CODE-SWITCHING BETWEEN THAI AND ENGLISH IN YOUNG THAI POLITICIANS' SPEECHES

Kwanjira Chatpunnarangsee[*] and Varisa Osatananda

Faculty of Liberal Arts, Thammasat University, Thailand

ABSTRACT

Previous studies have indicated that politicians often employ code-switching as a linguistic device to foster solidarity with the public and garner voters' support. In the Thai context, however, such devices as euphemism and hedging have been investigated, but not code-switching. In light of this lack of attention to code-switching in Thai political contexts, the Thai-English code-switching observed in the speeches of five young Thai politicians were analyzed in order to 1) examine the linguistic units of code-switching produced by the young Thai politicians in formal and informal speeches, and 2) investigate the strategies for which code-switching units have been employed. Data consisted of approximately two hours of formal and two hours of informal speeches by each person, 21 hours in total. The findings show that English nouns and noun phrases were the categories in which code-switching occurred most frequently. There was no major difference in the frequency of code-switching occurrences between formal and informal settings. Instead, the occurrence of Thai-English code-switching depended largely on the speakers' topics, particularly those related to their experiences abroad and issues in science and technology. It was also found that the majority of the occurrences of code-switching were in the strategic categories of convenience, jargon/technical terms clarification, repetition-for-clarification, and quotations. It was concluded that the Thai politicians were well aware of their speech styles as well as the various backgrounds of their diverse audiences. By mixing English vocabulary into their public speeches, they could simultaneously cater to and impress audiences from different backgrounds.

Keywords: Thai-English code-switching; Thai politician's speech; political discourse; bilingual code-mixing; bilingualism

1. INTRODUCTION

Nilep (2006) described code-switching (hereafter CS) as "an alternation in the form of communication that signals a context in which the linguistic contribution can be understood." In this context the term "code" refers to not only a language but also a dialect of the language. Researchers in western countries have found that in settings where minority or immigrant communities form sectors within the whole population, politicians code-switch between the standard and local dialects, or between different languages for that matter, to create the sense that they belong among their constituents, thereby establishing and strengthening a bond between them and their supporters. CS has thus become a tool that politicians use to foster solidarity with groups of people to gain voters' support. For instance, Moody and Eslami (2020) reported that Senator Tim Kaine code-switched in his speeches to portray his attentiveness to the Latin community in America.

As a global language, English has become associated with progress and development. In Thailand, even though English is not an official language and therefore not on par with Thai, over the past few decades it has gained prestige and been endowed with a special status. The language is often associated with class and education, and although it remains a foreign language, among middle-class citizens, English is now often spoken for intra- as well as inter-cultural communication (Baker & Jarunthawatchai, 2017). Because of its prestige in Thailand, English speaking ability is prioritized over all other foreign language skills. As a result of this popularity, CS between Thai and English, in particular intra-sentential or seamless code-mixing, both written and spoken, is common practice for intra-communication among Thais in both academic and non-academic settings (Kangkha & Mahadi, 2018).

Researchers have reported that Thai politicians use various discursive devices for political purposes, such as clever words and phrases (Gadavanij, 2002a), euphemisms (Treeklangdorn, 2019) and hedging (Nusartlert, 2017; Theamsomboon, 1998). On the other hand, politicians' use of CS between either standard Thai or the official English dialect and a local dialect, which could foster solidarity, has not been found to be common practice. Although using only a few local phrases such as standard greetings can be a powerful way to draw people's attention and gain their trust, politicians fail to incorporate local dialects into their speeches. For example, Thanathorn Juangroongruangkit spoke only Standard Thai to his supporters in the Southern provinces during his 2019 election campaign, and Paethongthan Shinnawatra also used only Standard Thai in her campaign in the north-eastern provinces in March 2022. On the other hand, Sathit Wongnongtoey, a politician from the south, spoke only in his own local Southern dialect during his political campaign in Surat Thani in March, 2019. As noted, simply greeting the audience in the local dialect can start a speech off on a highly positive note and greatly enhance the speaker's popularity, while not doing so could suggest the politician cannot be bothered to make this gesture. The politicians' choice of giving a monodialectal speech, therefore, seems to demonstrate failure to take advantage of an effective rhetorical strategy.

In contrast, CS between Thai and English is commonly found in the speeches of young Thai politicians, especially those who have a good command of English due to their overseas education. The habit of alternating between Thai and English in their spoken discourse should come as no surprise, as many researchers have pointed out that Thai-English CS commonly occurs in TV programs (Kannaovakun & Gunther, 2003) as well as among Thai speakers who have had exposure to English in English-speaking countries (Suraratdecha, 2003). What is rather surprising, however, is that these young politicians insert English words and phrases into their speeches to audiences of various backgrounds, many of whom may not understand English at all. Thus, the use of English may be lost on some listeners who would respond enthusiastically to a few phrases in their own dialect.

To gain deeper insight into how these politicians are using CS in their public addresses, this study examined the speeches of five Thai-English bilingual politicians who hold degrees from universities in English-speaking countries. The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What are the linguistic units of CS produced by the young Thai politicians in formal and informal speeches?

2. What are the strategies for which CS units have been employed?

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Myers-Scotton and Ury (1977) provided the general concept of CS as a speaker's alternation between two or more languages within the same act of communication. Boztepe (2003) explained that the term "code" in "code-switching" refers to any linguistic variety, whether a dialect or a language. Nilep (2006), however, posited that the notion of "code" cannot be restricted to a language or language variety because the term "language" itself remains disputable in linguistics, so CS should be understood as "an alternation in the form of communication that signals a context in which the linguistic contribution can be understood." In the same vein, Bullock and Toribio (2012) stated that CS encompasses a broad range of language contact situations. Poplack (1980) used the term "intra-sentential" to describe the occurrence of CS within a sentence, (for which Muysken (2000), coined the term "code-mixing") to contrast with "inter-sentential" CS, referring to alternation across sentences. Gardner-Chloros (2009) described CS broadly as a phenomenon in which "varied combinations of two or more linguistic varieties occur" as may be found "in countless bilingual societies and communities." In terms of grammatical structure, CS may extend from a single word to discourse segments. When and how CS may occur varies widely as bilingual speakers have different levels of language skills, social backgrounds, and past experience. Thus Gardner-Chloros (2009) deemed CS as a "multifaceted phenomenon," which can be approached from sociolinguistic, pragmatic, and grammatical perspectives. Myers-Scotton (1993, 1997) proposed a methodological framework called the Matrix Language

Frame (MLF) in which one language, the matrix or base, predominantly determines the grammatical structure of utterances, while the embedded (or "guest") language provides some of their lexical forms.

Bullock and Toribio (2012) categorized the many reasons why bilinguals code-switch into social and pragmatic purposes. Socially, CS may covertly confer prestige by identifying the speaker as a member of the select group of those who possess bilingual ability. CS also overtly confers status when one of the languages is powerful or prestigious in certain circumstances. On the other hand, the pragmatic purposes of CS include verbatim quoting, emphasizing, realigning speech roles, reiterating, and elaborating (Gumperz, 1976, 1982) as well as clarifying what has been said (Haid, 2016). The bi-/multilingual speaker's choice of language while code-switching reflects intention to communicate directly with a particular audience. CS can trigger emotional reactions, such as amusement or a sense of formality. CS may invoke solidarity when speakers use their minority-status L1 in the presence of fellow speakers, in which case it is known as the "we-code;" or it may create social distance when the dominant language, or the "they-code," is chosen (Gumperz, 1982). Bullock and Toribio (2012) and Gardner-Chloros (2009) share the view that the occurrence of CS generally depends on three sociolinguistic factors: 1) factors beyond speakers and their personal attributes, namely, economic forces, overt-covert prestige, power relations, and a community's way of life; 2) factors that derive from the speakers themselves; and 3) factors inherent in the settings in which communications take place. They also allude to Gumperz' situational and conversational dichotomy of CS. In situational CS, interlocutors code-switch when changes in interlocutor, context, or topic take place. On the other hand, conversational CS occurs with no relation to the current context; the speaker code-switches in order to "evoke the connotations, the metaphorical 'world' of that variety" (Bullock & Toribio, 2012, p. 107).

Politicians in the United States have been cited by the media for using CS to gain popularity. For example, former President Obama was reported to have used a word local to the neighbourhood when talking to a Black cashier in Washington DC (Demby, 2013), presumably to identify himself as a community insider. He often displayed his identity as an American citizen with a multi-linguocultural background by shifting among Hawai'ian, Chicago dialect, African-American Vernacular (AAV), and standard English. Senator Ted Cruz, though not of Southern American heritage, occasionally speaks with a Southern American accent and code-switches to Spanish. Similarly, former President Donald Trump and Senator Bernie Sanders displayed their Northeastern credentials by maintaining New York accents (Vargas, 2016). CS doesn't always benefit politicians, however. It can backfire if the speech doesn't sound natural to the audience, as is exemplified by the criticism directed at Democratic congresswoman Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez for feigning an accent when speaking to the local Black-American audience (Keller, 2020; Leith, 2019). Former senator Tim Kaine's CS between English and Spanish was also disapproved by the media and viewed by voters as a manipulative tactic to gain Spanish-speaking American voters' support (Moody & Eslami, 2020). Whether effective or not, these examples show that CS is a common tool in U.S. politics.

Studies of politicians' CS around the globe have often focused on both different dialects of the same language (e.g., Bulgarian by Kementchedjhieva, 2016; Telugu by Sravani et al., 2021) and different languages (e.g., Mandarin-Taiwanese by Wei, 2003; English-German-Russian by Haid, 2016). Boyko Borisov, Bulgaria's former Prime Minister, was well-known for his casual character when he sought people's attention and his ability to code-switch between standard Bulgarian and non-standard varieties to maintain a balance between political power and social solidarity (Kementchedjhieva, 2016). Sravani et al. (2021) studied CS and code-mixing in the speeches of two politicians in Telangana, a state in south-central India, where many dialects of Telugu as well as of Hindi-Urdu and English are spoken. They found that occurrences of CM/CS depended on the audience, the speaker's ideology, and the speech context. Wei (2003) argued that CS could be viewed as indirect speech, serving politicians as "a disclaimer of performance, which further aids the speaker to either avoid responsibility, escalate confrontation, or transform into other roles" (p. 161). For example, Chen Shui-bian, a presidential candidate in Taiwan, pragmatically code-switched between local Taiwanese and Mandarin to manipulate ambiguous statements. Unlike conversational CS in bi-/multi-lingual communities where the "we-code" (local minority language) vs "they-code" (dominant standard language) values prevail (Gumperz, 1982), Haid (2016) described CS in political discourse as "a consciously planned strategy in political speeches'' (p. 222) and provided three powerful examples: Russian president Vladimir Putin, former German chancellor Angela Merkel, and former US president Barack Obama. When Vladimir Putin gave an address at the German parliament, he stated in German. "I'm going to speak in Russian," triggering laughter among the audience. Angela Merkel began and ended her speech at the Israel Parliament in Hebrew, signalling solidarity and an enduring relationship between Germany and Israel. In his speech addressing the National Association of Latino Elected Officials (NALEO), Barack Obama code-switched by following English phrases with Spanish translation as in, "Thank you! Gracias!" The CS triggered enthusiastic cheers among the crowd. Haid concluded that the three politicians intentionally and in these cases effectively performed CS to elicit sympathy and trust from the audience.

In Thailand, during the 1980s English-Thai CS was considered an inappropriate means of communication (Khanitthanan, 1983; Mantrasutra, 1982; Sangpolsitha, 1981) that threatened to undermine Thais' loyalty to their own language and culture (Kannaovakun & Gunther, 2003). In recent years, however, the attitude towards English-Thai CS has been more positive, especially among younger generations (Inta, 2012; Chairat, 2014). Kangkha and Mahadi (2018) posited that CS is an act of translanguaging, performed even by Thai-monolingual speakers in both academic and non-academic contexts where people engage in sharing and exchanging information and ideas, and in less formal settings, such as in the family or market. Thai-English CS data have been examined in written texts (Inta, 2012; Janhom, 2011; Kumtanit & Srisakorn, 2016), spoken texts (Kannaovakun, 2001; Kannaovakun & Gunther, 2003; Narkkaew, 2013; Papijit, 2013; Yutthayothin & Thippayasuparat, 2018), and other modes of communication such as Thai pop songs (Chairat, 2014; Likhitphongsathorn & Sappapan, 2013) and chat rooms (Yiamkhamnuan, 2011). These studies demonstrate that instances of intrasentential CS are more common than intersentential CS in both spoken and written texts. Single nouns are found more frequently than other parts of speech, and CS forms have been extensively nativized in a wide range of ways such as truncation, semantic shift, and reduplication. Suraratdecha (2003) examined the nature of CS among Thai students studying in Hawaii and found that it was fairly common, as is often the case in multilingual communities. Contrary to Bell's (1984) audience design framework, Suraratdecha posited that audience or conversational partner doesn't have a great impact on the occurrence of CS, the frequency of which largely depends on the topic of the conversation. All in all, previous research on Thai-English CS focuses on forms rather than functions. Kannaovakun and Gunther (2003) concluded that CM serves "more than a utilitarian purpose or linguistic needs for lexical items, but may rather serve expressive functions such as prestige motive" (p. 66).

The pioneer research on Thai politicians' parliamentary interactions was Gadavanij's (2002a, 2002b) investigation of the no-confidence debates in 1995 performed by such maverick politicians as Chalerm Yubumrung, Chuan Leekpai, and the late Samak Sundaravej. Gadavanij found that members of the Thai parliament employed 13 discursive strategies to perform six functions, which could not otherwise be achieved. Various other discursive strategies such as politeness, enthymemes (unstated premises), and face-threatening acts (FTAs) have been widely used in both accusational and respondent speeches (Gadavanij, 2002b). Considering data from the micro level, for example, Samak used metaphor as a strategy to make himself understood by some in the audience who might not be familiar with the complex issues he was discussing. On the other hand, Chalerm's catchy word choice effectively drew the audience's attention (Gadavanij, 2002a). In addition to these discursive strategies, Rotcharoen (2009) studied the reprimanding language used by Thai politicians and found it could produce many powerful effects such attacking opponents, creating semantic ambiguity, attracting the audience's attention, and avoiding responsibility.

In studies of politicians' responses to interview questions, Theamsomboon (1998) and Vongkrajang (2004) both found that they gave three types: answer-response (direct answer), non-answer response (indirect answer), and non-response (answer unrelated to the questions). Their responses reflected all four of Grice's (1975) Conversational Maxims: quality, quantity, relevance, and manner. Theamsomboon found that in spontaneous interviews politicians tended to give answers unrelated to the questions, and Vongkrajang reported that several face-saving discourse strategies were adopted, including hedging, giving new information, referring to others, giving too little information, answering vaguely, refusing to give answers, stating that there is no sufficient information, denying the interviewer's assumptions, questioning the interviewer, and threatening other people's face. In order to dismiss the accusations posted by reporters, Former Premier Yingluck Shinawatra responded to questions by using both direct and indirect negation, refusing to answer, and asking questions back or otherwise retaliating (Gadavanij, 2014). According to Nusartlert (2017), politicians carefully choose a specific term of address and the first-person pronoun to maintain solidarity. Rhetorical questions, final particles, and repetition are other linguistic elements that are often found in political speeches.

By and large, scholars have thoroughly examined pragmatic strategies used by Thai politicians with the exception of CS, although young Thai politicians code-switch often in public speeches, and CS has been widely researched in other Thai contexts. In this study we sought to bridge the disconnect between the study of CS and Thai political discourse and demonstrate the important role that Thai-English CS plays in Thai political speech.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Participants
The participants in this study were selected based on the following criteria. First, they were present or former elected members of the House of Representatives or otherwise actively involved in Thai politics.

Second, they were in their 20s to 40s and had political careers of 20 years or fewer. Finally, they demonstrated fluency in both Thai and English, either through obtaining university degrees, or participating in overseas programs or education in major English-speaking countries. Five politicians were identified who fulfilled these three criteria: 1) Parit Wacharasindhu, 2) Pita Limjaroenrat, 3) Preechaphol Pongpanit, 4) Thanathorn Juangroongruangkit, and 5) Varawut Silpa-archa. In terms of language proficiency and popularity, all had been invited by the prestigious Foreign Correspondents' Club of Thailand to express their political positions. Their educational backgrounds are described below.

Parit Wacharasindhu, 29, graduated from a Thai elementary school at the age of nine and continued his education in an international school in Thailand. After that, he further pursued his education in England, attending preparatory schools and eventually Eton College. He holds a bachelor's degree in Philosophy, Politics and Economics from the University of Oxford, where he served as president of the Oxford Union, a well-known debating club and the largest student society at Oxford University. Parit embarked on his career in Thai politics in 2018 when he joined the Democrat Party and ran for office to become a member of the House of Representatives. Although he did not win a seat, he has remained active in Thai politics. In 2022 he left the Democrat Party and joined the Move Forward Party, marking a transition in his political affiliation.

Pita Limjaroenrat, 41, studied at a Thai high school before attending a high school in New Zealand. Upon returning to Thailand, he pursued a bachelor's degree in Finance in the Faculty of Commerce and Accountancy, Thammasat University. Later, he received a scholarship to study at the University of Texas, Austin. Following that, he received an international student scholarship from Harvard University, where he earned a Master of Public Policy degree in the John F. Kennedy School of Government. He then pursued a master's degree in Business Administration at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Pita joined the Move Forward Party, and in 2019, he won a seat in the House of Representatives. He is now the leader of the Move Forward Party.

Preechaphol Pongpanit, 41, graduated from a high school in Bangkok. He completed a bachelor's degree in Engineering and a master's degree in Economics/Political Economy at the University of Sydney. Both of his parents are politicians. He joined the People Power Party, and in 2007, at the age of 27, he became the youngest member of the House of Representatives at that time. Later, he joined the Thai Raksa Chart Party and became its leader.

Thanathorn Juangroongruangkit, 43, attended a high school in Bangkok. He obtained a joint-honors Bachelor of Engineering (B.Eng) in Mechanical Engineering from Thammasat University and the University of Nottingham. Pursuing his interest in social and economic issues, Thanathorn earned three master's degrees: in Political Economy from Chulalongkorn University; in Global Finance from Stern School of Business, which is a joint program with New York University and The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology; and in International Business Law from the University of St. Gallen in Switzerland. He was the leader of the Move Forward Party when it was first founded.

Varawut Silpa-archa, 48, attended primary and secondary school (grades 7–8) in Bangkok. He completed his high school studies in England and earned a bachelor's degree in Mechanical Engineering at University College London. Varawut obtained a master's degree in Finance and Banking from the University of Wisconsin–Madison. He started his political career around 2002 and is currently the Minister of Natural Resources and Environment.

3.2 Data collection
The data for this study consisted of transcripts of YouTube video-clips featuring speeches delivered by the five focal politicians posted between 2015 and 2021. The dataset comprised 21.05 hours of videos. For each participant, there were approximately two hours of formal and two hours of informal speeches.

3.3 Data analysis
Three analytical methods were applied to organize, manage and code the data. For the first research question, the English words in each participant's CS utterances were coded according to parts of speech. To ensure accuracy, each researcher separately coded the data, and the results were compared. The frequency of each category was then converted into a percentage of all the English words. In order to investigate the effect of topics for which CS was used, the framework suggested by Suraratdecha (2003) was employed. During the coding process, the YouTube clip transcriptions were identified and labelled as "formal" or "informal" and categorized by topics (e.g., personal life in Thailand, studying overseas, policy announcements), and by occasion (e.g., formal interview or speaking on a panel). Clips with frequent CS (every one or two minutes) were collected in one column, while those with less frequent CS were placed in another column. This sorting facilitated the identification of patterns in the data and the derivation of a nuanced understanding regarding the impact of different topics and occasions on the participants' CS.

For the second research question, Kannaovakun and Gunther's (2003) and Moody and Eslami's (2020) methodologies were combined to develop a coding scheme consisting of CS strategies that overlapped between the two studies and have been found to be common in political discourse. The modified framework consisted of the following political discourse strategies:

1. Convenience: the speaker chooses to use English words rather than seek Thai equivalents for the same concepts in order to proceed with little effort.

2. Repetition-for-clarification: the speaker follows a Thai word/phrase with the English equivalent word/phrase or vice versa.

3. Jargon/technical terms: the speaker uses a term with a special meaning within particular profession or group which may be difficult for others to understand.

4. Quotations: the speaker provides a verbatim quote in the original language, often proverbs, famous expressions, or utterances of well-known figures or other sources.

5. Others: the speaker uses loanwords, current ad hoc situational words such as "COVID-19," proper nouns, acronyms and abbreviations.

The data was coded separately and then cross-checked in order to establish inter-rater reliability. Discrepancies were resolved by in-depth discussions.

4. RESULTS

This study investigated the extent to which CS is used by Thai politicians in formal and informal speeches conducted on TV and social media interviews. The findings indicate that the majority (99.56%) of these Thai politicians' alternations between Thai (the matrix language) and English were within clause boundaries, with very few instances of language switching at sentential boundaries. Therefore, it can be concluded that the CS observed was predominantly intra-sentential CS, in which English words or phrases were inserted into Thai clauses or sentences. The results of the linguistic unit analysis, addressing the first research question, are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: The Results of the Linguistics Unit Analysis

Name	Time	N	V	Adj	NP	VP	AdjP	Acronym	Sentence	Proper n.	Total
Parit											
Informal	2 hrs. 07 mins	42	17	1	30	2	0	1	0	7	100
Formal	2 hrs. 08 mins	46	4	0	23	0	0	0	0	7	80
Pita											
Informal	2 hrs. 17 mins	44	21	4	36	0	0	2	0	0	107
Formal	2 hrs. 21 mins	39	12	5	41	0	0	32	2	0	131
Preechaphol											
Informal	1 hr. 59 mins	50	16	2	27	2	1	1	0	0	99
Formal	1 hr. 59 mins	21	2	0	17	1	0	10	0	0	51
Thanathorn											
Informal	2 hrs. 10 mins	41	0	5	20	7	2	3	0	0	78
Formal	2 hrs. 16 mins	37	2	1	17	0	0	7	0	0	64
Varawut											
Informal	2 hrs. 05 mins	50	17	0	14	10	0	6	0	2	99
Formal	2 hrs. 01 min	20	14	2	38	0	0	9	2	1	86
Total											
Informal	10 hrs. 26 mins	227	71	12	127	21	3	13	0	9	483 (54%)
Formal	10 hrs. 37 mins	163	34	8	136	1	0	58	4	8	412 (46%)
Grand total	21 hrs. 3 mins	390 (43.6%)	105 (11.7%)	20 (2.2%)	263 (29.5%)	22 (2.5%)	3 (0.3%)	71 (7.9%)	4 (0.4%)	17 (1.9%)	895 (100%)

The analysis of the approximately 21-hour dataset, comprising excerpts from both formal and informal media-published speeches and interviews of five Thai politicians, revealed that CS occurred most frequently in the categories of nouns (390 units or 43.6% of the total linguistic units) and noun phrases (263 units or 29.5%). The parts of speech less frequently involved in code mixing were verbs (105 units or 11.7% of the total linguistic units), acronyms (71 units or 7.9%), verb phrases (22 units or 2.5%), adjectives (20 units or 2.2%), sentences (4 units or 0.4%), and adjective phrases (3 or 0.3%).

Examining the numbers of CS instances in each participant's formal and informal communication acts revealed that only Pita switched languages more often in formal settings (131 times) than in informal

settings (107 times). Among the other four, Parit code-switched 80 times in formal settings and 100 times in informal settings; Preechapol code-switched 51 times in formal settings and 99 times in informal settings; Thanathorn code-switched 64 times in formal settings and 78 times in informal settings; and Varawut code-switched 86 times in formal settings and 99 times in informal settings. Although these results suggest a slight trend of CS occurring more often in informal settings, it is important to note the total numbers of linguistic units spoken in formal and informal settings were 412 and 483 units respectively, indicating no major difference. Therefore, other factors, such as the topics of their speeches, might have influenced the frequency with which the Thai politicians engaged in CS.

Further investigation of the role played by topics in the Thai politicians' insertion of English words into Thai discourse indicated that some topics exerted a major influence, particularly when they were discussing their experiences overseas. For example, in 30-minute informal interviews, Parit code-switched 43 times when talking about his education in the United Kingdom, and Pita code-switched 55 times when giving an account of life at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) during COVID restrictions. The politicians also engaged in CS quite often when they talked about scientific and technological issues and their specialized fields. For instance, Thanathorn inserted English words eight times in a three-minute formal interview in Thai, and Varawut's CS noticeably increased when he talked about environmental issues, his field of specialization. In contrast, CS occurred less frequently in discussions of such topics as personal life, family, hometown, and new projects and work in Thailand.

It should also be noted that the politicians' audience awareness was another factor that potentially affected their decisions to code switch. To illustrate, Preechaphol did not insert any English words in a 43-minute speech to local audiences in the southern part of Thailand, while Parit code-switched 15 times in a 25-minute talk in a panel discussion with university professors. However, he did not code-switch that often in a formal interview addressing a more general audience, in which he expressed his opinion on whether the Thai Parliament should use a unicameral instead of a bicameral system. Besides including few English words, he even used the Thai names for the United Kingdom, [saharaatcha-anaajak], and the United States, [saharat-amerika]. Pita showed his mindfulness of his audience by pausing briefly before using an English word or phrase.

It was also observed that the politicians tended to code switch differently when they spoke with and without scripts. For example, in a no-confidence parliamentary debate, Pita, speaking with a script in front of him, code-switched only six times in 43 minutes. But in a formal speech also delivered in parliament, speaking without a script, he code-switched 26 times in 33 minutes, a clear difference in the frequency of CS by the same speaker in the same setting but under different circumstances.

In order to determine the frequency of CS occurrences for different purposes, we investigated how Thai politicians utilized CS as discourse strategies. The results of this coding process are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: The Results of Discourse Strategies Used by the Thai Politicians

Strategies	Occurrences (informal)	Occurrences (formal)
1. Convenience	281 (66%)	137 (36.4%)
2. Repetition-for-clarification	24 (5.6%)	44 (11.7%)
3. Jargon/technical terms	56 (13.2%)	93 (24.7%)
4. Quotations	14 (3.3%)	7 (1.9%)
5. Others	51 (11.9%)	95 (25.3%)
Total	426 (100%)	376 (100%)

The analysis shows that overall the category of convenience strategies had the largest frequency of CS occurrences, and the rate of occurrence in informal settings was almost twice that of formal speeches (66% and 36.4% respectively). Conversely, they used CS for clarification or in the form of jargon or technical terms almost twice as often in their formal speeches as in their informal speeches (36.4% and 18.8% respectively). Thai politicians were also more likely to use CS in the "others" category in their formal speeches, including loanwords, references to the current situation such as COVID-19, proper nouns such as place names, and acronyms and abbreviations, even when there were Thai terms for the English terms used. Relating back to the first category, such usages, current the global media, might have been for their or their audiences' convenience. Some examples of English words used in CS are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3: Examples of English Words Used for Convenience Strategy in CS

Informal	Formal
campaign, claim, compromise, consensus, enjoy, collapse, interest, design, conflict, launch, limitation, radical change, success history, panic, serious, refer, scenario, back to basic, too little too late, deliver, trend dialogue, message, censor, feedback, workshop, model, version, trend, gap year	percent, demand, supply, benchmark, champ, center, approach, campaign, poll, feedback, data analytics, top comment, fake news, character, concept, criticize, error, guarantee, philosophy, term, byproduct, candidate, social commerce, value added

Repetition-for-clarification, a strategy that involves repeating the meaning of a Thai expression in English or vice versa, was evidenced in all five politicians' talks on both formal and informal occasions, although it occurred more frequently in the formal speeches, perhaps because the speakers wanted to ensure that their audiences understood what they meant by saying it in two languages. Following are some illustrative excerpts from their talks:

Parit's CS

> **meritocracy,** [pasaathai thii klay khiang thiisut khue khwaam samaat niyom]
> "**meritocracy**, in Thai the closest meaning is 'meritocracy'"

> [raw pen prachaathippatai thii bokphrong rue waa] **flawed democracy.**
> "We embrace flawed democracy, or as it is called **flawed democracy.**"

> **fake news** [rue khaaw thet]
> "**fake news** or fake news"

Preechaphol's CS

> [khaw koet khwaam mai manjai] **no confidence. No confidence** [ko tham hai mai koet kaan longthun.]
> "he has no confidence **no confidence. No confidence** demotes investment."

> [prathetthai tonnii kamlang klaai pen rat.] **Monocrat State** [ko khue ratraatchakaan]
> "Thailand is currently becoming a state. **Monocrat State** refers to a state of the government"

> [thaen thii ja pen] **People's Democratic State,** [ko khue rat khong prachachon]
> "instead of being a **People's Democratic State**, which means the state of the people"

> **dual-track economy** [khue kaan duulae setthakit chanthaanraak lae chanbon]
> "**dual-track economy**, that is, taking charge of economics at the root and upper level"

Thanathorn's CS

> **dual-track economy** [rue kaan phatthanaa prathetthai chai song maatrakaan]
> "**dual-track economy** or the development of the nation by using two measures"

Among the five politicians, 13.2% of their CS items were jargon and technical terms in their informal talks and 24.7% in their formal talks. These included words in their specialized fields and in any areas of science and technology (e.g., "cyber"), most of which do not have equivalent terms in Thai, necessitating CS into English. Some examples are conlab (constitution laboratory), bubble and seal, bubble and spread, dual-track economy, hyper loop, solar panels, sea wall, volatile organic compounds, Airbnb (community online based platform listing and renting local homes), app (application).

A few of the CS items (3.3% in the informal talks and 1.9% in the formal talks) were quotations, usually famous expressions and proverbs by figures or from sources that were well known. Some examples of such insertions from Varawut's interviews in Thai are, "see not with your eyes but with your heart," "listen not with your ears but with your mind," "speak not with your mouth but with your actions." In another interview, he referred to an English expression as follows:

[Tong yok phaasaa angkrit phuut nitnuengna khaw bok waa], **it's not the years in your life [that counts]** [maichaiwaa chiiwit nii luea weelaaa yuu thawrai], **but the life in your years** [ko khue wa chiiwit thii khun mii nai tae la pii thii khun yuu nan lae].

"Let me say it in English. It has been said that **it's not the years in your life [that counts]**. It is not about [the number of the years] you have left, **but the life in your years**, meaning that it's all about the life you have in each year you live."

As mentioned earlier, the remaining CS items categorized as "Others" includes loanwords, ad hoc current situational words such as COVID-19 terms, proper nouns, acronyms, and abbreviations. They accounted for 11.9% and 25.3% of CS units in the informal and formal talks respectively. Another observation that emerged from the analysis was that although Thai speakers regularly use the truncated forms of some English terms commonly used by native speakers, such as "app" for "application" and "spec" for "specification", we found only two truncations, neither of which occur among native speakers. Parit said [traap dai thii raw mai noid], in which "paranoid" was shortened to "-noid," and Varawut said [mii khwaam tist yuu nai tua], in which "artistic" was truncated to "-tist."

5. DISCUSSION

In this section, the findings are discussed in response to the two research questions. The first research question involves the linguistic units of CS produced by the young Thai politicians in formal and informal speeches. The findings indicate that in both speech styles, intrasentential CS dominated. Within the intrasentential CS categories, nouns occurred most frequently. Many previous studies on Thai-English CS among Thai speakers in various settings show similar results. For example, Janhom (2011) found that nouns constituted the most common CS category in health magazines. Narkkaew (2013) found similar results in a study of Thai-English CS in a popular TV show called "Thoey Thiaw Thai." Kannaovakun and Gunther (2003) examined several TV program genres and concluded that noun expressions dominated CS several TV program genres, which was most often found in sports programs. The politicians in the current study used CS in a variety of ways, including words, phrases, and idiomatic expressions. Their tendency to insert various English lexical items and phrases into their speech was similar to the practices of Thai scholars, who also mix in English words of various parts of speech, phrases and sentences (Dhithiwattana, 1996). In addressing current problems within the fields of technology, environment, global economy, COVID-19 pandemic, the digital revolution, government policies, and politics, the politicians freely code-switched, so CS between Thai and English has become a widely common feature in both academic and political communications (Kangkha & Mahadi, 2018). As the politicians in this study had all received higher education degrees in the UK, the US, and Australia, their ways of expressing ideas and communicating with others were not strikingly different from those of academics.

To answer the second research question, the strategies for which CS units have been employed, the politicians code-switched for convenience more than for other strategies, which reflected their proficiency with the English language. Their overseas experiences enabled them to balance their identities as both local and global citizens, so they could meet the expectations of both domestic and international communities. Varawut, Pita and Thanathorn participated in the international community as parents of children attending English-based international schools. All five politicians gave interviews in fluent English to the foreign media and hence positioned themselves on the international stage of politics. The ease with which they switched between Thai and English words indirectly signaled their status as members of a prestigious bilingual community as well as the global community (Bullock & Toribio, 2012). Unlike speakers who code-switched between Thai and English in other Thai settings, however, the politicians often immediately explained the meaning of an English word in Thai, referred to here as the repetition-for-clarification strategy. Additionally, they used quotations in English for rhetorical effect, a strategy that has not been reported in previous studies, suggesting that it is particular to English-speaking Thai politicians. Moreover, while the quotations put their advanced English skills on display, their immediate translation of them into Thai could serve to ensure that all audience members regardless of educational levels or English proficiency would understand the messages. The occurrences of these unique strategies demonstrate that these politicians were well aware of their speech and its impact on the multiple audiences who were attending to them. Thus, they took measures to simultaneously project their charisma with their advanced English ability and make sure that all members of diverse audiences understood their point by explaining it in Thai.

In this regard, the findings support Gadavanij's (2002a) assertion that awareness of multiple audiences is one of the factors that determines the politician's adoption of discursive strategy. In addition to

the repetition-for-clarification strategy, the politicians often incorporated jargon, academic and scientific technical terms, quotations, and idiomatic expressions into their utterances. These strategies deviate considerably from those found to be used by Thai speakers in other contexts. For example, Kannaovakun and Gunther (2003), Inta (2012), Papijit (2013), and Yutthayothin and Thippayasuparat (2018) reported English word uses that are derived from linguistic process such as truncation, conversion, or semantic shift, which Kannaovakun and Gunther viewed as nativized processes, by which English words become loanwords. While there are no well-defined boundaries among alterations, congruent lexicalizations of terms clearly distinguish between two separate languages (Treffers-Daller, 2009). In other instances of CS described in previous studies, foreign words seem to be on the continuum of the process of becoming loanwords. In contrast, the CS units found in the politicians' speech showed no signs of becoming loanwords.

Overall, the occurrence of CS produced by these five politicians is attributed to three main factors: topic, the presence (or absence) of a moderator, and the background of the audience, whereas the speech style, i.e., the formality and informality of the event, was sometimes found to be less significant. The three factors are in line with the findings of sociolinguistic approaches (Bell, 1984; Bullock & Toribio, 2012; Gardner-Chloros, 2009; Suraratdecha, 2003). In his early work, Gumperz (1982) proposed that interaction of speakers, external factors such as economic forces or power relations, and settings are the main influences on whether a speaker engages in CS. In so-called situational CS, the occurrences and types of CS depend on interlocutor, context, and topic. As an example of the influence of context, when Preechapol addressed a local audience, he carefully avoided using CS because he was aware of the background of the audience, who might not be able to understand English words. Illustrating the influence of topics, when being interviewed on television about his experiences in the UK, Parit used various English words, proper nouns, and acronyms. In particular, his CS patterns seemed to synchronize the patterns and frequency of his CS with those of his host.

Research on political discourse in other countries indicates that CS is an effective tool that politicians use to elicit empathy, establish solidarity, and gain support (Demby, 2013; Haid, 2016; Keller, 2020; Kementchedjhieva, 2016; Leith, 2019; Moody & Eslami, 2020; Sravani et al., 2021; Vargas, 2016; Wei, 2003). Political CS often occurs in countries where majorities and minorities speak different languages such as English–Spanish CS by American politicians. Our data, however, do not show this practice to be the case in Thai political discourse. In Thailand, English is spoken as a popular and prestigious foreign language (Luangthongkum, 2007). The ability to speak English proficiently implies that the speaker has an elite socio-economic background. By code-switching between Thai and English while using academic and sophisticated words and phrases, these five politicians were representing themselves as highly educated and socially influential, qualifications that could convince their audience to support them. According to Nusartlert (2017), linguistic units such as address terms, pronouns, rhetorical questions, particles, and repetitive words in political speeches have been identified as means to persuade as well as to gain solidarity with the audience. The findings of this study indicate that CS can also serve as a tool for politicians to impress their audiences with evidence of their superior intellectual qualifications and help them achieve the persuasive goal of their speeches.

According to the previous literature on political language outside Thailand, solidarity has been secured in situations in which politicians were able to speak the language of the audience, as in the case of US Senator Ted Cruz's ability to style-shift between a Standard American and a Southern dialect, with some alternations with Spanish (Vargas, 2016), or US Senator Tim Kaine's frequent CS between English and Spanish (Moody & Eslami, 2020). But CS can occasionally backfire, as in the case of US congresswoman Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, who was criticized by the press when she attempted to insert Black English into her speech at Al Sharpton's National Action Network (Keller, 2020; Leith, 2019). In contrast, based on the data analyzed in this study, there is no evidence to suggest that Thai audiences have reacted negatively to English-Thai CS in speeches, suggesting it plays a different role in Thai political contexts from the role CS plays outside Thailand. That is, while CS is implemented for solidarity in other countries, CS between English and Thai appears to be used as a tool to persuade Thai audiences of the speaker's advanced educational qualifications.

Given the positive attitude towards English-Thai CS among young people (Chairat, 2014; Inta, 2012), Thai politicians are able to code-switch between English and Thai without alienating their audiences, whatever their backgrounds. In fact, this linguistic behavior is accepted as normal in public rhetoric and carries no negative connotations. The politicians in this study were well aware of their speech styles as well as the various backgrounds of their diverse audiences. The repetition-for-clarification strategy, together with jargon/technical terms and quotations, devices which have not been previously acknowledged in Thai political discourse, were found to be used strategically by young English-speaking Thai politicians. Overall, mixing bits and pieces of English vocabulary into their public speeches was a tactic requiring little effort for these fluent English-speaking politicians in communicating with their diverse audiences. By cleverly

manipulating their linguistic abilities, they could simultaneously impress educated audiences with their advanced English skills, flatter middle-class audiences by acknowledging their level of inter- and intra-cultural communication abilities (Baker & Jarunthawatchai, 2017), and use the clarification strategy to ensure that less educated and lower English-proficient audiences could understand the message.

6. CONCLUSION

The present findings indicate that, unlike political discourse in other countries, CS is not primarily used as a tool to gain solidarity from the audience, but instead serves as a tool for English-speaking Thai politicians to impress audiences of various backgrounds. CS in these politicians' speeches was different from Thai-English CS in other contexts as it involves the deliberate selection of sophisticated English words to convey deep knowledgeability. These words are then translated to ensure their meanings were broadly understood. Thai-English CS can be seen as a foreign language skill that young politicians may intentionally cultivate to captivate their listeners. By incorporating English vocabulary and idioms into their rhetoric, they effectively garner acceptance, enhance their popularity, and foster loyal support.

REFERENCES

Baker, W., & Jarunthawatchai, W. (2017). English language policy in Thailand. *European Journal of Language Policy, 9*(1), 27–44.

Bell, A. (1984). Language style as audience design. *Language in Society, 13*(2), 145–204.

Boztepe, E. (2003). Issues in code-switching: Competing theories and models. *Studies in Applied Linguistics and TESOL,* 3(2), 1–27.

Bullock, B. E., & Toribio, A. J. (2012). *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching*. Cambridge University Press.

Chairat, P. (2014). English code-mixing and code-switching in Thai songs. *NIDA Journal of Language and Communication, 19*(22), 1–29.

Demby, G. (2013, April 8). How code-switching explains the world. *NPR*. https://www.npr.org/sections/codeswitch/2013/04/08/176064688/how-code-switching-explains-the-world

Dhithiwattana, N. (1996). *The mixing of English in Thai by lecturers of different disciplines at Kasetsart University* [Master's thesis, Chulalongkorn University]. Chulalongkorn University Intellectual Repository. https://cuir.car.chula.ac.th/handle/123456789/71662 [in Thai]

Gadavanij, S. (2002a). *Discursive strategies for political survival: A critical discourse analysis of Thai no confidence debates*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Leeds]. EThOS. https://ethos.bl.uk/Order Details.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.270747

Gadavanij, S. (2002b). Intertextuality as discourse strategy: The case of no-confidence debates in Thailand. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics, 9,* 35–55.

Gadavanij, S. (2014). The politics of denial: The case of PM Yingluck government. *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, *33*(1), 62–86.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (2009). *Code-switching*. Cambridge University Press.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan. (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics, Volume 3: Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.

Gumperz, J. J. (1976). *The sociolinguistic significance of conversational code-switching*. University of California.

Gumperz, J. J. (1982). Conversational codeswitching. In J. J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Discourse strategies* (pp. 59–99). Cambridge University Press.

Haid, J. (2016): "Yes we can! – Sí se puede!" Speaking the language of the masses. Codeswitching for creating togetherness with a foreign audience in political speeches. In K. Jungbluth & M. Fernández-Villanueva (Eds.), *Beyond language boundaries: Multimodal use in multilingual contexts* (pp. 221–234). De Gruyter.

Inta, P. (2012). The mixing of English in Thai magazines. *Phikanate Journal, 8*(1), 33–42. [in Thai]

Janhom, W. (2011). *English-Thai code-mixing in Thai health magazines*. [Master's thesis, Srinakharinwirot University]. http://thesis.swu.ac.th/swuthesis/Bus_Eng_Int_Com/Watcharee_J.pdf

Kangkha, P., & Mahadi, T. S. T. (2018). Code switching in Thai society: Four decades of research. *International Journal of Language, Literacy and Translation, 1*(1), 21–36.

Kannaovakun, P., & Gunther, A. C. (2003). The mixing of English and Thai in Thai television programs. *MANUSYA: Journal of Humanities, 6*(2), 66–80.

Keller, L. (2020). *"Tu me gustas, but do you like me?": Quantifying affective and political response to political code-switching* [Doctoral dissertation, Yale University]. Yale University. https://cogsci.yale.edu/sites/default/files/files/2020ThesisKELLER.pdf

Kementchedjhieva, Y. (2016). Code-switching as strategically employed in political discourse. *Lifespans and Styles, 2*(1), 3–9.

Khanitthanan, W. (1983). *Influences of foreign languages on Thai, a seminar report on Thai usage*. National Research Committee on Philosophy, and National Research Committee Office, Ministry of Science, Technology and Energy.

Kumtanit, S., & Srisakorn, P. (2016). Code-mixing between Thai and English in Thai printed media: A case study of the Thairath Newspaper. *KKU Research Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (Graduate Studies), 4*(2), 52–66.

Leith, S. (2019, April 11). When a politician uses linguistic fluidity, it can backfire. *Financial Times* https://www.ft.com/content/12c419d4-5ad2-11e9-840c-530737425559

Likhitphongsathorn, L., & Sappapan, P. (2013). Study of English code-mixing and code-switching in Thai pop songs. *FLLTCP Language Institute, 2*(1), 1494–1505.

Luangthongkum, T. (2007). The positions of non-Thai languages in Thailand. In L. H. Guan & L. Suryadinata (Eds.), *Language, nation and development in Southeast Asia* (pp. 181–194). Cambridge University Press.

Mantrasutra, S. (1982). *Seminar on Current Thai Usage*. Odean Store Press.

Moody, S., & Eslami, Z. R. (2020). Political discourse, code-switching, and ideology. *Russian Journal of Linguistics: Language, Culture and Ideology in Discursive Practices, 24*(2), 325–343.

Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for codeswitching: Evidence from Africa.* Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1997). Code-Switching. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 217–237). Blackwell Publishing.

Myers-Scotton, C. M., & Ury, W. (1977). Bilingual strategies: The social function of code-switching. *International Journal of Sociology of Language, 1997*(13), 5–20.

Narkkaew, N. (2013). *English code mixing in Thai: A case study in Thoey Thiaw Thai*. [Master's thesis, Silpakorn University]. Silpakorn University Repository. https://sure.su.ac.th/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/12922/fulltext.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y [in Thai]

Nilep, C. (2006). "Code switching" in sociocultural linguistics. *Colorado Research in Linguistics, 19*(1), 1–22.

Nusartlert, A. (2017). Political language in Thai and English: Findings and implications for society. *Journal of Mekong Societies, 3*(3), 57–75.

Papijit, W. (2013). Thai-English code-mixing in hormones the series] [Master's thesis, National Institute of Development Administration]. Library and Information Center. http://library1.nida.ac.th/termpaper6/lang/2013/20090.pdf [in Thai]

Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics, 18*(7–8), 581–681.

Rotcharoen, A. (2009). *The study of reprimanding language used by Thai politicians*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. Kasetsart University.

Sangpolsitha, W. (1981). *Knowledge of foreign languages in Thai*. Odean Store Press.

Sravani, D., Kameswari, L., & Mamidi R. (2021). Political discourse analysis: A case study of code mixing and code switching in political speeches. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on Computational Approaches to Linguistic Code-Switching* (pp. 1–5). Association for Computational Linguistics. https://aclanthology.org/2021.calcs-1.1/

Suraratdecha, S. (2003). Social and psychological factors in Thai student's code-switching. *MANUSYA: Journal of Humanities, 6*(1), 67–83.

Theamsomboon, S. (1998). Linguistic devices in politicians' responses in journalistic interviews [Master's thesis, Chulalongkorn University]. Chulalongkorn University Intellectual Repository. https://cuir.car.chula.ac.th/handle/123456789/11467 [in Thai]

Treeklangdorn, K. (2019, March 7–8). Thai political euphemism. In *The 2019 International Academic Research Conference in Zurich* [Paper presentation] (pp. 119–122). http://www.ijbts-journal.com/images/main_1366796758/LO19-1363%20Full%20paper%20-%20Kanchalika%20%20Treeklangdorn%20(1).pdf?mode=preview

Treffers-Daller, J. (2009). Code-switching and transfer: an exploration of similarities and differences. In B. E. Bullock & A. J. Toriio (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching* (pp. 58–74). Cambridge University Press.

Vargas, Y. (2016, April 29). Talk D.C. to me: Presidential code-switching. *USC Center on Public Diplomacy (CPD).* https://uscpublicdiplomacy.org/blog/talk-dc-me-presidential-code-switching

HASS Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences Studies

Vongkrajang, N. (2004). Thai politicians' face-saving strategies in answering questions. *Language and Linguistics, 22*(2), 23–45.

Wei, J. M. Y. (2003). Codeswitching in campaigning discourse: The case of Taiwanese president Chen Shui-bian. *Language and Linguistics, 4*(1), 139–165.

Yiamkhamnuan, J. (2011). The mixing of Thai and English: Communicative strategies in internet chat rooms. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences, 32*(3), 478–492.

Yutthayothin, W., & Thippayasuparat, N. (2018). A Study of Thai-English code-mixing in "Pentor", Thai sitcom television program. *Journal of Liberal Arts, Rangsit University, 14*(1), 153–174.