English-Thai Interpreters' Use of Direct Style Interpreting:
The Effect of Gender-Specific Pronouns and Formality-Marking Particles in Thai

英タイ通訳者による直接通訳の扱い方：
タイ語における男女別人称代名詞と終助詞の影響

Benjarat SUKGASI

Key words
direct style interpreting, first-person pronouns, formality-marking particles, Thai language

Abstract: Direct style interpreting is regarded as a normative practice for professional interpreters. However, as some first-person pronouns and formality-marking particles (FMPs) in Thai are gender-specific, following this style might be challenging for Thai interpreters (e.g. using unfamiliar pronouns and FMPs might trigger cognitive load). This paper investigates how English-Thai interpreters use first-person pronouns and FMPs as well as the effect of these gender-specific linguistic tools on direct style interpreting. Recorded performances of three English-Thai simultaneous interpreters, together with their interviews, are analyzed. The results suggest that although all three interpreters followed direct style interpreting, they had their own ways of using first-person pronouns and FMPs. Some of their choices were affected by gender-related issues.

1. Introduction

Direct style interpreting[1] is regarded as a normative interpreting practice for professional interpreters. The International Association of Conference Interpreter (AIIC) Webzine, for instance, presents a practical guide for professional conference interpreters, which states that "[p]rofessional conference interpreters speak in the first-person on behalf of the speaker" (AIIC Webzine, 1999/2016). Although this guideline is not an official document of the AIIC[2], it still indicates a general trend preferring direct style

interpreting. Prior studies such as Harris (1990) also consider direct style interpreting as the norm of professional interpreting.

However, as some first-person pronouns and formality-marking particles in Thai[3] are gender-specific, Thai interpreters who follow direct style interpreting have to select these linguistic tools according to the gender of the primary speakers[4]. First-person pronouns in Thai contain a large inventory, and the choice of these pronouns is based on various factors (Cooke, 1965). One of those factors is the gender of the speaker (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005). For example, *phŏm* and *dichăn* are first-person pronouns which are frequently used in formal settings, while *phŏm* is used only by male speakers and *dichăn* is used only by female speakers. Formality-marking particles (FMPs), on the other hand, are particles which are used at the end of a clause or a phrase to code formality (Iwasaki & Horie, 2000). Some of them are also gender-specific. For example, *khráp* and *khá* are FMPs commonly used in formal settings, while *khráp* is used only by male speakers and *khá* is used only by female speakers.

Since Thai interpreters have to select these linguistic features according to the gender of the speaker, it might be difficult for them to follow direct style interpreting. One of the reasons is that first-person pronouns in Thai are also used as a linguistic tool to present femininity or masculinity. This kind of usage can be found in the actual language use by "third gender" persons. Saisuwan (2016), for example, reports that *kathoey*, male-to-female transgender individuals in Thailand, use female first-person pronouns such as *dìchăn* to identify themselves as women. Using opposite-gender pronouns, therefore, might be similar to identifying oneself as an opposite-gender speaker.

Moreover, selecting first-person pronouns and FMPs according to the gender of the speaker might also trigger the interpreter's cognitive overload, especially when the primary speaker's gender is different from that of the interpreter. In fact, Sukgasi (2017) found that Japanese-Thai interpreters who followed direct style interpreting sometimes made an error in the selection of FMPs. A female interpreter, for example, used *khâ*, a female FMP, instead of *khráp*, a male FMP, when interpreting for a male speaker. Cognitive load is considered as one of the reasons behind this error because Thai interpreters have to decide a correct FMP instantly which, as a result, might impact the interpreter's cognitive load (Sukgasi, 2017).

Although Sukgasi (2017) identified the problems interpreters experience in relation to Thai FMPs, it did not address the possible effect of Thai first-person pronouns on interpreters' performance. This is due to the characteristic of the language combination focused in that study: as Japanese is a language in which speakers can avoid personal pronouns, interpreters who interpret from Japanese into Thai can also avoid using first-person pronouns in their rendition. In contrast, English is a language in which personal pronouns are obligatory (Ramón & Gutiérrez-Lanza, 2018). Thus, it is possible to observe how first-person pronouns are addressed in renditions by English-Thai interpreters.

The present paper, therefore, investigates how first-person pronouns and FMPs are used in renditions by English-Thai simultaneous interpreters who follow direct style

interpreting. It also explores the effect of gender-specific pronouns and FMPs on English-Thai interpreters' use of direct style interpreting. Since this study focuses on one session of interpreting performed by three interpreters, the findings might not be representative of English-Thai interpreters' style. But, hopefully, they would present possible directions for future study of direct style interpreting in Thai.

2. Direct style interpreting

The study of direct style interpreting originates in Harris (1990) who, based on his own experience, states that using direct style interpreting is a norm of professional interpreting, while using indirect style interpreting is a general feature of performance by "natural" interpreters[5] (Harris, 1990: 115-116). A norm is "the translation of general values or ideas shared by a community – as to what count as right or wrong, adequate or inadequate – into performance 'instructions' appropriate for and applicable to concrete situations" (Toury, 2012: 63). In other words, norms are a guideline decided by a community on what should be done or should not be done. Based on this definition, Harris's statement indicates that direct style interpreting is seen as appropriate by the community of professional interpreters. Hence, in order to be accepted as a member of the professional interpreters' community, using direct style interpreting is imperative.

Most research on the issue of direct style interpreting has focused on the reasons why interpreters shift from direct style to indirect style interpreting so far. The reasons include: to clarify the authorship of the speech (Bot, 2005; Takimoto & Koshiba, 2009; Van de Mieroop, 2012; Cheung, 2012); to avoid miscommunication (Dubslaff & Martinsen, 2005; Zhan, 2012); to distance the interpreter's self from the primary speaker (Dubslaff & Martinsen, 2005; Van de Mieroop, 2012); and to correct errors made by the interpreter (Dubslaff & Martinsen, 2005; Zhan, 2012). The only research which investigates the impact of direct style interpreting on audiences is Cheung (2014), who examined the effect of reported speech on the perceived neutrality of court interpreters and found that using professional titles in the reporting clauses (e.g. "the judges said") affected the perceived neutrality of the interpreter. In other words, interpreters who use professional titles in their renditions are likely to be seen as aligned with the speakers. It means that in the eyes of the audiences, they are not impartial. All of these studies consider indirect style interpreting as a deviation from how interpreting should be done, which indicates their general view of direct style interpreting as the default interpreting style.

However, as Gile (1999) argues, interpreting norms are greatly affected by the cognitive capacity of interpreters. In some language combinations, it may be difficult for interpreters to follow the professional norm of direct style interpreting due to interpreters' cognitive issues. For example, Sukgasi (2017) points out that Japanese-Thai interpreters have to make extra effort in selecting FMPs according to the gender of the primary speaker; thus they sometimes make a mistake in selecting FMPs when their gender is not the same as the speaker's.

Although Sukgasi (2017) indicates, to some extent, the effect of direct style interpreting on the cognition of Japanese-Thai interpreters in their use of FMPs, it does not cover the use of first-person pronouns due to the nature of Japanese-Thai language combination, that is, two "PRO-drop" languages that allow interpreters to omit first-person pronouns. The present paper, therefore, explores the practice of English-Thai interpreters in order to examine the use of both first-person pronouns and FMPs.

3. First-person pronouns and formality-marking particles in Thai

3.1 First-person pronouns in Thai

One characteristic of first-person pronouns in Thai is their large inventory (Cooke, 1965). Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom (2005: 50) list the nine most commonly used first-person pronouns in order from high to low formality: *khâaphacâw*, *kràphŏm*, *dìchăn*, *phŏm*, *chăn*, *raw*, *khăw*, *tuaeeŋ*, *kuu*. Some can be used by both male and female speakers (*khâaphacâw*, *chăn*, *raw*, *kuu*). Some can be used only by male speakers (*kràphŏm*, *phŏm*) and some can be used only by female speakers (*dìchăn*, *khăw*).

Some studies point out that female speakers in Thai face more difficulties in selecting self-reference terms than male speakers. *Dìchăn*, a female first-person pronoun, tends to be used only in formal situations such as when speaking with non-acquaintances (Hoonchamlong, 1992; Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005). On the other hand, *phŏm*, a male first-person pronoun which is viewed as a counterpart of *dìchăn*, can be used in almost all contexts (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005; Attaviriyanupap, 2015). Since females do not have a first-person pronoun that can be used in every situation, females have to use nicknames, kinship terms or other self-reference terms instead (Hoonchamlong, 1992). The reason why males can use *phŏm* in almost all contexts but females cannot use *dìchăn* in the same functions is that *phŏm* does not index any power or status between speakers and addressees (Attaviriyanupap, 2015). In contrast, *dìchăn* indexes a high degree of formality and some social distance between the speakers (Hoonchamlong, 1992). Because of these characteristics, many Thai females tend to avoid using *dìchăn* when possible.

The social group which benefits from the gender rules most seems to be "third gender" people. Investigating first-person pronouns used by females and *kathoey* (male-to-female transgender individuals), Saisuwan (2016) found that while females select pronouns based on the situation, *kathoey* tend to use female first-person pronouns to present femininity. For example, *dìchăn* is used by females usually in formal situations, but *dìchăn* used by *kathoey* tends to be used in informal situations. It seems that gender-related first-person pronouns are used strategically to index the gender the speaker wants to be.

3.2 Formality-marking particles in Thai

Besides first-person pronouns, there is another part of speech in Thai which is gender-specific: formality-marking particles (FMPs) (Iwasaki & Horie, 2000: 536). Iwasaki and Horie (2000) categorize FMPs into three groups based on their formality levels: high

formality (i.e. *khráp*, *khă*), mid formality (i.e. *há, hă*), and low formality (e.g. *wá*, *wóoy*) level FMPs. Since there are several types of FMPs, Thai speakers usually select them according to the context and the relationship between the speaker and the audience (Iwasaki & Horie, 2000).

FMPs at the highest level of formality such as *khráp* and *khâ* are usually sex-exclusive (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005). This means that they are used according to the gender of the speaker. Usually, this kind of FMPs are used when non-acquaintances talk in formal settings or when there is an apparent social distance between the speakers (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005). Male speakers usually use *khráp*, while female speakers usually use *khâ*.

At the mid formality level, speakers usually use *há* and *hâ*. *Há* is a male-specific FMP used as an informal substitute for *khráp*, while *hâ* is a female-specific FMP used as an informal substitute for *khâ* (Attaviriyanupap, 2015). Females sometimes use *há*, but both *há* and *hâ* are rarely used by females nowadays (Attaviriyanupap, 2015). Now, *hâ* seems to be used by *kathoey* (male-to-female transgender individuals) instead (Attaviriyanupap, 2015).

FMPs can also be used as vocative markers adding to an addressee's name when calling him/her or when responding to a call (Attaviriyanupap, 2015). For example, at the end of the name such as *thân pràthaan khráp* [Mr. President + FMP]. FMPs can also be used as response tokens and backchannel expressions (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005). Response tokens are used to respond to a call, a question, or a comment such as "yes" and "right" in English, while backchannel expressions such as "uh-huh" in English are given by the addressee to signal that s/he is listening and to encourage the speaker to continue speaking (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005).

In actuality, speakers can switch FMPs freely. For example, they can first use *khráp* and then switch into *há* in the middle of the conversation. This kind of usage indicates the fluctuation of speech-levels in real situations (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005). Since FMPs can be switched, the overall formality level of speech is determined by both the frequency of FMPs and the type of FMPs which are used (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005).

In addition, FMPs do not need to be added at the end of every clause or sentence; they can be used only in some utterances (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005). Since politeness can be maintained through other methods such as using polite address terms, conversations without FMPs are not necessarily considered as impolite (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005).

3.3 First-person pronouns and FMPs

Although both personal pronouns and FMPs are capable of coding formality, Iwasaki and Horie (2000) state that it is FMPs that play a more important role. Iwasaki and Horie (ibid.) investigated the frequency of personal pronouns and FMPs in four different conversations and found that while FMPs were used 106 times in overall, only seven first-person pronouns appeared and second-person pronouns did not appear at all. Moreover, they also found that personal pronouns appeared only in a formal conversation (i.e. a job interview) and did not appear in other kinds of conversations such as in a conversation

between a senior and a junior teacher or a conversation between students. The results indicate "a general tendency in Thai to favor zero pronominals" (Iwasaki & Horie, 2000: 540) and that Thai speakers strategically use personal pronouns and FMPs to negotiate their relationship with the addressees (Iwasaki & Horie, 2000).

4. Methodology

This study explored how English-Thai interpreters used first-person pronouns and FMPs in their rendition. The actual renditions of three professional interpreters, combined with the interviews with two out of the three interpreters were used as data for analysis.

4.1 The context

Public hearings of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) over a Thai-Cambodia border dispute were selected as primary data because English-Thai interpreters that participated there were expected to use direct style interpreting due to their status as members of the International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC) (Sakduang, 2013). This is because the practical guide published by the AIIC Webzine, recommend that professional interpreters use direct style interpreting (AIIC Webzine, 1999/2016). Moreover, in order to be an AIIC member, interpreters must have at least 150 days of working experience as an interpreter (Admissions Committee, 2000/2016). Interpreters who make their living by interpreting are usually classified as a professional interpreter (Chesterman, 2016). Since direct style interpreting is regarded to be a norm among professional interpreters (Harris, 1990), interpreters in this dataset were expected to use direct style interpreting as their default interpreting style.

The public hearings were conducted originally in English and French. However, since the hearings were of major concern for Thai people, simultaneous interpreting from English into Thai was also available through television and radio in Thailand. The hearings were held on 15th-19th April 2013, but only those on 17th (henceforth, 'the first day') and 19th ('the second day') were selected for analysis because that is when Thai lawyers made their presentations and all the oral hearings were broadcast without edited.

There were five primary speakers in the data: four males (Virachai Plasai, Donald McRae, Alain Pellet, and James Crawford) and one female (Alina Miron). Each primary speaker made a presentation which varied in length between 14 and 44 minutes. At the beginning and the end of each presentation, the president and sometimes also the judge made remarks, but their utterances were excluded from the data because they were too short and sometimes were not interpreted.

4.2 The interpreters

Three interpreters were included in the data: one male (henceforth, 'M1'), and two females ('F2' and 'F3'). The interpreters did not take turns based on the time length

but did so after each speaker ended their presentation[6]. It was also observed that each interpreter tended to interpret for the same speakers: M1 for Plasai and Pellet; F2 for McRae; F3 for Miron and Crawford. There are, however, some exceptions: F3 sometimes interpreted a beginning or a latter part of Pellet's and McRae's presentations. The reason might be because the presentation ran too long so the assigned interpreter could not keep up through the end. Since F3 sometimes interpreted a very short source speech, the renditions which lasted less than 10 minutes were excluded from the analysis in order to make the length of all renditions as similar as possible. Therefore, the total interpreting length used for analysis was 5 hours and 43 minutes.

4.3 Data analysis

A quantitative approach was adopted to provide an overall trend of how first-person pronouns and FMPs were used by the three interpreters. First, first-person pronoun types were identified based on the list of commonly used first-person pronouns made by Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom (2005). FMP types, on the other hand, were identified using the criteria established by Iwasaki and Horie (2000). After all first-person pronoun and FMP types were identified, each type was counted to determine the frequencies at which they were used. Then, a qualitative approach was used to examine how the three interpreters used these linguistic tools in context.

4.4 Interviews

Interviews with two out of the three interpreters (M1 and F3) were also conducted in order to establish the backgrounds and attitudes of the interpreters. Due to the physical distance between the interviewer and the interviewees, M1 was interviewed via email, while F3 was interviewed via telephone. F2 was also contacted, but was not available for the interview. The questions consisted of two parts: the backgrounds of the interpreters (e.g. language combination, years of interpreting, training experiences, etc.) and their attitudes toward direct style interpreting in Thai (e.g. the types of first-person pronouns and FMPs they usually use, the reasons behind their choices, the problems they find, etc.).

5. Results and Discussion

5.1 Backgrounds of the interpreters

The backgrounds of the two interpreters that undertook an interview are as follows. M1 and F3 are freelance English-Thai interpreters with a professional experience of more than 20 years. They are native speakers of Thai who have worked as interpreters in a variety of fields, including conferences, medicine, business, and the law. They have worked in both Thailand and in various other countries. M1 has worked in Thailand about 30% of the times and in North America about another 30%. F3, on the other hand, has worked mainly in Thailand but has also worked in other countries such as Japan, France, and Italy. Both of them were teaching interpreting at a graduate school in Thailand at the

time of the interviews. F3 has also taught interpreting at the Translator and Interpreter Association of Thailand (TIAT).

As for their experiences regarding interpreter training, M1 did not receive any interpreter training. F3, on the other hand, attended only short 2-5 day interpreting courses. The interpreting courses F3 took were all held outside of Thailand. Since students in those classes had different language combinations, the classes focused mainly on general interpreting techniques such as note-taking. F3 did not have a chance to practice interpreting between English and Thai in those classes.

5.2 First-person pronouns used by the three interpreters

There were four types of first-person pronouns used by the three interpreters: *khâaphacâw*, *phŏm*, *dichăn*, and *raw*. Although *raw* was observed throughout the renditions of the three interpreters, it was excluded from the analysis because it was used in the plural first-person form, not the singular first-person form like the other three pronouns.

M1, the only male interpreter in the data, interpreted only for male speakers (Plasai and Pellet) for a total of 138 minutes. He used only *khâaphacâw*, a gender-neutral first-person pronoun, 72 out of 72 times. An example is shown below.

Example 1. Plasai's presentation on the first day

Plasai: I will simply say a brief word about your Order.

M1: ***khâaphacâw*** *khrây yàak bɔ̀ɔk, khrây klàawthŭŋ sìŋ thîi thân dâay phûut pay*
[I would like to say, to mention what you had already said]

In this instance, M1 interpreted "I" of the primary speaker into *khâaphacâw*, a gender-neutral singular first-person pronoun that is equal to "I" in English. However, according to previous studies (Cooke, 1965; Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005), *khâaphacâw* is normally used in writing; although it can be used in a formal public speech, such use is becoming rare. As such, using *khâaphacâw* instead of *phŏm* might indicate that M1 was trying to avoid using gender-specific first-person pronouns. In fact, M1 admitted in the interview that he used *khâaphacâw* to minimize the chance of misrepresentation.

F2 interpreted also only for a male speaker. She interpreted the speeches by McRae for 82 minutes in total. Like M1, she only used *khâaphacâw*, a gender-neutral first-person pronoun, 18 out of 18 times. Since F2 used *khâaphacâw* instead of *phŏm*, it might indicate that she too was trying to avoid using gender-specific pronouns.

F3 was the only interpreter who interpreted for both male and female speakers. She interpreted for two males (Crawford and Pellet) and one female (Miron) for a total of 66 and 56 minutes, respectively. When interpreting the speeches of male speakers, she used two types of first-person pronouns: *khâaphacâw* and *phŏm*. However, the frequency was not the same: F3 used *khâaphacâw* twice but used *phŏm* 22 out of 24 times. On the other hand, when interpreting for a female speaker, she used only *dichăn*, a female first-person pronoun, 38 out of 38 times.

There was a case in which F3 switched her first-person pronouns from *phŏm* to *khâaphacâw*. The change occurred immediately after the lunch break on the first day. Before the lunch break, F3 interpreted Crawford's presentation by using *phŏm*, a male first-person pronoun, consistently (Example 2). After the break, however, she started interpreting Crawford's utterance by using *khâaphacâw* and continued to use it until the end of Crawford's presentation (Example 3). However, when she started interpreting for another male speaker, she switched back to *phŏm* and never used *khâaphacâw* again. In the interview, F3 admitted that she could not remember using *khâaphacâw* at all.

Example 2. Crawford's presentation on the first half of the first day

Crawford: I will read only the first and last sentence.

F3: ***phŏm*** *cà àan chàphɔ sùanbon kàp sùanlâaŋ thâwnán*

[I will say only the upper part and the lower part]

Example 3. Crawford's presentation on the second half of the first day

Crawford: In view of time restrictions, I shall deal with these extremely briefly.

F3: *sû ŋ* ***khâaphacâw*** *cà phûut dooy săŋkhèep*

[which I will say briefly]

These examples might suggest that F3 was influenced by M1 and F2's use of first-person pronouns because M1 and F2 used the gender-neutral pronoun *khâaphacâw* consistently while F3 was the only interpreter who used *phŏm* and *dichăn*. Since norms in interpreting can be learned by observing the practice of colleagues (Shlesinger, 1989), using the same pronouns as M1 and F2 implies that F3 was searching for a way to deal with the issue of gender and learned a different strategy by observing her colleagues' work.

Table 5.1 summarizes the type and frequency of first-person pronouns used by the three interpreters when interpreting for male and female speakers.

Table 5.1. First-person pronouns used by M1, F2, and F3

	When interpreting for male speakers			When interpreting for female speakers		
	khâaphacâw	*phŏm*	*dichăn*	*khâaphacâw*	*phŏm*	*dichăn*
M1	72	0	0			
F2	18	0	0			
F3	2	22	0	0	0	38

Since the interpreters' use of first-person pronouns depended on the frequencies of first-person pronouns used by primary speakers, the numbers in Table 5.1 could not be used to compare the frequencies of first-person pronouns used by the three interpreters directly. However, the numbers clearly show that M1 and F2 preferred to use *khâaphacâw* over *phŏm* when interpreting for a male speaker. F3, on the other hand, showed different preferences

compared to M1 and F2. She used *phŏm* mainly when interpreting for male speakers and *dichăn* when interpreting for a female speaker. This kind of usage indicates that F3 used first-person pronouns according to the gender of the primary speakers.

5.3 Formality-marking particles used by the three interpreters

There were three types of FMPs used by the three interpreters: *khráp*, *khá*, and *há*. M1 consistently used *khráp* in all of his renditions. Although *khráp* can be added to the end of every clause or sentence (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005), M1 did not add *khráp* in that way but used it only when addressing the addressees. He added *khráp* after the word *thân pràthaan* [Mr. President]. This kind of usage is called vocative markers, which is considered as one of the functions of FMPs (Attaviriyanupap, 2015). Here is an example of how M1 used FMPs:

Example 4. Plasai's presentation on the second day

Plasai: Mr. President, the Court in 1962, within the limits of its jurisdiction, certainly had in mind the desire to provide a long-term settlement.

M1: *thân pràthaan **khráp**, săan nay pii 1962, phaaytây khɔ̀ɔpkhèet khɔ̆ɔŋ amnâat săan, kɔ̂ɔ nay tɔɔnnán kɔ̂ɔ dâay, ə̀ə, yàak cà yútì rɯ̂aŋníi nay ráyá yaaw*

[Mr. President *khráp*, the Court in 1962, within the limits of the Court's jurisdiction, at that time, ah, wanted to settle down this case in the long term]

In this instance, Plasai, a male speaker, was drawing attention from the Court by calling Mr. President. So M1 interpreted "Mr. President" as *thân pràthaan* and added *khráp* at the end of this word to increase the formality level of the speech. Since M1 limited the usage of FMPs to only vocative markers, it might suggest that he was trying to avoid using FMPs as much as possible.

F2, on the other hand, interpreted only for McRae, a male speaker, at a total of 82 minutes. However, she used *khráp*, a male-specific FMP, only once, but instead used *há*, a neutral-gender FMP, 34 out of 35 times. It appears that F2 used *há* as her default FMP when interpreting for male speakers. The only time she used *khráp* was at the beginning of her first rendition.

Example 5. McRae's presentation on the first day

McRae: Thank you, Sir. Mr. President, Members of the Court, it is a great privilege for me to appear before this Court…

F2: *khɔ̀ɔpkhun **khráp**, thân pràthaan, kháná tùlaakaan, khâaphacâw rúusɯ̀k penkìat yàaŋyîŋ thîi dâay maa praakòttua tɔ̀ɔnâa săan hè̀ŋníi…*

[Thank you *khráp*. Mr. President, Members of the Court. I am honored to be able to appear before this court…]

As shown in Example 5, F2 added *khráp* to the word *khɔ̀ɔpkhun* [thank you], which helped to increase the formality level of appreciation. Since F2 used *khráp* when interpreting for a male speaker, it indicates that she was trying to use FMPs based on the gender of the speaker. However, as she used it only at the beginning of her first rendition or, to be more precise, at the first sentence of her first rendition, it also indicates that continuously using *khráp*, an opposite-gender FMP for F2, was cognitively taxing to her; hence, she could only use *khráp* at the beginning of her interpreting where her cognitive capacity was still high.

Instead of using *khráp*, F2 switched to *há*, a gender-neutral FMP. Although *há* can be used by both males and females, its formality level is lower than *khráp* and *khâ* (Iwasaki & Horie, 2000). Although in actuality, Thai speakers can switch FMPs freely, the overall formality level of speech in Thai is still determined by both the frequency and the type of FMPs (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005). Since F2 almost exclusively used *há* (34 out of 35 times), it might suggest that continuously using the opposite-gender FMP was difficult for F2; hence she decided to sacrifice the formality level of her renditions instead of using the opposite-gender FMPs.

In contrast, F3 mainly used *khráp* when interpreting for male speakers and mainly used *khâ* when interpreting for a female speaker. In short, she seemed to select FMPs according to the gender of the primary speakers. However, looking at the occurrence rates of FMPs, the data showed some interesting points. When interpreting for male speakers, F3 used *khráp* 7 out of 7 times (0.11 times per minute), but when interpreting for a female speaker, she used *khâ* 88 out of 88 times (1.57 times per minute). The results clearly indicate that F3 used *khâ* far more frequently than *khráp*.

Furthermore, looking closely at the situations where F3 used *khráp*, one can see that she mainly used *khráp* as vocative markers, just like M1, by adding *khráp* after *thân pràthaan* [Mr. President] or *samaachík săan* [Members of the Court]. Apart from using *khráp* as vocative markers, F3 also added *khráp* after short phrases. For example, she rendered "true enough" as *nêɛnɔɔn khráp* [of course *khráp*] and rendered "so far, Mr. President" as *chây khráp ə̀ə thân pràthaan* [Yes *khráp*, uh, Mr. President].

Compared to how she used *khráp*, F3's usage of *khâ* is much more varied. She used *khâ* as vocative markers, added *khâ* after short phrases, and, unlike *khráp*, added *khâ* after long sentences. An example is shown below:

Example 6. Miron's presentation on the first day

Miron: …even though it claims that the perimeter in question results from the intersection of two lines on a map.

F3: *...tèɛ nay khànàdiawkan kô ɔ klàawâaŋ wâa phúนunthîi níi maa càak ə̀ə phĕɛnthîi sŭ̂ŋ mii sên sɔ̌ɔŋ sên tàt kan ná* ***khá***

[…but at the same time, also claims that the perimeter comes from uh a map which the two lines intersect each other *khá*]

Although F3 also added *khâ* after interpreting long sentences, this kind of usage could not

be found when she interpreted for male speakers. The differences in the frequencies and ways of how F3 used *khráp* and *khâ* imply that using the opposite-gender FMPs was more difficult for F3 than using the same-gender FMPs.

Apart from *khráp* and *khâ*, F3 also used *há*, a gender-neutral FMP, both when interpreting for male and female speakers. When interpreting for male speakers, F3 used *há* two out of seven times (0.03 times per minute) and when interpreting for a female speaker, she used *há* once out of 88 times (0.02 times per minute). The frequencies were nearly the same. *Há* was only used by F3 in her rendition on the second day when she interpreted for Crawford and Miron. When she interpreted for Crawford, she used *há* at the end of her rendition. Below is an example.

Example 7. Crawford's presentation on the second day

Crawford: But we all know that in international law jurisdiction depends on consent. It would be odd if that principle could be subverted by reference to Article 60. Mr. President, Members of the Court that completes what I have time to say. I would ask you to call upon the Agent for Thailand to conclude. Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Court.

F3: *tèɛ raw kɔ̂ɔ sâap ná* ***<u>há</u>****, wâa phaaytây kòtmăay ráwàaŋ pràthêet nán, amnâat săan nán man tɔ̂ŋ khû̌n yùu kàp kaanyinyɔɔm dûay*

[But we all know *há* that under the international law, jurisdiction depends on consent]

F3: *thân pràthaan* ***<u>khráp</u>****, thân samaachík săan, ə̀ə mii weelaa thîi cà phûut phiaŋ khêɛ níi*

[Mr. President *khráp*, Members of the Court, uh the time is coming]

F3: *kɔ̂ɔ khɔ̌ɔ hây thân chəən tuathɛɛn khɔ̌ɔŋ pràthêetthay khû̌n phûut tɔ̀ɔ*

[Please invite the Agent for Thailand to continue the speech]

F3: *khɔ̀ɔpkhun* ***<u>há</u>****.*

[Thank you *há*]

Firstly, F3 used *há* after *tèɛ raw kɔ̂ɔ sâap ná* [but we all know] which, as is shown above, divided the sentence into two clauses: "but we all know" and "that under the international law, jurisdiction depends on consent". She then omitted the next sentence "It would be odd if that principle could be subverted by reference to Article 60" and started interpreting from "Mr. President" instead. She added *khráp* after *thân pràthaan* [Mr. President] and continued interpreting without adding FMPs. Then she interpreted "thank you" as *khòpkhun* [thank you] and adds *há* at the end of her twenty-one-minute-long rendition.

Since *há* is considered a mid-formality level FMP (Iwasaki & Horie, 2000), its usage indicates the intention of a speaker to lower the formality level. In fact, F3 explained in the interview that she used *há* for ironic purposes. This answer seems to match with the context of Example 7 where Crawford said "But we all know that in international law jurisdiction depends on consent" in a sarcastic tone. Therefore, using *há* in this context

helped to retain the tone in the source speech.

However, looking at the usage of *há* in the last sentence of this example, it does not seem to indicate a sarcastic tone; it was used with *khɔ̀ɔpkhun* [thank you] which indicates appreciation. In the interview, F3 admitted that she could not remember why she chose *há* in this context. Considering the context where *há* was used, it might suggest cognitive overload for F3. Before interpreting this sentence, F3 was using two types of FMPs, *khráp* and *há,* but then the primary speaker ended the speech, meaning F3 also needed to end her rendition as soon as possible. The time constraints and the effort to use two types of FMPs might have triggered the mistake this time. This kind of mistake is similar to that found in Sukgasi (2017), where it was shown that a Japanese-Thai interpreter had misused *khráp* and *khâ* when interpreting the dialogue between male and female speakers. However, since this study focused on monologues which lasted more than 10 minutes, the interpreters did not have to switch FMPs as frequently as when interpreting dialogues. Therefore, except the mistake in Example 7, no interpreter misused FMPs in the way found in Sukgasi (2017). In other words, switching between two types of FMPs might increase the possibility of cognitive overload.

Table 5.2 summarizes the type and frequency of FMPs used by M1, F2, and F3 when interpreting for male and female speakers. The rate of occurrences per minute is shown using parentheses (no. of occurrence/interpreting lengths).

Table 5.2. Formality-marking particles (FMPs) used by M1, F2, and F3

	When interpreting for a male speaker				When interpreting for a female speaker			
	Interpreting length	*khráp*	*khâ*	*há*	Interpreting length	*khráp*	*khâ*	*há*
M1	138 minutes	26 (0.19)	0	0				
F2	82 minutes	1 (0.01)	0	34 (0.41)				
F3	66 minutes	7 (0.02)	0	2 (0.03)	56 minutes	0	88 (1.57)	1 (0.02)

All three interpreters seem to have their own styles regarding their usage of FMPs. When interpreting for male speakers, M1 used only *khráp*, a male-specific FMP. F2, in contrast, used *khráp* only once but used *há* at a highest frequency. F3, on the other hand, used FMPs according to the gender of the primary speakers, but she used *khâ* far more frequently than *khráp*.

5.4 Attitudes of the interpreters

The interviews with two of the three interpreters also sought their attitudes toward direct style interpreting. M1 said he uses *khâaphacâw* when interpreting for either male or female speakers. The reasons behind his decision are 1) to minimize the chances of

misrepresentation; 2) to reduce cognitive overload; and 3) to avoid a male voice speaking female-associated words. M1 also said he uses *khráp* when interpreting for males, but omits *khâ* when interpreting for females. He also said that he limits the frequency of FMPs by using them only when addressing someone.

F3, on the other hand, said she does not use the same first-person pronoun all the time, but instead chooses them based on the context. F3 also expresses her negative feelings toward the interpreter's use of *khâaphacâw*. She said *khâaphacâw* should not be used in almost all contexts because it is used in highly formal situations. She, herself, uses it only when interpreting for the royal family. She also said she uses FMPs based on the gender of the primary speakers and uses them according to the context. In addition, she mentioned that she sometimes uses FMPs with *ná*[7] to buy time.

When asked about the pronouns and FMPs she used in the public hearings, F3 said she used *phŏm* and *khráp* when interpreting for males and *dichăn* and *khâ* when interpreting for a female. She furthermore said she also deliberately used *há* to indicate an ironic tone in the source speech.

In sum, although both M1 and F3 believed that interpreters should use direct style interpreting, they showed different attitudes regarding the choice of first-person pronouns and FMPs.

6. Conclusion

This study explored how first-person pronouns and FMPs were used in the renditions of three English-Thai simultaneous interpreters (M1, F2, and F3) who used direct style interpreting during hearings at the ICJ. The findings show that each interpreter had their own way of using first-person pronouns and FMPs. M1 used *khâaphacâw* when interpreting for both males and females. He also used *khráp* when interpreting for males, but omitted FMPs when interpreting for females. F2 also used *khâaphacâw* when interpreting for males but rarely used *khráp* in her renditions. F3, by contrast, used both first-person pronouns and FMPs according to the gender of the primary speakers.

Direct style interpreting is considered as a norm of professional interpreting (Harris, 1990). However, the results of this study indicate that using direct style interpreting might be difficult for English-Thai interpreters. First, interpreters have to select first-person pronouns according to the gender of the primary speakers. However, using the opposite-gender pronouns seems to be taxing for some interpreters. M1 said in the interview that he avoids gender-specific pronouns partly to reduce cognitive overload. However, since *khâaphacâw* is normally used in writing and rarely used in speech, it remains doubtful whether it is possible to use it in every interpreting setting.

Second, English-Thai interpreters using direct style interpreting also have to select FMPs based on the gender of the primary speakers. Findings on the present study, however, indicate that interpreters seem to avoid using the opposite-gender FMPs. For example, when interpreting for the opposite-gender speakers, F3 used FMPs less frequently

than when interpreting for the same-gender speaker. F2, who interpreted for a male speaker, also shifted from *khráp*, a male-specific FMP used in highly formal situations, to *há*, a gender-neutral FMP used in mid-formal situations. This practice may show F2's resistance toward using opposite-gender FMPs because by using *há* the formality level of F2's renditions was automatically lowered. M1 also showed a similar tendency: he would omit female-specific FMP if he had to interpret for females. All of these practices imply that all three interpreters tried to avoid using the opposite-gender FMPs.

In addition, this study showed, to some extent, that switching between two kinds of FMPs may increase cognitive load on interpreters. F3 misused FMPs when switching between *khráp* and *há*. However, since this kind of error occurred only once, further investigation is needed in order to clarify factors which trigger cognitive overload.

Direct style interpreting is generally regarded as a norm of professional interpreting. As members of AIIC, the three interpreters in this study seem to be influenced by this norm as well. However, as shown above, even interpreters who believe they should use direct style interpreting faced difficulties in using first-person pronouns and FMPs in Thai due to gender-related issues. Compared to first-person pronouns, however, third-person pronouns in Thai such as *khăw* are usually gender-neutral; hence, using third-person pronouns allows interpreters to avoid potential gender issues. Moreover, if interpreters speak from their own perspective, they can use their own gender FMPs, which would not impose extra effort on the interpreters and might sound more natural to the audience. Because of these reasons, it can be argued that indirect style interpreting may be more suitable for interpreting into Thai than direct style interpreting.

This paper presented a case study, focusing on the renditions of three English-Thai interpreters during international legal proceedings. The findings might not be representative of how first-person pronouns and FMPs are handled in interpreting into Thai when direct style interpreting is used. This study also lacked data on how male interpreters interpret for female speakers. More samples should be studied in future research. In addition, the issues of cognitive overload as well as user expectations should be further explored.

Notes

1 The term "direct style interpreting" in this research is defined as an interpreter speaking without changing the perspective of the primary speaker (Bot, 2005). For example, if the primary speaker said "I am hungry," the interpreter should say "I am hungry" in his/her rendition, not "s/he says I am hungry" or "s/he is hungry."

2 "Practical guide for professional conference interpreters" is not seen as the official document of the AIIC because there is a note, stating that "[t]he suggestions contained in this document are not meant as an official interpretation of any policy or text of the International Association of Conference Interpreters (AIIC)…" (AIIC Webzine, 1999/2016).

3 "Thai" described here is standard Thai, the language used by the educated middle-class in the central region of Thailand (Attaviriyanupap, 2015).

4 The term "primary speaker" is used in this paper to refer to the speaker whose speech is rendered by the interpreter. This term is used because the primary speaker speaks first (primary) then the interpreter renders (Bot, 2005).
5 Natural interpreters are those who become an interpreter without having received interpreter training.
6 There were also some exceptions. For example, when interpreting for Pellet who spoke for about 44 minutes, M1 first interpreted for about 25 minutes, and then F3 interpreted the second part, which lasted for about 19 minutes.
7 *Ná* is a pragmatic particle used to request some action from the addressee (Iwasaki & Ingkaphirom, 2005).

References

AIIC Admissions Committee. (2000, May 13 / 2016, July 6). A practical guide for applicants. Retrieved from https://aiic.net/node/2399/admission-procedure/lang/1

AIIC Webzine. (1999, December 1 / 2016, October 11). Practical guide for professional conference interpreters. Retrieved from http://aiic.net/p/628

Attaviriyanupap, K. (2015). The linguistic representation of gender in Thai. In M. Hellinger, & H. Motschenbacher (Eds.), *Gender across language: volume 4* (pp. 369-399). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. doi: 10.1075/impact.36

Bot, H. (2005). Dialogue interpreting as a specific case of reported speech. *Interpreting, 7*(2), 237-261. doi:10.1075/intp.7.2.06bot

Chesterman, A. (2016). *Memes of translation: The spread of ideas in translation theory* (Rev. ed.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cheung, A. K. F. (2012). The use of reported speech by court interpreters in Hong Kong. *Interpreting, 14*(1), 73-91. doi:10.1075/intp.14.1.04che

Cheung, A. K. F. (2014). The use of reported speech and the perceived neutrality of court interpreters. *Interpreting, 16*(2), 191-208. doi:10.1075/intp.16.2.03che

Cooke, J. R. (1965). *Pronominal reference in Thai, Burmese, and Vietnamese* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Berkeley.

Dubslaff, F., & Martinsen, B. (2005). Exploring untrained interpreters' use of direct versus indirect speech. *Interpreting*, 7(2), 211-236. doi:10.1075/intp.7.2.05dub

Gile, D. (1999). Norms in research on conference interpreting: A response to Theo Hermans and Gideon Toury. In C. Schaffner (Ed.), *Translation and norms* (pp. 98-105). Frankfurt Lodge: Multilingual Matters.

Harris, B. (1990). Norms in interpretation. *Target, 2*(1), 115-119. doi:10.1075/target.2.1.08har

Hoonchamlong, Y. (1992). Some observations on phŏm and dichăn: Male and female 1st person pronouns in Thai. In C. J. Compton, & J. F. Hartmann (Eds.), *Papers on Tai languages, linguistics and literatures in honour of William J. Gedney on his 77th birthday* (pp. 186-204). Dekalb, IL: Northen Illinois University, Center for Southeast Asian Studies.

Iwasaki, S., & Horie, P. I. (2000). Creating speech register in Thai conversation. *Language in Society, 29*(4), 519-554.

Iwasaki, S., & Ingkaphirom, P. (2005). *A reference grammar of Thai*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ramón, N., & Gutiérrez-Lanza, C. (2018). Translation description for assessment and post-editing: The case of personal pronouns in translated Spanish. *Target, 30*(1), 112-136. doi: 10.1075/target.15098.ram

Saisuwan, P. (2016). Kathoey and the linguistic construction of gender identity in Thailand. In E. Levon, & R. B. Mendes (Eds.), *Language, sexuality, and power: Studies in intersectional sociolinguistics* (pp. 189-214). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Sakduang, S. (2013, April 20). "The interpreters in the Temple of Preah Vihear Case interpreted well" president of Thai Interpreter Association guaranteed. *Isaranews Agency*. Retrieved from https://www.isranews.org/isranews-article/20682-translator-1-sp-1546476433.html

Shlesinger, M. (1989). Extending the theory of translation to interpretation: Norms as a case in point. *Target, 1*(1), 111-115. doi:10.1075/target.1.1.09shl

Sukgasi, B. (2017). *A study of first person pronouns and final particles used in Japanese-to-Thai court interpreting* (Unpublished master's thesis). Rikkyo University, Tokyo, Japan.

Takimoto, M., & Koshiba, K. (2009). Shift in footing in a multi-party interpreting situation: The choice of pronouns by an interpreter and its effects. *Monash University linguistics papers, 6*(2), 1-9.

Van De Mieroop, D. (2012). The quotative 'he/she says' in interpreted doctor-patient interaction. *Interpreting, 14*(1), 92-117. doi:10.1075/intp.14.1.05mie

Wadensjö, C. (1997). Recycled information as a questioning strategy: Pitfalls in interpreter-mediated talk. In S. E. Carr, R. Roberts, A. Dufour, & D. Stein (Eds.), *The critical link: interpreters in the community* (pp. 35-52). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Zhan, C. (2012). Mediation through personal pronoun shifts in dialogue interpreting of political meetings. *Interpreting, 14*(2), 192-216. doi:10.1075/intp.14.2.04zha