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2.0 Preliminaries

Code-mixing or code-switching is the result of a language contact which occurred in societies of many ethnicities or in communities of multilingual people. In other words, one language has the chance to come in contact with the other languages. It is a natural phenomenon since most of the countries have opened doors to the world outside by having contact in areas of trading, exchanging of knowledge and cultures with both neighboring countries and the countries in other areas more and more. It is due to the influx of other languages, the nature and prospect of the native language has undergone a sweeping change. There are many language theories in this respect.

2.1 Linguistic Variation or Language Variation

Code-mixing is regarded as a linguistic or language variation. Amara Prasithrathsint (1989:18) defined the term as the characteristic of any kind of languages that is varied or changed from its origin or from the standard language pattern. In addition, the newly changed language pattern still keeps its original meaning. There are two kinds of variations: Intra-language variation and Inter-language variation.
2.1.1 Intra-language variation

Intra-language variation refers to some patterns of language with many forms of variation. In Thai word, for instance, a sound of a letter “R” as in “Reng-reep” (hurry up) is also pronounced by some Thai people as “Leng-leep”. In case, the sound of the letter “L” is a variation of the word; or a pronoun word “I” is articulated differently such as I /phom/ (for male), I /dichan/ (for female), I /nu/ (for female), I /ua/ (impolite, for both sexes) or I /ku/ (for both sexes, grass-root people), etc. The intra-language variation can occur frequently in accordance with various factors: sex, age, education and so forth.

2.1.2 Inter-language variation

The phenomenon of inter-language variation is quite similar to that of code-mixing and code-switching. Amara Prasitrathsint (1989:20) defined the term as the state of a speaker who has a word or sentence from many languages switched. In Thai context, for example, the words like “vidya-niphon” is replaced by “thesis”; “paiprakat” by “poster”; “nam-sa-noe” by “present”; “yuen-yan” by “confirm”; “tha a-ka-sa-yan” by “airport” or the sentence like “chan chop man” is replaced by “I like it”, etc. The above examples are derived from English and Thai that are able to take the place of each other as they identify the same meaning. The other examples are as follows:
“Team ma khao Stuttgart control boll”
Team Horse White Stuttgart controls ball
= Stuttgart White Horse team controls the ball.

From the above sentence, the term “control” is used for “kuap-kum”, whereas the terms “team”, “Stuttgart” and “ball” are the borrowing words used regularly until they become a part of Thai utterance. Here is another example:

“kao rop song dua score 4-3”
Advance round second with score 4-3
= to advance the second round with score 4-3.

In this sentence, the speaker uses the term “score” to take the place of “ka-naen”. However, with this result, it can be concluded that the linguistic/language variation is not merely code-mixing but also borrowing from English used abundantly in the land of smiles (Thailand).

Therefore, the inter-language variation is code-mixing in which the words or sentences of one language are used in the context of another. They have the same meaning though they are derived from different languages.
2.2 Code-Mixing, Code-Switching and the Related Research

When language communities come in contact, the result is usually the use of two or more language systems in various combinations. These different combinations can be considered code-mixing, whereby the elements of two language systems mix together, resulting in the creation of a new system. The use of the terms 'code' and 'mixing' is traditional in the study of linguistics. Code is a neutral term for any linguistic variety. The Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics defines code-mixing as a linguistic behavior that "involves the transfer of linguistic elements from one language into another" (Crystal, 1997: 66). The literature on language contact phenomena presents patterns of language mixing. There are different terms used in this respect. The terms: code-mixing; code-switching; code alteration; borrowing; interference; and integration are some of the important terms.

A major problem in exploring this field of research is that there is a dispute over the concepts of the terms. It is undisputable that some of the terms overlap. In this regard, Romaine comments

"Problems of terminology continue to plague the study of language contact phenomena with terms such as code-switching, mixing, borrowing not being used by all researchers in the same way or even defined at all, which makes comparison across studies difficult" (1995:180).
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Code-mixing is always associated with code-switching. Some scholars distinguish code-mixing from the concept of code-switching. Adding to the problem is the overlap and the lack of distinction between code-mixing/code-switching and other terms like borrowing. Table 2.1 below illustrates some of these concepts as used by scholars in the field.

**Table 2.1: Illustration of Concepts of Terms Used in Research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>Code-switching</th>
<th>Code-mixing</th>
<th>Borrowing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheng and Butler</td>
<td>“Code-switching occurs at the lexical level as well as the syntactic, morphological, and phonological levels of language.”</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1989:294)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotton and Ury</td>
<td>“CS is the use of two or more linguistic varieties in the same conversation or interaction.”</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1977:5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamwanga-malu</td>
<td>“...where the alternating use of two languages is inter-sentential.”</td>
<td>“...where the alternating use of two languages is intra-sentential.”</td>
<td>“…entails integration of linguistic units from one language into the linguistic system of the other language. The linguistic units thus integrated become part of the linguistic system of the borrowing language.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1992: 173-174)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annamalai</td>
<td>“...switching is usually done for the duration of a</td>
<td>“In mixing the speech event is constant, with no</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1989:48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The terms “code-switching” and “code-mixing” are used by scholars to refer to different concepts. For Cheng and Butler (1989), Scotton and Ury (1977) and Grosjean (1982), there is no distinction between code-switching and code-mixing. Their concept of code-switching extends to
include intra-sentential switching which is labeled differently in other studies. Kamwangamalu (1992), Annamalai (1989), and Bokamba’s (1989) studies are examples of cases where a distinction is made between code-switching and code-mixing on the basis of the grammatical categories involved. Annamalai’s (1989) description of code-mixing extends further to include conditions related to participants and the topic in the speech events. However, his description of code-switching falls somewhat short in considering instances of inter-sentential switching that occurs as part of the unit of discourse. Moreover, concerning the distinction among borrowing, code-switching and code-mixing, Gardner-Chioros (as cited in Scotton, 1990) explains that there are difficulties in separating the concepts of code-switching and borrowing due to the fact that there are no categorical criteria to separate them. She lists three tendencies of borrowing: being more likely brief, linguistically integrated, and filling a semantic gap in the matrix language. However, she notes that such tendencies are also applicable to cases of switching. The following comment speaks volumes about the distinction between the two terms under consideration:

"Of a ‘more or less’ and not an absolute nature" (1990:101)

However, the distinction is made between these two terms. Code-mixing is referred to the alternate use of two or more languages at the level of words, phrases, idioms, subordinate clauses or linguistic unit such as prefixes or affixes of one language mixed with another one within the same sentence of the speaker (Sridhar, 1980; Luke, 1984; Bokamba,
1988; Chan 2004). On the other hand, code-switching is referred to as the alternate use of two or more languages at or above the level of sentence although both code-mixing and code-switching are products of bilingualism. Therefore, code-mixing is a language switching within a sentence (intra-sentential) while code-switching is a language switching between sentences (inter-sentential).

The distinction between code-switching and code-mixing is one of the most puzzling terminological problems in the study of code-alternation. Some scholars find it necessary to draw a distinction between them because of their syntactic difference. Others, however, prefer to use 'code-switching', 'mixing' or 'code-alternation' as the cover terms for both types of code-alternation (e.g. Gumperz 1982; Grosjean 1982; Lederberg and Morales 1985; Clyne 1991; Bhatia 1992; Li 2000). Clyne argues that code-switching and code-mixing refer to the same phenomenon in which “the speaker stops using language A and employs language B” (1991:161). A slightly different line of argument is developed by Romaine (1989) who regards code-switching phenomenon as continuum on which exists both inter-sentential and intra-sentential code-alternation.

Li (1996), based on mixed code data collected from Hong Kong newspapers, showed that many cases of code-mixing in Hong Kong are due to the lack of equivalents in the host language. The above discussion highlights the terminological problems related to code-alternation. For the purpose of the present study, the researcher merely proposes to
express the distinction between code-switching and code-mixing in general. As shown in many previous studies, intra-sentential code-alternation or code-mixing is a prevalent phenomenon in Thai society whereas inter-sentential code-alternation or code-switching is extremely rare. The same situation can also be seen in the results of the present study. Due to the occurrence of code-mixing and code-switching in Thai society, the researcher believes that, at least in Thai speech community, they should be regarded as two challenged phenomena of Thai linguists.

The above observation leads one to think that there is a disagreement among the language scientists over the use of these terms. However, scholarly views vary on the issue of establishing a distinction. For example, Eastman (1992) reported a common theme found in twelve papers on language contact phenomena. He states this theme as:

"Efforts to distinguish code-switching, code-mixing and borrowing are doomed" (1992:1)

Tay (1989) stresses that the distinction between code-mixing and code-switching cannot be maintained. On the other hand, some research scholars, for example, Kachru (1983) and Sridhar (1980) hold the view that such distinction is crucial and must be made. Romaine (1995) and Eastman (1992) suggest that one should be freed from the need to categorize instances of language mix and go beyond such distinctions in order to understand more about the processes involved in language contact. However, in this field of research, it is a tradition that each writer presents his or her definitions of the terms used in the discussion.
Usually code-switching in idealism is to switch the language of the person who has the ability in using two languages equally (bilingual). According to Bloomfield the term “bilingual” should be used with the person who can speak both languages the same as that of the native speaker or who has the ability in using both languages equivalently. However, in fact, many academicians (such as Scotton and Ury, 1977; Gumperz, 1982) found that code-switching was found to operate in the level lower than ideal (less-than-ideal). This term seems more suitable with Thai society since in Thailand the persons who can speak both Thai and English like the native speaker are very few. Moreover, code-switching in the form of ideal can be found in the group of the people with half-blood; who have the lineage from the country where English is used as the first language or the ones who have lived in English speaking countries for a long time until they have been able to speak English as fluently as the Thai language (Amara Prasithrathsint, 1997). Most of the Thai people usually speak Thai, even though they learn English at school but the ability in using English does not cover every situation and there will be the Thai language interfering with English.

It is noticed that most student speakers who used code-mixing in this study cannot speak English as consistently as the native speakers do. The fact is that they have the ability in using both languages but cannot speak the second language as fluently as the first one. They used to learn English at the level of elementary communicative skills but that was not good enough to compare their ability to that of the native speaker. Therefore, their knowledge of English is more a matter of familiarity
with a certain number of words and phrases than fluency in a second language.

The phenomena like this occurred in Taiwan (Chen, 1996) and Korea (Shim, 1994). In their research work, they used a technical term “bilingual” in a broad sense. It means anyone who has ability in using English in spite of their limited level of ability, i.e. they are able to speak English but cannot communicate fluently with the native speakers.

Code-switching and code-mixing have very close similarity. Many academicians (Chen, 1996; Kishe, 1994; Mkilifi, 1972, etc.) consider these two kinds of phenomena as the same and call them either code-mixing or code-switching, or use both the terms alternately. For avoiding confusion and misinterpretation between the two terms, however, this research work does not separate code-mixing from code-switching. These two phenomena, therefore, are called code-mixing in broad meaning. It means the use of English at or above every level of words, phrases, sentences used in Thai utterance.

2.3 Functional Aspects of Code-Mixing

Examining the phenomenon of code-mixing from another perspective, a group of socio-linguistically orientated scholars (Gumperz, 1971; Hoffman, 1991; Gal, 1979; Di Pietro, 1977; Scotton, 1983, 1988, 1989) raised interest in investigating the functional aspects of this particular style of speech. Maintaining an interpretive approach in their studies, they addressed the question of why code-mixing and code-switching take
place. Mixing codes seems to occur instinctively while the speakers’ main concern is to communicate effectively (Gumperz, 1982). In this group of sociolinguistic inquiries, code-mixing is regarded as a strategy and a meaningful style employed by participants to convey linguistic and social information. It is also regarded as an additional option to the language choices with which bilingual and multilingual individuals are endowed.

A study of function of code-mixing or code-switching of English in other languages has been conducted by different scholars in the field. Grosjean (1982:145) pointed out that the speaker used different languages in order to make the intention clear. Code-switching and function are known as the tactic in a dialogue to be able to use to create a close relationship or express an intimacy. When the speaker, for example, wanted to make friendship with the listeners, he/she would switch words into the language of listeners. Thus, code-switching is the tactic for changing the relation between the speaker and listener. Accordingly, code-switching done from one language into another is based on the hypothesis that any language may be more suitable in using than another language in other speech situations and speech events.

Summarizing conclusions reached in this area of investigation, Grosjean (1982:152) presented a number of communicative functions that the strategy of code-mixing is seen to fulfill in speech events. They are as follows:
Fill a linguistic need for lexical item, set phrase, discourse marker, or sentence filler.

Continue the last language used (triggering)

Quote someone

Specify addressee

Qualify message: amplify or emphasize ("topper" in argument)

Specify speaker involvement (personalize message)

Mark and emphasize group identity (solidarity)

Exclude someone from conversation

Change role of speaker: raise status, add authority, and show expertise

Convey confidentiality, anger, annoyance; showing that any language is more suitable than another one in good communication; that using some languages for doing some functions or that using language to express the intention or effort of the speaker in order to attain some goals such as to create solidarity or to create psychological distance. This displayed the attitudes towards the value of the language used.

Gibbons (1987) mentioned the function of code-mixing in a similar way. According to him, the cause of using code-mixing of English in Chinese is derived from the needs to stress or modify statements, to refer to the speech of others, to use idioms, prohibited words and the vocabulary unavailable in one’s own language. Besides, code-mixing is the symbol to express the desirable roles in society owing to English combined with modernization and the status of high classes and good education.
Chen (1996) found that the sample group used code-mixing in order to relieve the temper, in particular, to decrease stress, constraint, or despair. They used swear words in English that have the prohibited meaning in Chinese or English words that expressed loving kindness, admiration in order to tell the feeling and to relieve stress in various situations such as anger, fear, sorrow. English is, therefore, a medium language in these situations to tell emotion and real feeling and to avoid a negative meaning of words/phrases in Chinese as well.

Using English in such a context can be explained from the value in philosophy of Confucius who taught educated people to control the temper; a person who has a serious temper or who likes to be praised, admired by the others is unreliable, and has a weak personality. However, the idea of Confucius is contrasted with a modern psychology and western culture. He taught that to release the temper or stress is a normal matter whereas admiring others is regarded as a manner of conversation. Therefore, Chinese people who were educated in modern culture, when necessary, will behave themselves as a central medium by using English mixed with Chinese to release their emotional feeling. Such behavior is performed under the criterion of ancient Chinese and modern thought.

Code-mixing is still used to create an impression to the others or to show that the speaker has a good educational background. Generally, the person who uses Chinese and switches with English is often considered an experienced person having the knowledge that is associated with
certain career. In addition, he is associated with modernization because English has spread out in this part of the world as the language of science, technology and modernization. Therefore, switching English with a mother tongue is a status symbol, which is linked with the status of English in the world.

Besides, Chen (1996) conducted an experiment on code-mixing in a speech. He observed that the speaker is more comfortable in English than in Chinese. It happened most frequently. The speaker used English mixed with Chinese to express idea, concept or the objects which he had learned and borrowed from the English books, mass media or the speech of the others. Chinese people in Taiwan who studied at the high level used English textbooks. Thus, they were accustomed to the academic and technical terms in English rather than that in Chinese. Therefore, another function of code-mixing/switching in English is to communicate effectively when terms are unavailable in Chinese or the terms that lacked the suitable counterpart in Chinese or the terms that the speaker was more accustomed in English than that in Chinese. In the technical or scientific language, for example, some words such as objects, idea or behavior as English cannot be translated suitably into Chinese. Therefore, code-mixing in English is performed for accuracy of the meaning. Furthermore, the lack of the standardized translation into Chinese affects the informative function of communication. As a result, the use of transliterated words in English is popularized rather than the use of ambiguous translation in Chinese.
In conclusion, code-mixing is used to denote the status of being “we-code” or “they-code”. It indicates togetherness within the same group, which has, for example, the characteristic of life experience, educational background, knowledge of contemporary events, ability to use English. It also reveals equivalent status (we-code), social distance, non-equivalent status and role (they-code). Besides, code-mixing is still used for the suitability in different situations such as expressing intense emotions (the use of swear word in English seems not as aggressive as those in mother tongue and much more acceptable), and for indicating the social status which denote respectability, education or occupation of the speaker.

Nevertheless, it is not necessary for every speaker to use code-mixing to show that he/she is honorable or being professional. Code-mixing may indicate that the speaker wants to imitate the person of another class. Code-mixing has implicated to denote about the speaker’s status and background because such a language behavior initiates from the leading or high class of people who have had good educational background and good family status. Therefore, this kind of linguistic behavior is imitated by every class of people who are from different socio-economic background and need to be called modernized and honorable in society.

Mass media is one of the institutes in helping the people imitate code-mixing very easily. Especially, English programs and popular mass culture, gramophone record, magazine, newspaper, consumption habit, new culture etc. are responsible for allowing the people come in contact
with English and change their lifestyle more and more. Finally, it may lead the people to the habit of mixing English in their own languages. Thus, the mass media has an important role in the process of code-mixing of English in other languages since it is the medium of language contact. Tanaka (1994), for instance, remarked that the satellite and cable system brought English to the Japanese family. Similarly, Koll-Stobbe (1994) thought that the impact of English in Germany is noticeable due to the increased use of English in the German families. English has entered into the lives of Germans through the distribution of favorite culture by mass media causing the interference and language contact. Furthermore, the tendency to use code-mixing of English for speaking Chinese in Taiwan is also promoted by the mass media which uses both languages in television programs, commercial breaks, top-hit songs or newspapers (Chen, 1996).

2.4 Linguistic Effectiveness of Language Contact

Language contact can affect the structure of a target language such as word order arrangement or the use of the structure of new sentences showing surprise, etc. Such a linguistic influence of English on other languages is called “Englishization”. It is a natural phenomenon resulted from the language contact (Kishe, 1994). The study on this phenomenon has been done by some research scholars in different countries such as the Englishization of Indian language (Kachru, 1983, 1986), Japanese language (Morrow, 1987), Chinese language (Cheng, 1992; Zhou and Feng, 1987). Linguistic influence of English has resulted in making the
Thai language change its structure or technique in communication with respect to verb agreement in English, the use of idiom in English, the use of prepositions before nouns, the use of sentence to modify the subject, the use of a passive voiced sentence (Wilaiwan Khanitthanan, 1983).

However, another result of English contact is nativization or localized form of English. The process of adapting English with other languages of the world mostly has the similar character. Shim (1994), for instance, finds that the adaptation of English into Korean language is of the following characters:

1. **Truncation** - It means to shorten a compound loan word in English. For instance, the words “super” and “condo” are truncated or shortened from supermarket and condominium respectively.

2. **Semantic shift** - Many words in English are used in Korean with another meaning, for instance, “back” means supporter, “meeting” means blind date or a young boy and a young girl dating each other without any appointment and being unknown to each other. Sometimes, English words get a new meaning by change. In Korean language, for instance, the word “location” means a film area; “talent” means T.V. stars; “digest” means the dialogue with short and clear content as in the Reader’s Digest magazine.

3. **Lexical creativity** - It is the use of English in creating words for a new idealism, sometimes, by mixing together both Korean and English words. For instance, “maikha sitae” (my car period) means
the period in which a person has a car for himself/herself. Similarly, the word or “nochönyö histeli” (old maid hysteria) means an angry temper of a single young girl at the age of around 30.

4. **Hybridization** - It refers to a combination of noun or adjective words in English with modifier “-hata”; adjective “-han” or adverb “-hake”.

Example:

- *Suthati (study)-hata* = to study (in a group)
- *Temo (demonstration)-hata* = to protest in a demonstration
- *Libölöl (liberal)-hata* = to be liberal

- *Suthati (study)-han (x)* = (x) who participated in group study
- *Temo (demonstration)-han (x)* = (x) who participated in a demonstration
- *Libölöl (liberal)-han (x)* = (x) who is liberal

- *Suthati (study)-hake* = in order to participate in group study
- *Temo (demonstration)-hake* = in order to participate in a demonstration
- *Libölöl (liberal)-hake* = liberally

Bobda (1994) studied the process to create the new words in English to be used in Cameroon country called Cameroon English and found that Cameroon English or CamE has shifted the meaning, that is, some words have got more broad meaning. The word “stranger” in English, for example, means “unknown person” but in CamE it includes a guest and visitor. Similarly, the word “applicant” in English means “candidate” but in CamE it also means “unemployed person.” Some words have the changed meaning such as the word “dateline” which originally means a
“day” or “day boundary line” has changed into the last or final day to submit assignment work. The word “workmanship” originally translated as “skillfulness” but now it is used in the sense of “labor.”

Besides, there is still the extension of collocation. For instance, the word “win” is used with the phrases “win a battle”, “win a match”, “win a prize” but in CamE it is also with “win a candidate”, “win an opponent”, “win a team.”

There is the development of words from its original root by putting prefix or suffix, etc. Sample is obviously found in case to create “adverb” by adding suffix “-ly” after adjective such as the word “detail + ly = detailly” (‘in detail’ in English) or the word “new + ly = newly” as in phrase “newly-born baby” but in English used as “new-born baby”.

Truncation such as “bath” is the equivalent to “bathroom.” Likewise, the word “spare” stands for “spare tyre.”

Besides, there is still to shift the grammatical function of the words in English such as from noun to verb. For instance, the word “chairman” functions as a noun which means “a president” but in CamE it is used as a verb, “to preside” as in the sentence “The meeting was chairmaned by the governor”, etc.

Reduplication is likely to be used with the word showing quantity or number such as in the sentence “Your team played very very well. They are many many Cameroonians who can no longer make both ends meet.”
As far as research is concerned, the empirical research regarding code-mixing of English in the Thai language has not been yet adequate. Moreover, this kind of study has not been taken on the large scale to be equal to study the influence of English or code-mixing of English in other languages as discussed in the preceding chapter. Here, it is necessary to have a cursory glance at the earlier studies on code-mixing or code-shifting of English in the Thai language. It is equally necessary to deal with some of the important aspects of the present study.

Art Siha-amphai (1987) is one of the reputed scholars who studied code-mixing between Thai and English by the tourist guides in Bangkok metropolis. He discovered that the sample group used the transliterated words in order that it should have the equivalent meaning with the purpose of communication. The word “credit card”, for example, is used instead of Thai word “bat sin-chuea” which needs to be explained additionally since this word has not been accustomed to ears or to be very much popular in conversation domain in daily life. Thai people are much more accustomed to the word “credit card” or “bat credit”. In other words, some words in English when translated into Thai are too long and inconvenient to be used in conversations. For instance, the word “lobby” is shorter and easier to speak than the Thai word ‘hong-thong khong rong-raem’ (a hall of hotel). Thus, it becomes clear that some words in English are actively used in Thai. Besides, it is found that Thai people make use of English words as per the characteristic features of Thai. Following are some of the important observations in this regard:
1. It is very common to use the compound noun consisting of Thai and English words in which English word is used to modify the main one, Thai. For instance, the word “dek-floor” means a boy who works regularly as a waiter on the floor in a restaurant, pub, etc. The compound noun “kha-drink” denotes drinking price whereas the words “rakha-net” and “kha-laundry” stand for net price and laundry price respectively.

2. Word arrangement in Thai English is very peculiar. Modifier usually comes before the main word in English. When it is used in Thai, it comes after the main word such as “hong double” for “double room” or “hong single” for “single room”, etc.

The revision on research work mentioned earlier on Englishization (Bobda, 1994; Shim, 1994) points out that it may bring English to be adapted as per the structure of the Thai language. Here, other characteristics have not been discussed in the above cited research work such as reduplication, truncation, word usage in wrong grammar (conversion), and the word usage in another meaning (semantic shift), etc. These features may not appear in the conversations of the people who have guide career because they have knowledge of speaking in English fluently, and it may be possible that the said characteristic features will appear in a conversation of general people who have different levels of the knowledge of English. Therefore, such a point should be studied from the sample group in other contexts.
Another scholar, Parisara Tantinakom, (1988) studied another feature in using Thai language of disk jockeys (DJ) who promote the program of radio broadcasting F.M. wave from six stations in Bangkok metropolis. She found that the sample group used many English words mixed in different spoken statements. The vocabulary used is English pertaining to the mass media domain such as “station”, “spot” (advertising spot), “sponsor” (supporter of program), and the use of general English such as “taun-ni mi order” (now there is an order, “ya pai mind” (don’t mind), “ya pai worry” (don’t worry), etc. These English words are of equivalent meaning in Thai. It is, therefore, not necessary to use the transliterated words at all. However, most of disk jockeys (D.J.) use these words for fantasy and fashion. Parisara (1985) noticed that it was a wrong value to show the influence of English on the Thai people who liked to use English words rather than or nearly to be equal with Thai language; and it seems that in the future Thai language may be abandoned. This is seen that the researcher on this research work had viewed code-mixing of English in Thai as an attitudinal matter towards the use of English. However, the said research work was not done with the purpose to study the point of attitudes in code-mixing of English in Thai by empirical character.

Napharat Thitiwathana (1996) studied the mixing of English in Thai by lecturers of different disciplines at Kasetsart University, Bangkok, Thailand. She also studied the attitude and behavior of the professors regarding code-mixing by juxtaposing their three fields of academics: English, Thai and Public Administration. In this research work, it was
found that the professors of English mixed English and used the most variety of English words and then the professors of Public Administration and the professors of Thai did respectively. It was found that the majority of the professors used code-mixing at the word level. Only the professors of English used code-mixing at the sentence level. The result of study on the attitude and behavior of code-mixing revealed that the attitude is not necessarily to be relevant to behavior because some professors who have negative attitude toward mixing of English in Thai, still behave so while speaking Thai as well.

Napharat (1996), in her study of code-mixing of English in Thai, found that there was a tendency to adapt the category of words as per Thai and English grammar. The unique features of adaptation with Thai grammar were found as shown below:

1. There is the lack of determiners before nouns. For instance, phrasal verbs “test ability” and “promote product” were used instead of saying “test your ability” or “promote our product.”

2. The Thai speakers adjust and arrange the noun phrases to be agreed to Thai grammar. In other words, they shift the principle word before the modified words such as “attention class” which is the only sample ever found.

3. They use adjectives instead of verbs such as “private the nation” instead of “privatize the nation.”
4. Using the word “Kan” together with the verbs in English is very common such as “kan-manage” (management) or “kan-apply” (application), etc.

5. Using reduplication is also very common such as “hai free free” (give free of charge).

The research result of Napharat (1996) found that the character of adapting the words as per Thai grammar was similar to the study of research work of Art Siha-amphai (1987). However, there are three characters of added discussion, that are, the lack of determiner, the usage of words of wrong grammar in English (adjective instead of verb) and the use of reduplication. As the sample group for the study has a few quantities, it has not found the usage of other kinds of words of wrong grammar in English such as using nouns as verbs and adjusting English words as per Thai grammar in other characters. Besides, it may be possible that the sample group in this study consists of the professors at the university level; most of them are good at English at a fair level as compared to the general people. The adjusting of English words as per Thai grammar may not have been found and seen frequently. It is because the users possibly emphasized on correctness of English grammar when using English words.

Phatchari Phokasamrit (1980: 25-61) studied code-mixing of English in the spoken language of Thai people. She noticed that English words, sounds structures of sentence and meaning were borrowed by way of changing the sound and meaning followed by the Thai structure of
sentence. The people in various fields such as in academics, profession use such words in their day-to-day communication.

Pairat Warie (1977: 25-28) studied code-mixing of English in Thai and found that for the aspect of usage, the type of words to be taken to use are noun and verb but not to be pronounced as English sound. For example, the ending sound of English as the level sound when used in Thai context becomes falling sound [^] such as “Chicago” pronounced as “Chichagò” and the affix sound in English is not pronounced in Thai. For instance, “two litters” is pronounced as “song lit” (two litter). The reason is that the Thai language has no “affixes” to express the meaning about the number (singular/plural).

In 1979, Pairat Warie studied “Some Sociolinguistic Aspects of Language Contact” among Thai and Chinese; Thai and Khmer; Thai and Pali; Thai and Sanskrit and Thai and English. The research work mainly focused on code-mixing of English in Thai. The collection of data was taken from the standard Thai language which was collected from magazines or weekly journals, newspapers, reports or government announcement notices, literary books, history books and science books while the expressions or dialogues were collected from novels and short stories. The result showed that the words in different languages were borrowed to use in the Thai language. These words were classified into many categories: words in Khmer language were used as royal terms; words in Chinese were used as kitchen equipments and utensils; words in Pali and Sanskrit were used as religious or written terms and vocabulary
implying emotion, feeling; whereas code-mixing of English in Thai was divided in to three levels: phonology; lexical; and sentence. It was found that at the levels of phonology and lexical, the adaptation was performed in Thai system such as “met” (meter), “kilomet” (kilometer), etc; or mixing an English word with Thai to construct a noun phrase or verb phrase or using English word preceded by Thai lexical unit like “kan control” (control (n.)); “chao India” (Indian people). As a result, the same researcher revealed that English usage in Thai context has the following objectives:

1. To show modernization and high education
   Example:
   “Tha thoe sop tok, thoë tong xam rue peat”
   = if you fail the examination, you must take re-exam or repeat.
   /xam/ = re-exam, /peat/ = repeat

2. To use a language for a specific group, for example, the medical terms are used and understood only among medical doctor groups.

3. To make use of a media in explaining the statements and giving or justifying the reason such as “…the remembering thing on income effect is that it is not always positive, for example, in case dealt with liquid, inferior goods, income effect may be negative.”

Kachru (1978: 23-24) studied code-mixing in India consisting of four characters as follows:
1. **Englishization**- It means using English mixing with the mother tongue of the user, i.e. English was the symbol of the persons in the popular time, which was the language to be used on socio-economic occasions and to be used in community of the people with good knowledge.

2. **Sanskritization**- It means Sanskrit language mixing with the mother tongue of the user; and using this kind of character belongs to the matter concerned religious ceremony, criticized literature and philosophy.

3. **Persianization**- It is the use of Persian language mixing with the mother tongue of the user, to use it in this style is to use among the people who are Muslim and in the criminal court and it is to bring words to use in law.

4. **Pidginization**- It is the use of language, which depends on unspecific situation. The language use in such a kind is Bazar Hindi, Butler English or Chi Chi English (Kachru 1978: 23-24). According to Britannica Concise Encyclopedia *Pidgins* usually arise to permit communication between groups with no language in common. If a pidgin becomes established as the native language of the group, it is known as creole.

Sridhar (1978: 113) studied the language usage in Karnataka and found that code-mixing of English in Kannada language depended on the education level and showing off the “scholarship.” The study was also
based on code-mixing of English in Karnataka. It is concluded that English was an elite language.

2.5 Code-mixing of English in Thai in the Past

History of Languages in Thailand, the land of the smiling, indicates that there were instances of code-mixing in the past. It is interesting as well as motivating to study the use of code-mixing diachronically.

In the time of His Majesty the King Rama the 5th, the use of English mixing in Thai was prevalent, especially in the members of the royal family and in the domain of educated people. It is learnt that there were foreign teachers who came to Thailand for teaching English as appeared in the stories of students from England written by Phra Raja Varawongthoe Krommuen Vidyalongkorn (1971: 15). It said:

"Khru khon thi song chue Mr. Green pen M.A. ma chak Oxford. Wela ma rong-rian, kae taeng-tua chai cab la gown yang M.A. sa-moe, chueng ao ngue ma ok sia nai mueang Thai ni mak..."

(A second English teacher named Mr. Green is M.A. from Oxford University. When he came to school, he had always worn cab la gown like M.A. style. So he absolutely lost a lot of sweat in Thailand...)
Let us look at the following example related to the trade relationship that appeared in the chronicle, section 55th, (Royal Highness prince Damrong Raja Nubhava, 1969: 16), it said:

“Crawford long khwam-hen khong ton-eng wa kan khat-thun nan mai na atsachan, duai Thai mai mi agent thi-di, mi tae phuak khaek nai hang thi ha prayot mai sucharit, Thai chueng thuk cho-kong chon khat-thun...”

(Crawford himself had agreed that a loss of interest is not surprising, because Thais lack a good agent. They have only foreign storeowners who seek for illegal advantages, so Thais were always cheated and got disadvantaged...)

In the period of King Chulalongkorn (King Rama the 5th), besides the change of government service administration, all walks of lives of Thai people began to change and have been transforming continuously and slowly until now. As many Thais went to study in England (not in other countries), the influence of English was naturally higher than that of other languages. In this case, the evidence appeared in the Royal writings of King Chulalongkorn, Royal writings as well as the contemporary writings in this period such as “Klaiban” (Being far away from home) of His Majesty the king Chulalongkorn:

- Rue thot sa-mo sip-ha minute cha-yam-kham.

= A ship has anchored for 15 minutes before twine light.
- Thi-wa-kan **consule** lae **hotel** kap ran-khai-khong.
  = Consulate (consulate), hotel and selling stores.

- Pai thi ran-khai-lao sueng dai **appointment** duei phue cha pai kin nam.
  = Go to a liquor store where I also get appointment for drinking water.

- Chut duei thian-khai yang **fairy-lamp**.
  = to lit with a candle like fairy lamp.

- …chueng dai nam **lemonade** pon **soda**.
  = …then it becomes soda mixed lemonade.

- Than sa-mu-ha-raja-ong-kha-rak tang-ton **speech** pen pha-sa angkrit.
  = Excellency chief aid-de-camp to the king begins his speech in English.

- We-la-nan ra-kha **share** thi khai-kan nai ta-lat song-phan **franc**.
  = By that time, the share price sold in the market was two thousand Francs.

- Phu-bang-khap-kan **police** nai lam-khlong.
  = The police commissioner for canals.

- Non khlum-pong **blanket** tang-tae wan-ni.
  = To have slept within a blanket since yesterday.
- Kan thi ma Europe khrao-ni pen kan phit kap khrao-kon, khue ma yang private, khwam mung-mai wa cha mai tong taeng uniform nai thi dai.

= To come to Europe on this occasion is not the same at that of the last time, that is, to come for private work with the purpose of not wearing a uniform anywhere.

- President mueang farangset.

= The president of France

- Khong cha tong tham to-pai, week la song khrang.

= It may keep on working two times a week.

- Choen professor thi pen phu ru lak mak.

= To invite a professor who is real expert.

- Phra that nan khao song pai-wai thi British museum.

= The Buddha relic was sent to keep in the British museum.

- ...hai pen na-thi sop entrance examination yang-diau.

= Let it be in charge of an entrance examination only.

Innumerable examples of code-mixing are seen in “The Story of Continental Thai Students in England” written by Phra Raja Varawongthoe Krommuen Vidyalongkor here are a few examples:

- Khwam-khit khong kha-pha-chao nan tha-yan wa cha khuen pai University.

= My idea has a determination to study at a university level.
- Tha pen chen-nan ko cha lam-bak duai-pra-kan thang-puang, mi fang lecture mai khao chai penton.
  = If it is so, it might be under the trouble by all means, such as, a failure in understanding the lecture, etc.
- Kan taeng essay rue riang-khwam phasa angkrit.
  = Essay writing or the so called English composition.
- Khao mak pai private school, public school.
  = He/she has often gone to private school, public school.
- Suan kan doen-thang pai ma nai ruea mail yang rai nan...
  = However, a travel to and fro by mail motorboat...
- Wan-thi 11 mesayon, thueng mueang Singapore, siang ying salute, hu thaep lun.
  = On April 11, arriving at Singapore and hearing shooting sound for salute very noisily.
- Sue khao khong tam thi tong-kan, setlaeu ko pai thi hotel.
  = After buying things as needed, go back to the hotel.
- Hip sam-rap sai card chue.
  = A case for containing name cards
- We-la thi nak-rian dai yut rian, pen khrao holiday.
  = The time on which students stop going to school is called holiday.
- Ruen thi rap licence chenni, cha rap khrai ma yu mai dai, nok chak tutor tam college.
  = Such a licensed home cannot be allowed anybody to stay, except tutors in colleges.
- Wen tae nak-rian thi dai scholarship khue ngoen-rang-wan chuai nai kan rian.
  = Except for the student who got the scholarship, that is, the money awards to support the study.

- Cha tong khao sop lai phai nai 6 term.
  = It must take the exam within 6 terms.

2.6 Code-Mixing of English in Thai at Present

Since the reign of King Chulalongkorn onwards, the development in various fields especially in technology, commerce and education has helped immensely to increase the instances of code-mixing of English in Thai. It is due to the fact that English is recognized as a widespread language as well as a medium for communication locally as well as globally. In whatever field, the presence of English is felt at all times. Therefore, it is noticed that the main cause of code-mixing of English in Thai consists of two points:

1. **Need for Global Communication**: Technological innovation, educational necessities and need for communication with foreign countries are new areas where Thai speakers are involved. Moreover, the words that come along with globalization are the words which were never in use in Thai Language ever before. Therefore, it is necessary to go with the changing linguistic environment. It is convenient for the Thai people to accept this new change for the purpose of clarity in meaning. Change is a universal phenomenon in
all the historical periods. With the fast pace of the globalization the countries in the world have a good opportunity to have relationship at various levels. The more the people have relationship with one another, the higher the usage of code-mixing in individual languages will exist.

2. Individual need: The relationship at the individual level is another factor responsible for the use of code-mixing. The selection of words for communication at individual level depends on different components concerned, but the use of code-mixing of English in Thai is for conveying the meaning in order to express the two important aspects: to express users' intelligence and attitude toward the word usage.

The use of English is made by the user to feel that he/she is different from others. The user of English wants to show that he has some reputation in the society. In addition, he/she wants the hearers to recognize that he/she is a knowledgeable person. In most cases, the speaker wants to convey the intended meaning to the specific group – not to the others (Boonserm Littapirom, 1979: 4) or to express the user's modernization (Pairat Warie, 1977: 26). In general, an educated person who selects words needs an accurate and concise meaning that demonstrates one's own knowledge. Thus, the use of English mixing while explaining or lecturing is to display intelligence of the user. Since English language has undergone tremendous changes over the years, selection in using the appropriate
words by the speaker is to express modernization, knowledge and outstanding point of the user.

Some words in the Thai language when taken to use at earlier period had a negative meaning owing to different reasons. For instance, the word “rongraem” is being replaced by “hotel” instead. Despite the fact that “rongraem” does not convey a negative meaning, it is accepted by common people, some groups of people are seen using the word “hotel” as usual.

The above discussion leads to a very significant aspect. Code-mixing of English in Thai at present is not only limited to a high social class and elites domain, but it is also found generally at every level of social groups such as school children, students, hotel employees, taxi drivers, etc. There are two main factors that are responsible for code-mixing of English in Thai language i.e. influence of technology and distribution of western civilization. It is due to the globalization process that can be seen that Thai people tend to use lexical items and culture specific terms borrowed from English language. The present study shows remarkable change in the style of using the strategy of code-mixing.

2.7 Borrowing

Borrowing is one of the ways in which different languages may become mixed up with each other. It is an instance of diffusion where the elements of one language are adopted into another when the communities speaking the two languages are in general, different
cultiually. The direction of borrowing a prestigious language into the other and the borrowing words, again predominantly but not exclusively, relate to culturally specific objects and concepts. As the source language is prestigious and provides the mode, non-cultural items may also be borrowed due to their perceived value. The above characterization of borrowing suggests that it is relatively a conscious process and that it primarily affects the lexicon. Elite bilingualism is sufficient for borrowing to take place and the initial instances of borrowing may start with individuals or groups and then spread to the entire community. It is also revisable under certain socio-political conditions (Annamalai, 1989) when borrowing becomes so extensive as to threaten the separate identity of the borrowing language in popular perception. The words once adopted in the borrowing language will be inherited by the successive generations and each generation does not borrow them afresh, and they might add to the already borrowed items.

Borrowing language separated from language mixing, it seems difficult. Hoffman (1991) had already said that borrowing is related closely with language mixing very much, to have seen in general discourse. In day-to-day conversation, the Thai word “si tha pak” is less used. Instead, the English word “lipstick” is borrowed to use in Thai much more. Hoffman noticed that to borrow the words in other languages to be adapted in ones own language could have a negative result also, because it may decrease the importance of the mother tongue or original language.
In conclusion, one can say that while teaching, the majority of the population extensively makes use of code-mixing irrespective of the knowledge of loan words. The distinction between code-mixing and borrowing is to be made here for understanding the linguistic behavior of a person.

2.8 Distinction of Code-Mixing and Borrowing

Code-mixing has a different characteristic feature from borrowing. Borrowing is referred to the way by which one language adopts a characteristic of another one as a part of the native language. In the Thai language, for instance, the words: per cent, motorcy (cle), taxi, are borrowed words, which Thai people adopted until they have already become assimilated with the Thai words. On the other hand, most borrowed words are accepted in Thai society more prevalently and are inserted in the Thai dictionary while their characteristic of sound adaptation is associated with the sound system of mother tongue (Amara Prasithrathsint, 1999). However, there are many English words used in Thai language such as designer, costume, collection which are not accepted as much as the borrowed words. Thus, they are merely English words brought to mix in Thai utterance.

The word “mixing” is not equal to the word “borrowing” because the word “borrowing” does not express the language ability (Plaff, 1979:195, Kachru, 1986:66). Thai people, for example, who lack the knowledge of English, are still able to use or understand the meaning of
the word “football” very well whereas perhaps they have a little knowledge of English for understanding the meaning of the word “presentation.” It may be concluded that code-mixing is different from borrowing in the aspect that loan words are used by the person who can speak one language (monolingual), two languages (bilingual) or many languages (multilingual) but code-mixing is used by a person who can speak two languages (bilingual) or many languages (multilingual), (Kachru, 1982).

“Loan word” (another term for borrowed word) used in code-mixing does not come from the needs of new vocabulary to create the name of things or new ideas but it is used for the emphasis of statements, meaning, neutralization or unique expression (Scotton 1990; Kachru, 1986, Kamwangamalu, 1989). Mkilifi (1972:140) ventilated his opinion about the use of code-mixing and English loan words of Kiswahili people. He found that the loan words used in code-mixing occurred despite the fact that there were words in Kiswahili that were equivalents to loan words; and the loan words in this case were used for many reasons such as for showing off oneself as an educated person and so on. The role of loan words used in code-mixing is worth studying. It is observed that the selection in using language is determined by the function of the context of situation: topics, people, dialogues and cultures.

Lau (1999) defines borrowing as the adaptation of lexical items from a donor language into a recipient language. This definition of borrowing is
parallel to Sridhar and Sridhar’s (1980) definition of code-mixing which suggests that code-mixing refers to the transition from using linguistic units, such as words and phrases, of one language to using those of another within a single utterance. According to these two views, it is almost impossible to tell whether a word is a code-mix or a loan item when it is ‘imported’ from one language to another language by a speaker. As it is difficult to distinguish between code-mixing and borrowing, Treffers-Dallers (1994) suggests that code-mixing and borrowing should be treated as fundamentally the same. In her study in Brussels, she uses the term ‘borrowing’ for all kinds of single-word switches while longer switches below clause level are termed “code-mixing.” However, some other researchers have insisted on maintaining a distinction between code-mixing and borrowing. Sridhar (1980) outlines four criteria for the differentiation between code-mixing and borrowing:

1) Loan items are often adopted when there are no equivalents in the host language while mixed items are used even when equivalents can be found in the host language.

2) The mixed items are usually longer than single words while loan items are not.

3) Loan items are used by all speakers in the speech community, including both bilingual and monolingual speakers while mixed items are only limited to bilingual speakers.
4) Loan items have been nativized into the host language by phonological and morpho-syntactic processes while mixed items are not assimilated into the host language.

Myers-Scotton (1993) suggests that borrowing only occurs in monolingual speech while code-mixing is necessarily a product of bilingualism. Li (1996) pointed out that loan items are items of foreign origins, which have become a part of the repertoire of the monolingual speech community by integration into the phonology and morpho-syntax of the host language. Despite these attempts at clarifications, the terminological dispute remains far from resolved. For example, Chan (2004) pointed out that borrowing could also occur in cases where an equivalent counterpart existed in the recipient language. Koll-Stobbe (1994) argues that some borrowed items may not have been fully nativized into the host language by phonological process.

When distinguishing code-mixing from borrowing, the borrowing is one of the ways in which languages can get mixed up with each other whereas code-mixing involves mixing languages in speech, borrowing involves mixing the systems themselves, because an item is “borrowed” from one language to become part of the other language. According to Muysken (2000), code-mixing and borrowing are often distinguished formally, e.g. through morphology, as taking place above and below the word level, respectively. Code-mixing involves inserting foreign words or constituents into a clause; borrowing involves entering alien elements into a lexicon. The integration of borrowed elements is a very gradual
process, which may take generations, and the degree of integration is generally indicative of the time of borrowing. This integration is based on the parameters of: frequency of use, displacement of native language synonyms, grammatical integration and acceptability by the speaker. It is not always the case, however, that borrowing can be seen as a form of simple vocabulary extension, and that code-mixing has a primarily symbolic function, e.g. marking a mixed cultural identity.

Most code-mixings are spontaneously formed in discourse. Poplak and Sankoff (1988) state that certain patterns of mixing are more frequent in one speech community, others in another speech community. In this case, one might speak of conventional code-mixing, the phenomenon of nonce loans where elements are borrowed on the spur of the moment, without having any status yet in the receiving speech community and finally of established loans.

According to Weinreich (1953), only the most concrete loan words, such as names for newly invented or imported objects can be thought of as mere additions to the vocabulary. Except for loanwords with entirely new content, the transfer or reproduction of foreign words must affect the existing vocabulary in one of the three ways:

1) Confusion in usage: a set of specialized signs in one language may become confusing due to interference of another language where the same content is not similarly sub-divided. In such a case, one of the terms may eventually become fixed as an expression of the combined content, and the other abandoned.
2) Old words may be discarded as their content becomes fully covered by the loanword.

3) The clashing of the old and borrowed words may result into a specialized content.

According to Hudson:

"It is important to distinguish example like these from the enormous number of words which are borrowings only in the historical sense and which ordinary people no longer associate with any other language. Such words account for more than half of the vocabulary of English, which has borrowed a great deal from Latin, French and Greek. Words like money, car, church and letter can all be traced to borrowings from these languages, but none of us are aware of this and use them just like any other English word, without any trace of foreign association. However, borrowings can keep their foreign associations for a very long time, whether or not we recognize them as loans" (1996:56).

One important consequence of borrowing is that the boundaries between languages come into question. We assume that a loan word is definitely part of the borrowing language, but this is in fact a matter of degree. It is common for items to get assimilated in some degree to the items already
in the borrowing variety, with foreign sounds being replaced by native sounds. This partial assimilation of borrowed words is an extremely common phenomenon in English and other languages.

There is a scale on which one can see the degree of borrowing in a language. At one end of the scale is the completely unassimilated loan word and at the other end are items bearing no formal resemblance to the foreign words on which they are based. Such items are called Loan Translations or calques. Hudson (1996) says:

1) There is a tendency to eliminate alternatives in syntax.

2) There is an existence of specific loan translations which may then act as models from which regular “native” constructions can be developed.

3) There is code-mixing which encourages the languages concerned to become more similar in their syntax so that items from each may be more easily substituted for one another within the same sentence.

In conclusion, code-mixing should not be confused with “borrowing” which refers to the adaptation of lexical items from a foreign language to one’s native language, and these borrowed lexical items are usually pronounced and used grammatically as if they were part of the native tongue.
2.9 Attitude towards English

Attitude is one of the important factors, which influences the phenomena of code-mixing. It can vary from person to person. There are people who are in favor of code-mixing of English in Thai and there are people in favor of not doing so. English is a symbol of education, modernization, achievement, stability such as in Korea (Shim, 1994), Hong Kong (Yau, 1994), Switzerland (Kamwangamalu, 1996), Taiwan (Chen, 1996) and Saudi Arabia (Al-Haq and Smadi, 1996). The people in these countries use English as a symbol of social status, prestige etc. With the help of English, they not only develop their personality but they also make economic progress. English has gained the significance in the fields of administration and economy as well. The attainment of knowledge of English is necessary for acquiring a high work position and job. English has become the prerequisite for the study of science, technology and medical science. As a result, English is regarded as a popular language in societies all over the world.

Labov (1972) studied New York people’s attitudes toward the sound production of post-vocalic “r” according to the group, age and social class of speakers and found that the language attitude had affected the age of the speaker. The new generation group had the highest positive attitude towards “r”, accepting that the sound “r” is a form of language associated with dignity in a modern style for a new generation of all the classes who live in New York. When Labov compared the result of attitude collected to the sound production of “r” in a real conversation, it
was found that the consequence of sound production of “r” is opposite to that of the attitude. In other words, the new generation who had a positive attitude towards the sound production of “r” actually used “r” at a very low level, except for the highest-class group.

English enables those who have ability in using English in many regions of the world to achieve economic progress. Therefore, majority of people have developed a positive attitude towards English. The attitude of the people towards any language and the social symbol associated with that language influenced and motivated the use of that language (Giles, 1998). Thus, Munro (1996) noticed that as the United States of America was a leader in economic and political field, the American dialect is recognized as a language of honor, significance and popularity.

Many people fear that English will replace their own language. In Saudi Arabia, for instance, English has played an important role in daily life; there is the emphasis on using English as a tool in creating the economic growth at the national level. At individual level, those who have the ability in using English are being given the top work positions and have an opportunity to get promotion and receive the benefits of advance increments. Therefore, the fear that English will play an important role and replace the Arabic is a reasonable one (Al-Haq and Smadi, 1996). Saudi people were afraid that the use of English might give rise to the popularity of English language and westernization. They were also of the opinion that the increasing popularity of English might lead to deterioration of morality.
Al-Haq and Smadi (1996) tried to study and hunt for the cause of such a fear. The research showed that the majority of the sample group had linked the knowledge of English to a social status. In addition, they found that English is used as a vehicle for development or promotion of personality and gain experience of the world culture. They looked at English as a tool in transferring technological knowledge and progress. In this case, the sample group had the resolution that the study of English is a national duty to help protecting the country away from backwardness of economy, education, culture and modernization. The use of English is an honorable act and a tool to propagate Islamic religion to foreigners who are not Muslims.

In Thailand, a mass media is a very influential “teacher” of language. The people learn language from the mass media automatically, without realization, and often imitate the words routinely. The language imitated from such a media mostly is used in a spoken form. Besides, there is still a result of research work to be found that the mass media had influence on the language of the young people; for example, they try to imitate the speech on television and use slang expressions.

2.10 Attitude towards Code-Mixing

The area of research inquiry on code-mixing is the investigation of attitudes towards this particular phenomenon. There are widely different attitudes towards code-mixing, which is a phenomenon observed all over the world and yet in some communities has been the norm rather than the
exception (Grosjean, 1982). The difference among peoples’ attitudes towards code-mixing depends mainly on how linguistic behavior is perceived both at the individual and the community levels. In discussion of this topic, research studies (Kachru, 1978; Grosjean, 1982; Gumperz, 1982; Cheng and Butler, 1989) illustrate varying attitudes towards code-mixing that range from positive to negative. These studies find that some people see code-mixing as a useful strategy, a competence, or even a good skill in communicating effectively. Other people have moderate and relaxed feelings about code-mixing. They accept it as a style of communication or as a variety used by participants in some speech events; it is neither better nor worse than single code-use. In contrast, some people’s attitude towards code-mixing are negative. They consider it a grammarless mixture of two languages, and a deficiency in the speaker’s ability to converse in either one of his/her languages well enough. In this negative view, code-mixing is characterized as: bad manners, an embarrassing behavior, a dangerous behavior, a behavior that is not pure, a behavior that should be avoided, and a behavior that can pollute a language (Grosjean, 1982). However, there are factors that come into play in forming peoples’ attitudes. Some of these factors are community-specific, such as the language situation (if there are high and low varieties and language policy restrictions) and the appropriateness of language use determined by the community’s social norms. Other factors fall into the level of the individual participant such as the degree of language proficiency, the intent of the message to be conveyed, age, sex, education, and the personal judgment involved in the suitability of code-mixing in particular situations.
Contrary to the negative views about code-mixing, the literature reviewed reflects positive attitudes among scholars with regard to this particular phenomenon. Such a trend is particularly evident in the literature on the functional aspects of code-switching and code-mixing, where this style of speech is characterized as a competence, a communicative strategy, and a resource for effective communication. Apart from professionals who deal with language disorders and discuss the use of code-mixing as an indicator of language proficiency or sometimes lack thereof, code-mixing/switching has always been portrayed in scholarly discussions as a benefit. One example of how code-mixing is usually characterized is in Poplack’s study where she states:

“Code-mixing is a verbal skill requiring a large degree of competence in more than one language, rather than a defect arising from insufficient knowledge of one or the other” (1980:72).

However, in spite of how scholars feel about what this strategy could serve, Sanchez (as cited in Cheng and Butler) has argued that code-mixing could “take away the purity of the language” (1989:298).

Studies on language attitudes employ different methodological procedures to obtain evaluative judgments about other people’s speech patterns. In most cases, subjects evaluate recorded speech samples using pen and paper instruments. Questionnaires, matched-guise techniques, and interviews are used in attitude investigations, where results are
collected as numerical data and statistical analysis is applied to discover the significant tendencies (Fasold, 1984). Nevertheless, these designs are open to the criticism that there are accuracy problems in the measuring instruments, and that such designs are too laboratory-like and so responses may be systematically artificial (Fitch and Hopper, 1983). Moreover, although aspects of code-mixing have been examined in several different situations, it remains difficult to generalize findings, because each investigation had its own specific characteristic feature. Yet, generally, with regard to the study of issues of bilingualism, researchers (for example Romaine, 1995; Tay, 1989-; Baker, 1993; and Bokamba, 1989) agree that there is a need to evolve unified bilingual norms for the description and analysis of bilingual phenomena such as code-mixing.

2.11 Motivation for Code-Mixing

A research study on cause or motivation of code-mixing of English has been done in many other languages as given in the following details:

Luke (1998) tried to explain cause or social motivation in language selection and found that code-mixing of Kwangtung-Chinese and English was owing to two reasons:

1. To be expedient; as particular words used in Chinese are not available, English is used to help adding the vocabulary need.
2. To be orientational; this can take place when English words are used despite particular words are available in Chinese. The speaker preferred English words because he/she wanted to express himself/herself as an educated person who had had western education. Thus, the reason of this kind of code-mixing is to tell with a style of “knowing by force” or “showing off” the social uniqueness of the speaker and show the distant intimacy for the listener or interlocutor.

Chen (1996) found that the sample group used code-mixing in order to release an emotional feeling: in particular, stress reduction or depression. On the one hand, they used offensive words in English which have the meaning prohibited in Chinese. On the other hand, they used English words to express loving-kindness and praise for the purpose of showing their feeling and for relieving the stresses of different situations such as anger, fear, sorrow, etc. Therefore, under these situations, English is used as a medium for explaining emotions and feelings and for avoiding a negative aspect of meaning of words/phrases in Chinese.

In addition, the research work of Chen (1996) revealed that code-mixing is used to create the appreciation of the others or to show that the speaker is an educated person. Code-mixing of Chinese and English made a speaker to be recognized as having life experience whereas his/her knowledge was linked with some careers or modernization because English has been looked at as a language of science, technology,
modernization. Code-mixing, therefore, displayed the symbol and status linked with the status of English around the world.

Yau (1993) found that the books or magazines mixed with English in Hong Kong often consisted of the topics concerned with technology business and administration. The use of English in Chinese writing reflected on education, westernization and modernization of the writer. However, whoever used English would be linked with the power, honor and good education. English is a language of science, technology, international trade and commerce.

Li (2000) categorized the cause or motivation for code-mixing of English in Chinese of Hong Kong people into four types as follows:

1. **Euphemism**: It means to select the use of English words to avoid in using Chinese words that seem impolite or inappropriate. For example, “bra” is used instead of the words in Chinese “thing to cover the breasts”, “thing to cover woman’s chest” and “thing to fasten the upper body”.

2. **Specificity**: English words are used because of their precision. Compared to the equivalent Chinese words, the selected English words convey the meaning or message more clearly and unambiguously.

3. **Bilingual Punning**: It means the use of Kwangtung-Chinese and English mixed together to build up a double meaning. In addition, mostly, synonymous sound of the words in Kwangtung-Chinese and
English has been performed. This process is used very favorably in the advertising language.

4. **Principle of Economy**: It means to select the use of English words because English words are shorter and more efficient in communication than the words in Kwangtung-Chinese.

### 2.12 Conclusion

In the beginning of the chapter, two kinds of linguistic variations; intra-language and inter-language have been discussed in detail. It also takes the survey of related research work in the field of code-mixing and code-switching. The views of different scholars are examined in this respect. Then the chapter goes on to highlight the functional aspects of code-mixing. The significant concepts viz. truncation, semantic shift, lexical creativity, hybridization have been fully explicated. A historical perspective of code-mixing of English in Thai is also given. The socio-cultural dimensions of code-mixing, attitudes towards code-mixing, cause and motivation, etc. have been thoroughly examined towards the end of the chapter.