imported from Thai and blended with the English morpheme 'Island'. However, the morpheme '*Koh*' should be deleted but substituted by the morpheme 'Island' to become the word '*Lanta Yai* Island'. As '*koh*' means 'island', these two morphemes remain to serve the function of loanblend stems. Thus, there seems to be no morphemic substitution. In this case the substitution has occurred via semantic stems. The loanblend stems found are

created by the KM and SM foreign writers who are aware of their semantic share in Thai and English, but they still want to retain the two words as they are typically used in the local area. The morphemes '*koh*' and 'island' are widely found as blends as a reflection of the lexical use by the foreign tourists.

Loanblend derivatives are also morphemically imported and substituted. Majority of the Thai nouns and verbs have no English equivalents, so they are imported to replace their English versions which may not be familiar to the locals. Moreover, they are suffixed by the English derivational and inflectional morphemes '-'s', '-s', '-ing', '-d', '-an', and '-ains' so that they become blended.

The loanblend compounds found follow importation and substitution (Haugen, 1972). For instance, the word '*Hanuman* world' shows that the Thai morpheme '*Hanuman*' has its long English version, so it is imported to replace such an English phrase. Likewise, the item 'Miss *Noppamass*' may have its English version which is not widely accepted by the locals, but the Thai morpheme 'Noppamass' is imported to replace the term 'Miss Beauty Queen of the Floating Lantern Festival'.

For loanblend derivatives, the words '*SAWNG THAEWS*', 'Buddhas relics', 'distinct bungalow *salas*', *krathong*s', '*wat*s', '*farang*s', '*wai*ing', '*wai*'d', '*Phuket*ians' and '*Koh Samui*an' are similar to those found in Thai English fiction such as '*farang*s', '*wai*ed', '*Vipassana*-ing', '*Bangkok*ians' and '*Napo*tians' (Bennui and Hashim, 2013, p.153). Those Thai words ending with the suffix form '-s' are also morphologically shared similar with the findings of Chutisilp's (1984) in which the words '*kuti*s' (monk buildings) and '*pasin*s' (female Thai skirts) are found in Thai English writing. Then, the word '*soi* dogs' is similar to '*soi* dog' in Mathias's (2011) study. The words '*Koh Lanta Yai* Island' and '*Ao Thalane* Bay' are shared by the word '*pla tapoh* fish' found in Thai English literature by Watkhaolarm (2005) because they are constructed through lexical and semantic repetition. The word '*Koh*' means 'island' and the word '*Ao*' refers to 'Bay'. Likewise, the word '*pla*' is equal to 'fish'.

Many loanblend compounds constructed with the pattern 'Thai noun + English noun' can be related to the previous study. They are *Himmapan* forest, *Naga* Trek, and *Kantoke* section which are similar to the items found in Thai

English literary writings (Watkhaolarm, 2005): "*bo* tree, *bo* leaves, *jampa* flowers, *sarika* birds, *takraw* ball, and *Nora* dance" in that English nouns as heads are modified by Thai nouns. In this category, a number of English words blended with the Thai nouns '*muay Thai*' such as '*muay Thai* school(s)', '*muay Thai* gyms', '*muay Thai* boxing stadiums', and '*muay Thai* boxing possessions' involve the word 'the *Muay Thai* style' (Watkhaolarm, 2005) because this popular Thai sport functions as a compound noun in various forms. Besides, the word '*Massaman* Curry' is related to the blended word '*Masaman* Curry Paste' used as the business name of Thai OTOP food which shows a Thai identity of English (Snodin et al., 2017, p.125).

Several loanblend compounds of the pattern 'English adjective +Thai noun' such as the words 'traditional *pad Thai*' and 'friendly *Samui*' involve the word 'plastic khan' examined by Bennui and Hashim (2013, p.153) and the word 'a big *klong*' in the study of Chutisilp (1984, as cited in Trakulkasemsuk, 2012, p.106) because of their morphological share that Thai nouns as heads are modified by English adjectives.

C. Loan Shifts

There is only one type of loan shifts found according to Haugen's (1953) category, namely creation; semantic shifts are not apparent. Creation here concerns two sub-types which are literal and approximating translation.

Creation of literal translation refers to loan translation involving particular English lexical items translated with a direct sequence of their Thai items. Indeed, English and Thai words are differently ranked, so a few items yield the direct rank between English and Thai morphological structure. Some interesting examples are illustrated.

> Example 16
> …, from where you can catch a longtail boat directly to Koh Jum…
> *(KM, April - May, 2016, p.71)*
> Example 17
> phuketindex.com recently took a day trip to Banana beach on nearby Coral island...
> *(PM, February - April 2017, an editorial page)*

Example 18

The Muay Thai that you'll see today is a modern version of the older kind, or 'Muay Boraan', literally '<u>ancient boxing</u>'… *(SM, November - December, 2016, p.34)*

Regarding examples 17-18, only the word 'ancient boxing' is given English translation while the word 'longtail boat' is the most popular as it has been known among the foreign tourists. Likewise, the word 'Banana beach' has no English version as it is obvious among the foreigners. These three words in English are not directly ranked according to their Thai words. To be directly sequenced, they should be 'boat tail long', 'beach banana', and 'boxing ancient'. The other words of this sub-type cover "chicken island, seashell cemetery, the island with the room, tiger cave temple, sticky rice, long beach, Thai boxing, spiritual binding".

The creation of approximating translation is the way the writers translate Thai items into English ones by adapting their semantic and grammatical segments for creating possible loan translation which will be communicatively understandable among foreigners and familiar to the locals. Some key words are discussed.

Example 19

We recommend you serve Massaman curry over <u>jasmine rice</u>… *(KM, August - September, 2016, p. 61)*

Example 20

King Power Phuket Complex and the <u>floating market</u> in Krathu… *(PM, August - October, 2016, p.17)*

Example 21

IT'S A WHAT? A look at Lamai's <u>Grandmother and Grandfather Rocks</u>. *(SM, March - April, 2017, p.112)*

Based on examples 19-21, the adjective 'fragrant' is embedded in the word 'jasmine rice'. This adjusted form appears in mass media, regarding Thai rice exports. The word 'jasmine rice' is more linguistically and communicatively appropriate than the term 'jasmine fragrant rice' which is too straightforwardly translated. Further, the term 'floating market' is an original loan translation of Thai English. The condition of this market is 'floating' or the

market is located in water, not purely 'water', although Thais call this market 'water market'. The English version is pragmatically deserved. If the term 'water market' is used, it may be misunderstood by foreign visitors as a place for selling water. For the word 'Grandmother and Grandfather Rocks', the conjunction 'and' is not necessary for the direct translation to the Thai item of 'grandmother rock, grandfather rock'. The specific words 'maternal' and 'paternal' are added to meet its correct version in Thai, although they are not a must. The other words under this sub-type include "tiger traffic lights, papaya salad, coral island, and spirit houses".

This lexical borrowing type is discussed through the framework. For Haugen (1972), "loanshifts show morphemic substitution without importation. These include what are usually called 'loan translation' and 'semantic shifts'; the term 'shift' is suggested because they appear in the borrowing language only as functional shifts of native morphemes" (p.85). In this study, this concept means that Thai morphemes are not imported but they are substituted by their English forms. They (native/Thai words) are morphologically shifted or left, and they are replaced by their English translation (loan translation). However, only semantic shifts are not found.

The items of literal and approximating translation found yield the concept of the loanshifts above. The three groups of the direct translated loans - literal arrangement, near literal arrangement, and rank-shifted arrangement - are created to replace their Thai version. For instance, the word 'Big Buddha temple' is translated as the morpheme 'Big Buddha' which is used to replace its Thai term '*Pra Yai*' to make the foreign tourists in Samui understand. Similarly, the word 'floating market' is loaned through its adapted translation; the Thai word '*nam*' (water) is substituted by the English word 'floating' based on an adjusted meaning of '*loy nam*' (floating).

Many items of literal and adapted translation reflect Thai English words. The words 'long tail boat', 'quick longtail boat', 'long tail tickets', and 'long tail taxi boats' are similarly formed with the translation of Thai words '*rua*' (boat) '*hang*' (tail), '*yao*' (long), and the word 'sticky rice' are found in several studies (Bennui, 2015; Bennui and Hashim, 2013; Butler, 1999; Mathias, 2011). Further, the word 'tiger cave temple' is identical to the word 'monkey temple' used by tour guides in Krabi (Bennui, 2017) due to the

semantic basis of temples. In addition, the word 'Thai boxing' is translated from '*Muay Thai*'; an English version of this Thai word appears in a codified native English dictionary (Bennui, 2015). Similarly, the word 'jasmine rice' is another English word with a Thai origin found in an Australian English dictionary (Bennui, 2015). Likewise, the word 'floating market' is found by Mathias (2011) in popular English web boards about Thailand.

D. Loan Creation

Loan creation or new coinage refers to words in English or Thai coined or invented as a lexical strategy for marketing and advertising, especially regarding a product's branding or trademark in society. These invented words have been familiar to either the locals or the foreigners. In this study, coinages found are grouped into two sub-types - product branding and trademarks. Examples of each are shown.

> Example 22
> That means that the Chang beer here is the same price…*(SM, November - December, 2016, p.88)*
> Example 23
> The glass noodle is mixed with sriracha, beetroot and butterfly peas…*(PM, February - April, 2017, p.43)*

From the above instances, the word '*Chang* Beer' is coined with a mixture between Thai and English words. The word '*chang*' (elephant) is transliterated on the beer can and bottle regarding the two elephants' pictures. As elephants are sacred and the national animal of Thailand, the branding lexicon '*chang*' disseminates Thai identity through alcoholic beverage world. In contrast, the word '*Sriracha*' is invented in Thai via the Romanized/Englishished form. It refers to a toponym, namely a district in Chonburi province, where the factory of tomato and chili sauces branded in '*Sriracha*' is located. This product seems to be a well-known brand in Thailand. The other words of this sub-type are "*Doi Chang* coffee*, Krongthip,* and *Krungthong*".

> Example 24
> Being only a 15-minute drive from the recently opened Tesco, Big C, … *(KM, January 2017, p.50)*

The word 'Big C' is coined in the morphological construction of the letter 'C' modified by the adjective 'big'. The word 'Big' refers to the big area where many products are sold while the letter 'C' means 'customers' who shop at this place. This trademark is known as the low priced retailing supercenter among Thais and foreigners in Thailand, so its form 'Big C' is addressed without the term 'supercenter'. The other Thai trademarks found are "Central Festival, King Power, Topp *Caroen*, *Wat Po*, the Thai Authority for Message".

This type of lexical borrowing yields the framework. According to Polome (1975), loan creations refer to "a term applied to new coinages which are stimulated by the need to match designations available in a language in contact" (p.3). The items found are coined as designation for new or innovative or specific places, brand names, and trademarks used in Thai society. There are only four words which are available in the contact language between Thai and English and vice versa: *Doi Chang* Coffee, Top(p) *Caroen, Wat Po,* the Thai Authority for Massage*,* and *Chang* Beer.

Meanwhile, particular English words of coinages represent an invention of "new words of the language from existing names rather than existing words. These may be the names of people and places, or of trademarks for products" (Low and Brown, 2005, p.71) such as 'Colagate', a Singapore English coinages, which is a trade name used for any other toothpastes in Singapore. This is evident in this study: Big C and King Power. Although these words do not represent the overall shopping malls in Thailand, they are one of the most popular shopping malls for the retailing products (Big C) and duty free products (King Power).

Likewise, the coinages in Thai are also regarded as loan creation according to the view of Bamgbose (1983, as cited in Bamiro, 1991) who points out coinages can concern the way new words based on local languages or translation are invented. This is found in the words - *Sriracha, Krongthip*, and *Krungthong* - which are specific brand names of products and trademarks in Thailand and in a provincial city.

Moreover, the English items – *Big C, King Power*, and *Central Festival* - are lexical markers used to symbolize modernity in Thai society. This accords Masavisut et al.'s (1986) views that English is used as the major language in

advertising and marketing strategies of Thai made products, entertainment and commercial sectors because Thai customers have values and attitudes toward imported products or services branded in English which provide more creditability than Thai products.

The word '*Chang* Beer' is regarded as a Thai English word since it is a branding name used by a tourist guide along the Andaman Sea without translating it into 'elephant beer' (Bennui, 2017). Further, the other coinage mixed between Thai and English, namely Topp *Caroen*, is similar to specific Thai stores' names '*Rungruang* Ceramic and *Wassadu*' and '*Waen* Top *Chareon*' found by Arakwanich (1996, p.35) who states that Thais often blend Thai and English words to name their products or stores.

E. Pronunciation Borrowing

The pronunciation borrowing found involves Chinese lexical borrowing as the phonological elements of Chinese words are lent into Thai words and transferred into English. The morphological formation of English words here is based on the way Thai people pronounce certain Chinese loanwords. Only three words found are '*Gin Je*', *'Kuan Im'*, and *'Ziam Zee'*. The following instance from the last word is remarkable.

> Example 25
> Then, he observes '<u>Ziam Zee</u>'. *(SM, May - June, 2016, p.80)*

The word *'Ziam Zee'* is a variant from '*Zian Zue*' in Tewchew Chinese. The word '*Zian*' is adjusted into '*Ziam*' while the word '*Zue*' is assimilated into *'Zee'* according to Thais/Chinese Thais' pronunciation. '*Zian*' means 'a fortune stick', but '*zee*' refers to poems. '*Ziam Zee*' currently means a fortune stick in a bamboo tube found in a Chinese temple (Palungdham, n.d.). The two others are also distinct. The word '*Gin Je*' is grounded in the Thai word 'gin' or 'eat' as blended here. Its origin is the Hokkien word '*zhāi*' which is pronounced by Thais and Chinese Thais as /je/. This may lead to a misunderstanding that the word '*je*' is taken from 'ge' (vegetarian) in English. Indeed, this word is phonologically borrowed from Chinese. Similarly, the word '*Kuan Im*' is pronounced by Thais via the borrowing of its Hokkien word '*Guan In*' which is

later adjusted into '*Kuan Im*'. The form '*Im*' is phonetically adapted into '*In*' by Thai people.

This type of lexical borrowing is observed in the framework. According to Anttila (1989), pronunciation borrowing is a part of lexical borrowing as it involves phonetic substitution accompanied by influential adaptation and gender alignment. This is seen in some loans of immigrants such as the addition of the vowel /i/ in the American Italian word 'pinozz-i' (peanuts). In this study, the three words '*Gin Je*', '*Kuan Im*', and '*Ziam Zee*' are loans of Chinese Thais or Chinese immigrants in Thailand. They are then adapted into Thai phonological, orthographical, and morphological forms influencing their Romanized forms. That is, the word '*Gin Je*' shows that the Hokkien vowel /āi/ of the word '*zhāi*' is substituted by the vowel /e/ of the word '*je*'. Likewise, in the word '*Kuan Im*' the consonant sound /g/ is substituted by the sound /k/, and the sound /n/ is replaced by the sound /m/. Similarly, the word '*Ziam Zee*' reveals that the consonant sound /n/ is adjusted into the sound /m/ for the word /*ziam*/ and the diphthong /ue/ is monophthongized into /ee/ for the word /*zee*/ with regard to Thais/Chinese Thais' pronunciation.

This type is not supported by any studies in Thai English, but by those in other Englishes. The word '*Gin Je*' seems to be misunderstood as an English morpheme of the word 've*get*arian' although it is a pronunciation borrowing from Chinese Hokkien. This is similar to the origin of some Philippine English words due to their spelling and pronunciation change regarding Tagalog - whether they are borrowed from English or Spanish. They are '*destinasyon*' (destination) and '*bakasyon*' (vacation). The answer is they are English lexical borrowing (McFarland, 2009). Moreover, the words '*Kuan Im*' and '*Ziam Zee*' can be compared to English lexical borrowing into Chinese. As these two Chinese words are phonologically adjusted by Thais/Chinese Thais, their English spelling is a variant from the original version in Mandarin and Tewchew, respectively. That is, their orthographic shape in English is influenced by Thais. This is partially related to the English words borrowed into Mandarin which are to be phonologically adjusted according to Chinese people; they are '*disini*' (Disney) and '*baibai*' (bye bye) (Hall-Lew, 2002).

F. Acronyms

Acronyms are based on the abbreviation of lexical borrowing from Thai and English. For the English ones, they are used in the Thai context. There are four items found "BMA (Bangkok Metropolitan Administration)", "M. (*Moo*/house number), T. (*Tambol*/sub-district), A. (*Amphor*/district)", "TAT (Tourism Authority of Thailand), and "OTOP (One *Tambon* One Product)". The last item stands out.

> Example 26
>
> …such as Thai food produced by <u>OTOP</u> village communities … *(PM, February - April 2017, p.60)*

This hybrid acronym means that 'One *Tambon*' stands for 'one sub-district' and 'one product' refers to local products. It is to build up a local entrepreneurship program in each sub-district of Thailand so that a variety of unique Thai products will be marketed locally and internationally. This word can represent a branding of Thai products guaranteed by the Thai Ministry of Commerce (Royal Thai Embassy, Singapore, 2010). Linguistically, each initial letter is abbreviated to invent a new English acronym easily used in Thai and international contexts. These English letters unclearly mirror Thai identity, but the full word from 'T' blended here represents a Thai word of local administration which highlights where local products are produced.

These acronyms are supported by Görlach (1995) who states that "if acronyms and other abbreviations may be included under word-formation at all, then their frequency is again a modern feature and their distribution confined to certain registers, especially that of administration" (p.90). The acronyms found are created in the administrative/political registers of English in Thai society – BMA, M.T.A., and TAT. There is only one, namely 'OTOP', based on the economic register, but it also concerns the government management. These words are still used in Thai and English spoken and written texts, so their linguistic forms reflect the modern feature of English in the country.

Further, the acronym 'OTOP' (One *Tambon* One Product) is similar to the word 'KCF' (*Kasemchai* Farm Group Co., Ltd) (Snodin et al., 2017, p.125) in that they are based on a mixture of Thai and English words. This can also be similar to a compound of Polish and English abbreviations, namely 'marker

genetyczny' (genetic marker) found in biotechnology materials (Klos et al., 2006). Moreover, the words 'BMA' (Bangkok Metropolitan Administration), and 'M.T.A.' (*Moo* or House Number, *Tambon* or Sub-district, and *Amphoer* or District) are morphologically shared by the Thai initials created in English 'TC' (The Honourable *Thaninsak Chainarongwan* MP) and English initials created for the Thai context 'NPF' (the National Peacekeeping Force) found in Thai English fiction (Bennui and Hashim, 2013).

Nativization of Thai English Words

The above lexical features parallel Kachru's (1981, 1983, 1986) nativization in World Englishes which involves two linguistic and cultural processes – functional and formal. In this study, the imaginative or innovative function of English in Thailand is reflected in the linguistic formations in the tourism magazines. Indeed, this function refers to the literary writing by non-native English authors. Language used in the selected magazines is non-fictional style. However, narration and description, both vital linguistic styles in fiction and non-fiction, are mainly found in many columns. The majority of the selected writers and editors are foreigners while the minority is Thais, but they create linguistic innovation to serve the nativization of English in the Thai context.

Formal aspects of the nativization are manifested in English linguistic forms indicating non-nativeness. Kachru (1981) mentions lexical borrowing from vernaculars, hybridization, lexical transfer, semantic changes, coinages, and shifts as morphological nativization of English. All these aspects of lexical nativization are obvious in this study, except for semantic changes. Although the rest of three linguistic levels are not the main focus of this study, they are partially apparent through the shape of the six types of lexical borrowing. Some Thai loanwords are phonologically adjusted into English spelling systems as seen in the words '*Tambol*' and '*See Klong Moo Yang*'. Moreover, three items of the pronunciation borrowing are based on the adaptation of Chinese consonant and vowel sounds used by Thais/Chinese Thais affecting the Romanized/English written forms. Grammatically, the majority of the Thai loanwords are nouns. They are used in the grammatical elements of phrases, clauses, and sentences in English with the use of appropriate punctuation marks.

For loanblends, a lexico-grammatical element of words is applied through the inflectional and derivational morphemes as attached to Thai words. Further, many loanblend compounds are grammatically patterned via functional and content words such as conjunctions and adjectives. Stylistically, the lexical style concerns word choices used by the magazine writers to promote Thai English. Although many editors and writers are non-Thais, their linguistic creativity reflects their Thai linguistic and cultural awareness.

Kachru (1983) states that the nativization of English consists of linguistic and cultural manifestation. The cultural manifestation is seen through the closer use of English to the socio-cultural context of situation while the linguistic manifestations refer to the expression of English forms diverging from Standard English. In this study, all the lexical borrowing items are used in the local areas, namely Phuket, Krabi, and Koh Samui. Some are universal words used throughout the country such as *tuk-tuk,* long tailed boats*, pad Thai, farang*, among others. Outstandingly, those words are invented in divergence from the British/American English words' orthographic, phonological, semantic, morphological, and grammatical elements. These two factors are evident in that the lexical borrowings in this study represent the nativization of English.

As Lau (1999) uses the codified document, namely native English dictionaries, as the evidence of nativization of China English words, this is similarly found in this study. Some loanwords and loan shifts discussed are found in native English dictionaries such as *'*jasmine rice'*, 'muay Thai, 'Muang', 'khun', 'ajarn', 'nong', 'farang', 'wai', 'rai', 'pad Thai', 'Songkran', '*sticky rice', 'floating market'*,* among others. Moreover, the word 'the Lantern Festival' in China English indicating nativization (Gao, 2001) can be similar to the loan word '*Loi Krathong* Festivals' in the present study. Although these two words are differently categorized, they share a semantic feature of 'lantern' symbolizing the Chinese and Thai cultural activities. According to Stanlaw (1992), some acronyms indicate Japanese English as they are derived from English words used via the phonological Japanization (nativization) of English – '*pi-aru*' (public relations). This form can be possibly shared by the English acronyms found 'BMA' and 'TAT'. However, the Thai-English word 'OTOP' is much similar to the word '*pi-aru*' in Japanese English in that it is usually pronounced through the Thai tonal level - /OTOP/. Further, some cultural hybrid

word in Ghanaian English '*tao dazzafi* special' (food) (Ngula, 2014) can be shared by the word 'traditional *Pad Thai*' in this study as they are well known among foreigners in the countries. Besides, the word of loan translation 'mother earth' in Sri Lankan English (Rajashantan, 2016) can be similar to some words in this study such as 'three spirits' and 'spirit houses', due to their Buddhist and superstitious context. Then, some terms in Nepali English '*Da, Didi, Bhai*' (Karn, 2012) are shared by the loanwords '*lung*', '*nong*', and '*ta*' in this study due to their kinship background. Finally, the word '*puja*' in Tamil Malaysian English (Cesarano, 2000) is similar to the word '*mongkon*' found due to the Hindu and Buddhist ceremony.

In brief, it is interesting that the lexical borrowing from Thai has semantic shares with those of other East Asian, South Asian, South-East Asian, and African Englishes.

Editors and Writers' Attitudes towards Thai Lexical Borrowing in the Magazines

The attitudinal findings are of the editors and writers. They contain three aspects - professional background, factors that motivate lexical borrowing, and Thai English words. They are also discussed through the framework and the previous studies so that their perceptions on Thai English words are further concretized.

A. The Editors' Perspectives

Editor C is the senior with the longest writing experience (10 years). This is followed by editor A, 9 years, and editor B, 5 years. Further, only editor C did not reveal any problems as he considers himself a native English writer with effective writing skills. Meanwhile, editor A mentioned the lexical problems in articles solved with dictionaries. Editor B revealed limited contents of Krabi which were solved by his wife who explored the area. Editors A and B did not consider themselves as perfect writers as they need proofreading.

In terms of factors that motivate their lexical borrowing, their views are different. First of all, editors A and B similarly show positive views about the phenomenon of Thai lexical borrowing in written English. They think these words, especially toponyms, are needed to appear in the magazines as

they are important for the foreigners to use them when travelling. This conforms to Hock's (1986) factor, namely a need for using lexical borrowing for foreign locations. In contrast, editor C disagreed that it is a lexical borrowing but it is a use of Thai words. However, the three editors had never translated the Thai lexical borrowing items into English. Some translations in English might be given in parentheses for some Thai words to help the foreigners understand. This accords Hock's (1986) factor, namely 'adoption and adaptation'. In this respect, the three editors agree that they retain some Thai items given by the writers as a representation of the local terms. However, editor A, a Thai, seems to be proud of this adoption compared to the two other editors; she wants to show the Thai identity of English through Thai words. Moreover, the three did not directly state that the use of Thai lexical borrowing would enrich the effectiveness of the English written works because this borrowing is not the main factor. Editor A mentioned *Thainess* from the lexical borrowing which would highlight writing while editor B merely referred to the necessities of Thai words in local stories. Nevertheless, editor C did not support this idea. In addition, the three had never motivated the contributing writers to write some Thai words in the magazines; the contents depend on the writers. The use of Thai words could be possible if necessary. This is supported by Wong's (1992) factor of 'fulfilling a need' in lexical borrowing. Apart from these, editors A and B similarly viewed that the Thai lexical borrowing used is due to lexical innovation, but editor C did not support this. Editor A repeated the notion of *Thainess* in some words that lead to innovation – '*som tam*' and '*kha*' – whereas editor B mentioned the word 'longtail boat' for this innovation. Here, editors A and B's views yield Weinreich's (1968) factor of lexical innovation. Moreover, their views on *Thainess* and *localization* are also similar to the English speakers in Quebec, Canada, who use French lexical borrowing because of a need for cultural borrowing (Grant-Russel and Beaudet, 1999). Then, the three ensured that the Thai lexical borrowing items are correctly written. Editor A checked them via official websites, and editor C did it through the Google website. Meanwhile, editor B inspected them via his Thai friends and editor. Editors A and B are motivated to do so while editing, but editor C accepted that he did it due to his responsibility, not motivation.

In light of nativization of Thai words and Thai English words, there are four aspects of the editors' views. Firstly, editors A and B similarly accepted that they played partial roles in disseminating Thai lexical borrowing because this is a chance to present Thai words in English texts and to make the local and global readers become aware of Thai identity in English. In contrast, this view was not agreed by editor C who did not accept the roles of Thai lexical borrowings. Secondly, editors A and B agreed that the editor played roles in promoting the nativization process of Thai borrowed items in the magazines to a sufficient extent. Editor B added that the word *rai* could be nativized as everyone uses it in Thailand. He did not use the other English word of the area measurement because it was not important here. In contrast, editor C did not agree with this idea without providing any reason. Thirdly, editors A and B still agreed with their roles in asserting that those Thai lexical borrowing items reflect Thai English words. Editor A accepted that some Thai words can be universal such as Songkran, not 'water festival', as its Thai version is recognized worldwide. Likewise, editor B mentioned the word 'longtail boat' and '*songthaew*' which are well-known Thai English items. However, editor C did not accept Thai English words. Finally, editors A and B accepted that the Thai lexical borrowing could partially lead to the effectiveness of the local English magazines as Thai words make the local stories distinct; however, editor C did not realize that this factor would contribute to the effectiveness of the magazines.

Hence, the views of editors A and B are mostly convergent to a reflection of Thai lexical borrowing on Thai English. This relates to the study by Chamcharatsri (2013) in which 137 Thai respondents responded to an online questionnaire regarding Thai English. The majority of the respondents, 104 people, have heard the term 'Thai English' although they viewed that the mixture of Thai and English words is the karaoke style of language. Meanwhile, minority of them viewed Thai English as Tinglish. This can parallel the view of editor C who did not accept Thai English words based on Thai lexical borrowing items. Further, this is related to what Buripakdi (2012) found; 19 of 20 professional Thai writers of English did not agree that their English fell into Thai English which was viewed as the lowest level as compared to Queen's English, Instrumental English, Cosmopolitan English, and Glocal English. Only one

accepted his Thai English as a representation of Thai identity of English. Editor C's view is also related to Jocuns's (2018) study that 77 of 116 people viewed that Thai English is being spoken by low-educated people such as *tuk-tuk* and taxi drivers in tourism places. Though editor C did not suggest Thai English as Tinglish, his disagreement of Thai English words can match the views of these 77 Thais.

B. The Writers' Perspectives

For their professional background, writers E, H, and I were writing for other magazines in Thailand while writer F was writing for a foreign magazine. Only writers D and G did not write for other magazines. Only writers F and I, native English speakers, thought their English writing is perfect. Although writer H is also a native speaker, he accepted that he has only a good writing ability level. Writers D (a Thai) and G (a Russian) viewed that their writing is communicative and needs editing while writer E, a Thai, rated her writing good.

In line with the factors that motivate Thai lexical borrowing, their views are related to 10 aspects.

Firstly, among the six writers, only writer D is a trilingual of Thai, English, and Chinese effectively. Writers E and G are bilingual, but writers F, H, and I are monolingual (native English speakers).

Secondly, the phenomenon of Thai lexical borrowing in English texts is satisfied by writers F, G, H, and I who said that it is important to borrow Thai words without being translated into English texts as the stories and tourist places are about the locals. However, this phenomenon is preferred by writers D and E, Thais, who are very motivated to borrow as they are very proud of Thai socio-cultural words to be lent into English texts as a representation of Thai identity in English and a linguistic aid to the foreigners.

Thirdly, the six writers agreed that they used loanwords rather than the other five types, and they accepted that this phenomenon indicates the linguistic and cultural contact between Thai and English. Writers F, G, and H are identical in that they did not reveal the other types of lexical borrowing they often used. Writer D also used acronyms whereas writer E used loan blends and loan shifts. Likewise, writer I employed loan blends. These three writers, D, E, I, realized the use of Thai lexical borrowing to benefit the foreign tourists. These second

and third aspects of the views parallel Hock's (1986) factor, namely 'adoption and adaptation'. Five writers, except writer H, used adoption, purely Thai words as they are needed in local and cultural stories, and some Thai words cannot be sufficiently translated in English. In light of adaptation, all the six writers used Thai words and their English translation to facilitate the foreign readers' understanding. Writer E, a Thai, shows much adjustment of the translation. She attempted to give more explanation about the word 'stir-fried' of Thai cooking in English as it has many types of stir-fried Thai foods. Meanwhile, writer I, a British, presents her adaptation of Thai words borrowed. The term '*Chiang Mai*' has been adapted into '*Chang Mai*'. Although it is misspelled, it is easily understood by the foreigners in Samui.

Fourthly, the majority of the writers accepted that Thai lexical borrowing in the magazines could result in lexical innovation in English. This accords Wong's (1992) factor 'desire for novelty' in words. Only writer H disagreed with this. However, the rest viewed that this borrowing was not because of designating new things, persons, or concepts in English because they never created new vocabulary items from Thai into their written English. This is contrary to Weinreich's (1968) factor 'designation of new concepts'. They merely used some important words from Thai, but they translated using their own style of written English.

Fifthly, the six writers are similar in that they did not use any Thai lexical borrowing items since they were homonymous to their English equivalents. This is also divergent to the factor 'homophones' of lexical borrowing of Weinreich (1968). Further, all agreed that they used Thai words for necessity in specific contents and helping foreigners to comprehend Thai items used in the tourist places, not because of their affective or elegant synonyms in English. This is related to the factor 'fulfilling a need' given by Wong (1992). This is also supported by Hock (1986) that these two editors need to borrow Thai toponyms as 'foreign locations' to ease the understanding. Then, only writers D and E similarly stated that the Thai lexical borrowing items appear in their columns because such equivalent items in English are infrequently used in particular contexts. That is, some English terms are not often used by these writers, so the Thai terms are popular. This is supported by the low frequency of lexical borrowing as a factor in Weinreich (1968).

Nevertheless, those Thai items and their English equivalents are frequently used by the four other writers who attempted to put some English translation in parentheses.

Sixthly, writers D and E agreed that Thai and English words present their insufficient translation in their written English as they wanted to detail more translation such as the words 'fried noodle' and 'curries' which have more various forms in Thai as well as Thai words in Romanized forms which cannot be described by their tonal levels. These two writers are sensitive to the presentation of Thai linguistic and cultural elements in English. This is in line with the factor 'insufficient differentiation' of lexical borrowing in Weinreich (1968). On the contrary, the four other writers similarly thought that those Thai items in their written English represented sufficient translation to English because they merely want their foreign readers to have a general insight into the contact between Thai and English.

Seventhly, the six writers agreed that those borrowed items from Thai in English texts of the magazines symbolize social values of English in Thai society. They similarly viewed that those Thai language items could possibly be accepted as part of English forms based on Thai socio-cultural contexts or Thai English words in the future. This is also supported by a social value and social prestige of the lexical borrowing mentioned in Weinreich (1968). Indeed, using English in Thai society, it is inevitable to borrow some Thai socio-cultural words which are not found in English, so this factor also indicates social prestige.

Eighthly, all the writers accepted that they never used Thai lexical borrowing of the cacophemistic or colloquial purposes. This differs from what Weinreich (1968) proposes.

Ninthly, the majority viewed that the Thai lexical borrowing did not lead to lexical interference in English texts as their lexical use is translated in English for the foreigners' understanding. This excludes only writer H who thought that this borrowing would provide meaning errors.

Finally, the majority agreed that the Thai lexical borrowing would not affect the grammatical and textual construction of English writing as they used mostly Thai nouns. Nevertheless, writer E thought that some loan blends would affect the grammatical feature of English writing. Likewise, writer F disagreed with the word '*songthaew*s' as it is ungrammatical, so she uses only Thai

loanwords. These views accord Rüdiger (2018) study that many Korean students had negative attitudes towards the mixing of English and Korean words as they are odd to the Korean society.

In terms of the nativization of Thai words and Thai English words, the writers' views relate to five aspects. First, the six writers agreed that the borrowed items from Thai were used in English texts because of their nativization. The universalization of Thai words is accepted by writers D, E, and H, and the internationalization of Thai English words is agreed by writers F and G. Meanwhile, writer I thought of Thai English words that can persuade foreign tourists to Thailand. Second, all seemed to accept that the Thai lexical borrowing in the English magazines indicate an extent of cultural innovations of English for Thai identity as Thai English words can be presented to the globe. Third, all agreed with those borrowed items would be Thai English words in the future as they are created with the writers' goals to use Thai identity in English. Fourth, all accepted that those borrowed items are very significant for local and foreign readers. Last, all accepted that the Thai lexical borrowing is significant for southern Thai tourism. These words processed in the nativization of English could be useful for foreign tourists who can communicate with the locals in Thailand.

The Thai writers are sensitive with borrowing Thai words, and they prioritize their reflection of Thai English words compared to the foreign writers since the Thai writers take pride in their linguistic and cultural identity presented in English forms. This is similar to Buang et al.'s (2008) study that Malay lexical borrowing in Singapore colloquial English is used for social solidarity which is to balance social distance and to accommodate each other. In this study, writers D and E, Thais, are fond of Thai words. They do not exactly mention the notion of social solidarity, but the term 'Thainess'. It is easy for them to borrow Thai terms as they are the locals who love the language. They would like to disseminate the Thai words in English texts to global readership. Meanwhile, the foreign writers merely used such borrowing items due to mostly the subject matters in the content of the local stories. They are only satisfied with a reflection of Thai English words; no writers disagreed with this reflection. This accords what Jocuns (2018) explored through 116 Thai speakers. Majority of these respondents, 106 Thais, were interviewed and agreed that they have heard

the notion of Thai English, although the minority viewed Thai English as Tinglish.

In short, a reflection of Thai English words from the Thai lexical borrowing items seems to be possible as they are supported by the framework, previous studies, and the analysis of linguistic and attitudinal data.

Remarkable Characteristics of Thai English Words

The discussion of the linguistic analysis and the editors and writers' perceptions brings a triangulation of the findings which lead to a summary of remarkable features of Thai English lexicons in the tourism aspects as follows:

(i) Thainess or Thai identity of English covers all six types of lexical borrowing in which Thai words or English words in the Thai contexts represent their morphological, semantic, grammatical, and semantic elements in relation to the social, ethnic, religious, cultural, physical, and literary components of Thais;

(ii) The codification of Thai English words is evident in some loanwords and loan shifts supported by native English dictionaries;

(iii) The nativization of English in the Thai context is apparent via the five types of lexical borrowing, except acronyms, which yield Kachru's (1981;1983;1986) nativization as well the majority of the editors and writers' agreement with this concept as reflected in all types of lexical borrowing;

(iv) The internationalization and universalization of Thai words through loanwords and loan shifts is mentioned by some editors and writers;

(v) The cultural innovations of Thai English words is supported by all six writers who agreed with the cultural innovations of Thai English lexicons as mirrored through the six types of lexical borrowing;

(vi) Social values and prestige of English in Thai society is evident in the writer's special attention to some significant loanwords which are popular among foreign tourists;

(vii) The congruence of linguistic borrowing is linked to the notions of importation and substitution as well as adoption and adaptation. This structural feature indeed covers all six types of lexical borrowing which meet Haugen's (1950, 1953, 1972) works. Although these works are not based on non-native

varieties of English, they are taken to analyze lexical borrowing in Malaysian English (Tan, 2009a, 2009b). Thus, this feature of this framework inevitably provides significantly linguistic implications towards Thai English words;

(viii) The linguistic and socio-cultural needs of lexical borrowing usage are based on particular factors that motivate the use of lexical borrowing from the Thai language according to Weinriech (1968) and other scholars. The Thai lexical borrowing items which reflect their Thai English facets are agreed by the editors and writers that they are useful and needed to assist the everyday communication needs of the foreign tourists in Krabi, Phuket, and Koh Samui, through the lexical strategy of translation and non-translation;

(ix) Linguistic similarities of other Englishes and world languages are found in some types of lexical borrowing which are linguistically convergent to those in Philippine English as well as Mandarin, Arabic and Polish languages. Such types are loanwords, pronunciation borrowing, and acronyms. Further, all six types are linguistically similar to other Asian and African varieties of English as they are supported by previous foreign studies on the nativization of English words and lexical borrowing - Malaysian English, China English, Sri Lankan English, Nepalese English, Japanese English, and Ghanaian English; and

(x) The power of linguistic and cultural contact between Thai and English is supported by the writers' agreement with the use of only four types of the lexical borrowing as a result of the powerful phenomenon of the dual language interface. Those types exclude only coinages and pronunciation borrowing.

Overall, these ten features are evident in that the lexical borrowing types found in this study yield a Thai variety of English.

Conclusion

In this study, several Thai lexical borrowing items in English language tourism magazines in the south have been examined linguistically and attitudinally. It reveals that the six types of lexical borrowing - loanwords, loan blends, loan shifts, loan creation, pronunciation borrowing, and acronyms - provide outstanding lexico-phonological, lexico-semantic, and morpho-grammatical features grounded in an interface between Thai and English

linguistic and cultural elements suggesting their nativization and reflection of Thai English words. Further, this linguistic analysis is supported by the majority of the local and foreign editors and writers of the magazines which reflect salient sociolinguistic factors that motivate their lexical borrowing and their perspectives towards the nativized Thai English words and the Thai cultural identity in English words.

This study also provides suggestions for future research. First of all, the future researchers may apply the theoretical framework used in this study to analyze lexical borrowing from many other non-English words in a variety of media texts as well as other texts of literary, scientific, and socio-economic matters, among others. Moreover, they may attempt to study lexical borrowing from Thai produced by only Thai writers of the tourism magazines or any other magazines published in Thailand. Additionally, they should study the reasons and motivations in using lexical borrowing from Thai by interviewing other media writers such newspaper journalists, creative writers, and academic writers. Finally, the other discipline of sociolinguistics, for example, linguistic landscape, can be another framework for studying lexical borrowing from Thai. That is, future studies can be lexical borrowing analysis of signage texts from officials, commerce, and tourism, among others.

Acknowledgement

References

Anttila, R. (1989) *Historical and Comparative Linguistics.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Arakwanich, O. (1996) Karn Chai Pasaa Angkrit Nai Pasaa Thai Patchuban (English Used in the Present Thai Language). *Journal of Language and Culture* 15(2): 28-36.

Bahumaid, S. (2015) Lexical Borrowing: The Case of English Loanwords in Hadhrami Arabic. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics* 2(6): 13-24.

Baker, W. (2012) English as a Lingua Franca in Thailand: Characterisations and implications, *Englishes in Practice: Working Papers of the Centre for Global Englishes* 1(1): 18-27.

Bamgbose, A. (1983) Standard Nigerian English: Issues of Identification. In B.B. Kachru (Ed.), *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures*, pp. 99-111. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Bamiro, E. O. (1991) Nigerian Englishes in Nigerian English Literatures. *World Englishes* 10 (1): 7-17.

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

Bennui, P. (2017) Speaking Tinglish for Professional Communication: A Reflection of Thai English Used by Tour Guides along the Andaman Sea. *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts* 17(3): 233-266.

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

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

Bolton, K. (2003) English: The Asian way. *Bangkok Post*. September 2-8 [Online URL: http://www.bangkokpost.com/education/site2003/cvse0203.htm] accessed on October 10, 2018.

Buang, S. N., Abdul Halim, N. and Rarnakresinin, S. (2008) Malay Lexical Borrowings in Singapore Colloquial English. *Journal of Modern Languages* 18(1): 143-161.

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

Butler, S. (1999) The needs of dictionary users in South-East Asia, In M. Newbrook (Ed.), *English is an Asian language: The Thai Context*, 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.* Unpublished Master's Dissertation, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.

Chamcharatsri, P. B. (2013) Perception of Thai English. *Journal of English as an International Language* 8(1): 21-36.

Chutisilp, P. (1984) *A Sociolinguistic Study of an Additional Language: English in Thailand*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign.

Field, F. W. (2002) *Linguistic Borrowing in Bilingual Contexts.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Gao, L. (2001) The Lexical Acculturation of English in the Chinese Context. *Studies in the Linguistic Science* 31(2): 73-88.

Görlach, M. (1995) *More Englishes: New Studies in Varieties of English 1988-1994*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Grant-Russel, P. and Beaudet, C. (1999) Lexical Borrowings from French in Written Quebec English. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 6(2): 17-33.

Hall-Lew, L. A. (2002) *English Loanwords in Mandarin Chinese*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, the University of Arizona, Arizona.

Haspelmath, M. and Tadmor, U. (2009) The loanword typology project and the world loanword database'. In M. Haspelmath and U. Tadmor (Eds.), *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook,* pp. 1-34. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Haugen, E. (1950) The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing, *Language* 26: 210-231.

Haugen, E. (1953) *The Norwegian Language in America, a Study in Bilingual Behaviour (Vol. II)*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Haugen, E. (1972) *The Ecology of Language: Essays by Einar Haugen*. California: Stanford University Press.

Hock, H. H. (1986) *Principles of Historical Linguistics*. Berline: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hock, H. H. (2009) *Principles of Historical Linguistics* (2nd edition). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jocuns, A. (2018) English in Thai tourism: Global English as a Nexus of Practice, In S. R. Mehta (Ed.), *Language and Literature in a Glocal World*, pp. 57-76. Singapore: Springer.

Kachru, B. B. (1981) The Pragmatics of Non-Native Varieties of English, In L. Smith (Ed.), *English for Cross-Cultural Communication*, pp. 15-39. New York: St. Martin's Press.

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

Kachru, B. B. (1986) *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions and models of non-native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Karn, S. K. (2012) This Is How I Can Write: Towards Nepalese English Literature. *Journal of NELTA* 17(1-2): 26-39. [Online URL: www.nepjol.info/index.php/NELTA/article/view/8090] accessed on February 10, 2019.

Klos, P., Maternik, E., Matulewska, A. and Piontek, P. (2006) *Translation or non-translation? Borrowings from English in the Polish language of biotechnology*. [Online URL: https://repozytorium.amu.edu.pl/bitstream/10593/4724/1/05.%20K%C5%82os.pdf] accessed on November 7, 2018.

Lau, M. (1999) *Lexical Borrowing in Hong Kong: A Study of the Englishization of Chinese and the Nativitization of English*. Unpublished Master's Dissertation, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.

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

Makishima, M. (2003) Toward a Knowledge-Based Economy: Southern Thailand, In M. Makishima and S. Suksiriserekul (Eds.), *Human Resource Development toward a Knowledge-Based Economy: The Case of Thailand*, pp. 269-312. Chiba: Institute of Developing Economies.

Masavisut, N., Sukwiwat, M. and Wongmontha, S. (1986) The Power of the English Language in Thai Media. *World Englishes* 5(2/3): 197-207.

Mathias, P. (2011) Lexical Innovation and the Use of English in Thai Contexts on Internet Forums. *BU Academic Review* 10(1): 8-13.

McFarland, C. D. (2009) Linguistic Diversity and English in the Philippines, In Ma. Lourdes S. Bautista and K. Bolton (Eds.), *Philppine English: Linguistic and Literary Perspectives,* pp. 131-155. Manila: Anvil.

Ngula, R. S. (2014) Hybridized Lexical Innovations in Ghanaian English. *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 23(3): 180-200. [Online URL: www.njas.helsinki.fi/pdf-files/vol23num3/ngula.pdf] accessed on December 4, 2008.

Palungdham. (n.d.) Ziamzee *Satha Lae Khamchue Un Yao Nan (Ziamzee, Faith, and a Long Belief)*. [Online URL: www.palungdham.com/ t760.html] accessed on January 30, 2019.

Polome, E. C. (1975) Linguistic Borrowing, In V. Olphen and H. Herman (Eds.), *Working Papers, 1974 Conference American Council of Teachers of Uncommonly-Taught Asian Languages*, pp. 2-14. Texas: Centre for Asian Studies, University of Texas.

Rajashantan, S. S. (2016) Nativization of English by Jaffna Writers. *International Journal of Management and Applied Science* 2(2): 27-33.

Royal Thai Embassy, Singapore. (2010) *What is OTOP?* [Online URL: www.thaiembassy.sg/friends-of-thailand/p/what-is-otop] accessed on January 8, 2019.

Rüdiger, S. (2018) Mixed Feelings: Attitudes towards English Loanwords and their Use in South Korea. *Open Linguistics* 4: 184-198.

Singhasak, P. and Methitham, P. (2016) Non-Native English Varieties: Thainess in English Narratives. *English Language Teaching* 9(4): 128-138.

Snodin, N. S., Higgins, J. and Yoovathaworn, S. (2017) How Thai Businesses Utilize English in their Product Names. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences* 38: 123-128.

Stanlaw, J. (1992) English in Japanese Communicative Strategies, In B. B. Kachru (Ed.), *The Other Tongues: English across Cultures* (2nd edition), pp. 178-208. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Tan, S. I. (2009a) Lexical Borrowing from Chinese Languages in Malaysian English. *World Englishes* 28(4): 451-484.

Tan, S. I. (2009b) Lexical Borrowing in Malaysian English: Influences of Malay. *Lexis: Journal in English Lexicology* 3: 11-62.

Trakulkasemsuk, W. (2012) Thai English, In E. L. Low and A. Hashim (Eds.), *English in Southeast Asia: Features, Policy and Language in Use*, pp. 101-111. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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

Weinreich, U. (1968) *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hauge, Paris: Mouton & Co.

Wong, N. F. W. (1992) *A Study of English Loanwords in Selected Malay Short Stories.* Unpublished Master's Dissertation, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.

Appendix A: List of the Selected Magazines' Issues

	Magazine Title		
	Phuketindex.com Magazine	**Krabi Magazine**	**Samui Holiday Magazine**
Issue/Month/Year	February - April, 2016	April - May, 2016	March - April, 2016
	May - July, 2016	June, 2016	May - June, 2016
	August - October, 2016	July, 2016	July - August, 2016
	November, 2016 - January, 2017	August - September, 2016	September - October, 2016
	February - April, 2017	October, 2016	November - December, 2016
		November, 2016	January - February, 2017
		December, 2016	March - April, 2017
		January, 2017	
		February, 2017	
		March, 2017	

Appendix B

Semi-Structured Interview (for Editors)
The Editors' Perspectives on Lexical Borrowing in English Language Tourism Magazines in Southern Thailand

Part I: General Information

(1) What is your nationality?
(2) How many years have you been living in Thailand? (for foreign writers)
(3) How old are you?
(4) What is your educational background?
(5) What is your mother tongue?
(6) How well do you use Thai language (listening-speaking and reading-writing)? (for foreign writers)
(7) If English is not your mother tongue, where did you learn the language and how do you improve your language skills?

Part II: About the magazine

(1) When was this magazine founded?

(2) Why was this magazine published?

(3) Why is it named as 'Phuketindex.com Magazine'/ 'Krabi Magazine'/ 'Samui Holiday Magazine'?

(4) Who are the readers of this magazine?

(5) How do you invite writers/contributors/team workers/sponsors?

Part III: About an editor of the magazine

(1) How did you become an editor of this magazine? How many years have you been an editor of this magazine?

(2) How many years have you been in the field of English writing as a career?

(3) What are the language and non-language problems of working as an editor of English magazines of Thai tourism?

(4) How do you solve such problems?

(5) How effective is your English in editing other writers' works? (for Thai and non-native English editors)

Part IV: Reasons and motivation for using 'lexical borrowing from Thai in written English in columns' in the magazine?

(1) What do you think about the use of lexical borrowing from Thai in English magazines?

Types of lexical borrowing found in magazines:

- Loanwords
- Loan blends
- Loan shifts (loan translation/semantic shift)
- Loan creation (new coinages)
- Pronunciation borrowing
- Acronyms

(2) As an editor, have you ever tried to change or translate all lexical borrowing items in the written works in English in the magazine into English? Why or why not?

(3) In your point of view, if there are no any lexical borrowing items from Thai in this English magazine, will the written work be better? Why or why not?

(4) Do you motivate the writers to write some Thai words in their English texts? How?

(5) In your viewpoint, what are the reasons why magazine writers borrow Thai words into their written English? Is it because of 'lexical innovation' or 'lexical interference'? Why?

(6) How do you make sure that the Thai borrowed items in the written English are all correct? How do you edit them? Are you motivated to edit them?

Part V: Nativization of Thai Words/ Thai English words

(1) To what extent does the editor play roles in disseminating Thai borrowed items in this English magazine to the local and global readership?

(2) To what extent does the editor play roles in promoting the nativization (the way Thai words are universalized, or Romanized or nativized) process of Thai borrowed items in the magazine?

(3) To what extent does the editor play roles in asserting that those Thai borrowed words in this English magazine can represent Thai English words?

(4) Do the borrowed items from Thai used by the editor and the writers lead to the overall effectiveness or ineffectiveness of this English magazine?

Semi-Structured Interview (for Writers)
The Writers' Perspectives on Lexical Borrowing in English Language Tourism Magazines in Southern Thailand

Part I: General Information

(1) What is your nationality?
(2) How many years have you been living in Thailand? (for foreign writers)
(3) How old are you?

(4) What is your educational background?

(5) What is your mother tongue?

(6) How well do you use Thai language (listening-speaking and reading-writing)? (for foreign writers)

(7) If English is not your mother tongue, where did you learn English and how do you improve your language skills?

Part II: About a career in writing columns in the magazine

(1) Are you a freelance or full-time writer of this magazine?

(2) What is your full-time job? (for a freelancer)

(3) How many years have you been writing columns in this magazine?

(4) Do you write for other magazines? If yes, is it published in Thailand or somewhere else?

(5) How effective is your written English in the column? (for Thai and non-native English writers)

Part III: Reasons and motivations for using 'lexical borrowing from Thai in written English in columns' in the magazine?

(1) Do you consider yourself a monolingual, a bilingual, or a multilingual writer? Why or why not?

(2) As there are a number of lexical items borrowed from the Thai language found in your columns in English, what do you think about this phenomenon? Do you intentionally use such Thai words? Why don't you try to translate them into English?

(3) Are the borrowed items from Thai you created a part of loanwords, loan blends, loan shift, loan creation, or pronunciation borrowing, or acronyms in relation to the contact between Thai and English? How?

(4) Do you borrow Thai words in your written English in the magazine because you need to designate new things, persons or concepts in English in order to create 'lexical innovation' in English?

(5) Do the lexical borrowing items from Thai language appear in your columns because such equivalent items in English are infrequently used in particular contexts? Or is this because items in English are homonymous to

those in Thai? Or is this because those Thai words represent affective words or elegant synonyms?

(6) Do you think those borrowed items from Thai in English texts (in the magazine) present an 'insufficient differentiation' from Thai and English words? How?

(7) Do you think those borrowed items from Thai in English texts (in the magazine) symbolize 'social values' of English in Thai society?

(8) Do you think those borrowed items from Thai in English texts (in the magazine) are used because of cacophemistic purposes (taboo, rudeness, slangs, or swearing)? How?

(9) Do you think those borrowed items from Thai in English texts (in the magazine) lead to lexical interference (for example, the bilingual writers make errors in their second language writing)? How?

(10) Do you think those borrowed items from Thai in English texts (in the magazine) will affect the grammatical or textual construction of the written text? How?

Part IV: Nativization of Thai Words/ Thai English words

(1) Do you think the borrowed items from Thai are used in English texts (in the magazine) because of the nativization process (the way Thai words are nativized or Romanized or universalized)? How?

(2) In your point of view, to what extent do the Thai words borrowed in English texts (in the magazine) imply 'cultural innovations' of English in Thai identity?

(3) In your point of view, to what extent do the Thai words borrowed in English texts (in the magazine) imply 'Thai English words'?

(4) In your point of view, to what extent are the borrowed items from Thai in English texts (in the magazine) 'significant' for Thai/foreign readers of the English magazine?

(5) In your point of view, to what extent should the borrowed items from Thai in English texts (in the magazine) be 'significant' as the interface of Thai and English languages for tourism in the Thai context?