BRILL

Independence or Interdependence?: The Thai Self-Construal as Reflected by Linguistic Evidence

Natthaporn Panpothong
Associate Professor, Department of Thai/ Thaivithat Research Unit,
Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand
ntp1142@hotmail.com

Siriporn Phakdeephasook
Associate Professor, Department of Thai/ Thaivithat Research Unit,
Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand
spr1141@hotmail.com

Abstract

Self-construal can influence the ways people in distinct cultures think, perceive and interact with others. To date, scholars still present different arguments on the prominent self-construal of Thais. The present study aims at examining Thai linguistic data including proverbs, sayings, cultural key terms and interactional data in response to the question of whether Thai culture places emphasis on independent or interdependent perspectives of the self. The findings reveal that Thai sayings, proverbs and cultural key terms reflect both independent and interdependent self-construals. Yet, those that stress interdependency outnumber independency. As for interactional practices in daily exchanges, the usage of pronominal terms, final particles for (im) politeness and lexical variants marking interpersonal relationships make it mandatory for Thai speakers to pay attention to interpersonal relationships. Lastly, in task-based superior-subordinate conversations, collaborative and non-confrontational styles are preferred by Thai superiors. Their interactional style reflects features influenced by interdependent self-construal.

Keywords

interdependent self-construal – independent self-construal – the Thai self – linguistic evidence – cultural key terms – Thai interaction

1   Introduction

Coined by Markus and Kitayama (1991), the term 'self-construal' describes the way people understand and define themselves, especially the degree to which they perceive themselves as connected and separate from others. As proposed by the researchers, self-construals can be divided into two primary types – independent and interdependent. Based on this well-known theory, people with independent self-construal are likely to define themselves with reference to internal traits that are stable across situations. In contrast, those with interdependent self-construal perceive themselves not as separate from their social setting but as part of an encompassing interpersonal relationship.

The notion of self-construal is one of the most adopted constructs in studies on psychology and related fields (Cross et al. 2011). It is argued in previous works that self-construal can influence the ways people in distinct cultures think, perceive and interact with others. In linguistic and communication research, the notion is used as an underlying logic to account for cross-cultural differences in interactional style (Gudykunst et al. 1996; Kapoor et al. 2003; Fujii 2012). As observed by Kapoor et al. (2003), Indians who regard themselves as having more interdependent self-construals tend to prefer silence and indirect communication. Fujii (2012) notes that the American participants in her study are likely to express ideas directly and prefer a one-person-at-a-time style of interaction whereas Japanese participants prefer to put forth ideas mainly through question forms and frequently seek understanding and agreement from partners during interactions. According to Fujii, the fact that the two groups prefer different interactional styles is owing to the different ways they perceive and situate themselves in interaction.While the American self-construal is more independent, the Japanese self-construal is connected to others or interdependent.

As stated in Markus and Kitayama's seminal work (1991, 228), Thai culture is an example of a culture in which people are likely to have some version of an interdependent self. Nevertheless, not all scholars working on Thai culture agree with this proposal. Some argue that Thais have a strong sense of independence, and their individualistic behavior can be found in many aspects of daily life (e.g., Embree 1950; Komin 1991).

To date, scholars continue to present different arguments on the prominent self-construal of Thais. Most previous studies were conducted from the perspectives of social psychology and anthropology using data from interviews, questionnaires and psychological experiments. Little has been done from the linguistic viewpoint. The present study aims at examining Thai linguistic data in response to the question of whether Thai culture places emphasis on independent or interdependent perspectives of the self. The paper consists of 4 sections. Section 2 is an overview of previous studies on the Thai self. Section 3 presents theoretical perspectives and data. Section 4 presents an analysis of linguistic data and Section 5 is the conclusion.

2   Previous Studies – Different Views of the Thai Self

2.1   *Thais are Individualistic and Tend to Construe the Self as Independent*

In a pioneering work by Benedict (1943), Thai people are described as friendly, fun-loving, laid-back, self-reliant and individualistic. According to Embree (1950), Thai society is loosely structured as opposed to a tightly woven society. He also notes that Thai people do not have a strong sense of duty and obligation in social relationships whereas people in more tightly woven cultures such as the Vietnamese, Chinese and Japanese, emphasize the importance of observing rights and duties. As can be seen in daily life, Thais tend to act of their own will, not as a result of social constraints. Nevertheless, Bunnag (2010, 1) points out that it is not clearly stated in Embree (1950) whether the term "loosely structured" refers to the psychological traits of individual Thais, to the ease with which they change their social roles or to their antipathy to be cooperative with others. Even though Embree's claim has been criticized for being inaccurate and oversimplified, the view of Thai society as a loosely structured society appears to have inspired subsequent studies.

A well-known psychological study conducted by Suntaree Komin (1991) reinforces Embree's model to some extent. Based on data from two sets of national samples, Komin claims that Thai people are first and foremost ego-oriented and have a deep sense of independence. The individualistic behavior of Thais can be found in many aspects of daily life. The Thai expression /pen tua khɔ̌ːŋ tuaʔeːŋ/ or 'being independent – being oneself' reflects the outstanding Thai characteristic of being independent. However, Komin points out that individualism does not encompass all aspects of Western individualism, namely a sense of separate personal identity, self-actualization and moral reasoning. As further stated by Komin, Thais might have a gentle and calm front, but if the

self is offended, they can easily become angry and sometimes react violently. It should be noted that anger and frustration are considered to be aspects of ego-focused emotions related to those who have independent self-construals.

In a recent work by Yamklinfung and Nishio (1998), it is argued that Thais place high value on maintaining their individual freedom and autonomy. For the Thai, it is significant to be able to be oneself, to do things one's own way and to be free of obligation (Yamklinfung and Nishio 1998, 54). Similar to Komin (1991), Yamklinfung and Nishio (1998) also note that Thai individualism is not the same as Western individualism. While Western individualism emphasizes asserting one's rights and protecting one's interest against infringement, being individualistic in the Thai sense focuses on being free from controls by external powers.

2.2   *Thai Culture is Collectivistic and Thais Have Some Version of Interdependent Self-construals.*

Let us turn to the existing literature that presents a very different picture of Thai people. As pointed out by Markus and Kitayama (1991, 227–229), people with interdependent self-construals perceive themselves not as separate from the social setting but as part of encompassing interpersonal relationships. They are likely to think first and foremost about their roles in a relationship. In Markus and Kitayama's influential work, Thai culture is presented as an example of a culture in which people are likely to have some version of an interdependent self.

According to the cultural dimensions model proposed by Hofstede (2001), Thailand is categorized as a highly collectivist country with a low score of 20 on the individualism index. Despite being criticized for inappropriate sampling, Hofstede's theory has been widely cited in subsequent research focusing on business practices in Thailand. As proposed in business management research (Buriyameathagul 2013; Vathansri 2015), Thai people focus more on the group interest rather than an individual's needs. Similarly, in a cross-cultural study by Neff, Pisitsungkagarn and Hsieh (2008), Thailand is presented as a typical example of an interdependent culture where people place high value on interpersonal relationships and social conformity.

The Thai view of interdependent self-construal is somewhat related to the Buddhist concept of inter-being. Hitokoto, Takahashi and Kaewpijit (2014) claim that Buddhism, practiced by over 94% of the Thais, is the historical precedent for the notion of interdependent self-construal. The Buddhist teaching of *Paticca-samuppāda* or 'dependent origination' appears to have an influence upon the Thai view of self. According to this Buddhist concept, existence is seen as an interrelated flux of phenomenal events without any permanent,

independent existence of their own. Another cultural value that is evidently related to Thai interdependent behavior is /kreːŋcaj/ which is literally translated as 'fear of hearts'. Intachakra (2012) describes /kreːŋcaj/ as the principle of self-restraint and other-accommodation. By observing this principle, Thais are reluctant to impose upon others, are considerate of others' feelings and tend to value the needs of others above the needs of themselves.

To summarize thus far, previous works present different views of the Thai self. As pointed out by various anthropologists and psychologists, Thais have a deep sense of independence. The expression /pen tua khɔ̌ːŋ tuaʔeːŋ/ or 'being independent-being oneself' reflects one of the outstanding characteristics of Thai people. In other studies, Thai society is presented as a typical example of an interdependent culture. Thais tend to place high value on interpersonal relationships. Thus, it is yet undecided whether the Thai self-construal is independent or interdependent. There is also the possibiliy that may hold both independent and interdependent self-construals, with the salience of each depending on context. To shed further light on these issues, we shall look into some linguistic evidence which is rarely examined in the existing literature.

3 Theoretical Perspectives and Data

Within the field of pragmatics, Brown and Levinson's (1978; 1987) notion of face as the key motivating force underlying our interactional behavior has been influential on a vast amount of research. Yet, as argued by Ide, Hanks and Katagiri (2006), there are other motivating forces we should take into consideration when examining interactional behavior. According to some scholars (e.g., Markus and Kitayama 1991; Gudykunst et al. 1996; Hara and Kim 2004; Fujii 2012; etc.) self-construal – the way people perceive and situate themselves – is one of the key components that has influence upon our ways of interaction.

As proposed by Markus and Kitayama (1991), there are two major types of self-construals – independent and interdependent, and people from different backgrounds develop different versions of self-construals. Those who have independent self-construals tend to give priority to the individual's personal needs and goals. They define themselves with reference to their internal traits that are stable across various situations. In contrast, those who have interdependent self-construals define themselves in reference to others and tend to give priority to their social relationships. To be able to fit into a group is their major concern. Markus and Kitayama (1991) argue that self-construals play a significant role in cognition, emotion and social behavior.

As for the effect of self-construals on our interactional behavior, Kim (1995) and Kim et al. (1994; 1996) note that people in cultures where interdependent construal of the self is predominant tend to place a high value on concern for minimizing imposition, concern for avoiding damage to the hearer's feelings and concern for avoiding negative evaluation. In addition, Gudykunst et al. (1996), points out that the styles individuals use to interact with others vary across cultures and within cultures and are influenced by self-construals and values. Those who have a version of independent self-construal prefer low-context communication which involves the use of explicit and direct statements. On the contrary, those who have a version of interdependent self-construal tend to use implicit and indirect strategies which are features of high-context communication.

Following Markus and Kitayama (1991), Kim et al. (1994), and Gudykunst et al. (1996), this study maintains the assumption that there are two main types of self-construals, independent and interdependent, which have an influence upon our linguistic behavior. It is hypothesized that by investigating linguistic evidence in Thai, we might be able to indicate the Thai self-construals underlying them.

Goddard (2006) provides a long inventory of linguistic evidence that serve as indexes of our ways of thinking including cultural key words, proverbs and sayings, words for speech acts and genres, terms of address, interactional routines, discourse particles and interjections, etc. Nonetheless, it is beyond the scope of this paper to look at the entire list. The present study focuses its examination on three sets of data:

1. Sayings, proverbs and cultural key terms about self and interpersonal relations are examined to see whether their meaning reflects features of independent or interdependent self-construals. The data was collected from Wichitmatra (1998), The Royal Institute (2002), Klaysuban (2012), Amorntham (2013) and Satha-Anand and Boonyanate (1999).

2. Linguistic elements relating to interactional context in Thai daily conversations, namely Thai pronominal usage, final particles for (im)politeness and Thai lexical variants marking interpersonal relationship are examined from an interactional pragmatic perspective to see how they reflect the concept of self. Examples are drawn from personal observation of Thai daily conversations.

3. Interactional behaviors in task-based interaction are examined to determine whether they reflect features influenced by the interdependent self-construal. The data consisting of 10 teacher-student conversations is taken from the Thai dataset of Mister O Corpus. This study focuses its analysis on linguistic devices adopted by teachers who are superior. Their

interactional behaviors when proposing ideas and expressing disagreement are examined to see if they reflect concerns for the subordinates' feelings.

4   Analysis

4.1   *Thai Sayings, Proverbs and Cultural Key Terms*

Markus and Kitayama (1991, 224) cite the American proverb "The squeaky wheel gets grease" and the Japanese proverb "The nail that stands out gets pounded down" as pieces of linguistic evidence to support their claim that the independent self-construal is predominant in American culture while the interdependent self-construal is influential in Japanese culture. Correspondingly, Goddard (2006, 14–16) proposes that taking a closer look at sayings, proverbs and cultural key terms can allow us to understand the speaker's cultural worldview. Thus, let us first examine these linguistic items to see how they reflect the Thai view of the self.

4.1.1   Thai Cultural Expressions Reflecting Independent Self-construal

Findings reveal that there are several Thai expressions that reflect independent self-construal. Among these, one remarkable example is /pen tua khɔ̌:ŋ tuaʔe:ŋ/ 'being independent-being oneself.' The expression 'being independent-being oneself' is widely used in daily conversation with the positive connotation emphasizing that independence is a desirable personality trait. In addition, the sayings /ton pen thî:phîŋ hæ̀:ŋ ton/ 'it's one own self that one should depend on' and /tham ʔaraj ta:m caj khɨ: thaj thǽ:/ 'To do whatever one pleases is a real Thai' are noteworthy. The saying /ton pen thî:phîŋ hæ̀:ŋ ton/ 'it's one own self that one should depend on' is deeply related to the Theravada Buddhist teachings on self-reliance. Theravada Buddhism stresses the significance of self-reliance as a way for a Buddhist to attain *nirvana* or the ultimate deliverance (Astore; 2016). An individual must put forth her/his own effort to liberate her/himself from repeated rebirth in *saṃsāra* and achieve the state of ultimate liberation. Since Buddhism is the major religion in Thai society, this teaching and this saying appear to have a certain influence upon the Thai way of thinking. Lastly, the saying /tham ʔaraj ta:m caj khɨ: thaj thǽ:/ 'To do whatever one pleases is a real Thai' is often cited for explaining one of the outstanding characteristics of Thai people and justifying certain disorderly misbehavior. Nonetheless, it should also be noted that the expression is sometimes used with sarcastic intent towards those who are inconsiderate.

To summarize thus far, Thai has some widely-used expressions that stress the significance of self, self-worth, self-reliance and independency.

4.1.2   Thai Cultural Expressions Reflecting the Interdependent
           Self-construal

There are also several proverbs, sayings and cultural key terms that reflect the interdependent view of the self. These expressions can be categorized into two groups, namely 1) proverbs, sayings and cultural key terms stressing the concept of interdependency and social bonding, and 2) proverbs and cultural key terms emphasizing consideration and thoughtfulness towards others.

As for the first group, the notable examples stressing the concept of interdependency and social bonding include the proverb /ná:m phîŋ rɨa sǐa phîŋ pà:/ 'The necessity of water depends on the existence of boats. The survival of tigers is dependent upon the existence of the forest,' and the proverb /sǐa mi: phrɔ́ʔ pà: pòk pà: rók phrɔ́ʔ sǐa jaŋ/ 'Tigers can survive because the forest exists. The forest is abundant because the tigers are there.' These two proverbs reflect the Thai way of thinking that everything is interdependent and mutually supportive of each other.

Moreover, there exist a few proverbs and sayings about dependency with negative connotations. To illustrate, the saying /hǔa diaw krathiam lî:p/ which can be literally translated as 'a single withered garlic head' is frequently used with the contextual meaning 'being friendless is disadvantageous.' This metaphorical saying obviously represents a negative aspect of being independent. On the contrary, a related saying /sɔ̌:ŋ hǔa di:kwà: hǔa diaw/ 'two heads are better than one' indicates that interdependency is advantageous.

As for Thai cultural key terms emphasizing interdependency and social bonding, the terms /bunkhun/ 'debt of gratitude'; /phákphûak/ 'partisan'; and /thî:phɨ̂ŋ/ 'patron' are considered notable examples due to their widely use in daily interactions. The term /bunkhun/ 'debt of gratitude' refers to a psychological and social bonding between oneself and others who render her/him the needed help and favors. The favors and kindness result in gratitude and the emergence of a psychological and social bond between them (Komin 1990; Smuckarn 1985; Boonchai and Beeton 2015). These indebted (*bunkhun*) relationships in Thai society bring about strong social bonds in the vertical dimension (between patrons and clients) (Taylor 1997). The term /phákphûak/ 'partisan' stresses that being a part of a collective group is crucial for members of Thai society. If one is not accepted as a member of a group, one's own self will become meaningless (Pothisita 1999). Lastly, the term /thî:phɨ̂ŋ/ 'patron' is related to the patron-client relationship in Thai society (Pothisita 1999, Komin 1991). These cultural key terms reflect the perception of oneself as a part of

one's social relationship with others. Also, it can be seen that the interdependency and social bond in Thai culture are partly based on the concept of patronage and the debt of gratitude.

As for the second group, the proverbs and cultural key terms emphasizing considerateness and thoughtfulness indirectly reflect the influence of the interdependent self-construal. To give an example, the term /kreːŋcaj/ 'fear of heart' or 'self-restraint and other-accommodation' reflects the Thai principle of interaction stressing that one should give high priority to how another person feels or thinks. As pointed out by Intachakra (2012), /kreːŋcaj/ is a Thai notion of politeness that underlies the concern for the feeling of others. Likewise, the proverb /náːmkhùn jùː naj náːmsǎj jùː nɔ̀ːk/ 'keep the murky water inside, let the clear water out' stresses the role of self-control and attending to the feeling of others. Both the concept of /kreːŋcaj/ and the proverb indicate that norms of Thai interactions are related to the interdependent concept of self.

Let us now turn to a quantitative analysis to find out what type of the self is predominantly emphasized by proverbs and sayings in Thai culture. The findings reveal that 27 proverbs and sayings reflect the interdependent construal of the self while only 7 indicate the independent self-construal. The items related to the interdependent self can be categorized into three groups namely 1) those stressing the concept of interdependency and social bonding, 2) those emphasizing considerateness and thoughtfulness and 3) those stressing independency with negative connotations. The following table displays an overview of the analysis.

The proverbs and sayings related to the concepts of self-construal are listed below.

4.1.2.1 *Proverbs and sayings reflecting the concept of interdependent self-construal*

A.   Proverbs stressing the concept of interdependency and social bonding

- **On interdependency**

(1)   /náːm phîŋ rɨa sǎ phîŋ pàː/

The necessity of water depends on the existence of boats. The survival of tigers is dependent upon the existence of the forest.

(2)   /náːm phîŋ rɨa sǎ phîŋ pàː jâː phîŋ din/

The necessity of water depends on the existence of boats. The survival of tigers is dependent upon the existence of the forest. The existence of grass depends on that of earth.

(3) /khâːw phɨ̀ŋ naː pla: phɨ̀ŋ náːm/

The growth of rice depends on the existence of paddy fields; the survival of fish depends on the existence of water.

(4) /sǐa mi: phrɔ́ʔ pàː pòk pà: rók phrɔ́ʔ sǐa jaŋ/

Tigers can survive because the forest exists. The forest is abundant because the tigers are there.

(5) /rɨa kîa phaːj sǐa kîa pà: náːm kîa pla:/

Boat and paddle support each other. The relation between tigers and forest as well as that between water and fishes are in a similar vein.

(6) /pen rɨa jà: thíŋ thâː pen sǐa jà: thìŋ pàːjàj/

Boats and piers are concomitant. Tigers and forests are in the same vein.

- On social bonding and *bunkhun* (debt of gratitude) network

TABLE 1   Proverbs and sayings reflecting the concepts of self-construal in Thai

Proverbs and sayings reflecting the interdependent self		Proverbs and sayings reflecting the independent self	
Proverbs and sayings stressing the concept of interdependency and social bonding	20	Proverbs and sayings related to the concept of independent self-construal	7
– On interdependency	[6]		
– On social bonding or *bunkhun* network	[14]		
Proverbs and sayings emphasizing considerateness and thoughtfulness	3		
Proverbs and sayings stressing independency with negative connotations	4		
Total	27	Total	7

(1) /khâː phîŋ câːw bàːw phîŋ naːj/

Servants depend on their master. Retainers depend on their lords.

(2) /mæːːw phîŋ phráʔ/

Cats depend on monks.

(3) /khâː kàw tàw líaŋ/

Slaves since childhood. (Old servants who have been brought up by their masters.)

(4) /jùː bâːn thân jàː nîŋ duːdaːj pân wua pân khwaːj hâj lûːk thân lên/

Earn one's keep.

(5) /kin bon rɨan khîː rót bon lǎŋkhaː/

Betray the one who feeds you. (Don't bite the hand that feeds you.)

(6) /ʔaːsǎː cáːw con tua taːj ʔaːsǎː naːj hâj phɔː ræːŋ/

Serve your lord till you die. Serve your master to the utmost.

(7) /khâː sɔ̌ːŋ câːw bàːw sɔ̌ːŋ naːj/

A servant of two masters. (No man can serve two masters.)

(8) /kæːŋ cɨ̀ːt cɨŋ rúː khun klɨa/

You never miss the salt till you try the bland soup. (You never miss the water till the well runs dry.)

(9) /khâːw dæːŋ kæːŋ rɔ́ːn/

Rice and curry. Debt of gratitude. (Don't bite the hand that feeds you.)

(10) /nók ráj máːj hòːt máːj rôm nók càp/

Birds leave rotten trees for healthy ones.

(11) /rômphoː rômsaj/

Being protectors.

(12) /thìːp hǔa rɨa sòŋ/

To disregard one's benefactor.

(13) /thɔːraphiː/

To be ungrateful to one's parents.

(14) /sìt khít láːŋ khruː/

To be ungrateful to one's mentor

B. Proverbs and sayings emphasizing consideration and thoughtfulness

    (1) /bua mâj hâj chám ná:m mâj hâj khùn/

        Neither let a lotus get bruised nor let water get turbid. (To think before you speak and to speak tactfully to satisfy both parties.)

    (2) /ʔaw caj khǎw ma: sàj caj raw/

        To be considerate.

    (3) /ná:m khùn jù: naj ná:m sǎj jù: nɔ̂:k/

        Keep the murky water inside, let the clear water out.

C. Proverbs stressing independency with negative connotation

    (1) /hǔa diaw krathiam lî:p/

        A single withered garlic head. (Being friendless is disadvantageous.)

    (2) /sɔ̌:ŋ hǔa di:kwâ: hǔa diaw/

        Two heads are better than one. (Interdependency is advantageous.)

    (3) /mǎ: hǔa nâw/

        A social outcast. (A bad penny)

    (4) /má:j nɔ̂:k kɔ:/

        A black sheep.

4.1.2.2. Proverbs related to the concept of independent self-construal

(1) /châ:t sǐa càp nɨ́a kin ʔe:ŋ/

    Tigers catch their own meat.

(2) /jɨ:n dûaj lamkhɛ̌:ŋ tuaʔe:ŋ/

    To stand on one's own feet.

(3) /phɨ̂ŋ la:mkhɛ̌:ŋ tuaʔe:ŋ/

    To rely on one's own feet.

(4) /jà: jɨ:m camù:k khonʔɨ̀:n hǎ:jcaj/

    Do not borrow another person's nose to breathe.

(5) /tua khraj tua man/

    Every man for himself.

(6) /pen tua khɔ̌:ŋ tuaʔe:ŋ/

    Be yourself. (To be self-assured.)

(7)   /ton pen thîːphɨ̂ŋ hɛ̀ːŋ ton/

          To rely on one's own self. (To be self-reliant.)

To sum up, Thai proverbs, sayings and key cultural terms reflect both the independent and the interdependent construals of the self. Nonetheless, it is evident that those stressing interdependency and attending to other people's feelings clearly outnumber those reflecting independency.

4.2   *Linguistic Elements Relating to Interactional Context in Daily Thai Conversations*

Some linguistic elements in daily Thai conversation are determined by components of interactional context, for instance, the gender, age and social status of the participants, relationship between the speaker and the hearer, degree of formality, etc. These linguistic elements include Thai pronominal usage, final particles for (im)politeness and lexical variants marking interpersonal relationship. The principles governing the use of these elements make it mandatory for Thai speakers to pay attention to the context of interaction, particularly the interpersonal relationship between the speaker and the hearer. In order to select appropriate choices of pronouns, (im)politeness final particles and lexical variants for an on-going conversation, one has to take into account the identities of her/himself and the other party and their relationship. To put it another way, Thai speakers cannot ignore the co-existence of themselves and others. Thus, the use of these elements in Thai obviously reflects the predominance of interdependent construal of the self in Thai culture. Let us examine how these elements are used in everyday interaction.

4.2.1   Thai Pronominal Usage

The Thai pronominal system is complex. An appropriate use of personal pronouns or pronominal terms in Thai is contingent on the context, particularly the interpersonal relationship between the speaker and the hearer. In Thai, it cannot be appropriately specified which pronominal terms should be used in a conversation unless the relationship between the participants is taken into consideration.

   In English, the pronoun "I" serves as the first-person singular pronoun in most, if not all, cases. But in Thai, as observed in previous works (e.g., Palakornkul 1975, Bhandhumedha 1998, Hongladarom 2009), the pronominal system is much more complicated since there are several terms equivalent to "I." Let us provide some of the examples for those who are not familiar with Thai.

/chǎn/	(female speaker; informal),
/dìchǎn/	(female speaker; formal)
/nǔ:/	(female speaker; intimacy or the hearer is of higher status)
/khâ:pacâ:w/	(female or male speaker; formal)
/ku:/	(female or male speaker; vulgar)
/phî:/	(female or male speaker; kinship term meaning 'an elder sister or brother')
/nɔ́:ŋ/	(female or male speaker; kinship term meaning 'a younger brother or sister')
/phɔ̂:/	(male speaker; kinship term meaning 'a father')
/mɛ̂:/	(female speaker; kinship term meaning 'a mother')
/khru:/	(female or male speaker; occupation term meaning 'a teacher')
/mɔ̌:/	(female or male speaker; occupation term meaning 'a doctor')
/ʔà:ttama:/	(male speaker; the term to be used by a Buddhist monk)
/nɔ́:j/	(female or male speaker; a nickname, Noi)
/sǒmcha:j/	(male speaker; a personal first name, Somchai)

Likewise, there are also several pronominal terms equivalent to "you" depending on social identity and the role relation between the participants. For example,

/thân/	(female or male hearer; formal; the hearer is of higher status)
/khun/	(female or male hearer; formal)
/thə:/	(female hearer; intimate)
/kæ:/	(female or male hearer; informal)
/mɨŋ/	(female or male hearer; vulgar)
/phî:/	(female or male hearer; a kinship term meaning 'an elder sister or brother')
/nɔ́:ŋ/	(female or male speaker; a kinship term meaning 'younger brother orsister')
/phɔ̂:/	(male hearer; a kinship term meaning 'a father')
/mɛ̂:/	(female hearer; a kinship term meaning 'a mother')

/khru:/	(female or male hearer; an occupational term meaning 'a teacher')
/ mɔ̌:/	(female or male hearer; occupational term meaning 'a doctor')
/phráʔkhun-câ:w/	(male hearer; the term to be used for addressing a Buddhist monk)
/lǔaŋphɔ̂:/	(male hearer; informal; a term to be used for addressing a Buddhist monk)
/jo:m/	(female or male hearer; a term used by a Buddhist monk for addressing a layperson)
/sǐːka:/	(female hearer; a term used by a Buddhist monk for address-ing a female layperson)
/nɔ́:j/	(female or male hearer; a nickname, Noi)
/sǒmcha:j/	(male hearer; a personal first name, Somchai).

Bhandhumedha (1998) insightfully points out that the Thai pronominal system reflects the Thai view of an individual as a social being. That is, pro-nominal terms in Thai mark not only the role of the individual in an ongoing interaction but also the social identity of that person. Furthermore, the use of Thai pronominal terms is dynamic and context-dependent, as observed by Hongladarom (2009). For instance, when a female teacher talks to her student, it is most likely that she will refer to herself by the term / khru:/ 'teacher' in order to mark her social status. On the other hand, when she speaks with her colleague, she may switch to refer to herself by another first-person pronoun that fits their relationship. In the situation in which she talks to her supervi-sor, she may use / nǔː/ 'I-- female speaker; intimacy or the hearer is of higher status' to refer to herself in order to lower herself and to show recognition to the supervisor's status. Moreover, kinship terms can also be used as pronomi-nal terms. It is normal for Thai people to extend the usage of kinship terms to address those who are not their own relatives. Vongvipanond (1994) conceptu-alizes this practice by using the term countless / yâ:t/ 'countless relatives.'

The above-mentioned context-dependent and dynamic nature of pronom-inal usage in Thai interaction entails that to communicate in an appropriate manner Thai speakers must constantly take into account the relationship between themselves and the hearer. Iwasaki and Horie (2000, 524) corre-spondingly point out that "the 1st and 2nd person pronouns in languages that have more than one form of these pronouns (such as Thai) index the partic-ipants' concern for their mutual social relationship." This is remarkably con-gruent with the notion of interdependent self. As for the concept of countless

/ yâːt/ 'countless relatives,' it is argued that the practice of extending the usage of kinship terms to others who are not one's own relative clearly demonstrates the interconnectedness between oneself and others in Thai culture.

4.2.2 Thai Final Particles for (Im)politeness

Final particles in Thai can be adopted to serve several semantic and pragmatic functions. Cooke (1989, 5) categorizes the final particles based on their functions into four types, namely those signaling speaker-addressee relationships, those calling for a response from the addressee, those signaling the speaker's response to the verbal or situational context and those signaling the contextual orientation of the utterance in question. The first type of final particle is related to the Thai view of self. These particles include /kháʔ/, /khàʔ/ (female, polite, respectful, formal); /khráp/ (male, polite, respectful, formal), /câʔ/ (female, polite, informal), /wáʔ/ (neutral, intimacy, informal, impolite). It can be seen that the Thai final particles for im/politeness are used to mark not only politeness but also the gender of the speaker, the degree of intimacy between the interlocutors and the level of formality (Peyasantiwong 1981). To appropriately use these final particles, the speaker must pay attention to the relationship between the participants and the degree of formality of the speech event.

Even a small final particle used in daily interaction can indicate the level of interpersonal relationship. The following exchange between a senior professor and a junior lecturer serves as a remarkable illustration. The two are not only colleagues, but the junior lecturer was also previously a student of the senior professor. Hence, the social ties between them are quite strong. When they interact with each other, the junior lecturer usually adopts kháʔ/ or /khàʔ/-- the respectful and formal forms while the senior professor adopts /cáʔ/ or /câʔ/ -- the intimate and informal forms in return to show caring and intimacy. However, it happened that one day the senior professor greeted the junior by saying /sawàtdi: khàʔ/ 'Good morning' – a greeting ending with the formal form instead of /câʔ/ as she normally did. Soon after the senior professor had turned away, the junior lecturer realized that she might have done something wrong and their social bond was damaged for some reason. Normally, the senior professor would say /sawàtdi: câʔ/ – a greeting with the informal and intimate form of particle. That the senior lecturer switched to use the formal form of final particle signals distance and coldness.

4.2.3 Thai Lexical Variants That Mark Interpersonal Relationship

Many Thai words not only encompass lexical meaning but also mark the degree of formality and interpersonal relationship of the participants in a speech event. To illustrate, the words /sǐːsàʔ/, /hǔa/, and /kabaːn/ all mean 'head' but

mark different levels of formality and interpersonal relationship. The term /sǐːsàʔ/ is used to communicate with the hearer who is of higher status in formal interaction while /hǔa/ is more informal. As for /kabaːn/, it is considered vulgar and is only used when the other party is of equal or of lower status.

To further elaborate, there are several utterances in Thai equivalent to "What would you like to eat?" in English. In order to select an appropriate utterance for a speech event, the speaker must take into account the interpersonal relationship and degree of formality. The following are some examples.

Example 1: A man asks a Buddhist monk what he would like to eat.
lǔaŋphɔ̂ː càʔ chǎn ʔaraj khɔ̌ːráp (S: a man; H: a Buddhist monk; R: formal)

lǔaŋphɔ̂ː	càʔ	chǎn	ʔaraj	khɔ̌ːráp
you [a Buddhist monk]	will	to eat [term for a Buddhist monk]	what	*khawrap*-FP [male speaker; polite+formal]

'what would you like to eat?'

Example 2: A female waitress in a luxury restaurant asks a customer what she would like to eat.
khunphûːjǐŋ càʔ ráppràthaːn ʔaraj kháʔ? (S: a female waitress; H: a customer; R: formal)

khunphûːjǐŋ	càʔ	ráppràthaːn	ʔaraj	kháʔ
you [female hearer; polite, deference, formal]	will	to eat [polite; formal]	what	*kha*-FP [female speaker; polite; formal]

'what would you like to eat, ma'am?'

Example 3: A female student asks her teacher in an informal context what she would like to eat.
ʔaːcaːn càʔ thaːn ʔaraj kháʔ? (S: a female student; H: a teacher; R: informal)

ʔaːcaːn	càʔ	thaːn	ʔaraj kháʔ
You [occupational term -- a lecture]	will	to eat [polite, informal]	what *kha*-FP [female speaker; polite; formal]

'what would you like to eat?'

Example 4: A woman asks her friend in an informal context what she would like to eat.

thə: càʔ kin ʔaraj cáʔ (S: a female friend; H: a female friend; R: informal)

thə:	càʔ	kin	ʔaraj	cáʔ
you [polite; informal]	will	to eat [polite; informal]	what	ca-FP [female speaker; intimate, informal]

'what would you like to eat?'

Example 5: A woman asks her close friend what she would like to eat.

kæ: càʔ kin ʔaraj wáʔ (S: a friend; H: a friend; R: intimate)

kæ:	càʔ	kin	ʔaraj	wáʔ
you [impolite; informal]	will	to eat [polite; informal]	what	wa-FP [intimate; vulgar]

'what would you like to eat?'

Example 6: A man/woman asks her/his close friend in a casual context what s/he would like to eat.

mɨŋ càʔ dɛ̀:k ʔaraj wáʔ (S: a close friend; H: a close friend: R: intimate, vulgar)

mɨŋ	càʔ	dɛ̀:k	ʔaraj	wáʔ
You [vulgar]	will	to eat [vulgar]	what	wa-FP [intimate; vulgar]

'what would you like to eat?'

Table 2 provides an overall picture of the lexical variants presented in the examples above.

Thai speakers need to constantly pay attention to the context and the relationship between themselves and the hearer in order to select appropriate lexical variants for an ongoing interaction. This interactional practice indicates that Thai speakers must be aware of the co-existence between themselves and other participants.

Likewise, Iwasaki and Horie (2000) also point out that Thai speakers must constantly pay attention to the components of an ongoing interactional context, be it identity of the interactants, relationship of the participants, or level of formality, in order to select the appropriate register for the current conversation. In most cases, the components of an interactional context are clear,

TABLE 2: Examples of Thai lexical variants marking interpersonal relationships

Speaker	Hearer	Degree of formality	YOU	EAT	Final particle
a man	a Buddhist monk	formal	lǔaŋphɔ̂:	chǎn	khɔ̌:ráp
a female waitress	a female customer	formal	khun-phû:jǐŋ	ráp-pràtha:n	kháʔ
a female student	a teacher	informal	ʔa:ca:n	tha:n	kháʔ
a female friend	a female friend	informal	thə:	kin	cáʔ
a friend	a friend	intimate	kæ:	kin	wáʔ
a close friend	a close friend	intimate, vulgar	mɨŋ	dæ̀:k	wáʔ

and this enables a competent Thai speaker to properly adopt the available pre-defined set of devices to fit such context. However, a speaker may encounter a situation in which the components of the interactional context are unclear which causes certain difficulties for the interlocutors in handling such an ambiguous interaction. In such cases, the speaker must work out on her/his own to figure out the middle ground register and select alternative choices for the interaction.

As we have seen, the use of the three elements in Thai verbal interaction appears to serve as evidence to support the argument that the interdependent self-construal is salient in Thai.

4.3   *Interactional Behaviors in Task-based Interaction from the Thai Dataset of Mister O Corpus*

As proposed by Kim et al.(1994; 1996), and Kim (1995; 2004; 2017), people in cultures where interdependent construal of the self is predominant tend to place high value on concern for minimizing imposition, concern for avoiding damage to the hearer's feelings and concern for avoiding negative evaluation.

In this study, we investigated teacher-student task-based interaction from the Thai dataset of Mr. O Corpus. The participants were university lecturers and undergraduate students. All were female. They were asked to arrange

fifteen picture cards to make a coherent story. In Thai culture where teachers are powerful and highly respected, teacher-student interaction is considered a notable representation of superior-subordinate discourse. The analysis focuses on interactional devices adopted by Thai teachers when proposing ideas and showing disagreement to see how those of higher status in Thai culture interact with their subordinates.

The findings reveal that in all ten pairs, it was the teachers who took control of the verbal exchange. Interestingly, teachers appear to prefer indirect ways of control which enable them to simultaneously seek agreement, minimize imposition and maintain smooth interpersonal connection with their students. There were three devices frequently used by Thai teachers.

First, to minimize imposition in proposing ideas, Thai teachers preferred question forms and mitigated forms to declarative statements. The repeated use of /châjmaj/ and /châjrǐ:plà:w/ by Thai teachers in this study indicates that they prefer to have student's consent at each step during the task of arranging cards and co-constructing a story. In addition, they frequently use the Wh-questions /wâ:ŋaj/ or /ʔawŋaj/ 'What do you think?' to stimulate discussion. Instead of giving orders, Thai teachers achieve control of the interaction in a subtle manner. By using question forms and mitigated forms to propose ideas as well as using stimulating questions, teachers take control of the interaction in a less imposing and more hearer-oriented manner.

The second strategy is using /raw/ or the inclusive 'we' instead of / khru:/ 'teacher' as the first-person pronoun while working on the task with their student to evoke a sense of togetherness. As observed by Palakornkul (1975), almost all Thai teachers use the occupation term /khru:/ 'teacher' for self-reference when speaking to students. But in the task-based discourse examined here, nine out of ten teachers adopted /raw/ or the inclusive *we* in proposing ideas. As noted in several studies (Brown and Gilman 1960; Brozin 2010; Hakansson 2012), the inclusive *we* can be used as a strategy to evoke solidarity. The choice of the inclusive *we* made by Thai teachers appears to evoke a sense of togetherness and reduce the gap between superiors and subordinates.

Lastly, Thai teachers used expressions such as /ʔéʔ/ 'Uhm,' /ʔà:tcàʔ/ 'maybe,' and /ba:ŋthi:/ 'perhaps' to show uncertainty and hesitation. Both teachers and students show hesitation and uncertainty in proposing ideas. Yet, it is the teachers who adopt the device more frequently. It is found that Thai teachers sometimes show hesitation and ask their students to provide suggestions. By showing uncertainty, teachers seem to propose ideas and show disagreement in a less imposing manner. Furthermore, the device is also used to stimulate discussion.

Based on the strategies repeatedly adopted, it is evident that the Thai teachers in this study preferred the indirect way of control while working on a task with their students. The fact that they preferred to guide their students in a subtle way and asked for consent from time to time indicates their concerns for minimizing imposition and avoiding damage to the hearer's feelings even though they are of a higher status. As proposed by Kim et al. (1994; 1996) and Kim (1995; 2004; 2017), concern for minimizing imposition and concern for avoiding damage to the hearer's feelings are conversational constraints observed by those with interdependent self-construal.

Even though the corpus size of Mister O data is considered adequate in pragmatic research (e.g., Fujii 2012; Kim 2014; etc.), the findings in this study might be limited to the group examined. Further research using more samples is required to get more widely generalizable results.

5   Conclusion

This study examines Thai proverbs, sayings, cultural key terms and interactional practices in order to see which type of the self is predominant in Thai culture. Most linguistic evidence seems to support Markus and Kitayama's (1991, 228) proposal that Thai is one of the cultures in which people are likely to have the interdependent construal of the self. The findings reveal that Thai proverbs, sayings, and cultural key terms reflect both the independent and interdependent construals of the self. Yet, those that stress interdependency and attend to other people's feelings clearly outnumber those in the other group. As for the interactional practices in daily exchange, the use of pronominal terms, final particles for (im)politeness and lexical variants marking interpersonal relationship make it mandatory for the Thai speakers to pay attention to the context of interaction, particularly the interpersonal relationship. Lastly, in task-based superior-subordinate conversation, the less-imposing and hearer-oriented interactional devices which are characteristics of collaborative and non-confrontational styles are preferred by Thai participants. Thai speakers' concerns for minimizing imposition and avoiding damage to the hearer's feelings are conversational constraints observed by people with the interdependent self-construal (Kim 1995, 2017). Nonetheless, results from the task-based interaction might not be completely generalizable to other social groups of Thais. Further research using conversational data from various social groups is required in order to confirm the findings in this study.

A crucial question that arises is: How can we explain the existing linguistic evidence that stresses the values related to the independent construal of the self? It is argued in this study that both the interdependent self-construal and the independent self-construal co-exist in Thai culture. As explained by Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988), individualism and collectivism exist in all cultures, but one pattern tends to be predominant.

As for Thai culture, the interdependent self-construal appears to be prominent in most of the contexts. Thais define themselves with reference to others, prefer to be a part of collective groups and opt for an indirect and less-imposing style when interacting to maintain smooth interpersonal relationships. Yet, in a certain context, a version of independent self-construal might be more salient. Thais prefer to be unrestrained and sometimes tend to do things in their own ways as demonstrated by the sayings /tham ʔaraj taːm caj khɨ̀ː thaj thɛ́ː/ 'To do whatever one pleases is a real Thai' and /pen tua khɔ̌ːŋ tuaʔeːŋ/ 'being independent-- being oneself.'

While previous works in cultural psychology and anthropology propose different views of the Thai self, the findings in the present study based on linguistic evidence reveal that the interdependent self-construal is more predominant.

Acknowledgements

References

Amorntham, Udomporn. 2013. *Samnuan Thai Chabap Jat Muatmoo* [Thai sayings: Categorized collection]. Bangkok: Saengdao Publishing. (in Thai)

Astore, Rocco A. 2016. Understanding Nirvana in Theravada and Mahayana Buddhism: In Support of Nagarjuna's Mahayana Perspective. *Inquiries Journal/Student Pulse* 8 (02), http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/a?id=1370

Benedict, Ruth. 1943. *Thai Culture and Behavior: An Unpublished War-time Study Dated September, 1943*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University.

Bandhumedha, Navavan. 1998. "Thai Views of Man as A Social Being." In *Traditional and Changing Thai World View*, edited by Amara Pongsapich, 103–129. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Press.

Boonchai, Chantinee, and Robert Beeton. 2015. "Sustainable Development in the Asian Century: An Inquiry of Its Understanding in Phuket, Thailand." *Sustainable Development* 24, no. 2: 109–123. DOI: 10.1002/sd.1612.

Bunnag, Ratanan. 2010. "*Modeling and Analysis of Demand by Malysian and Japanese Tourists to Thailand*." PhD thesis, Chiang Mai University.

Buriyameathagul, Kumpol, 2013. "Characteristics of Culture in Thai Society and Virtual Communities." *Silpakorn University Journal of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts* 13, no. 2: 207–270.

Cooke, Joseph R. 1989. " Thai Sentence Particles: Forms, Meanings, and Formal-semantic Variations." In *Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics No.12, Thai Sentence Particles and Other Topics*: 1–90. Pacific Linguistics, the Australian National University.

Cross, Susan, Erin Hardin, and Berna Gercek-Swing. 2011. "The What, How, Why, and Where of Self-Construal." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 15: 142–79. 10.1177/1088868310373752.

Embree, John F. 1950. "Thailand – A Loosely Structured Social System." *American Anthropologist*, New Series, 52, no. 2 (1950): 181–93. http://www.jstor.org/stable/664920.

Fujii, Yoko. 2012. "Differences of Situating Self in the Place/Ba of Interaction between the Japanese and American English Speakers." *Journal of Pragmatics* 44, no. 5: 636–662.

Goddard, Cliff. 2006. "Ethnopragmatics: A New Paradigm." In *Ethnopragmatics: Understanding Discourse in Cultural Context*, edited by Cliff Goddard, 1–30. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Gudykunst, William. B., Yuko Matsumoto, Stella Ting-Toomey, Tsukasa Nishida, Kwangsu Kim, and Sam Heyman. 1996. "The Influence of Cultural Individualism-Collectivism, Self-construals, and Individual Values on Communication Styles Across Cultures." *Human Communication Research* 22, no. 4 (June 1996): 510–543. doi: 10.1111/j.1468–2958.1996.tb00377.x

Gudykunst, William B., and Stella Ting-Toomey. 1988. "Culture and Affective Communication*." American Behavioral Scientist* 31, no. 3 (January 1988): 384–400. https ://doi.org/10.1177/000276488031003009.

Hara, Kazuya, and Min-Sun Kim. 2004. "The Effect of Self-construals on Conversational Indirectness." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 28, no. 1: 1–18. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2003.12.005

Hitokoto, Hidefum, Yoshiaki Takahashi, and Juthamas Kaewpijit. 2014. "Happiness in Thailand: Variation between Urban and Rural Regions." *Psychologia* 57: 229–244. https://doi.org/10.2117/psysoc.2014.229

Hofstede, Geert. 2001. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations across Nation*s. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hongladarom, Krisdawan. 2009. "Indexicality in Thai and in Tibetan: Implications for a Buddhism grounded approach." *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, no.1: 47–59.

Intachakra, Songthama. 2012. "Politeness Motivated by the 'Heart' and 'Binary Rationality' in Thai Culture." *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 619–635. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.07.016.

Iwasaki, Shoichi, and Preeya Ingkapirom Horie. 2000. "Creating Speech Register in Thai Conversation." *Language in Society* 29, no. 4: 519–554. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500004024.

Kapoor, Suraj, Patrick Hughes, John Baldwin, and Janet Blue. 2003. "The Relationship of Individualism–Collectivism and Self-construals to Communication Styles in India and the United States." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 27: 683–700. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2003.08.002.

Kim, Min-Sun. 1995. "Toward a Theory of Conversational Constraints." In *Intercultural Communication Theory*, edited by Richard L. Wiseman, 148–169. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Kim, Min-Sun. 2004. "Culture-Based Conversational Constraints Theory: Individual- and Culture-Level Analyses." In *Theorizing about Intercultural Communication*, edited by William B. Gudykunst, 93–117. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kim, Min-Sun. 2017. "Culture-Based Conversational Constraints Theory." In *The International Encyclopedia of Intercultural Communication*, edited by Young Yun Kim, 1–10. Malden, MA: Wiley & Sons. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118783665.ieicc0102.

Kim, Min-Sun, John E. Hunter, Akira Miyahara, Ann-Marie Horvath, Mary Bresnahan, and Hei-Jin Yoon. 1996. "Individual- vs. Culture-level Dimensions of Individualism and Collectivism: Effects on Preferred Conversation Style." *Communication Monographs* 63, (1996): 29–49. DOI: 10.1080/03637759609376373

Kim, Min-Sun, William F. Sharkey, and Theodore M. Singelis. 1994. "The Relationships between Individuals' Self-construals and Perceived Importance of Interactive Constraints." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 18: 117–140. doi:10.1016/0147-1767(94)90008-6.

Kim, Myung-Hee. 2014. "Why Self-deprecating? Achieving 'Oneness' in Conversation." *Journal of Pragmatics* 69 (2014): 82–98. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2014.03.004

Klaysuban, Prathueng. 2012. *Samnuan Thai* [Thai sayings]. Bangkok: P.S. Patthana Publishing. (in Thai)

Komin, Suntharee. 1991. *Psychology of the Thai People: Values and Behavioral Patterns*. Bangkok: Research Center, National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA)

Markus, Hazel Rose, and Shinobu Kitayama. 1991. "Culture and the Self: Implications for Cognition, Emotion, and Motivation." *Psychological Review* 98 (2): 224–253. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224

Neff, Kristin D., Kullaya Pisitsungkagarn, and Ya-Ping Hsieh. 2008. "Self-Compassion and Self-Construal in the United States, Thailand, and Taiwan." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 39, no. 3 (May 2008): 267–85. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022108314544.

Palakornkul, Angkab. 1975. "A Sociolinguistic Study of Pronominal Usage in Spoken Bangkok Thai." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 5: 11–42.

Peyasantiwong, Patcharin. 1981. "A Study of Final Particles in Conversational Thai." PhD diss. University of Michigan.

Podhisita, Chai,1999. "Phakphuak (partisan)." In *Kham:Rongroy Khwamkhit Khwam-chue Thai* [Words:Traces of Thai Thoughts and Beliefs], edited by Suwanna Satha-Anant and Nuengnoi Boonyanet, 172–179. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Press. (in Thai).

Royal Institute. 2005. *Phasit Samnuan Khamphungphoey Thai Chabap Ratchabundit* [The Royal Institute Collection of Thai Proverbs and Sayings]. 12th ed. Bangkok: Office of the Royal Institute. (in Thai)

Smuckarn, Snit. 1985. "Thai Peasant World View." In *Traditional and Changing World View*, edited by Amara Pongsapich, 134–146. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Social Research Institute. (in Thai)

Satha-Anand, Suwanna and Nuengnoi Boonyanate. 1999. *Kham: Rongroy Khwamkhit Khwamchue Thai* (Words: Traces of Thai Thoughts and Beliefs); 3rd ed. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Press. (in Thai)

Taylor, Steve. 1997. Patron Client Relationships and The Challenge for the Thai Church. Master of Christian Studies thesis, Discipleship Training Centre Singapore.

Vathansri, Maeteevat. 2015. *The Thai Cultural and Management Style*. [online] academia.edu. https://www.academia.edu/5296154/The_Thai_Cultural_and_Management_Style.

Vongvipanond, Peansiri. 1994. *Linguistic Perspectives of Thai Culture*. Paper Presented at a Workshop of Teachers of Social Science, University of New Orleans, 1994. *http://thaiarc.tu.ac.th/thai/peansiri.htm#mpr*.

Wichitmatra, Khun (Sa-nga Kanchanakkhaphan). 1998. *Samnuan Thai* [Thai sayings]. 4th ed. Bangkok: Technology Promotion Association (Thai-Japan). (in Thai)

Yamklinfung, Prasert, and Harry K. Nishio. 1998. "Traditional Values, Social Organization and Patterns of Modernization: A Comparative Study of Japan and Thailand." *Journal of Japanese Studies* 15, no. 1 (1998): 52–86. https://s002.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/japanese/article/view/52052/43128