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ABSTRACT

This study aims to discursively examine the ways in which Thai and non-Thai participants manage face concerns in articulating and responding to interpersonally-sensitive activities, i.e. disagreements, rejections and refusals, in Thai service encounter contexts. Data included audio- and video-recordings and field-notes from naturally-occurring interactions between Thai agents and (non-)Thai customers in two hotels, a travel agency and a tourist information centre in Thailand. A fine-grained analysis of Thai service encounters revealed that the Thai and non-Thai customers preferred implicitness to explicitness in rejecting the suggested product, in order to avoid confrontation and maintain face. Their non-confrontation, through implicitness, indicated that the participants did not take into account the unequal status between agents and customers. This behaviour, which was signaled through nonverbally and prosodically dispreferred responses, e.g. silence and hesitators, was viewed by the interactants as politic behaviour. The Thai agents also showed implicitness by withholding (dis)agreements with the customers; this implicitness is linked with face concerns and commercial goal orientedness. However, the Thai agents occasionally formulated explicit disagreements without any mitigating strategies, when they wanted to ensure that the non-Thai customers understood their meanings clearly. Explicitness also occurred when they wanted to encourage the customers to buy the product at full price. Nonetheless, there was insufficient evidence to show that the agents’ explicitness was interpreted as non-politic behaviour by the non-Thai customers. This study contributes to the sparse discursive examination of verbal and nonverbal behaviour in authentic Thai institutional interactions and provides a rare insight to changes in social hierarchy and status in Thai culture.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Research Rationale

The interrelation between face and politeness, on the one hand, and (linguistic) activities, on the other, has been broadly studied across cultures and in various contextual situations, as they are central in effective communication which results in interactional harmony between participants. Previous studies in face and politeness revealed the impact of cultural orientation on the difference in face concerns across cultures (Aoki, 2010; Culpeper et al., 2010; Chen et al., 2011). For instance, group values in Oriental cultures, i.e. Chinese, are more influential upon communicative behaviour than those in Western cultures, i.e., British, German and Finn (Culpeper et al., 2010). Chinese complaints are likely to be more sensitive to socio-cultural authorities than American ones, i.e., Chinese inferiors are socially expected to redress social superiors’ dignity and to express modesty for their own face (Chen et al., 2011). Therefore, findings on face and politeness in the context of one culture cannot be unproblematically applied to another.

Research in face and politeness across cultures, including the Thai culture, is of importance in revealing the behaviour of people in those cultures in reality. The notion of Thai face and politeness have previously been studied, with a focus on politeness-related linguistic forms in Thai (Khanittanan, 1988; Kummer, 2005; Intachakra, 2012), idioms and expressions (Ukosakul, 2009) and Thai values related to face (Persons, 2008). In addition, most studies in Thai contexts have investigated politeness and face, as well as their relation with speech acts through written responses and focused, almost exclusively, on the sentence level. Examples of those studies include digitally written communication (e.g. chatrooms) (Hongladarom and Hongladarom, 2005), Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs) (Promsrimas, 2000; Panpothong, 2004; Rhurakvit, 2011) and letters (Chakorn, 2006). Nonetheless, there is a gap in research of politeness and face in Thai contexts using naturally occurring
spoken data which provide rich information on the holistic behaviour of participants, i.e. linguistic, non-linguistic and prosodic forms, used to formulate activities during interaction. Additionally, in some cultures such as Thai, the presence or absence of non-linguistic features, for instance, silence (Knutson, 1994; Phukanchana, 1995) and smiles (Knutson, 2004) have a great impact on the interlocutor’s positive and negative perception on the actor. In contrast, written data lack nonverbal features, and elicited data, such as DCTs provide little information about actual situated interactional behaviour (see further discussion in Chapter 3.1). Consequently, multimodal, interactional, naturally occurring data would provide a fuller insight into (in)appropriate behaviour relevant to face and politeness in Thai culture.

Furthermore, previous research on Thai politeness and face was undertaken in academic settings or simulation situations but not in institutional settings, possibly due to the difficulty in accessibility. I, as a Thai lecturer, who have academic relationship with tourism sites, was able to access hospitality sites and receive permission for data collection. This study is the first on politeness and face using naturally occurring interactions in real service encounter contexts. Institutional interactions, in particular service encounters, are daily social encounters between agents and customers (Merritt, 1976). However, they differ from everyday interactions, such as dinner talk. This is because they are primarily goal-oriented interactions and participants’ roles, i.e. service seekers (i.e. customers) and service providers (i.e. agents), are fixed (Solon, 2013). Therefore, service encounters are shaped by social and commercial factors which may affect participants’ communicative behaviour differently everyday conversations, for instance, intimacy, power of money and cultural difference (in the case of cross-cultural interactions). Consequently, in present times where the economy affects people’s lives and their behaviour, an insight into behaviour related to politeness and face in service encounter contexts is of importance for both professional service providers and the general public who are also customers. Moreover, activities generally observed in service encounters include customers’ service requests, agents’ provision, or not, of service suggestions or offers (Merritt, 1976; Whalen and Zimmerman, 1987; Zimmerman, 1992). These activities are likely to be related to face manifestation and (im)politeness since they are sensitive to both the face of participants and interpersonal and interactional harmony between the agents and customers. The way
in which these activities are articulated in service encounters, thus, may affect the achievement or failure of the transactional goal.

Moreover, out of the various types of service encounters, hospitality contexts such as hotels and customer service have been widely investigated from various perspectives. Examples include consumer behaviour (Gabbott and Hogg, 1994), customers’ evaluations on service (Larsen and Bastiansen, 1991; Mostert et al., 2009), the impact of cultural orientation on customers’ behaviour (Mattila, 1999; Mattila and Patterson, 2004a; Wan, 2011) and staff’s and consumers’ management of potentially critical situations in terms of politeness and face (Márquez-Reiter, 2005; 2008; 2009; 2013; Lerman, 2006; Li and Su, 2007; Lee, S., 2011). At present, tourism and hospitality industries have become one of the main sources of income for several countries, including Thailand, and are consequently a priority for the governments of those countries. According to the World Travel and Tourism Council (2014), travel and tourism contributed USD 73.8 billion to Thailand’s GDP in 2013, about 20.2% of the total GDP. This figure is significantly higher than the amount of the travel and tourism income in 2012 (USD 58.4 billion to Thailand’s GDP in 2012, about 16.7% of the total GDP) (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2013). Previous research in Thai hospitality contexts, in particular, was conducted within marketing and management disciplines, e.g. looking at customer/tourist satisfaction (Rittichainuwat et al., 2002; Somwang, 2008; Thitthongkam, 2013b). It has thus not taken into account pragmatic views on politeness and face, and thus resulted in limited insights into the (in)appropriateness of participants’ behaviour in Thai hospitality settings, even though the encounters with agents and other tourist service providers are central in customer satisfaction and thus critically affect tourism industry. Consequently, the current research will address this gap, by providing an in-depth examination into the way in which participants in Thai hospitality settings engage in articulating and responding to interpersonally-sensitive activities, i.e. disagreements, refusals and rejections, through both verbal and nonverbal means, and how these activities are shaped by face concerns.

The present research, thus, combines three main characteristics: (a) hospitality settings; (b) Thai culture; and (c) natural interactional data. It concentrates on participants in Thai tourism sites, i.e. hotels, a travel agency and a tourist information centre. These research sites are principle service providers for tourists and vary in
types of services/products, thus providing richer, multifaceted data. In addition to these three main characteristics, participants in the present research include both Thais and non-Thais, i.e. Thai agents and customers and non-Thai customers. In the real world of hospitality contexts, the cross-cultural communication between people from different cultural backgrounds occurs frequently. Therefore, this study is expected to shed light on the cross-cultural communicative behaviour of those participants in real Thai tourism contexts, their strategic organisation of and responses to the delicate activities for the maintenance of face and interpersonal relationship during the encounter. It will also include an analysis of actions that may be harmful for the smooth negotiation of the (cross-cultural) business interaction.

The study, in addition to contributing to literature on face and politeness in specific cultural contexts and in communicative practices in (Thai) tourism settings, also aims to have applied implications. The findings will shed light on the (in)appropriate (non)verbal behaviour of agents and customers when navigating through interpersonally-sensitive activities and the range of (non)verbal strategies used by participants in Thai institutional encounters. Therefore, they can be used as a case study which can be employed for learning, teaching and training of tourism and hospitality students and staff but also, more generally, for staff in customer facing roles.

1.2 Research Objectives

The central research objective of this enquiry is to provide an investigation of the way in which Thai and non-Thai participants manage face concerns in their joint performance of interpersonally-sensitive activities, i.e. disagreements, refusals and rejections, in Thai service encounter contexts. For analytical purposes, this principle research objective is subdivided, into the following three specific research objectives:

1) To indicate the (non)verbal and prosodic strategies that participants in Thai hospitality contexts deploy to articulate and respond to interpersonally-sensitive activities.
2) To examine whether and why the observed behaviour is viewed as acceptable or unacceptable, and whether it is related to face manifestations.

3) To compare the behaviour observed between (a) the Thai-Thai and (b) the Thai-non-Thai service encounters and interpret why they are similar or different.

Research objective (1) and (2) will be addressed in both analytical chapters (Chapter 4 and 5), firstly in Thai-Thai and then in Thai-non-Thai encounters. The third research objective will be mainly addressed in Chapter 5. The concluding chapter provides a further discussion of the main and the three specific objectives.

1.3 Thesis Organization

This thesis is organised in six chapters: Chapter 2 and 3 map out the theoretical and methodological framework of the thesis respectively, Chapter 4 and 5 provide analyses of different discursive phenomena and the final chapter provides a concluding discussion.

Chapter 2 provides a background of theories of face, i.e. Goffman’s notion of face and first-wave approaches to face connected with politeness, as well as face and interactions. This chapter also examines the characteristics of potentially interpersonally-sensitive activities and their intersection with face concern, the interpersonal relationship between participants, Thai culture and the service encounter context. It then reviews the literature of the types of interpersonally-sensitive activities found in the data at hand, i.e. disagreements, refusals and rejections, and also outlines socially-prescribed formulations in Thai language.

Chapter 3 describes data collection methods, including audio- and video-recordings and field-notes. It then provides some background information on the sites researched, i.e. two hotels and a travel agency in Hua Hin, as well as a tourist information centre in Bangkok. Finally, ethical considerations, the procedure of the data collection and analysis and transcription conventions are discussed.

Chapter 4 presents the data analysis. It focuses on participants’ behaviour in the Thai-Thai service encounters when they engage in articulating and responding to interpersonally-sensitive activities. It discusses the agents’ withholding
(dis)agreements and the Thai customers’ implicit rejections and classifies these behaviours as (non-)politic or polite. It also analyses observed behaviour which potentially causes confrontation and face-threat.

Chapter 5 presents the data analysis of the Thai-non-Thai service encounters. It concentrates on the way in which the agents respond to the non-Thai customers’ negative assessment, i.e. their suspension of (dis)agreements and their explicit disagreement. It then focuses on the non-Thai customers’ behaviour when rejecting the agents’ product suggestion. Finally, it provides a comparative picture of the behaviour observed between the Thai-Thai interactions and the Thai-non-Thai interactions.

Chapter 6 discusses the findings of Chapter 4 and 5 and considers how interpersonally-sensitive activities are constructed, their relation to previous study results. It outlines academic and practical implications of the research, its limitations and concludes with recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Face

The chapter begins with Goffman’s notion of face considered fundamental to the establishment of the notion of face linked to politeness as presented by Brown and Levinson (1987), Spencer-Oatey (2000) and Watts (2003). After this, the development of Arundale’s face theory will be presented. It is oriented to the role of contextual factors where face occurs. It considers the whole thread of interaction between participants, not only the interactional dyad structure in order to reveal face manifestations. Thus, contextual situations and the relationship between participants have an impact on face manifestation.

2.1.1 Goffman’s notion of face and the first-wave approaches to face linked with politeness

In several Eastern languages, there are idioms or expressions with the term ‘face’, e.g. Thai (e.g. สิ่งที่ไม่มี (lose face)) and Chinese (e.g. mianzi, i.e. face associated with social expectations influencing a person’s attempt to secure public acknowledgement of his/her prestige, lian, i.e. face associated with a person’s desire to be approved of by others (Ji, 2000; Kádár and Pan, 2012) and yan, i.e. one’s physical face and prestige (Kádár and Pan, 2012)). Oriental linguists are not the only ones who have focused on the roles of “face” on human communicative behaviour in terms of linguistics, communication, anthropology and sociology (Tracy, 1990) but so have Western ones. However, Western linguists conceptualised the influence of face on the study of the interpersonal underpinnings of language use as a notion. Amongst earlier scholars, Goffman (1967), a distinguished sociologist, proposed a conceptualized thought of face. Goffman (1967: 5) defines the term ‘face’ as:
“…the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. ‘Face’ is an image of self delineated in terms of approved social attributes—albeit an image that others may share, as when a person makes a good showing for his profession or religion by making a good showing for himself.”

According to the definition above, ‘face’ is an image which a person claims for him/herself in public in accordance with social norms. If Goffman’s definition is assumed, it means belief in the influence of social norms on an individual’s production of his/her positively valued own image in public through (non)verbal behaviour. However, its definition is considered ambiguous since Goffman does not indicate clearly what triggers the manifestation of face. This ambiguity leads to its critical interpretation. O’Driscoll (1996: 6) considers Goffman’s notion of face as “public declaration” or an attribute driven by the public and that a person is aware of that social stimulus and, finally, behaves according to social norms, rather than “private feelings”. Goffman’s concept of face has a reflexive feature, i.e. being seen in others’ eyes (O’Driscoll, 1996). In contrast, Arundale (1999; 2006; 2008; 2009; 2010) interprets Goffman’s concept of face as a personal, individual possession presented through actions conducted in the immediate presence of others in a particular encounter given his orientation to conversation analysis. For Bousfield (2008), Goffman’s concept of face is established mutually by internal and external factors, i.e. an individual’s personal motivation and social expectations. The difference in interpretation of Goffman’s notion of face illustrates its ambiguity. I agree with O’Driscoll that Goffman’s face is mainly derived from socio-culturally and/or socio-professionally-related norms which assign a societal member to implement in connection with his/her social role during a particular interaction and to be respectful for others’ socially attributed value since Goffman expresses his concern of the impact of the society and societal members on a person’s manifestation of face in his definition.

Arundale (2009) and Bargiela-Chiappini (2003), contend that Goffman’s notion of face is limited to some cultures and seems “eurocentric”, i.e. it is constructed based on a Western framework of participants, usually obsessively focusing on his/her own self-image, self-preservation and individualism. Instead, face is conceptualized as emic in accordance with culture-specificity (Bargiela-Chiappini,
As a result, Goffman’s concept of face is not practical for examining face in Eastern languages such as Korean face practices (Kim, 2001) where Kim claims that the (im)politeness under the dual medical discourse in Korea is dynamic and does not belong to one participant. However, Goffman’s notion of face is potentially applicable to (some) Asian cultures. Arundale’s and Bargiela-Chiappini’s criticism on Goffman’s notion of face as eurocentrism is likely to miss the principle idea of its fundamental thought, i.e. the influence of socio-cultural norms on societal members’ communicative behaviour, since this impact is part of Goffman’s definition of face “…by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact” (assuming that these are people in the same community). Face, for instance, in Thai culture categorized as collectivist with groups by Hofstede (2001), is a structurally underlying concept FACE IS THE CONTAINER FOR HONOUR (Ukosakul, 2003: 298). This concept of Thai face seems to elevate the self-image which is approved of in accordance with the social attributes (Goffman, 1967). This means that the Thai notion of face is not relatively relevant to a person’s right to do whatever he/she wishes but is weighed on the acceptance of his/her achievement or social position by other societal members (Ukosakul, 2009). At the same time, Thai face is associated with the interlocutor’s face which includes a Thai social value called “ krêng cay/ (This Thai value will be discussed in section 2.2.2.). That signals that Thai people must serve their own honour and simultaneously avoid behaviour that may cause embarrassment to others (Ukosakul, 2009). It seems that the preservation of one’s face in Thai culture is to consider and accept another’s social roles, status and achievement. Despite the fact that Ukosakul does not clearly explain Thai face and its presence during the interaction, it is assumed that Thai face is dynamic and context-sensitive in accordance with a person’s social (and/or socio-professional) role and status during the interaction. That means that maintaining or threatening a person is likely to arise from his/her social roles and the interlocutor’s during the interaction. In other words, face in Thai culture is associated with an awareness of an individual’s social status within the structure of social relationships.

However, the definition of face may be insufficient regarding its applicability. Goffman extends his work on what a societal member conducts to present him/herself in accordance with standardized or acceptable social values to achieve one of the two
directions of face; this (non-)linguistic practice is called “facework” (Goffman, 1967) which consists of two types of strategies used to discuss face: corrective practices and preventative practices. **Corrective practices** include a method that a person conducts to revive his/her face after one of the participants threatens his/her face (Goffman, 1967), i.e. a person’s desire to restore a satisfactory state. For example, when an individual reproaches another one (“This steak is too salty”), the reproached one may reply “Next time I will do it better” as a corrective strategy which varies from offers of compensation to a decision of self-punishment. In contrast, **preventive practices** include actions that people do to avoid or prevent threat to one’s face and to another’s (Goffman, 1967). They are sub-classified into two types: (a) defensive practices, i.e. actions which people do to avoid threat to one’s face, e.g. avoidance of threatening topics or activities which may lead to informative transfers irrelevant to the line he/she wishes to sustain; and (b) protective practices, i.e. actions used to minimize threat to the other’s face or conducted to manage facework, e.g. an attempt not to finish unstated facts that might cause conflict (Goffman, 1967). Integrating Goffman’s definition of face and his extended explanations of the facework process, it may be assumed that face involves socio-linguistically cognitive and communicative processes which can be manifested before, during and after the interaction since it arises from a person’s personal motivation which comprises social expectations as a backdrop to trigger face manifestation. Preventative strategies refer to an individual’s recognition of face manifestation before and during the interaction and correction strategies represent one’s attempt to manifest face during the interaction. Arundale’s (2010) claim that face is an outcome of the relationship conjointly co-constituted by at least two participants is likely to be part of Goffman’s notion of face for me. A person is culturally socialized from birth and has a set of knowledge implanted by society which Goffman (1974) calls “frame” for his/her (non-)linguistic practices in various situations. Therefore, Arundale’s claim about relational face co-constructed by at least two participants is partially, but not entirely, true. Face manifested by a person is also the result of his/her acquisition and application of a set of socially-cultivated knowledge into the ongoing (non-)linguistic practices to get others to accept him/her as a part of community.

Goffman’s notion of face is broadly accepted regarding its applicability to research in communicative behaviour (Holtgraves, 1992) and applied by
pragmalinguists such as Brown and Levinson (1987) to conceptualise their politeness approaches. Brown and Levinson’s (1987: 61) concept of face which they claim is established on the basis of Goffman’s notion of face consists of two types that everyone maintains and his/her interlocutors are assumed to cooperate to save: “(a) negative face: the want of every “competent adult member that his actions be unimpeded by others; and (b) positive face: the desire of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others”. However, some scholars, for instance, O’Driscoll (1996), Márquez-Reiter (2000) and Locher (2004), doubt Brown and Levinson’s interpretation of the notion of face which they claim they draw from Goffman. He uses the word ‘image’ when defining the notion of face, signifying that face is derived from outside, whereas Brown and Levinson insist on the presence of ‘want’ in face, meaning that face is derived from inside (O’Driscoll, 1996). Brown and Levinson’s positive and negative face focuses on an individual, not external image, whereas Goffman’s face arises from the public as a main factor in the construction of face (O’Driscoll, 1996; Márquez-Reiter, 2000; Locher, 2004). Regarding Goffman’s features of face and as discussed earlier in the same section, social expectations work as a backseat which stimulates a person to behave in a particular way in order to be acceptable as part of a social community. Therefore, Brown and Levinson seem to bring only one of two driving factors which co-operate in the manifestation of face into the conceptualization of face. The absence of Brown and Levinson’s concern of the societal influence about face manifestation may be problematic in considering some cultures where people are regarded as potentially group-oriented societies.

Brown and Levinson propose that every participant is interested in minimizing face-threat that is inherently attached to types of speech acts called “face-threatening acts (FTAs)”. Like Leech (1983), some speech acts, for instance, criticisms, advice, challenges and talking about dangerously emotional topics, are considered face-threatening. It is not surprising that, like Leech’s, Brown and Levinson’s theory is criticized for its inherent (im)politeness (Eelen, 2001; Watts, 2003). Nonetheless, face is not only related to a threat to a person’s self-image but also to groups (Haugh, 2009 [2011]) and an awareness of a person’s position in social relationships (Ukosakul, 2003; 2005).
In addition, Brown and Levinson (1987) believe in the universality of face but such an assumption is questionable. They try to convince us that some linguistic forms such as honorifics, which function as an indicator of deference, impersonalisation and high-class society, for example, those in Japanese (Ide, 1989), Chinese (Gu, 1990), Korean and Thai (Hongladarom and Hongladarom, 2005) cultures, are considered negative politeness strategies based on the notion of “negative face”. Nevertheless, Kádár and Haugh (2013) claim that the notion of face involves a specific comprehension of the mind of a given people which differs across cultures or societies. Some non-Western scholars such as Ide (1989) and Gu (1990) reject the applicability of Brown and Levinson’s negative face to their cultures. Gudykunst et al. (1988) also criticize Brown and Levinson’s excessive focus of face-threat and their negligence of face-respect. Ide (1989) argues that Brown and Levinson’s face is eurocentric and corresponds to Western people who are brought up to consider face as the main principle of interaction. Instead, Ide (1992) suggests the notion of wakimae (discernment) which includes the idea that Japanese speakers are socio-pragmatically obligated to produce utterances in a particular way in accordance with social conventions and place of both participants such as honorifics, address terms, pronouns, and speech formulas. Formal forms and honorifics in Japanese are presented in training workforce development companies in terms of discernment, rather than as individually motivated choices of strategies (Dunn, 2011). The discernment aspect of linguistic forms deals with the desire to indicate the speaker’s perception towards social interactions, i.e. the expected positions or roles of participants, and to conform to the social norms of the formality of the settings (Ide, 1989). Parallel to discernment, the higher degree of discernment, called “volition” (Ide, 1989) is defined as the application of linguistic politeness markers in an excessive use of the level of discernment and is associated with face wants. In Asian cultures but also in some European cultures e.g. Spanish, the application of Brown and Levinson’s positive and negative face is questionable. Advice in Spanish colloquial conversations does not always indicate the avoidance or mitigation of threat as Brown and Levinson claim, but the enhancement of the relationship between participants (Hernández-Flores, 1999). In conclusion, Brown and Levinson’s positive and negative face is not universal as it is not applicable to all cultures.
After Brown and Levinson’s development of politeness theory based on the notion of face (adapted from Goffman’s as they claim) and the criticism of their theory regarding their claim about the universality of face, some scholars, for example, Spencer-Oatey (2000) and Watts (2003), attempt to link face to relationships. Spencer-Oatey (2000; 2002) develops her own notion of face which relies more on the first-wave approaches to politeness (Kádár and Haugh, 2013). She (2000) adapts Goffman’s concept of face and amends challenges on Brown and Levinson’s concept of face. Spencer-Oatey pays attention to both individual-focused face and society-prescribed attributes by constructing two face needs (i.e. quality face and identity face\(^1\)) and connecting them to rights (i.e. equity rights and association rights\(^2\)). Spencer-Oatey’s concept of face needs is criticized regarding the ambiguity of the definition of identity face (Culpeper et al., 2010). It is unclear whether identity face also includes an individual’s action on behalf of his/her organization or institution. Moreover, Spencer-Oatey’s claim of rights is likely to be partially similar to the description of face. Her classification of rights strengthens her viewpoint of face as self-identification. Association rights also seem to overlap with quality face. Both of them focus on others’ positive attitude towards self. In conclusion, the definition and classification of Spencer-Oatey’s concept of face and rights are ambiguous. In addition, Spencer-Oatey’s claim about the high involvement of face and rights to explain why the interaction is elaborated is questionable for Hernández Lopéz (2008) who believes that interactional goals are in an individual’s mind whereas face and rights are social and interactionally managed. Thus, face and rights should be considered as a medium to manage rapport appropriately, not the reason why the interaction is developed.

Despite applying Goffman’s concept of face, Watts’s (2003) theory is more embedded with a discursive analysis, unlike Spencer-Oatey’s. Adapting Goffman’s notion of face (as he claims), Watts (2003: 125) proposes his adaptive concept of face

---

1 *Quality face* is defined as an individual’s fundamental desire to be acknowledged and evaluated positively by others and his/her concern for his or her own self-esteem, e.g. competence and appearance, whereas *identity face* as an individual’s desire to be admired and acknowledged with regard to his/her social role and identity in public, e.g. as valued staff and a best friend (Spencer-Oatey, 2000; Spencer-Oatey and Franklin, 2009).

2 *Equity rights* are involved in the idea that a person should be treated fairly (Spencer-Oatey, 2000; 2002). This means an individual should not be impeded by others. In contrast, Spencer-Oatey’s (2000; 2002) *association rights* are related to the idea that a person expects to appropriately cooperate with others according to the relationship he/she has with them.
defined as “…a socially attributed aspect of self that is temporarily on loan for the duration of the interaction in accordance with the line or lines\(^3\) that the individual has adopted. It is not our personal construction of the self, although the different faces we are required to adopt in different interactions do contribute towards that construction”. In other words, face is a basic conceptualized thought which determines a person to conduct politic behaviour or what is socio-culturally required with regard to social norms.

Watts’s concept of face is likely to share three similar characteristics with Goffman’s notion of face: Face is (a) a temporary aspect that a person assumes from social norms during a particular interaction; (b) related to the line(s) or forms of (non)verbal behaviour that is expressed by a person in order to reflect his/her perspective of the events and his/her assessment of the participants; and (c) a construction of the self in accordance with the construals of others/the society determined in social interaction. However, Watts’s definition partially differs from Goffman’s. Goffman’s face as a positive social value seems ambiguous, i.e. it can be both a state of being socially existent and the state of being created. In contrast, Watts’s face as a socially attributed aspect is interpretable as social appropriateness which is likely to be a state of being socially existent. This feature of Watts’s notion of face seems to be a revisited version of that proposed by Goffman. It also corresponds to O’Driscoll’s concept of face which he reinterprets as “face-as-existential-attribute” or an aspect of face whose quality can be changeable and threatened in interaction but whose existence is unchangeable (2011: 26). Moreover, Watts’s (2003) claim that “face is not our personal construction of the self” signals that face is dependent on the interpretation that others assume, rather than his/her own interpretation. That means Watts (2003) focuses on the interpersonal relationship arising in ongoing interaction (Kádár and Haugh, 2013). Unlike Spencer-Oatey, Watts’s (2003) approach underlies the discursive analysis of at least the dyad interaction. Although Goffman’s notion is assumed about the influence of construals of others on an individual’s constructed self, it is not specified clearly as to who face is interpreted by, i.e. either a person’s own interpretation or others’ interpretation or

\(^3\) Line is defined as a linguistic structure of (non)verbal acts that a person uses to display his/her viewpoint and/or assessment of the situation and/or others (Watts, 2003). The lines that participants assume to take then establish politic behaviour. Breaking these lines can be considered positive (polite) and negative (impolite).
both. Moreover, both Watts and Goffman do not indicate clearly the influence of face after the encounter ends. However, I believe that it exists. For instance, the junior accountant’s late arrival is regarded in general as his/her absence of responsibility, less concern of time and place and not “local” to the professional setting, i.e. the company meeting, in the view of other company members both during the interaction and after it is terminated. This means that that person’s withdrawn face during a particular interaction may potentially result in others’ negative assessment towards that individual’s image.

Locher and Watts’s (2008) idea which focuses on face constructed discursively with others, seems to be relevant to part of Arundale’s face as a relational and an interactional achievement. Watts’s approach is based on linking face to politeness and is criticized regarding its applicability to reveal what is marked or unmarked behaviour. Haugh (2007b) doubts the true relevance of the conceptualization of politeness in the discursive models of politeness and a first-order notion (Politeness 1). Watts’s (2005: xxi) belief that a theory of politeness can be established by considering closely and more intensively the way in which “people use the terms that are available to them in their own languages” is rather problematic, since few chances to do so exist when politeness is regarded as recognition of marked behaviour or behaviour in excess of social expectations (Haugh, 2007b).

Later, post-modern linguists such as Arundale (1999; 2006; 2008; 2009; 2010) and Terkourafi (2008a; 2008b) argue that face is co-established by at least two participants, which is taken as the unit of analysis, not portrayed in accordance with personal desires or social expectancy. The next sub-section will present face and interaction.

2.1.2 Face and interactions

Arundale (1999; 2006), Terkourafi (2008a; 2008b), Haugh (2009 [2011]) and Kádár and Haugh (2013), and other post 2000 researchers in politeness, argue that face and facework should be focused on in their own right and be broader than just politeness. While several proposed (and adapted) notions of face are grounded in either individuals (e.g. Brown and Levinson’s (1987)) or groups and relationships
(e.g. Spencer-Oatey’s (2000) and Watts’s (2003)), Arundale (1999; 2006; 2008; 2009; 2010) suggests his Face Constituting Theory (FCT) as an alternative insight into the presence of face within a different conceptualization of communication.

Unlike Brown and Levinson’s notion of face, Arundale’s FCT focuses on the discursive analysis of communicative behaviour in the thread of conversations. Arundale tries to create a framework of face which eliminates the weaknesses of Brown and Levinson’s theory, and Goffman’s notion of face that Arundale (2010) interprets as a self-and-other-focused image that a person possesses for his/her own value. Based on an attempt to answer the main question, “How do participants achieve face in everyday talk?”, FCT helps explain the interactional achievement of face and facework in relation to face-to-face communication in relationships (Arundale, 2010). Influenced by Conversation Analysis (CA)\(^4\), Arundale (2010) creates three principles which he claims are fundamental to the Conjoint Co-constituting Model of Communication, or a conceptualization of achieving meaning and actions that participants convey in daily interactions and relevant paralinguistic behaviour. They include the Adjacent Placement Principle, the Sequential Interpreting Principle and the Recipient Design Principle. The former one deploys the idea of Sacks’ adjacency pair to explain the designing and interpretation of the utterance which is produced in accordance with the view of a prior utterance and which simultaneously functions as a ground for designing the subsequent utterance. The latter two, as Arundale claims, are associated with “expectations and participants’ interpreting” and differ from the view of participants as speaker and hearer. The Sequential Interpreting Principle is a core process of recipients’ interpreting utterances adjacent to one another in sequential interactions, whereas the Recipient Design Principle is a core process of speakers’ designing/producing of the utterance. Although Arundale’s framework includes the idea of expectation which participants have and which forms interpreting, the expectation Arundale defines focuses on expectation arising in designing and interpreting prior utterances according to the recipient and prior designing and interpreting. He (1999; 2009; 2010) disagrees with the influence of socially-prescribed norms on individuals’ communicative behaviour. Nonetheless, this claim seems questionable in my view since, beneath expectations

\(^4\) Conversation Analysis is a domain which scholars deploy to describe the way in which persons use in doing social life (Sack, 1985) by examining the socially sequential organization underlying the production of those everyday social actions (Ten Have, 1999).
arising in designing, producing and interpreting the prior utterance during the interaction, participants develop those expectations in line with what is socio-culturally acceptable.

In addition, Arundale (and other subsequent linguists such as Terkourafi (2008b) and Haugh (2007b; 2009 [2011])) strongly believes that the achievement of human communication needs to be co-constructed by at least two persons and analysed within a discursive phenomenon that includes two or more independent individuals influencing and influenced by one another’s producing and interpreting utterances and/or apparent behaviour in a sequentially ongoing interaction. That means his notion of face concentrates on the relationship conjointly co-constituted by two or more participants in interaction of interpreting both connection with others and of separation from them. According to Arundale (2006; 2010), face consists of three qualities: (a) it is a relational and interactional phenomenon in a particular time; (b) it is conceptualized by one of two different poles, i.e. either “connectedness” (solidarity or convergence) or “separateness” (independence or divergence); and (c) it is interactionally achieved when participants interactionally accomplish and conjointly co-constitute interpreting of meaning and action (i.e. the achievement of meaning and action, and face in interaction is harmoniously interdependent). His notion of face is in line with his proposed interactional sequence. It may be assumed that face in FCT is unrelated to the set of knowledge or social norms which assign or motivate a person to resume appropriate behaviour. Instead, face is an interactional phenomenon which occurs uniquely in a particular interaction. It is also interactional in that it is vital for the presupposition of evaluation by others of the participants’ behaviour (Arundale, 1999; Haugh (2009) [2011]).

Nonetheless, the notion of face in Thai culture seems to be beyond Arundale’s notion of face. Thai face is associated with the sense of dignity, self-esteem, reputation and pride and with the idea that an individual’s accomplishments and social position are socially accepted by others (Ukosakul, 2009). Although Thai face is constructed by at least two people in an ongoing interaction, it is mainly created and supported in line with those socially-attributed thoughts and involves a person’s consideration of one’s social position within a network of relationships (Ukosakul, 2003). As in Chinese culture (Gu, 1990), the notion of face in Thai culture is important for Thais’ perception and construction of interpersonal relationships in
interaction. This notion is reflected through a variety of Thai idioms, for example, เพิ่มหน้า /sāa nāa/ (lose face), รักษาหน้า /ráksāa nāa/ (save face), ได้หน้า /dāay nāa/ (gain face), ขายหน้า /khǎay nāa/ (sell face), and ไว้หน้า /wāy nāa/ (keep face). Four conceptualized thoughts of Thai people which have a strong impact on Thai people’s communicative behaviour and reflect their awareness of societal members’ basic needs based on socially-prescribed norms include: (a) น้ำใจ naam jai (“water of heart” or one’s genuine concern for others); (b) เกรงใจ kreng jai (one’s consideration of others’ face need and feelings so that one shows an extreme reluctance to impose on others (Knutson, 1994; Sriussadaporn-Charoenngam and Jablin, 1999; Ukosakul, 2009)); (c) บุญคุณ bunkhun (“the reciprocity of goodness” or one’s awareness of consciousness of the benefit or favour that others have provided to oneself); and (d) เกียรติ kiat (concept of honour or one’s genuine acceptance and respect from others (Persons, 2008; Ukosakul, 2009)) (Ukosakul, 2009: 297). The concept of เกียรติ kiat is based on the possession of หน้าตา /nāa taa/ (face) which can also refer to people’s external qualities, i.e. competence, appearance, influence, intellectual and money (Person, 2008). In conclusion, Arundale’s concept of face may be able to describe the presence of face interactionally (and changeably) co-constructed during the ongoing interaction, but is unlikely or insufficient to justify what motivates the (non-)linguistic behaviour of participants. This is because Thai people’s communicative behaviour is expressed on the basis of socio-cultural expectations.

After Arundale launched the idea of the FCT, few linguists applied it for almost ten years because of its level of difficulty, until Haugh (2010) and his PhD student (Chang and Haugh, 2011) deployed FCT to explore linguistic behaviour in different situations through naturally occurring interactions. Furthermore, its theme, which focuses on the relational and interactional phenomenon of face conjointly co-constructed by at least two participants as a unit of the interaction, may not enable analysis of some types of speech events, for instance, political speech (not debates) where the audience has no opportunity to interact with the speaker. In my opinion FCT is restricted to the analysis of face-to-face communication such as group discussions and naturally occurring interactions and interactively written
communication, for example, emails. It is also likely that FCT might be questionable when applied to some communicative methods such as political speech and questionnaires, since those methods do not comprise at least two participants, which Arundale considers as a basic unit of the interaction.

In this study, face manifestations found in the collected data will be acquired in line with the emic understanding (Ide, Haugh, 2009 [2011]) of communicative behaviour of people in a particular cultural perspective, i.e. Thai service encounters. Through the emic examination of communicative behaviour in Thai service encounters, speech practices can be understood (Haugh, 2009 [2011]) as making sense for the involved people in Thai service encounters and reveal values, attitudes and social characteristics in Thai culture. Face manifestations in this study are also revealed in accordance with participant perspective (Haugh, 2009 [2011]), i.e. participants’ views or interpretation of the utterance in ongoing interactions. This can reflect real meanings of the utterance, intention and emotion of the participants in those ongoing interactions.

I will move on to potentially interpersonally-sensitive activities which are the focus of the present study.

2.2 Interpersonally-Sensitive Activities

Earlier studies of (im)politeness and face, e.g. Brown and Levinson (1987), have been significantly criticized regarding the connection of the expression of (im)politeness to particular speech acts. Thus, some speech acts such as commanding, criticizing and requesting, are inherently regarded as impolite acts due to the cost to the hearer. In contrast, those, for instance, offering and thanking, are inherently considered as favourable activities to the hearer due to the benefits given to him/her and related to politeness. Instead, accounting contextual factors, for instance, variation in cultures (Blum-Kulka, 1989; 2005), situational contexts (Tannen and Kakava, 1992; Hwang et al., 2003; Wong, 2004; Thitthongkam, 2013b) and social roles of participants (Spencer-Oatey, 2000), are inevitably required by the speaker for the elaboration of (non-)linguistic behaviour which affects the interpretation as face concern and (im)politeness. For example, German participants in academic settings,
i.e. professors and their students, tend to interpret what others, particularly those in Anglo-phone cultural communities, outside the academic context consider tentatively face-sensitive, e.g. corrections, overlapping and reformulation, as “unmarked” or acceptable behaviour (House, 2010). Despite the criticisms regarding the excessively superficial consideration of speech acts about face, considering them can provide an insight into the presence of face. They are significantly relevant to be integrated with the interplay of contextual factors in the elaboration of meanings, e.g. situational contexts and participants’ roles. Much earlier research in face has been conducted with regard to a variety of speech acts, i.e. requesting, apologizing, refusing and disagreeing, in a variety of situational contexts. This implicates a certain involvement of those speech acts to the expression of face-vulnerability and face manifestations.

The section will begin with the definition of “activity type” and “interpersonally-sensitive activities”. Then, I will concentrate on face that agents and customers are assumed to be taking in service encounters. Afterwards, the focus will be on characteristics of Thai culture where the hierarchical system has been reported to impact on the communicative behaviour and thoughts of Thai people (Kummer, 2005). Following this, types of potentially interpersonally-sensitive activities will be discussed beginning from disagreement to refusals/rejections. Finally, socially-indexing linguistic formulation in Thai culture will be presented in detail in pronominal forms and sentence particles.

2.2.1 Potentially interpersonally-sensitive activities and face

Levinson (1979 [1992]: 368) claims that activity type is “…any culturally recognized activity, whether or not that activity is co-extensive with a period of speech or indeed whether any talk takes place in it at all”. He further adds that the activity type refers to “a fuzzy category whose focal members are goal-defined, socially constituted, bounded, events with constraints on participants, setting, and so on, but above all on the kinds of allowable contributions”. An activity, therefore, refers to a (non-)linguistically behavioural unit of interaction culturally constructed in a sequential structure of interaction consisting of several constraints or variables relevant to their production and perception and as resources of inferences for a
specific activity. Examples of activity types are a job interview, a football game and a dinner party (Levinson, 1979 [1992]).

The activity types in the present study include primarily requesting and providing a service in service encounters. However, embedded within these activity types there are sub activity types such as disagreeing and explaining information. This signals that activity type is a multilayered concept. According to earlier research in (im)politeness in accordance with speech acts, it seems that some speech acts are more likely to be constructed as potentially interpersonally-delicate activities. In the present research, potentially “interpersonally-sensitive activities” or delicate activities (Márquez-Reiter, 2013) in interaction are defined as (non)verbal actions that indicate participants’ concern about their own face and their interlocutor’s face, as well as their interpersonal relationship when participants in interaction show disalignment (Goffman, 1967) with the interlocutor. Moreover, participants also orient those linguistic activities as delicate (Márquez-Reiter, 2013) throughout the interaction and elaborate them carefully. Since they are interpersonally-delicate, participants often elaborate them by providing preference as an initiating response (Pomerantz and Heritage, 2013). That means participants often produce dispreferred signals before getting to the delicate activities, for instance, the use of hesitation markers (Watts, 2003) and delay markers (e.g. silence), before elaborating refusals/rejections (Pomerantz and Heritage, 2013), and the use of the low degree of committers (e.g. I think) before disagreeing with the interlocutor (Watts, 2003). Additionally, participants are concerned with potentially interpersonal delicacy of the direct elaboration of those linguistic activities; therefore, they do not want to conduct the activities themselves. Instead, they want their interlocutor to construct the activities for them. Thus, those linguistic activities are oriented as delicate through (a) (non-)linguistic resources such as laughter, smiles, pause and hesitation markers (Pomerantz, 1984; Pomerantz and Heritage, 2013), and (b) interactions throughout which participants recalibrate what they wish, i.e. the speaker offers a chance for the other person to do the activities instead of him/her and wants their delicate utterances to be noticed by their interlocutor.

The absence of certain interpersonally-sensitive activities seems to correspond to the absence of certain activities or linguistic forms considered as appropriate behaviour. Nonetheless, interpersonally-sensitive activities are potentially regarded as
appropriate behaviour. This is because they are constructed appropriately and carefully through (non-)linguistic forms, which tend to ensure that threatening the speaker’s own face and the hearer’s face does not take place and that their interpersonal relationship is maintained. In fact, the interactional responses of participants (and probably contextual variables) are likely to affect the interpretation of a potentially interpersonally-sensitive utterance—as either the presence of face concern or face threat.

Since interpersonally-sensitive activities are involved with face concern and the interpersonal relationship between participants during the interaction, face on loans by agents and customers in service encounters should be examined. Agents have roles socio-professionally-oriented by customers (and the public) and their professional institution both before and during the interaction. In service exchanges the public and customers expect agents to be, i.e. friendly, welcoming and positively emotional, to customers (Bitner et al., 1990; Price et al., 1995b; Tsiotsou and Wirtz, 2011). The positively emotional expression of agents is positively associated with customers’ impression and with their assessment of service quality (Pugh, 2001). They must show more characteristics of friendship than the commercial service provision. When acknowledging customers’ arrival at the hospitality setting, agents should signal that they are happy to provide services to customers. Secondly, the face that agents must socially reserve is that they must be competent, skillful and helpful to customers (Bitner et al., 1990; Price et al., 1995b; Burgers et al., 2000; Tsiotsou and Wirtz, 2011). They must have sufficient knowledge regarding the provided service. Thirdly, agents are assumed to manage various interpersonal situations (Burgers et al., 2000). They must adapt their behaviour to customers in various situations. This means that agents must elaborate carefully activities potentially interpersonally-delicate to customers’ face and their own face. For instance, agents should avoid explicitly rejecting customers’ request and replace the prior offer with which customers are unhappy with another offer. Finally, in critical situations, the face that people expect agents to have is the management of feelings to accomplish service encounter goals and to avoid a clash of interests. When customers negatively assess the provided service, the line that their institution and customers assume agents to be taking is the avoidance of explicit disagreement and negatively emotional expressions such as in a complaint sequence where customers may display outrage with the provided service.
Simultaneously the face shown by agents as a part of their professional institution includes protecting the institutional image from a bad reputation, if the provided service is negatively criticised by customers. This socio-professional value by agents may contradict their face that customers socially assume agents to be carrying, i.e. the avoidance of explicitly (non)verbal expressions of potentially delicate activities. Thus, the maintenance of an institutional image should be conducted on the basis of the avoidance of personally vulnerable (non-)linguistic practices. Secondly, agents are also expected to be restricted to institutional policies, e.g. discount-giving, a payment process and the amount of deposits. Agents are also professionally expected to accomplish the institutional demand of their jobs. On some occasions the lines of agents assigned by customers and by their employer may contradict each other, for example, customers’ request for a service/product which infringes institutional regulations.

Despite being a money power holder, the public can expect customers to accompany the socially-prescribed etiquette as far as customers’ face is concerned i.e. the manifestation of sociability and friendliness to their interlocutor. Thus, the face that customers are socially assumed to perform is to maintain the interpersonal relationship in non-everyday interactions when elaborating requests and refusing offers. Furthermore, the line that the institution and public assume agents to be taking is to protect institutional benefits, whereas customers are socially predictable in protecting their own benefits, i.e. customers want the best service for their money.

Throughout the section the impact of cultures is reflected on the manifestation of face and lines that societal members are expected to be carrying. The present study focuses on service encounters in Thai culture which will be discussed in the next subsection.

2.2.2 Thai culture and service encounter contexts

There has not been a unanimous agreement of defining the term `culture” until the present (Gudyskunst et al., 1988; Belshek, 2006; Spencer-Oatey, 2012). Hofstede (1980: 21-23), who comparatively studies people’s behaviour across cultures, defines “culture” as “the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the
members of one group from another”. In fact, there are some principle aspects of culture: Culture (a) affects behaviour and interpretations of behaviour as well as everything people do in their society (Gundyskunst et al., 1988; Belshek, 2006; Spencer-Oatey, 2012); (b) is learned, not inherited but is always shared by members of a society (Belshek, 2006; Browne, 2008; Birukou et al., 2009; Spencer-Oatey, 2012); and (c) can be differentiated from both universal human nature and unique individual personality and is passed from generation to generation (Hofstede, 1980; Browne, 2008; Spencer-Oatey, 2012). Moreover, Gudykunst et al. (1988) believe that culture is equated with communication. In other words, for them, culture is communication and communication is culture.

Thai culture is claimed and characterized as a complicated pyramid where His Majesty the King, His Royal Family and the Supreme Patriarch are elevated at the top of the pyramid (Kummer, 2005) followed by governors, politicians, doctors and professors. In contrast, some occupations, for example, door-men, farmers and labourers, are classified into the lower group (Kummer, 2005). The nobility have been strongly implanted in Thai society for a very long time (Gannon and Pillai, 2010). Moreover, if the lower-ranking people want to meet the higher-ranking ones, the lower-class ones need to have a good connection with someone who is close to those higher-ranking ones (Thitthongkam, 2013b). In other words, the above mentioned scholars claim that Thai people are elevated or discriminated in accordance with their socio-professional status (and their status which is assumed when they were born). However, the hierarchical difference in the socio-professional status is likely to change due to the increasing presence of new occupations such as computer programmers and online sale assistants and to their influential roles in the real world. According to a recent survey about the dream occupations of Thai children (Adecco Group Thailand, 2014), being a doctor is still the first choice of occupation amongst Thai people, followed by engineers, businessmen and teachers. Nonetheless, the survey also indicates that policemen and soldiers who were ranked in the low class group, according to Kummer’s (2005) classification, have become more popular amongst Thai children instead. These recent studies may imply the unstable (and probably undermined but still existent) influence of the hierarchical system in Thai culture. They also indicate the gradual change in Thais’ attitudes towards the criteria of the order of society according to Thai economy, values, political thoughts and
differences in behaviour and attitudes and the influence of the capitalism on Thai culture (Saxer, 2011). The choice of linguistic features of pronominal references in accordance with the interlocutor, time and place evidences the existence of the hierarchical system in Thai culture despite the slight difference in pronominal forms in accordance with time and Thai people’s change in thoughts. Each pronominal form reflects the speaker’s socially-related stance in connection with socio-cultural norms (e.g. intimacy and deference of subordinates towards superiors) and their emotional stance toward his/her interlocutor (e.g. anger and friendliness) and the discussed issue. The pronominal system and other forms such as titles, kinship terms and names in Thai will be discussed further in section 2.2.5 (Formulations).

Despite the unstable hierarchical difference in the socio-professional status and the status by birth in Thai culture at present, other sociological variables such as seniority and the social position, are influential for (non-)linguistic practices. Thai culture values deference to authority and distance. This Thai value is called /kren cay/ (one’s consideration of others’ faces, needs and feelings so that one shows an extreme reluctance to impose on others) (KJ) (Knutson, 1994; Sriussadaporn-Charoenngam and Jablin, 1999; Pornpitakpan, 2000; Ukosakul, 2009; Intachakra, 2012). In Thai contexts, a Thai national value /kren cay/ (KJ) affects the linguistic choice in elaborating potentially interpersonally-delicate activities in the both hierarchical (e.g. subordinate-superior and elder-younger relationship) and non-hierarchical (e.g. friend-friend relationship) conversations. This interactional principle seems to be accurately equated with a concern or an anxiety about how others may think or feel as a result of one’s expressed words and action (Intachakra, 2012) and about the fact that one should not take advantage of another person (Ukosakul, 2009). Subordinates, e.g. younger people and students, should be quiet in confrontational situations and display modesty to superiors, e.g. older people and teachers (Knutson, 1994; 2004). This interactional principle is significantly dominated by relational work rationality (Watts, 2003). The speaker’s desire for interpersonal relationship-building, the Thai value “KJ”, and the linguistic choice in social practices have an interrelated relationship which forces the presence of the Thai value “KJ”, and then the latter concept forces the speaker to choose (non-)linguistic forms socially-prescribed as appropriateness.
Thai people usually say “yes” and hardly say directly “no” when answering the question or agreeing with others (although in reality they do not) (Hendon, 1999; Witkowski and Wofinbarger, 2001; Katz, 2008). Additionally, Phukanchana (1995) evidences the use of off-record strategies of Thai subordinates to express disagreement and Thai superiors’ lessened concern about the face of subordinates. She also claims the reverse communicative behaviour between superiors and subordinates is unacceptable since it signals subordinates’ absence of respect towards superiors. Nevertheless, it seems that her claim is partly overgeneralized since Phukanchana (1995) specifies neither the intimacy level of “subordinates and superiors” nor the situational context where the interaction occurs. Those social variables may affect the diversity of linguistic forms in the expression of potentially interpersonally delicate acts. For example, in the present study social distance seems to be less influential in manifesting interactionally disagreement and refusals/rejections; it is relatively the same across the gathered interactions. This means that most customers and agents are not personally intimate unlike cordial friendships. In general service encounters are oriented to a primarily commercial aim despite the interpersonal one which occupies as a secondary aim. Thus, they are likely to spend limited time on achieving the primarily transactional goal and simultaneously on strengthening sociability between customers and agents. Despite a small number of loyal customers, they occupy fewer chances in conducting relational work than participants in other socio-cultural contexts such as colleagues at their workplace. The value “KJ” may or may not function as a backdrop which forces Thai superiors and subordinates to avoid confrontation through the off-record strategies in every situational context as Phukanchana (1995) claims. Other variables (e.g. situational contexts) and/or primarily communicative goals may impact on (non-)linguistic practices in Thai contexts.

In the present study which focuses on the investigation of (non-)linguistic forms in Thai service encounters, agents and customers, their socio-economic roles and service encounter contexts need to be considered. In hospitality contexts, it is generally understood that service encounters are sequentially organized upon an adjacency pair of participants, these being customers who are making a request for service and agents who take action and either fulfill or do not comply with the request. Moreover, in service encounters, activities which participants do occur based
on the participants common shared knowledge, i.e. activities known in common and
causing “socially sanctioned grounds for inference and action” (Kidwell, 2000: 27),
but vary in the way in which service is delivered and what is delivered (Gabbott and
Hogg, 1994). In other words, common features of service encounters and
communicative behaviour that participants expect their interlocutor to say and do
impact on the ability of participants to understand one another. This is also contingent
on activity types related to the context that is in accordance with agents’ and
customers’ role or behaviour that is socially expected in play (Tsiotsou and Wirtz,
2011). The study of variables influencing linguistic behaviour of agents and
customers in service encounters may be significant in comprehending their
communicative behaviour. The study will consider these factors i.e. cultural
orientation and the power of money.

Cultural orientation can shape customers’ evaluation of service failure and
service recovery (Wong, 2004) and affect customer satisfaction (Thitthongkam,
2013b). Customers across cultures may evaluate agents’ communicative behaviour in
a different way. Through explanations North American customers pay attention to the
situation as a cause of failure, rather than insisting on the agent’s failure (Mattila and
Patterson, 2004a). In contrast, making apologies to American customers results in
lower satisfaction than that to Singaporean ones (Wong, 2004). Witkowski and
Wolfinbarger (2001) claim that Thai culture has an impact on service performance.
Thailand is named the “Land of Smiles” (Knutson, 2004; 2005). Despite the
difference in meaning of smiles across situations and the actor’s emotion, smiles in
Thai culture seem to function to lubricate embarrassing or difficult interactions
(Witkowski and Wolfinbarger, 2001) in social harmony (Knutson, 2005). I will
consider the hierarchical position between customers and agents in Thai culture and
its impact on linguistic practices. Hospitality comprises a host-guest relationship
where the host is socially and professionally expected to serve customers’ wants and
pleasure (King, 1995: 228). Commercial relationships between agents and customers
are likely to be unequal due to the difference in the power of money (which will be
further discussed in the same sub-section) and their professionally-prescribed roles.
Agents are expected to provide as good a service as possible to customers whereas
customers visit hospitality settings for a primarily transactional goal, i.e. getting the
best value for their money. Kummer (2005) and Triwittayapoom (2011) claim in their
studies in Thai culture that most agents, in particular those working at hotel front

desks and hotel boys, are categorized as people in the lower-middle class, i.e. which
also includes low paid office working for private companies or governmental sections,
technicians, small-business owners, and those in the upper-lower class, i.e. unskilled
workers.

Nonetheless, the claims that Thai agents in hospitality industries are partially
unskilled workers are likely to contradict my data gathered from the informal
conversation between managers or agents at each research site as well as from the
fieldwork notes. Agents working at each research site have a command of English
which enables them to communicate with non-Thai customers and deal with non-Thai
written documents. They can also use computers well, in particular those working for
tour agents who are familiar with the specific and international air ticketing
programme “Amadeus”. Moreover, they need to have a good command of specific
knowledge necessary for their customers. For instance, agents at the tourist
information centre, namely “Bangkok Tourism Division”, can not only provide tourist
information about tourist attractions and transportation in Bangkok but also that in
other Thai cities.

Furthermore, most customers taking services at the research sites, namely
“Western Tours Hua Hin” and at “Bangkok Tourism Division”, include non-Thai
people who may potentially lack knowledge of the hierarchical system in Thai
culture. If at least one of the participants lacks knowledge of the hierarchical position
in Thai service encounter contexts, its impact as Kummer and Triwittayapoom claim
is questionable in terms of applicability. Instead, according to the data collected in the
present study, the power that customers carry over agents is by virtue of the fact that
encounters gathered in service contexts are primarily for a commercial goal in a
commercial setting, rather than the power by virtue of the social class. In other words,
it is the power of money that produces the communicative behaviour of participants in
transactional exchanges. This means that agents are subordinated to the power of
money whereas customers dominate and manage it.

As institutional representatives, agents must sell as many products/services as
possible in order to meet the institutional demands of their job and their own benefits
(i.e. agents’ progress of career path). A well-known economically-related thought that
Service encounters have been of interest to both linguists and marketing/management scholars. However, in general the study of service encounters by linguists has been data-focused, i.e. their analyses are based on authentic data. In contrast, the research of service encounters in the marketing field has been theory-focused, i.e. most of the marketing researchers concentrate on constituting and examining a model of the service production and the consumption perspective in service encounters. Research in service encounters in terms of marketing has rarely been conducted, except the involvement of the notion of face with consumption behaviour such as Chinese customers’ potential weight of associating brand and price to face (Li and Su, 2007). Nonetheless, the present research focuses on the pragmatic perspective on service encounters. Therefore, service encounters in the view of linguistic transition should be concentrated on.

Conversational linguists have been interested in the sequentially-organised structure of service encounters (Merritt, 1976; Whalen and Zimmerman, 1987; Kidwell, 2000; Solon, 2013) and the prefacing strategies which signal the opening of requests (Aston, 1995). Conversational research in service encounters has been conducted to examine the specific sequential pattern of service encounters across cultures such as the cross-cultural study of the opening sequence between Syrian and French hospitality encounters (Traverso, 2006). According to Ventola (1983: 257), at
the stage of “service bid”, service encounters are likely to be approached by signaling the readiness to serve with phrases such as “can I help you?” and “what would you like?”. Pragmalinguists have focused on types of activities commonly occurring in service encounters, in particular those potentially interpersonally delicate, for instance, complaints and their potential involvement with the presence of face and (im)politeness. Márquez-Reiter (2005; 2008; 2013) consistently studies commercial telephone conversations in Uruguayan culture in diverse perspectives, from the investigation of pragmatic strategies used to construct and respond to complaints to the interactional examination of the development of complaints. These studies evidence the importance of explanations/accounts in both elaborating and mitigating complaints in response in Uruguayan culture and the gradual articulation and negotiation of complaints in a long sequence. The subsequent result is discussed by Orthaber and Márquez-Reiter (2011) when they conduct a discursive investigation of Slovenian commercial calls interactions. They (2011) also indicate the significant existence of face and the influence of contexts and socio-economic roles of participants on assumption about facework in service encounters. An increase in voice in a complaint sequence in a hospitality encounter is likely to relate to impoliteness (Shahid, 2013).

Nonetheless, hotel and touristic encounters have hardly been studied by Thai scholars. Most of the studies in Thai service contexts have emphasized the management/marketing viewpoints in various dimensions, for instance, consumer behaviour, service quality (Somwang, 2008) and service satisfaction (Rittichainuwat et al., 2002; Thitthongkam, 2013b), apart from service encounters. More importantly, there is no research into Thai service encounters from the pragmatic viewpoint which is the focus of the present research, apart from the study of language roles in tourism and tourism education in Thailand (Thitthongkam and Walsh, 2010a; 2010b; Thitthongkam, 2013a) These studies (Thitthongkam and Walsh, 2010a; 2010b; Thitthongkam, 2013a) indicate that the language competence of tourist staff has an impact on business success and competitiveness in the tourism industry. Nonetheless, they only concentrate on the importance of enhancing Thai staff members’ competence in English to facilitate informational communication but do not consider participants’ communicative behaviour between Thai service providers and Thai customers.
Earlier studies in service encounters across cultures from the linguistic perspective, report, as mentioned, that activities that occur in service encounters, i.e. complaints and refusals/rejections, are associated with the existence of face concern and (im)politeness. The fact that they are gradually articulated throughout the interaction signals the speaker’s realisation about their potentially interpersonal delicacy. Unlike refusals/rejections, some potentially interpersonally-sensitive activities, for instance, disagreements, which can appear in service encounters have rarely been examined by linguists in earlier research into service encounters. Furthermore, the gathered data of the present research shed light on the tentative assumption that participants in Thai service encounters tend to orient disagreements and refusals/rejections to interpersonal delicacy. The next section will discuss these potentially interpersonally-delicate activities.

2.2.3 Disagreement

Disagreement has been broadly studied in a variety of contextual situations but its definition is not unanimously agreed. However, it is often considered as conflict, offensiveness and defensiveness. For example, Edstrom (2004) claims that disagreement is an expression through which the speaker conveys his/her opinion or belief oppositional to that presented by the interlocutor and may be linked to the self-protection of his/her own opinion, a counter-attack to the other in the interaction, or withholding a/an (dis)agreement. According to Locher (2004: 94-95), disagreement involves “the action-restriction” of the hearer and the occurrence of a clash in interests between participants, as well as implicating “the exercise of power”. In other words, disagreement is an oppositional opinion, feeling or assessment of a speaker expressed through verbal and nonverbal behaviour to a prior verbal action (Locher, 2004) in a variety of “activity types” which is socially constituted in connection with the different roles of participants and the interactional goal (Levinson, 1979), e.g. a committee meeting (Kangasharju, 2002), a dinner party and a political debate (Sifianou, 2012). Prior verbal actions which may trigger the occurrence of disagreement include assessments where a speaker claims knowledge (Pomerantz, 1984) of the “assessable” or “the entity being evaluated by an assessment” (Goodwin and Goodwin, 1987: 10). Since disagreement is a (non-)linguistic reaction relevant to
prior verbal behaviour, it is likely to be retrospective, i.e. it is strongly connected with the past action about which the speaker has made a second assessment or an oppositional opinion or feeling.

Moreover, the speaker in disagreement situations is tied both to confrontation and to defense of each other’s face (Locher, 2004; Paramasivam, 2007). The way in which the speaker can get across the point while maintaining the face of both participants is strongly relevant to the presence of (im)politeness. Thus, disagreement in the earlier studies in politeness is regarded as conduct that the speaker needs to avoid for the interest of the other’s face and his/her own face (Leech, 1983; Brown and Levinson, 1987). In terms of Conversation Analysis, an adjacency pair, which is defined as a sequence of two utterances of which the first part provides the interpretation source and triggers the presence of the second pair part (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973), for instance, a first assessment-a second assessment (Pomerantz, 1984) and question-answer (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973), is significantly related to disagreement. That means the expression of disagreement is the fact that the speaker brings him/herself into participation in formulating an assessment oppositional to an initial assessment proffered by the speaker. Disagreement, or a negatively second assessment, is destructive for the solidarity and contiguity between participants (Sacks, 1987 [1973]) when the speaker produces a first assessment on the ongoing topic and the recently shown person or thing and/or the third party. In contrast, the “preference for agreement” (Sacks, 1987 [1973]) is connected with the enhancement of affiliation. According to the definition of disagreement, it is considered the result which arises from the speaker’s opinion disputing the prior utterance, e.g. a first assessment and a piece of information. Thus, it is by its natural characteristic significantly connected with the second pair part of an adjacency pair, i.e. the speaker’s expression of disagreeing utterance against the eliciting activity. However, simultaneously it triggers the next disagreeing utterance in the next turn (Locher, 2004).

With regard to its high involvement with face concern, it is likely to be delicately articulated through (non-)linguistic forms which are tentatively considered
to be polite. I will examine expressions of procedural meaning (EPMs)\(^5\) according to Watts (2003) which are available for conducting oppositional assessments. They function pragmatically to elicit inferences in the hearer that indicate interpersonal meanings or to orient the hearer to the place and way in which he/she can assume inferences from propositional values. (Non-)linguistic resources acting as EPMs (Watts, 2003) available to articulate oppositional assessments include: (a) hesitators (e.g. \textit{well, uh} and \textit{um}); (b) understaters and downgraders (e.g. \textit{pretty, just, a bit} and \textit{briefly}); and (c) the use of weakened forms, i.e. hedges (e.g. \textit{kind of} and \textit{somehow}), the low degree of committers (e.g. \textit{I think}) and cajolers (e.g. \textit{I mean} and \textit{you see}).

Silence can function as a delay mechanism prior to an oppositional assessment (Zuo, 2002). According to the two functions of EPMs, they are likely to signal pragmatically the speaker’s realisation about the potentially interpersonal delicacy of his/her utterances and his/her consideration of politeness and his/her own face and others’. Oppositional assessments can be attenuated by using EPMs in the construction of the proffered assessment and the second assessment. Additionally, earlier scholars (Brown and Levinson, 1987) claim the potential involvement of (dis)agreement with face. Brown and Levinson’s (1987) positive politeness strategies, i.e. Seek agreement (e.g. the avoidance of the critical topic) and Avoid disagreement, are a (non-)linguistic device which the speaker uses to reinforce the intimacy between participants for the sake of the hearer’s face. In some cultures much earlier empirical research on disagreement has supported these scholars’ claim that disagreement is likely to be related to face-threat and is to be avoided. American and British interviewers construct inviting-interplay questions to maintain neutralism and distance themselves from verbal rebuttal and disagreement (Clayman, 2002). Participants in Thai online talk tend to demonstrate a sense of social contiguity than hostility against other parties and minimize displays of disagreement (Hongladarom and Hongladarom, 2005).

Nonetheless, much research on disagreement in diverse cultural communities has opposed the universal assumption of disagreement as conflict-building. Schiffrin’s

\(^5\) Watts (2003: 180-182) proposes linguistic expressions which have the potential to be considered polite and which are pragmatically conveyed as procedural meaning, for instance, greetings, address terms and leave-taking. Formulaic and semi-formulaic expressions are highly conventionalized terms used in the ritualized forms of verbal interaction which pragmatically function to carry out “the status of extra-sentential markers of politic behaviour” and “indirect speech acts appropriate to politic behaviour of a social situation” (Watts, 2003: 168).
classic paper about Jewish disputes argues that disagreement amongst intimate people can be viewed as sociability, not the source of conflicts. Following research conducted by several scholars, for instance, Tannen and Kakava (1992) and Locher (2004) has also supported Schiffrin’s (1984) claim about disagreement as sociability. Linking disagreement to the natural characteristic of service encounters, disagreement is likely to be relatively connected to transactional failure. Thus, in service encounter contexts it is potentially considered more confrontational than sociable. However, it needs to be considered on the interactional level. Linguistic activities are constructed in accordance with the faces and lines that others in a cultural community socially assign him/her to be carrying during the interaction. They should be studied throughout the stretch of discursive talk (Watts, 2003). Thus, disagreement can be treated not only as communicative behaviour which should be avoided but also as an expression of alliance between participants. Disagreement is constituted by means of the multifaceted, compatibly-integrated, socio-culturally contextual variables, i.e. cultural orientation (Angouri and Tseliga, 2010), situational scenes (Georgakopoulou, 2001; Tracy, 2008), power of participants (Kotthoff, 1993) and social distance (Kakava, 2002). For instance, the exercise of power of participants in interaction is tangled with situational settings where the interaction occurs. Kotthoff (1993) proposes the influence of context sensitivity, i.e. academic discussion between students and lecturers, on linguistic strategies used for arguments.

Regarding the expression of disagreement in Thai, people of a lower social status or younger people often avoid disagreeing with older people or those of a higher social status in Thai society (Knutson, 2004). This study reflects the potential impact of age on disagreement practices. Nevertheless, age of participants is not a significant variable in the present study since customers taking service vary in age. Agents are potentially socially subordinate to customers due to the power of money as discussed, not customers’ age. Thus, Knutson’s (2004) claim about the involvement of the difference in age as to displaying disagreement in Thai culture seems inapplicable to the present study. Instead, Kotthoff’s (1993) claim about the relationship between power and situational scenes towards participants’ expression of disagreement is likely to be more applicable to the present study because the natural characteristics of service encounter contexts, i.e. the primarily transactional goal and the secondary interactional goal, and the difference between the agents and customers
due to the power of money and their socio-professional roles, seem to affect their interactional behaviour.

The study will then consider another type of potentially interpersonally-sensitive activity frequently observed in service encounters, i.e. refusals/rejections.

2.2.4 Refusals/Rejections

Like disagreements, refusals/rejections have been of interest amongst pragmatic, sociolinguistic and pedagogical scholars in various cultural contexts, for example, Mexican-Spanish (Félix-Brasdefer, 2006; 2008), Arabian (Aliakbari and Changizi, 2012), American (Liao and Bresnahan, 1996; Johnson, 2007), Greek (Bella, 2011), Chinese (Liao and Bresnahan, 1996; Yang, 2008), Korean (Lee, S. 2011) and Thai (Panpothong, 2001). Refusals/rejections are seen as a complex (non-)linguistic phenomenon derived from its requirement in constructing it at a high level of pragmatic competence (Beebe et al., 1990) in intercultural communication. Thus, earlier research on refusals/rejections has been undertaken to study pragmatic competence, in particular studies conducted amongst non-native speakers of English, for instance, Thai learners of English (Wannaruk, 2008), Malaysian and Jordanian learners of English (Al-shboul et al., no date), Persian learners of English (Hashemian, 2012) and various national non-native speakers of English compared with American native speakers of English (Tanck, 2002). However, unlike disagreements, the definition of refusals/rejections is unlikely to be arguable amongst scholars. They usually function as second pair parts of a first pair part such as responses to requests, offers, invitations and suggestions. Refusals/rejections are also significantly associated with the presence of politeness and face concerns (Johnson, 2007; 2008; Johnson et al., 2009; Bella, 2011). In this study, the term “refusals” is usually associated with offers and the term “rejections” with suggestions.

Brown and Levinson (1987) consider refusals/rejections as a face-threatening act which is potentially likely to threaten the positive face of the interlocutor who initiates a first pair part and which should be avoided in social practices. Several linguists (Félix-Brasdefer, 2006; Johnson, 2007; 2008; Johnson et al., 2009), who apply Brown and Levinson’s (1987) notion as a principle theoretical framework, have
agreed with their consideration of refusals/rejections as a face-threatening act and their involvement with impoliteness. This assumption may be derived from the view that a refuser commits him/herself not to conduct any future actions given in response to the eliciting linguistic activities (Searle, 1977) through a variety of (non-)linguistic strategies, depending on contextual variables. Félix-Brasdefer (2006) claims that refusals/rejections of Mexicans are elaborated by using diminutives which help increase the degree of politeness and display in-group solidarity over independence. In cordial relationships between friends, despite their high level of intimacy, refusals/rejections which contain modal expressions are seen as more polite (Johnson, 2008). Nonetheless, those studies are based on written or simulation data collection devices, i.e. Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs) and role-play. These data collection instruments may be questionable as to their reliability since DCTs are derived from what participants think is appropriate according to socio-cultural norms not their authentic actions (Golato, 2003).

With regard to the critical issues concerning Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory, i.e. its excessively superficial consideration of linguistic forms at the sentence level (Watts, 2003; 2005), the results of the earlier research using DCTs or role-play as a data gathering device and applying Brown and Levinson’s framework are likely to lack the entirely multifaceted concern of the reaction of participants in the thread of the interaction which is regarded significant for the view of face manifestation and (im)politeness (Arundale, 2009; 2010). Moreover, the claim that refusals/rejections are a face-threatening act seems to be overgeneralized because of the absence of situational contexts. In service encounters refusals/rejections are somehow unavoidably elaborated on some occasions by agents (Lee, S., 2011) since their serviceability (Lee, S., 2011) is restricted by practical policies and economic necessity. Despite the deficiency of the earlier studies in refusal/rejection strategies as discussed earlier, they signal the significant relevance of refusals/rejections to the existence of potential vulnerability to face of both speaker and recipient and their relationship but not to that of the inherent face-threat and impoliteness. The negotiation of face is realized through (semi-)formulaic expressions of refusals/rejections (Félix-Brasdefer, 2006). That means that the refuser is aware of the potentially interpersonal sensitivity of refusals/rejections and that participants’ face needs to be manifested.
Furthermore, refusals/rejections are also viewed as culture-specific. This means refusal/rejection strategies and accountability vary across cultures (Liao and Bresnahan, 1996; Aliakbari and Changizi, 2012), in particular those in Oriental and Western countries. The Americans provide a broader range of reasons for the refusal/rejection elaboration than the Chinese whereas Chinese people are significantly concerned with face-saving and avoidance of embarrassment (Guo, 2012). Exploring written responses of Thais, Wannaruk (2008) reveals that the provision of justification is often preceded by negative ability (e.g. I can’t do it) amongst Thai people and by positive feelings (e.g. I’d love to do so) amongst American people. Wannaruk’s study results are likely to correspond to Márquez-Reiter (2008) who claims that apologetic terms help intensify explanations functioning as remedial work in telephone service encounters. However, Wannaruk’s (2008) study focuses on only everyday contexts, rather than primarily transactional ones and is conducted only through written Thai responses, rather than naturally occurring interactions. The use of DCTs in Wannaruk’s (2008) empirical research seems to be biased towards the idea of the researcher who creates choices for each question and to be restricted to the choices in questions. Situational contexts (Lee, S., 2011) and contextual factors, for instance, age, gender, social distance and social status (Félix-Brasdefer, 2006; Johnson, 2008; Guo, 2012) can affect (non-)linguistic behaviour in the elaboration of refusals/rejections (Xiaoning, 2004; Félix-Brasdefer, 2006). Thus, Wannaruk’s (2008) refusal/rejection strategies found in everyday contexts may be irrelevant to those in service contexts due to the difference in the impact of contextual variables on participants’ (non-)linguistic behaviour in service encounters. In service encounters the primarily transactional goal, the power of money and professional roles of participants are likely to be more influential than some contextual factors such as age and gender which impact communicative behaviour in the construction of refusals/rejections in everyday contexts. According to earlier research in refusal/rejection devices, linguistic devices frequently used include giving accounts (Wannaruk, 2008), expressing conventional gratitude (Wannaruk, 2008), making excuses (Al-Shboul et al., no date; Aliakbari and Changizi, 2012) and expressing regret (Al-Shboul et al., no date; Aliakbari and Changizi, 2012).

According to the nature of service encounters, the principle activity types in service encounter context i.e. requesting, providing or not a service, and accepting or
rejecting the offered/suggested product, provide a great chance for refusals/rejections and should be considered common, not intrinsically face-enhancing or face-threatening. Since the primary nature of offers is a voluntary action that the offerer, a person who provides an offer, commits him/herself to conduct for a person who accepts an offer, the act of refusing is likely to be related to the denial of willingness of the offerer. In service encounters requests are constructed in a different context where it is considered advantageous for the request addressee, rather than imposing costs on the addressee (Lee, S., 2011). They are also a mainly customer-oriented activity. Rejections of the requests in service encounters seem to be linked to transactional failure and interpersonal vulnerability during the interaction. If these ideas are assumed to be true, the rejecter/refuser seems to orient to his/her rejection/refusal as interpersonally-sensitive by finely and ritually constructing it through appropriately linguistic features in order to avoid threat to his/her own face and the interlocutor’s.

Strategic alternative offers/suggestions can often be observed in offer-refusal/suggestion-rejection sequences and regarded as a remedial action or a mitigating device. In Thai culture, statement of alternatives can be employed as a mitigating strategy when the speaker wishes to elaborate the refusals/rejections (Wannaruk, 2008). Offering an alternative is one of the linguistic devices which a person uses to deny (1) an invitation of his/her colleague and (2) that of the superior (professors vs students) (Tanck, 2002). In other words, on some occasions alternative offers/suggestions function as an implicit refusal/rejection, convey face manifestation and signal the speaker’s realisation about the potentially interpersonal sensitivity of his/her utterance.

Due to the fact that the present research concentrates on (non-)linguistic practices in Thai service encounters, some linguistic forms in Thai which carry sociolinguistic and pragmatic meanings and which can reflect Thai culture may have potential involvement with the Thai’s communicative practices. The next sub-section will discuss two distinctly linguistic forms in Thai, i.e. pronominal forms and sentence particles.
2.2.5 Formulations

The grammatically-oriented linguistic forms differ in their positions at the sentence level, their grammatical construction and/or their usage prescribed in accordance with socio-cultural norms. As there is grammatically no verb conjugation system in Thai, tense indicators are used instead and are demonstrated by either words of time or the contextualization within the utterance. In addition, some Thai linguistic forms convey sociolinguistic and pragmatic meanings: (a) Thai pronominal forms which are likely to differ from Western languages and (b) sentence particles which are related to the Thai value “deference”.

1) Thai pronominal forms

Unlike French, Italian and Spanish, the English language does not consist of address terms T/V systems which signal the speaker’s administration of power and solidarity (Brown and Gilman, 1960) in the present spoken and written language system. However, in the past the term “thou” was a familiar address term to a single person (Brown and Gilman, 1960). The Thai pronominal system is a multifaceted linguistic phenomenon which reflects power and solidarity between participants as in many European languages. However, it is more complicated than address terms T/V of European languages due to a larger number of pronominal forms. Some of them carry the semantic function which expresses the speaker’s solidarity offer to the interlocutor whereas some indicate the speaker’s exercise of power or his/her display of distancing him/herself from the interlocutor. They also carry the speaker’s positive, negative or neutral mood towards the interlocutor and/or content. At some places, like honorific terms in Japanese, the Thai pronominal form system is associated with a sense of (im)politeness in a particular situational context. Furthermore, it has high involvement with the strongly hierarchical system and is significantly associated with socio-linguistic factors, for example, gender, age, social distance, time and place, and social/socio-economic positions (Palakornkul, 1975; Khanittanan, 1988; Sodsongkij, 2006). Table 1 below illustrates the system of person pronouns proper in Thai (based on Noss, 1964; Moerman, 1973; Palakornkul, 1975; Khanittanan, 1988; Hoonchamlong, 1992; Smyth, 2002; Kummer, 2005). (see the full details in Appendix 1, page 155)
### Table 1: Person pronouns proper in Thai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun/variant forms</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Social mood/situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ต้น /ชัน, ชน /ชัน</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Younger people or those with equal status</td>
<td>Intimate; less formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>หมอ /phoon/</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>General (intimate and non-intimate)</td>
<td>Used in most situations; ranging from polite to intimate; ranging from formal to informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เว้ /raw/</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Friends or intimate people</td>
<td>Intimate; ranging from formal to informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>หนู /nűu/</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;, 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Adults; professional or social superiors</td>
<td>Used by male and female children; used by professional or social female inferiors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>คุณ /khun/</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>General (intimate and non-intimate), elders, youngers, equals</td>
<td>Polite; formal use among equals; ranging from formal to informal; used by superiors to inferiors it expresses formality or perhaps negative emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>พ่ย /than/</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;, 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>People of significantly higher social status</td>
<td>Formal; polite; showing high deference and respect; distant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เจาก /thaw/</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;, 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Amongst young people; females</td>
<td>Intimate; informal; used by males or females to females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เขา /khaw/, ท่าน /khaw/</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>General; mainly used to refer to males</td>
<td>Ranging from intimate to distant (outsider) and from intimate to polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ก้า /kææ/</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;, 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; person, general; 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; person, amongst intimate members of the same sex</td>
<td>Intimate; informal; as a 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; person it expresses close friendship but less polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>บ่ม /man/</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>People, either derogatively or familiarly; inferiors; animals or things</td>
<td>Often avoided in polite, formal speech and writing; used broadly in informal situations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 1, the use of Thai pronominal forms varies according to gender, socio-economic and socio-cultural positions, the relationship between
participants, the level of formality and the speaker’s intentional mood during the interaction. Thai speakers are socially assigned to use the proper address terms in connection with socially-prescribed norms. Thus, the (un)intentional misuse of those address terms is likely to be potentially marked by the others and interpretable as (im)politeness. In other words, those forms are related to the indexicality of participants’ membership in an ongoing interaction and face concern (Ruhi, 2010). They, therefore, indicate participants’ social states and relationship as well as their face concern (Ruhi, 2010).

Moreover, other linguistic forms function as recognition labels to refer to the speaker, hearer and referent, and can replace the person pronoun proper: (a) titles (e.g. อาจารย์ /täaakaan/ (Teacher)); (b) titles plus name (e.g. อาจารย์และ /täaakaan täaen/ (Teacher Ann)); (c) first names (e.g. แอน /täaen/ (Ann)); (d) nicknames which are normally given to a child to be referred to amongst intimate people or in informal situations (Moerman, 1973; Khanittanan, 1988; Hoonchamlong, 1992). The use of titles and titles plus name are strongly associated with social or occupational positions to elevate the listener (Khanittanan, 1988) whereas that of nicknames indicates acquaintances in informal situations and a friendly or affectionate connotation (Hoonchamlong, 1992).

According to Khanittanan (1988) and Hoonchamlong (1992), kinship terms function to express social relation and enact interpersonal relationship which varies according to their types—either biological or metaphor kinship terms—in several languages, for example, Japanese, Vietnamese and Bengali. In Thai kinship terms convey sociolinguistic meanings and are deployed as person pronouns proper. The reference and meanings of kinship terms in Thai are context-based, for example, the sentence ผอมผุ่ว which can mean: (a) I (father speaking) am drunk; (b) You (addressing father) are drunk; or (c) He (referring to father) is drunk” (Smyth, 2002: 43). If kinship terms are used with people who are blood relatives of the speaker, it does not indicate the speaker's (im)politeness. Furthermore, kinship terms can be combined in use with names or nicknames, for instance, ป้า /paa täaen/ (Older Aunt Ann) (Smyth, 2002). In Thai society, metaphor kinship terms or pseudo-kin terms function as an indicator of the speaker’s establishment of congenial
interpersonal relationship, e.g. addressing an unrelated elderly man /ลุง/ (older uncle) and referring to an elderly friend or colleague by using the term ที่ /พี่/ (older sibling) or a younger friend or colleague by using the term น้อง /น้อง/ (younger sibling) (Hoonchamlong, 1992; Smyth, 2002). The kinship term ที่ /พี่/ (older sibling) has a large range of use, e.g. agents addressing customers and strangers making a conversation accidentally with someone elder. In other words, the use of pseudo-kinship terms in transactional exchanges may reflect the speaker’s attempt to decrease the distance between participants.

To show politeness and further respect, the pronominal reference by using titles, titles plus names, names, nicknames and kinship terms can be preceded by the polite title /คุณ/, which also functions as a second person pronoun used amongst general people (Khanittanan, 1988; Symth, 2002), for example, /คุณหมอ /คุณหมอ/ (Doctor) and /คุณพ่อ /คุณพ่อ/ (Father). The title /คุณ/, which is also a second person pronoun used with the highly social-ranking people, can be put before occupational titles as a double expression of politeness, e.g. /คุณเค้าที่ /คุณเค้าที่/ (Dean).

2) Sentence particles

Particles are semantic and grammatical forms which Holmes (1990) considers signals of solidarity. Nonetheless, this claim may be inapplicable to particles in Thai language. Unlike English, Thai sentence particles convey mood and (im)politeness in interaction. Sentence particles are placed at the end of an utterance (Smyth, 2002; Kummer, 2005) or occur in isolation (Kummer, 2005). They also serve a grammatical, semantic and pragmatic function (Moerman, 1973; Smyth, 2002; Kummer, 2005). Moreover, like Thai pronominal forms, they carry information about gender, the status level of the speaker, the interlocutor and the third mentioned parties, as well as the attitude of the speaker towards what he/she is saying (Noss, 1964; Moerman, 1973; Kummer, 2005). In addition, the (in)appropriate use of sentence particles
depends on time and place where they are applied. According to Noss (1964), Smyth (2002) and Kummer (2005), sentence particles are categorized into two kinds: (a) polite particles and (b) mood particles. Considering polite particles according to Watts (2003), particles considered as politeness should not be regarded as inherently polite particles since they are socially employed according to the lines that people in a community assign a societal member to be carrying during the particular interaction not the speaker’s volition him/herself. Table 2 shows sentence particles, the variables affecting their use and their semantic and grammatical functions.

Table 2: Sentence particles and their application (based on the data from Noss, 1964; Moerman, 1973; Smyth, 2002; Kummer, 2005) (see the full details in Appendix 2, page 159)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles</th>
<th>Speaker gender</th>
<th>Speaker social position vs the interlocutor</th>
<th>Grammatical function</th>
<th>Social mood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ขร่าป /khráp/</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L / E / H</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Polite, reserved, but intimate and distant, formal and informal situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ฆ่า /khāʔ/ ฆะ /khâʔ/</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>L / E / H</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Polite, reserved, but intimate and distant, formal and informal situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>สะ /háʔ/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>L / E</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Intimate and affable, informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ฐี /câʔ/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>L / E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Intimate and affable, talking to children and inferiors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ว่า /wâʔ/ วตาม /wóoy/ ว่าย /wéey/ วะ /wâʔ/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>E / H</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Very intimate or informal, indicating anger and aggressiveness when speaking to strangers but expressing intimacy with close friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>นะ /nâʔ/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>E / H</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Making an utterance less confrontational in seeking agreement; conveying a sense of coaxing and urging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>นำ /nàʔ/ นำ /nâʔ/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>E / H</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Used when persuading someone to do something or to accept an idea when they are reluctant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ด้วย /dûay/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>L / E / H</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Often used with ขร่าป /khráp/, ฆ่า /khāʔ/ or สะ /háʔ/, used in polite requests and apologies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ละ /lâʔ/ | M / F | L / E / H | A | Indicating that a state has been
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles</th>
<th>Speaker gender</th>
<th>Speaker social position vs the interlocutor</th>
<th>Grammatical function</th>
<th>Social mood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/lâʔ/ /sè/ /lâʔ/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>L / E / H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Reached; and used after the term /lîik/ to show the speaker’s mild irritation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/sì/ /sì/ /sìi/ /sìi/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>H / E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Used as a way of eliciting an answer; expressing a sense of irritation; /sè/ /lâʔ/ more informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/nâʔ/ /nèi/ /nàʔ/ /này/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>H / E</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Indicating that something previously unknown is now relevant or this new thing is not overlooked. It is in the emphatic element which occasionally expresses mild irritation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/thâʔ/ /thi/ /thâət/ /thâʔ</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>H / E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Used as a mild, urging particle in suggestions, invitations, requests and mild commands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:  
(1) “M” refers to males while “F” refers to females.  
(2) “L” refers to the fact that the speaker is socially lower than the recipient; “E” to the fact that the speaker is equal to the recipient; and “H” to the fact that the speaker is socially higher than the recipient.  
(3) “A” refers to an affirmative statement and “I” to an interrogative statement.  

Sentence particles are not significantly compulsory in terms of the grammatical system since they are not the main part of sentences unlike subjects and predicates. However, their absence in use, in particular the polite particle type, may be regarded relevant to inappropriate behaviour which is called มะเร็งไม่แฉะ (juiceless lemon) in Thai. This saying refers to a person who speaks impolitely, not in a beautiful way and, probably expresses unfriendliness. Bringing them into the consideration of Watts’s (2003) notion, the appropriate use of sentence particles to avoid being regarded as “juiceless lemon” can be viewed as politic behaviour.
Furthermore, sentence particles also express the speaker’s either positive or negative mood. Mood sentence particles may indicate the identity and intention of the speaker. Thus, this type of particle is open to be interpretable as (im)politeness, depending on the interactionally-oriented context.

2.3 Summary

This chapter started out by attempting to provide an insight into the concept of face initially proposed by Goffman and then adapted by Brown and Levinson (1987), Spencer-Oatey (2000) and Watts (2003) for their development of their own theories of politeness. Afterwards, subsequent scholars such as Arundale (1999) shift the focus of face onto the discursive examination of the thread of interaction which helps shed light on both the speaker’s production and the hearer’s reception (as they claim). Moreover, most (not all) of the notions of face indicate that face is connected to justifying a person’s careful or careless elaboration of communicative behaviour which is delicate for interpersonal relationship between participants during the interaction and to the influence of social norms. Furthermore, most of the scholars who propose (or adapt) the notions of face deem the impact of contextual variables on the realisation and interpretation of (im)politeness and face concern. After this, interpersonally-sensitive activities and Thai culture and service encounter contexts were introduced. Interpersonally-sensitive activities, defined as activities that the speaker carefully elaborates, are assumed to have potential relationship with (im)politeness and face manifestation and to be dominated by context. I point out that cultural orientation and the power of money may affect the speaker’s orientation of potentially interpersonally-sensitive activities as delicate.

The following chapter will demonstrate the way in which the data of the present study was gathered and its rationality. It also includes the research sites and information about the gathered data.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents data collection, i.e. instruments considered, the process, its limitations, ethical considerations and transcription conventions, which have been conducted to achieve the objectives of this study. These include an investigation into the way agents and customers in Thai hospitality contexts elaborate and respond to potentially interpersonally-sensitive activities through a variety of (non)verbal features of communication in order to reserve interpersonal relationship and reach the transactional goal.

An examination of verbal and nonverbal communicative practices in the articulation of potentially interpersonally-sensitive activities in Thai hospitality contexts requires naturally occurring data to provide vocally and visually communicative evidence. To achieve both audio and visual data, naturally occurring interactions in this study are gathered by combining three research instruments: audio- and video-recordings of interactions and field-notes. The combined use of these three instruments helps minimize their critical points. The first part of this section is devoted to discussing the strengths and weaknesses of these instruments. Afterwards, access to the research sites, ethical concerns, populations, the procedures of data collection, and transcription conventions are illustrated in detail.

3.1 Instruments Considered: Audio- and Video-Recordings and Field-Notes

The main instrument of this study is the video-recorder which provides for the availability of relevant details, i.e. the linguistic and paralinguistic features of social actions (Mondada, 2006; 2008), and presentations of the active relevant arrangements of bodies, artifacts and spaces where the discourse was organized (Goodwin, 1994a). It is suited to the present research since in a hospitality setting, tourist officers have to deal with multi-tasking, e.g. telephone answering, checking information for customers.
and dealing with payment and sometimes with multi-party conversations happening at the same time. There is a pronounced tendency to unintentionally ignore many crucial discourse features of interactions in multi-party conversations. Video-recordings allowed me to review unnoticed activities, circumstances, and the (non-)linguistic features of participants (Saville-Troike, 1989; Büscher, 2005). Two camcorders were employed in this study to provide more detailed insights into observed participant communicative behaviour (Mondada, 2008) and note the third parties which may affect participant sequential actions. The first camcorder was used to capture agents’ communicative behaviour and the work environment relevant to or affecting their verbal and non-verbal acts. The other focused on customers’ communicative practices and the artifacts around them. Since I could not predict when interesting events or actions would occur, video-recordings of interactions had to be conducted continuously (Goodwin, 1994b: 190). In addition, due to the business owners’ serious concerns about customers’ privacy which may have affected their satisfaction and thus any purchase decisions, as well as my wish to preserve as many naturally occurring conversations as possible and to minimize the influence of the presence of the technicians in ongoing interactions, the camcorders were turned on at the beginning of the day when data were collected and off at the end of the day’s work.

Moreover, two types of lenses were used in this study: a fish-eye lens and a normal lens. The former, which achieve extremely wide angles of view, were used to supplement the capacity of the camcorder zoom lens, resulting in a greater horizontal angle of view. For example, the 37mm fish-eye lens employed, offers a 130-degree horizontal angle of view. This quality of the fish-eye lens enhances the recorded images at a wider angle of view. However, a fish-eye lens produces significant distortion in the picture, even though it enlarges the angle of view (Shah and Aggarwal, 1996). It pulls nearby objects closer, but pushes more distant objects to the background as the photographs included below illustrate. Figure 1 is an image taken by a 37mm fish-eye lens camcorder, whereas Figure 2 represents a picture taken by a normal camcorder lens.
Figure 1: A picture taken by a fish-eye lens camcorder

Figure 2: A picture taken by a normal camcorder lens

Compared to Figure 2, the image in Figure 1 tends to bend away from the optical centre, meaning that images at the wider angle of view are captured but simultaneously, the size of the captured images may be more distorted than that of the original image. Additionally, this distortion results in unclear images as the distance between the lens and subject is significant and many background objects in focus may be moved, while the stationary camcorders remain on their tripods. It may be said that the advantageous use of fish-eye lenses depends on the research sites themselves. They seem suited to capturing multi-activities and multi-party talks in large areas. In contrast, in small areas where interactions occurred and where furniture and the architecture of research sites were barriers against the positioning of the camcorders, the normal lenses provide sufficiently clear recorded images. In conclusion, one of these two lenses was chosen for use, depending on the architecture and furniture of research sites.

The position of the camcorders varied depending on the place being observed (Saville-Troike, 1989: 98) and the site owner’s permission. They were sometimes
placed at a rather distant angle of view and adjusted to zoom in for closer images. Such positioning resulted in a lower quality of recorded voices. Consequently, audio-recording was needed to gather clear ongoing exchanges. An mp3 audio-recorder, a small electronic device with high recording quality and the capacity to sort out files, was positioned nearest to where the conversation took place. Nevertheless, in some cases, audio-recordings of conversations should be combined with video-recordings to compensate for the latter’s weaknesses as they can provide only vocal evidence that participants produce but lack the necessary evidence of nonverbal features (Mondada, 2008) such as eye contact, gazing, a person’s delivery of things to another person, someone having a look at the surroundings or a third party. It is also rather difficult to distinguish separate voices when multi-party conversations take place. Moreover, the source of pauses and sounds, for example, keyboard tapping, may be too unclear to indicate what action is ongoing such as surfing the Internet or filling in information. These activities can be accomplished by video-recording. The combined application of camcorders, which provide high quality images and the audio-recorder, which help clarify participants’ spoken interactions, enhances the recorded quality of naturally occurring conversations. As a result, the data collection in this study comprises an audio-recording and two video-recordings of each conversation. Unlike video-recorders, the mp3 audio-recorder in the present study was turned on at the beginning of the conversation and turned off as the interaction ended due to the amount of recording storage, the limited opportunity to recharge batteries at the research sites and my concerns about agents’ private remarks and confidential information. Although the camcorders were turned on all day when data were collected, private conversations and any exchange of confidential information between agents were not captured clearly on video due to the limited quality audio-recording of the camcorders.

However, in hospitality settings, multi-party conversations and multi-activities often occur simultaneously. Audio- and video-recordings may not always be sufficient. Consequently, note-taking and observation conducted by the researcher as a passive observer during interactions are also methodological adjuncts to audio- and video-recordings of conversations. As discussed in the previous section, the observational field-notes are restricted to what the researcher expects to see, over-reliance on the researcher’s memory and the lack of empirical evidence of non-verbal
acts which are also the focus of this study. Nevertheless, field-notes are significantly useful when video-taping has been done over several days (Goodwin, 1994b). They functioned as a reminder of several activities happening at a particular time and specific events of importance in a conversation which were collected for seven days. Looking at field-notes to find specific incidents could save time when matched to empirical evidence discovered through audio- and video-recorded data. Note-taking also provided an overview of the relationship between participants and circumstances. Moreover, as the camera was unable to capture the events, note-taking provided a record of what happened beyond the camera’s ability to record, for example, documents (brochures and maps, possibly used in interactions between participants). Occasionally, the interaction was initiated at a location within the camera’s view and ability to record and subsequently the participants continued their discussion in another location beyond the recording devices. It is evident that the electronic devices and note-taking in the present research helped to eliminate the shortcomings of each method. This enhanced the quality of data collection.

### 3.2 Research Sites and Contacts

Since this study concentrates on Thai hospitality settings, the current situation of tourism in Thailand is likely to be of importance. Political unrest, which has continued in fits and starts since 2004, has had an effect on this industry. According to the World Tourism Organisation (2010), the number of international tourist arrivals decreased by 3% to 14.145 million in 2009, compared to 14.584 million in 2008. Nevertheless, Thailand ranked fourth among Asian and Pacific countries. Globally, Thailand is a major tourist destination that is rich in cultural resources (Blanke and Chiesa, 2008). Despite challenges, the highly competitive tourist industry in Thailand has grown. Government tourism divisions function to promote the industry in Thailand and facilitate tourist arrivals. Popular destinations among Westerners and Asians include historic remains, ancient sites, museums, beaches and mountains. Two very well-known attractions in Thailand are the beach resort of Hua Hin and Bangkok, the capital city. These two tourist attractions differ in types of tourist activities and transportation.
Since the southern railway to Malaysia, which passes near Hua Hin, was constructed, the seaside town has become much more well-known as a beautiful weekend resort beach. Moreover, King Rama VII chose the site in Hua Hin for the construction of a summer palace, named ‘Klai Kangwon,’ meaning ‘Far From Worries’ (Tourism Authority of Thailand (TAT), 2005). According to TAT (2010b), Hua Hin is less than 200 km south of Bangkok and has become one of the most popular weekend getaway destinations for Bangkok residents. Private cars and taxis are the main vehicles used inside Hua Hin and public coaches are provided for travelling between Hua Hin and Bangkok and other nearby provinces. An increasing number of international tourists visit Hua Hin (TAT, 2009) to enjoy its magnificent beaches, a wide range of luxury hotels, resorts and spas, and modern and world-standard golf courses which have established Hua Hin’s reputation among golfers (TAT, 2005; 2010b).

After the coup d’etat in 2004, Thailand experienced continuing political unrest because of both support for and opposition to ex-Prime Minister Taksin Shinawatra. Political unrest has been expressed in street demonstrations in the capital. However, the violence appears to have been contained in most instances. A political crisis has been withheld and maintained until now (2014). It is likely that the Thai people are getting acquainted with the unstable political situation. Unlike Hua Hin, Bangkok is the political, economic, cultural, culinary, and spiritual center of Thailand (TAT, 2010a). A large number of both Thai and non-Thai tourists visit Bangkok because of the variety of tourist and sightseeing activities such as modern shopping malls, ancient sites, and locations for leisure activities. Moreover, Bangkok’s urban transport system is well-developed and includes the underground, the skytrain, public buses, taxis and private cars. Good connections exist to tourist attractions around Bangkok, for instance, Nonthaburi, a city famous for boat trips to Thai-Chinese temples. Consequently, many Bangkok tourist information centres are equipped to provide sightseeing for both Thai and non-Thai tourists in and around main tourist attractions.

In conclusion, both Bangkok and Hua Hin are well-known tourist destinations for both Thai and non-Thai tourists. However, they offer different tourist attractions and activities. Bangkok has historic sites and temples, and shopping malls. Hua Hin has well-known beach resorts and golf courses. This signifies the difference in targeting different groups of tourists.
Nonetheless, a month before this data were collected, i.e. May 2010, the political situation in Thailand seemed to be gradually deteriorating due to the aggressive conflict between protesters and the government which announced that Thailand was under curfew and a state of emergency was declared a week before the start of data collection. The curfew had a significant impact on the present study. First, most Thai people in Bangkok and in urban areas around Bangkok stayed at home. The number of visitors to Thailand dramatically decreased due to their lack of confidence in security. Second, the announcement resulted in a critical and immediate disruption in government administration and economy. The target research site, which is administrated by the government sector in Bangkok, was suspended. Pre-arranged dates of data collection were postponed until the curfew was lifted. Third, travel was difficult. Therefore, some tourist sites I had arranged to visit beforehand were not explored before the data were collected. The dramatically reduced number of tourists resulted in a smaller number of recorded interactions than expected.

Subsequently, I will focus on the research sites of this study to justify why they were chosen and the way in which they were accessed for data collection.

3.2.1 Research sites

Two well-known tourist destinations in Thailand were chosen as main research bases, i.e. Bangkok and Hua Hin. Naturally occurring interactions between agents and customers were collected in three different types of tourist sites: a tourist information centre in Bangkok, (“Bangkok Tourism Division”), two resorts and a spa in Hua Hin (“Let’s Sea Hua Hin Al Fresco Resort” and “Haven Resort and Spa Hua Hin”), and a tour agency in Hua Hin (“Western Tours Hua Hin”). In addition to the accessibility of the target subjects and the quality of the data appropriate to the research questions, two factors which influenced the choice of the research settings were (a) the ease of contact with the owners of the tourist sites and (b) the opportunities for obtaining a wide variability of data.

Because of the rapidly increasing number of hospitality providers and greater competition in the hospitality business, agents, particularly those who work in the private sector, i.e. hotels and tour agents, concentrate on customer satisfaction which
can result in continuing customer loyalty and an increase in the number of new customers due to the positive reputation of the tourist sites. Nevertheless, it is likely that audio- and video-recordings of naturally occurring interactions between agents and customers may result in customer dissatisfaction, since they may be concerned about loss of privacy and the fact that agent work efficiency may be reduced. A number of researchers have expressed concerns (Kasper, 2000) about the difficulty and sensitive nature of gaining access to gather naturally occurring data at research sites. Consequently, clear explanations of the research aims of this study and the benefits expected to be gained were considered as a significantly important step which needed to be discussed with administrators of the target research settings for the present research.

According to Kummer (2005), lecturers at university are ranked in a higher social position than white collar workers and officers and are elevated above students. My professional position as a lecturer at a government university may have resulted in increased local cooperation. I had experience in taking students on academic excursions to hotels, attending tourism seminars in Hua Hin, as well as teaching a number of students who manage tourism businesses (tour agencies). My colleagues, lecturers in tourism and hotel management, also have good relationships with agents in Hua Hin, i.e. those working for hotels, tour agents and governmental tourist offices. Due to my professional position in Thailand and my colleagues’ good relationships with tourist site personnel in Hua Hin, the three sites mentioned granted me approval to collect data.

Despite the political unrest in Bangkok, the areas where opponents against the government assembled were far from historic and cultural tourist attractions. Since two hotels and a tour agent in Hua Hin had already granted permission to gather natural data, tourist information centres, another important type of tourist location where both Thai and non-Thai tourists visit, were in focus in order to gain variability of natural data. Additionally, as a lecturer at a government university, I was able to improve the chances of being granted permission to gather data when contacting tourist information centres, which are also run by government sectors. Most representatives of government sectors normally cooperate with other government sectors. Subsequently, a tourist information centre (“Bangkok Tourism Division”) granted me permission to collect data.
These four tourist sites differ in customer attitudes towards service failures because of money. It is likely that customers at the tourist information centre enjoyed complimentary services from agents there since they do not need to pay for a product. In contrast, customers at the tour agent and hotels were likely to be more concerned with service quality since in general customers expect the best service in terms of value for money. Despite differences in customer attitudes towards service failures, tourist officers in all of the four tourist sites attempted to preserve a good image of Thai tourism. This is a sign of stability in their occupations and the growth of Thai tourism. Moreover, agents of all four tourist sites shared a common work goal, i.e. customer satisfaction is the most prominent aim of agents.

3.2.2 Contacts at research sites

An Internet search of target tourist sites in Hua Hin and Bangkok produced a lengthy list. Additionally, the database of tourist sites from the Faculty of Management Science at the university where I lecture, used to arrange for student internships in tourism and hotel management, was also useful. Finally, I received helpful recommendations from my colleagues who are lecturers in tourism and hotel management. In general, informal contact via emails was mainly conducted with each tourist site, but the initial contact varied across tourist sites. “Informal contact” in this study is defined as “unofficial talk carried out to exchange information crucial for this study, such as an explanation of the methodological plan for data gathering and ethical concerns”. Informal contact via emails or by telephone and unstructured face-to-face talk were conducted with agents. These types of communicative encounters enabled me to contact the target data sources to inquire about permission for data collection. The email explaining research aims, expected benefits to the tourist sites and what types of subjects involved in the study, was sent to each tourist site in order to obtain permission to gather data. In the email messages, appropriate dates and periods of time for data collections were recommended. Each tourist site received assurances that the results of the study would be reported back with a suggestion that the study could possibly be used to improve the current service of each tourist site. A letter written by the acting postgraduate director of research, Department of English,
Western Tours Hua Hin: Western Tours Hua Hin established in 1987 (Western Tours Hua Hin, see at http://www.westerntourshuahin.com/) is a tour agency which provides customers with the following services: daily tours and excursions from Hua Hin, air ticketing, hotel reservations, package tours, visa arrangements, travel insurance. The contact for gaining permission for the data collection was initially made by phone with the company owner’s son. This was followed by an email explaining detailed research as outlined above. The initial informal contacts revealed that the severe political crisis in Thailand and the low season of Thai tourism caused a dramatic decrease in the number of tourists during the time when data were being collected. They also indicated that most of the consumers were non-Thais.

Haven Resort Hua Hin: This is a resort located at Hua Hin-Cha-Am beach about 2.5 hours by car from Bangkok. The resort has 46 guestrooms and 7 private villas decorated with natural handmade materials in a contemporary style. (Haven Resort Hua Hin, http://www.haven-huahin.com/). My colleague (a lecturer in hotel and lodging management, Silpakorn University) is well acquainted with the front manager at Haven Resort Hua Hin and asked for permission for me to collect data which was then obtained. The information received indicated that most customers at Haven Resort Hua Hin were Thais.

Let’s Sea Hua Hin Al Fresco Resort: This is a contemporary compact resort located on the Hua Hin beach front 230 kilometres southwest of Bangkok. In addition to a range of decorated rooms with full en-suite facilities, it provides various services such as airport transfers, a fitness garden and sightseeing tours (Let’s Sea Hua Hin Al Fresco Resort, see at http://www.letussea.com/). In order to gain permission for data collection, detailed research aims and the method of data collection were sent in emails to the general manager of Let’s Sea Hua Hin Al Fresco Resort. The general manager was most concerned with customer privacy. Therefore, the procedure of data collection, i.e. the position of electronic equipment used and that of the researcher taking field-notes and doing audio-recording, as well as a number of technical assistants and their jobs, needed to be fully explained to avoid customer
dissatisfaction. Indeed, the ethics policy of this study will be thoroughly discussed in the next sub-section. The general manager granted permission for data collection and provided a coordinator who would help who would help with the work. Most customers at this tourist site were Thais, while others were Asians from other countries.

The Bangkok Tourism Division: This is administered by the Governor of Bangkok and located on Phra-Athit Road near many Bangkok tourist attractions such as the Grand Palace, the National Museum and the National Theatre. One of the goals assigned to the Bangkok Tourism Division includes promoting tourism in a wide range of media while enhancing Bangkok tourism services to achieve international standards and assist tourists as a tourist information centre (Bangkok Tourism Division, see at http://www.bangkoktourist.com/theme_4/about.asp?lang=en). The detailed research protocol and a letter of confirmation issued by the University of Surrey were initially sent to the director of Bangkok Tourism Division. Subsequently, I was informed in an official letter that permission for data collection had been granted (see Appendix 4, page 165). Informal contacts suggested that most of the customers were non-Thai speakers and that, on average, 60 customers per day visited the Division. However, due to the severe political crisis at the time of data collection, the number of visitors declined rapidly.

Agents’ concerns about customer privacy and anxiety over worker efficiency could have hindered data collection, as discussed above. These were also a concern for me. The next section will describe how these concerns were addressed.

3.3 Ethical Considerations

This study was given a favorable ethical opinion by the University Ethics Committee, University of Surrey (EC/2011/123/FAHS) (see Appendix 5, page 166). In undertaking research, ethics is a key issue that the researcher must be aware of when gathering data. According to the research ethics required by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences (see at http://www2.surrey.ac.uk/fahs/staffandstudents/ethicalprocedures/briefing/), I need to
protect the participants by eliminating or minimising any significant harm that may result from their involvement in the study.

The ethical concerns and plans were explained (Howitt and Cramer, 2005) to both appropriate institutional representatives, i.e. the director or general manager of each research site, for institutional approval and agents working on the day when data were gathered. Audio- and video-recordings of interactions would not be conducted without the involved agents’ acknowledgement and permission due to my awareness of the tourist sites’ prior concerns about customer privacy and satisfaction. The ethics of the methods are:

1) The announcement which informed customers that audio- and video-recordings of ongoing interactions were in progress for academic purposes and to benefit the enhancement of service in the future was posted at the counter where most customers came to seek service (see Appendix 6, page 168). The announcement also included the customer’s right to withdraw consent and stop recordings being made.

2) Two research assistants were responsible for installing two video-recorders in positions which could capture participants’ communicative behavior but which did not have an impact on the agents’ work efficiency.

3) I acted as a passive observer in charge of audio-recording and took notes near the place where interactions occurred, but where agents’ work was not disturbed. As a passive observer, ongoing interactions between agents and customers were not interrupted. No actions that violated the general regulations of the agent or customer privacy were undertaken, e.g. conducting interviews with customers.

Furthermore, the private information of participants in recorded interactions was kept confidential. Their names were anonymised. Since the collected data were used only for academic purposes, inadvertent audio- and video-recordings of data irrelevant to the research aim were not played publicly or exploited for other purposes. Exclusively partial video-recorded pictures relevant to the analysis of nonverbal behaviour were disclosed.

However, each tourist site varied concerning the degree of ethical concern and work policy, indicating differences in the position of camcorders and the passive observer as well as the quality of recorded images and sounds. In fact, the camcorders
were placed at the particular area designated by agents at each tourist site when data were collected.

An official notice stated that the data collection was taking place for academic purposes and explained the participants’ right to stop recordings of their interactions at any time and was posted in a visible place, i.e. the counter where consumers contacted the site representatives. However, four customers asked why video-recordings were being conducted: three non-Thai customers at Western Tours Hua Hin and one Thai customer at Bangkok Tourism Division. I explained to the non-Thai customers that video-recordings were being done for academic purposes and might benefit the enhancement of service in the future and that they could withdraw from the recordings if they wanted to. Subsequently, they gave me their informed consent to record their conversations and resumed the interaction between themselves and the agents. One Thai customer who questioned the video-recording received an explanation from agent. She subsequently gave me her verbal informed consent to record her talk and resumed her interaction. A brief explanation of the research aims, awareness of customer rights to stop recordings of interactions, and my professional and academic profiles helped agents to explain the video-recordings and relate them to customers who did not ask me directly.

3.4 Preparation of the Electronic Equipment and Data Collection

The electronic equipment needed to be prepared (i.e. its technical capacity: the length of memory cards used to record the data, the position of the equipment at the best angle of view, and the study of its functional capacity) and checked before audio-and video-recordings began (Goodwin, 1994b; Mondada, 2006). Two camcorders were sent to two technical assistants with manuals and fish-eye lenses to study how to use them before data were collected. Some additional equipment, such as tripods, fish-eye lenses and a laptop with a visual-editing program also needed to be checked. This study involved three electronic recording devices, i.e. an audio-recorder and two camcorders and concentrating on only one of them possibly helped record better data. In contrast, focusing on more than one piece of equipment at a time may distract attention and have an impact on the quality of recorded data. I, as a researcher, was in
charge of audio-recording and note-taking, whereas two technical assistants dealt with the video-recordings. They are studying for MAs in Sustainable Tourism Management, and had experience photographing and video-recording the ordinary lives of people. They were responsible for placing the camcorders, checking the equipment’s technical capacity (e.g. fish-eye lenses, zoom function and battery power), editing the recorded data into appropriate and complete conversations and cross-checking edited video shots of one camcorder with the other. They dealt with the zoom functions of the camcorders in order to gain the best images. The camcorders were placed in designated positions at the beginning of the day when data were to be collected and with the agreement of the agents to ensure minimal impact on work efficiency and customer privacy. Therefore, the two assistants did not need to be present when interactions were ongoing and so the collected interactions were not affected by the technical assistants.

In this study, a rehearsal of audio- and video-recordings was undertaken in the lobby of the Veridian Lodge, at the Faculty of Management Science, Silpakorn University, Thailand, on the day before the data collection occurred. This demonstration unit hotel was a suitable place to try out the equipment, since the space, size and the position of facilities (e.g. counters, the PC and sofas) are quite similar to many hotels. Setting up camcorders, placing an mp3 audio-recorder, and determining the position where I, as a passive observer, stood, were tried out. The assistants practiced taping and adjusting the camcorders’ angle of view. Some technical difficulties with the experiment came to light, for example, the long distance between sockets and the position of the electronic equipment, tripods that were too large and the capacity of the hard disk memory of the camcorder. These difficulties were solved by preparing two extension cables and two multi-outlet plugs, smaller-sized tripods and a reserve video camera.

Additionally, before the data were collected, the researcher and technical assistants explored the tourist sites in order to decide how to place the video cameras and decide where stand to take notes and do the audio-recording. Visiting the sites beforehand and talking with a number of agents highlighted the need for other equipment, e.g. extension cables. Agents suggested appropriate periods of time when data collection should be started.
3.5 Days of Data Collection

The data collection took place at Western Tours Hua Hin for three days (18, 19 and 21 May, 2010 from 9.30 to 18.00). The data were gathered at Let’s Sea Hua Hin Al Fresco Resort and at Haven Resort and Spa Hua Hin for one day at each resort on 20 May, 2010 from 9.30 to 15.00 and on 22 May, 2010 from 10.00 to 16.30, respectively. Finally, the data were collected at the Bangkok Tourism Division for two days on 25 and 26 May, 2010 from 8.30 to 18.00. The difference in starting and finishing times at each site was necessary to coincide with periods of time when most customers needed their services. At the hotel resorts, check-out time is between 10.00 and 11.00 a.m., while check-in time is between 2.00 and 3.30 p.m. Check-in and check-out times are considered peak hours when most customers have contact with the front desk. However, it is rather difficult to estimate when customers will use the services at the tourist information centre and the tour agent. The difference in the number of days when the data were collected also varied because of the period of time the owners and managers allowed data to be collected at their sites.

On the day the data were to be gathered, the first camcorder focused on the resort representatives and the second concentrated on customers as previously mentioned. Pictures 3 and 4 show the positions of the camcorders as the data were collected at Haven Resort Hua Hin.

Figure 3: A camcorder recording consumer actions at Haven Resort and Spa Hua Hin
Of course, the positions of the camcorders varied depending on the size and constraints of the architecture and furniture of the tourist sites and the permission given by the head or owner of the site.

The audio-recorder was placed on the counter or table where the interaction occurred. I took field-notes next to where service staff were sitting or standing. Figure 5 illustrates the position of the researcher while taking notes at Western Tours Hua Hin and where the audio-recorder was placed.

However, there were two factors which had an important impact on video-recordings of naturally occurring conversations and the quality of the collected data. First, the architecture and furniture of the tourist site significantly influenced the
positions where the camcorders and audio-recorder were placed and where I stood to take notes. As the office at Western Tours Hua Hin was small and my position was very near the place where interactions occurred, recorded voice and video film of the interactions at this location were of high quality. In contrast, the architecture of the reception area at Let’s Sea Hua Hin Al Fresco Resort, i.e. a big column in the middle of the reception area and a large waiting area, was a major barrier to video-recordings of conversations and resulted in poorer quality of voice and video-recordings. Second, work guidelines at the tourist sites made audio- and video-recordings inconvenient. According to the work guidelines of Let’s Sea Hua Hin Al Fresco Resort, a member of the service staff had to walk to the visitors’ car to welcome them to the front area. The interaction between staff and customers could occur either in the waiting area or at the counter, but the camcorders had to be placed in set positions, giving fixed angles of view as the General Manager of Let’s Sea Hua Hin Al Fresco Resort had designated. An informal chat with an agent at Let’s Sea Hua Hin Al Fresco Resort revealed that agents there had to speak in a very soft voice because of the General Manager’s concern relating to their manners and polite behavior. This resulted in lower quality recordings than those at the other three tourist sites.

3.6 Subjects and the Collected Data

Subjects of this study include staff members who work for the four tourist sites and their customers. Naturally occurring interactions as a focus of this study arise at the front desk of each site. Some recorded data are in the form of two-party conversations, whereas others are multi-party. A few are also multi-party conversations but with new participants joining the conversation, while others are conversations where a change of topic occurs.

All the agents at the different tourist sites were Thai. Participants were both male and female and of different ages. In contrast, customers at the different tourist sites were both Thais and non-Thais of different ages and sexes. Non-Thai customers could be identified by appearance and/or language but not for their nationality even though I was there as an observer and the business owners were concerned with
customer privacy. The exact number of participants was unpredictable. Therefore, the
subjects of this study vary in age, gender and nationality.

After seven days of data gathering, 80 spontaneous interactions between Thais
and between Thais and non-Thais were recorded. Table 3 illustrates the number of
agents at each tourist site, the number of Thai and non-Thai customers and the
number of recorded conversations.

**Table 3: Number of agents, customers and recorded conversations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>Let’s Sea</th>
<th>Haven</th>
<th>BKK Division</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Days of data collection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agents</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Customers</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai customers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Thai customers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interactions</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in table 3, there were 28 agents at the different tourist sites and all
were Thai speakers. There were six tourist officers each at Western Tours Hua Hin,
Let’s Sea Hua Hin Al Fresco Resort and Haven Resort Hua Hin and ten
representatives at the Bangkok Tourism Division. A total of 143 customers used the
services at all four tourist sites while the data were being collected. There were 51
Thai and non-Thai visitors at Western Tours Hua Hin, 8 Thai tourists at Let’s Sea Hua
Hin Al Fresco Resort, 45 Thai and non-Thai customers at Haven Resort and Spa Hua
Hin and 32 Thai and non-Thai visitors at the Bangkok Tourism Division. Despite
some limitations of the study, which are discussed in the next section, 80 complete
conversations were audio- and video-recorded. These include 36 conversations at
Western Tours Hua Hin, 20 conversations at Haven Resort and Spa Hua Hin, 3
conversations at Let’s Sea Hua Hin Al Fresco Resort and 21 conversations at the
Bangkok Tourism Division.
All 80 audio- and video-recorded interactions were preliminarily examined without being transcribed. Notes were taken with regard to particular linguistic and paralinguistic actions and circumstances discovered in the interactions. Field-notes were employed as a reminder of important actions and events which may be related to communicative behaviour relevant to the elaboration of and responses to potentially interpersonally-sensitive activities in a particular conversation. Afterwards, the notes were reviewed by focusing on those relevant to potentially interpersonally-delicate activities, i.e. expressions of disagreements and refusals/rejections. Finally, 41 out of 80 interactions were considered to be in line with communicative acts relevant to potentially interpersonally-delicate activities. Table 4 illustrates the number of relevant interactions which resulted in the presence of strategies of face mitigation and orientation of (non-)politic and polite behaviour. It also presents participants’ gender and the length of recorded interactions.

Table 4: Number of interactions relevant to potentially interpersonally-sensitive activities, participants according to the gender and length of interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>Let’s Sea</th>
<th>Haven</th>
<th>BKK Division</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of interactions relevant to potentially interpersonally-sensitive activities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Thais</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Non-Thais</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>Let’s Sea</td>
<td>Haven</td>
<td>BKK Division</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Length</strong></td>
<td><strong>2h 10m 35s</strong></td>
<td><strong>10m 45s</strong></td>
<td><strong>38m 06s</strong></td>
<td><strong>49m 16s</strong></td>
<td><strong>3h 48m 02s</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remark: The abbreviations ‘h’, ‘m’ and ‘s’ refer to ‘hours’, ‘minutes’ and ‘seconds’.

Subsequently, the next sub-section will present the way in which the collected data were prepared for analysis.

### 3.7 The Procedure of Data Analysis

When the data collection was completed, it was arranged as follows:

1. All of the audio-recorded files were examined to check their sound quality and cross-checked with the field-notes. The list of conversations with some details of participants’ appearance was noted in a document file and sent to the two technical assistants.

2. Each technical assistant took responsibility for editing conversations recorded by each camcorder and cross-checking with the list of the conversations. Video-edited conversations were arranged to correspond with the audio-recorded files. While editing video-recorded conversations, the two assistants cross-checked the content of each video-edited file and edited it to a similar length as the audio recording.

3. The data were transcribed using audio- and video-recordings and included the written notes. The selected data, which contained situations relevant to potentially interpersonally-sensitive activities which resulted in (non)verbal strategies of face mitigation and orientation of (non-)politic and polite behaviour, were then translated from Thai into English.

4. The data analysis will be conducted to comply with the selected theoretical framework.
3.8 Transcription Conventions

For verbal acts, the data in this study have been transcribed according to Jefferson’s transcript notation (Atkinson and Heritage, 1984; Howitt and Cramer, 2005). Multimodal details have been written in accordance with Mondada (2008). Jefferson’s transcript notation, more generally used in conversation analysis research (Atkinson and Heritage, 1984; Howitt and Cramer, 2005), provides transcript symbols that indicate as many (non)verbal acts as possible. In addition, because visual-recorded images reveal the actions of speakers and other participants which may occur at the same time or at a particular time when another action is taking place and nonverbal acts or events happening in interactions which audio-recording cannot demonstrate, Jefferson’s transcript notation is insufficient. Mondada’s transcript symbols, which are aimed at identifying multimodal actions and events video-recorded in greater detail, are applied in transcription. Each transcription notation is summarized below:

3.8.1 Verbal acts: Jefferson’s transcription

Square brackets are used when two (or more) speakers are talking together. The speakers are given different lines and the brackets should be in line where the speech overlaps.

Equal signs ordinarily come in pairs—one at the end of a line and another at the start of the next line or one shortly thereafter. They indicate that there are no identifiable pauses between the two (latching) when the two lines are produced by different speakers, and that there was a single, continuous utterance with no break, which was broken up in order to accommodate the placement of overlapping talk.

A dot in brackets indicates a micropause—a noticeable but very short pause in the speech.

The numbers-in-brackets sign is placed to indicate the length of a
pause between words.

: Colons are used to indicate the prolongation of the sound just preceding them. The more colons, the longer the stretching.

. The period refers to a falling intonation contour.

, A comma indicates continuing intonation.

? A question mark indicates rising intonation.

˚˚ Words between signs ˚ are spoken more quietly by the speaker.

WHAT Capitals indicate that the word(s) is (are) louder than the surrounding words.

h The letter “h” is used to indicate audible aspiration or breathing out sounds. The more “h”, the more aspiration.

`h The letter “h” with a raised dot indicates an inhalation or breathing in sound.

↑ ↓ The up and down arrows are used to indicate substantial movements in pitch. They mark out of the ordinary changes, i.e. sharper intonation which rises or falls than would be indicated by combinations of colons.

> < Words between > and < signs are speeded up.

< > Words between < and > signs are slowed down.

((sniff)) Double parentheses indicate the transcriber’s description of nonverbal acts or events, rather than representations of them.

( ) Words in brackets are the analyst’s best guess as to somewhat inaudible passages.

Underlining indicates emphasis such as on a particular syllable.
3.8.2 Multimodal acts: Mondada’s transcription

* * delimit one participant’s actions

++ delimit other participant’s action descriptions

*---> gesture or action described continues across subsequent lines

*--->>> gesture or action described continues until and after excerpt’s end

--->* gesture or action described continues until the same symbol is reached

>>-- gesture or action described begins before the excerpt’s beginning

.... gesture’s preparation

---- gesture’s apex is reached and maintained

scr describes what appears on the PC’s screen

3.8.3 Transcription process

The 41 interactions roughly examined that contained potentially interpersonally-sensitive activities which caused the presence of strategies of face mitigation and orientation of (non-)politic and polite behaviour through two recorded camcorders, an audio-recorder and a field-note were subjected to the following transcription process:

(1) Abbreviations which describe semantically and socially-oriented linguistic features of the Thai language which do not exist in English, such as socially-prescribed address terms and final particles which indicate formality of situations and intimacy of participants, are used in the transcribed data. Some grammatical features of the Thai language which exist in English but differ in form, for example, discourse markers, past and future tense markers and question markers are also abbreviated. Table 5 demonstrates abbreviations which indicate semantically and socially-prescribed linguistic features of the Thai language.
Table 5: Abbreviations indicating semantically and socially-prescribed linguistic features of the Thai language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thai</th>
<th>Abbreviations</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronominal reference terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicating the hearer’s age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) older than the speaker</td>
<td>KPS</td>
<td>a Kinship Pronoun Referring to a Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) younger than the speaker</td>
<td>KPJ</td>
<td>a Kinship Pronoun Referring to a Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/khráp/</td>
<td>FPM</td>
<td>a Final Particle used by Males and expressing politeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/khrâ?/ /khrâ?/</td>
<td>FPF</td>
<td>a Final Particle used by Females and expressing politeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/nâ?/ /nâ?/</td>
<td>WS/P</td>
<td>a Word added to the end of a Sentence to soften it, emphasize, or make it Polite; OR requesting politely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/câ?/</td>
<td>FI/P</td>
<td>a Final particle conveying Intimacy and Politeness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/sî/ /dî/</td>
<td>PCR</td>
<td>a Colloquial Particle used to (1) emphasize or indicate a Request; (2) emphasize an invitation or a complaint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/wâ?/</td>
<td>FIm</td>
<td>an informal and Impolite Final particle placed at the end of a phrase or a sentence, usually a question, to indicate familiarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/nâ?/ /lâ?/ /nâ?/ /hâ?/</td>
<td>FCoq</td>
<td>an informal and a Colloquial Final particle placed at the end of a phrase or a sentence, usually a question or a statement, to indicate familiarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/kuu/</td>
<td>C/IP1</td>
<td>an Impolite or Colloquial first person Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/kææ/</td>
<td>C/IP2</td>
<td>an Impolite or Colloquial second person Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/mûu/</td>
<td>CCP</td>
<td>A Colloquial Pronoun, implying the speaker’s tender feeling towards a Child, or referring to oneself in a cute way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Abbreviations</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>คุณ /khun/</td>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>A Polite Second person Pronoun which expresses the distance between interlocutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เรา /wot/</td>
<td>FI/A</td>
<td>An Informal Final particle used to express the speaker’s desire to seek Approval or agreement from the hearer on minor issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>หน/ /phom/</td>
<td>PFP/M</td>
<td>A Polite First person Pronoun for Males which can be used both in formal and informal situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ผู้ /khaw/</td>
<td>NTP</td>
<td>A Neutral Third person Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>นี่ /na?/</td>
<td>FP/E</td>
<td>A Final Particle used to refer back to something previously known, but expresses a certain sense of surprise at something truly new, and not previously relevant in context. It also refers to indicate Emphasis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The abbreviations used to refer to some grammatical features of the Thai language which differ from those in English are as follows:

- **AVD** = Additional verbs put before some verbs to express the speaker’s feeling of deference
- **DM** = Discourse marker
- **FTM** = Future tense marker
- **PTM** = Past tense marker
- **PrTM** = Present tense marker
- **Q-WH** = WH question
- **Q-YN** = Yes-no question
- **PL** = A word that indicates plural numbers
- **INI** = An initiator put in front of anything to show informality, intimacy, or sometimes impoliteness
PVM = Passive voice marker
CL = Classifier

(2) When collected interactions in Thai were completely transcribed, they were translated into English. The abbreviations which indicate semantically and socially-oriented linguistic characteristics and grammatical features of the Thai language were employed. The transcript of an interaction between Thai agents and Thai customers consists of three parts: (a) the first line contains the original words in Thai; (b) the second line includes a word-by-word translation with grammatical glossing and; (c) the third line is an idiomatic translation in English in italics. Regarding the Thai-non-Thai interactions, the transcript exclusively comprises the original words of the participants. (see Appendix 7 for transcripts, page 169-313)

(3) The transcribed data were properly laid out and lines of messages and described circumstances were numbered.

3.9 Summary

This chapter focuses on the various aspects of data collection: the consideration of the instruments, research sites and contacts, ethical concerns, preparation of the electronically methodological equipment, days of data collection, as well as subjects and the collected data. The second sub-section also includes the procedure of data analysis and transcription conventions used to manage the collected data for analysis.

The next chapter will shed light on to what extent Thai agents and non-Thai customers engage in elaborating and responding to potentially interpersonally-sensitive activities, i.e. disagreements and rejections/refusals, through both verbal and nonverbal features. It also includes whether the observed behaviour is potentially regarded as (in)appropriate or polite behaviour.
CHAPTER 4
INTERPERSONALLY-SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES
BETWEEN AGENTS AND THAI CUSTOMERS

In this chapter I investigate the way in which Thai agents and Thai customers manage interpersonally delicate activities in service encounters by analyzing the linguistic practices agents and customers engage in articulating them, the way in which they react to them and the extent to which manifestations of (non-)politic, polite behaviour and face surface during this process. Two principal activities, potentially signaling interpersonal sensitivity are: disagreements and rejections/refusals, as defined and discussed in Chapters 2.2.3-2.2.4.

The selection of the transcribed interactions used to demonstrate the way in which participants in Thai hospitality settings manage face concerns when engaging in disagreements and rejections or refusals in Chapters 4 and 5 is derived from the recurrent patterns of those activities. The transcribed interactions, which comprise situations in accordance with potentially interactionally-sensitive activities but which do not fit in the recurrent patterns of those activities, will not be shown. Moreover, the selected interactions shown in Chapters 4 and 5 include the recurrent strategies employed to manifest face when participants disagree with and reject the interlocutors. Consequently, of 41 interactions relevant to the presence of potentially-sensitive activities, the 14 selected and transcribed interactions, which contained situations with the recurrent patterns of disagreements and rejections and the recurrent strategies, will be present in the data analysis chapters.
4.1 Disagreements

4.1.1 Suspension of disagreements

Disagreements\(^6\) were observed in four interactions between Thai agents and Thai customers. They were present in the third turn as a result of customers’ negative assessment of a product and/or service offered/suggested by the agents. Since agents are designated by their professional institution to accomplish as many transactions as possible, the transactional concept “customers are always right” (Thitthongkam, 2013b) is a prominent economically-related principle which assumes that agents would avoid explicitly disagreeing with the customers to enhance their chances of obtaining their goal. Instead of disagreeing with the customers’ negative assessment, the agents reacted by withholding (dis)agreements. Of the 21 interactions between agents and Thai customers, the agents in five conversational segments within three interactions withhold (dis)agreements and in so doing, I argue, signal their concern for interpersonal sensitivity. An excerpt from the Let’s Sea Resort and Spa Hua Hin will now be considered.

In Excerpt 1, a Thai client and his relatives want a room for their “unplanned holiday”, and have not booked a room in advance. The agent thus offers them a room with the required facilities. The client implicitly refuses the offer\(^7\) and the agent avoids explicitly disagreeing with his negative assessment through the suspension of (dis)agreements. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.8, page 252)

**Excerpt 1** [3:6] Expensive room prices (L2006) Let’s Sea Resort and Spa Hua Hin

(A = Agent; C = Customer)

\[
\begin{align*}
24 & \quad A \quad มี \quad อิสระ \quad ให้ \quad ราคา \quad ห้อง \quad 9 \quad พัน \quad 9 \quad แต่ \quad ถ้า \quad ห้อง \quad ราคา \quad 24 \\
24 & \quad \text{Have special price normally er: price room 9 thousand 9 but if room} \\
\end{align*}
\]

---

\(^6\) The definition of disagreements is provided in Chapter 2.2.3.

\(^7\) Offers are defined as a commissive or an act which the speaker voluntarily commits him/herself to performing some future actions for the hearer (Searle, 1977). Leech’s (1983) consideration of the act of offering proposed acts which provide benefits to the hearer, seems to be overgeneralized when applied to service encounter contexts. This is because in hospitality contexts the agents who act as service providers can gain commercial benefits from the customer, whereas the customers who act as service seekers can receive the offered service they want.
(We can) offer a special price normally er: the price of the room is 9,900
have swimming pool --->[kind of with
(baht) but rooms with a swimming pool --->[kind of (those) with
--->[A gives a piece of paper with the detailed
information to C.*

→ 26 C [9 พัน 9 เหลือ (loud voice))
26 [9 THOUSAND 9 Q-YN (loud voice)]
26 [9 THOUSAND 9 (HUNDRED) REALLY?]

→ 27 A °แล้ว ในส่วน เลย เรามี special rate สำหรับ ช่วง นี้ ช่วง ที่ว่า
°but in part this we have special rate for this time that
°but we have a special offer now during the period of (political) chaos
เป็น (fighting) ทั่วหมด เราเอง มี special rate (สำหรับ คน ที่
be (fighting) total we er have special rate (for people that
we have a special rate (for people who live in the red zone) only
มา จาก เขต fighting) เลยนะ วันที่ 21-30 นี้ ค่ะ”
come from zone fighting) particularly date 21-30 now FPF) “
between 21st and 30th)”

30 C °รับหมาย
30 °FPM (=yes)
30 °yes sir
30 °C looks at the details on the piece of paper shown by A.--->

Figure 6: A male Thai customer, with his back to the camera at the reception desk, is elaborating a negative assessment of the offer (line 26 in Excerpt 1).

Lines 24-25 (excerpt 1) the agent carefully introduces the offer with a positive assessment specifically tailored to the customer (i.e. ‘special price’). The customer, however, refuses it, by indicating his opposing assessment, which is intensified by an increase in volume. The use of Extreme Case formulation (ECf) (Pomerantz, 1986), as shown from the exaggerated intonation of line 26 and the use of “really”, further indicates the force of the customer’s negative assessment of the offer and potentially shapes the agent’s negative interpretation of the customer’s utterance (Stadler, 2006). The customer’s negative assessment of the product through verbal and prosodic features is reminiscent of ridiculing for the maintenance of interactional harmony
(Hendon, 1999; Pornpitakpan, 2000; Katz, 2008; Ukosakul, 2009) and is potentially considered as politic behaviour. This is because elaborating the interpersonally-sensitive utterance with humor or a joke (Brown and Levinson, 1987) can help reduce its seriousness and the agent in the following turn can continue bringing the interaction into the transactionally-oriented goal through an alternative offer. At the same time, through intensifying the ECf in a loud voice, the customer implies: “I cannot afford that price. I want a discount”.

Then, in line 27 the way in which the agent initiates her response by using the semantically contrastive conjunction “but” at the beginning of line 27 seems to pragmatically index the point-making (Schiffrin, 1987) which refers to the agent’s attempt to provide a justification for the offered room price. The agent implicitly responds to the negative assessment as indicated by her offering an alternative in a soft voice to withhold an explicit (dis)agreement with the customer. Her soft voice may allow us to potentially interpret it as her unwillingness to produce a negative assessment of the product. The suspension of (dis)agreements through these mixed (non)verbal means signals that explicit disagreements are regarded as interpersonally-delicate for the agent and may threaten the customer’s face. It reflects the agent’s face concerns shaped by institutional constraints. This means that the agent needs to avoid confrontation and manage sensitive situations (Burgers et al., 2000) for the maintenance of interpersonal harmony during the interaction and then the sale achievement. Through the alternative offer, the agent can re-gain an opportunity to achieve the sale, in connection with the institutional demands of her jobs.

The suspension of (dis)agreements may be partially derived from the training received by the agents as emerged during the collection of the data in conversations with hotel staff members. One of them reported that the main policy which agents are restricted to includes the use of a soft voice and well-mannered and polite behaviour. The same agent in Excerpt 1 reacts in the same way with other customers when her product is criticized in Excerpt 2. The latter is part of a multiparty conversation between the agent and the customers. Customer 1 and 4 are at the reception desk when the same agent as in Excerpt 1 attempts to provide an offer whereas Customer 2 and 3 come to join the interaction and overhear the agent’s offer. The agent describes the offered special services (as she claims) to the customers such as facilities and
meals. Nonetheless, the customers think that the offered meal package is too expensive. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.8 page 252)


(A = Agent; C3 = Customer 3)

→ 75 A จะแนะนำ package นี้ เพิ่ม แต่ ทานละ 765 บาท ต่อ
    75 FTM recommend package this add only CL each 765 baht per
    75 (I would like) to recommend that (you) pay only 765 baht per
    76 ทาน
    76 CL
    76 person more
    77 +C2 and C3 follow C1 to the front desk and listen to A’s speaking.+

→ 78 C3 โอ้ มั้ย
    78 Oh my god
    78 Oh my god
    79 +C2 walks out of the front desk and sits on the sofa in the waiting
    79 area.+

→ 80 A แต่ ถ้า ไม่ชอบ package นี้ จะ เปลี่ยนเป็น a la carte ก็ได้
    80 But if not like package this FTM choose as a la carte can
    80 But if (you) don’t like this package (you) can choose a la carte because
    81 เพราะอาหารเช้า ราคา จะ แยกอยู่ แล้ว
    81 because breakfast we FTM separate PTM
    81 breakfast is not included

Figure 7: Customer 2, a female Thai customer who is standing near Customer 1 (in shorts with his back to the camera), and Customer 3, a male Thai customer (with his hands behind his back,) are walking to join the interaction and overhear it from line 77 in Excerpt 2.

8 The exclamation term โอ้ มั้ย is derived from a Chinese word 哎呀 lāiyā used to express surprise and blame (WordSense.eu Dictionary, 2014). Then, it was borrowed by Chinese-Thai people and modified in pronunciation. It is referred to as the expression of surprise, anger and fright.
In line 75 (Excerpt 2), the agent makes an explicit suggestion through the expression of procedural meaning (EPM), i.e. the semi-formulaic structure\(^9\) and the predicative verb relevant to suggestions ว่าจะแนะนำ (would like to recommend). It is combined with the implicitly positive assessment of the suggested service/product through an EPM. The downtoner “only” (Watts, 2003) implies reasonable value and shows she understands that the price is too high for the customer. In general, the classifier\(^10\) ส่วน /khon/ is used to classify the number of persons in both formal and informal situations. In the extract above, the classifier ส่วน /thân/ (CL as shown at line 76 in Excerpt 2) the meaning of which, in general, is related to the speaker’s elevation and respect for the hearer, for example, when functioning as a pronominal form (Khanittanan, 1988), indicates her expression of deference. Thus, her formulaic suggestion with the elevated classifier ส่วน /thân/ functions here as supportive facework.

At line 78 Customer 3, who overhears the agent’s suggestion while walking to the reception desk, constructs an explicitly negative assessment of the prior suggestion through the ECf โอ้ย (oh my god) to proffer to the agent an emergent utterance which rejects the suggestion. The ECf โอ้ย (oh my god) seems to be oriented to Customer 3’s performance of joking in a metaphoric way (Edwards, 2000: 370) since he may want to mitigate the rejection. The agent can move the interaction forwards by suggesting an alternative in line with the commercially-oriented goal in the following turn. Customer 3’s application of the ECf reflects his concern for interpersonal relationship and face concern. He wants the agent to reduce the price herself. The customer’s concern for face and interpersonal harmony seems to contradict Pornpitakpan (2000) who claims that customers are treated as bosses and of higher status than agents, and Kummer (2005) who claims that agents (e.g. hotel boys

---

\(^9\) Formulaic utterances refer to “highly conventionalized utterances, containing linguistic expressions that are used in ritualized forms of verbal interaction and have been reduced from fully grammatical structures to the status of extra-sentential markers of politic behaviour” (Watts, 2003: 168). In contrast, semi-formulaic utterances are defined as “conventionalized utterances containing linguistic expressions that carry out indirect speech acts appropriate to the politic behaviour of a social situation” (Watts, 2003: 169).

\(^10\) Classifiers refer to an obligatory linguistic element of noun phrase containing numerals for both uncountable and countable nouns in Thai (Smyth, 2002). For example, the noun phrase “two dogs” in English is equivalent to “dog-two-classifier”.
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and office boys) are classified into the lowest group in Thai society\textsuperscript{11} (see details in Chapter 2.2.2). It is noteworthy that the participants in Excerpts 1 and 2 oriented to harmony in interaction, as seen by their avoidance of direct confrontation (Pornpitakpan, 2000; Knutson, 2004; Ukosakul, 2009). This was illustrated by the customers’ animated reactions (e.g. 9 พันบาท (9 THOUSAND 9 (HUNDRED) REALLY?) in Excerpt 1 and อะไร (oh my god)) in Excerpt 2) to offers or suggestions they had no interest in. Although the use of the ECs is animated and thus indicative of interactional attentiveness, it signals rejection and was interpreted as such by the agents who revised their offer to accommodate customers’ emerging needs in Excerpt 1 and those who makes a new offer in Excerpt 2.

Subsequently, in lines 80-81 the agent withholds (dis)agreements by deploying rather similar (non)verbal strategies to those in Excerpt 1, i.e. an explicitly contrastive marker แต่ “but” accompanied by an alternative suggestion as a mitigating device. As in Excerpt 1, the semantically contrastive conjunction แต่ “but” initiated at the beginning of line 80, pragmatically signifies the agent’s articulation of the point (Schiffrin, 1987) she wants to justify before offering an alternative suggestion. As Excerpt 1, this observed behaviour evidences that the transaction orientedness results in the agent’s suspension of (dis)agreement through the alternative suggestion. Thus, it is potentially explained for the purpose of sale achievement. It may also arise from her concern for face of both participants by avoiding criticizing her institutional product in front of the customer: “the excessively high suggested price is unaffordable for the customer” and “the suggested price is too expensive”.

Thai customers’ negative assessment, which leads to the agent’s withholding (dis)agreements, is also triggered by agents’ information-giving, in addition to the product offer and suggestion. The next to be considered is part of an interaction at Haven Resort and Spa Hua Hin, where a Thai customer, who has booked rooms in advance, comes to check in with an agent. However, the price the agent gives is not the same as the one that the customer was given before visiting the hotel. Thus,\textsuperscript{11} Thai society is known as a hierarchical society (Gannon and Pillai, 2010; Thitthongkam, 2013) where people are classified in accordance with diverse criteria, i.e. age, professions, family and education (Pornpitakpan, 2000; Kummer, 2005). The term “social/socially” refers here to the ranking of occupations in Thai society.
disagreements unavoidably occur. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.13, page 298)

**Excerpt 3**  [5:22I] Political unrest (H2222I) Haven Resort and Spa Hua Hin

(A = Hotel Agent; C = Customer)

→ 51 A อันนี้ ถ้า มอง มอง มอง person นะ จะ อù ที่ A 12 year old child is charged as an adult 1,200 baht
51 CL this in part of KPJ: age 12 "we charge be person FP" be at
51 A 12 year old child is charged as an adult 1,200 baht
52 1,200 บาท
52 1,200 baht

→ 53 C หูหุ้น แต่ เมื่อเร็ว ที่ คุณมา เนื่อง ชั่วโมง 5 ฟัน: 7
53 huh↑ but morning that discuss FP/E total 5 thousand: 7
53 huh↑ when I discussed this earlier this morning, we agreed it would cost 5,775
54 ร่วม: 75 บาท
54 hundred: 75 baht
54 baht

→ 55 (0.05)

→ 56 +A looks at the computer screen.+

→ 57 C คือ เคย มา พัก แล้ว "ที่ hỏng เนื่อง ฟิช์นิ๊”
57 Mean PTM come stay already "remainder for tomorrow”
57 (I) mean (I) have been here “the remainder is to be paid tomorrow”
58 (.)

→ 59 +A continues looking at the computer screen.+

→ 60 A "อื่น ค่ะ” ((nods)) “3 วัน ห้าง อù ที่ 5,775 บาท ค่ะ”
60 “ah FPF” ((nods)) “3 day room be at 5,775 baht FPF”
60 “ah” ((nods)) that’s 5,775 baht for 3 days”

![Figure 8: The client, on the left of the picture, is listening to the Thai agent, on the far view angle of the camera, in lines 51-52 in Excerpt 3.](image)
In lines 51-52 (Excerpt 3) the agent is explaining the price for the rooms which is not the same as the customer expected. Thus, at line 53 the customer prefaces her disagreement with the token ḫu (huh) produced with a rising pitch. The token ḫu (huh) is similar to “What?” and “uh” in English (Smyth, 2002). Like the token “uh” prefacing the utterance which will be an interactional source of the error correction (Jefferson, 1974) and rejection (Davidson, 1984), the token ḫu (huh) in this situation seems to signal interactionally the speaker’s disapproval with the interlocutor and/or with what has been said. Then, she elaborates the disagreement with the agent through the explicitly semantically contrastive linguistic form ḫu “but”.

The customer emphasizes her disagreeing utterance by using the sentence particle “मा” /nīa/ which expresses the customer’s mild irritation (Noss, 1964; Moerman, 1973; Smyth, 2002) in the elaboration of the indirect reported speech to legitimate her claim (Holt and Clift, 2007; Bangerter et al., 2011). The customer’s disagreement in lines 53-54 seems to be seen as aggressive facework because of the (non)verbal and prosodic features which potentially contain negative meaning, i.e. the explicitly contrastive marker ḫu “but”, the sentence particle “मा” /nīa/ and the reported speech.

**Figure 9:** The agent, with her back to the camera, is looking for information on the computer screen while keeping silent in line 56, Excerpt 3.

The agent carefully elaborates a response to the customer’s disagreement by delaying it through silence (5 seconds) at line 55. Silence functions both as a carefully preceding marker of the upcoming oppositional thought against the prior one (Davidson, 1984) and as the omission of something negative to the interlocutor (Tannen, 1985). This means through it the agent withholds disagreements with the customer. Instead of a verbal reaction to the customer’s disagreement, the agent shifts
activity by examining information on the computer in line 56. This carefully elaborated behaviour through silence and activity shift signals her concern for the face of both participants and her avoidance of a clash of interest with the customer for the maintenance of interpersonal harmony (Pornpitakpan, 2000; Knutson, 2004; Ukosakul, 2009). However, the absence of response may construct an ambiguous situation for the customer. This silence in line 55 may cause insecure feelings (Watts, 1997) in the customer who is uncertain as to why the agent is silent. This can help increase the agent’s power over the customer, as power is interactionally negotiated (Jaworski, 1997; Watts, 1997). Consequently, in line 57 the customer attempts to elicit a response from the agent by reporting a past experience in a soft voice. In short, the customer’s careful elicitation of a response supports my observation that Thai customers do not treat agents as socially inferior to themselves, contrary to Pornpitakpan’s (2000) claim.

Considering these three segments of talk, it can be concluded that Thai-Thai disagreements may be organised as follows:

**Pattern 1**

1. A: Product offer/suggestion/information-giving
2. C: (Implicit) refusal/rejection via a negative assessment
3. A: Withholding (dis)agreements

According to Pattern 1, in potentially sensitive situations where the Thai customers articulate a refusal/rejection of the agents’ prior offer/suggestion, the Thai agents avoid explicit disagreements with Thai customers, in particular when the Thai customers criticize their products. Negative assessments of the quality of services offered/suggested may be sensitive to the agents’ professional face since they can be associated with the agents’ transactional failure to provide a good product according to customers’ expectations. In contrast, they signal that Thai customers potentially consider the explicit disagreement as interpersonally-delicate since through it, the agents’ personal face is vulnerable and the customers risk breaking Thai social obligations regarding the avoidance of face-loss and breach of interactional harmony (Pornpitakpan, 2000; Knutson, 2004; Ukosakul, 2009). Moreover, the refusals/rejections through the negative assessments help reserve the customers’
commercial benefits of getting the best value for money. In other words, considering the customers’ goal-oriented demands and their concern for face, the negative assessments of the product are potentially seen as appropriate behaviour since the customers as consumers can legitimately demand the best service. Furthermore, this finding contradicts Pornpitakpan’s (2000) and Kummer’s (2005) claims that Thai agents are classified into the lowest group in the Thai society since the analysis revealed Thai customers’ avoidance of explicit disagreements.

Then, the agents withhold (dis)agreements with the Thai customers’ negative assessment of their services and show their reluctance to engage in the bargaining sequence that Thai clients’ refusals/rejections might bring through the negative assessment. This observed behaviour suggests that Thai agents treat explicit disagreements as an interpersonally-sensitive activity which can jeopardise the interpersonal comity. It may be explained by the fact that Thai agents are aware of face of both participants and interactional harmony according to the same Thai norms as observed in the Thai customers’ behaviour when they avoid confrontation with the agents. It also reflects the agents’ restriction of the institutional roles which entail them not to criticize their institutional product in public. Consequently, the agents’ suspension of (dis)agreements with Thai customers or their reluctance to engage in an implicit bargaining sequence is potentially seen as acceptable behaviour. Alternative offers are a major (linguistic) strategy that agents deploy to avoid explicitly disagreeing with Thai customers as shown in Excerpts 1 and 2 since they can serve the primarily commercially-focused rationale. Through them the agents can potentially increase the transactional accomplishment and enhance the customers’ positive attitudes towards the provided service. Furthermore, nonverbal and prosodic features, i.e. the use of a soft voice in Excerpt 1 and silence in Excerpt 2, played a vital role in avoiding confrontation and/or toning down utterances delicate to face and interpersonal relationship.

4.1.2 Summary

In 4.1 it was shown that both agents and Thai customers provide an expected picture in accordance with their institutional roles across the examined service encounters. Theoretically speaking, the customers usually articulate a chance for the
best value for money. The analysis revealed that they rejected the agents’ eliciting activities, i.e. offers and suggestions, via the negative assessment of the service/product and disagreement with the agents. This behaviour generally arises from the customers’ request for a discount or a special offer/suggestion. It is non-salient behaviour since it is commonly part of the commercial negotiation of the service encounter for a transactional agreement. The negative assessment observed in my data is mainly elaborated through the ECfs and supportive through an increase in volume whereas disagreement is signaled by a delay marker and followed by indirect reported speech.

On the part of the agents, since the Thai agents need to persuade the Thai customers who have a power of money to align with the transactional deal, we would assume that they need to satisfy the Thai customers. The analysis revealed the same picture: the Thai agents avoid explicitly disagreeing with Thai customers and maintain the interactional comity (Burgers et al., 2000) when the Thai customers elaborate a negative assessment of the product. Instead, they withhold (dis)agreements with the Thai customers. This observed behaviour can move forwards the commercially-oriented interaction in an unnoticeable way.

Furthermore, the Thai customers’ explicitness for best value for money and the agents’ implicitness for the maintenance of interpersonal harmony and transactional agreement are potentially regarded as appropriate behaviour that Thai people would generally assume their members to be taking in service encounter contexts. Despite the customers’ explicitness, the data indicate their concern for their own face since strategic negative assessment implies getting a discount or a special offer/suggestion. Moreover, the agents’ implicitness also shows their concern for customers’ face and safeguarding their personal face from being seen as someone who breaks institutional norms in service encounter contexts. In other words, agents are aware of the need for non-confrontation with Thai customers. Furthermore, Thai agents’ suspension of (dis)agreements with Thai customers reflects the impact of institutional roles and demands of the jobs to explicitly avoid negative responses to customers.

Alternative offers are a prominent conventional device Thai agents deploy to withhold (dis)agreements and increase the chance of reaching a commercial deal.
Through them, agents can pretend not to acknowledge the implicit request for a discount and bring the interaction forwards to complete a commercial goal. The avoidance of confrontation by withholding (dis)agreements is also evidenced by decreasing intensity (using a soft voice) and keeping silent. In other words, in Thai service encounter contexts, the mixed resources between verbal (alternative offers) and prosodic means (a soft voice) potentially indicate appropriate behaviour when the speaker withholds (dis)agreements.

Subsequently, the following section will consider how participants in Thai hospitality settings engage in articulating rejections.

4.2 Rejections

Rejections\textsuperscript{12} of suggestions were found in six segments of talk within five service encounters between Thai agents and Thai customers. The term “suggestions” in service encounter contexts in this study is defined as a directive speech act (Searle, 1977) that agents usually attempt to get customers, who generally seek suggestions regarding the product (Jefferson and Lee, 1981), to accept the product. Searle (1977) and Banerjee and Carrell (1988) claim that the hearer is a beneficiary of the act of suggesting. However, suggestions in hospitality contexts can be potentially seen as an act in which both agents and customers receive benefits since agents can achieve a sale through them and customers receive the suggested product relevant to their wants. The rejections observed in my data were present in the second turn as a consequence of agents’ suggestion regarding a product and in response to request for a product respectively. Instead of an explicit rejection to the suggestion, Thai customers were found to offer an implicit one. Of the 21 Thai-Thai interactions, three segments of talk in three service encounters reveal customers’ implicit rejections of a product suggestion and one segment of talk discloses agents’ implicit non-granting of a customer’s request. In the following sub-section, implicit rejection of product suggestion will be investigated.

\textsuperscript{12} The definition of rejections is provided in Chapter 2.2.4.
4.2.1 Implicit rejections

In Excerpt 4, a Thai female customer wants to buy an air ticket to Birgen at Western Tours Hua Hin. She plans to stay there for about a year. Thus, the agent suggests that she should book a one-year return ticket rather than a single ticket. However, the customer rejects this. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.9, page 261)

Excerpt 4 [4:4] Checking the flight to Birgen (W2104) Western Tours Hua Hin

(A = Agent; C = Customer)

\[41\] A
*^[ทำไมไม่ซื้อตั๋วปีเต็มตัว\]
*^[why not buy ticket year FCoq ticket\]
*^[why don't you buy a one-year ticket?\]
*^[A holds a pen in her hand.---->

\[42\] ปีถูกกว่าซื้อวันเดียวนะ
year cheaper buy one way WS/P
It's cheaper than a one-way ticket

\[43\] C
*อีม: แต่ไม่ทราบว่าจะมาช่วงไหนใส่ค่ะ
*Um: but kindly wonder that FTM come when FPF
*Um: but (I) am uncertain about when I will return
*C puts her left elbow on the front desk where her arm is in a vertical position and her left palm on her cheek.---->

\[44\] A
ก็ทำเป็นopenได้(.)ตัวบั้นทำเป็นopenได้ระยะเวลายี่ปี
DM do as open can(.)ticket it do as open can duration 1 year
(You) can do it as an open ticket for a year and can return (to

\[45\] เววุ่มเข้ากลับวันไหนก็ตาม(.)ได้
we FTM return day any(.)can

Thailand) any day

Figure 10: The customer on the right, is implicitly rejecting the suggestion given by the agent on the left in Excerpt 4 in line 43.
In lines 41-42 (Excerpt 4) the agent uses a conventional suggestion via “ทำไม่” (why don’t you) (Bolden and Robinson, 2011) and thus supports it by positively assessing the suggested service/product through the comparative form “ถูกกว่า” (cheaper than). According to Dolphen (2001), “ทำไม่” (why don’t you) is categorized as a sentence pattern commonly used in constructing indirect suggestions in Thai. In line 43, the customer carefully attends to the rejection by delaying her acceptance/rejection of the suggestion through the hesitator “อู” (um) produced with a vowel elongation. The token “อู” (um) shows the speaker’s hesitation on the upcoming utterance (Watts, 2003) and, in this case, functions as a preface of the subsequent rejection (Davidson, 1984; Pomerantz, 1986) which she introduces via the semantically contrastive conjunction “แต่” (but) as a point-maker (Schiffrin, 1987). This signals her oppositional stance while orienting to interactional harmony as observed by the way in which it was constructed. The rejection is delayed, conventionally prefaced and contains a relevant reason as to why she cannot accept it. The way in which accounts are given in my data is in line with the findings of other studies in that accounts are a linguistic device as prefaces to refusals/rejections of the eliciting activities (e.g. offers, requests and invitations) such as Liao and Bresnahan (1996), Johnson (2007), Wannaruk (2008), Yang (2008), Bella (2011), and Aliakbari and Changizi (2012).

The explanation given is impersonally constructed, in the form of the semi-formulaic reported predicate “เป็นอย่างไร” (be uncertain) at the beginning of line 43. It also lacks the personal pronominal term in Thai language which occurs when the hearer’s age and social position are unavailable to the speaker (Moerman, 1973; Palakornkul, 1975; Hoonchamlong, 1992). The omission of the pronominal term as a self-reference or a reference to the interlocutor indicates that the customer carefully constructs her utterance since the customer avoids using the pronominal forms

---

13 According to Dolphen (2001), suggestions are expressed in direct and indirect ways. The direct ways are usually expressed through the predicative verb “แนะนำ” (recommend/suggest/advise) in the head act, and modal verbs (e.g. ควร/ควรจะ (should, had better) and ต้อง (have to)). Adverbial terms (e.g. ผิ่น/ผิ่นจะ (perhaps/maybe)) are used as internal modifiers. Indirect suggestions are displayed in the form of representatives and interrogatives, for example, yes-no questions and why-questions.
relevant to the difference in status or age which may have an involvement with the hierarchy in Thai society (Pornpitakpan, 2000; Kummer, 2005). Inappropriate use of the pronominal forms may be marked and affect the agent’s negative perception. The lack of the pronominal form which signals the careful articulation of the rejections may reveal that the participants do not treat it either explicitly or implicitly. In (4) the customer’s implicit rejection through the prefacing marker of the rejection “ุ” (um) and the account indicates that she is concerned with the interpersonal relationship during the interaction and the avoidance of confrontation with the agent, even though the service encounter settings, theoretically speaking, would potentially make explicit rejections, a case of politic behaviour. It also maintains her own face and the agent’s face (Locher, 2004) since the account that the customer gives is related to the inevitable reason which forces her to reject the suggestion, but is unrelated to the quality of the product. The customer’s implicit rejection of the suggestion through the account is not treated as salient behaviour when the agent reformulates the suggestion as a response to it in lines 44-45. This also suggests that the explicit rejection by the customer is potentially treated as inappropriate behaviour since it seems to jeopardise the social cohesion that has to exist between the participants for the achievement of the commercially-related goal.

I would argue that the absence of the pronominal forms in line 43 which according to some scholars’ (Arrington, 1990; Witkowski and Wofinbarger, 2001; Chan et al., 2007; Thitthongkam, 2013b) claim that customers are Gods due to the power of money and Pornpitakpan’s (2000) and Kummer’s (2005) claims that agents are socially inferior in the pyramid order of Thai society, are unlikely to be applicable in Thai hospitality contexts. Instead, Thai values such as the avoidance of confrontation and face-loss and the maintenance of interactional harmony (Hendon, 1999; Katz, 2008; Ukosakul, 2009) have a greater impact on the customers’ delicate articulation of rejection.

In reformulating the suggestion, in lines 44-45, the agent further elaborates the explanation about the benefits of the one-year ticket relevant to the customer’s account given for her implicit refusal of the prior offer. This behaviour may arise from the fact that the agent acknowledges that the customer is uninterested in her commercial suggestion but still wants to pursue the sale. Moreover, it is a non-
confrontation device of pro-agreement which helps the agent maintain the smooth negotiation of the interaction. In other words, like the customer’s careful articulation of the rejection, the agent considers the elicitation of acceptance of the suggestion as interpersonally-delicate since the explicit elicitation of the acceptance (e.g. “You must buy the one-year ticket”) seems to be regarded as aggressive facework by the both participants and easily threatens the hearer’s face and their interpersonal relationship during the interaction. These reasons seem to imply that the agent’s careful reformulation of the suggestion as a response to the customer’s implicit rejection is potentially interpretable as appropriate behaviour.

Another example of an implicit rejection of a suggestion in which an account and absence of pronominal forms is found can be seen in Excerpt 5 in which two Thai customers want to check a ticket price at Western Tours Hua Hin. An agent offers a refundable ticket and non-refundable travel insurance. Nonetheless, one of the customers does not want to accept the offer at that moment. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.2, page 187)

Excerpt 5  [1:6] Checking a flight to Sweden (W1806) Western Tours Hua Hin

(A = Agent; C = Customer)

→ 129 A *อย่างที่พี่บอกนะ ว่าให้สื่อค์ที่นั่งไวก่อน 129 *As KPS tell WS/P that should lock seat in advance 129 *As I (KPS) told (you) (WS/P) that booking a seat in advance had better 129 *A hands the same piece of paper to C, and C receives it while A is saying this utterance.--->
130 จนแจะตีไม่ได้= 130 FPF FTM [good= 130 be done=
→ 131 C [แล้วต้องถามแฟน= 131 [and have to ask boyfriend 131 [and (I) have to ask (my) boyfriend
132 A =[เพื่อบทกเกิดไปขึ้น จะย่า= 132 =[will if apply visa= 132 =if (you) apply for a visa= 133 C [ถามแฟนลูก่อน 133 [ask boyfriend first 133 [(I have to) ask (my) boyfriend first
→ 134 A =ถ้าเกิดไม่มีที่นั่ง ไปก็ต้อง 134 =if if not have seat available it DM have to
=if there is no seat available (you) will have to postpone the
postpone date travel far away

Figure 11: The agent who faces the camera on the left is giving a suggestion to the Thai customers in Excerpt 5 in line 129.

In lines 129-130 (Excerpt 5), the agent attempts to elicit an acceptance of the suggestion from the customer as evidenced by her reference to her prior claim through direct reported speech (Holt and Clift, 2007) through which the agent inserts her emphasis on the suggestion and the predicative verb สะทับ (had better). In lines 131 and 133, the customer’s interruption of the ongoing utterance signals her oppositional attitude towards the suggestion. It is delicately articulated, like Excerpt 4, by providing an explanation regarding her personal reason why she is forced not to accept the suggestion. Instead of explicitness (e.g. through negative particles (“no”, “not”)), this delicate construction of the customer’s implicit rejections through the explanation is potentially regarded as appropriate behaviour. This is because, like the customer’s rejection in Excerpt 4, it may potentially signal that the customer is concerned with her own face and the agent’s personal face, in addition to the smooth negotiation of the interaction, to avoid potential failure of the commercial deal, embarrassment to the self and being regarded as a person who breaches the social norms. Furthermore, like Excerpt 4, it is noteworthy that the omission of the pronominal form as a self-reference occurs. This may potentially indicate that the customer’s concern for face shows that she does not make relevant status inequality.

In lines 132 and 134, the agent attempts to elicit the acceptance of the same product suggestion from the customer. In so doing, it is constructed through a conditional clause (ถ้าไม่มีที่นั่งว่าไม่ได้จึงต้องเลื่อนวันเดินทางออกไปอีก (if there is no seat
available (you) will have to postpone the travel date). Instead of explicitly stating “You must make a decision now”, the agent does it implicitly by constructing the scenario in case the customer rejects her suggestion. Like the agent’s reformulation of the suggestion in Excerpt 4, this observed behaviour reflects the impact of institutional constraints on the agent’s behaviour, i.e. she wants to achieve the sale. It may also be explained by the fact that the agent treats the elicitation of the acceptance (despite being implicitly rejected) as delicate.

However, not only explanations and the lack of the pronominal forms as indicated in Excerpts 4 and 5 but also other types of (non-)linguistic devices are observed in order to articulate implicit rejections. An illustration of this can be found in an incident at Western Tours Hua Hin. Excerpt 6 illustrates an incident where a Thai female customer wants to buy a ticket from Bangkok to Copenhagen. An agent suggests a ticket and travel insurance. Nonetheless, the customer does not respond to the agent’s suggestion. Instead, she recites her personal experience about past travelling. Then, the agent tries to bring the conversation back to the commercial goal. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.4, page 207)

**Excerpt 6**  [1:15] Buying a ticket to Copenhagen (W1815) Western Tours Hua Hin

(A = Agent; C = Customer)

91 C ปี ที่แล้ว ไป สำหรับธุริบธุริบ ของ UCL เที่ยวที่กัน
91 Year last KPS go airline of UCL as well
91 Last year I flew on UCL airline

→ 92 A แต่ ตอนนี้ การบิน ไทย มี ตัว promotion นะครับ
92 FPF (=yes) now Airway Thai have ticket promotion FPF
92 Yes now Thai Airways have a promotional tickets but
93 promotion เดิม เดือน เดียว 30,000 กว่า บาท นะ
93 but promotion only month one 30,000 more baht only
93 one-month promotional ticket for just over 30,000 baht roughly 34,000
94 34,000 33,000-34,000
94 34,000 33,000-34,000
94 baht between 33,000-34,000 baht

→ 95 (0.03)

→ 96 C ไม่ รู้ [สำหรับรวม เลย นะ]
96 KPS think FTM get to embassy Q-WH KPS not yet
96 I have no ideas about how to get to the embassy
97 not know [destiny DM WS/P
I don't know what will happen in the future

You have to ((nods)) call (them) to check (it) first

Figure 12: The Thai female customer in the middle is shifting topic in Excerpt 6 in lines 96-97.

In lines 92-94 (Excerpt 6), the agent attempts to bring the conversation back to the commercially-focused interaction by constituting a positive assessment of an implicit suggestion of the service through the inclusion “promotional” and “มี” (just). Instead of an immediate reaction to the offer, the customer’s silence (3 seconds) indexes a potential rejection of the suggestion (Davidson, 1984; Lemak, 2012) and her avoidance of confrontation for the maintenance of the interpersonal relationship during the interaction, before switching topic. It is noteworthy that the switch in topic is initiated by the pseudo-kinship term “พี่” /phi/ (elder sibling) which functions as a first person pronominal term (Khanittanan, 1988) conveying the speaker’s desire to minimize the distance between the agent and the customer (Hoonchamlong, 1992; Smyth, 2002) and thus minimize the cost of the action. The agent’s reaction in line 98 indicates that the customer’s delicately constructed rejection through silence and the switch in topic in lines 95-97 is non-salient. This is because the agent responds to the new topic, does not bring the interaction back to the prior suggestion in line 98 and thus makes the interaction in line with what can be expected.

From an analysis of Excerpts 4-6, a pattern emerges in the organization of (non)verbal practices in the rejection of a suggested service/product:
Pattern 2

1. A: Product suggestion

2. C: Implicit rejection through mitigating devices

According to Pattern 2, Thai customers implicitly reject a product suggestion provided by the agents. This suggests that they reject the suggestion as delicately as possible to show their concern for face. The agents’ personal face is protected from being explicitly rejected and the Thai customers’ face is also saved by being regarded as a person who behaves in line with social obligations. The implicit rejection may arise from Thai peoples’ concern with the maintenance of harmony, the suspension of emotional restraint, avoidance of face-loss and open criticism of others (Hendon, 1999; Katz, 2008; Ukosakul, 2009). These characteristics seem to be part of a Thai value called “อดีต” (one’s consideration of others’ face, needs and feelings so that one shows an extreme reluctance to impose on others (KJ), see the details in Chapter 2.2.2) (Knutson, 1994; Sriussadaporn-Charoennangam and Jablin, 1999; Pornpitakpan, 2000; Ukosakul, 2009; Intachakra, 2012) which is the interactional principle regarding one’s anxiety or concern about how others may think or feel as a consequence of one’s words or actions (Intachakra, 2012). Furthermore, due to the nature of commercially-oriented encounters, customers usually want the product which offers the best value for money. Therefore, Thai customers’ implicit rejection of a suggestion is interpretable as appropriate behaviour. Accounts are a prominent verbal device deployed to implicitly deny the suggestion and mitigate the rejection as shown in Excerpts 4 and 5 (Liao and Bresnahan, 1996; Johnson, 2007; Wannaruk, 2008; Yang, 2008; Bella, 2011; Aliakbari and Changizi, 2012) whereas some types of paralinguistic features such as hesitators and silence function to delay and implicitly signal the upcoming rejection. Topic shift can assist in both conveying the implicit rejection and terminating the chance of agents reiterating the same suggestion as in Excerpt 6. The customers’ absence of the pronominal forms as shown in Excerpts 4 and 5 seems to be involved in their concern for interpersonal sensitivity of the activities that they are articulating and awareness of the inappropriate use of the pronominal forms which can be salient and have a great impact on the agents’ perception.
In addition, the implicit rejections are observed in part of the agents’ interaction when they reject the customers’ request. There is a case where the agent carefully elaborates the non-granting of the customer’s request. In Excerpt 7, a Thai client wants 40 copies of a Bangkok map at the Bangkok Tourism Division. However, two agents refuse her request since the request impinges on institutional policy. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.14, page 310)

**Excerpt 7**  
[7:1] 40 Copies of Maps (B2601) Bangkok Tourism Division

(A1 = Agent1; A2 = Agent2; C = Customer)

→ 18 C  

*สัก 40 จะ ไถ่ ไหมคะ ((smiles))
*approximately 40 DM can Q-YN FPF ((smiles))
*approximately 40 (copies) is that OK? ((smiles))
*C bends forwards and looks at A1 while speaking. Then, she smiles to both A1 and A2.--->

→ 19 A1  

*โทษ:=
*Q[h:=
*Q[h:=
*A1 looks quickly at A2.--->

→ 20 A2  

*โทษ:=
*[Oh:=
*[Oh:=
*[A2 looks at A1.--->

→ 21 A1  

*[คำถาม 40 ต้อง ระบุว่าเป็น หนังสือ หนังสือ ทางราชการ=  
*[if 40 must ADV do letter letter official=  
*[if (you want) 40 could (you) please write  an official letter=  
*[A1 glances at A2 a second and touches the hair a bit. Then, he turns to look at C a second.--->

→ 22 A2  

*[คำถาม เป็น อย่าง นั้น ต้อง ทำ หนังสือ 봐]  
*[if be like that must do letter DM]  
*[if so (you) must write  a letter]  
*[A2 looks at C.--->

→ 23 C  

+C keeps an eye on A2 and smiles while both agents are speaking.+

→ 24 A1  

*[ต้อง ค่ะ ---มี อะไรบิ [แล้ว 3 วัน ทำการ=  
*[send to ---Director FPM* [then 3 day working=  
*[sent to the Director? After that we will=  
*[When saying the word "Director", A1 raises his left hand to the level of his chest and moves it to the right side, signifying the inside of the office.*

→ 25 C  

*[อะไร*  

→ 25 A1  

*[อะไร*
Figure 13: The Thai customer, facing the camera on the right side, is requesting 40 copies of the maps in Excerpt 7, line 18.

In (7), the customer requests in the conventionally requestive form of a yes-no question combined with the appropriate choice of particles (Khanittanan, 1988; Smyth, 2002; Khahua, 2003; Chakorn, 2006) in line 18. Additionally, the customer smiles at the end of line 18.

Figure 14: The Thai customer, on the right side, is smiling after her request to the agent, whose back is to the camera on the left side, in Excerpt 7, line 18.

The customer’s smile can be described as a small open mouth smile with a long onset and offset and tense lips. It is considered to be an embarrassed smile (Ochs et al., 2010) which is a non-shared smile with the interlocutor (Ambadar et al., 2008; Hoque et al., 2011). It may signal that the customer realizes that she is requesting too...
many copies of the maps and that, if her request is denied, her face may be threatened. She wants to create an informal atmosphere for the interaction and may be aware of the high possibility that her request is likely to be rejected.

In lines 19-24, Agent 1 and Agent 2 carefully articulate the rejection by attending to the customer’s request through the token “โอ” (oh). The token “โอ” (oh) in lines 19-20, which is likely to be abbreviated from “โอฮู” (ohhuh), is an emotional exclamation used to express surprise (Thawarah, 2014) and, like the “oh-prefaced” marker, is related to the speaker’s initial signal of trouble-telling (Heritage, 1998). In this context it functions as a pre-sequence of the implicit rejection made by suggesting an alternative in lines 21-22 through the if-clause structure (“ถ้า 40 ต้องการจะทำเป็นหนังสือราชการ” (if 40 could you please write an official letter?)). Moreover, the fact that both agents watch each other while implicitly rejecting the request at lines 19-21 may indicate that they want each other to help elaborate the potentially vulnerable utterance and that they are cautious of the construction of it. This carefully-constituted behaviour through the dispreferred marker “โอ” (oh) followed by the alternative suggestion is considered potentially appropriate, since it signals that the two agents are attempting to avoid threat to both their own face and the customer’s in accordance with the Thai value “กตัญญู” (KJ). It also arises from the two agents’ restriction of institutional policies that entail agents not to comply with the customer’s request as individuals but as staff.

In line 25 the expression of the token “เอา” (ah), which involves the customer’s acknowledgement of new information (Thawarah, 2014), is likely to indicate the customer’s effort to save face and sustain smooth negotiation. It also functions as a delay to her negative evaluative stance towards the agents’ explanation (D’Hondt, 2011). While Agent 2 continues to expand the explanation in line 26, the customer continues reformulating a new request for fewer copies of the maps in line 27 through the request “ถ้าถ้า” (literally meaning “then if”) likely equivalent to “what about” in this context, which, in general may function as a consultative and/or challenging form. The customer’s reformulation of a new request indicates that the customer treats the agents’ implicit refusal as non-salient behaviour. Instead, the customer treats her
gradual articulation of the new request as interpersonally-delicate since she may realise the agents’ claim of institutional regulations despite her concentration on her transactional benefits. Furthermore, like the customer’s delicately-articulated rejection in Excerpt 4, the customer’s careful construction of a new request emphasizes the fact that the participants do not seem to perceive the power differences between them (see details in Excerpt 4).

Nonetheless, there are some cases in which Thai agents dis-attend to the customers’ request. The next sub-section will present this observed behaviour.

4.2.2 Dis-attending to requests

In Excerpt 8, a Thai customer wants to extend her stay in the same room as their existing booking at Haven Resort and Spa Hua Hin. A male agent checks whether those rooms are available that day. However, they are unavailable and thus the agent cannot grant the customer’s request. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.12, page 292)

Excerpt 8  [5:3] Extending the stay (H2203) Haven Resort and Spa Hua Hin

(A = Agent; C = Customer)

\[
\begin{align*}
4 & C & *("ปกติ คืน ต่อ คืน ใหม่ ที่ ขอ ไว") & \\
4 & *("normally night by night Q-YN that ask PTM") & \\
4 & *("normally (the rooms) that (I) asked for are (booked) every day") & \\
4 & *(C puts two elbows on the desk.--->) & \\
5 & A & ครับ ผม คืน นี้ ขอรับ & \\
5 & FPM (=yes) night this FPM & \\
5 & Yes tonight? & \\
6 & C & *(nods) room it yet available 302 and 30: & \\
6 & *FPF (=yes) room it yet available 302 and 30: & \\
6 & *Yes ((nods)) the rooms are available, are they? (Room) 302 and 30: & \\
6 & *C puts two elbows on the desk and rests her hands on her chin.--->) & \\
7 & A & ทั้ง สอง ห้อง ขอรับ & \\
7 & Both two room FPM & \\
7 & Both rooms? & \\
8 & C & *((nods)) & \\
8 & *C puts two elbows on the desk and two back palms on the chin.--->) & \\
9 & *A checks some information on the computer screen.* & 
\end{align*}
\]
Figure 15: The Thai customer facing the camera is requesting rooms 302 and 303 in line 6 of Excerpt 8.

On line 10 (Excerpt 8) the agent implicitly rejects the customer’s request for the extension of the stay constructed in line 4 without providing any preceding markers such as hesitators that would indicate the speaker’s stance. In so doing, the agent offers an alternative as a replacement when the requested product is unavailable, i.e. superior rooms and deluxe rooms. This observed behaviour reflects that the agent considers the non-granting of the request as an activity which can cause interpersonal sensitivity and is goal-oriented at achieving a sale. The agent’s implicit non-granting of the request by offering an alternative indicates the agent’s concern for face and the influence of the commercial context on his behaviour for the transactional achievement in accordance with Thai values regarding non-confrontation.

It is noteworthy that, like the suspension of (dis)agreements with Thai customers’ negative assessment of the product (see section 4.1), alternative offers are likely to help agents maintain an interpersonal relationship during the encounter and face of the participants when implicitly rejecting Thai customers’ requests for unavailable products. Through these linguistic means, agents can save their two
institutional roles, i.e., the avoidance of conflicts with customers and an increase in an opportunity for the transactional agreement according to the institutional demands of their jobs.

Nonetheless, in line 11 the customer declares her treatment of the agent’s implicit non-granting of the request as inappropriate behaviour since the customer does not perceive the hints that the agent provides and feels her request is neglected by the agent. Unlike Excerpt 7, in line 10 the agent does not provide an adequate cue/a pre-sequence for non-granting the request but instead shifts to making an alternative offer. Thus, she requests an explanation from the agent about his prior utterance in linguistic forms which are potentially seen as aggressive facework. In doing so, the customer uses the pronominal form “อ่อน” (rao) as a self-reference and the pronominal form “คุณ” (khun) as a second person pronoun. This indicates the unparalleled use of the pronominal forms which is potentially marked behaviour and has an impact on the hearer’s perception. This is because the inappropriate use of pronominal forms is associated with the speaker’s intentional mood (Palakornkul, 1975; Khanittanan, 1988; Sodsongkij, 2006) (For details of pronominal forms in Thai culture, see Chapter 2.2.5). In general, the customer’s self-referent form in line 11 is usually used in informal situations, whereas the second person pronoun in line 11 reflects the customer’s definition of the present situation as formal and her negative stance (Noss, 1964; Moerman, 1973; Palakornkul, 1975; Khanittanan, 1988; Hoonchamlong, 1992; Smyth, 2002). In other words, the unparalleled application of the pronominal terms indicates misalignment with the activity proposed by the agent. In addition to the unparalleled application of the pronominal terms, the fact that the customer’s utterance is upfront and explicit is potentially considered as salient behaviour due to its negatively semantic meaning which signals his deficiency regarding the provision of the requested service. The customer’s observed behaviour is explained by the fact that she focuses more on her commercial benefits than interpersonal comity.

Comparing Excerpt 8 with Excerpt 7, it seems that preceding markers which signal the pre-sequence of the rejection have a great impact on the perception and interpretation of the interlocutor. In Excerpt 7, the prefaced-oh before the explanation prepares the customer for a potential rejection. The preceding markers before the
rejection, e.g. nonverbal/prosodic features (e.g. hesitators), considered EPMs which signal politeness (Watts, 2003), are seen as politic behaviour due to the speaker’s concern for face and social cohesion. In contrast, the agent in Excerpt 8 reacts by launching an alternative offer thus dis-attending to the rejection. The unstated rejection in Excerpt 8 is seen as marked behaviour since it can cause the hearer’s misinterpretation as being interactionally ignored or as being irrelevant to the prior utterance. The fact that the provision of the preceding marker of the rejection is of importance for the interpretation of the rejecting utterance is also evidenced in another extract of the interaction.

In Excerpt 9, a Thai client and her non-Thai partner require an air ticket from Bangkok to Copenhagen and travel insurance at Western Tours Hua Hin. The Thai agent issues a ticket operated by Thai Airways and explains the conditions which require the client to pay a deposit for the ticket, and the full amount for the travel insurance. Finally, both the agent and the client reach a commercial agreement. The following excerpt presents an incident in which the agent offers a new ticket envelope to the customer, but the customer seems unhappy with it. The agent urges the customer to take her offered envelope and extends the offer to redress the customer’s unhappiness. However, the customer criticizes the extended offer. Then, the agent dis-attends to the negative assessment by lacking any (non)verbal and prosodic responses to it. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.4, page 207)

**Excerpt 9**  **[1:15] Buying a ticket to Copenhagen (W1815) Western Tours Hua Hin (Continued)**

(A = Agent; C = Customer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Um envelope year this not beautiful at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>*((laughs a bit))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>isn’t it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Have envelope style old can FPF ((laughs and smiles))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(You) can have an old-style envelope. ((laughs and smiles))*
A =/uni0เ0A/uni0เ2D/uni0เ1A  /uni0เ0B/uni0เ2D/uni0เ07 /uni0เ2D/uni0เ31/uni0เ19  เ/uni0เ01/uni0เ48/uni0เ32   /uni0เ43/uni0เ0A/uni0เ48/uni0เ21/uni0เ30 =like envelope  CL  old   Q-YN

((You) like the old style envelope, don't you?)

A ---»=((nods))     
---»Yes*  [=want CL  that Q-YN ((nods))
---»Yes* /=[You want that, don't you? ((nods))
---»A nods*

C [โอ เดิม บั้น ขาด
[Oh FTM it torn
[Oh it'll be torn

A *((smiles)) เ/uni0เ2D/uni0เ32   /uni0เ41/uni0เ1A/uni0เ1A  /uni0เ19/uni0เ35/glyph1144     /uni0เ41/uni0เ2B/uni0เ25/uni0เ30 ((little smiles))
*(smiles)) Take CL  this DM ((little smiles))
*(smiles)) Take this type ((little smiles))
*A looks at C while speaking and standing, and holds the envelope in her hands.---»

C *อื้อ
*Um
*C does not look at A.-»

A พอ บั้น ขาด *แล้ว ค่อยมา เล่า ใหม่
If it torn *then later take new
If it’s torn, I’ll give you a new one
*A does not look at C but smiles a little and concentrates on placing the document into the zipped envelope.---»

C >>--บั้น ขาด อยู่ก่อนแล้ว ละ เสีย ((laughs))
>>--It torn PTM FCq PCR ((laughs))
>>--It has been torn, hasn’t it? ((laughs))
>>--C gazes at A, who is standing, for a second.

+A does not look at C when C says the utterance in line 331. Then, she leaves the desk and takes the company stamp from another desk. (0.10)+

+A returns to the desk, stamps the ticket.+

A *อื้อ จ่ะ
*yeah FI/P
*yeah
Figure 16: The agent (standing) is reformulating her offer to the client who is facing the camera (Excerpt 9, line 330).

In lines 324 and 326 (Excerpt 9) the agent withholds (dis)agreements with the customer by offering a new envelope after the first envelope is criticized by the customer at the same time as the customer indicates its weakness, i.e. ิติี่งวิานมาก (it’ll be torn). The agent expresses her concern for the interpersonal relationship by attempting to elicit the acceptance of the new offer from the customer. In so doing, at line 328, the agent smiles before and after her offer, which is constructed in the form of the imperative ("เซ้าท์มันหนี้uze" (Take this type)). It is emphasized by the sentence particle  affirmative /læ/ which functions semantically as an emphasis indicator of the utterance (Royal Institution Dictionary). In this case, this sentence particle indicates that the agent emphatically urges the customer to take her offer and that she wants to terminate the problematic envelope issue.

In line 329, the customer indicates the implicit refusal through the preceding marker, i.e. the hesitator "ิี" (um) which signals politeness and functions as a pre-sequence of the rejection (Davidson, 1984; Pomerantz, 1986). Additionally, the lack of eye contact with the agent in line 329 may avoid revealing the speaker’s authentic feelings (Argyle and Dean, 1965) or indicate disaffiliation from the prior utterance of the interlocutor. Through these (non)verbal means the customer is aware that the refusal is delicate. The agent signals her realisation about the weakness of the present envelope about which the customer displayed her concern in line 327. In so doing, the agent extends the offer as an after-service in line 330 through an if-clause structure ("พอติี่งแล้วฉันมาซ่า" (If it’s torn, I’ll give you a new one)) and a little smile. It may arise from the agent’s concern for the interpersonal relationship with the
customer during the interaction (despite the completion of the commercial deal) and the face of both participants.

Subsequently, the customer does not treat the refusal as interpersonal sensitive. Instead, the customer considers the agent’s extension of the offer as an after-service, as a source where she exploits to articulate a negative assessment of the extended offer as a refusal of it by providing the problematic scenario. The scenario with the present envelope, i.e. มันขาดอยู่ที่ถ้วยแล้วล้มพัง (it has been torn), is constructed, even though the agent is holding the envelope on the hand and the customer does not carefully consider it, according to lines 329 and 331. In doing so, the customer uses the tense (i.e. อดูแลหมดแล้ว (past time marker)) oppositional to the agent’s extended offer constituted through the first conditional clause (i.e. the future tense). Moreover, the sentence particle /ชื่อ/ ดี/ convey the semantic meaning that the customer wants to urge action on the part of the agent for a new (third) offer and also expresses any sense of abruptly negative attitude towards the prior utterance (Noss, 1964; Moerman, 1973; Smyth, 2002; Kummer, 2005). The customer also laughs at the end of the utterance, potentially conveying sarcasm and designating hostility towards the agent. This observed behaviour through the mixed (non)verbal means as explained carries not only the implicit refusal of the extended offer and the implicit request for a new offer but also the negative attitude towards it. Consequently, it is seen as marked behaviour.

In lines 332-334, the agent dis-attends to the implicit request for a new (third) offer via the criticism of the extended offer by not providing linguistic responses to it, by shifting activity for 10 seconds and then shifting topic at the end. This observed behaviour seems to be problematic in the interpretation since the marked distinction cannot be clearly specified. First, the agent’s suspension of the offer through silence and shift in both activity and topic seems to reflect the impact of institutional constraints (i.e. the avoidance of conflicts with the customer in order to achieve a sale) and the Thai value, which elevates silence and the avoidance of confrontation for the maintenance of interactional harmony (Hendon, 1999; Knutson et al., 2002; Knutson, 2004; Katz, 2008), on the agent’s behaviour. Thus, through silence, activity and topic shift this observed behaviour is potentially interpretable as appropriate.
behaviour. This means that the agent does not perceive the customer’s criticism as marked behaviour and a threat to her personal face. Thus, the agent withholds the offer despite being implicitly requested. However, it does not mean that they accept the prior utterance or action or that the customer’s action is potentially regarded as politic behaviour. Second, when the agent’s suspension of the offer is considered, the customer views this as marked behaviour since the agent ignores the customer’s implicit request for a new (third) offer and does not give any responses, e.g. explanations and alternative offers, to the customer. This observed behaviour may potentially threaten the customer’s personal face and the smooth negotiation of the interaction and portray the agent’s inability as a service provider. It is noteworthy that the agent’s topic shift in line 334 seems to bring the conversation back on track, i.e. the delivery of the ticket and travel insurance. The ambiguous interpretation of the agent’s lack of responses to the customer’s implicit request in line 332 may be explained by the fact that Thai people are taught to keep silent (Knutson, 2004), conceal their feelings and avoid conflicts (Hendon, 1999; Katz, 2008). In some situations the fact that an utterance may be considered marked behaviour can be hidden by the impact of Thai people’s need to avoid confrontation and face-loss but it can also be seen as unmarked behaviour.

4.2.3 Summary

In the service encounter contexts, theoretically speaking, for Thai customers there should be no need to implicitly reject the suggestion made by Thai agents because, in general, customers have the power of money and the agents’ job is partly dependent on achieving a sale. Nonetheless, my data showed a different picture, i.e. all the reactions to suggestions made by Thai customers were not conducted explicitly. This means that Thai customers do not necessarily interact in a way that makes relevant their alleged superiority to Thai agents. Instead, Thai customers implicitly rejected suggestions and the conversation continued in a completely unmarked way. In other words, customers’ implicitly negative responses to suggestions are seen by the participants as acceptable behaviour. This finding may contribute to the idea that power and social superiority in Thai service encounter contexts seem to be flexible and negotiable throughout the interaction, and cannot be
linked to Thai social class taxonomies as described by Pornpitakpan (2000) and Kummer (2005).

Agents use both direct and indirect ways of packaging the first pair part of the suggestion. The direct ways include the use of modal verbs (e.g. had better, can) and predicative verbs relevant to the suggestion (e.g. recommend) (Dolphen, 2001) whereas the indirect ones are the content of the suggestion constructed in the form of interrogatives (e.g. Why don’t you) (Dolphen, 2001), the construction of the positive assessment and the reference to the prior claim.

Additionally, the implicitness that is observed in my data and that Thai people expect their societal members to be taking indicates that Thai customers are concerned with the non-confrontation of pro-agreements in accordance with the Thai value called “เกลียบ” (KJ) which encourages them to avoid face-damage and maintain harmony during the encounter (Hendon, 1999; Knutson et al., 2002; Knutson, 2004; Katz, 2008). Through explanations and the absence of the pronominal forms, including non-linguistic features (e.g. a topic change, the prosodic features “um” and silence), they mitigate rejections. Those (non)verbal means index dispreferred responses which imply “I am not interested but I am making a rejection appropriately”. This phenomenon also suggests that Thai agents and customers take their interlocutor’s face into consideration and avoiding damaging it since they want the interaction to end smoothly. Simultaneously, when the speaker (either Thai agents or Thai customers) considers the interlocutor’s face, his/her behaviour also considers safeguarding his/her own face. This is because the speaker does not want to be seen as a person who does not abide by the social obligations required in a particular situation.

The data also revealed that accounts are provided for rejection in the same way as observed in previous research in the strategic elaboration of rejections/refusals across cultures such as American (Johnson, 2007; 2008), Thai (Wannaruk, 2008), Chinese (Yang, 2008), Greek (Bella, 2011), and Persian (Aliakbari and Changizi, 2012). However, the rejections are in general attended to before the accounts via various prosodic means, i.e. hesitators (e.g. “ใช่” (um)), the expression of surprise (e.g. “โอ” (prefaced-oh)) and the interruption of the ongoing utterance. Moreover, silence
and topic shifts can function as signals of rejection. This phenomenon brings another contribution to the present study: in Thai service encounter contexts the implicit rejection which is commonly considered appropriate, needs to be mainly signaled through nonverbal and prosodic features and then verbal strategies.

The Thai customers’ strategic absence of pronominal forms is associated with their careful articulation of the interpersonally-sensitive activities such as rejections since their inappropriate use according to social factors, the level of formality and the relationship between participants (Palakornkul, 1975; Khanittanan, 1988; Sodsongkij, 2006) is salient and can cause negative perception in the hearer. Thus, the lack of the pronominal terms in Thai service encounter contexts potentially manifests acceptable behaviour. This strategy also indicates that the alleged difference in status between customers and agents does not have an impact on the organization of Thai service encounters. In contrast, the unparalleled use of the pronominal forms shows the speaker’s misalignment with the hearer and is potentially related to unacceptable behaviour.

In addition, in some situations, despite being aware of the impact of the refusals on the presence of face-threat and a crash in interpersonal relationships, the careful elaboration of the refusals may not be potentially perceived by the interlocutor when the speaker dis-attends to them. Instead, the excessive avoidance of interpersonally-sensitive activities can render them inappropriate behaviour.

In the next chapter I will examine the extent to which Thai agents and non-Thai customers engage in articulating interpersonally-sensitive activities.
CHAPTER 5

INTERPERSONALLY-SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES
BETWEEN AGENTS AND NON-THAI CUSTOMERS

In this chapter I focus on the examination of the (non)verbal practices that Thai agents and non-Thai customers engage in performing and responding to potentially interpersonally-sensitive activities across the collected encounters and to the extent to which (non-)politic, polite behaviour and face are manifested throughout the interaction. Two types of potentially interpersonally-sensitive activities will be focused on i.e. disagreements\textsuperscript{14} and rejections\textsuperscript{15} respectively.

5.1 Disagreements

Disagreements were observed in three interactions between Thai agents and non-Thai customers. In the case of Thai-Thai interactions, here too disagreements are triggered by customers’ negative assessments of the service or product offered. Of the 20 gathered encounters between agents and non-Thai customers, the agents in two extracts, occurring in three interactions, withhold (dis)agreements with the customers’ negative assessment of the service or product, whereas other four segments of talk feature cases of the agents’ explicit disagreements with it. Suspension of disagreements will be examined in the next sub-section.

5.1.1 Suspension of disagreements

A non-Thai customer in Excerpt 1 wants a ticket to Laos, Cambodia or Kuala Lumpur, in order to have his visa extended. At first, the agent offers a price for a flight to Laos, but the customer refuses it because it is too expensive. The agent withholds (dis)agreement with the customer’s criticism. Then, the customer shifts his

\textsuperscript{14} The definition of disagreements is provided in Chapter 2.2.3.
\textsuperscript{15} The definition of rejections is provided in Chapter 2.2.4.
interest from Laos to Kuala Lumpur. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.3, page 199)

**Excerpt 1** [1:13] Vientiane trip (W1813) Western Tours Hua Hin

(A = Tour Agent; C = Customer)

→ 33 A 8000 going back by Laos Airlines

→ 34 C *(nods down) Is it expensive?
34 *C puts his left elbow on the front desk and his fingers on his head.→

→ 35 A *um:*

36 C *Cheaper ฎุ ฎุ cheaper Kuala Lumpur cheaper
36 *Cheaper one that cheaper Kuala Lumpur cheaper
36 *Cheaper that one cheaper Kuala Lumpur cheaper
36 * C puts his left elbow on the front desk and his fingers on his head.→

37 A Yeah ((nods))

**Figure 17:** The male non-Thai customer, nearest the camera, is articulating a negative assessment of the agent’s offer, (facing the camera) in Excerpt 1, line 34.

In line 33 (Excerpt 1) the agent offers a ticket for 8,000 baht operated by Laos Airlines. The nod at the beginning of line 34 is potentially interpreted as supportive facework since it indicates the customer’s communicative attention (Heylen, 2005) to the agent’s offer and his potential approval (Poggi et al., 2010) of the proposal. Subsequently, the customer implicitly refuses the agent’s offer by elaborating an implicitly negative assessment of the product through the yes-no question “Is it expensive?” in line 34. It contains the inclusion “expensive” and is strengthened by being elaborated in the form of a yes-no question which can indicate the speaker’s negative responses to the prior utterance (Georgakopoulou, 2001; Locher, 2004; Bolden and Robinson, 2011). In other words, it implies: “The offer is too expensive
for me” and “I want an alternative offer”. The use of the interrogative form and the nod indicate his negative assessment of the product as potentially delicate, even though in hospitality contexts, theoretically speaking, the customers’ oppositional thoughts can be expressed directly due to the power of money. The customer’s careful articulation of the negative assessment through the nod and the objection in the form of questions (Locher, 2004) is potentially seen as acceptable behaviour since it signals his consideration of face of both participants and his interpersonal relationship with the agent during the interaction, in addition to his wish for the best value for money.

In line 35, the agent avoids evaluating the product by withholding (dis)agreements with the customer’s implicitly negative assessment through the hesitator “um” (Watts, 2003) with a vowel elongation in a soft voice. These prosodic features signal the agent’s realisation that the customer is criticizing her offer and implicitly requesting an alternative one. Through the hesitator “um” the agent may agree with the customer’s negative assessment but due to her institutional role she cannot do this. This is because it affects the customer’s purchase decision. These prosodic features allow the agent to avoid explicitly denying the customer’s implicit request for a discount or alternative offer which the agent may be unable to serve due to the restriction of the company policies or the availability of flights. They also indicate that the agent attends to both her personal face and the customer’s. The customer’s face is saved from being explicitly disagreed whereas the agent can save her image from being seen as a person who breaches the social norms where Thai people must minimize face-loss and maintain the social cohesion during the encounter (Hendon, 1999; Katz, 2008). Therefore, the agent’s suspension of (dis)agreements with the customer through the hesitator with the vowel elongation in a soft voice can be regarded as acceptable behaviour since it indicates the influence of the transactional constraint on the agent’s behaviour and the customer’s topic shift in line 36 signals that he does not interpret the agent’s withholding (dis)agreement as non-salient behaviour. Moreover, the agent’s response to the customer’s new topic in line 37 supports the idea that she withholds (dis)agreements with the customer by not bringing the interaction back to the ticket operated by Laos Airlines.

In fact, it is interesting to examine whether agents will engage in the suspension of (dis)agreements when triggered by non-Thai customers’ explicitly negative assessment as the agent in Excerpt 1 did. Examining another segment of talk
may provide the answer. In Excerpt 2, a non-Thai customer, with a limited command of Thai, wants a flight to England. The agent’s first two offers are assessed as expensive. Then, the agent provides a third offer but it is negatively assessed for the same reason. Nonetheless, the customer accepts one of the offers. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.7, page 241)

Excerpt 2  [2:11] Wrong pronunciation (W1911) Western Tours Hua Hin

(A = Tour Agent; C = Customer)

66  A  *And other choice is by Eva Airways 47 ((smiles))
66  *A takes another piece of paper which is put in front of her, and then shows it to C.--->

67  C  These two แพงมาก:
67  These two expensive very:

67  A  ((smiles)) *and this one the last one by Qatar Airways 41500
68  *A takes another piece of paper which is put in front of her to show C and points at the price on the shown paper.--->

Figure 18: The agent (facing the camera) is offering an alternative to the non-Thai customer (back to the camera) in Excerpt 2, line 68.

In line 66 (Excerpt 2), the agent elaborates another offer by using the demonstrative adjective “other” modifying the term “choice” which implies that she had made a previous offer. In line 67, the customer explicitly negatively assesses the offers through the inclusion “แพงมาก” (expensive) modified by the intensifier “มาก” (very) produced using an elongated vowel. This arises from the customer’s consideration of what is the best value for money that is generally expected in a transaction-oriented interaction.
In line 68, the agent avoids explicitly disagreeing with the customer by refraining from offering her own assessment of the price or indeed of the customer’s assessment. Instead, she smiles. Figure 19 shows the agent’s smile preceding an alternative offer.

Figure 19: The agent (facing the camera) smiles for a second before offering an alternative to the non-Thai customer, (back to the camera) in Excerpt 2, line 68.

The agent’s smile in Figure 19 is described as a polite smile (Ambadar et al., 2008; Moscoviter, 2010; Ochs et al., 2010) which is a small closed mouth smile with small amplitude and brief duration (for a second). Since the customer’s negative assessment of the product is explicit and may imply a potential commercial failure, this smile seems not to be related to happiness, but to sociability (Hoque et al., 2011). It also acts as a mask for a socially inappropriate facial expression (Kraut and Johnson, 1979; Hess et al., 2002). The agent, as a member of the professional institution, is not supposed to criticize the service/product. Consequently, in line 68 after smiling, she offers an alternative as a response to the negative assessment, unlike in Excerpt 1 where the customer makes a new request. Like the encounters between Thai agents and Thai customers, alternative offers are an interpersonal strategy which can assist the agents in withholding (dis)agreements with the customers’ negative assessment of the offered product. Through them, the Thai agents can avoid any actions which are delicate for both their own face and their customers, the interpersonal relationship with the customers during the encounter and increase the possibility of a commercial agreement. The agent’s avoidance of (dis)agreements with the customer by offering an alternative can be viewed as acceptable behaviour since it portrays her restriction resulting from the institutional contexts which encourage her to maintain interational comity in order to achieve a transaction.
Moreover, the difference in the degree of customers’ negative assessments does not affect the agents’ (non)verbal responses to them. The agents’ suspension of (dis)agreements was triggered by the non-Thai customer’s implicit negative assessment of the product in Excerpt 1 and the explicit one in Excerpt 2.

An analysis of Excerpts 1-2, reveals a pattern in the structure of (non)verbal practices in the disagreement of an offered service/product:

**Pattern 1**

1. A:  Product offer
2. C:  (Implicit) refusal via a negative assessment
3. A:  Withholding (dis)agreements

The pattern is in line with the one observed across the service encounters between Thai agents and Thai customers in Chapter 4.1. By negatively assessing the product, the non-Thai customers treat the refusal of the offer as face-sensitive. Instead of articulating an explicit request, customers want the agents to offer good value for money possibly in the form of a special offer or discount because an explicit request potentially threatens the agents’ face and their personal face if they are explicitly denied. The customers’ implicit refusal of the offer through negative assessment is likely to be regarded as acceptable behaviour since it indicates their concern for face and the effect of the transactional context on their behaviour where, in general, the customers want the best value for money. The negative assessment is constructed via the inclusions which carry negative meanings to the thing which is assessed in the form of an interrogative and an affirmative in Excerpts 1-2 as analysed respectively.

As with the agents in Thai-Thai service encounters, transactional constraints affect the agents’ behaviour. The agents in the Thai-non-Thai interactions tend to avoid explicit disagreements with the non-Thai customers by withholding them. Theoretically speaking, the agents cannot criticize the product in front of the customers despite their (dis)agreement with it in reality since this may influence the customers’ purchase decision. Furthermore, their withholding (dis)agreements with the customers by offering an alternative, supported by a smile, as shown in Excerpt 2 and by expressing hesitation “um” in a soft voice as indicated in Excerpt 1 can be
potentially seen as acceptable behaviour. This is because the agents’ careful suspension of (dis)agreements through these (non)verbal devices signals their face concern and the maintenance of social cohesion during the encounter. Through them agents can save the positive image of the product and their personal face from being seen as a person who violates Thai norms, i.e. the avoidance of confrontation and interactional harmony (Hendon, 1999; Katz, 2008; Ukosakul, 2009). It also reflects their avoidance of threat to the customers’ personal face. Moreover, the maintenance of face and social harmony potentially increases the chance of a commercial accomplishment.

5.1.2 Explicit disagreements

The second pattern of disagreements in the Thai-non-Thai service encounters was not found in the Thai-Thai interactions when the agents explicitly disagree with the non-Thai customers’ negative assessment of the service/product. This may be explained by language ability. In the Thai-Thai encounters, agents who use Thai as a mother tongue have the vast range of Thai lexical items and know how to engage in articulating disagreements with Thai customers’ negative assessment of a product.

In Excerpt 3, the interaction after the agent withholds (dis)agreements with the customer’s negative assessment of all the three offers in line 67 is brought back to the negotiation of the price. The customer, who had negatively appraised the first two offers of the ticket prices operated by two airlines, assessed the third one. Then, the agent explicitly disagrees with the customer as shown in Excerpt 3. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.7, page 241)

**Excerpt 3  [2:11] Wrong pronunciation (W1911) Western Tours Hua Hin**

(Continued)

(A = Tour Agent; C = Customer)

183  C  *สี่ หมื่น คิด ห้า พัน หนึ่ง หมื่น
183  *four ten thousand think first five thousand one ten thousand
183  *forty thousand let me think first five thousand ten thousand very
183  *C turns back to look at A.--->

→ 184  แพง มาก:
184  expensive very:
184  expensive:

185  +A nods gradually and a few times while listening to C.+
In (3) above in lines 183-184, the customer reiterates an explicitly negative assessment of the offered price through the inclusion “แพง” (expensive) intensified by the adverbial term “มาก” (very) with vowel elongation. The interpersonal meaning of the customer’s negative assessment is interactionally evidenced by his subsequent utterance in lines 187-189 where he verbally accepts the offer. This implies that he has decided to take the offer but by reiterating the negative assessment in lines 183-184 he was possibly fishing (Pomerantz, 1980) for an alternative offer and perhaps some sort of discount. This observed behaviour indicates that the customer treats the explicit request as delicate and invites the agent to provide the sought-after alternative.

Then, in line 186, the agent explicitly disagrees with the customer’s second negative assessment as a second assessment (Pomerantz, 1984) through the negation “ไม่” (not/no) and the same inclusion “แพง” (expensive) which the customer uses. However, it is noticeable that the agent’s explicit disagreement in line 186 is initiated by laughter and a wide smile and ends with a smile (again). Figure 20 shows the agent's smile at the beginning of line 186.
**Figure 20:** The agent smiles before launching her dispreferred response (Excerpt 3, line 186).

The agent’s smile in Figure 20 is described as a large, closed mouth smile with tense lips which signals her embarrassment (Ochs et al., 2010). The smile and laughter before the explicit disagreements seem to indicate the agent’s resistance (Glenn, 2003) to the customer’s prior utterance and her awareness of the potentially interpersonal delicacy of her upcoming negative assessment. Therefore, they function to downgrade the agent’s explicit disagreement. Then, the second smile occurs after the end of the agent’s second assessment in line 186. Figure 21 presents the agent’s second smile.

**Figure 21:** The agent smiles after constructing the dispreferred response (Excerpt 3, line 186).

As shown in Figure 21, the agent produces a smile described as a closed mouth smile with no rising cheek (Ochs et al., 2010). It is likely to be regarded as a polite or masking smile (Schmidt et al., 2003) which functions to weaken the potentially interpersonally-delicate utterance preceding it (Hess et al., 2002). Thus,
the second smile supportively evidences that the agent is relatively concerned about the potentially interpersonal delicacy of the activity. Furthermore, through her quick bend forward and glance at the customer, the agent is cautious of the threat to the customer’s face and interactional harmony due to her ongoing utterance. The agent’s explicitly linguistic disagreement in line 186 may be justified by the fact that her personal and institutional face is threatened by the customer’s reiteration of the negative assessment of the product prices in lines 183-184 after he did in at line 67. Thus, she wants to maintain face. This observed behaviour may also arise when the criticisms are related to the product prices and convey the implicature of the request for a product which impinges on company policies. Despite being downgraded by smiles and laughter, the agent’s explicit disagreement through the negative particle is potentially regarded as unacceptable behaviour. This is because of the greater impact of institutional policies that entice the agent to violate the conventional line, i.e. the avoidance of confrontation, than social orientedness, i.e. her concern for the customer’s personal face and interactional relationship.

According to Excerpt 3 above, institutional policies are more potentially influential on the agent’s (non)verbal practices in articulating disagreements than the maintenance of face and interpersonal relationship during the encounter. This observed behaviour is further evidenced in the extract below.

A non-Thai customer wants to check a flight to Udonthani in a service encounter at Western Tours Hua Hin. An agent offers a ticket operated by Thai Airways. Nonetheless, it is criticized for being expensive. The segment of talk as shown below does not include the agent’s offering utterance which is constructed over several turns. After the offer is proposed, the agent and the non-Thai customer change topic. The shown extract focuses on the time when the interaction shifts back to the ticket offer. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.11, page 283)

**Excerpt 4 [4:12] Flight to Udonthani (W2112) Western Tours Hua Hin**

(A = Tour Agent; C = Customer)

58 *C takes the printed paper for his consideration.*

⇒ 59 C Can that be the best price?* [Nothing special

* [C stops considering the flight detail on the paper and looks at A.--->

115
((nods down)) this is the special price=

61  C  Is it?

62  A  =because if you buy normal ticket it’s about [8000=

63  C  [Yeah?

64  A  =now

65  (.)

Figure 22: The female Thai agent (facing the camera) is disagreeing with the non-Thai customer (back to the camera) in Excerpt 4 in line 60.

In (4) after considering the agent’s offer on paper that the agent gave him carefully, the customer counter-offers by elaborating a negative assessment of the offer at the beginning of line 59. It conveys his implicit request for a discount in the form of questions and his implicit refusal of the agent’s prior offer. It is constructed through the consultative question “can”, an EPM which can potentially be regarded as politeness (Watts, 2003), in particular when it is frequently used to articulate a request (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989). In this situation, the negative assessment “can that be the best price?” carries a pragmatic implicature: “I think it is not the best one. Can you give me a discount?” This is emphasized by reiterating the negative assessment in the form of the affirmative. Unlike the first-time negative assessment, the second-time one is articulated explicitly. The double Extreme Case formulations (ECfs) “nothing” and “special” (Pomerantz, 1986) convey the customer’s strongly negative assessment of the offered price and reiterate his implicit request for a discount. The double negative assessments are potentially interpreted as appropriate behaviour since they
reflect the institutional contexts which affect the customer’s behaviour, i.e. his desire for the best value for money. However, they seem to potentially threaten the agent’s personal face since they are explicitly elaborated and less mitigated.

Nonetheless, the agent’s interruption of the customer’s ongoing counter-offer through a nod in line 60 is a transitional index according to Poggi et al. (2010). If the nod occurs while the present speaker has not finished his/her disagreement with the prior utterance, it signals the agent’s oppositional thought with the customer’s negative assessment of the service/product. The agent expresses an explicit disagreement by articulating a positive assessment through the ECF “special” in opposition to the customer’s negative assessments of the same thing which is assessed. This phenomenon results from the institutional constraints and policies regarding the provision of discounts that have an effect on the agent’s behaviour, like the one in Excerpt 3. Moreover, it may also result from the agent’s personal thought towards the offered price. She personally thinks that the price is cheap. Thus, the agent’s explicit disagreement through the ECF opposite to the customer’s prior utterance and preceded by the nod in line 60, is potentially seen as aggressive facework since it lacks any mitigating (non)verbal and prosodic devices to attend to disagreements.

In line 61, the customer elaborates his indirect disagreement (Georgakopoulou, 2001) with the agent’s prior positive assessment by means of the tag question “is it?” (Muntigl and Turnbull, 1998). This may signal his pro-agreement by attempting to elicit agreement from the agent through the mitigating device, i.e. the challenge, instead of an explicit disagreement with the agent. Moreover, this behaviour does not evidence that the customer treats the agent’s explicit disagreement through the negative particle and the positive assessment oppositional to his negative assessment as unacceptable behaviour. Instead, it indicates his desire to achieve a commercial agreement and to receive the best value for money.

It is noteworthy that at the same time, the agent provides an account for her prior explicit disagreement in line 62 which signals the agent’s effort to tone it down. The agent’s explicit disagreement begins in line 60 and continues to line 62 despite being interrupted by the customer’s challenge. This linguistic structure seems to be a reverse version of the mild negative phrase “yes, but” (Teigen and Brun, 1995) or
counterclaim (Muntigl and Turnbull, 1998) in which the speaker expresses partial agreements through a short positive response (Kotthoff, 1993) as a prefacing marker of the subsequent disagreement with the prior one. The mild negative phrase “yes, but” is seen as a strategic linguistic phrase through which the speaker avoids explicitly contradicting the interlocutor. The structure “no, because” in lines 60 and 62 may arise from the fact that the Thai agent wants to ensure that the non-Thai customer understands her non-compliance of the customer’s implicit request for a discount. The observed behaviour is evidenced in another extract of the service encounter at Western Tours Hua Hin.

Excerpt 5 below is part of the same interaction as that in Excerpt 1. In Excerpt 5 an agent offers a flight ticket operated by Lufthansa Airlines which she claims is the cheapest. However, a non-Thai customer disagrees with her. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.3, page 199)

**Excerpt 5 [1:13] Vientiane trip (W1813) Western Tours Hua Hin (Continued)**

(A = Tour Agent; C = Customer)

→ 123 A But the cheapest time --->only one time* by Lufthansa Lufthansa

   --->A lifts one finger.*

124 they have flight to Kuala Lumpur cheapest one do you want to check the time?

→ 126 C Lufthansa cheapest [one↑

→ 127 A [cheapest one ((nods)) (.) [Thai Airways has a

128 [A Airway Air Asia er

129 A No Air Asia the cheapest one we don't ((shakes the head)) sell its

130 tickets here

In lines 123-125 (Excerpt 5) the agent makes an offer by articulating a positive assessment of Lufthansa flights through the ECF “cheapest” (superlative form) (Pomerantz, 1986). Then, in line 126 the customer initiates his disagreement by challenging in the form of a colloquial question (Muntigl and Turnbull, 1988; Locher, 2004) produced with a rising intonation. The challenge indicates that the customer believes in the opposite of the agent’s claim and provides insufficient evidence for her claim (Muntigl and Turnbull, 1988) but simultaneously avoids explicitly disagreeing
with it. The challenge in line 126 reflects the customer’s restriction to the institutional constraints for his personal benefit. It also helps mitigate the agent’s prior utterance for the maintenance of the personal face of the participants. In other words, this behaviour shows the customer’s pro-agreement.

In line 127 the agent explicitly disagrees with the customer by interrupting the customer’s implicit disagreement and then reiterating the positive assessment of the offered information through the ECf “cheapest” to assert her knowledge of the product. As in Excerpt 4, the nod functions as a nonverbal index of the oppositional thought when it is deployed to interrupt the interlocutor’s ongoing disagreement (Poggi et al., 2010) and intensifies her explicitly verbal disagreement. This phenomenon may arise from the fact that she wants to protect her personal face from being considered as an agent who has poor professional knowledge and to ensure that the customer understands her utterance which is oppositional to his prior one. The explicit disagreement in line 127 may be regarded as aggressive facework due to the lack of the mitigating devices such as prosodic and nonverbal features (e.g. hesitators and downtoners) preceding disagreements. Then, the short pause which occurs after the explicit disagreement, signals the hesitation about who will take the next turn. Thus, after the pause, the agent and the customer take the turn simultaneously. The pause may occur because of the absence of mitigating devices in elaborating the explicit disagreement. The overlapped turn-taking makes the meaning of the agent’s incomplete utterance unclear. Her claim about Thai Airways may potentially be involved in either her alternative offer or her interactional shift in a topic of the available product since these linguistic strategies can help avoid confrontation and maintain interactional comity.

Like the customer in Excerpt 4, the customer here continues implicitly disagreeing with the agent by extending the challenge after being counter-attacked by the agent in the prior turn in line 128. This suggests that he is unlikely to interpret the agent’s explicit disagreement as inappropriate behaviour but orients the interaction instead to interactional harmony during the encounter. In other words, he wants to avoid confrontation and elicit agreement from the agent.

Furthermore, the non-Thai customers’ implicit rejections/refusals of the suggestion/offer are elaborated not only via negative assessment but also via other
mitigating devices. Example 6 is a conversational phase of an interaction where the Thai agent is attempting to get the non-Thai customers to accept the suggested return ticket which is not shown in the extract. Then, the non-Thai customers implicitly reject it by withholding the decision. However, the agent disagrees with it. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.1, page 169)

**Excerpt 6**  
[1:3] Bangladeshi customers (W1803) Western Tours Hua Hin

\[A = \text{Agent}; \ C1 = \text{Customer 1}; \ C2 = \text{Customer 2}\]

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\rightarrow & 170 & A & \text{*OK deal ((smiles))} \\
& 170 & \text{*A starts speaking while C1 and C2 are talking. Thus, they stop talking in their mother tongue.*} \\
\rightarrow & 171 & C1 & \text{*(laughs))} \\
& 171 & \text{*C1 looks at A.--->} \\
\rightarrow & 172 & C2 & \text{*Can I er come later?} \\
& 172 & \text{*C2 points his left hand towards himself several times.--->} \\
\rightarrow & 173 & A & \text{*No this one you going to leave Bangkok on 28 of [May next two} \\
& 173 & \text{days=} \\
& 175 & C2 & \text{*[} \text{to C1 while A is continuing her utterance.--->} \\
& 175 & \text{*[} \text{C2 speaks his mother tongue} \\
\rightarrow & 176 & A & \text{=you have to make decision [today=} \\
& 177 & C2 & \text{*[} \text{yeah OK OK}< \\
& 177 & \text{*[} \text{C2 turns quickly to look at A and nods several} \\
\end{array}
\]

**Figure 23:** Customer 2, on the left-hand side, is implicitly rejecting the suggestion in Excerpt 6, line 172.

In line 170 (Excerpt 6), the agent attempts to elicit agreement of the prior suggested return ticket from the non-Thai customers through the positive term “OK”
which semantically functions as an acceptance of the speaker like the term “yes” and the colloquial affirmative “deal”. However, the agent’s smile at the end of line 170 treats the previous utterance as a joke or the unseriousness. Then, the non-Thai customers treat the rejection of the suggestion as delicate when they withhold the acceptance/rejection. In so doing, Customer 1 laughs in line 171 to both avoid confrontation (Gilmartin et al., 2013) and delay the acceptance/rejection whereas Customer 2 carefully uses the conventionally consultative means “can I?” or the EPM (Watts, 2003) which potentially signals politeness. The EPM “can I?” is commonly observed in the elaboration of conventional requests (Blum-Kulka, 1987). In this situation it is deployed to avoid explicitly rejecting the suggestion. Customer 2’s utterance “can I come back later?” implies: “I don’t want to take the offer now and need time to consider it”. The careful suspensions of the acceptance/rejection through laughter and the consultative forms of Customer 1 and Customer 2 respectively reflect their avoidance of confrontation and their consideration of the agent’s face and interactional comity. This phenomenon may also be derived from their desire to reserve the suggestion (if they change their mind to take it). Customer 2’s concern for face, through the conventionally consultative means in line 172 may indicate that the non-Thai customers do not take into consideration the social inequality between them and their agents in connection with the economically-related thought which is “Customers are God” (Arrington, 1990; Thitthongkam, 2013b) treating the rejection as interpersonally-sensitive.

Nonetheless, the agent explicitly disagrees with Customer 2’s suspension of the acceptance/rejection through the negative particle “no” in lines 173-174. It is subsequently supported by an account which functions as an argumentative device (Geogakopoulou, 2001). The account continues until line 176. This observed behaviour may be explained by the fact that the agent wants to pressure the customers into accepting the suggestion at the suggested price and condition and to ensure that the customers understand her utterance. However, the absence of mitigating (non)verbal or prosodic means such as the hesitators (Watts, 2003) potentially causes aggressive facework since it indicates the agent’s lack of concern for the participants’ face and interactional harmony. Then, in line 177 Customer 2 treats the agent’s explicit disagreement through the pressure strategy without any redressing means as inappropriate behaviour. In so doing, Customer 2 interrupts the unfinished utterance,
changes an immediate nonverbal feature by turning quickly to look at the agent and speeds up the interrupting utterance. These mixed (non)verbal and prosodic forms signal Customer 2’s negative emotion or irritation towards the prior utterance. The term “yeah” and “OK” are semantically related to the acceptance of the speaker but in this situation, they seem to pragmatically function to mark topic termination. They imply: “Yeah, I know I know”.

Considering the analysis of Excerpts 3-6, a pattern observed in the structure of (non)verbal practices in the disagreement of the non-Thai customers’ implicit rejection/refusal includes:

**Pattern 2**

1. A: Product offer/suggestion
2. C: (Implicit) refusal/rejection via a negative assessment/a challenge OR withholding a decision
3. A: Explicit disagreement

According to Pattern 2, by negatively assessing the product or withholding to accept or reject/refuse it, non-Thai customers consider the rejection as face-sensitive. As in Pattern 1, through the negative assessment of the product, non-Thai customers want the agents to offer a better choice, perhaps some sort of discount, for their commercial benefit. By withholding the acceptance or rejection/refusal, the customers can reserve the suggested/offered product if they change their mind and take it later. Both negative assessment and suspension of the decision reflect the customers’ preference for non-confrontation and their consideration of face. The face of both participants is potentially threatened if the explicit request is rejected. This observed behaviour is potentially seen as acceptable behaviour since it shows the influence of institutional contexts as well as the socially-related etiquette on the customers’ implicitness for the best value for money and the smooth negotiation of the interaction. The ECfs (Pomerantz, 1986) and challenge (Muntigl and Turnbull, 1988) (or objection in the form of questions (Locher, 2004)) are two main linguistic strategies frequently observed in elaborating the negative assessment as shown in Excerpts 4-5. The consultative means (Can..?) and the nonverbal feature (e.g.
laughter) as indicated in Excerpt 6, help the customers withhold the acceptance or rejection/refusal.

The Thai agents threaten the face and lines which the public assumes them to minimize conflicts (Burgers et al., 2000) when explicitly disagreeing with the customers’ negative assessment or with their suspension of the decision. This observed behaviour arises when they are (implicitly) requested for a discount or want to pressure the customers into buying at the suggested/offered price, and/or are challenged for their lack of professionalism (e.g. providing the wrong information). This means that the company policies and roles are more significantly influential on the agents’ explicit disagreements than interpersonal harmony and face concern. Moreover, this phenomenon may arise from the fact that the agents want to ensure that the non-Thai customers understand what they want to convey since they are not fluent in Thai. The Thai agents’ explicit disagreements without any mitigating devices are potentially seen as aggressive facework whereas those with mitigating devices are considered acceptable. Instead, they are expressed by elaborating the second negative assessment as shown in Excerpt 3, the positive assessment opposite to the prior assessment as observed in Excerpts 4-5 and the negative particle “no” supported by an account (Georgakopoulou, 2001) as indicated in Excerpt 6. In addition, nods often support the speaker’s oppositional thought against the prior disagreement as found in Excerpts 4-5 whereas smiles and laughter in Excerpt 3 can weaken disagreements.

5.1.3 Summary

In Chapter 5.1, the analysis revealed that, as in the Thai-Thai interactions, instead of explicit disagreements, the negative assessment of the product was mainly relevant to disagreements and conveyed the implicit refusal/rejection of the offered/suggested product. This observed behaviour is unmarked behaviour since the encounter can be brought forwards. The non-Thai customers negatively assess the suggestion/offer through the ECfs (Pomerantz, 1986) (e.g. nothing, cheapest), challenges (Muntigl and Turnbull, 1988) (e.g. yes-no interrogatives) and the inclusion carrying the negative meaning to the service/product (e.g. not expensive, special).
Moreover, the findings revealed that the company policies and roles were likely to be more influential on the Thai agents’ response to the non-Thai customers’ negative assessment and their suspension of the acceptance or rejection/refusal. The appropriate behaviour is associated with the implicitness of Thai agents who commonly withhold (dis)agreements with the non-Thai customers’ implicit refusal/rejection via negative assessment. This finding shows that they are restricted by their institutional roles and sales orientation that entail avoidance of negative assessments of their institutional product in public. It also reflects the Thai agents’ pro-agreement in accordance with the nature of the economically-oriented goal, to avoid confrontation with customers (Burgers et al., 2000). Through this behaviour, the interaction can go along the commercially-oriented goal in an unmarked way. In other words, the suspension of (dis)agreements with non-Thai customers is regarded as appropriate behaviour. As in Thai-Thai interactions, the implicitness of the agents when being challenged via the customers’ negative assessment of the product is frequently articulated via alternative offers/suggestions because they help maintain face and interactional harmony, the avoidance of conflicts with the customers, as well as increasing the possibility of a commercial agreement. Moreover, the nonverbal and prosodic features such as hesitators (e.g. um), a soft voice and smiles, play a vital role in signaling implicitness to withhold (dis)agreements.

Unlike the Thai-Thai interactions, in some situations the Thai agents break the professionally-prescribed line by explicitly disagreeing with the non-Thai customers. The explicitness signals that the Thai agents want to terminate the sequence of the non-Thai customers’ implicit request for a discount hidden in their negative assessment of the service/product and to encourage the customers to buy the service/product at full price. The findings revealed the involvement of the explicitness with the aggressive facework which is not always related to impoliteness. It shows that there is no evidence to support the fact that non-Thai customers always consider Thai agents’ explicitness in disagreeing with non-Thai customers as unacceptable behaviour, apart from the case in Excerpt 5 where the non-Thai customer treats the agent’s explicit disagreement through the continuous pressure strategy as unacceptable behaviour after he fails to withhold (dis)agreements. Instead, the non-Thai customers attempt to elicit agreements from the agents through the indirect/mitigating disagreement such as challenges. In other words, they are pro-
agreement and dislike of confrontation. The explicitness of the agents to the non-Thai customers’ negative assessment is elaborated through the negated proposition expressed by the previous claim or “contradiction” (Muntigl and Turnbull, 1998), the negative particle (e.g. no, not) and the nonverbal features (e.g. laughter, smiles and nods).

Subsequently, the focus will now move to the way in which participants in service encounters treat (or do not treat) another interpersonally-sensitive activity, i.e. rejections as delicate.

5.2 Rejections

5.2.1 Mitigated and implicit rejections

Out of 20 service encounters between Thai agents and non-Thai customers, customers implicitly rejected the agents’ suggestions in eight segments of talk in seven Thai-non-Thai service encounters.

In Excerpt 7, a non-Thai customer, who seems to be familiar with the agents in Western Tours Hua Hin as evidenced in the interaction, wants two flight tickets—one between Bangkok and New Delhi and the other from Siem Reap to Phnom Penh. The agent suggests two possibilities, one of which is denied, as shown below. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.10, page 272)

Excerpt 7  [4:9] Trip to India and Cambodia (W2109) Western Tours Hua Hin

(A = Agent; C = Customer)

130  A  *And they have flight every day morning flight? afternoon and evening
130   *A writes something on the noted paper.--->
131   three times
→  132   (.)
→  133  C  *OK (0.02) *number two er:* I know the bus (.). er::: called Maekhong
133   *C looks at A.--->
134   Express (.). they come er::: they look er:::
A nods time by time while listening to C.+

A Yes

C =5 or 6 hours er: cost [ten

A [you can buy the bus ticket at the hotel

Figure 24: The Thai agent, facing the camera on the left, is providing a ticket from Siem Reap to Phnom Penh in Excerpt 7 in lines 130-131.

In (7) the agent suggests a ticket in lines 130-131 by describing the details of the suggested flight. Afterwards, the customer’s term “OK” in the same line which, in general, pragmatically indicates an acknowledgement of the agent’s suggestion. The pause and silence within a turn (2 seconds) which occur in line 132 reflect the customer’s control of his language processing (Chaimanee, 1996) and his selection of words (Zuo, 2002). This signals the customer’s concern for the speech he is articulating and also implies that the customer is probably producing an upcoming dispreferred response (i.e. a rejection of the agent’s suggestion) (Davidson, 1984). Moreover, the customer carefully elaborates an account for the rejection through the use of a soft voice and the hesitation marker “er” with vowel elongation in lines 133-134. Through these verbal and nonverbal resources, the customer treats the rejection of the suggestion as interpersonally-sensitive and shows his unwillingness to make a negative response to the agent’s suggestion. This observed behaviour may arise from his desire to maintain interpersonal and interactional equilibrium (Watts, 2003). The customer’s implicit rejection of the suggestion in lines 133-134 is potentially interpreted as appropriate behaviour since the mixed verbal and nonverbal strategies signal his non-confrontation and maintenance of face of both participants in line with
normative expectations of social appropriateness. As in Thai-Thai interactions, this carefully-articulated rejection of the suggestion through mixed and diverse means thus suggests that the alleged difference as claimed through the commercially-related thought called “คูณก็คือพระเจ้า” (Customers are God) (Arrington, 1990; Thitthongkam, 2013b) does not have a great impact on the organization of the interaction since the customer does not exercise the power by explicitly rejecting the suggestion but minimizes potential sources of offense instead. In other words, customers do not make relevant the alleged unequal status.

At the same time in line 135 the agent nods, while listening to the customer and produces the term “yes” in line 136. Both verbal and nonverbal features are interpretable as supportive facework since they reflect the agent’s communicative attention (Heylen, 2005) to the customer’s elaboration of the implicit rejection and her potential approval of it (Poggi et al., 2010). In other words, they function to urge the customer to continue his utterance. Thus, in line 137 the customer completes his implicit rejection of the suggestion by giving an account (Liao and Bresnahan, 1996; Johnson, 2007; Wannaruk, 2008; Yang, 2008; Bella, 2011; Aliakbari and Changizi, 2012). Afterwards, unlike the agents’ response to the Thai customers’ implicit rejection of the suggestion as presented in Chapter 4.2, the agent in this segment of talk, does not reformulate or reiterate the offer. Instead, she implicitly agrees with the customer’s implicit rejection of the suggestion by providing further suggestions as to where the customer can buy a bus ticket. This phenomenon is potentially viewed as politic behaviour since the agent’s behaviour is dominated by the transactional orientedness, i.e. institutional roles which entail her not to criticize the institutional product in public and the product availability (i.e. she cannot provide a better offer than the bus fare the customer mentioned). Additionally, it reflects her face consideration by avoiding any actions which can cause a threat to the customer’s face and protects her own face from being regarded as a person who does not behave in line with the social norms, in addition to her concern for interpersonal and interactional cohesion.

This extract provides an insight into the non-Thai customer who does not make relevant the rejection to the alleged difference between agents and customers. Instead, the customer carefully elaborates the implicit rejection of the suggestion
through the mixed (non)verbal means, i.e. silence, the positive marker “yes”, a soft voice, hesitators “er” and vowel elongation. This phenomenon may result from the non-Thai customer’s awareness of the social norms that entail the societal member to consider the face of both participants and interactional harmony, in addition to the commercially-oriented goal which entails him to reserve their own commercial benefits. Unlike Excerpt 7, the following segment of talk will show that the customer uses only one mitigating device in rejecting the suggestion and that the agent responds to it.

Excerpt 8 is an interaction in which a non-Thai customer and his Thai partner want a ticket from Bangkok to Copenhagen as well as travel insurance. The Thai agent suggests a ticket operated by Thai Airways and explains the condition which requires the client to pay a deposit for the ticket and for the whole amount for the travel insurance. The client is reluctant to pay for both the ticket and the travel insurance. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.4, page 207)

**Excerpt 8 [1:15] Buying a ticket to Copenhagen (W1815) Western Tours Hua Hin (Continued)**

(A = Agent; C1 = Customer 1; C2 = Customer 2)

235 C1 But now it’s problem

→ 236 A ((laughs)) *All together

→ 236 A *A hands the calculator with the total price to C1 for consideration.--->

→ 237 (0.03)

→ 238 A Ticket and insurance

→ 239 (0.07)

→ 240 A *Ticket and insurance (.) all together this price

→ 240 A *A moves her hand in a circle, and then points at the total price while saying.--->

→ 241 C1 [Yes, but er: I:

→ 242 C2 *[แกะ จะ จ่าย แต่ ตัว นี้ ค่อน]

→ 242 *[C/IP2 FTM pay only CL this first]

→ 242 *[He (C/IP2) wants to pay only for this first]

→ 242 *[C2 points at the insurance fee while saying.--->
In line 236 (Excerpt 8) the agent attempts to elicit from Customer 1, an acceptance of the previous suggestion through an indefinite pronoun “all” which refers to the previously mentioned products, i.e. a ticket and travel insurance. Her suggestion is initiated by laughter. Since it occurs after Customer 1 explicitly expresses an oppositional response to her prior utterance, the laughter in line 236 seems to mask the agent’s feeling, maintain her own face and decrease the seriousness of the ongoing utterance (Zayts and Schunurr, 2011).

Subsequently, the silence (3 seconds and 7 seconds) occurs when Customer 1 is interactionally assumed to take his turn in lines 237 and 239 and functions as a dispreferred response signaling his implicit rejection of the agent’s suggestion (Davidson, 1984). According to Tannen (1985), silence can be associated with the absence of something negative to the interlocutor. In other words, instead of the explicit or verbally implicit rejection of the suggestion, silence helps Customer 1 avoid confrontation with the agent for the sake of interactional cohesion. The silence reflects management of the emotional state (Jaworski, 1993; 1997; Jaworski and Stephens, 1998; Sfianou, 1997; Jones, no date; Lemak, 2012) of Customer 1 who is repetitively elicited for his commercial agreement by the agent. Although silence helps increase Customer 1’s power over the agent (if Customer 1 subsequently exercises it), in this situation he seems not to exercise that power as presented in lines 237 and 239. Customer 1’s silence at lines 237 and 239 indexes face concern for both participants and the maintenance of interpersonal relationship associated with social etiquette by avoiding a clash of interests.

In contrast, silence in lines 237 and 239 also provides the agent with uncertainty regarding what Customer 1 thinks about the suggestion (Watts, 1997).
whether he will accept or reject it, or provides with a chance to elicit agreement from Customer 1. Consequently, the agent, who wants to achieve the transaction, reiterates the suggestion to elicit a transactional agreement from Customer 1 in lines 238 and 240. This observed behaviour is potentially considered appropriate behaviour since it signals that the agent is restricted to the institutional demands of the job which entails achieving a sale with Customer 1. Since she wants to reach a transactional deal, the agent ignores the implicit (and nonverbal) signal of rejection.

In line 241, Customer 1 carefully elaborates the implicit rejection of the suggestion through the mild negative phrase “yes, but” (Teigen and Brun, 1995) in which the speaker displays partial agreement through the short positive response (Kotthoff, 1993). The hesitator “er” produced with vowel elongation potentially signals his reluctance to produce the verbally implicit rejection of the suggestion. Customer 1’s mild negative phrase “yes, but” (which shows preference before attending to rejections) supported by the mitigating devices (i.e. hesitator and the use of vowel elongation) reflect that the customer does not consider the inequality status according to the economically-oriented value called “Customers are God”. They also indicate his concern for the agent’s face, interpersonal and interactional harmony, as well as his resistance to the emotional state in spite of his two failures at silence. This phenomenon may be also justified by Customer 1’s focus on the smooth negotiation of the interaction, rather than his own commercial benefits.

Compared to Excerpt 8, the same behaviour, i.e. the customers’ implicitness of the suggestion rejection for interactional non-confrontation, is also observed in Excerpt 9. In fact, not only silence but also other (non)verbal means are observed when the non-Thai customers withhold acceptance/rejection of the suggestion as shown in the following extract. In Excerpt 9 two non-Thai customers come to check the price of a ticket from Bangkok to Bangladesh. One of them can speak Thai and acts as the interpreter. The agent suggests a price for the ticket and the customers ask for an alternative ticket with a specific airline which is cheaper than the previous suggestion. During the conversation, the customers talk to each other in their mother tongue, whereas the agent often urges them to accept her suggested return ticket. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.1, page 169)
Excerpt 9  [1:3] Bangladeshi customers (W1803) Western Tours Hua Hin
(Continued)

(A = Agent; C1 = Customer 1; C2 = Customer 2)

→ 164  A  *Um this one is perfect (. ) direct flight good price good condition ((smiles))
     164  *A uses her left hand to hit slightly on the ticket detail put on the counter, and then makes her fingers one, two and three shapes with smiles.-->

165  C1  (   )

166  +C1 talks to C2 again in their mother tongue.+

167  (0.04)

168  +A laughs and smiles while C1 and C2 talk to each other in their language. She tidies up the pens on her desk, closes the book in front of her, and places her two hands together in front of her chest. +

169  +C1 and C2 continue discussing in their mother tongue. At the same time A watches the customers as they continue their conversation.+ (0.35)

→ 170  A  *OK deal ((smiles))
     170  *A starts saying while C1 and C2 are talking. Thus, they stop talking in their mother tongue.*

Figure 26: The agent (facing the camera) is articulating a suggestion to the two non-Thai customers with their back to the camera (Excerpt 9, line 164).

In line 164 (Excerpt 9) the agent suggests a product by elaborating a positive assessment of the ticket as indicated by the ECf “perfect” (Pomerantz, 1986) and subsequently the double uses of the inclusion “good” in order to tailor the activity to the customers. The agent’s suggestion is accompanied by a smile at the end as shown in Figure 27 below.
Figure 27: The agent is smiling at Customer 1 and Customer 2 (Excerpt 9, line 164).

The agent’s smile in Figure 27, described as a quick, closed mouth smile with pressed lips (Ambadar et al., 2008) is categorized as a polite or masking smile (Ekman and Friesen, 1982; Ambadar et al., 2008) which the actor uses for sociability, solidarity and conceals negative emotions (Hess et al., 2002; Schmidt et al., 2003; Drahota et al., 2008; Ambadar et al., 2008). The agent’s smile, after the suggestion, is likely to be regarded as appropriate behaviour since it signals her restriction to institutional roles which encourage her to be friendly, welcoming and positively emotional to customers (Bitner et al., 1990; Price et al., 1995b; Tsiotsou and Wirtz, 2011).

Customer 1 and Customer 2 withhold the acceptance/rejection of the suggestion by a lack of response to the agent’s suggestion and have a talk in their mother tongue in lines 166-167 and 169. The code-switching seems to function as a delay device and to possibly suggest the implicitly negative response to the prior suggestion. The customers’ suspension of the acceptance/rejection through the conversation in the different language seems to be regarded as acceptable behaviour since the code-switching indexes the customers’ avoidance of conflicts with the agent and concern for their face. Furthermore, it provides them with an opportunity to participate in a lexical-decision-making process before producing a verbal response. In line 170, the agent attempts to bring the ongoing interaction into the direction she wants by getting the customers to agree to the suggestion through the interruption of the ongoing conversation between Customer 1 and Customer 2 in their mother tongue. In so doing, the agent uses the positive term “OK” which seems to pragmatically
function to recapture her turn in the conversation and mark the turn change (Hockey, 1992). Then, the agent elicits the commercial agreement from the customer through the colloquial affirmative “deal”. The agent’s attempt to elicit the agreement is potentially seen as politic behaviour since it reflects the commercial contexts which influence her behaviour to complete the transaction. It is noteworthy that the agent smiles at the end of line 170.

Figure 28: The agent, facing the camera, is smiling at Customer 1 and Customer 2, whose backs are to the camera (Excerpt 9, line 170).

According to Figure 28, the agent’s smile in line 170 is narrated as a quick small open mouth smile with tense lips (Ochs et al., 2010). It is classified as a polite smile (Ochs et al., 2010) which helps reduce tension and the seriousness of the utterance. In other words, the agent’s elicitation of the acceptance of the offer is softened by her smile since it may signal her realisation about its potential threat to the customers’ face due to the interruption of the ongoing utterance of Customer 1 and Customer 2 and her desire to minimize it through the smile.

Silence and code-switching as indicated in Excerpts 8-9 allow the agents to increase their chance to achieve a sale. In contrast, through some nonverbal means, e.g. topic shifts, the non-Thai customers terminate an opportunity to do so. This observed behaviour can further be evidenced by the extract below.

The following segment of talk is part of the same interaction as that in Excerpt 1. A non-Thai customer wants a ticket to one of the countries bordering Thailand in order to obtain a visa extension. An agent provides more than one suggestion. The extract below includes an incident when the agent attempts to give the second
suggestion. Nevertheless, the customer is unhappy with it. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.3, page 199)

Excerpt 10  [1:13] Vientiane trip (W1813) Western Tours Hua Hin  
(Continued)

(A = Agent; C = Customer)

→ 39 A Kuala Lumpur cheaper why don’t you go to Kuala Lumpur? (. ) Kuala Lumpur is about 7000 baht

→ 41 C *“uhhuh”*  
*C puts his left elbow on the front desk and his fingers on his head.*--->

→ 42 (0.03)

→ 43 C *And er by bus you don’t (talk about) by bus  
*C puts his left elbow on the front desk and his fingers on his head.*--->

→ 44 A By bus we don’t do by bus normally it starts from Bangkok

**Figure 29:** The agent on the left side is giving a suggestion to the non-Thai customer in Excerpt 10, lines 39-40.

In (10) the agent conventionally packages the first pair part of the suggestion through the conventional expression “why don’t you?”(Bolding and Robinson, 2011) and thus a positive assessment of the product through the positive inclusion “cheaper” in lines 39-40. The customer treats the rejection as interpersonally-sensitive by articulating it carefully through mixed (non)verbal means. First, the customer signals his attention and takes the chance to take the full turn through the token “uhhuh” in line 41 (Schegloff, 1982). However, because he speaks in a soft voice, it is potentially interpreted as his unwillingness to show interest in the suggestion and signals his hesitation. Then, the customer implies an offensive response through silence (3
seconds) (Lemak, 2002). Using silence, the customer attends to the implicit rejection by reformulating a new request as a verbal device equivalent to a topic shift and thus to the implicit rejection of the prior suggestion. In so doing, the customer’s elaboration of the new request is initiated through the connection marker “and” which here pragmatically regains the turn (Schiffrin, 1987). This delicately-constructed rejection through mixed (non)verbal means can be regarded as acceptable behaviour. This is because it shows his concern for face: He avoids threatening the agent’s face and also saves his self-image not to be regarded as a person who violates the interactional norms regarding face-threat which can cause a clash in social cohesion and result in commercial failure. Unlike the use of silence in isolation or the account preceded by the hesitator, the topic shift, by articulating a new request, also indicates that the customer wants to completely terminate the agent’s further reiteration of the suggestion, signifying that he is really unhappy with the suggestion and wants to be given an alternative.

In addition to the customers’ suspension of the acceptance/rejection and/or their implicit rejection of the suggestion, the non-Thai customers elaborate the rejection of the suggestion by explicitly stating the negation but mitigating it through diverse (non)verbal means. This behaviour is evidenced in Excerpt 11.

Excerpt 11 relates to an incident occurring at Western Tours Hua Hin. Two non-Thai customers want information about travelling to Koh Tao and accommodation there. An agent suggests a three-star hotel. The suggestion seems not to fit their expectation. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.5, page 226)

**Excerpt 11  [2:2] Koh Tao (W1902) Western Tours Hua Hin**

(A = Agent; C1 = Customer 1; C2 = Customer 2)

58 A We have a good hotel three-star hotel (.) the price about 3100 baht
59 something like that for two [including breakfast

60 C2 *no I think we will er::
60 *[C2 looks at C1 who looks at A.--->

61 A Two-star?
In (11) the agent suggests a product by conducting a positive assessment through the inclusion “good” modifying the suggested product in lines 58-59. Customer 2’s interruption of the ongoing utterance in line 60 shows her implicitly negative response to the agent’s suggestion. Customer 2 uses the negative particle “no” (Pomerantz, 1984) in order to explicitly contradict the prior suggestion (Muntigl and Turnbull, 1998). However, her explicit rejection is mitigated by the committer “I think”, an EPM which reduces the degree to which the speaker commits him/herself to the propositional meaning of the utterance (Watts, 2003), and the hesitator “er” (Watts, 2003) with vowel elongation. Through these (non)verbal means, Customer 2 seems to provide a careful explanation which supports and mitigates her rejection (Liao and Bresnahan, 1996; Johnson, 2007; Wannaruk, 2008; Yang, 2008; Bella, 2011; Aliakbari and Changizi, 2012). Additionally, her eyes focus on Customer 1 to indicate her request for Customer 1’s help in articulating the interpersonally-sensitive activity. Customer 2’s explicit but mitigated rejection reveals her concern for interactional sensitivity and the face of both participants. In other words, it also signals that the explicit rejection without any mitigating means is potentially treated as inappropriate behaviour since it may cause interactional vulnerability, face-threat to the agent and simultaneously the risk of being considered a person who causes interactional conflicts and behaves improperly.

In line 61, the agent is restricted to her institutional role that expects her to reach a commercial agreement by reformulating a new suggestion in the form of a colloquial question “Two stars?”. Although Customer 2’s explicit rejection of the suggestion is unfinished, the agent presumes the reason for its denial, i.e. a higher
price than Customer 2 expected. Thus, she offers the lower-price accommodation suggestion. The reformulation of the suggestion may signal that she treats the explicit but mitigated rejection as acceptable behaviour because it is in relation to the institutional constraints which demand her to achieve a sale and avoid conflicts with the customers for social cohesion.

This extract sheds light on non-Thai customers’ explicit but mitigated rejection of the suggestion which occurs when the suggestion does not fit their interest but they want to sustain interactional harmony. This observed behaviour is potentially regarded as acceptable behaviour because it can help them maintain face and the smooth negotiation of the interaction. Moreover, it seems that the agent’s reformulation of the suggestion is an appropriately linguistic response to that carefully-articulated rejection. This observation is further evidenced by another segment of talk in the interaction shown below.

A non-Thai client wants a day-flight ticket to Shanghai at Western Tours Hua Hin. However, the first suggestion does not suit the client. A new suggestion is provided. Excerpt 12 shows an incident after the new suggestion is given when the customer is reluctant to accept that suggestion at that time. The agent attempts to persuade him to agree with it by giving him a suggestion. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.6, page 233)

**Excerpt 12  [2:10] Daytime flight to Shanghai (W1910) Western Tours Hua Hin**

(A1 = Agent 1; C = Customer)

\[
\begin{align*}
\rightarrow & 102 \quad A1 \quad \text{You told me at the beginning two day later today} \quad \text{---}>\text{is (.)}^* \\
& 102 \quad \text{---}>A1 \text{ looks at her} \\
& 103 \quad \text{wrist watch to check the date and looks up to continue speaking.} \quad \text{---}>A1 \text{ smiles and nods at the end while} \\
& 19^\text{th} \text{ why don’t you book today ((smiles))} \\
\rightarrow & 104 \quad C \quad \text{“no ((little shakes head)) because I wanna check time”} \\
& 105 \quad +A1 \text{ smiles and nods at the end while listening to C’s utterance.}+ \\
& 106 \quad \text{(.)} \\
\rightarrow & 107 \quad A1 \quad \text{>>>---I can hold this reservation for you until tomorrow ((nods)) just} \\
& 107 \quad \text{>>>---A1 nods and bows the head before speaking.}
\end{align*}
\]
In lines 102-103 (Excerpt 12), Agent 1 attempts to get the customer to accept the prior offer which does not appear in the shown segment of talk, by providing a suggestion. This is initiated by direct reported speech (Haakana, 2007) which functions as the replay of a story (Holt and Clift, 2007) and enables Agent 1 to elaborate the subsequent utterance (Clift, 2006) and then the conventional expression for suggestions “why don’t you?” (Bolden and Robinson, 2011) which reveals her illocutionary force. She also smiles at the end of line 103 as shown in Figure 31.

**Figure 31:** The agent, on the left, is eliciting agreement of the offer from the customer, on the right, in Excerpt 12, line 103.

Agent 1’s smile in Figure 31 described as a quick closed mouth smile with asymmetrically pressed lips is regarded as a polite smile (Ambadar et al., 2008). Her suggestion with the smile is potentially interpreted as politic behaviour since it reflects her restriction by the institutional roles which force her to attempt to elicit a commercial agreement from the customer and her display of friendliness attempts to sustain the smooth negotiation of the interaction (Barger and Grandey, 2006).

Like the customer’s response in Excerpt 10, line 104 the customer explicitly rejects the suggestion through the negative particle “no” intensified by the headshake. However, it is toned down by the account which is a communicative tool frequently deployed to make a rejection (Liao and Bresnahan, 1996; Johnson, 2007; Wannaruk, 2008; Yang, 2008; Bella, 2011; Aliakbari and Changizi, 2012). The account (verbal means) and the use of a soft voice (prosodic means) help mitigate the explicit negation “no”. The explicit but mitigated rejection of the suggestion is potentially seen as acceptable behaviour since, despite his concentration on the best product for his money, through the mitigating devices, he considers the interpersonal sensitivity
and face of both participants which may affect the smooth negotiation of the interaction. Moreover, the explicit but mitigated rejection allows the customer to terminate Agent 1’s effort to get him to accept the suggestion at that moment and to implicitly request an alternative suggestion from Agent 1 instead.

It is noticeable that Agent 1 smiles and nods while listening to the customer’s explicit but mitigated rejection in line 105. Both nonverbal features can be seen as supportive facework since they reflect Agent 1’s communicative attention and her patience (Heylen, 2005) in spite of the customer’s explicit but mitigated rejection. Figure 32 shows Agent 1’s smile in line 105.

![Figure 32](image)

**Figure 32:** The agent, facing the camera on the left, is smiling while listening to the customer, on the right, in Excerpt 12 line 105.

Agent 1’s smile in line 105, which is somewhat similar to her smile in line 103, is narrated as a quick, closed mouth smile with asymmetrically pressed lips and half-raised cheeks (Ambadar et al., 2008). It is regarded as a polite smile for expressing sociability (Kraut and Johnston, 1979) and masking of feelings (Ochs et al., 2010). The nod and smile may be derived from the fact that Agent 1 manages her emotional stance during the encounter and expresses her friendliness to the customer rather than for any commercial benefits. Moreover, a pause in line 106 allows the agent to select the words for the subsequent utterance that she may use to respond to the customer’s explicit but mitigated rejection. In line 107 Agent 1 nods and bows her head before initiating the response. The nods and head-bow or leaning forward convey her attention and positive feelings (Mehrabian, 1972) towards the customer. It can be said that Agent 1 treats the response to the customer’s explicit but mitigated rejection as delicate through the nonverbal means, i.e. smiles, nods and leaning forward while the customer is speaking, and before and after her own response, and through verbal
means articulated after nonverbal features. These nonverbal resources may express modesty to the customer. Then, Agent 1 reformulates a new suggestion in line with the customer’s want in lines 107-108 through the downtoner “just” (Watts, 2003). The reformulation of the suggestion combined with a variety of the nonverbal means (i.e. nods, smiles and leaning forward) reflect her avoidance of confrontation, her concern for face and interactional relationship during the encounter, as well as the management of her emotional stance, in addition to increasing the chance of a sale.

An analysis of Excerpts 7-12, shows a pattern in the organization of (non-)linguistic practices in rejecting a suggested service/product:

**Pattern 3**

1. A: Product suggestion
2. C: Mitigated rejection OR Implicit rejection OR Withheld acceptance/rejection
3. A: Reformulating/reiterating the suggestion OR Accepting the rejection

According to Pattern 3, the non-Thai customers implicitly reject a product suggestion given by the Thai agents or occasionally articulate an explicit but mitigated rejection. This observed behaviour indexes the non-Thai customers’ orientation of the rejection as interpersonally-sensitive. Through it they show their concern for face, the caution of the potentially interpersonal threat and the avoidance of confrontation with the Thai agents. It helps protect the agents’ personal face from being explicitly rejected and saves the non-Thai customers’ self-image through which the societal members must maintain interpersonal and interactional harmony. In other words, the explicit but mitigated and implicit rejections of the suggestion may arise from their consideration of the socially-prescribed etiquette that others assume a societal member to be taking in everyday and institutional encounters, i.e. the manifestation of sociability and friendliness to their interlocutor. Moreover, according to the nature of service encounter contexts, customers usually want the best value for money. Therefore, occasionally they explicitly reject the suggestion of the product but

---

16 Modesty is defined as “behaviour, manner or appearance intended to avoid impropriety or indecency” (Oxford Dictionaries, 2014). According to Leech (1983), modesty is related to a “minimized praise of self” and a “maximized dispraise of self”. In Thai culture, a performance of modesty through verbal and nonverbal means is directed towards a communication partner in a dyadic system (Kummer, 2005).
the explicit rejection is carefully mitigated through a variety of (non-)linguistic devices. Due to the institutional constraints and the socially-prescribed norms as discussed, the non-Thai customers’ explicit but mitigated and implicit rejection of the suggestion is potentially seen as acceptable behaviour.

The tokens classified as the EPMs such as hesitators (e.g. “er” and “uh huh”) and downtoners (e.g. I think) (Watts, 2003), and the use of a soft voice are frequently observed in toning down the rejection of the suggestion as shown in Excerpts 7-11. Silence as indicated in Excerpt 8 also functions to delay and implicitly reject the suggestion since it provides the actor with the ability to convey the negative response which he/she does not wish to verbally produce and reflects his/her face concern (Sifianou, 1997). Furthermore, topic shifts can help terminate the opportunity for agents to reiterate/reformulate the suggestion as presented in Excerpts 10. These nonverbal and prosodic means function as a dispreferred marker (Pomerantz, 1984) which signals the upcoming sequence of the oppositional response to the prior suggestion. In addition to the nonverbal and prosodic means, the analysis revealed that the non-Thai customers provide accounts to mitigate the rejection as indicated in Excerpts 7 and 12, whereas the negative particle “no” in Excerpts 11-12 is deployed to explicitly reject the suggestion.

The Thai agents treat the non-Thai customers’ implicit and explicit but mitigated rejection of the suggestion as non-salient behaviour when they respond to it by reiterating/reformulating the suggestion as shown in Excerpts 8-9 and 11-12. The reiteration/reformulation of the suggestion reflects the impact of institutional contexts on the agents’ behaviour which entice them to achieve a sale and avoid conflicts with the customers. In so doing, the agents provide an alternative suggestion. However, the agent in Excerpt 7 accepts the rejection of the suggestion since the customer’s account for it is related to a product whose price is much lower than her product, signifying that she does not have any available comparable products.

In addition, the non-Thai customer’s explicit rejection of the suggestion without any mitigating devices is observed in a segment of talk which occurs in Western Tours Hua Hin. In Excerpt 13, a non-Thai client wants a day-flight ticket between Bangkok and Shanghai. An agent does not notice his specific request for only a day-flight ticket. She suggests the night-flight ticket, but it does not fit the
customer’s needs and he explicitly rejects the suggestion. (see the full conversation in Appendix 7.6, page 233)

Excerpt 13  [2:10] Daytime flight to Shanghai (W1910) Western Tours Hua Hin (Continued)

(A1 = Agent 1; A2 = Agent 2; C = Customer)

→ 65 A1 --->Monday* (. ) --->back to Bangkok 9 pm very good price*
65 --->A1 points to the calendar.* --->A1 points to the detail of the ticket
65 on the piece of paper while standing.*
66 *normally we (.) sold out (.) about 22000
66 *A1 sits down.--->

→ 67 C *This night flight I don’t want to go night time (.) on the way from
67 *C points to the details which A1 gives to him.--->
68 Bangkok to to er Shanghai

69 A1 *Night flight
69 *A1 nods and takes the details back from C.--->

→ 70 C Yeah I don’t want night flight

71 (0.02)

72 *A1 turns around and A2 who seems to be listening to the conversation
72 between A1 and C says something to A1 in a soft voice.*

73 A2 °สิบเอ็ด°
73 °Eleven°

→ 74 A1 The other flight is 11: am

75 C Yeah ((nods))

76 A1 That’s much better ((nods and little smiles))

Figure 33: The agent, who is standing and facing the camera, is offering a
night-flight ticket to a non-Thai customer, on the right, in Excerpt 13, lines 65-66.
In (13) Agent 1 formulates a suggestion by positively assessing the product through the inclusion “good” modified by the adverbial term “very”. The utterance “normally we sold out” carries the pragmatic meaning: “You need to decide to accept it as soon as possible. If you delay in making a decision, you may miss this good chance”. It is noteworthy that three pauses within the turn may indicate that Agent 1 perceives the suggestion as delicate since silence or pauses within the turn is involved in the speaker’s lexical-decision-making process and her selection of words (Zuo, 2002).

In lines 67-68, the customer explicitly rejects the suggestion when observing that it does not exactly fit his request. The explicit rejection is derived from the incorrect provided product and his desire to get the agent to provide him an alternative suggestion related to his wish. This means that actually the customer does not want to reject the suggestion but does it for the particular product unrelated to his want. He is unwilling to make a negative assessment of the product or disagree with the price of the product. In so doing, it is articulated by the negative particle “don’t” which functions as part of a predicate “want”. The customer’s explicit rejection of the suggestion in lines 67-68 can be expected to emerge in service encounters and is potentially viewed as acceptable behaviour since, in theory, the customers have the power of money and the right to choose the best value for their money. However, in reality as my data has shown, in practice the rejection is treated as delicate and the explicit one is avoided due to the actor’s concern for face and his/her maintenance of interactional harmony. Consequently, the explicit rejection in lines 67-68 can be considered as a threat to Agent 1’s face because it potentially signals Agent 1’s failure to provide the product the customer requested or it challenges her professional ability. Nevertheless, due to the customer’s focus of the rejection of the particular suggested product, not the product itself and his implicit request for an alternative, the conversation can move forwards.

It is noteworthy that Agent 1 does not make an explicit apology for her mistake. Instead, in line 69, Agent 1 reiterates part of the key terms in the customer’s explicit rejection related to his requested product as a request for the customer’s confirmation. This observed behaviour may be linked to the assumption that Agent 1 attempts to pretend not to acknowledge the presence of face-threat to herself despite perceiving face-loss caused by the explicit rejection. Agent 1’s absence of the explicit
apology may be explained by the fact that she is unwilling to accept that she has made a mistake or that the suggested product is not good enough. Moreover, instead of a verbal apology, Agent 1 corrects her mistake by reformulating a new suggestion in line 74. The reformulation of the suggestion may arise from Agent 1’s attempt to revive her damaged personal face after being threatened by the explicit rejection. Additionally, it assists her in increasing a chance to achieve the transactional agreement and indexes her well-managed emotional stance as a service provider (Price et al., 1995b; Tsiotsou and Wirtz, 2011) who needs to minimize confrontation with the customer. Moreover, it is noticeable that the customer treats Agent 1’s absence of the explicit apology as acceptable behaviour since he may now concentrate on being given an alternative suggestion relevant to his wish than the socially-prescribed etiquette that a person needs to comply with.

In conclusion, in service encounter contexts the non-Thai customers’ explicit rejection without any mitigating devices seems to be interpreted as unacceptable behaviour due to the lack of concern for face and a potential clash of interactional harmony. Nonetheless, it can be potentially seen as acceptable behaviour when the rejection is relevant to the particular product unrelated to the non-Thai customers’ request since it reflects their remaining interest in the suggested product.

5.2.2 Summary

As in the Thai-Thai interactions, the analysis in Chapter 5.2 revealed that the non-Thai customers do not exercise the power which, theoretically speaking, they have from their possession of money. They avoid explicitly rejecting the Thai agents’ suggestion. Like the Thai customers, the non-Thai customers do not interact in the ways one would expect based on the widely accepted concepts of customer superiority (Arrington, 1990; Witkowski and Wolfinbarger, 2001). In fact, customers go to interactional trouble to attend to the agent’s face, e.g. by implicitly rejecting suggestions and through mixed (non)verbal and prosodic means. Those devices include the EPMs (e.g. the hesitators (“er”, “um”), downtoners (“I think”) (Watts, 2003), silence, the use of a soft voice and topic shifts, in addition to accounts. This behaviour, which is also encountered in Thai-Thai interactions, is considered unmarked behaviour since the conversation can move forwards smoothly.
The data revealed the appropriate behaviour that both Thai and non-Thai customers commonly exhibit, i.e. the implicitness, when they implicitly reject the suggestion. As with Thai customers, this finding showed non-Thai customers’ pro-agreement ethos, as well as their consideration for face and the agents’ face and the interpersonal relationship. This signals that they do not consider the unequal status between themselves and the agents. This behaviour also seems to stem from the customers’ desire to reach the best transactional deal at the lowest price, since the confrontation with the agents may affect the suggested product being offered (i.e. they may not be given a good offer if they argue with the agents). The customers’ implicitness is achieved through accounts, silence and the prosodic means (e.g. hesitators and the soft voice) which function as dispreference markers (Pomerantz, 1984) to mitigate the rejection. Through these devices, they attend to the pragmatic meaning (i.e. “I don’t want that suggested product”) and simultaneously to the face of both participants (i.e. “I am conducting an appropriate rejection in accordance with the social etiquette in this situation”).

The next section will look at the conclusions of the present study relevant to the research questions and the contribution of the study to current research.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

6.1. Concluding Discussion of the Findings

The present study examined the way in which Thai agents and (non-)Thai customers engage in articulating and responding to interpersonally-sensitive activities in Thai hospitality encounters with specific attention to disagreements and rejections/refusals and the extent to which they are interpreted as acceptable or unacceptable behaviour and whether they are associated with face manifestations.

The findings revealed that both Thai and non-Thai customers implicitly refused or rejected the agents’ product suggestions and offers to avoid possible confrontations and maintain interactional harmony between the agents and customers which potentially resulted in the agents’ offer/suggestion of the best values for money and thus the transactional agreement. Moreover, interactional harmony was regarded by some earlier scholars (Lakoff, 1973b; Leech, 1983; Brown and Levinson, 1987) as having an involvement with the actor’s expression of politeness. The way in which the Thai and non-Thai customers implicitly constructed dispreferred responses was categorised as acceptable behaviour and related to face concerns. This was because the customers attended to the agents’ face and their own face, by signaling the interpersonally-sensitive nature of these activities, via a number of dispreference markers (Pomerantz, 1984) (see the interpersonally-sensitive activities in details in later in this chapter, in Chapters 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1 and 5.2)

Theoretically speaking, rejections/refusals of suggestions/offers should not necessarily be seen as interpersonally-sensitive in service encounter contexts due to the influence of the difference in hierarchy between the agents and customers in line with the economically-oriented value “Customers are God” (Arrington, 1990; Thitthongkam, 2013b). There is also, in theory, no interpersonal relationship between the customers and the agents beyond what happens in the actual encounter.

Despite being labeled differently, for example, ‘Make the interlocutor feel good’ (Lakoff, 1973b).
Nonetheless, the present study has shown that those activities were treated as potentially delicate in the Thai hospitality context. This could be accounted for by the fact that both Thai and non-Thai customers wanted to receive good value for their money from the agents and to behave in line with the socially-prescribed obligations, i.e. the maintenance of face and interpersonal comity during the encounter. In (non-)everyday conversations, theoretically speaking, a person who threatens his/her interlocutor’s face could be negatively viewed as someone who has breached the social obligations and the concept of considerateness and thus has a bad image (Goffman, 1967). The (non-)Thai customers’ explicitness might thus result in face-loss and difficulty in negotiating the interaction and thus jeopardise their chance of receiving the best value for money. Instead, the customers’ maintenance of the interpersonal harmony and face consideration seemed to help them to achieve their commercial goal.

Thai customers’ implicitness, in addition to their wish to receive the best value for money like the non-Thai customers, made the Thai value called “ kratay” relevant (one’s consideration of others’ faces, needs and feelings so that one shows an extreme reluctance to impose on others) (KJ) (Knutson, 1994; Sriussadaporn-Charoenngam and Jablin, 1999; Pornpitakpan, 2000; Ukosakul, 2009). The contribution of this study then is that it shows how this value was oriented to by both Thai agents and Thai customers through verbal and nonverbal acts. The implicitness of Thai customers also made the Thai values of face-loss and confrontation avoidance relevant, as well as the maintenance of the interactional harmony (Hendon, 1999; Knutson et al., 2002; Knutson, 2004; Katz, 2008). However, the implicitness of non-Thai customers did not attribute to these Thai values. Instead, it made the non-confrontation and face consideration relevant according to the socially-described obligation as discussed earlier.

Face consideration and the non-confrontation (see details in Chapters 4.1 and 5.1) of both Thai and non-Thai customers through the implicit activities which were shown in my data were not in line with other studies. First, in view of the Thai culture which was, in general, categorized as a strongly hierarchical society (Gannon and Pillai, 2010) the Thai customers’ face consideration via implicitness did not make the unequal status between themselves and the agents relevant, unlike Pornpitakpan’s
(2000) and Kummer’s (2005) claim that the Thai agents were interactionally constructed as socially inferior to the Thai customers in the Thai order of class. Instead, these results suggest that the difference in the social position does not necessarily shape institutional encounters. Second, the Thai and non-Thai customers’ minimization of potentially offensive sources contradicted the economically-oriented value called “คุณค่ากับประชาชน” (Customers are God) (Arrington, 1990; Thitthongkam, 2013b) claiming that customers are a priori superior to the agents, due to their power of money. However, the data provided a different picture as the alleged inequality according to economically-related factors was not evident in my data.

The results showed that the implicitness in Thai service encounters was signaled via (non)verbal or prosodic mitigating devices. In other words, participants in both Thai-Thai interactions and Thai-non-Thai interactions usually attended to disagreements and refusals/rejections as interpersonally-sensitive by employing dispreference markers (Pomerantz, 1984). Some previous research in strategic disagreements and refusals/refusals in Thai contexts indexed only a single (non)verbal strategy used to construct the implicitness such as the work of Phukanchana (1995), Promsrimas (2000), Panpothong (2001), Wannaruk (2008) and Srisuruk (2011). In contrast, the analysis of the present study indicated that implicitness was achieved via dispreference markers (Pomerantz, 1984) which carried the implicature of disagreements and refusals/refusals by combining the nonverbal, verbal and/or prosodic means. This result corresponds to the principles of preference organization (Pomerantz and Heritage, 2013), according to which certain activities (often disagreements and refusals) are avoided or minimized, if possible. Nonverbal and prosodic features, i.e. silence (Davidson, 1984; Lemak, 2012), topic shifts, a soft voice, smiling (Ambadar et al., 2008; Hoque et al., 2011) and some EPMs such as hesitators (e.g. um, huh) and downtoners (e.g. I think) (Watts, 2003), which functioned as dispreference markers and implicitly signaled oppositional responses to the eliciting activities were either followed by or occurred at the same time as accounts. Although dispreference markers in the performance of disagreements, refusals and rejections have been shown to constitute politic behaviour, in contrast, dis-attending to refusals and disagreements without any dispreference marker was shown to cause the hearer’s interpretation of the prior utterance as non-politic behaviour as discussed in Chapter 4.2.2.
The findings also revealed a propensity for implicitness as evidenced, in particular, by the agents’ withholding of (dis)agreements following customers’ negative assessments of the product. The agents’ implicitness in responding to the negative assessments was treated as politic behaviour by the customers. This is because withholding of (dis)agreement through the mixed verbally and nonverbally mitigating devices minimizes the threat to the interlocutor’s face and safeguards the speaker’s face, thus helping to maintain interactional harmony. Alternative suggestions were a key verbally mitigating device used by the Thai agents to save face of both the participants and the interactional harmony in order to increase their chance of reaching a commercial deal. These were supported by nonverbal features such as a soft voice and smiles in both intra and intercultural encounters as indicated in Chapters 4.1.1 and 5.1.1. More importantly, the interpretation of the agents’ implicitness as acceptable behaviour in the customers’ views takes place by expressing implicitness through these softening strategies, allowing the interaction to move forwards to the end. This behaviour is also derived from the agents’ institutional roles which precludes them from performing actions which could endanger the customers’ (future) purchasing behaviour (e.g. explicit disagreements or rejections without any mitigating devices which may potentially generate the customers’ negative feelings or attitudes) and for their institutional image (e.g. criticisms of the institutional products in front of the customers).

Although the data revealed that the Thai agents signaled their face concern and consideration of the interpersonal harmony via the suspension of (dis)agreements with the non-Thai customers, they occasionally formulated explicit disagreements with the non-Thai customers. The agents’ explicitness was expressed through verbal acts (e.g. contradiction (Muntigl and Turnbull, 1998), negative particles, laughter and nods) without any prosodically and nonverbally mitigating devices and were potentially seen as aggressive facework (see details in Chapter 5.1.2). This behaviour potentially arose from the fact that they wanted (a) to ensure that the non-Thai customers understood their meanings due to the customers’ insufficient command of English, and (b) to entice the non-Thai customers to buy the service/product at full price. Contrary to the Thai-Thai interactions, the results did not reveal the explicitness of the Thai agents when responding to Thai customers. This phenomenon was explained by the Thai agents’ consideration of the strong Thai value as mentioned, i.e. the
avoidance of face-loss and confrontation (Ukosakul, 2003; 2009; Srisuruk, 2011). With regard to the agents’ explicit disagreement, theoretically speaking, the agents needed to manage various potential sensitive situations and their emotional stance (Burgers et al., 2000; Tsiotsou and Wirtz, 2011) as shown in Chapter 2.2.1. Consequently, in theory, they should avoid explicitly disagreeing with the customers and thus the explicitness should be seen as non-politic behaviour. Nevertheless, the findings revealed that there was insufficient evidence to indicate that the non-Thai customers treated it as unacceptable behaviour. This was because, instead of explicitly negative responses to the agents in line with the transactionally-oriented nature of hospitality encounters, the non-Thai customers expressed non-confrontation by eliciting agreements from the agents through mitigating strategies such as objections in the form of questions (Locher, 2004).

The (non-)Thai customers express explicitness by rejecting the Thai agents’ suggestions. Through the negative particles (no, not) which were mitigated through (more than) one of the dispreference markers the customers’ explicitness was potentially seen as acceptable behaviour. This is since the mitigating devices indicated the customers’ face consideration and their desire to ensure that the Thai agents understood their rejection. However, the customers’ explicit and negative assessment of the product conveyed the rejection through the (non)verbal and prosodic means which carry the speaker’s negative attitude towards the prior utterance. These devices include the ECfs (Pomerantz, 1986), an increase in intensity (Stadler, 2006), the challenges (Muntigl and Turnbull, 1998), expressions of surprise (e.g. token “huh”) (Davidson, 1984) and reported speech (Holt and Clift, 2007; Bangerter et al., 2011).

Moreover, the research also gave an insight into a typically Thai linguistic device signaling marked and unmarked behaviour in the Thai-Thai interactions, i.e. the pronominal forms in Thai (see details in Chapter 2.2.6). The absence of the pronominal forms in Thai hospitality contexts for the avoidance of inappropriate use which may result in the hearer’s negative attitude indicated the speaker’s delicate construction of the interpersonally-sensitive activities and thus was considered appropriate. In contrast, the unparalleled application of the pronominal forms has been linked with the speaker’s misalignment with the interlocutor and thus was potentially associated with acceptable behaviour.
6.2 Contributions of the Research

Most previous studies in politeness and speech acts in Thai culture have applied pragmatic theories of politeness, in particular Brown and Levinson’s notion and Blum-Kulka et al.’s (1987) strategies adapted from Brown and Levinson’s (see Phukanchana 1995 on disagreements, Panpoothong 2001 on refusals, Panpoothong 2004 on responses to an expression of gratitude, Srinarawat 2005 on indirectness, Rhurakvit 2011 on complaints and Srisuruk 2011 on pragmatic competence). However, Brown and Levinson’s theory has been extensively criticized especially regarding its applicability to some Asian cultures such as Japanese (Ide, 1989) and Chinese (Gu, 1990) and its excessive focus at the utterance level (Terkourafi, 1999; Eelen, 2001; Watts, 2003; Locher, 2004) (see full discussion in Chapter 2.1.2). Additionally, earlier research in Thai disregarded the examination of politeness and activities from a discursive viewpoint. This research has contributed to the sparse discursive study of communicative behaviour in Thai contexts, in particular in authentic Thai institutional settings, providing a fuller investigation of interpersonally sensitive activities, face and politeness that takes into account the interactional context and both the speaker’s and the hearer’s behaviour.

In addition to the use of the pragmatic theories of politeness, most previous studies in politeness in Thai culture have been conducted by examining students through written responses (e.g. questionnaires and DCTs) and simulated situations (e.g. role-play) (e.g. Srisuruk 2011). Analysis of interactions amongst real participants (e.g. agents and customers) through real data (e.g. naturally occurring interactions) in Thai contexts was limited. The present research addressed this academic gap by analysing natural data in real institutional settings and suggesting that naturally occurring encounters could provide significant reliability of the findings, since the collected data was not from the actor’s perception of what he/she should (not) do, but showed authentic, locally occasioned communicative behaviour. Furthermore, through two video-recorders, an audio-recorder and non-participation observation (see details in Chapters 3.2.1 and 3.2.2) the present research captured nonverbal behaviour which is very important in Thai culture, in addition to the verbal actions and the
contextual situations around the focused behaviour to obtain high quality data and offer behavioural patterns in contemporary Thai business interactions.

Additionally, the implicitness of the customers observed in the Thai-Thai interactions offered a slightly different picture, compared to the previous studies that revealed that Thai superiors explicitly oppose subordinates (Phukanchana, 1995). The present research contributed a new viewpoint, showing that power and social difference in status in Thai culture tended not to be fixed according to the Thai order of society. It thus revealed a potential change in the social inequality amongst Thai people because of the global change in values, economy (Saxter, 2011) and the presence of new professions.

Regarding the hospitality industry, previous research in Thai hospitality contexts has concentrated on marketing and management, for instance, consumer behaviour (Somwong, 2008) and service satisfaction (Rittichainuwat et al., 2002; Thitthongkam, 2013b) but disregarded research of Thai service encounters in the linguistic field. The present study addressed this academic gap by viewing the appropriate behaviour of both Thai and non-Thai customers and the Thai agents in authentic service encounters. Tourism and hotel managers can use the findings regarding the customers’ pro-implicitness and the importance of dispreferred responses in attending to the interpersonally-sensitive activities to train their staff to manage interpersonally-sensitive activities in order to maintain interpersonal harmony and thus the commercial goal. Additionally, on the part of the Thai-non-Thai interactions, one of the findings showed that the Thai agents’ explicitness when disagreeing with the non-Thai customers on some occasions can feed into staff development programmes in the Thai hospitality sector.

6.3 Limitations

Although the present research was designed carefully with an effort to collect high-quality data as shown in Chapter 3.1.1, it was acknowledged that some constraints remained.
During the period of data collection in May 2010, Thailand was in political unrest and the government at that time announced a state of emergency and curfew due to demonstrations and clashes between protesters and the police. This uncontrolled constraint affected the preparation of the data collection since it caused tourists and clients difficulties in travelling, including the hospitality sites chosen as the research sites for this study. The political constraint had a great impact on the number of customers and thus the amount of the collected data. The estimated number of customers given by the staff members of each research site went down dramatically and thus the amount of the recorded interactions also decreased. Moreover, the political crisis was prolonged and suspended from time to time from 2010. Consequently, it was rather difficult to estimate when it would end and when the supplementary data collection could occur.

Another limitation arose from company policies and the architecture of the research sites. The positions where the camcorders were placed and where I could stand for note-taking were designated by the hotel managers or if the staff were involved, they were concerned with customers’ potential dissatisfaction and privacy. Additionally, the architecture and furniture of each research site differed in style and area size. The big column in the middle of the reception area and the vast area at Let’s Sea Hua Hin Al Fresco Resort hindered the audio- and video-recording of the interactions. Recorded pictures behind the column, in particular nonverbal actions (e.g. smiles, gestures and eye contact), were unclear. These constraints resulted in the poorer quality of the recorded data than those collected from other research sites.

I was not allowed to interview or talk to any customers at the research sites because the hotel managers and institutional staff did not want to risk customer dissatisfaction. This had ethical implications when the data were collected as indicated in Chapter 3.2.3. Consequently, there was insufficient basic information, especially the nationality of the non-Thai customers which might help explain appropriate behaviour for customers from different countries. This issue may lead to a suggestion for future research which can be conducted by interviewing participants after the interaction (see further details in Chapter 6.4).
6.4 Direction for Future Research

The present study has focused on the articulation of and response to disagreements and rejections. It has not examined another interpersonally-sensitive activity which may often occur in service encounter contexts, i.e. complaints. Future research could look into the interactional management of complaints in Thai tourism/service encounters that would provide a fuller understanding of sensitive activities in Thai hospitality contexts.

Second, this study was only conducted in three types of hospitality business, i.e. hotels, travel agencies and tourist information centres. However, there are several categories of business in service encounter contexts, for example, restaurants, shops and supermarkets. A follow-up study could include encounters in these alternative tourism and hospitality settings. In addition to service encounter contexts, the study of the appropriate behaviour when constructing and responding to the interpersonally-sensitive activities may be extended to other contexts, for instance, business meetings.

Finally, based on the limitations of the present research, in addition to the audio- and video-recordings and field-notes, future research could include interviewing customers after the interaction has been recorded in order to gain some background information about the customer and also an understanding of how the participants might regard their interlocutor’s behaviour.
APPENDICES
Appendix 1: Person pronouns proper in Thai


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun/variant forms</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Social mood/situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ตัน /chân/, ฆาน /chán/</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Offspring, younger people or those with equal status</td>
<td>Intimate; less formal; used by males as an expression of intimacy when it is paired with /tʰɔː/; paired with /kæː/ when used with very close friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ติขัน /dichăn/, ติัขัน /dichán/, ติัขัน /tichán/</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Elder people, superiors, people with equal status; colleagues</td>
<td>Formal; distant; polite; deferential (when used with superiors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>หมอ /phôm/</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>General (intimate and non-intimate), elder people, superiors, people with equal status; not with children</td>
<td>Used in most situations; ranging from polite to intimate; ranging from formal to informal; deferential when used with superiors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>กระทรวง /krâphôm/</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>High-ranking superiors; general in public</td>
<td>Indicating high deference; formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>เรา /raw/</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Friends or intimate people, e.g., relatives; general in public</td>
<td>Intimate; used as 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; person singular pronoun in informal situations; used as 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; person plural pronoun on the behalf of the institution or a group of people (= “I and my group” or “you and I”); ranging from formal to informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>หนู /núu/</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;, 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Adults; professional or social superiors; elder colleagues</td>
<td>Used by male and female children; used by professional or social female inferiors, e.g., female students to teachers and secretaries to boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ข้าพเจ้า /khâaphacâw/</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>General in public</td>
<td>Used formally in public statements and official documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun/variant forms</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Social mood/situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ถ้า /kháw/</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Between boyfriends and girlfriends; between husbands and wives; female friends</td>
<td>Intimate; mainly used by females; informal; expressing affectionate; paired with the second person pronoun ฉัน /tua/ or ตัวเอง /tua/ which implies “oneself”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>คุณ /kuu/</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Friends, very intimate people, e.g., family members with equal status or age</td>
<td>Used mainly by males; intimate; very informal; occasionally used to show anger and considered impolite; paired with the second person pronoun ฉัน /muh/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ด้วย /t’uă/</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Amongst male friends; Thai peddlers and Chinese customers</td>
<td>Solidarity, intimate; used by Chinese or Thai superiors or people with equal status; used by Chinese peddlers and Thai customers; very informal; paired with the second person pronoun ฉัน /t’uă/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>พี่ /khàa/</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Male friends, close friends, inferiors</td>
<td>Used by poor-educated; elders talking to youngers; male friends; informal; casual situations; intimate; less polite; often used with the second person pronoun ฉัน /n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>คุณ /?ay/</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Amongst modern people; people finishing studying from or having been abroad</td>
<td>From English “I”; intimate; informal; rarely used; paired with the second person pronoun คุณ /yuu/ which comes from English “you”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>แน่ /kan/</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Amongst close male friends</td>
<td>Intimate; informal; rarely used; paired with the second person pronoun แน่ /kææ/ or แน่ /khu/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>คุณ /khun/</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>General (intimate)</td>
<td>Polite; formal use among</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun/variant forms</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Social mood/situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and non-intimate), elders, youngers, equals; singular and plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>equals; ranging from formal to informal; ranging from intimate to distant; used by general intimate or non-intimate youngers or inferiors; often found in public or business; indicating an equality of the position between the speaker and the hearer; used by superiors to inferiors it expresses formality or perhaps negative emotions; also used as a polite title before name, kinship terms and certain occupation to elevate the hearer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>พ่๊ /พ่๊</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;; 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>People of significantly higher social status; singular and plural</td>
<td>Formal; polite; showing high deference and respect; distant; used by inferiors; greatly restricted to social status; used as a deferential title with certain high status positions; paired with พ่๊ /พ่๊, พ่๊ /พ่๊ or กร奥巴马 /กร奥巴马</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>พ่อ /พ่อ</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;; 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>Amongst young people; females</td>
<td>Intimate; informal; used by males or females to females; as a 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; person pronoun it is paired with the 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; person pronoun พ่๊ /พ่๊ amongst female friends and พ่๊ /พ่๊ when the speaker is either male or female and indicating intimacy; as a 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; person pronoun it usually refers to a female or male and shows respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronoun/variant forms</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Social mood/situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ฅว /khāw/, ฅน /khāw/</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>General, singular and plural; mainly used to refer to males</td>
<td>Ranging from intimate to distant (outsider) and from intimate to polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ฅน /kææ/</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;, 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; person, singular and plural, general; 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; person, singular, amongst intimate members of the same sex when it is paired with ขน /chán/ (F) and ฅน /kan/</td>
<td>Intimate; informal; as a 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; person it expresses close friendship, solidarity but less polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ฅน /naay/</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Intimate males with equal status</td>
<td>Often used by females; intimate; informal; paired with ขน /chán/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ฅน /man/</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>People, either derogatively or familiarly; inferiors; animals or things</td>
<td>Regarded as unrefined and often avoided in polite, formal speech and writing; used broadly in informal situations; equivalent to “it” in English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Sentence particles and their application
(based on the data from Noss, 1964; Moerman, 1973; Smyth, 2002; Kummer, 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles</th>
<th>Speaker gender</th>
<th>Speaker social position vs the interlocutor</th>
<th>Grammatical function</th>
<th>Social mood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>คะรฆ /khráp/</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L / E / H</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Polite, reserved, but friendly, intimate and distant, formal and informal situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>คะรฆผ /khrápphôm/</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>L / E</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Polite, reserved and highly deferent, slightly intimate and very distant, formal and informal situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>คะ /khaʔ/</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>L / E / H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Polite, reserved, but friendly, intimate and distant, formal and informal situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>คะ /khaʔ/</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>L / E / H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Polite, reserved, but friendly, intimate and distant, formal and informal situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>คะ /khāa/</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>L / E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Intimate, used in isolation as a response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>คะ /hāʔ/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>L / E</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Intimate and affable, informal form of คะรฆ /khráp/ and คะ /khaʔ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>คะ /cāʔ/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>L / E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Intimate and affable, talking to children and inferiors, used as a sweet-talk question particle between males and females, used as a best-friend question particle between females, and used in polite requests after the particle คะ /khaʔ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>คะ /cāʔ/ ข้า /cāa/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>L / E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Intimate and affable, talking to children and inferiors, used as a sweet-talk question particle between males and females, used as a best-friend question particle between females, and used in isolation as a response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ข้า /cāa/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>L / E / H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Intimate, affectionate, used in isolation as a response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>คะ /wāʔ? ไร่</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>E / H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Very intimate or informal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles</td>
<td>Speaker gender</td>
<td>Speaker social position vs the interlocutor</td>
<td>Grammatical function</td>
<td>Social mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/wóoy/ /wíy/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>E / H</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>indicating rudeness, anger and aggressiveness when speaking to strangers but expressing intimacy with close friends or people with the equal status, more common in male speech but can be used by females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/wâ?/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>E / H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Very intimate or informal, indicating rudeness, anger and aggressiveness when speaking to strangers but expressing intimacy with close friends or people with the equal status, more common in male speech but can be used by females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/yá?/ /yá?/</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>E / H</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Very intimate or informal, serving the same semantic and pragmatic meanings as /wâ?/, /wóoy/ and /wíy/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/phâyákha?/</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Royal family members</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Very distant, used only with royal family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/pheékha?/</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Royal family members</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Very distant, used only with royal family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/nâ?/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>E / H</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Making an utterance milder and less confrontational in seeking agreement or compromise; conveying a sense of coaxing and urging; used in requests and questions when seeking agreement; occasionally used with people with the higher status when followed by polite particles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/nâ?/ /nâa/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>E / H</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Used when persuading someone to do something or to accept an idea when they are reluctant; used to highlight the topic of a sentence (= “right” in English); occasionally used with people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles</td>
<td>Speaker gender</td>
<td>Speaker social position vs the interlocutor</td>
<td>Grammatical function</td>
<td>Social mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ตัวอย่าง/ตัวอย่าง</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>L / E / H</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>with the higher status when followed by polite particles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ต่าง/ต่าง</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>L / E / H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Often used with ทรรศ/กทรง, ที่/กหะ/ or นี่/น่า?, used in polite requests and apologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ต่าง/ต่าง</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>L / E / H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Indicating that a state has been reached; that a situation is about to change; and used after the term ต้อง/ต้อง/ to show the speaker’s mild irritation; able to be used before ทรรศ/กทรง, ที่/กหะ/ or นี่/น่า?/ and มี/มี/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ต่าง/ต่าง</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>L / E / H</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Used as a way of eliciting an answer; expressing a sense of irritation; used with the term ต้อง/ต้อง/ to change the focus or topic of conversation (=and how about…?); มี/น่า?/ more informal; used with ทรรศ/กทรง, ที่/กหะ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ต่าง/ต่าง</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>H / E</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Often used as a response to a statement or question to show something known previously becomes newly relevant or how can one overlook this fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ต่าง/ต่าง</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>L / E / H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Usually used in negative utterances which occasionally turn up in positive statement in order to contradict the hearer’s statement or belief; used in positive statement to convey a qualified or hesitant acceptance of the hearer’s statement or belief; used to express sarcasm or mild annoyance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ต่าง/ต่าง</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>H / E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Used most commonly to urge action on the part of someone who is not acting or to change the course of action of someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles</td>
<td>Speaker gender</td>
<td>Speaker social position vs the interlocutor</td>
<td>Grammatical function</td>
<td>Social mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/næʔ/ /næʔ/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>H / E</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>who is. When pronounced with a short vowel and followed by a polite particle (e.g., /khráʔ/, /kʰáʔ/), it does not express any sense of abruptness and is widely used in polite requests. In contrast, when the particle is pronounced with a falling tone and longer vowel, more insistent requests and commands are conveyed. Moreover, the particle with a longer vowel can be used to emphasize a positive response to a question, to urge agreement, and to contradict negative statements; /dī/ is a colloquial word which is not followed by the polite particles and conveys a request, an invitation or a complaint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/thəʔ/ /thəʔ/ /həʔ/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>H / E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Indicating that something previously unknown is now relevant or this new thing is not overlooked. It is in the emphatic element which occasionally expresses mild irritation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/nəʔ/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>H / E</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Used as a mild, urging particle in suggestions, invitations, requests and mild commands. When used to urge someone to do something, a reason is often given. When the speaker wants to suggest joint activity, it is often precede by /kən/ (“together”). /həʔ/ is used in informal speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/nəy/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>L / E / H</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Used in polite requests (= “just a little”); used to minimize the degree of imposition on the listener; commonly occur in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particles</td>
<td>Speaker gender</td>
<td>Speaker social position vs the interlocutor</td>
<td>Grammatical function</td>
<td>Social mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ติ่ /thii/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>L / E / H</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Polite request particle (= “just this once”); used to minimize degree of imposition on the hearer; similar in function as นะ /nãy/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>นะ /nãy/</td>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>L / E</td>
<td>A / I</td>
<td>Informal; used to express the speaker’s desire to seek approval or agreement from the hearer on minor issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:  
(1) “M” refers to males while “F” refers to females.  
(2) “L” refers to the fact that the speaker is socially lower than the recipient; “E” to the fact that the speaker is equal to the recipient; and “H” to the fact that the speaker is socially higher than the recipient.  
(3) “A” refers to an affirmative statement and “I” to an interrogative statement.
Appendix 3: Official University letter to help gain access to research sites (issued by the Acting Postgraduate Research Director in the Department of English at the University of Surrey)

01 March 2010

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to you in my capacity as Acting Postgraduate Research Director in the Department of English at the University of Surrey. One of our PhD students, Nattana Leelaharittrananak, is planning to undertake research into politeness strategies employed by Thai and native speakers of English and to study cultural interference when using English as a Lingua Franca. As such, she would like to be able to audio- and video-record conversations between front desk officials and hotel guests in Hua Hin. I'd be very grateful if you were able to authorize this on behalf of the hotel.

As she has indicated in her accompanying letter, she would ensure the least possible disruption and would advise guests of the nature of the project, securing their agreement to use the material.

If I can be of further assistance in this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me at: F.Doloughan@Surrey.ac.uk

Many thanks in advance for your help.

All the very best,

[Signature]

Dr. Fiona J. Doloughan
Acting Postgraduate Director of Research
Dept. of English
Appendix 4: Letter of granting permission issued by the Bangkok Tourism Division

ที่ ถ. 12077/104
สัณหีบวัฒนธรรม ที่ทำ และการท่องเที่ยว
123 ถนนเจริญฯ เขตดินแดง กรุงเทพฯ 10400

๓๐ เมษายน 2553

เรื่อง การอนุญาตเข้าศึกษาและที่นั่งชม

เรียน คุณอธิบดี ฝ่ายพัฒนาธุรกิจ

ตามที่ท่านได้ส่งหนังสือ ปี 2553/12077/104 เรื่อง ขออนุญาตเข้าศึกษาและที่นั่งชม แล้วจึงได้รับความเห็นชอบในการท่องเที่ยว ที่ทำ ในการรับผิดชอบในการทำหน้าที่ของจังหวัดการท่องเที่ยว ได้ทำหน้าที่ในการที่ทำหน้าที่ของจังหวัดการท่องเที่ยว ได้

จึงเรียนมาเพื่อโปรดทราบ

(นายกิตติ์ หัวเรียน)

กองการท่องเที่ยว
โทร. 02225 7612-4 ต่อ 211
โทรสาร 02225 7612-4 ต่อ 213
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PhD candidate
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Appendix 7: Transcripts observed in Chapters 4 and 5

Appendix 7.1: [1:3] Bangladeshi customers (W1803) Western Tours Hua Hin

Length: 22.04 minutes

A1 = female agent 1
A2 = female agent 2
A3 = female agent 3
C1 = male non-Thai customer 1
C2 = male non-Thai customer 2

1  *C1 pushes the door and walks to the counter while C2 follows him.--->

2 A1 สรีสิ่งค่ะ ค่ะ เขียนค่ะ ค่ะ
   Good morning FPF please FPF
   Good morning please

3 +A2 walks to the counter where C1 is standing. C1 points to an
   available seat provided for the service providers and then starts
talking.+

4 C1 นี่ (refer to 'a service provider') ไป ไหน
   This (refer to 'a service provider') go Q-WH
   Where does she go?

5 A2 ไป ไหน เธอ หยุด ค่ะ
   Go Q-WH er day-off FPF
   Where does (she) go? Er (she is) day-off

6 C1 อื
   Ah
   Ah

7 *A2 takes some pieces of paper and puts them on her side. She also
   spreads out her hand to invite C1 to sit down.*

8 +C1 sits on the chair at the counter but C2 sits at the waiting area
   behind C1.+

9 +A2 walks to the back of the office.+

10 +C1 sits on the chair at the counter and then puts his left hand on the
   cushion of the next chair. + (0.25)

11 +A2 comes back with a book and sits on the chair opposite to C1. She
   looks for something from the book.+

12 (0.05)
Yesterday DM made a reservation Q-YN yet FPF

Yesterday (you) made a reservation, didn’t you?

Not yet, haven’t you? So I will check the price for (you) again (.)

Where will you go?

Bangladesh Dhaka

Why (will you) go?

Air India er *on 18 20 20

When (will you) go?

(You’ll) go on 20th?

19th (or) 20th is OK (for me)

*19 20 ไม่ [ผมชิน]
*19 20 OK [all]
*A2 writes down what C1 said-->

[C1 writes down what A2 said]

[OK OK]
Then come back on day Q-WH FPF

Then what day (will you) come back?

Ticket 1 month

A one-month ticket

Q-WH CL FPF

For how many people?

1 person FPM

1 person

Person one

One person

FPM (= 'yes')

Yes

*Yesterday KPS she offer flight KPJ she offer
*Yesterday she (KPS) or she (KPJ) offered you a flight operated by
* A2 looks at C1.-->
*การบิน ไทย ไป ใช่หรือ ((nods))
*Airways Thai DM Q-YN (colloquial) ((nods))
*Thai Airways, didn't she? ((nods))
* A2 looks at C1.-->

Yes yes

Yes yes

Yes yes

But today FTM check Air India WS/P ((nods))
But today (you want to) check Air India ((nods))?

Yes Air India

Yes Air India

* A2 leaves the counter to the computer and checks the flight while C1
is waiting at the counter.*

+C1 puts his left hand on the cushion of the next chair again. Then, when two new customers come to another counter where another service provider is ready to serve them, C1 looks at them. + (3.15)

*A2 turns back and restarts talking despite sitting at the computer area. (She hasn't returned to the counter.)*

Air Asia it not operate flight [direct WS/P=
Air Asia doesn't operate [direct flights=
(*A2 produces the wrong word (Air Asia), not India Air.)*

*Have to go transfer flight at Mumbai
*(You) have to transfer the flight in Mumbai
*A2 walks up next to the computer and continues talking.--->

*(We have to) transfer the flight in Mumbai
*C1 moves his left hand, places both hands on the counter and bends forwards the counter.--->

*A2 leaves the computer and sits on the chair at the counter opposite to C1.--->

*A2 puts a book on her left.--->

It is *better to fly on Thai Airways they are direct flights if compared more expensive but [they are direct flights=

*er hold on hold on=

=A2 stands up next to the computer and continues talking. --->

Mumbai
*Mumbai
*A2 leaves the computer and sits on the chair at the counter opposite to C1.--->

*dit it DM flight direct=

more expensive but [they are direct flights=

C1 *เ/uni0เ1B/uni0เ25/uni0เ35/glyph1143/uni0เ22/uni0เ19 เ/uni0เ04/uni0เ23/uni0เ37/glyph1143/uni0เ2D/uni0เ07  /uni0เ21/uni0เ38/uni0เ21/uni0เ44/uni0เ1A  
*(We have to) transfer the flight in Mumbai
*C1 moves his left hand, places both hands on the counter and bends forwards the counter.--->

C1 *เ/uni0เ1B/uni0เ25/uni0เ35/glyph1143/uni0เ22/uni0เ19 เ/uni0เ04/uni0เ23/uni0เ37/glyph1143/uni0เ2D/uni0เ07  /uni0เ21/uni0เ38/uni0เ21/uni0เ44/uni0เ1A 
*(We have to) transfer the flight in Mumbai
*C1 moves his left hand, places both hands on the counter and bends forwards the counter.--->

C1 *เ/uni0เ1B/uni0เ25/uni0เ35/glyph1143/uni0เ22/uni0เ19 เ/uni0เ04/uni0เ23/uni0เ37/glyph1143/uni0เ2D/uni0เ07  /uni0เ21/uni0เ38/uni0เ21/uni0เ44/uni0เ1A 
*(We have to) transfer the flight in Mumbai
*C1 moves his left hand, places both hands on the counter and bends forwards the counter.--->

A2 */uni0เ21/uni0เ38/uni0เ21/uni0เ44/uni0เ1A 
*Mumbai
*A2 leaves the computer and sits on the chair at the counter opposite to C1.--->

A2 */uni0เ21/uni0เ38/uni0เ21/uni0เ44/uni0เ1A 
*Mumbai
*A2 leaves the computer and sits on the chair at the counter opposite to C1.--->

A2 */uni0เ21/uni0เ38/uni0เ21/uni0เ44/uni0เ1A 
*Mumbai
*A2 leaves the computer and sits on the chair at the counter opposite to C1.--->

A2 */uni0เ21/uni0เ38/uni0เ21/uni0เ44/uni0เ1A 
*Mumbai
*A2 leaves the computer and sits on the chair at the counter opposite to C1.--->

A2 */uni0เ21/uni0เ38/uni0เ21/uni0เ44/uni0เ1A 
*Mumbai
*A2 leaves the computer and sits on the chair at the counter opposite to C1.--->

A2 */uni0เ21/uni0เ38/uni0เ21/uni0เ44/uni0เ1A 
*Mumbai
*A2 leaves the computer and sits on the chair at the counter opposite to C1.--->

A2 */uni0เ21/uni0เ38/uni0เ21/uni0เ44/uni0เ1A 
*Mumbai
*A2 leaves the computer and sits on the chair at the counter opposite to C1.--->

A2 */uni0เ21/uni0เ38/uni0เ21/uni0เ44/uni0เ1A 
*Mumbai
*A2 leaves the computer and sits on the chair at the counter opposite to C1.--->

A2 */uni0เ21/uni0เ38/uni0เ21/uni0เ44/uni0เ1A 
*Mumbai
*A2 leaves the computer and sits on the chair at the counter opposite to C1.--->

A2 */uni0เ21/uni0เ38/uni0เ21/uni0เ44/uni0เ1A 
*Mumbai
*A2 leaves the computer and sits on the chair at the counter opposite to C1.--->
=er another thing seat yet not full
=er another thing is the seat is still available

C1 =[แอร์ อินเดีย เท่าไหร่ แอร์ อินเดีย] เท่าไหร่
=Air India Q-WH Air India [ Q-WH
=How much for Air India? How much for Air India?

A2 *[แอร์ อินเดีย หรือ
*[Air India Q-YN
*[Air India isn’t it?
*[A2 takes a book and puts it on her right.--->

C1 อีกรุ่งๆ นะ
Ueh cheap cheap FCo
Ueh (I want) a very cheap (flight)

A2 ถูกๆ ใช่ยัง
Cheap *cheap Q-YN (colloquial)
A *very cheap (one) isn’t it?
*A2 glances at C1 and takes a piece of paper from a small box on her right.--->

C1 ((mumble))

A2 แล้ว เมื่อวาน ที่ เคาร ให้ ราคา ไป เท่าไหร่ คร
Then yesterday KPS she offer price DM Q-WH FPF
Then how much did she offer (you) (room) price?

C1 เขา เช็ค ราคา เป็น อีก หนึ่ง หนึ่ง ( ) สาม
She check price be more one ten thousand ( ) three
She checked the price (and) it was thirteen thousand ( )
เจ็ด ร้อย หUND บาท สาม [เดือน
seven hundred sixty baht three [month
seven hundred and sixty baht for a three-months (ticket)

A2 [กี่ หนึ่ง
[Q-WH ten thousands
[how much?

C1 หรือ หนึ่ง สาม เจ็ด ร้อย หUND
One ten thousand three seven hundred sixty
Thirteen thousand seven hundred and sixty

A2 *อูช นี้ ถูก [แล้ว นะคร
*Ouch this cheap [truly FPF
*Ouch this is truly cheap
*A2 raises the piece of paper which she wrote the ticket price to show
C1. She also looks at him with a suspicious face.--->

C1 [แล้ว มัน สาม เดือน (จึ่งยิ่งดี) แล้วว่า
[but it three month (GMD) but
[but it lasts three months (GMD) but

they not (“do...”) three month two day straight

When non-Thai speakers speak Thai, it is quite difficult to occasionally catch their pronunciation.
they don’t (do…) three-months-and-two-days-straight (tickets)

Because Airway Thai they have 3 month DM they not

(This is) because Thai Airways have three-months (tickets) they don’t

must ตัว 1 เดือน สองเดือน จะ อยู่ 1 เดือน ก็
have ticket 1-month although FTM stay 1 month DM

have one-month tickets although (you) will stay (there) for a month
t้อง ราคา นี่
have to price this
(you) also have to pay at the same price

And what about one-month (tickets)?

So FTM check *CL other for DM [FPF
So (I) will check other airlines for (you)

Have CL this FPF Biman Airlines one ten thousand
(We) have this one operated by Biman (Bangladesh) Airlines for

and six hundred cheap –est DM flight direct flight
ten thousand and six hundred (it’s) the cheapest direct flight
can on 20 be flight midnight twenty-five
(you) can fly on the 20th the flight (departs) at 12.25 a.m.
Um ( ) airplane Q-WH WS/P

UM ( ) what is an airplane?

Airlines Q-YN FTM check for FPF
(you mean) airlines aren’t they? (I) will check it for (you)

*A2 turns her chair to the computer in order to check what airline it is. Then, when receiving the answer, A2 turns her chair to the counter again.* (0.13)

Biman [Bangladesh
Biman [Bangladesh

Biman Bangladesh

[you have ever flown on (that airline)?

*Ah yes yes

*Ah yes yes

*C1 looks at the detailed air ticket that A2 handed him-->

Flight direct
Direct flight

+*C1 stops talking with A2. He puts his left hand on the cushion of the chair and puts his right hand on the counter. Then, he talks to his friend (C2), who sits at the waiting area, in a foreign language (probably his mother tongue).+

*Ah yes yes

*(you) have ever flown on (that airline)?

Take CL this FCoq cheapest because intend

OK take this one it’s the cheapest because (you) intended

to want to pay about 9,000 Q-YN (colloquial)
to pay about 9,000 didn’t you? but well there are no (tickets)
But DM 9,000 it not [have= which cost 9,000 baht (aren't there?)=]

[No there aren't]

=then add only thousand more baht
=then (you can get) a return ticket by adding only
return
a thousand baht

Then ( ) day ( ) day

[one way, isn’t it?]

[one way Q-YN]

But (you) will have to come back to Thailand, right?

Yes (we) have to come back

=if (you) buy two one-way tickets (they) are surely more expensive (than return tickets)

*A2 lifts two fingers.----->

*C1 turns round to talk to C2 in their mother tongue.*

*C1 uses the right hand to move a chair next to him out in order to invite C2 to sit there. C2 sits on that chair while C1 is hitting on the cushion as his invitation again. Then, C1 shows to C2 the detailed air ticket that A2 gave to him. Then, they discuss about it in their language. Sometimes they smile and laugh. Finally C2 starts talking to A2.*

---

19 The word ‘วัน’ in Thai means ‘day’ but the way in which it is pronounced is the same as the word ‘one’ in English.
C2 Just got one

A2 One ( ) you *won’t come back? *[A2 shakes slightly his head.---->

C2 Er[:]

A2 [You will not come back to Bangkok?]

C2 *[come back but I don’t
                      *[C2 circles his right hand while

                      speaking.---->

A2 know one week two weeks or how many days if I’m go: again India

C2 or some place: to Laos

A2 Because this ticket is valid for one month *for if you have to

C2 >

A2 come back to Thailand within one month this one is

A2 [recommended=]

C2 [yeah

A2 =*I will check with the airline how much you have to [pay

A2 =*A2 shows the ticket detail.---->

C2 for:=

C2 [yeah

A2 =changing

C2 Yeah yeah yeah

A2 Because if you buy two --->single tickets I mean one from

A2 ---A2 raises her hands a bit and nods to

intensify her saying. When talking about a single ticket, she lifts her two

fingers.]*

A2 Bangkok to Dakar and another* --->single ticket from Dakar

A2 --->A2 also moves her finger from left
to right when explaining single tickets each.*

A2 back to Bangkok (.) it’s* *expensive it’s more expensive

A2 *When saying ‘expensive’, A2 moves her hands
down on the desk and nods to confirm her saying.---->

C2 ((mumble))

C1 +C1 turns round to C2 and nods.+

A2 *Then, A2 opens a book to find some information. Then, she leaves the

C1 counter to take another book and searches for some information (a

C2 telephone number).*

(1.34)

A2 *A2 starts a new conversation by telephone.*
Good morning FPF have flight FPF FTM check er FTM
Good morning there is a flight (I) want to check ticket prices
check price ticket FPF

Route Bangkok to Dhaka FPF
Route from Bangkok to Dhaka

Er make make booking *already FPF
Er (I) have already made a booking
*A2 leaves the counter with the detail of the air ticket to the computer while talking by phone.-->

Code be Jinnie X-ray ( ) FPF
The code is Jinnie X-ray ( )

*Roger Beger
*At the same time C1 and C2 talk to each other in their language.-->

*C1 and C2 continue talking to each other in their mother tongue.-->

*Call from Western Tour FPF
*(I'm) from Western Tours
*At the same time C1 and C2 are talking by using their mother tongue. Other service providers talk to new customers.-->

+C1 and C2 stop talking in their language when two new consumers use in the office and speak very loudly. C1 and C2 look at the new customers’ talking.+ 

+A3 comes to take a book from the drawer of the counter where C1 and C2 are sitting.+ 

(1.02)

*After finishing the telephone conversation, A2 comes back to the counter.*

*Good condition (.) I told you right your ticket is valid for 45 days and if you would like to change the flight you can
change for free

Free

No charge (.) but you have to day (.) oh sorry you have to do
*two days before
*A2 lifts two fingers when saying the term “two days”.

Two days before ( ) but *how long er: have valid 40 [45
*C2 points to the paper while saying the phrase “how long” whereas putting his left hand on the cushion of his chair.

two days

elbow on the counter.

one and a half month

+C1 talks to C2 in their mother tongue. He moves his hand from right to left.

*Um this one is perfect (. ) direct flight good price good condition
*Um this one is perfect (. ) direct flight good price good condition
((smiles))
*A2 uses her left hand to hit slightly on the ticket detail put on the counter, and then makes her fingers one, two and three shapes with smiles.

+C1 talks to C2 again in their mother tongue.

+A2 laughs and smiles while C1 and C2 talk to each other in their language. She also keeps a pen in the proper condition, closes the book in front of her, and puts her two hands together in front of her chest.

+C1 and C2 continue discussing in their mother tongue. At the same time A2 keeps looking at the conversation between C1 and C2.

*OK deal ((smiles))
*A2 starts speaking while C1 and C2 are talking. Thus, they stop talking in their mother tongue.

*(((laughs)))
*C1 looks at A2.

*Can I er come later?
*C2 points his left hand towards himself several times.

*No this one you going to leave Bangkok on 28 of [May next two
*A2 waves her hands and then points to the paper.

days=
C2 speaks his mother tongue to C1 while A2 is continuing her utterance.

A2 = you have to make decision [today= 

C2 = [yeah OK OK< 

C2 turns quickly to look at A2 and nods several times.

A2 = *we need time to issue the ticket 

A2 moves the hand forwards and backwards.

C1 and C2 talk together in their mother tongue.* (0.07)

A2 = [Next door ATM machine 

A2 interrupts the conversation between C1 and C2.* 

A2 smiles and point to the door.

C1 = ( ) the same

A2 = OK? ((laughs))

C2 = ((laughs))

C1 and C2 continue discussing in their mother tongue.* (0.05)

A2 smiles, takes a book and puts it on the desk.*

So this one I book you on return 15th June would you like to 

A2 interrupts the conversation between C1 and C2 again, stands up and bends forward to point on the same paper in front of C2.

change now? So I’ll fix another day

( . ) + C2 turns to look at C1 as if C2 is asking for help.+

C1 = *Sorry sorry

C1 bends forward to look at the paper which A2 is describing to C2.>

A2 = *I book him on 15th June=

A2 still stands opposite C1 and C2 sitting on the chairs.

C1 = [yeah

A2 = on return from Dhaka to Bangkok would you like to change now to the last two day of ticket?

C1 = Oh no 15 June June *

C1 talks to C2 in their mother tongue. (0.05)

He go himself first then=

He (will) go (there) himself first then=

A2 = *ไป เปลี่ยน ที่ ( )
Go transfer at ( )  
*Transfer (the flight) at ( )  
*A2 is standing while speaking and moves her hands.--->
=แล้วค่อย เปลี่ยน
=then transfer
=then transfer (the flight)

อะ อี โอ ก โอฟ ของ ค รื่อง FPF (.) ท ะ go
*Ah OK of course FPF (.) so go
*Ah OK of course (.) so withdraw ten thousand and six hundred
*A2 sits down again when talking about the receipt.--->

ถอนเงิน หนึ่ง หมื่น หก ด วย
withdraw money one ten thousand and six hundred

(baht) (from the ATM) I will give you a receipt

FPF FTM we (=I (singular)) give receipt to

*C1 turns himself to talk to C2 in their mother tongue again.* (0.18)

*Simultaneously A2 collects an invoice book from the drawer, opens it, writes something down and then listens to the talk between C1 and C2.*

One way (.) cannot see how much
*C2 turns himself to talk to A2.*

"one way"

( .)

(+C1 little laughs.+)

Not believe *FTM have to pay expensive trip return (you) don't believe me (you) *will have to pay more for a return trip (to Thailand)

*A2 picks up the phone on the desk and makes a call.--->

( .)

เขา รู้ มา ดู แต่ว่า
He knows (he) comes to have a look but

*A2 walks to the computer screen which is located behind the counter.*

(0.15) +A2 works out with the computer behind the desk.+

+C1 and C2 start talking together in their mother tongue.+ (0.33)

*A2 comes back to the counter with calculator in her hand.*

*7 พัน 5 สามพันห้า ดุณ 2 มะ > (.)

182
*7 thousand 5 suppose that multiply 2 WS/P> (.)

*7 thousand five (hundred) supposed that (it is) multiplied by 2

7 thousand five (hundred) supposed that (it is) multiplied by 2

A2 hands a calculator to C2 for his consideration and then she takes a seat. Then, A2 presses buttons when trying to calculate the total price for two one-way tickets.--->

*มีี่ วิธี่ ที่แก่งค์ เนื่องก็ 15 OK 14 13 but you save a lot

*see the return ticket nearly 15 OK 14 13 but you save a lot

(.) (you) see the return ticket is nearly 15 OK 14 13 but you save a lot

A2 shows the calculator with the result to C2--->

( )

+C1 holds the calculator in his hand and C2 also looks at it. Then, C1 and C2 start talking in their mother tongue.

(0.18) +A2 keeps watching the talk between C1 and C2. Then, C1 returns the calculator to A2.+

A2

ไม่มี่ ให้ เมื่อมี่ ((reproaching sound)) ให้ ต้องค์

Not get at all DM ((reproaching sound)) give money

*(I) don't get (anything) at all ((reproaching sound)) give (me)

A2 speaks when seeing the number in the calculator which C1 returns to her. A2 also waves her hand to reject their request and does not look at C1 and C2 while speaking.--->

กิน ข้าว บาง ((smiles))

eat rice some ((smiles))

some money for having meals ((smiles))

C1

*(((loudly laughs))

*C1 leans backwards against the cushion of the chair with his left hand put on the cushion of the next chair. He touches the head and puts her right hand on the cushion of his chair.--->

(. )

C1

(มีี่ เพื่อน ผ่าน *[คน นึง ทำ กำไรก็=]

*have friend PFP/M *[CL one at Bangkok=]

(มีี่)((I) have a friend in Bangkok=)

*[C1 lifts a finger.--->

A2

[ยิ้่ม (nods)]

[Um (nods)]

[Um (nods)]

C1

(*จริงๆ ไม่ใช่ เพื่อน ทำก็ เจ้า คน ใน หมู่บ้าน (ซึ่ง

*actually not friend DM be person in village (buy

*"actually (he) is not a friend (he) is a person in a village (who

ราคา นี้("))

bought (it) for this price")

A2

*Thank you very much that's very kind of you

*A2 smiles and bends forwards while speaking. Her palms are in front of the chest.--->

C and C2 have a conversation in their mother tongue. * ((in a soft voice))
C1: "discount can"

"(you) can give (me) a discount"

A2: ไม่ ได้ เลย (. ) แทบไม่ ได้ ก้าว อะไรเลย ได้

Not get at all (. ) rarely get profit any get

(I) don't receive (anything) at all (. ) (I) rarely receive any profits

นิดเดียว เลย ดี เล่อ แล้ว เดี๋ยวนี้ ครั้ง ต่อไป
discount cannot even one satang ('satang' is one hundredth of one baht) ( )

(you) cannot give me any discounts even one satang ( )?

C2 stands up and puts his hand into his jean pocket to collect something.+

C1: [((little laughs and smiles))

A2: =this one

(A2) (laughs)) not have to bargain anymore

(C1) ((laughs)) (laughs) don't bargain anymore

C1: "discount cannot even one satang ('satang' is one hundredth of one baht) ( )"

C2 walks out of the office.+

C2 continues writing something in the invoice whereas C1 is sitting

and placing his left hand on the cushion of the next chair and his right
hand on the cushion of his chair. + (0.25)

247  C1  ใช้มี ใช้มี ( ) วันที่ 20 ใช้ นั่นก็ กลับ มา:: วัน สุดท้าย
247  This (colloquial) this (colloquial) ( ) on 20th travel
247  Does this travel on 20th?
248  ใช่ไหม
248  Q-YN

249  A2  หน
249  Uh
249  Uh?

250  C1  วันที่ 20 ใช้ ไป นั่นก็ กลับ มา:: วัน สุดท้าย
250  On 20th travel
250  The travel (date) is on 20th

251  A2  วันที่ 20 ใช้ ไป นั่นก็ กลับ มา:: วัน สุดท้าย
251  On 20th travel
251  The travel (date) is on 20th

252  C1  แล้วก็ กลับ มา:: วัน สุดท้าย
252  Then back come:: day last
252  Then (he will) come back:: on the last day

253  A2  เปลี่ยน เป็น วัน สุดท้าย เลย นะ
253  Change to day last DM WS/P
253  Change to the last day?

254  C1  เอ้ๆ วัน สุดท้าย วันที่:: 25
254  Yes yes day last on:: 25th
254  Yes yes the last day is on 25th OK?
255  วัน สุดท้าย เลย
255  day last FI/A

256  A2  *แล้ว ค่ะ ค่อย เปลี่ยน ไป [เร็วขึ้น นะ
256  *Then he FTM change to [earlier WS/P
256  *Then he will change to (the) [earlier (flight)
256  *A2 writes something on the same book.--->

257  C1  เค้า เค้า 2 อาทิตย์ สุดท้าย ก็ได้
257  he he 2 week last fine
257  The is ok with the last two weeks
258  เค้า เค้า เปลี่ยน เลย ก็ได้ เนอะ
258  FTM he change himself possible FI/A
258  he will be able to change (the flight) himself, won’t he?

259  A2  *ได้ คะ ติดต่อ ด่วนนน ที่ไหนเลย
259  *yes FPF contact demand over there
259  *Yes (he can) contact the demand over there
259  *A2 continues writing something on the same book (she doesn’t look at
259  C1 at all) and nods. When talking about the demand, she raises her
259  finger.--->

260  C1  เค้า ได้
260  yes OK
260  Yes OK
261 *C1 uses his finger to knock beneath his chair.* (0.03)
262 +A2 tears a piece of paper and puts the book in the box on her right.+
263 +At the same time C2 comes back to the office and starts a
264 +conversation with C1 in their mother tongue.+
265 +At the same time A2 stands up, leaves the desk with all the
266 +documents and go to the computer behind the counter.+
267 *Once C2 almost leaves the office again, C1 stops him and hits on the
desk as a sign to invite C2 to sit down. Then, C2 sits down and starts
268 talking again in his mother tongue* (0.10)
269
270 C1 ที่ ครับ
271 KPS  FPM (equivalent to attention-calling)
272 Miss
273 *She stops working with the computer screen and looks at C1 for a
274 second. Then, she continues doing something on the computer screen.*
275 (0.03)
276
277 *A2 leaves the computer and goes back to the counter. She stands in
278 front of C1 and bends forwards a bit while listening to him.*
279 C1 เดี่ยว มา
280 FTM  be back
281 (I) will be back
282 A2 เดี่ยว มา ใช้ไหม ไม่ เดี่ยว *โอยด์ บัดดิ้ง ไว้ 2
283 FTM be back Q-YN OK FTM  *hold booking for 2
284 Will (you) be back? OK (I) will *hold the booking for 2 hours=
285 *A2 stands at the counter opposite
286 C1 while speaking. She points at the computer and lifts her two
287 fingers.--->>>
288 [ชั่วโมง นะครับ=
289 [hour  FPF=
290 C1 [ใส่ ใส่ ใส่
291 [OK OK OK
292 [OK OK OK
293
294 A2 =*เพราะ เรา ต้อง ใช้ เวลา ใน การออกตัว และ
295 =*because we have to spend time in ticketing and
296 =*because we have to spend time on ticketing and
297 =*A2 waves her hands while saying.--->>> 298
299 *มา บอก ว่า เล่า หรือ ไม่ เล่า
300 *come tell that want or not want
301 *come to tell (me) whether (you) want (it)
302 *A2 waves her hands while speaking.--->>> 297
303 C1 *( . )
304 *C1 nods.--->
305
306 A2 *ถ้า แพง กว่า ห้าสิบล้าน ร้อย หนึ่งร้อย
307 *If expensive more a bit hundred one hundred
277 *If (it) is a bit more expensive by a hundred please
277 *A2 stands while speaking.--->
278 ซื้อ ที่นี่ และแคร.use [good service=
278 buy here [good service=
278 buy (it) from here [good service=

279 C1 ไวด้ ให้ ได้ อีกครับ
279 [OK OK OK FPM
279 [OK OK OK

280 A2 =นะ
280 =WS/P (equivalent to a question marker)
280 =OK?

281 C1 *("เดี๋ยว มา")
281 *("will be back")
281 *("I will be back")
281 *(C1 stands up and leaves the office.*

282 +C2 also stands up and leaves the company.+ 

283 +A2 returns to the computer again.+

---

20 The term “แคร.” is word expressing the speaker’s request; here it is rather equivalent to ‘please’.
Appendix 7.2: [1:6] Checking a flight to Sweden (W1806) Western Tours Hua Hin

Length: 4.17 minutes

A1 = female agent 1
A2 = female agent 2
A3 = female agent 3
C1 = female Thai customer 1
C2 = female Thai customer 2

1  Since the camcorders are removed to another position which provides a better view, this conversation was recorded when both C1 and C2 sit opposite to A1. There are no details of when C1 and C2 walk into the office.

2  Two young Thai females (C1 and C2) start talking before sitting down on the chair.

3  A1 */uni0เ44/uni0เ14 /uni0เ49 /uni0เ08/uni0เ4A/uni0เ30 /uni0เ44/uni0เ1B /uni0เ44/uni0เ2B/uni0เ19 /uni0เ08/uni0เ4A/uni0เ30*OK  FI/P  go where  FI/P
3  *OK where (are you) going?
3  *A1 folds a book and puts it on her right. Then she takes a pile of reused paper to prepare to write down what C1 and C2 are going to say.--->

4  C1 /uni0เ2A/uni0เ27/uni0เ35เ/uni0เ14/uni0เ19 /uni0เ2B/uni0เ19/uni0เ49/uni0เ32 /uni0เ1B/uni0เ23/uni0เ30/uni0เ21/uni0เ32/uni0เ13 /uni0เ27/uni0เ31/uni0เ19/uni0เ17/uni0เ35/glyph1143 10) *(สวีเดน)
4  (Sweden)
4  (Sweden)

5  A1 /uni0เ27/uni0เ31/uni0เ19/uni0เ17/uni0เ35/glyph1143 10 /uni0เ27/uni0เ35/uni0เ0B/uni0เ48/uni0เ32 ... /uni0เ41/uni0เ25 /uni0เ49 /uni0เ27 /uni0เ43/uni0เ0A/uni0เ48/uni0เ44/uni0เ2B/uni0เ21 /uni0เ04/uni0เ30*On 10th visa ready already Q-YN FPF
5  *On 10th your visa is ready, isn’t it?
5  *A1 writes down what A1 said in line 4.--->

6  C1 /uni0เ22/uni0เ31/uni0เ07 *(เดือน หน้า ประมาณ วันที่ 10)
6  *(month next approximately on 10th)
6  *(approximately on 10th of next month)
6  *(C1 takes the table calendar to consider the travel date.--->

7  +A2 uses her left hand to open the calendar while C1 is speaking in line 4.+

8  A1 /uni0เ22/uni0เ31/uni0เ07 *วันที่ 10 วีซ่า เรียบร้อย แล้ว ใช้ไหม คะ
8  *On 10th visa ready already Q-YN FPF
8  *On 10th your visa is ready, isn’t it?
8  *A1 writes down what A1 said in line 4.--->

9  C1 /uni0เ22/uni0เ31/uni0เ07 ยัง
9 Not yet
9 Not yet
10 A1 ต้อง [ไปขอ วีซ่า
10 Have to [apply for visa
10 (you) have to apply for a visa
11 C2 [ใช่ ใช่ [ใช่
11 [yes yes [yes
11 [yes yes yes
12 A1 *[สอง คน หรือ
12 *[Two person Q-YN
12 *[Two of you, aren’t you?
12 *[A1 turns up her face and lifts her two fingers.--->
13 C1 *คน เดียว
13 *Person one
13 *One person
13 *C1 lifts a finger.--->
14 A1 คน เดียว แล้ว ไป อยู่ นาน ไหม คะ (. 3 [เดือน,
14 Person one and go stay long time Q-YN FPF (. 3 [month,
14 One person and (will you) stay (there) for a long time (. 3 [months?,
15 C1 [3 เดือน
15 [3 month
15 [3 months
16 (.)
17 A2 การบินไทย เนอะ?
17 Airway Thai FI/A?
17 Thai Airways OK?
18 C2 ค่ะ
18 FPF (=yes)
18 Yes
19 A1 กรุงเทพ สต็อกฮัน (.) เอาจริงๆ การ ขอ วีซ่า
19 Bangkok Stockholm (. ) er: if go apply for visa
19 (From) Bangkok (to) Stockholm (. ) er: if (you) apply for a visa
20 เมื่อ จะ ต้อง ใช้ ตั๋ว เครื่องบิน กับ ประกัน
20 DM/C FTM have to use ticket airplane and insurance
20 (you) will also have to use an air ticket and travel insurance
21 การเดินทาง ด้วย จะใช้
21 travel also FPF
22 C1 [ค่ะ
22 [FPF (=yes)
22 [Yes
23 C2 [ค่ะ] (พูดพร้อมกับ line 13)
23 [FPF] (=yes) (said as the same time as line 13)
23 [Yes] (said as the same time as line 13)
24 A1 *แล้วกับ ที่นี้ สามารถ ซื้อ ตั๋ว แล้วกับ ประกัน การเดินทาง
And here can buy ticket and travel insurance

And here (you) can buy a ticket and travel insurance

A1 lifts each finger when talking about the ticket and insurance, and then points down on the desk when talking about Western Tours Hua Hin.-->

at the same time can

And it have what friend suggest that

And do (you) have what (my) friends suggested that

(word used to indicate suggestions and orders) buy front

(I) bought a front ticket first? (I) means we aren't sure whether

ticket first mean we not sure that visa they FTM

the request for a visa will be approved

ask for (the) money

approve Q-YN

A1 ไม่เป็นไร ก็ จ่าย แม้จะไว้ 5,000

F/P (= yes) never mind DM pay deposit 5,000

Yes never mind (you have to) pay 5,000 for a deposit

*แต่ ท่านก็ไม่ผ่าน พยายามแก้ไข แต่ 500 บาท

*but if visa not approve KPS deduct only 500 baht

*but if your request for a visa is not approved I (KPS) (will) deduct only

*A1 raises her left hand in front of her chest when saying '500 baht'.--->

>>

[ naï ]

[ WS/P ]

500 baht=

[ åö ]

[ Ah ]

[ Ah ]

A1 =แต่ก็ คืน 4,500 (.) ส่วน ประกัน เงื่อน เฉพาะ: ไป

=and return 4,500 (.) about insurance DM/C er: go.

=and (we will) return 4,500 (.) (to you) and about the insurance

อยู่ 3 *เดือน ประกัน มัน จะ อยู่ ที่ 2,430 ตัว เชนจะ

stay 3 *month insurance it FTM be at 2,430 one DM/C

er: (you will) stay for 3 months the insurance will be 2,430

*A1 writes the numbers to describe what she is saying.--->

t้อง จ่าย ทั้งหมด เพราะว่า ที่ ต้อง [ ขอประกัน

have to pay all because KPS have to [make insurance

(you) have to pay all for this one because I (KPS) have to

ไปเลย=

now=

make insurance (for you) now=

[ต่อ ได้]

[FPF (=yes) OK

[Yes OK (I)]

อันนี้ เข้าใจ]

this understand]

understand this]
A1 =แต่ถ้ารีบไม่ผ่านก็ให้ไร้10%จากยอด
=but if visa not approved DM deduct 10% of amount
นี้ก็ประมาณ200บาทบาทแล้วเพิ่มเติม
this DM approximately 200 more than baht and remainder
amount it is approximately more than 200 baht and the
คืนเงิน[เน็ตถ่าน]
DM return money [as well]
remainder will be refunded (to you) as well

C2 [อย่าโกรธ
[Ah OK
[Ah OK

A1 ที่นี่จะเอาหนังสือไปยื่นเมื่อไหร่
Well FTM take document to submit when
Well when will (you) take (your) documents to apply (for a visa)?

C2 คือ[ตอนนี้=
Mean [now=
(I) mean [now=

A1 [ถ้าตอนนี้ทำให้ได้เลย
[if [now do for can immediately
[If (it is) now (I) can do for (you) immediately

C2 [=ตอนนี้สถานที่(.)
[=now embassy(.)
[=now the embassy(.)

A1 [*สิ้น((smiles))
[*close((smiles))
[*is closed((smiles))

C1 แอดี้
Ah yes
Ah yes

C2 *ใช่
*Yes
*Yes
*Yes
*C2 touches and holds her neck.--->

C1 หน้ากี่เลย[ไม่แนใจ
CCP DM so [not sure
So I (CCP)’m [not sure

C2 [ไม่แน่ใจ
[not sure
[(I’m) not sure

A1 ไม่เป็นไรถ้าไอ้ก่อนวางแผนหน้าได้เลยเพราะว่า*มีอนุญาต
Never mind DM do in advance can because *June
Never mind (you) can do (it) in advance because in *June

*A1 uses her right finger to tap her left one lightly.--->
July August seats are rather fully booked if (you are) not hurry

travel cannot as plan postpone day travel can travel as (you) have made a plan (you) can postpone the
do not have expense FPF
ticket there is no extra charge

postpone the travel date

OK FPF

Ah can Q-YN FPF
Ah can (we do)?

*Yes FPF ((nods))

Not have to pay money more not have to anything at all
(you) don’t have to pay the extra charge (you) don’t have to (do) anything at all?

Not have to pay money more FPF *(you) don’t have to pay the extra charge
A1 shakes her head.-->

Ah the [day when
Ah the [day when

[But if (you) have never travelled before
A1 waves her hand from left to right.-->

[never go Q-YN (.) so FTM KPS check price for FPF
[(you have) never been (there), haven’t you? So I (KPS) will check the price for (you)

At present DM/C have seat available WS/P but not many seats
A1 starts talking while she is standing and then sitting down on the chair opposite to C1 and C2.-->

*A1 leaves the desk to the computer and searches for ticket details.*

(0.46)

*A1 returns to the counter with a pile of paper in her hands.*

*At present there are available seats (WS/P) but not many seats
A1 starts talking while she is standing and then sitting down on the chair opposite to C1 and C2.-->

No...
left not many already FCoq if suppose that KPJ FTM

left if you (KPJ) will *pay for a deposit (and) will take the

*When talking about the payment, A1 takes a piece of paper to write
down a detailed amount of money to be paid and others.--->

*C2
[(when?)

*pay deposit FTM take document [to apply visa DM/C
documents to apply for a visa

*pay     deposit   FTM  take    document  [to   apply  visa  DM/C
documents to apply for a visa

*When talking about the payment, A1 takes a piece of paper to write
down a detailed amount of money to be paid and others.--->

*C2

\[FPF (\text{the word used to indicate the listener's attention towards the}
speaker's utterance})

\[yes\]

*C1

\[about\]

\[about\]

+A1 write down what she is speaking.--->>*A1 stops writing when
saying, 'you don't have to pay anything more', turns up her face and
waves her left hand.--->>

anything more--->>*include  tax   airport   include  all everything

to pay anything more--->>(*this) includes an airport tax (and)

*A1 writes down again when talking about the
travel insurance.--->

but KPJ FTM have to prepare that KPS tell FPF insurance

everything but you (KPJ) will have to prepare what I (KPS) suggested
travel (. ) insurance (. ) buy sort of (. ) 3 month (. ) travel (. ) insurance (. ) which (. ) should be (. ) 3-month insurance (. ) the price is 2,430 baht

travel insurance (. ) which (. ) should be 3-month insurance

the price is 2,430 baht

travel (i.e.) travel insurance (. ) which (. ) should be 3-month insurance

the price is 2,430 baht

completely (. ) price be at 2,430 baht

100 +C1 turns to speak to C2, who puts her chin on her left palm. +

101 +A1 turns up her face and listens to C1. +

102 C1 ( ) (เหมือน ก็เหมือนว่า กลับ ต่อสั้นเท่า)=

102 ( ) (sort of sort of return August=)

102 ( ) (sort of (they will) return in August)=

103 C2 (กี่)

103 (sort)

103 (sort)

104 C1 (=แต่ก็ ไม่ แทบ)

104 (=but not sure)

104 (=but (I'm) not sure)

105 A1 เรา ระบุ วัน กลับ ได้ เพราะว่า ต่าง เยี่ย 3 เดือน

105 We specify date return can because ticket DM/C 3 month

105 We can specify the return date because the 3-month ticket=

106 [เมื่อ]=

106 [DM/C=]

107 C1 [เรา ระบุ]

107 [we specify]

107 [we specify]

108 A1 =เวร สามารถ จองไว้=

108 =we can book=

108 =we can book=

109 C1 วัน ไหน ก็ได้

109 day which any

109 any day

110 A1 =ภายใน 3 เดือน จะ กลับ กลับ ก็ได้

110 =within 3 month FTM return before can

110 =by 3 months (you) will have been able to return before (the last day)

111 C1 *อย่าง คือ เรา เลือก ก็ดี ตลอด

111 *Ah mean we postpone [can thoroughly

111 *Ah (you) mean we can postpone thoroughly

111 *C1 nods.--->

112 A1 *[ดีว่า เลือก ได้ ไม่ มี

112 *[ticket postpone can no have

112 *[the ticket can be postponed it is free

112 *[A1 slightly waves her hand while speaking.-

113 --->

113 [ค่าใช้จ่าย=}

113 [fee=}
of charge for changing the travel date

C1 [ก็คือ
[mean
[(you) mean

A1 =ถ้า มี ที่นั่ง วาง เลื่อน ได้ เลย
 =if have seat available postpone can immediately
 =if there are available seats (you) can postpone (the ticket) immediately

C1 เอง (nods))
Er (nods))

A1 *ถ้า น้อง อยู่ ที่ไหน นะ ส่ง อีเมล มาให้ ที่
*Although KPJ stay over there WS/P send email to KPS
*Although you (KPJ) stay over there, (you) can send me (KPS) an
*A1 slightly waves her finger alternatively from left to right.--->
ก็ให้ หรือ โทรมา ที่ได้ ที่ กี่ เล่ม ให้ ใน [ระบบ
can or phone can KPS FTM change for in [system
e-mail or phone (me) I (KPS) will change it for (you) in the system

C1 [เถอะ
Er [er
Er [er

A1 แล้ว ก็ ส่ง อีเมล ไป แล้ว เรา ก็ ไป เข้าถึง ตามปกติ
And DM send email to and we DM FTM check in as usual
And (we’ll) send an email and we will check in as usual

C1 เอง
Er

C2 *(word used to ask for something) number KPS
*(can I) have your (KPS) number?
*C2 points to the piece of paper in front of A1 to indicate where A1 can
write her contact number.--->

A1 ได้ ค่ะ
Yes FPF
Yes

A1 *A1 writes it down on that piece of paper as C2 said.*

(0.03)

A1 *แล้ว จะ ขอ วีซ่า ยัง ไม่ แม้ก็ ไม่ไหว
*And FTM apply visa yet not sure Q-YN
*And (you) will apply for a visa (you are) not sure, aren’t you?
*A1 continues writing on the same piece of paper while speaking.--->

C1 *คือ ตอนนี้ อะครับ
*Mean now FPF
*(I) mean now
*C1 scratches her chin.--->

127

128 C2

[( )°/uni0เ15/uni0เ2D/uni0เ19/uni0เ19/uni0เ35/glyph1144  /uni0เ2A/uni0เ16/uni0เ32/uni0เ19/uni0เ17/uni0เ39/uni0เ15    /uni0เ1B/uni0เ34/uni0เ14°

[(  )°now    embassy   close°

128

129 A1

*อย่างที่ พี่บอก นะ ว่า ให้ ล็อก ที่นั่ง ไว้ก่อน

*As KPS told (you) (WS/P) that should lock seat in advance

*As I (KPS) told (you) (WS/P) that booking a seat in advance had better

*A1 hands the same piece of paper to C2, and C2 receives it while A1 is

saying this utterance.--->

130 ขณะ จะ [ดี= FPFFFTM [good= be done=

130

131 C2

[แล้ว ต้อง ถาม แฟน

[and have to ask boyfriend

(and (I) have to ask (my) boyfriend

131

132 A1

=[เต็มว่ายังเกิดไป ขอ รีช้า=

=[will if apply visa=

=[if (you) apply for a visa=

132

133 C2

[ถาม แฟน ดูก่อน

[ask boyfriend first

[(I have to) ask (my) boyfriend first

133

134 A1

=ถ้าเกิด ถ้าเกิด ไม่มี ที่นั่ง วาง มัน ก็ ต้อง

=if if not have seat available it DM have to

=if there is no seat available (you) will have to postpone the

เลื่อน วัน เดินทาง ออกไปไม่ถูก

postpone date travel far away

travel date

134

135 C2

*อย่างน้อย (.) เรา ยิน รีช้า เรา กี่ ต้อง ยิน ยิน

*At least (.) we submit visa we also have to submit submit

*At least (.) (if) we apply for a visa we also have to submit a

*C2 bends forwards against the chair and holds the piece of paper

ต่ำ อยู่แล้ว

ticket surely

ticket surely

135

136 A1

*ยิน ต่ำ ต่ำ เวลาไป ขอ รีช้า

*Submit ticket FPF when apply visa

*(you have to) submit the ticket

*At least (.) we apply for a visa we also have to submit a

*c2 bends forwards against the chair and holds the piece of paper

ต่ำ อยู่แล้ว

have to take ticket

when applying for a visa (you)

เอา ใน [ประกัน การเดินทาง=

take document [insurance travel=

have to submit the ticket (and) the travel insurance

136

137 C1

[ประกัน

[insurance

[insurance
A1 =ไป พร้อมกัน
=go at the same time
=at the same time

C1 เออ
Er

A1 *แล้ว เค้า จะ ต้อง เข้า ด้วย ว่า วัน เดินทาง กับ
*And they FTM have to check also that date travel and
*And they will also have to check whether the travel date and
*A1 slightly moves her finger from left to right on the desk when talking
about the travel insurance and the travel date. --->
วันที่ ออก ประกัน ตรง ตรงกัน ไหม เวลา กลับ กลับ
date issue insurance match match Q-YN time return return
the issued date of insurance are the same (and) whether the return
date matches (with the return date in the insurance)

+C1 and C2 nod while listening to A1.+

C2 ต่ะ
FPF (=yes)
Yes

C1 ((nods))

A1 ถึงลง ถาม แฟน ก่อน ยังไง
Try out (why don't you ....?) ask boyfriend first however
Why don't you ask (your) boyfriend first? However (you) will be
พรุ่งนี้ ลองมา จง [ที่ไร=]
tomorrow try out book [can=]
able to book (it) tomorrow

C1 [คะ เดี๋ย
[FPF (=yes) FTM
[yes (I) will

A1 =เอา พาสปอร์ต มา
=take passport come
=take (your) passport here

C1 เอา พาสปอร์ต มา
take passport come
take (your) passport here

A1 พาสปอร์ต มา แล้วก็ บัตร ประชาชน เอามา ก็ได้ มา ทำ
Passport come and card identification take can to make
(your) passport and (you) can also take (your) ID card to make
ประกัน ด้วย
insurance also
insurance

C1 อ่า คะ ((nods))
Ah FPF (=yes) ((nods))
Ah yes ((nods))
A1 lifts her five fingers.--->

If (you) come (here) tomorrow (you) will have to pay 5,000 baht for a ticket deposit and 2,430 baht for travel insurance.

+C2 hands the same piece of paper to A1. Then, A1 writes down the amount of money that C1 and C2 have to pay for the ticket deposit and travel insurance.+

A1 hands the same piece of paper back to C2.*

A1 lifts her two palms together in front of her neck while speaking with a smile, ‘thank you’, together with slightly bending forward her head.--->

A1 puts her two palms together in front of her neck while speaking with a smile, ‘thank you’, together with slightly bending her head.--->

C1 and C2 leave the office whereas A1 writes down something in her notebook.*
Appendix 7.3: [1:13] Vientiane trip (W1813) Western Tours Hua Hin

Length: 15.40 minutes

A1 = female agent 1

A2 = female agent 2

C1 = male non-Thai customer 1

C2 = female Thai customer 2

1   +When C1 and C2 open the door of the office, A1 greets them.+  
2   A1 สวัสดีคะ Good morning FPF  
3       Good morning  
4   +A1 walks from the inside of the office to the front desk.+  
5   C1 *สวัสดีค่ะ*  *good morning FPM*  
6       *good morning*  
7       *C1 walks to the front desk.*  
8   A1 *yes*  
9       *yes*  
10  *A1 spreads out the right hand as an invitation signal to have C1 sit opposite her.----->  
11  +C2 walks to the waiting area. Then, she sits on the waiting chair.+  
12  +C1 sits on the chair opposite A1.+  
13  C1 (* --->your colleague* )  
14       --->C1 points to the air.*  
15  A1 Ah: moment please  
16  C1 Busy right?  
17  *A1 leaves the front desk and stops at the computer. She starts talking with her colleague, A2.*  
18  A1 (*เรื่อง ตั๋ว*)  
19       (*about tick*ets*)  
20  A2 "อ่า เค้า จะ ซื้อ ตั๋ว ใหม่ ไป ทำ วีซ่า ไป เลย ไป ( )"  
21       "Ah NTP FTM buy ticket new go do visa go er go ( )"  
22       "Ah he (NTP) wants a ticket for a visa extension to go to ( )"  
23  A1 returns to the front desk and starts the conversation while
She said you want to *go to* Cambodia
*A1 sits on the chair opposite C1.*--->

Er [I I

[make your visa?]

I think to (.)

*C1 turns right and looks at C2. Then, C1 touches the cushion of the chair next to his chair, and nods to C2 as a signal for her.*

we need to go to: to Laos

*Yes Vientiane or Luang [Prabang
*A1 writes something while speaking.*--->

*[Vientiane Vientiane
*[C1 puts his left elbow on the front desk and his fingers on his head.*--->

*Vientiane
*A1 writes something while speaking.*--->

*You have tickets for that?
*C1 puts his left elbow on the front desk and his fingers on his head.*--->

*Yes ((nods))
*A1 stops writing.*--->

*By by by plane [by bus
*C1 puts his left elbow on the front desk and his fingers on his head.*--->

*By plane
*C1 puts his left elbow on the front desk and his fingers on his head.*--->

*By plane

*From Bangkok
*C1 puts his left elbow on the front desk and his fingers on his head.*--->

Because right now the ticket is only 8000 baht per person return ticket

*("excellent")
*(C1 puts his left elbow on the front desk and his fingers on his head.*)--->

201
8000 going back by Laos Airlines

*(nods)* Is it expensive?
*C1 puts his left elbow on the front desk and his fingers on his head.*

*um:*

Cheaper ที่ถูกกว่า ที่ถูกกว่า Kuala Lumpur cheaper
Cheaper one ที่ถูกกว่า ที่ถูกกว่า Kuala Lumpur cheaper
Cheaper that one ที่ถูกกว่า ที่ถูกกว่า Kuala Lumpur cheaper
*C1 puts his left elbow on the front desk and his fingers on his head.*

Yeah *(nods)*

Anyway
*C1 puts his left elbow on the front desk and his fingers on his head.*

Kuala Lumpur cheaper why don’t you go to Kuala Lumpur? (..) Kuala Lumpur is about 7000 baht

*uhhuh*
*C1 puts his left elbow on the front desk and his fingers on his head.*

By bus we don’t do by bus normally it starts from Bangkok

*From this station "Mor Chit"
*C1 points to the air and waves a few times.*

*yeah*

Go to Nongkhlay

*yeah*

---Do you know *if you can Thai people if you don’t have passport you can go?* An inside outside Thailand or go to Laos and come back or not

No

No?
We need the passport (nods)

You need passport

She needs the passport (nods)

"Uh you can't (shakes the head) go out"

"we can't"

But but she can do only 2 or 3 days to get the passport (.) go to the office in Bangkok

In Bangkok

((nods)) and then [visit back=

[((mumble))

=to Hua Hin 2 or 3 days (nods))

Um: it's not a good moment now to go to Bangkok? ((little laughs and smiles))

Huh huh (shakes the head) (.) not in in town outside (nods)

Outside yeah?

Um ((nods)) do you know Pinklao

No

The::: bus the southern bus station (.) near the southern [bus station

[it's southern

bus

=it's southern [bus] station it's not far

["ah"]

.]

*Can you write for me?
*C1 makes fingers writing something--->
*Yes ((smile voice)) I can write in Thai and you can show=
*A1 takes a piece of paper from the box on the left hand side.---->

Yes

= the taxi

(0.03)
*A1 writes something down on the piece of paper.*

*A1 continues writing while speaking.---->  

A1 *So she has to show: her ID card at the office=  
*A1 continues writing while speaking.---->

C1 Uhhuh

A1 =and pay about 1,100 baht

C1 Right

A1 ((nods)) for make a passport

C1 huh and have to waiting?

A1 ((nods)) 33 days

C1 33

A1 give them the address in Hua Hin and they will send [to

C1 [Ah they can send

A1 Yes ((smile voice and nods)) you have to wait

C1 No no ((shakes the head))

A1 Ah

+A1 continues writing on the piece of paper.+  

(0.10)

+A1 gives the piece of paper to C1 after finishing writing.+  

(0.07)

C1 Thank you very much

A1 You’re welcome

+C1 receives the piece of paper and considers it carefully.+  

(0.07)

C1 So er::: uhhuh

A1 °huh°

(0.04)

C1 **Er::: you know what happening with these flights? Phnom Penh Kuala

*C1 puts the thumb and the index finger to touch the lips.---->

110

111 A1 Kuala Lumpur cheapest ((nods))

112 (.)

204
*Cheapest Kuala Lumpur

*C1 puts the thumb and the index finger to touch the lips.--->

A1 As I told you 7000 baht ((nods))

(0.07)

C1 But er: I would like to stay er one night

A1 Uhhuh ((nods))

C1 So: I fly er:: I don't know what er: early in the morning?

A1 Yes ((nods))

C1 *So only one hour one hour er one hour er:::
*C1 continues putting the thumb and the index finger to touch the lips.--->

A1 And they have flight four times per day

C1 Four times a day

A1 But the cheapest time ---»only one time* by Lufthansa Lufthansa they

---»A1 lifts a finger.*

have flight to Kuala Lumpur cheapest one do you want to check the time?

C1 Lufthansa cheapest [one?

A1 [cheapest one ((nods)) (.) [Thai Airways has a

[Airway Air Asia er

A1 No Air Asia the cheapest one we don't ((shakes the head)) sell its tickets here

C1 Ah ((nods))

A1 Air Asia you have to book from Internet

C1 Huh huh huh ((nods)) [we can do it

A1 Give them the credit card

C1 Um um um OK er:: yeah just look for the:: cheapest as cheap as possible because we think we er::: possible early early=

A1 Um: ((nods))

C1 =in the morning I can get mine and then er go to the embassy

A1 Um

C1 and::: I think I have to stay "here" (0.05) h because:: *(. ) I'm not sure

*C1 turns right to
look at the calendar.--->

they will give my passport *er: ° the day after [er:=

[When would you like to
go?]

I have to leave before 6th and the 6th's er:: *Sunday is it like that? So
and looks at the information on the calendar.--->

[er:=
Tues: (.)

*Tuesday
*A1 points to a date on the calendar.--->

*Yes I think first °one two three four five° yes first of June
*C1 continues holding the page of the calendar and looks at the dates
on the calendar while speaking.--->

Two nights? In Kuala Lumpur

*And I think two nights because I think I will °get my passport on
*C1 continues holding the page of the calendar and looks at the dates
on the calendar while speaking.--->

Thursday°

Um

*On Friday
*C1 continues holding the page of the calendar and looks at the dates
on the calendar while speaking.--->

*So three nights?
*A1 looks at the calendar.--->

No two nights [er sorry yes=

[Two nights you leave from

*=(mumble)) yes Thursday °I will get my passport and back° two
*C1 points at some places on the calendar while speaking.--->

nights and back on on Thursday evening

+A1 leaves the front desk and goes to the computer behind the front
desk.+

(3.16)

+A1 walks back to the front desk with a piece of paper on the hands.+

*by Lufthansa it’s possible on 31st of May on the first of June is no flight
*A1 shows the information on the piece of paper to C1.--->

Uhhuh

[31st of May=

[31st of May]
=the flight leaves afternoon 3.15 in the afternoon and you’ll arrive in Kuala Lumpur (.) 7000 baht

OK let me think about it I will come back tomorrow I didn’t bring the passport with me

OK bring it tomorrow

*Thank you very much see you tomorrow
*C1 stands up while speaking.--->

*You’re welcome
*A1 smiles.--->

+C1 leaves the company.+
Appendix 7.4: [1:15] Buying a ticket to Copenhagen (W1815) Western Tours Hua Hin

Length: 22.15 minutes

A1 = female agent 1

A2 = female agent 2

C1 = male non-Thai customer 1

C2 = female Thai customer 2

1  *A1 sees customers walking to the door, then stops her work returning to the desk. She also takes a notebook for note-taking. A Thai woman (C2) comes into the office.--->

2  A1  สิ้นสุด  คะ
2  Hello  FPF
2  Hello

3  +But C2 walks to the other counter where A1 is not standing.+

4  A1  *เชิญ  คะ  ที่
4  *Please  FPF  KPS
4  *(This way) please
4  *A1 stands while speaking--->

5  +C2 walks to the other counter where A1 is standing. Then, another female customer (C3) follows C2. A1 turns to talk to C3.+

6  A1  สิ้นสุด  คะ  รอ  ลักคู่  นะคะ
6  Hello  FPF  wait a moment  FPF
6  Hello wait a moment

7  +C3 walks to the waiting chair. A1 restarts talking to the first woman.+

8  A1  เชิญ นั่ง เลย คะ
8  Please  have a seat  DM  FPF
8  Please have a seat

9  +C2 comes to sit in front of A1. A1 runs her fingers through her hair.+

10 A1  มา ทำ อะไร คะ
10  Come  do  Q-WH  FPF
10  What are you doing here? (=‘How can I help?’)

11 C2  *---((mumble))--->

12  +At the same time a non-native Thai man (C1) comes into the office.+

13  *C2 and A1 stop their activity looking at C1.*
C1 *Hello FPM
*C1 sits on the chair beside C2.--->

(0.01)

>>--I have a ticket

>>--C1 receives a paper which C2 takes out of the envelope.

A1 Yes ((nods))

C1 Back to Sweden

A1 Yes ((nods))

C1 And a:

*C1 gives a ticket to A1 and A1 takes it and looks at it.*

C1 It's it's Swedish

(. )

A1 Bangkok to Paris and Paris to Copenhagen

C1 [It’s,

A1 [on 18th of June]

C1 Yes

A1 ((nods))

C1 I I I Can you (make a) the same ticket?

A1 same flight? ((nods))

C1 Yes

A1 And how long do you want to stay there?

C1 3 months

A1 a moment please ((nods))

*A1 leaves her desk and goes to the computer to check the flight.*

Scr. *A1 checks the flight using the Amadeus program.--->

*C1*[微笑] ครับ
*Hello FPM*

*Hello*

*C1 puts his two palms in front of his face ---*>

*Both C1 and C2 are looking around the office and at another customer dealing with her task.*

(1.28)

** C1 ( ) working a long time with (Alice)?

(0.02)

C2 ( ) by the same time last year

C1 But er...*the year with ticket

*C1 takes his hands off his face and points to C2. ---*>

+A1 prints out the details of the flight. She turns to listen to the talk between C1 and C2.+

C1 and *er::: long time long time long time I don't know

*C1 moves his two hands a bit and shakes his head a little.--*>

C2 >>---Everything

>>---C2 shakes her head.

C1 Yes yes

C2 Yes

+When printing is finished, A1 walks to take the paper and returns to the desk where C1 and C2 are. C1 and C2 stop talking. A1 puts the printed paper on the desk and writes down the ticket price.+

+A1 gives the printed paper to C1 and C2.+

A1 This is a price

+C1 takes and considers it.

A1 *Same flight 18 of June---*> (. ) leaves from Bangkok

A1 *C1 takes another paper and uses a pen to point to it. ---*>

C1 [yes]

A1 =22.45

C1 [yes]

A1 =Arriving in Paris 6 o'clock

C1 [yes]

A1 =Connecting flight leaves from Paris 15.25

C1 =No, no, no, no
*A1 stops explaining, lifts her eyes from the paper and looks at C1.*

A1 Long time ((nods))

C1 Yes, yes, yes

C2 *9 hour over there KPS run not on time WS/P KPS*  
*I (KPS) couldn’t run to the terminal on time*  
*C2 smiles while saying --->*

[กลับ ตนเดี่ยว]  
[come back alone]  
*I came back alone*

A1 *[คะ คะ] ((nods))  
*[FPF FPF] (=yes) ((nods))  
*[Yes, yes] ((nods))*

(.)

A1 อัน นี้ รอ หลาย ชั่วโมง เลย นะ ที่[ ((laughs))]

CL this wait many hour DM WS/P KPS[ ((laughs))]

*For this you have several hours to wait ((laughs))*

8-9 ชั่วโมง เลย นะ  
8-9 hour DM WS/P

8-9 hours

C2 [ปี ที่ผ่านมา]  
[last year]

KPS go [of Air Swiss]  
*I (=KPS) travelled on Swiss Air]*

A1 [ของ แอร์ สวิส หรือ คะ รอ นาน ไหม]

[of Air Swiss Q-YN FPF wait long time Q-YN]

*[On Swiss Air? You waited a long time, didn’t you?]*

FPF]

C2 1 ชั่วโมง ที่ วัง ไม่ หัน ที่ หา ไม่เจอ ((laughs))

1 hour KPS run not in time KPS find not find ((laughs))

*I couldn’t arrive in time I couldn’t find it (the gate ((laughs))

C1 Er they have break me (. I: have to stay two hours in Paris but er

newspaper long long long time (. yes, yes

A1 *Um: ((nods)) (. 3 3.25 from Paris

C2 ลง จา แก่ ไป ไหม เลยมา มา จะลง เครื่อง=  
KPJ remember C/IP2 can Q-YN PTM come book flight=  
*Do you remember him? He (is the one who) would have come to book a flight=

A1 [จำ ได้ ที่]

[remember can KPS]
[Yes, I do]

C2 =ลูกสาว แย่งทำเรื่องให้
=daughter C/IP do story for
=His daughter did it for (him)

A1 [หรอ] ((smiles))

C2 [Q-YN] ((smiles))

[Did she?] ((smiles))

A1 [ที่ หา ที่แพร่รอดูใหม่คะ]

C2 *=ลาง มาจากที่ไหน
*=send from over there
*=It was sent from over there
*=C2 smiles and laughs while speaking --->>

A1 ที่ หาย ที่แพร่รอดูใหม่คะ

C2 =daughter  C/IP   do   story  for

A1 That lose at airport Q-YN FPF

C2 The one which was lost at the airport, wasn’t it?

A1 (0.2)

*C1 considers the ticket detail.*

A1 3 months return

C1 *Yes ((nods))

C2 Year last KPS go airline of UCL as well

A1 3 months return

C2 Yes now Thai Airways have promotional tickets

A1 3 months return

C2 but promotion only month one 30,000 more baht only

A1 3 months return

C2 one-month promotional ticket for just over 30,000 baht roughly 34,000

A1 3 months return

C2 34,000 33,000-34,000

A1 3 months return

C2 baht between 33,000-34,000 baht

A1 3 months return

C2 I have no ideas about how to get to the embassy

A1 3 months return

C2 I don’t know what will happen in the future

A1 [ต้อง ((nods)) โทร ขอเช็คก่อนนะ]

C1 [have to ((nods)) phone check first WS/P]

A1 [(You) have to ((nods)) call (them) to check (it) first]
KPS call PTM they tell to come but DM that I have called to check it they told me that I could get to different men, different opinions Q-YN it close all DM there but different people told me different things everything is closed

So not know that FTM go road which Q-YN it close all DM but different people told me different things everything is closed

So you don’t know which road you can take, do you?

The embassy should know which road is convenient (and) safe

But the time ran out I (KPS) made an appointment book today DM yesterday they not close KPS phone today yesterday the embassy was closed no one answered but not connect have only computer answer phone the phone apart from the answering machine then,

phone finish opp get there Q-WH FCQ forget ask when the call was finished, (I) though, "How can (I) get

(I) forgot to ask them how I could get there

Yes try again tomorrow try to ask them a question

Yes try again tomorrow try to ask them a question

(I) have to get to Bangkok to sleep

(I’ll) go to stay with my relative
Better FI/A so not have to wake up early as well

(0.3)

OK er: OK I pay deposit because visas are:: not finished it's problem in [Bangkok

[yes]

OK?

*A1 turns to talk to C2.*

Did you bring your passport with you? And can I have your mobile number as well? 0

*Yes*

*A1 writes down the number.-->

*242

*A1 writes down the number.-->

*805

*A1 writes down the number.-->

*A1 looks at C2's passport, leaves the desk with the passport and goes over to the computer in order to book the ticket.*

OK I I: not sure but I:: we'll fly toge[ther

[yeah I know but tomorrow

I not sure I ( ) but I can't go]

yeah

When I not come back I will stay with a cousin You know?

"yes yes"

Same doctor go last year
I’ll stay with cousin one night with Phee Pin. I don’t know where I go I have to stay over. I’m not sure tomorrow I come back but I hope I’m lucky. But Finland close, Germany close, Australia close not working I look in two weeks. But Sweden with not sure they didn’t tell me in telephone we can come soon to see.

I call him I can come he says yes because she’s ok now. When she is (a name place)?

I don’t have I don’t ask she said she want too. ([laughs])

---

21 The word /phi/ in Thai means elder sisters or brothers, or is used to initiate a person name to show the speaker’s respect.
She said she go back with a boyfriend er: suddenly

OK

Yes

yes they have weekend before us about one week come back to embassy and call me could she come to Hua Hin to stay with me? Yeah, I say OK if I go to Bangkok (.) but sometime you can go with me but not same time but can come but I go to this week

[yes]

*C2 and C1 stop talking when A1 returns to the desk with a printed paper.*

+A1 returns the passport to C2 and leaves the desk to take an invoice-receipt book. Then, she returns to the desk where C2 and C1 are.+

A1 /uni0เ1เ/uni0เ35/glyph1143/uni0เ44/uni0เ21/uni0เ48/uni0เ23/uni0เ39/uni0เ49/uni0เ27/uni0เ48/uni0เ32/uni0เ04/uni0เ23/uni0เ31/glyph1144/uni0เ07/uni0เ17/uni0เ35/glyph1143/uni0เ41/uni0เ25/uni0เ49/uni0เ27

*Insurance 3 month DM ( ) 2,430 like last time*

+A1 shakes her head and takes a folder which consists of insurance details from the shelf on the left.++---->

*3-months’ insurance costs ( ) 2,430 baht like last time*

*A1 opens the page of the insurance detail, points to the detail and explains about it.---->
Boyfriend KPS he PTM hear from somewhere that My (KPS) boyfriend has heard that there is another ticket agency have place sell ticket another one

Then I (KPS) said that I (KPS) called my friend and asked about this and she told me it was on day FTM fly ticket airplane not have true but on the travelling day no air tickets were provided

Not know
I have no ideas

KPS so tell C/IP2 C/IP2 PTM hear from Q-WH not know So I (KPS) told him (C/IP2) (I) don’t know from whom he (C/IP2) knew about this

A1 turns to explain the details to C1.*

A1 looks at C1 and raises the card.--->

C1 I know er: I: I pay er: [this card
*[This one?]*

*[A1 uses the pen to point to the flight price.---]*

221 C1 Yes, yes

222 A1 *You have to pay this one too
*A1 circles the price of the travel insurance on the invoice paper.--->*

223 C1 [Yes, yes (.) but er she must have visa

224 A1 [If she cannot get visa=

225 C1 Yes

226 A1 =I will give you money [back

227 C1 [Yes, yes

228 A1 Transfer money to [your card

229 C1 [Yes yes yes] I don't understand you

230 A1 *A1 leaves the desk to take a calculator. Then, she returns to the desk.*

231 C1 *A1 calculates the total price and shakes her head when C1 agrees with his speaking.*

232 A1 *She always gets visa [every year ((laughs a bit))

233 C1 [Yes:]

234 A1 *She points to C2 while speaking.--->

235 C1 But now it's problem

236 A1 ((laughs)) *All together

237 A1 *A1 hands the calculator with the total price to C1 for consideration.--->

238 A1 Ticket and insurance

239 (0.07)

240 A1 *Ticket and insurance (.) all together this price

241 C1 [Yes, but er: I:

242 C2 *[แก่ ละ จ่าย แต่ ด้วย นี้ กลับ]*

242 *[C/IP2 FTM pay only CL this first]*

*[He (C/IP2) wants to pay only for this first]*
A1 points at the ticket price while speaking.

A1 points at the insurance fee while speaking.

A1 points at the ticket price while speaking.

A1 points at the ticket price while speaking.

A1 turns to talk to C1.

A1 points at the ticket price while speaking.

Maybe for ticket pay *some deposits.

*A1 takes a pen to write something.

No, yes deposit

*Er: deposit

*A1 writes something on a piece of paper.

[Yes, I:]

[and insurance]

I: pay my ticket in Sweden

Um

Yes and deposit

Um

Yes

This one for her ticket deposit and this is for travel insurance

*A1 circles the deposit and the travel insurance fee.

Yes

Yes, yes ((nods))

We charge this one for today

Um

*In this card

*A1 raises the cards.

Yes

*A1 leaves the desk to give her colleague the card. Then, she returns to the desk.

Can you give me a: copy?

Yes.
*A1 takes the invoice details from C1 to photocopy inside the office. Then, she returns to the desk.*

(A.40)

A1 เผย ต้อง ขอ บัตร ประชาชน ด้วย นะครับ นี้
FTM have to beg card citizen also FPF have

Could I have your ID card? It's for the insurance

+C2 puts her ID card on the desk and A1 leaves the desk to take the invoice-receipt book. Meanwhile, A1's colleague (A2) brings a copy of the invoice to C1.+

C1 ขอบคุณ ครับ
Thank you FPM

(A 0.3)

A2 ช่วย เขียน ตรงนี้ *ตัวย confidential
AVD sign here *DM FPF

Could you sign this?

*A2 gives C1 a pen and C1 signs the paper.--->>

A2 พาสปอร์ต
Passport

*A1 returns to the desk and gives A2 a piece of paper.*

A2 มี บัตร ประชาชน
Have card ID

Here is the ID card

A1 มี บัตร ประชาชน
*Have card ID

*Here is the ID card

*A1 gives A2 C2's ID card.--->>

A2 พาสปอร์ต
Passport


C1 *I think er: one for me
*C1 takes one of the slips and puts in front of himself instead.-----*

C2 *(laughs and laughs)*
*C2 glances at A1.-----*

C1 *I think so
*C1 laughs a lot and glances at A1, and simultaneously C2 smiles widely.-----*

*C1 puts that piece of paper into his wallet.*

(0.10)

+A1 returns to the desk.+

C1 *This for you and this for me, OK?
*C1 shows one of the two slips to A1.-----*

+A1 receives it, laughs and smiles. Meanwhile C1 laughs.+

*A1 writes something on the invoice book.-----*

(0.20)

C1 *((laughs)) I:

C2 *You won't come back
*C2 smiles-----*

C1 *((laughs)) I'm not say

A1 *((laughs a bit))

C2 ครั้ง ที่แล้ว ที่ ค่อย เครื่อง เหลืออีก 5 นาที ที่ มา
Time last KPS connect flight left 5 minute KPS find
Last time my (KPS) flight was a connecting one there were 5
เครื่อง ไม่ เจอ ((laughs))
flight not find ((laughs))
minutes left I (KPS) still couldn't find the gate ((laughs))

A1 *((laughs a bit)) ครั้ง นี้ มี เวลา เยอะ มาก ครับ ที่
((laughs a bit)) time this have time much very FPF KPS
((laughs a bit)) This time you (KPS) have plenty of time

C2 [but] นี่ ที่ บิน บอก ว่า สนามบิน อิน นี้ ใหญ่ มา
[but] He (C/IP2) told me that airport CL this big so
[bigger] CL that DM (laughs)
bigger CL that DM (laughs)
than the last one (laughs)

A1 *((laughs a bit))
*A1 writes something down.-----*

(0.7)

C1 I think Thai people(.) is a good people I don't understand they
face I don't understand ((laughs))
A1: I don't understand too ((laughs))

C1: ((laughs to another officer behind A1))

A1: *This is a copy for you
A1 gives a copy of the ticket to C1.--->

C1: Yes, please

C2:  Ah then KPS take CL Q-WH enter airport
Ah which one do I (KPS) have to show at the airport then?

A1: *เพื่อน เอา มาให้ที่ ค่ะ เพื่อน ทำประกัน แป๊ปนี่เอง
*FTM take to KPS FPF FTM make insurance for a while
*(I) will take this while you are waiting for the (travel) insurance for a while
*A1 stands up and turns back to walk away from the desk.--->

(.)

A1: *เพื่อน หนู เสริม ใส่ ของ ไว้ด้วยกัน เลย
*FTM CCP prepare keep in envelop together DM
*(I) will keep everything in the same envelope
*A1 stops leaving and turns to talk to C2.--->

C2: *( ) I can take go embassy
*C2 takes the copy from C1.--->

C2: *( ) I can take go embassy
*C2 takes the copy from C1.--->

C1: Yes, but you can

C2: อัน ไหน ว่า
CF Q-WH FIm
Which one?

C1: Huh?

(0.10) +C1 and C2 talk together in a soft voice.+

+A1 returns to the desk and gives C2 an envelope.+

C2: ที่อ ของ ปี นี้ ไม่ สวม เลย
Um envelope year this not beautiful at all
Um this year's envelope is not beautiful

A1: *((laughs a bit))
*A1 stands and holds a transparent zip-locked envelope.--->

C2: Isn't it?
Have envelope style old can FPF ((laughs and smiles)) [=
(You) can have an old-style envelope. ((laughs and smiles)) [=

((laughs))

Have envelope style old can FPF ((laughs and smiles)) [=
((laughs))

Have envelope style old can FPF ((laughs and smiles)) [=
((laughs))

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?

It be style button Q-YN

((laughs))

Is it the one with the button?
[yeah FI/P]

[yeah]

*ён นี่จ่ะ22 รอ ประกัน น้อง เค้า ทำ อยู
*So DM wait insurance KPJ she do -ing
*So please wait for the insurance she (my colleague) (KPJ) is getting for you
*A1 folds the document into the envelope.--->

เพื่อ นี่จ่ะ อยู่ ว่า เพื่อนี่ จ่ะ ไหน สิม
KPS DM think –ing that KPS submit CL Q-WH forget
I (KPS)’m thinking which one I (KPS) have to submit (I) forgot

*อันนี่ ล่ะ เฮีย หนะ ใส่ ไปด้วยกัน ของ เฮียกัน เลย
*CL this FCoq FTM CCP keep together envelope same DM
*This one I (CCP)’ll keep (it) together in the same envelope
*A1 folds the document into the envelope.--->

*A1 finishes folding the document into the envelope, puts it on the
desk, and goes to the office inside.*

(1.15)

C1 Today you go to (. ) ATM ( )

C2 Yeah?

(0.3)

C2 I pay for visa I don’t want ((looks at something C1 shows
behind the counter <out of sight>)) OK

(0.20)

C2 A little bit

C1 *((laughs))-----> before we go home we take a: ( )
*C1 looks at C2.----->

C2 โอ้ โอ้ โอ้
OK OK OK
OK OK OK

C1 Um

(0.3)

C2 No it’s half (0.5) you want?

C1 Yes

C2 OK only one

C1 No, no, no

22 The word “นี่จ่ะ” in this context implies the speaker’s indirect request made to the hearer by claiming
a reason why the hearer has to do something uncomfortable for himself/herself.
We have ticket

Oh, yes, yes ( ) I forget

+A1 returns to the desk with the insurance documents.+

*This is your insurance ( ) and (I) made a photocopy for (you)
*A1 shows the documents to C2.--->

A1 folds the documents and puts them in another envelope into the transparent zip envelope, and gives it to C2.*

*A1 puts her two palms on her face and bends forward a bit by positioning herself towards C1.--->

*C1 puts his two palms on his chest.--->

A1 puts her two palms on her face and bends forward a bit by positioning herself towards C2.--->

+C2 takes a pen on the desk with her.+

*(laughs)) write well KPS buy it write not well
*(laughs)) it works well I bought a pen but it didn't work well

*C2 stands up and takes her belongings. Meanwhile A1 takes the stamp and the invoice-receipt book to the drawer. Then, C1 follows C2 to leave the office.*
Appendix 7.5: [2:2] Koh Tao (W1902) Western Tours Hua Hin

Length: 6.37 minutes

A1 = female agent 1

A2 = female agent 2

C1 = female non-Thai customer 1

C2 = female non-Thai customer 2

C3 = male non-Thai customer 3

1  +C1, C2 and C3 walk into Western Tours Hua Hin.+

2  +A1, who is on the telephone conversation at the computer desk behind the front desk, stops the ongoing telephone conversation. Then, she walks to the front desk and hangs up the telephone. Then, she greets C1, C2 and C3.

3  A1  สาวผู้เข้าร่วม ค่ะ
   Good morning  FPF
   Good morning

4  *When A1 acknowledges that C1, C2 and C3 seem to walk forward to another front desk, A1 walks to the expected front desk as a guideline for them.*

5  A1  *This way please*
   *A1 uses the left hand to show the place that A1 expects that they should sit.---->

6  +C1 and C2 turn left, walk to and sit on the chairs opposite to A1.+

7  C1  We are going to er: Koh Tao

8  A1  Yes

9  C1  Er on Saturday?

10 A1  Yes

11 C1  How can we get there?

12  +A1 bends downward to take a brochure from the drawer.+

13  (0.07)

14 A1  *I recommend you go with this company
14  *A1 shows the brochure to C1 and C2.--->
C1 and C2 look at the brochure shown by A1.

A1 *Lumphaya we do a package to Koh Tao
A1 points to the brochure. --->

C1 To Koh Tao?
A1 Yes (nods)

C1 OK

A1 *The package including air-con air-con bus and high speed Sri
A1 points to a couple places on the brochure. --->

Thammarat

C1 OK

A1 *The price is er (.) this one is the old price
A1 points to the brochure. --->

( . )

A1 takes a new pen from the box on the left hand side.*

A1 *900 each
A1 points to the brochure. --->

( . )

C1 Uhhuh

C2 OK

A1 *The bus stops er the bus starts from the clock tower
A1 points to the brochure. --->

C1 [huh

C2 [huh

A1 --->Now we are here* take the bus four hours from Hua Hin to get to
A1 points to the brochure. *

Chumporn another way you can change to High Speed Sri Thammarat
for nearly two hours totally take nearly six hours

+The fax machine rings loudly. +

A1 (ahhuh?)

C2 Yes ((nods))

( . )

A1 *And the bus leaves here twice a day 8 o’clock in the morning er 8.30 in
**A1 points to something on the brochure.**

the morning or 11.30 pm

**C2** OK

**A1** *If you take in the morning you will get there 2.45

*A1 points to something on the brochure.**

**C2** Yes

**A1** *If you take the night bus you will get there 9 o'clock next day

*A1 points to something on the brochure.**

**C2** O.K

**A1** But I recommend you go in the morning it's faster

**C2** Yes

**(nods)** Night time you have to wait nearly 2 hours at the train

**C1** Ah I don't want to um: (0.02) what about the: huts in Kho Tao?

**A1** Accommodation?

**C1** Yes (nods) "accommodation"

(.)

+A1 seems to take something from the box on the left hand side but stops doing it and starts speaking.+

**A1** How much do you expect to pay per night?

**C1** Er:

**A1** We have a good hotel three-star hotel (.) the price about 3100 baht something like that for two [including breakfast

**C2** *[no I think we will er::

*[C2 looks at C1, who looks at A1.**

**A1** Two-star?

**C2** Can you do:

+C2 switches to speak her mother tongue to C1.

**C1** Can we er can we book this um: can we think about the hut ( ) and call you?

+A1 nods while listening to C1.+

**A1** Er: we don't accept the reservation to the phone

**C1** OK

229
A1 You have to come book (.) and pay everything --->here*
A1 uses the thumbs
to point downward to the desk.*

C1 OK

A1 *You can keep *this and you can think about it and then come back to
A1 points to the brochure.---->
book later

(0.03)

+C1 and C2 talk together in their mother tongue.+

C2 OK we will book this

A1 Uhhuh ((nods)) for Saturday morning

C2 Yeah ((nods))

*A1 takes the calendar from the left hand side and puts it on the right
hand side near C2.*

A1 *On 22th
A1 points to the calendar and glances at C2.---->

C2 Yes

C1 Yes

+A1 stands up and walks to another front desk in order to take an
invoice book out of the drawer. Then, A1 walks back to the front desk
where C1 and C2 are.+

(0.15)

A1 Can you write down your name please?

+A1 turns the invoice book upside down and gives it to C1.*

+C1 writes the name.+

+At the same time as C1 writes the name, A1 makes a call. She takes a
pen from the box on the left hand side.+

(0.20)

A1 จาก Western Tours จะ จอด ไป เกาะ เท่า ครับ
From Western Tours FPF book go Koh Tao FPF
From Western Tours (we want to) book a ticket to Koh Tao

(.)

A1 วันที่ 22 ละครับ
Day 22 FPF Saturday
On Saturday 22th please
+A1 spreads the hand out to take the invoice book that C1 wrote her name.+

*A1 writes something on the invoice book.--->

*A1 writes something on the invoice book.--->

*A1 writes something on the invoice book.--->

*A1 writes something on the invoice book.--->

*A1 writes something on the invoice book.--->

*A1 writes something on the invoice book.--->

*A1 writes something on the invoice book.--->

*A1 writes something on the invoice book.--->

*A1 writes something on the invoice book.--->

*A1 writes something on the invoice book.--->

*A1 writes something on the invoice book.--->

*A1 writes something on the invoice book.--->
109 *A1 hangs up the telephone.*

110 (0.08)

111 +A1 continues writing something on the invoice book. Then, she stops writing to start the conversation.+

102 A1 The bus leaves at 8.30 but you have to be at the Clock Tower at 8 o'clock to check in

104 C2 ((nods))

105 +C1 turns back to talk to C3, who is waiting at the waiting chairs, in the mother tongue.+

106 +C3 walks to C1 and C2 turns to look at the conversation between C1 and C3.+

107 (0.13)

108 C1 Perfect

109 A1 1800 baht

110 +C2 opens her purse, takes a 1000-baht note and puts it on the desk. Then, C1 does the same as C2 did.+

111 +A1 collects the money on the desk and walks to the inside of the office.+

112 +C3 returns to the waiting chair.+

113 (0.23)

114 +A2 walks past the front desk.+

115 +A1 returns to the front desk. When she sees A2, she stops A2.+

116 A1 *

116 *exchange (.) note 500

116 *go to change it into 500-baht notes

116 *A1 puts a 500-baht note into A2’s hand.--->

117 +A2 receives the money and walks out of Western Tours Hua Hin.+

118 (0.05)

119 *A1 sits on the chair opposite C1 and C2.*

120 A1 *She goes and exchange money ((smiles))

120 *A1 collects all the pieces of paper and folds them together.--->

121 C1 OK

122 C2 OK

123 +C1 and C2 talk together in the mother tongue.+
A1 takes the big book from the box on the left hand side, opens and looks at it.

A2 returns to the front desk and puts the amount of money on the front desk near A1.

A1 collects it. Then, she gives a 100-baht note each to C1 and C2.

A1 Thank you very much (.) *your tickets
A1 gives C1 and C2 the tickets—>

C2 *Yes
C2 collects the ticket—>

C1 collects the ticket. Both C1 and C2 put the tickets into the purse.

C1 /uni0เ02/uni0เ2D/uni0เ1A/uni0เ04/uni0เ38/uni0เ13       /uni0เ04/uni0เ48/uni0เ30 Thank you FPF

A1 Have a nice day (smiles)

A1 (0.17)

C1 and C2 talk together in the mother tongue, laugh and smile.

A1 Have a nice day (smiles)

A1 (0.10)

C1 Thank you very much

A1 You’re welcome have a nice day

C1 You too

A1 ((widely smiles and nods))

A1 (0.10)

C1 and C2 talk together in the mother tongue, laugh and smile.

A1 (0.10)

C1 Thank you very much

A1 You’re welcome have a nice day

C1 You too

A1 ((widely smiles and nods))

A1 (0.10)

C1 and C2 talk together in the mother tongue, laugh and smile.

A1 (0.10)

C1 Thank you very much

A1 You’re welcome have a nice day

C1 You too

A1 ((widely smiles and nods))

A1 (0.10)

C1 and C2 talk together in the mother tongue, laugh and smile.

A1 (0.10)

C1 Thank you very much

A1 You’re welcome have a nice day

C1 You too

A1 ((widely smiles and nods))

A1 (0.10)

C1 and C2 talk together in the mother tongue, laugh and smile.

A1 (0.10)

C1 Thank you very much

A1 You’re welcome have a nice day

C1 You too

A1 ((widely smiles and nods))

A1 (0.10)

C1 and C2 talk together in the mother tongue, laugh and smile.

A1 (0.10)

C1 Thank you very much

A1 You’re welcome have a nice day

C1 You too

A1 ((widely smiles and nods))

A1 (0.10)

C1 and C2 talk together in the mother tongue, laugh and smile.

A1 (0.10)

C1 Thank you very much

A1 You’re welcome have a nice day

C1 You too

A1 ((widely smiles and nods))

A1 (0.10)

C1 and C2 talk together in the mother tongue, laugh and smile.

A1 (0.10)

C1 Thank you very much

A1 You’re welcome have a nice day

C1 You too

A1 ((widely smiles and nods))

A1 (0.10)

C1 and C2 talk together in the mother tongue, laugh and smile.

A1 (0.10)

C1 Thank you very much

A1 You’re welcome have a nice day

C1 You too

A1 ((widely smiles and nods))
Appendix 7.6: [2:10] Daytime flight to Shanghai (W1910) Western Tours Hua Hin

Length: 8.03 minutes

A1 = female agent 1

A2 = female agent 2

C1 = male non-Thai customer 1

1 +C1 walks into the reception area. When A1 acknowledges his presence, she turns around and greets him.+

2 A1 *สวัสดี ค่ะ
   *good afternoon FPF
2 *good afternoon

3 C1 *สวัสดี ครับ if I want to go to China=
   *good afternoon FPM if I want to go to China=
   *good afternoon if I want to go to China=
3 *C1 touches his cap which is on the head and stands while speaking.--->

4 A1 Yes

5 C1 =er: how can I do with visa?

6 A1 You can apply from here we have er visa service to China

7 C1 *Oh OK how long time does it take?
7 *C1 still touches his cap and stands while speaking.--->

8 A1 It takes about five working days

9 C1 Ah OK er how much is it?

10 A1 3000

11 C1 3000 ah OK OK

12 *C1 moves the chair in front of him and sits down on it.*

13 +A1 presses the button of the calculator and shows it to C1.+

14 C1 *We wanna check er ((little coughs)) how much er: if I go er: on
14 *C1 sits opposite A1 and puts his right arm on the backrest of the chair.--->
15 number 3 with Bangkok Airways I’ll go back number er: Sunday er: what number is that?

17 +A1 takes a pen on her left and writes down what C1 said.+

18 A1 "OK"
Er: number two sorry “I’ll go on” number two

*Yes number 2
*A1 writes down while speaking.--->

And go back number 6

*6 (.) where would you like to go?
*A1 writes down while speaking ‘6’ and turns up to look at C1.--->

Er:

City

From from er: to Shanghai

**to Shanghai**
*A1 writes down what C1 said.--->

(0.05)

A1 Er how many people?

One

*Just one economy class?
*A1 writes down what C1 said.--->

Yeah

I’ll check the good price for *you
*A1 turns around to leave the front desk. --- >

Er you can check the economy class (for me) please er and if you can also check for Thai Airways

*A1 turns around to leave the front desk, but stops when C1 starts speaking to her.*

Yes ((nods)) Thai Airways

*Again A1 turns around to leave the front desk, but stops when C1 starts speaking to her.*

And the Bangkok Airways

Yes ((nods))

*A1 turns around to leave the front desk*

*C1 continues his utterance. However, this time A1 does not stop listening to him at the front desk. Instead she leaves the front desk to go to the computer behind the front desk.*

Just only the daytime not night flight
A1 gives the written piece of paper to her colleague, A2, who sits in front of the computer behind the front desk. Then, A1 waits for the results from A2.+

A1 Bangkok Airways does not operate flight from Bangkok to Shanghai we checked Thai because Thai Airways has promotions

C1 Ah OK

A1 Valid for one month but fixed flight

C1 OK thank you

A1 turns around to look for a calendar which is on the next front desk to check dates. Then, she goes to A2 who is in front of the computer behind the front desk. After that, A1 takes the calculator from the second front desk to calculate something.+

A1 takes the piece of paper and the calculator with her to return to the front desk where C1 is sitting.+

A1 We have two promotions on Thai Airways

C1 OK

A1 writes down the details of ticket prices and shows them to C1.+

C1 Fifteen thousand two hundred

A1 nods.+

A1 you have to* come back on 7 of June--- *is that OK?

A1 writes and marks the line where the ticket price and the travel date are.--- *A1 turns up to look at C1.--->

C1 Er: is that (on) Monday?

A1 *this Monday

A1 opens the calendar while speaking.--->

C1 Yeah

A1 looks for the date and puts the calendar in front of C1. She points to a date on the calendar.*

--->Monday* (. ) --->back to Bangkok 9 pm very good price*

--->A1 points to the calendar.* --->A1 points to the detail of the ticket on the piece of paper while standing.*
normally we sold out about 22000
*A1 sits down.

C1 This night flight I don't want to go night time on the way from Bangkok to Shanghai
*C1 points to the details which A1 gives to him.

A1 Night flight
*A1 nods and takes the details back from C1.

C1 Yeah I don't want night flight

A1 The other flight is 11: am

C1 Yeah ((nods))

A1 That's much better ((nods and little smiles))

C1 Yeah much better (.) but it's the same price "if I go (that time)"

A1 The same price ((nods))

C1 Ah OK OK OK

A1 But the condition is fixed flight this way you cannot change you ---A1 shakes her head and waves her right hand from left to right several times.

C1 OK

A1 This one is perfect

C1 Yeah

A1 Other airline is more expensive* because they don't have (.) this --->A1 raises her right hand.*

promotion

C1 Uh and for business class ((beep beep)) *how much is that?
*C1 takes the phone out of his trouser pocket and looks at it while speaking.

A1 *Business class
*A1 turns around to talk to A2.

(0.05)
A1 (° taxa°)

+A1 uses the calculator to calculate the tax. Then, she stands up and walks to stand and press the calculator near A2.+

+C1 checks and presses the phone.+

(0.28)

+A1 returns to the front desk with the flight price on the calculator. She smiles and nods to C1. Then, she shows it to C1 while smiling.+

C1 OK

A1 *Good price
*A1 smiles.--->

C1 Yeah

+A1 sits down.+

(0.03)

C1 (° great °) 28000 (0.03) and when um: do I have to book it?

+A1 writes something down while listening to C1's talk.+

A1 You told me at the beginning two day later today --->is (.)°
---->A1 looks at the wrist watch to check the date and looks up to continue speaking. °

10 th why don't you book today ((smiles))

C1 (°no ((little shakes head)) because I wanna check time°)

+A1 smiles and nods at the end while listening to C1's talk.+

(.)

A1 >>>--I can hold this reservation for you to tomorrow ((nods)) just give >>>--A1 nods and bows her head before speaking.

+C1 uses his left hand to touch his left forehead while listening to A1 speaking.°

C1 Ah OK ((nods))

A1 And then you: come to pay tomorrow by cash

C1 *Ah OK but I will not come tomorrow should I come in and I can do a
*C1 continues using his left hand to touch the left forehead.--->

A1 reservation

((nods)) °no problem°
A1 takes the calendar on the desk. She looks for something on the calendar and opens other page.+

But I cannot go Yugoslavia you know what’s going on in Bangkok the [other one=

*For visa application it takes about 5 working days
*A1 points to some dates on the calendar.--->

"OK"

*except this day
*A1 points to a date on the calendar.--->

"OK"

*today*
*A1 points to a date on the calendar.--->

Ah OK

*This one the embassy in Bangkok
*A1 points to a date on the calendar.--->

But you have to go er: to go [ah:=

[Yes ((nods)) I have

By pass

Yes ((nods)) by pass ((nods))

OK can I do this visa er if I don't buy this ticket air can I only make a visa
+A1 opens the next page of the calendar.+

You can ((nods))

*A1 moves the calendar in front of herself, opposite C1.*

OK I may [only

[But it may be easier if you (. ) do everything here

May er:

*Of course you can check flight first=
*A1 straights her arms on the desk and shakes them slightly.--->
[Yeah=  
[=and accept *our price  
*A1 brings her two hands to her chest.

=I don't want er: I don't want to make a booking here I want to make a  
booking latest as later as possible because we don't know they may  
close the airport=

°um° ((nods))  
=today I want to do so er if *I cannot change the ticket---> I will (lose  
*C1 points at the piece of paper put in front  
of A1.--->>  
a lot of money) that's why I have to wait for (.) booking=

I understand you

=but for the visa I can do before

Yes you can because visa is valid for (.) 30 days

30 days

You *entry: um: China  
*A1 moves the right hand forwards.

Yeah OK OK can I come here tomorrow and "give you" my passport  
((mumble))?

(.)

*May I have your: telephone number please?  
*A1 moves the piece of paper forwards on the desk and writes  
something while speaking.

+C1 takes the mobile phone out of his shorts' pocket and presses  
bUTTONS to find a telephone number. +

*This (.) ("this's")  
*C1 puts the mobile phone and shows the number on the telephone  
screen to A1.

+A1 looks at the number on the mobile phone screen.+

*แปด หนึ่ง หนึ่ง แปด สอง สาม สอง สาม แปด สาม  
*eight one six eight two four two oh eight three

+eight one six eight two four two oh eight three

*A1 writes it down on the piece of paper while repeating the number on  
the screen.

Can I go back?

*please write now your name and your family  
*A1 passes the piece of paper which contains the phone number and a  
pen to C1.
+C1 takes the piece of paper and the pen from A1 and writes something on it.+

A1 *I don’t ((nods)) force you to buy this ((smiles and nods)) just give you
*A1 waves her right hand slightly on the desk.--->

C1 *No no I understand yeah:
*C1 writes the name and the detail on the piece of paper and does not
look at A1 while speaking.--->

(0.03) *C1 returns both the piece of paper and the pen to A1.*

A1 *Are you member of Thai Airways?
*A1 glances at C1 while asking.--->

C1 Yeah Thai Airways ((coughs)) but I forgot my number

(0.12)

A1 writes something on the piece of paper.+

A1 *And for visa application I need (0.02) passport and two photos
*A1 continues writing while speaking.--->

C1 With a signature on the back

A1 ((nods))

(.

A1 *Bring this paper to me tomorrow
*A1 gives C1 the written piece of paper.--->

C1 *OK--->(. ) OK thank you very much
*C1 takes the piece of paper from A1.--->

A1 See you tomorrow

C1 *OK Bye
*C1 leaves the desk.--->

A1 Bye
Appendix 7.7: [2:11] Wrong pronunciation (W1911) Western Tours Hua Hin

Length: 14.14 minutes

A1 = female agent 1
A2 = female agent 2
A3 = female agent 3
C1 = male non-Thai customer 1

1 +A1 stands up and is on the phone. When she acknowledges that C1 is getting into the company, she walks towards the front desk. She tries to finish an ongoing telephone conversation.

2 +C1 walks into the office and to the front desk. A1 finishes the phone conversation when C1 arrives at the desk.

3 C1 ((slightly coughs)) let’s have a look

4 (0.03)

5 C1 My friend is going back to England I’ve been to check prices for one month now

6 A1 Yes

7 C1 เครื่องบิน แพง มาก:
8 Airplane expensive very:
The air ticket is very expensive:

9 A1 ((little smiles))

10 C1 ไม่เข้าใจ (.) นอน หรี่ Bangkok-Sri-dang เครื่องบิน หรี่ มากๆ
Not understand (.) sleep free Bangkok-Sri-dang airplane free very
I don’t understand (.) a lot of available rooms in Bangkok-Sri-dang there

11 ((nods)) ที่ ไหน (.) ไหน ((laughs))

12 A1 ((smiles))

13 (.)

14 C1 My friend’s just paid some 31000 บาท from Bangkok to go to look er:
14 My friend’s just paid some 31000 than from Bangkok to go to look er:
14 My friend’s just paid more than some 31000 from Bangkok to go to look er: I’m not sure (.) I’m not sure to go to London, Manchester*, Glasgow, Birmingham, East Midland---

*At the end

15 of each city as mentioned C1 uses the finger tips to knock the desk.---

16 >>

*in other words he goes to the UK

16 *C1 uses the right finger to make a
+A1 writes something down on a piece of paper while listening to C1. She nods when he says, “he goes to the UK”.+

*C1 is speaking, he has eye contact with A2, a senior service provider whose desk is behind the front desk. Therefore, he greets her despite interrupting his own ongoing conversation with A1.*

*C1 raises his left hand in front of his face to greet A2.---*

+A1 smiles widely and looks at C1 while listening to A2 and C1.+

*C1 lifts a finger while speaking.---*

+A2, who stands near her desk, continues watching their conversation.+

+C1 uses the right hand to wave down in front of his chest.---*

+A2 smiles widely and looks at C1 while listening to A2 and C1.+

+C1 raises his left hand in front of his face to greet A2.---*

+C1 lifts a finger while speaking.---*

+A2 smiles widely and looks at C1 while listening to A2 and C1.+

+C1 uses the right hand to wave down in front of his chest.---*

+C1 lifts a finger while speaking.---*

+A2 smiles widely and looks at C1 while listening to A2 and C1.+

+C1 lifts a finger while speaking.---*

+A2 smiles widely and looks at C1 while listening to A2 and C1.+

+C1 lifts a finger while speaking.---*
34  *A1 uses the finger tips to touch the surface of the desk a
couple times.--->
35  C1  คือ:  คิด ก่อน
36  I mean: think first
35  *C1 takes the pen which A1 holds in her hand and the piece of paper in
front of her to write something.*
37  +A1 little laughs and smiles while C1 is writing something on that
paper.+
38  (0.04)
39  C1  *If (I return to) England on June: 25th: to July: 1 2 3=
*If England June: 25th: to July: 1 2 3=
*If (I return to) England on June: 25th: to July: 1 2 3=
*C1 writes what he said on the paper.--->
40  A1  *พี่ ไม
40  *KPS Beau
40  *Beau
40  *A1 turns to call A3, who sits behind her by touching A3’s shoulder.--->
41  C1  =and come back (. ) October 2:: 2 2 October can I go เครื่องบิน
=and come back (. ) October 2:: 2 2 October can I go airplane
=and come back (. ) October 2:: 2 2 October can I go by plane?
42  +A1 turns back to C1 and is interested in what C1 is writing on the
paper.+
43  A1  เกี่ยว อะไร ไหม พี่ ไหม อัน นี้
43  Involve what QYN KPS Beau one this
43  Beau, is this involved in (it)?
44  C1  นางรอง อยู่ ไหน (.) นางรอง อยู่ ไหน (.) ดีย ขับ เครื่องบิน
Nang Rorng be where (. ) Nang Rorng be where (. ) huh drive airplane
Where is Nang Rorng (. ) Where is Nang Rorng? (. ) huh drive an airplane
((laughs))
((laughs))
((laughs))
45  A1  *You may do like to start from from Thailand
46  *A1 points at the paper being written by C1.--->
47  C1  *June 25th to July 1 2 3
47  *C1 stops writing for a while and uses the pen in his hand to point to
something on the paper.--->
48  A1  *Any day right?
48  *A1 shakes her right wrist slightly while speaking.--->
49  C1  ไม่เป็นไร     *no worries--->> and come back on October 2 3 4 5
49  It doesn't matter *no worries--->> and come back on October 2 3 4 5
49  *It doesn't matter *no worries--->> and come back on October 2 3 4 5 6
49  *C1 shakes the head a bit.---->>
6789 10 หนึ่ง สอง สาม สี่ ห้า ไม่เป็นไร
6789 10 one two three four five it doesn't matter
78910 one two three four five it doesn't matter

51 A1 ((nods slowly a few times))

52 +A1 takes the written paper in front of C1.+

53 C1 *°probably 6 months°

54 A1 *A1 turns back to sit on the chair beside A3 who is working on the computer behind the front desk. A1 types on the keyboard to look for some information.*

55 (0.05)

56 C1 ((hhh))

57 +C1 sits and waits for the result from A1 whereas A1 searches for information on the computer and the files, and prints out them.+

58 (3.55)

59 +A1 stands up in front of the computer for a while, and then returns to the front desk where C1 is waiting for her.+

60 A1 *The first one by Thai Airways (.) but this one possible you go on three-
*A1 shows to C1 the piece of paper in her hand and has eye contact with C1 while speaking.--->
number third of July and come back number first October this one is
month completely (.) price is by Thai Airways 46500 baht Thai [Airways
((nods))]

64 C1 [46

65 (. )

66 A1 *And other choice is by Eva Airways 47 ((smiles))

67 C1 These two แพง มาก:
These two expensive  very:
These two are very: expensive

68 A1 ((smiles)) *and this one the last one by Qatar Airways 41500

69 (. )

70 *A1 writes something on the paper which involves Qatar Airways in details.*
Do you do Qatar Airways?

Do you do Qatar Airways remember can Qatar Airways (you) can remember Qatar Airways

Qatar Airways to Doha

Qatar Airways

Qatar Airways

Qatar Airways

Qatar Airways

This airline and we have our some promotions but for [promotions

thinking about my friend=

thinking about my friend=

A1 lifts her two fingers.---->

=สาม สาม หมื่น
=three three ten thousand

=three ten thousand

=three ten thousand

*A1 continues lifting her two fingers.---->

He goes today----> *bye---->

*C1 points down to the desk a few times.----> *C1 waves slightly her right hand.---->

I think it is a promotion but the ticket's valid for two months----> (.) I

A1 lifts her two fingers.---->

I need three months really

I need three months really

Umm: one that FCoq a problem (.) if you need two months (tickets) you can I

think (you can buy) that price but you need three months really it's a
think (you can buy) that price but you need three months it’s a little bit more ((smiles))

C1 Not a little bit

A1 ((little laughs and smiles)) one:

C1 (You get=)

A1 Ten thousand baht more ((widely smiles))

C1 takes the pen held in A1’s hand to start writing.

C1 *You you you จ่ายไม่ได้ because I know you are Thai you remember can because I know you are Thai you

*C1 writes what he said down.--->

understand 5000 baht yeah=

C1 stops writing, looks at A1 while speaking, and nods a few times.--->

holiday for two days สบาย 5000 baht yeah=

holiday for two days beautiful hotels

A1 *Uhh?* A1 looks at what C1 wrote.--->

C1 Equals (. ) 100 pounds yeah? (. ) *100 pounds in England you can go on speaking, and nods a few times.--->

holiday for two days สบาย beautiful hotels

A1 *Uhh?* A1 looks at what C1 wrote.--->

C1 *KPS Beau FPF* *Beau* A1 turns back to speak to A3, who is working in front of the computer behind the front desk. A1 continues scratching the hair with a smile.--->

C1 ((laughs and smiles))

A1 (° °) A1 continues speaking to A3.+

A1 *(° °) A1 turns to smiles to C1 and then turns back to search for some information on the computer behind the front desk next to A3.--->

C1 (شف)
(name)

*C1 holds the pen and writes something on the written paper.*

(0.22)

+A1 turns to glance at C1 for a while whereas C1 turns right to look at the conversation between A2 and a non-Thai customer.+

+A1 turns back to search for some information on the computer again.+

+C1 changes his gesture. He puts his left hand on the desk and crosses the left leg over the right one.+

+A1 prints out the information.+

(2.13)

+A1 returns to the front desk with the printed paper.+

A1 *So another airline is by Jet Airways
A1 show the printed paper to C1.-->

C1 (no "what's it?"

(.

A1 *Jet Airways
A1 writes something on the printed paper put in front of her.-->

C1 /uni0เ44/uni0เ21/uni0เ48 เ/uni0เ02 /uni0เ49 /uni0เ32/uni0เ43/uni0เ08           what's that?
Not understand what's that? (I) don’t understand what’s that?

(.)

A1 *Bangkok to: Mumbai Mumbai to London
A1 shows what she wrote to C1.-->

C1 Mumbai India

A1 *Um ((nods and smiles))
A1 writes something on the printed paper.-->

C1 Could

A1 *Cheap
A1 nods and smiles while speaking.-->

C1 Could I

+A1 continues writing something.+

A1 *31000 baht
A1 shows what she wrote to C1.-->

248
*To Mumbai OK (.) what airplane
=C1 takes that paper for his consideration.--->

**To Mumbai OK (.) what airplane (is it)?**

A1 เครื่องบิน อะไร
Airplane what
What (kind of) airplane (is it)?

C1 เครื่องบิน อะไร
classic group one (.) ((laughs)) understand airplane
Er classic one group (.) ((laughs)) (do you) understand an airplane?

A1 เข้าใจ
Understand
(yes I) do

A1 takes the paper in C1’s hand for her consideration for a second.*

A1理解 (.) ((laughs)) बुध यहाँ
A1考虑 (.) ((laughs)) बुध यहाँ

**A1 returns the paper to C1.*

A1 spreads the left hand out and shakes the wrist a few times.--->

C1 मुंबई?
C1 1 hour 2 hours

A1 I don't know it *depends: which [day and:
A1 spreads the left hand out and shakes the wrist a few times.--->

C1 *Ah OK ah OK Mumbai I have never
C1 writes something on the paper.---

done that one before ah yeah India----> >>>--how long will stop over in
Mumbai?

C1 shows the printed paper in his hand to A1.*

A1 *Just:
A1 considers the printed paper shown by C1.---

C1 1 hour 2 hours
A1 1 hour and twenty minutes

C1 *1 hour and twenty minutes that’s not too bad
*C1 writes what A1 said.

(0.20)

+C1 considers the details on the printed paper.+

C1 To London Heathrow or Gatwick?

A1 Heathrow

C1 *Heathrow
*C1 writes what A1 said.

(0.04)

C1 OK I’ll confirm with my friend to collect me from Heathrow (.)

A1 About 40:

C1 43 or 44

A1 *45000 baht °for Emirate°

C1 Yeah expensive very that’s why I said 50,000 baht long time Thai

A1 ((little nods))

C1 =you can go England and everything in England is...
=you can go England and everything in England is not expensive very

((smiles))

(.)

I'm not sure you know but (.) รถ second-hand (nods) England
I'm not sure you know but (.) car second-hand (nods) England
I'm not sure you know but (.) second-hand cars (nods) England
((nods)) สี หนึ่ง
((nods)) four ten thousand
((nods)) (cost) forty thousand

+A1 smiles rather widely while listening to C1.+

(.)

*yeah, รถ อยู่ นี่
*yeah, car be here
*yeah, the car is here
*C1 turns on the right and points to cars parked in front of the company.--->

°ไถ่อะไร°
°what°
°what?°

*รถ อุ่น นี่
*car be here
*the car is here
*C1 continues pointing to the cars.--->

Umm:: ((little smiles))

*สี หนึ่ง คือ ก่อน ทำ พัน หนึ่ง หนึ่ง
*four ten thousand think first five thousand one ten thousand
*forty thousand let me think first five thousand ten thousand very
*C1 turns back to look at A1.--->

แปล มาก:
expensive very:

expensive:

+A1 nods gradually and a few times while listening to C1.+

((little laughs and widely smiles)) *ไม่ แพง ((smiles))
((little laughs and widely smiles)) *not expensive ((smiles))
((little laughs and widely smiles)) *not expensive ((smiles))

*A1 bows a second and then glances at C1 a second while speaking.--->

ไทย ( ) สาม มีน ทำ *OK I confirmed (.) London day--->
Thai ( ) three thousand three *OK I confirmed (.) London day--->
Thai ( ) thirty hundred ah *OK I confirmed (.) London day--->

*C1 folds the paper on his hand.--->

*will you write down your name?--->

*will you write down your name?--->
*will you write down your name?*--->
*C1 puts the folded paper and her arms on the desk.*--->

*มีอะไร เมื่อ (.) พูดถึง
*name what number (.) tomorrow

*what's (your) name? (your) number? (.) tomorrow

*C1 points to the paper a few times.*-->

+A1 takes a piece of paper on the right to write what C1 asked for. Then, she gives C1 the paper.+

*C1 stands up and leaves the desk.*

A1 คะ ((smiles)) see you tomorrow คะ ((smiles))
FPF (=yes) ((smiles)) see you tomorrow FPF ((smiles))
Yes ((smiles)) see you tomorrow ((smiles))
Appendix 7.8: [3:6] Expensive room price (L.2006) Let’s Sea Resort and Spa Hua Hin

Length: 11.13 minutes

A1 = male agent 1
A2 = female agent 2
A3 = male agent 3
A4 = female agent 4
C1 = male Thai customer 1
C2 = female Thai customer 2
C3 = male Thai customer 3
C4 = female Thai customer 4

1  +When A1 acknowledges that C1, C2 and C3 get into the company, he walks to the outside of the waiting area to greet them.+  
2  +The outside of the waiting area is not at the angle of the camcorders.+  
3  A1  "สวัสดี
3  "good morning FPM"  
3  "good morning"  
4  +When C1, C2, C3 and C4 walk into the waiting area opposite the front desk, A2 walks from the front desk to the waiting area and greets them.+  
5  A2  --->สวัสดี ค่ะ ยินดีต้อนรับ สู่ Let’s Sea คะ* เชิญ ข้างใน  
5  --->good morning FPF welcome to Let’s Sea FPF* invite inside  
5  --->good morning welcome to Let’s Sea please go to the inside  
5  --->A2 does “wai”.*  
6  ก่อน คะ  
6  before FPF  
7  +A2 walks together with C1 followed by C2, C3 and C4 to the front desk.+  
8  A3  "สวัสดี
8  "good morning FPF  
8  "good morning"  
8  *A3 does "wai"."---->
9  C1  ขอ ดู รายละเอียด ห้องพัก หน่อย  
9  Beg look detail room a bit
Could I consider details of the room a bit?

Could I consider details of the room a bit?

Stay how many CL FPF

How many night (will you) stay?

C1 *ประมาณกี่คืนรับ

*approximately how many CL FPM

*how many nights approximately?

*C1 turns back to talk to C3.--->

C2 *ยังไม่รู้

*yet not know

*I have no idea

*C2, who sits on the sofa at the waiting area, speaks to C1.--->

C1 ประมาณ 2 คืน รับ

Approximately 2 CL FPM

Approximately 2 nights

A3 2 คืน

2 CL

2 nights

+A3 looks for something under the front desk.+

C1 ((nods))

A3 Check-out วันเสาร์

Check-out Saturday

(you will) check out on Saturday

C1 ถ้าห้องที่มี 2 ห้องนอน เท่าไหร่ คืน

If room that have 2 bedroom how much FPM

How much does a double room cost?

A2 วันนี้ อะไรคะ

Today FPF

Today?

C1 รับ

FPM (=yes)

Yes

A2 มี special price ปกติ อีำ: ค้ำห้อง 9 พัน 9 แต่ ค้ำห้อง

Have special price normally er: price room 9 thousand 9 but if room

(We can) offer a special price normally er: the price of the room is 9,900

มี สรรพหำ --->[แบบวะ พร้อม

have swimming pool --->[kind of with

(baht) but rooms with a swimming pool --->[kind of (those) with

--->[A2 gives a piece of paper with the detailed
information to C1.*

26 C1 [9 พัน 9 เลย หรอ ((loud voice))
26 [9 THOUSAND 9 Q-YN ((loud voice))
26 [9 THOUSAND 9 (HUNDRED) REALLY?

27 A1 แต่ว่า ในฐานะ เวล วิ่ง VIไมช่วย ช่วย ช่วย ที่จะ
but in part this we have special rate for time this time that
*but we have a special offer now during the period of (political) chaos
เป็น (fighting) ท้องถิ่น เวลา เลย วิ่ง VIไมช่วย ช่วย ที่จะ
be (fighting) total we er have special rate (for people that
we have a special rate (for people who live in the red zone) only
มา จาก เขต (fighting) เฉลี่ย วันที่ 21-30 นี้ ตรง
come from zone fighting) particularly date 21-30 now FPF)
* between 21st and 30th*

28 A1 ˚ /uni0เ04/uni0เ23/uni0เ31/uni0เ1A/uni0เ1C/uni0เ21
29 FPM (=yes)
30 *yes sir
31 *C1 looks at the details on the piece of paper shown by A1.---->

32 C1 ˚ /uni0เ16 /uni0เ49 /uni0เ32  เ/uni0เ01/uni0เ34/uni0เ14/uni0เ2A/uni0เ19/uni0เ43/uni0เ08     /uni0เ08/uni0เ2D/uni0เ07    /uni0เ44/uni0เ14 /uni0เ49 เ/uni0เ25/uni0เ22  เ/uni0เ1เ/uni0เ23/uni0เ32/uni0เ30/uni0เ27/uni0เ48/uni0เ32˚)
33 (˚if interested book can because˚)
34 (˚if (you) are interested in (it) (you) can book now because˚)
35 *C1 continues looking at the details.---->

36 A2 ˚ /uni0เ21/uni0เ35       เ/uni0เ07/uni0เ37/glyph1143/uni0เ2D/uni0เ19/uni0เ44/uni0เ02     ... /uni0เ16 /uni0เ49/uni0เ32 /uni0เ04/uni0เ38/uni0เ13   /uni0เ17/uni0เ4D/uni0เ32/uni0เ07/uni0เ32/uni0เ19  
37˚ have condition a:: bit mean er: if PSP work [or live˚
38˚ (the offer) is slightly:: conditional (I) mean if you (=PSP) work or live in˚
39˚ (or you) live around the red zone particularly date 21-30 now FPF) ˚
40˚ between 21st and 30th˚)

41 C1 ˚ /uni0เ04/uni0เ23/uni0เ31/uni0เ1A/uni0เ1C/uni0เ21
42 *yes sir
43 *C1 continues looking at the details.---->

44 A2 ˚ /uni0เ2B/uni0เ23/uni0เ37/uni0เ2D/uni0เ27/uni0เ48/uni0เ32  /uni0เ2D/uni0เ22/uni0เ39/uni0เ48/uni0เ2D/uni0เ32/uni0เ28/uni0เ31/uni0เ22 ˚
45˚ have condition a:: bit mean er: if PSP work [or live˚
46˚ (the offer) is slightly:: conditional (I) mean if you (=PSP) work or live in˚
47˚ (or you) live around the red zone particularly date 21-30 now FPF) ˚
48˚ between 21st and 30th˚)

49 C1 ˚ /uni0เ2D/uni0เ31/uni0เ19    /uni0เ19/uni0เ35/glyph1144     ...               /uni0เ15/uni0เ23/uni0เ07 /uni0เ02 /uni0เ49 /uni0เ32/uni0เ07/uni0เ19/uni0เ2D/uni0เ01
50˚ one this swimming pool at outside
51˚ so the swimming pool is outside ah
C1: ถ้า บัตร แสดง ว่า ทำงาน อยู่ กรุงเทพฯ โอ้ เลย ดี ไง
Ah card citizen PFP/M be at Bangkok [but go up to work]

A2: [ah so you have]

C1: ฉัน มี บัตร นี้
I have (=PFP/M) registered residence in the ID card is Bangkok

A2: [ah so do you have]

C1: บัตร มี
Name card have (=yes)

A2: ถ้า นาม บัตร แสดง ว่า ทำงาน อยู่ กรุงเทพฯ โอ้ เลย ดี ไง
If name card show that work at Bangkok "we discount for"

C1: ฉัน มี
Name card have (=yes)

A2: ถ้า นาม บัตร แสดง ว่า ทำงาน อยู่ กรุงเทพฯ โอ้ เลย ดี ไง
If name card show that work at Bangkok "we will offer"

C3: นี่ละ แน่ ประะ เลย เลย เลย ดี ไง เท่าไหร่ นะละ ที่
yeah area attack exactly FTM discount for how much FPF that

C2: (yeah)

C3: *have cheap –er that Q-YN

C1: *มัน 9 พัน 9 ไง คง ไม่ สูง หรอก
*it 9 thousand 9 may not accept probably
*it costs 9 thousand 9 (hundred) (we) may not accept (it)
*C1 turns to talk with C2 and C3.

C2: (yeah)

C3: *มี ถูก กว่า นั้น ไหม
*do you have cheaper one?

C3: ถ้า เลย มัน ต้อง อย่างนั้น
Ah er it must so

A2: ไม่ รวม อาหารเช้า นะคะ
Breakfast is not included
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56  C4  [(เ/uni0เ2D/uni0เ2D/uni0เ30  /uni0เ23/uni0เ27/uni0เ21)
56  [(huh include)
56  [(huh included)

57  C3  [รวม หมด แล้ว
57  [include all PTM
57  [all are included

58  A2  เป็น ราคา ที่ดีที่สุดเลย ลอง เช็ค ดู ได้
58  Be price best exactly try check look can
58  (it's) exactly the best price (you can) compare (it with other hotels')

59  C1  62 centre ที่ ทำงาน ตรง สิ่งแวด แยะ ประมาณ เหลือ [ตรง McDonald's
59  62 centre address work at Silom area attack [at McDonald's
59  62 centre it's the address of the workplace at Silom which is in the red
59  zone it's near McDonald's (restaurant)

60  C4  [ถ้า รวม
60  [if include
60  [if including

61  อาหารเช้า เท่าไหร่
61  breakfast how much
61  breakfast how much does it cost?

62  A2  อาหารเช้า เดี๋ยว จะแนะนำ เป็น package deluxe club นะคะ จะ
62  Breakfast FTM recommend be package deluxe club FPF FTM
62  For breakfast may I recommend you the deluxe club package it is more
63  คุณ ภาพ ขออนุญาต สำหรับ นะคะ
63  valuable more beg permission a moment FPF
63  valuable May I ask for your permission for a second?

64  C4  เรา เข้า ไป ดู กลม ไหม ต่อมานะ²³ "เดี๋ยว เขา [เข่า ไป ดู"
64  We enter go look first Q-YN you "FTM we [enter go look"
64  Shall we have a look the inside (the room samples) first? "We will [have
64  a look"

65  +C2 walks to the place where C1 and C3 are. C1 turns back to talk with
65  C2 at the area beyond the capacity of the audio- and video-recorders.+

66  A2  จะ แนะนำ
66  [FTM recommend
66  [(I would like) to
67  เป็น package นะคะ จะ รวม อาหารเช้า รวม soft drink [ทาน
67  be package FPF FTM include breakfast include soft drink [tea
67  recommend you a package which includes breakfast, soft drinks, tea
68  กาแฟ
68  coffee
68  (and) coffee

69  C1  *[จะ
69  *[FTM
69  *[Can
69  *[C1

   turns back to the front desk and points to the outside of the waiting area

²³ The term ต่อมานะ is a second person pronoun usually used with intimate people in informal situations.
on the left hand side while speaking--->.

70 จะ เล่น น้ำ ได้ไหม เยี่ย
70 FTM play water can Q-YN DM/C
70 (I) swim?

71 A2 แล้ว ได้ คะ เป็น สาธารณูป
71 Play can FPF be swimming pool
71 Yes (you) can (we have) a swimming pool

72 C1 เป็น สาธารณูป ใชไหม
72 Be swimming pool Q-YN
72 Is it a swimming pool?

73 A2 ((nods))
74 C1 สาธารณูป
74 Pool big
74 A big pool

75 A2 จะแนะนำ package นี้ เพิ่มแค่ท่านละ 765 บาท ต่อ
75 FTM recommend package this add only CL each 765 baht per
75 (I would like) to recommend that (you) pay only 765 baht per
76 ทาน
76 CL
76 person more for this package

77 +C2 and C3 follow C1 to the front desk and listen to A2’s speaking.+

78 C3 โอ้ยมา 24
78 Oh my god
78 Oh my god

79 +C2 walks out of the front desk and sits on the sofa in the waiting area.+

80 A2 แค่ ถ้า ไม่ชอบ package นี้ จะเลือกเป็น a la carte ก็ได้
80 But if not like package this FTM choose as a la carte can
80 But if (you) don’t like this package (you) can choose a la carte because
81 เพราะว่า อาหารน้ำ เวลา จะแยกกัน แล้ว
81 because breakfast we FTM separate PTM
81 breakfast is not included

82 C1 ก็คือ สิ่ง ต่างหาก
82 DM mean order separate
82 That means (we can) order separately

83 A2 ใช้แล้ว จะเป็น (French fries ผัดเรอร์)
83 Yes and FTM be (French fries ready)
83 Yes and (French fries are ready) (to be served)

84 C1 อีกแล้ว ทานก็ได้ โปรด เครดิต อะไร มีโปรโมชั่น ลด ไหม
84 Ah and if use card credit what have promotion discount Q-YN
84 Ah and do you have any promotional discounts for people using any

24 The exclamation term อะไง is derived from a Chinese word 哎呀/āiyá/ used to express surprise and blame (WordSense.eu Dictionary, 2014). Then, it was borrowed by Chinese-Thai people and modified in pronunciation. It is referred to as the expression of surprise, anger and fright.
types of credit cards?

Have (=yes) FPF but must order price this 40%

Yes but (you) must order 40% of (food) by this price

er: so FPF/M take price this discount from price this

cannot

er: so I (=FPF/M) would like to take this price can't you give more

why

Q-YN

discounts based on this price?

er if (you mean) this one (it is for) only tomorrow night

doesn't

If you (=PSP) stay for 2 nights we can do for you for today and

tomorrow

tomorrow FTM available be room (mundex premier) today FTM

tomorrow but for tomorrow only (mundex premier) rooms are available

for today both types of the rooms are available but for tomorrow only

dad

on the top

rooms on the top are available

Ah if (we want to) stay (here) do we have to stay today?

Can I have a look a small room? I want to have a look the small one

Yes FPF you're welcome FPF

Yes you're welcome

Could I ask for your permission to have you wait a moment we need
Prepare room to look to prepare a room for your consideration

C1 *OK yes FPM

*C1 turns back to walk to the place where C2 and C3 are.--->

+C4 turns back to walk to the place where C2 and C3 are at the waiting area.+

(C.02)

C1 ขอ ดู ใบ หนังสือ นี้ หน่อย

Beg  look  CL brochure  this  a bit

Can I have a look this brochure a bit?

A2 *แยกไว้เลย

*keep

*(you can) keep it

*A2 gives the brochure to C1.--->

(C.02)

C1 *OK

*OK

*OK

*C1 receives the brochure from A2.--->

*C1 walks back to C2, C3 and C4.*

(0.23)

+C1 and C2 walk out of the waiting area.+

(4.30)

+A2 walks out of the front desk, stops at the intersection between the inside of the front desk and the place where C1 and C2 are.+

A2 *วิ่งทั้งหมด 25 ครั้ง ((smiles))

*invite FPF ((smiles))

*this way please ((smiles))

*A2 spreads her right hand backward to show the direction where to go.--->

+C4 stands up and looks for someone or something outside the waiting area.+

+C3 stands up and turns to talk to A2 but due to the distance between the audio-recorder and the place where the ongoing interaction occurs at that time, and to the interfering sounds from the wind, C3’s speaking is unclear.+

(0.32)

The term "วิ่ง" which literally means “to invite” connotes an invitation in meaning.
Enter to look first DM can FPF
(you) can have a look it first

Enter to look first DM can
(you) can have a look it first

(I will have a look it together with (my children)

(you) don't have to wait give (them) now

(you) don't have to wait give (them) now

(you) can have a look it first
Appendix 7.9: [4:4] Checking the flight to Birgen (W2104) Western Tours Hua Hin

Length: 10.36 minutes

A1 = female agent 1
C1 = female Thai customer 1

1. +A1 is on the phone when C1 gets into the company. When A1 acknowledges that C1 arrives there, A1 nods and smiles as a greeting. A1 also spreads out the right hand as a signal which invites C1 to sit on the chair opposite her.+

2. +C1 smiles while walking to the front desk.+

3. A1

4. +C1 sits on the chair where A1 invites her to take a seat.+

5. A1


7. (0.05)

8. +C1 fans herself.+

9. A1

10. (0.25)

11. +C1 drinks water.+

12. A1

13. (0.03)

14. A1

15. (0.05)
A1 ค่ะ
FPF (=yes)
yes
(0.03)

This be rate how much FI/P
How much for this rate?
(0.03)

OK FPF KPS FTM anyway if customer
It’s OK anyway if customers

( . )

FL/P (=yes)
Yes
( . )

FPF (=yes) KPS
Yes
( . )

FPF (=yes) so FTM Nune (=I) call to tell again FPF FPF: (=yes:)
Yes so I’ll call you again yes goodbye

Goodbye FPF

* A1 hangs up the phone. *

Good morning FPF (smiles) (your) time go again (smiles and laughs)
Good morning (smiles) it’s (your) time to go (there) again (smiles and laughs)
Go again ((smile voice)) ((smiles and laughs)) way one
Yes again ((smile voice)) ((smiles and laughs)) one-way (ticket)

((laughs)) ณี ได้ ไหม (.) กี่ ปี ละ
((laughs)) one this get visa (.) how many year FCoq
((laughs)) how many years is your visa valid?
+C1 puts her left elbow on the front desk and her left hand on her head while listening to A1.+

Really? when will you go?

Really go day which

*Why not buy ticket year FCoq ticket
*Why don't you buy a one-year ticket?
*A1 holds a pen in her hand.--->

It's cheaper than a one-way ticket

*It's cheaper buy one way WS/P

any day?

*It's cheaper than a one-way ticket

Any day?

A1 takes the calendar on her left hand side and shows it to C1.*

*FTM return day any (.) can

Any day?

*FTM return day any (.) can

Any day?
C1 "ภายใน 1 ปี" "within 1 year"

A1 ที่สามารถจองวันสดุดีายของตั้งปีได้ละ KPS (=you) can book day last of ticket year can FCoq=
You can book the last day of the one-year ticket

C1 ถือUm

A1 =แล้วพอเราจะกลับเนี่ยวเราก็แค่โทรมาเลื่อน
=and when we FTM return DM/C we DM only call to postpone
=and when we want to return, we just call (the agent) to postpone (.)
(,)หรือนี่ก็ถ้าจะกลับวันสดุดีายของตั้งปีหมดเลยก็
(,) or if FTM return day last of ticket year expire DM
or if (you) (want to) travel on the last day when the ticket expires, you
กลับตามตามตัวไดเลย
return according to according to ticket can
can return on that day

C1 ราคา มันก็ (.)ก็คือ
Price it be (.) be
Its price is (.) is

A1 ราคาต่างกันเยอะนะชื่อเที่ยงเดิว
Price different many WS/P buy way-one
There is a huge difference in price (if you) buy one-way (tickets)
[ชื่อไปกลับประหยัดกว่าเยอะ]
[buy return saver much]
[return (tickets) are much cheaper]

C1 [เที่ยงเดิวยก็คือ (.)อยู่ที่เที่ยวใคร
[way-one be (.) be at how much]
[how much do (.) one-way (tickets) cost?]

A1 --->เที่ยงเดียว*โทรศัพท์จะไปBirgenนะ
 --->way-one* excuse-me WS/P go Birgen WS/P
 --->one-way* excuse-me (you wanna) go to Birgen?
 --->A1 writes something on a piece of paper.*

C1 Birgen ((nods several times)) จำได้
Birgen ((nods several times)) remember can
Birgen ((nods several times)) (you) can remember

A1 *จำได้
*remember can
*yes I do
*A1 writes something on the same piece of paper.--->

C1 (laughs)

A1 --->ครั้งที่แล้ว:ไป:*
 --->time last: go:*
 --->last time: did (you) transit in Copenhagen?
--- A1 continues writing something on the same piece of paper.*
*เปลี่ยนเครื่องที่ Copenhagen ใช้ใหม่
*transit at Copenhagen Q-YN
*A1 glances at C1 while speaking.--->

C1 ใช่ ค่ะ ((nods))
Yes FPF ((nods))
Yes ((nods))
(.)
*A1 continues noting something on the same piece of paper.*

A1 --->ไป Birgen (.) เที่ยว เดียว (.)* *พี่ ให้ คุณ เป็น เที่ยว
 --->and then go Birgen (.) way one (.)* *KPS for look be way
 --->and then (you) travelled to Birgen (.) one-way (tickets) (.)* *I will
 --->A1 continues writing something on the same piece of paper.* *A1
 stops writing to look at C1.--->

A1 *go นั้น FPF
what month do you want to travel?
A1 stops walking and turns back to talk to C1.--->

C1 *เดือน นี้ละ เป็น สิ้นเดือนนี้ นะ
*month may be end month this WS/P
*month? it may be at the end of this month
*C1 looks at the calendar.--->

+A1 bends downward and looks at the calendar.+

A1 *ประมาณวันที่
*approximate date
*what date is it approximately?
*A1 looks at the same calendar as C1.--->

C1 3 30 นะ
3 30 WS/P
3 30

A1 30 นะ
30 WS/P
30

C1 เฮ
Yeah
Yeah
A1 30 ไปถึง โน่น 31 หรือว่า check-in (.) 2[9=
30 arrive over there 31 or check-in (.) 2[9=
30 (do you want to) arrive there on 31st or check in (.) on 29th

C1 [°29°
[°29°
[°29°

A1 =แล้ว ไปถึง วันที่ [30
=then arrive date [30
=then arrive (there) on 30th

C1 [°30°
[°30°
[°30°

*A1 leaves the front desk to the computer behind the front desk.)*

C1 ฉะ ประมาณนี้ ไม่ไってしまったหรือว่า ถ้า ไม่ได้ ก็ (.) หลังจาก 31
Yes something like that Q-YN or if not DM (.) after 31
Yeah something like that is that OK? If not it may (.) be after 31st
ก็ดี นั่น
OK Q-YN (colloquial)

+When A1 sits on the chair in front of the computer, she turns back to
talk to C1.+

A1 ได้
OK
OK

*A1 turns to search for information on the computer.*

(1.38)

*A1 walks to another front desk to take a calculator. Then, she returns
to the computer behind the front desk. After that, she tears a piece of
paper out of the printer.*

(0.55)

*A1 takes the pile of the printer paper and returns to the front desk
where C1 is waiting for her.*

A1 มัน แพง อะ
It expensive FCoq
It’s expensive

C1 แพง ใช้ไหม ช่วง นี้
Expensive Q-YN time this?
Is it expensive these days?

A1 ธีม *เจี่ยงเดียบร
Um *one-way

*A1 uses a pen to point at something on the printed paper.*--->
Way-one
One-way (tickets)

Yes ((nods)) return tickets are cheaper

Really? Thai Airways have promotion these days, don't they?

Thai Airways don't do either ((slightly shakes the head)) if (you mean)
be ticket promotion ตัว 1 เดือน
promotional tickets, they have (only) one-month tickets

Ticket 1 month
1-month tickets

*only one-month tickets
*A1 nods slightly.

Must return within 1 month
(you) must return by a month

Go way-one cannot Q-YN
Can't I go there via one-way (tickets)?

They don't have promotional one-way (tickets) ((shakes the head))

No promotion
No promotional (tickets)

ไป อย่างเดียว ไม่ได้ หรอ
Go way-one no promotion ((shakes the head))
They don't have promotional one-way (tickets) ((shakes the head))

ไป อย่างเดียว ไม่มี โปรโมชั่น ((shakes the head))
Go way-one cannot Q-YN
Can't I go there via one-way (tickets)?

No promotion
No promotional (tickets)

ไป อย่างเดียว (.) หรือว่า จะ ถู สายการบิน อื่น ไหม
Go way-one(.) or want look airlines other Q-YN
One-way(.) or would you like to check other airlines?

C1 อีก ดู ถูกจะ ดี
Um look probably good
Um it’s probably a good idea

A1 °รี่°
°FI/P° (=yes)
°yes°

Um it’s probably a good idea
*A1 leaves the front desk and walks to the computer, but stops for a
while in order to restart talking to C1.*

A1 วิชา เรียนร้อย แล้ว ไปไหน คะ
Visa ready already Q-YN FPF
Have (you) got a visa already?

C1 *เออ เรียนร้อย แล้ว แต่ มา ดู วัน ก่อน จะ ไป match
*yes ready already but come look date first FTM go match
*yes I have but I (want to) check the date first to match with (my)
*C1 takes the printed paper which describes the details of the Thai
Airways flight for her consideration.--->
กับ ที่ไหน คะ “ที่แฟน อยู่”
with over there FPF “where boyfriend live”
“boyfriend’s”

A1 ค่ะ ((nods))
FPF (=yes) ((nods))
Yes ((nods))

A1 searches for information on the computer whereas C1 considers
carefully the details of the Thai Airways flight.+

(0.40)

A1 tears the printed paper from the printer. Then, she continues
searching for information on the computer.+

(2.02)

A1 returns to the front desk with the printed piece of paper on her
hand.+

A1 ไม่กี่ ของ SAS
Or of SAS
Or SAS (Airline)

C1 อะสะ
Yeah
Yeah

A1 *เพิ่มเติมว่า
*way-one
*one-way
*A1 writes something on the printed paper that she takes from the
computer desk.--->
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Is that a one-way (ticket)?

---

A1: but CL this is be price special of SAS they book PTM
---

A1: but this one is a special price offered by SAS if (you) book it,

---

C1: If (I) book it do (I) need to pay for it immediately?

---

A1: Yes there are only 2 available seats on the 30th as shown in

---

C1: "We can change the flight?"
*because you will be able to
the printed paper that C1 holds on her hands.—>  
*because you will be able to

because Thai and SAS take

A1 points to something on

C1 points to the printed paper while speaking.—>  

because NTP yet not sure that date 25th DM/C=

because he (=NTP) is not sure whether this 25th=

C1 points to the printed paper while speaking.—>  

A1 um

um

C1 =ลง ลง เป็นวันที่ 25 ไม่รู้ ว่า เค้า จะ มา เมื่อไหร่

may have to be date 25 not know that NTP FT come Thailand

=it may have to be on 25th I am not sure whether he (NTP) can come to

ได้ หรือเปล่า

can Q-YN

Thailand

A1 ค่ะ ((nods))

FPF (=yes) ((nods))

Yes ((nods))

C1 เเพราะ ถ้า มา ไว้ ก็ดีค่ะ

Because if come can mean

If (he) can, it means

A1 พร้อมกัน หรอ

Together Q-YN (colloquial)

Together?

C1 ถ้ากลับ พร้อมกัน คือ เดือนหน้า=

Ah return together mean month next=

Ah (we'll) return together, i.e., next month=

A1 อื้ม ((nods))

Um ((nods))

Um ((nods))

C1 =คือ ถ้า เค้า จะมา ได้ เราก็ ไป พร้อมกัน

=mean if he book can we FT can go together

=I mean if he can book it and come (here) we will go there together

A1 โอเคฯ

"OK OK"

A1 โอเคฯ

"OK OK"

C1 แต่ ในกรณี ที่ เค้า ไม่มา ก็คือ

But in case that NTP not come mean

But if he (NTP) can't come (here), it means

A1 ไป [เอง

Go [yourself
(you’ll) go (there) yourself

[กลับ วันที่ 25]
[return date 25]
[and return on 25th]

จะ ((nods))
FI/P (=yes) ((nods))
Yes ((nods))

I will come (here) again"

บัน โทรศัพท์ พ่อ นั้นๆ ก็ได้ นะคะ
So call tell KPS(=I) a bit can FPF
So can (you) call me and let me know a bit please

คร่ำ *ไอ *เข้ำ เช้ามา*
FPF *OK FPF "FTM come"
Yes *OK "(I’ll) come (here)"
*C1 folds the printed paper and holds in her hands.---->

Yeah: yeah: thank you FPF
Yeah: yeah: thank you

+A1 leaves the front desk and sits in front of the computer screen behind the front desk.+

+C1 stands up and takes her handbag on another chair next to her chair. Then, C1 walks out of Western Tours Hua Hin.
Appendix 7.10: [4:9] Trip to India and Cambodia (W2109) Western Tours Hua Hin

Length: 16.49 minutes

A1 = female Thai agent 1
A2 = female Thai agent 2
C1 = male non-Thai customer 1

1  +A1 holds the phone line on her hands. When she sees C1, she smiles widely. She does "wai"\(^{26}\) as a traditional greeting to C1. Then, she hangs up the phone.+

2  +C1 walks into the office with a wide smile. When he sees A1’s “wai” as a greeting, he raises his left hand in front of his chest as a greeting back to A1. He stops for a while before walking to the front desk where A1 is and ready to give him a service.+

3  A1 เรน่า this way please
3  PSP เรน่า this way please
3  Mr Rena this way please

4  +C1 stands in front of the front desk and touches the collar. Then, he walks to the desk and sits down.+

5  +A1 puts things, i.e., a calculator, a pile of paper and pens, on the table+

6  A1 Something I can help?
7  C1 Ah: yes
8  (.)

9  A1 >>--About?
9  >>--A1 smiles widely.

10 C1 Jet Airline

11 A1 ((nods)) Yes ((smile voice and nods))

12 C1 Yeah: (.) Bangkok-New Delhi

13 +A1 nods while listening to C1.+

14 A1 *Yes?
14 *A1 writes what C1 said.---->

15 C1 Er: and Kerala:-Bangkok

\(^{26}\) “Wai” is an action which two palms are put in front of the chest and the head is bent forward a bit.
A1 *OK
*A1 writes what C1 said.--->

(0.02)

A1 When would you like to go?

C1 The fifth of July

A1 *The fifth of July
*A1 writes what C1 said.--->

C1 Er: and back 11th

(.

A1 OK (((nods)))

C1 I think they only have (.) one flight every day

A1 *OK=
*A1 nods.--->

C1 Yeah

A1 =*I will check good price for [you
=A1 looks shortly at her note.--->

C1 [18.20 I think er:: in the evening er:

A1 notes what C1 said.+

A1 *From Bangkok?
*A1 writes what C1 said.--->

C1 From Bangkok and [er: the other is=

A1 [And back from Kerala?

C1 =11.55 from Kerala=

A1 OK (((nods)))

C1 =I think

A1 *One moment please
*A1 stands up.--->

C1 Yes:

A1 takes the written note and goes to sit in front of the computer
behind the front desk.+

(2.04)

A1 returns to the front desk with the printed paper.+
A1: *Rena this is the flight fifth of July
KPS: *Rena this is the flight fifth of July
*Mr Rena this is the flight fifth of July
A1 shows the printed paper to C1.--->

C1: *Yeah?
C1 puts his fingers on the shown paper and looks at the details on the shown paper.--->

A1: *Bangkok to Delhi
A1 points to the details on the printed paper to show to C1.--->

C1: *Uhha:
C1 looks at the details which A1 points to.--->

A1: *And eleventh of July from Kerala to Bangkok
A1 points to the details on the printed paper to show to C1.--->

C1: *To Bangkok yeah
C1 looks at the details which A1 points at.--->

A1: *Total price (. ) 9800 baht
A1 shows another printed paper to C1.--->

(0.03)

+C1 considers the printed paper in front of her.+ 

C1: I take that

A1: OK ((smile voice and nods)) (. ) just you?

C1: Yeah

A1: *Not ((shakes the head)) for Mr Dune
A1: *Not ((shakes the head)) for Madam Dune
A1: *Not ((shakes the head)) for Madam Dune
A1: *Mr Rena can you check for me again?

C1: No: no:

A1: ((little laughs and widely smiles)) 

A1 holds the two pieces of paper in her hand, leaves the front desk and goes to the computer behind the front desk.*

C1: Party holiday

A1: *((laughs and widely smiles))
A1 stands near the computer.--->

(2.17)

+A1 turns to the front desk with a new printed piece of paper.+ 

A1: *Rena can you check for me again?
A1: *PSP Rena can you check for me again?
A1: *Mr Rena can you check for me again?
A1 shows the new printed piece of paper to C1.

A1 *Fifth of July
A1 *A1 points at the details on the printed paper.

C1 Ah yeap

A1 This time?

C1 Umm:

A1 Back eleventh of July=

C1 Uh

A1 =And for the visa you can give me your passport later

C1 Yeah

A1 >>--After you come back from Cambodia ((nods))
A1 >>--A1 nods.

C1 From Cambodia ah and another thing (.) er: I talk with Kampuchana Hotel in er: Phnom Penh=

A1 stands up and turns around to leave the front desk. However, when C1 starts saying, "I talk with...", she stops and turns around to listen to C1.+

A1 Yes ((nods))

C1 =they come here for fair and they said no water ((shakes the head)) in a river

A1 ((little laughs and widely smiles)) right now? ((widely smiles))

C1 Yes so no way to go

A1 Um:

C1 So er:: I have (.) then I can take the bus or take Bangkok Air=

A1 Um: ((nods))

C1 =From Siem Reap to er: Phnom Penh=

A1 Um: ((nods))

C1 =when I think to the Internet to look er: and check cost 18000 dollars

A1 *No:: from Siem Reap [to=
A1 *A1 makes her eyes bigger--->

C1 [yeah=
A1 =[Phnom Penh=

C1 =[Yeah

A1 =I can check the price for you

C1 ((much laughs))

A1 ((laughs))

*A1 gets out of the desk to check some information on the computer behind the front desk. *

(2.08)

+A2 walks out of the inside and greets C1.

A2 *คุณ Rena สวัสดี ค่ะ ((smiles))
+PSP Rena  good morning  FPF ((smiles))
*Mr Rena good morning ((smiles))
+A2 does “wai” to Rena.--->

C1  สวัสดี ครับ ((smiles))
Good morning  FPM ((smiles))
Good morning ((smiles))

+A2 puts her two hands together in front of her belly.+

A2 ((nods and smiles))

C1 You OK? ((smiles))

A2 Right ((nods and smiles)) everything OK ((smiles))

C1 Yeah ((little laughs and smiles)) ยุ่งยาก พอ ( ) play golf every
Yeah ((little laughs and smiles)) a bit  hot ( ) play golf every
Yeah ((little laughs and smiles)) a little bit hot ( ) play golf every
day?

A2 *Um: no ((nods))
+A2 stands and puts her hands together in front of her belly.--->

C1 No every second day ((laughs))

A2 I stop for: nearly two weeks too much

C1 °yeah°

A2 Very much (.) last time I started 10 o’clock not 7

C1 I go 7 o’clock in the morning and finish er: 10 around

A2 Ah: ((nods)) but if you start early ((conversation interrupted by printer sound)) good time you’ll finish around 9 o’clock=

C1 Yeah
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113  A2  =10 o’clock
114  C1  Yeah ((conversation interrupted by printer sound)) (° °) [so=
115  A2  [so how
116  much]
117  C1  =Myanmar) Myanmar go every (. ) *Monday Wednesday Friday
117  *C1 raises his right fingers to count
like one, two, three.--->
118  A2  Perfect ((smiles)) (0.02) good time ((nods and smiles))
119  C1  Yeah
120  +A2 steps backwards and turns to the left to greet other customers.+
121  +C1 continues waiting for the result from A1.+
122  (0.46)
123  +A1 returns back to the front desk with the written paper.+
124  A1  */uni0เ04/uni0เ38/uni0เ13 Rena (. ) this is the price and I can check for you 7000 baht from
124  *PSP Rena (. ) this is the price and I can check for you 7000 baht from
124  *Mr Rena (. ) this is the price and I can check for you 7000 baht from
124  *A1 shows the written paper and points to some information on the paper
while speaking.----->
125  Siem Reap Airport to Phnom Penh
125  Siem Reap Airport to Phnom Penh
125  *Siem Reap Airport to Phnom Penh
126  C1  °Um°
127  A1  *By Cambodia Angkor Airlines
127  *A1 points to some information on the paper while speaking.----->
128  (. )
129  C1  *OK
129  *C1 looks at the information pointed by A1.----->
130  A1  *And they have flight every day morning flight? afternoon and evening
130  *A1 writes something on the noted paper.-->---
131  three times
132  (. )
133  C1  *OK (0.02) °number two er:° I know the bus (. ) er::: called Maekhong
133  *C1 looks at A1.--->
134  Express (. ) they come er:: they look er::=
135  +A1 nods time by time while listening to C1.+
136  A1  Yes
137  C1  5 or 6 hours er: cost [ten
[you can buy the bus ticket at the hotel

*Yeah ten er: ten dollars
*C1 slightly nods.--->

I believe it’s good price ((little smiles))

((little laughs))

You can try ((smiles))

But er: *I can take this one?
*C1 looks at the piece of the paper which contains the
information about the flight between Siem Reap Airport and Phnom
Penh.--->

A1 Yes

*(with me)*

+A1 takes a pen from the box on the left.+

Ah::

+A1 walks to another front desk to take an invoice book, and returns it to
the front desk.+

*C1 turns to speak to another non-Thai customer who has just finished
taking service and is leaving from the company. C1 speaks a language
which is neither Thai nor English.

(0.09)

Rena you prefer window seat or aisle seat? (.) or you want to sit
PSP Rena you prefer window seat or aisle seat? (.) or you want to sit
Mr Rena you prefer window seat or aisle seat? (.) or you want to sit with
with your friend? ((little smiles))
with your friend? ((little smiles))
your friend? ((little smiles))

Yeah I don’t know that is: er: can you can you order er:: never mind
that’s it

+A1 smiles while listening to C1.+

OK

(.)

Good seat ((smiles))

Yeah

((laughs))
C1 I can seat (with) everyone=
+A1 opens the invoice book with a smile.+

C1 =((laughs))

+A1 writes something in the invoice book.+

(0.50)

+A1 tears the two pieces of paper out of the invoice book. Then, she
takes the staple to collect them together. She walks to the computer. She
sits in front of the computer and prints out the paper.+

(0.52)

+A1 walks to another front desk to take the stamp out of the drawer. She
stamps on the printed paper. Then, she returns to the front desk where
C1 is sitting.+

A1 *This is your electronic e-ticket
A1 *A1 gives him the printed paper.--->

C1 Yeap

(.)

A1 *This is the price
A1 *A1 shows another small piece of paper to C1.---->

+A1 folds the invoice book and puts it on the left. Then, she takes
another pile of paper in front of her to fold whereas C1 prepares money
to be paid and holds them in his hand.+

+C1 puts the amount of money and the e-ticket on the desk in front of
A1.+

+A1 folds every document, i.e., the e-ticket, the invoice and other printed
documents, and then put them into an envelope.+

+A1 gives C1 the envelope. Then, she takes the amount of money in
front of her, and counts it. Then, she puts the money into the invoice
book.+

+C1 takes a pen from the box on the right and writes something in front
of the envelope, but the pen does not work. Therefore, A1 gives him her
pen.+

+A1 takes the money and the invoice book to the inside whereas C1
writes something on the front of the envelope.+

(0.13)

A1 */uni0เ04/uni0เ48/uni0เ30
A1 */uni0เ48/uni0เ30

A1 *FPF (=Here you are)
A1 *Here you are
A1 *A1 gives C1 a change.--->
C1 *°OK?°
*C1 takes the change from A1.--->

A1 *ขอบคุณ ค่ะ
*thank you FPF
*thank you
*A1 does proper "wai" to C1.--->

+C1 counts the change.+

C1 (°well ((mumble)) --->I will sort it out* (.) I take it (.) and er::°)

+C1 uses the envelope to knock on the desk. *

+A1 nods and widely smiles while listening to C1.+

A1 So you can think about the flight from Siem Reap to Phnom Penh=

C1 Yeah I will

A1 [=Maybe you can take a bus

C1 Yeah maybe

A1 Cheaper ((nods and smiles))

C1 Yes 7 7000 baht [er::

A1 [how long: um:: from Cambodia er: Siem Reap to

Phnom Penh?

C1 It takes [er:

A1 [4 or 5

C1 5

A1 5 [hours ((nods))

C1 [5 hours but they said er:: nice bus I don't know er:: °maybe a little

bus°

+A1 little smiles and nods while listening to C1.+

A1 ((little laughs))

C1 But er:::

A1 [What time is spent ((smiles))

C1 =I haven't bought it yet

A1 ((laughs and smiles))

C1 As you said (0.03) but OK nowadays er from the hotel er:: I want that

you have 4500
208  +A1 nods and smiles time by time.+
209  A1  The ticket is cheaper ((smiles))=
210  C1  Cheaper
211  A1  From Internet ((nods)) [very good price ((nods))
212  C1  [2000 3400 er::
213  A1  They always have promotions from Internet
214  C1  Yeah (.) Agoda
215  A1  Agoda give them credit card everything ((smiles and nods))
216  C1  Yeah yeah
217  (.)
218  C1  OK but in er: Phnom Penh they taken the (27) they called the welcome
219  (they have) Cambodian boys er::: Cambodian girls they:: yeah they
220  close to the (. ) bus station close [to=
221  +A1 nods and smiles time by time while listening to C1.+
222  A1  [um: ((nods))
223  C1  =er ((mumble)) er: OK
224  A1  Um ((nods and smiles))
225  C1  Big room with with er: (.) normal proper (.) proper toilets [and some
226  A1  (((little laughs
227  and smiles)) OK ((smile voice, smiles and nods))
228  C1  Er: Terry always knows er: nice
229  A1  Also good price yeah ((smiles))
230  (.)
231  C1  *OK (.) he would do everything yeah:: take the trip around
232  A1  *C1 stands up and leaves the front desk. He also puts the envelope into
233  C1  the back trouser pocket.--->
234  A1  Yeah ((smiles))
235  C1  OK? so *everything sorts it out now I think OK
236  *C1 moves the chair as near as the desk and looks at the outside
237  of the company.--->
238  A1  +A2 walks from the inside and sees C1 departing from the Company.+
A1 /*phrase*)
   *thank you much FPF ((smile voice and smiles))
   *thank you very much ((smile voice and smiles))
   *A1 does proper “wai” to C1.-->

C1 *[OK bye
   *[C1 does quick “wai” back to A1.-->

A2 /*phrase*)
   *[หนุ่ม Rena สรรเสริญ
   *[PSP Rena goodbye FPF
   *[Mr Rena goodbye
   *[A2 does proper “wai” to C1 while standing at the back of the desk.-->

C1 *[see you
   *[C1 does quick “wai” back to A2.-->

A1 [bye bye

+C1 opens the door and leaves the company.+
Appendix 7.11: [4:12] Flight to Udonthani (W2112) Western Tours Hua Hin

Length: 5.40 minutes

A1 = female agent 1
A2 = female agent 2
A3 = female agent 3
C1 = male non-Thai customer 1

1  +When A2, who sits at the front desk inside the office, sees C1 walking into the company, A2 greets C1.+ 
   2  A2  สวัสดี ค่ะ ((smiles)) 
   3  Good morning FPF ((smiles))
   4  Good morning
   5  +When A1, who sits in front of the computer behind the front desk, recognizes C1’s arrival, A1 turns to greet C1.+ 
   6  A1  สวัสดี ค่ะ ((smiles))
   7  Good morning FPF ((smiles))
   8  Good morning
   9  *A1 stands up with a file in her hand and leaves the desk in front of the computer.*
10  A1  This way please
11  *A1 spreads out her right hand to invite C1 to sit down.
12  A1  May I help you? ((smiles))
13  C1  I want to check flight to Udonthani=
14  A1  *Yes? ((nods))
15  *A1 writes down what C1 said.--->
16  C1  =tomorrow and Sunday please
17  A1  OK. *Just one way=
18  *A1 stops writing and glances at C1.--->
19  C1  [er I want to come back=
20  A1  *=or you
21  *=A1 continues having eye contact with C1.--->
C1 = on Monday morning but I’m not sure if I go tomorrow or I go on Sunday depend on the time

A1 continues having eye contact with C1 while listening to him and writing down.

A1 OK just one person?
C1 Yes.

A1 °One moment please°
A1 lifts a finger.

A1 leaves the front desk and searches for some information on the computer behind the front desk.*

A1 prints out a piece of paper and returns to the front desk.

A1 This is flight from Thai Airways Saturday and Sunday same time (.)
A1 shows the printed paper to C1 and points to the details as described.---->
three times a day

C1 Three times?
C1 points to the details on the paper as described.--->

A1 Yeah

C1 takes the glasses case from the bag.

A1 This is the price for return ticket
A1 writes something on the printed paper.---->

A1 prints out a piece of paper and returns to the front desk.

A1 This is on the way back on Monday
A1 points to the details on the paper as described.---->

C1 Ah

A1 Also three times leave from Udon and back to Bangkok
A1 points to the details on the paper as described.---->

C1 Abhu airport
C1 reads a word in the printed paper.---->
A1  สุวรรณภูมิ  Airport
Suvarnabhumi Airport

C1  Ah Suvarnabhumi ah OK excellent

A1  ((nods))

C1  Is um: if I leave from Udonthani on Monday

A1  *(Uh:*
*A1 puts her left elbow on the desk and her left hand near the lip.-*

C1  Can I check my bag check-in for my international flight?

A1  *(.)

C1  Ah:: I can check for you because some sometime *[if you fly=
*A1 uses a pen to count her left fingers one by one.-*

A1  *[I can]

C1  *=to Chiang Mai [or Phuket but Udon
=*A1 uses a pen to count her left fingers one by one.-*

A1  *[I know from Chiang Mai but I don't think [Udon is an
international airport=*

A1  *[OK]

C1  *=but *it doesn’t a big problem- does need to go far OK
*C1 shakes his left finger to indicate his refusal.-*

A1  Um ((nods))

*C1 takes the printed paper for his consideration.*

C1  Can that be the best price?*[Nothing special
* [C1 stops considering the flight detail on
the paper and looks at A1.-*

A1  *[((nods)) this is the special price=

C1  Is it?

A1  =because if you buy normal ticket it’s about [8000=*

C1  *[Yeah?

A1  =now
*And all these flights are free?*  
*C1 points to the details on the printed paper.---*

A1 Yes ((nods))

OK (.) from here to Suvarnabhumi ใ

OK (.) from here to Suvarnabhumi spend time how much

OK (.) how long does it take from here to Suvarnabhumi?

A1 Three hours

*C1 lifts his three fingers.---*

A1 Three hours

C1 OK

And you --->have to check in one hour* before

A1 glances at a new customer who gets into the company

for a while.*

Sure

The ticket *its price is no change no refund

*A1 points to what she described.---*

Yes I understand

((little laughs))

So this is the same time (. ) tomorrow Sat er Saturday [Saturday and

Sunday the same time

C1 OK OK

(0.02)

+C1 spreads out his right hand towards A1 as a sign to ask for a pen.+

What is your name?

My name is N-O-O-N

+C1 writes A1’s name.+

(0.06)

+A1 looks at what C1 wrote.+

"ไม่ใช่ พ่อ" ((shakes the head slightly))

No "FPF" ((shakes the head slightly))

No ((shakes the head slightly))
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*A1 takes the pen that C1 gave and writes the name for him with a smile. When finishing writing, she returns that paper and the pen to C1.*

C1 Ah: it'd better you say Noon

A1 ((little laughs, widely smiles and nods))

C1 Not Nun

A1 *I don't know how to
A1 shakes the head while speaking.--->

C1 Yeah yeah

A1 Write my name in English ((laughs and smiles))

C1 Very hard because if you write like you say N-O-O-N

A1 ไผ่
A1 Yes

C1 It should say it Noon /nuun/

A1 Um:

C1 Wrong

A1 Um:: (.) like afternoon

C1 Yeah like afternoon you see I think I *write เขียน เขียน พาลพัน* 30
C1 Yeah like afternoon you see I think I *write write write those* 31
C1 Yeah like afternoon you see I think I *write those* 32

*C1 points to what he wrote.--->

A1 *This is [my name how] you write in English
A1 points to what she wrote on the paper.--->

C1 [I have noon /nuun/ noon /nuun/] (.) hard cannot

A1 ไผ่: ((emphasis)) ((laughs and widely smiles))
A1 Yes: ((emphasis)) ((laughs and widely smiles))
A1 Yes: ((emphasis)) ((laughs and widely smiles))

---

28 The word Noon is pronounced using a longer vowel.
29 The word Nun is pronounced using a shorter vowel.
30 The word “พานิ้ว” in Thai is pronounced rather similarly to the way in which “นิ้ว”, A1’s name is pronounced.
31 The word “พานิ้ว” in Thai is equivalent to “those” in English in meaning.
32 The word “those” in English in meaning is related to the word “พานิ้ว” in Thai in pronunciation.
Because --> very short* Nuni Nuni
Because --> very short* Nuni Nuni
Because --> very short* Nuni Nuni
---C1 makes a thumb and a finger a small-amount sign.*

Um N-U-N no? N-O-O-N no?

Yeah *N-U-N is nun /n/uni0เ44/uni0เ21/uni0เ48/uni0เ43/uni0เ0A/uni0เ48/uni0เ44/uni0เ21/uni0เ48/uni0เ16/uni0เ39/uni0เ01
Yeah it is the best one but it er: /uni0เ44/uni0เ21/uni0เ48/uni0เ43/uni0เ0A/uni0เ48/uni0เ44/uni0เ21/uni0เ48/uni0เ16/uni0เ39/uni0เ01
Yeah it is the best one but it er: no [not correct
Yeah it is the best one but it er: no [not correct

A1Maybe I have to change my name Q-YN? ((little nods))

C1 starts writing something on the paper.

*You may change your name to

To Q-WH should

What should I change to?

*No

*No

((largely laughs and smiles))

((laughs and smiles)) not good ((laughs and smiles))

((laughs and smiles))

((laughs and smiles))
((laughs and smiles)) not good ((laughs and smiles))

C1 Not good ((smile voice))
A1 *Not good ((smile voice, laughs and smiles))
*Not good PPF ((smile voice, laughs and smiles))
*Not good ((smile voice, laughs and smiles))
*A1 takes a highlight pen to the box on the left.--->
C1 Ah: OK ((smiles)) *what about ไม่ถูก?
Ah: OK ((smiles)) *what about falling tone marker?
Ah: OK ((smiles)) *what about the falling tone marker?
*C1 writes something on the paper.--->
A1 *ไม่ถูก it's not correct นะ
*not correct it's not correct FCoq
*not correct it's not correct
*A1 looks at what C1 showed to her and shakes the head several times.--->
C1 *ไม่ใช้ 
*rising tone marker 
*the rising tone marker
*C1 writes something on the paper.--->
A1 *ไม่ใช่ ไม่ใช่ ไม่ใช่ 
*no no no
*no no no
*A1 shakes her head several times.--->
C1 ไม่ใช้ 
Rise tone marker
Rise tone marker
A1 *ถ้า ไม่ใช่ 
*Um no
*Um no
*A1 shakes her head few times.--->
C1 ไม่ใช่ [ไม่ถูก] 
Falling tone marker [high tone marker]
Falling tone marker [high tone marker]
A1 *[ไม่ถูก ไม่ถูก not correct not correct
*not correct not correct
*A1 shakes her head several times.--->
C1 Noo
A1 *Should be this one นะ
*Should be this one WS/P
*Should be this one
*A1 points at what she wrote.--->
C1 OK ((smile voice and laughs)) OK and *เบอร์ จะใช้ ครับ
OK ((smile voice and laughs)) OK and *number Q-WH FPM
OK ((smile voice and laughs)) OK and *what is your (phone) number?*  

*C1 prepares to write the phone number.*  

+A1 smiles while listening to C1.+

--- businessmen card here คือ*  
--- number in business card  FPF*  
--- the number is on the business card*  
--- A1 takes a business card put on the left and gives it to C1.*  
*zero three two (.) five three three three zero three*  
*zero three two (.) five three three three zero three*  
*A1 reads and points at the number written on the card.*  

+C1 writes the number while listening to A1.+

C1 OK. And you’re sure plenty of tickets  

A1 Right now คือ (nods)  
Right now FPF (nods)  
Right now (nods)

C1 Yeah  

A1 Right now they have seats available=  

Yeah  

A1 =because the promotion I cannot* make a reservation for long time  
--- A1 shakes the head when speaking “cannot”.*  

C1 I know I know [I need the ticket=  

A1 [(“it’s available day by day“)]

C1 =but my problem is *I’m waiting for biking to come back ((laughs))  
*C1 takes off the eye glasses and holds them in her hand.*  

A1 Um:: (nods)

C1 I not know the situation you open *to seven pm?  
*C1 looks at his wrist watch.*  

A1 ใช้ คือ (nods)  
Yes FPF (nods)  
Yes (nods)

C1 OK excellent (.) *thank you for your help  
*C1 puts the eye glasses into the glasses case.*  

A1 You’re welcome ค่ะ  
You’re welcome FPF  
You’re welcome
+A3 gives A1 a piece of paper.+

+C1 folds the printed paper and details that A1 gave him into the pocket.+

+C1 takes his bag and wears the sunglasses. Then, he stands up.+

A1 สวัสดี ครับ  ((smile voice and smiles))
Goodbye FPF ((smile voice and smiles))

Goodbye ((smile voice and smiles))

+C1 leaves the company.+
Appendix 7.12: [5:3] Extending the stay (H2203) Haven Resort and Spa Hua Hin

Length: 3.12 minutes

A1 = male agent 1

A2 = female agent 2

C1 = female Thai customer 1

1  +A1 is on the phone. He glances at C1 who walks towards the front desk. A1 hangs up.+

2  A1 *สวัสิิา ครับ*
   *Good morning  FPM*
   *Good morning*
   *A1 does “wai” (an action which two palms are put in front of the chest and the head is bent forward a bit)---*

3  +C1 does “wai” back to A1 while walking. Then when she arrives at the front desk, C1 sits down in front of A1.+

4  C1 *(ถามค่ะ คือ ที่ ขอ อะไรค่ะ)*
   *(normally night by night Q-YN that ask PTM“)*
   *(normally (the rooms) that (I) asked for are (booked) every day”)*
   *C1 puts two elbows on the desk.---*

5  A1 ครับค่ะ คือ นี้ จะครับ
   FPM (=yes) night this FPM
   Yes (do you want to make a booking) tonight?

6  C1 *(ยังค่ะ) ห้อง ทั้ง คู่ วัน 302 ที่มี 30:
   *FPF (=yes) (nod) room it yet available 302 and 30:
   *Yes ((nod)) the rooms are available? (Room) 302 and 30:
   *C1 puts two elbows on the desk and raises her hands on her chin.---*

7  A1 ทั้ง สอง ห้อง เหมะ
   Both two room FPM
   Both rooms?

8  C1 ((nod))
   *A1 checks some information on the computer screen.*

9  A1 วันนี้ จะ ว่าง เป็น ห้อง superior ทั้ง ห้อง ดีเล็กจะครับ
   Today FTM available be room superior and room deluxe FPM
   Today the superior and deluxe rooms are available

10 C1 เรา ไม่รู้ ว่า คุณ พูดว่า อะไร=
    we not know that PSP speak what=
    I (singular we = I) have no idea what you (PSP) are talking about=

11 A1 ((simpers)) น่า: ”กึก คง” ((simpers))
   ((simpers)) Uh: “DM maybe” ((simpers))
   ((simpers)) Uh: “maybe” ((simpers))
293 *303 ยัง วาง อยู่ ไหม =
294 *303 still available PrTM Q-YN (colloquial) =
295 *303 is still available, isn’t it? =
296 *C1 uses the right finger to point to the computer and then points to her left palm. --->
297
298 A1 ย่า ((smiles))
299 Ah ((smiles))
300 Ah ((smiles))
301
302 C1 =คืน เนี่ย 33
303 =night this
304 =tonight
305
306 A1 คืน นี้ จะ ไม่ วาง [ละสิ้น
307 Night this FTM not available [FPM
308 It isn’t available tonight
309
310 C1 [คืน นี้ ไม่ วาง
311 [night this not available
312 [it isn’t available tonight
313
314 A1 (“ครับ”) ((nods))
315 (“FPM”) (=yes) ((nods))
316 (“Yes”) ((nods))
317
318 C1 302
319 302
320 (room) 302
321
322 A1 ก็ คง ต้อง ล้า อยู่ ต่อ ต้อง move ละสิ้น
323 DM so have to if stay more have to move FPM
324 So (you) may have to move (to other room) if you (want to) stay (here one) more (night)
325
326 C1 (nods many times)) แต่ เชื้อ ราคา ราคา ก็ ยัง ราคา เต็ม ด้วย
327 (nods many times)) But story price price DM still price same as well
328 (nods many times)) Anyway about the (room) price the (room) price is the same (as the present room?)
329
330 A1 ครับผม ((slightly nods))
331 FPM (=yes) ((slightly nods))
332 Yes madam ((slightly nods))
333
334 C1 เพราะก่อนนี้ เรายัง โพธิ์ มา ((nods)) ก็ ถูก เจ้าหน้าที่
335 Because before I O FM phone ((nods)) DM look officer
336 Because before I called (you) ((nods)) a male member of staff told (me)
337 ผู้ชาย เค้า บอก ว่า ยังไง ก็ ราคา เต็ม
338 male he tell that anyway DM price same
339 that the (room) price is the same
340
341 A1 *ครับผม
342
33 The term ก่อน/เมื่อ/ in Thai here is a demonstrative postposition to the noun phrase ก่อน /khun/. It also functions as a particle for emphasis.
And how are the rooms different (from the ones I stayed in)? The room (. ) that I stayed=

DM today FPM FTM get be room deluxe room one and room
Today (you) will have one deluxe room and one superior room if you
superior room ห้อง นี่ แหละ ถาม อยู่ ต่อ ((nods))
superior room one FPM if stay more ((nods))
stay (here one) more (night) ((nods))

+The telephone rings.+

*DM price it FTM equal Q-YN FPF
*are they the same price?
*C1 puts her palms on her face.--->

*ครับ мом
*FPM (=yes)
*Yes madam
*A1 nods.--->

( .

Price FTM: er:: (. ) second FPM
About the price (I) will: er:: (.) a second

+C1 จ่ะ
FI/P (=yes)
Yes

+The phone rings.+ (0.03)

+A1 takes a file which consists of documents out of the drawer on his right.+

+The phone continues ringing. A1 answers the phone.+
Haven, good morning

+A1 puts the file in a small drawer under the desk to look for some information.

*A1 looks at the file put in the small drawer near his nap.*

*A1 hangs up. Then, he borrows a pencil from A2 who is answering another phone.*

Many customers, aren’t there?

*Yes today (there are) many (customers) madam ((little laughs and smiles))*

The old room is number 3[0]

And it (will) be more than 3000

Include breakfast? ((nods))
*C1 puts her palms on her chin.--->

A1 *ใช้ ครับ
*yes FPM
*yes
*A1 nods.--->

C1 *แล้ว ถ้า ห้อง นี้ แทง 34
*And another room one FPM
*What about another room?
*C1 puts her palms on her chin.--->

A1 กี่ (.)
DM (=er) (.)
Er (.)

C1 *เหมือนเดิม ก็คือ มัน ก็ มี ห้อง วาง อยู่ แต่ มัน
*Same mean it DM have room available PrTM but it
*(It's) the same (I) mean there are (some) available rooms but (I am)
*C1 moves her right hand to touch the back of her neck and then
stretches out her arms quickly and puts them on her side.--->
*จำเป็นต้อง บ่าย ของ บ่าย บ้าน*
"need move belonging move house"
*required to move out (my) belongings"

A1 ใช้ ครับ ((nods)) กี่ คง ต้อง move อะครับ
Yes FPM ((nods)) DM may have to move FPM
Yes ((nods)) (you) may have to move out (of the old room)

C1 จะ ((nods))
FI/P (=Yes) ((nods))
Yes ((nods))

A1 เพราะว่า มี [จอง
Because have [booking
Because there is a [booking

C1 *[คน จอง ห้อง เรา ไป แล้ว]
*[someone book room my already FCQ
*[someone has already booked my room
*[C1 stands up and picks up her backpack on the chair
near her chair.--->

A1 ต้องการ ต้องการ ("ออก ตอนนี้ ไหม ครับ")
Want want ("move now Q-YN FPM")
Would (you) like to ("move out now")?

C1 เสียะ ขอ เข้า ไป หา คน แถว นี้ ก่อน *[เพราะ เสียะ
FPM ask walk in to find someone near here first *[because FPM
Could I see someone first? *[because he will have to
*C1 moves her

hands from left to right.--->

C1 เค้า ต้อง บ่าย ห้อง อะไร
he must move room FCQ

--->

The expression “และ…哉” is a question equivalent to “what/how about…?” in English.
move (to another) room

A1  [ยังไง]
[anyway could]

ยังไง เร็ว หน่อย ((little laughs and simpers))
anyway quick a bit ((little laughs and simpers))
you do it quickly ((little laughs and smiles))

C1  โต ครับ ((nods and little smiles)))
OK  FPF ((nods and little smiles))
OK ((nods and little smiles))

A1  ครับ สวัสดี ครับ ((smiles))
FPM (=Yes) goodbye  FPM ((smiles))
Yes goodbye ((smiles))

+C1 leaves the front desk.+
Appendix 7.13: [5:22I] Political unrest (H2222 (I)) Haven Resort and Spa Hua Hin

Length: 5.00 minutes

A1 = female agent 1

A2 = female agent 2

C1 = female Thai customer 1

C2 = female Thai young customer 2

C3 = male Thai customer 3

C4 = female Thai customer 4

C5 = male Thai customer 5

1  +A female customer (C1) walks from the entrance of the hotel. When two Thai agents (A1 and A2) acknowledge her arrival, they greet her by saying “good morning” while seated.+

2  A1 *[สวัสดี ค่ะ]
2  *[good morning FPF
2  *[good morning
2  *[A1 does “wai”35 with a wide smile while speaking and sitting on the chair.--->

3  A2 *[สวัสดี ค่ะ (A1 and A2 say “good morning” as a greeting to C1 at the same time)
3  *[good morning FPF
3  *[good morning
3  *[A2 holds a pile of documents and knocks it a few times while speaking.--->

4  +C1 does “wai” as a nonverbal response to the greeting of A1 and A2. Then, she walks to the front desk.+

5  +A3 walks from the inside office to the left side of the desk. She widely smiles and puts her hands together in front of her belly.+ 

6  A3 *[คุณ รามมายา หรือ คะ
6  *[PSP Rommaya Q-YN FPF
6  *(are you) Ms Rommaya?
6  *A3 bends forward a bit.--->

7  C1 *((nods))
7  *C1 continues walking to the front desk.---->

35 “Wai” is a Thai traditional nonverbal greeting which an action which two palms are put in front of the chest and the head is bended a bit.
*invite way this FPF
*this way please
*A3 spreads her right hand as an invitation signal for C1 to sit in front of
the desk. --->

+C1 continues walking to the front desk.+

+A3 walks out of the front of the desk while speaking. --->

+When C1 arrives at the front desk, C1 sits on the chair and opens the
purse to collect the ID card.+

+C3 walks from the left side of the desk and stops between A1 and A2.+

+C2 walks from the waiting area and sits next to C1.+

*A3 collects the ID card from C1. --->

+C1 gives a card to A3, who is standing between A1 and A2.+

+A1 stands up and hands the file to C1.+

+A3 uses the ID card that she collected from A1 to touch A1's waist as a
signal given to A1 to collect the ID card from her. Then, A3 leaves the
card on the desk near A1. Then, A3 goes out of the front desk area.+

+C1 takes the file and a pen from A1 to fill in the form on the file.+

+C1 collects the ID card near her and goes to the office behind the front
desk.+

---

The word ตั้ง ตั้ง literally means "to invite" but is often used to show politeness.

The word ตั้ง means a person but connotes the speaker's high deference and elevation towards the
hearer.

The word used as a classifier, i.e., ตั้ง connotes the speaker's high deference and the elevation
towards the hearer.
C1 is filling in the form while the interaction temporarily stops.+

+(sound of opening a new page of the file)+

C1 *˚/uni0เ16/uni0เ2D˚ /uni0เ2D/uni0เ30/uni0เ44/uni0เ23   /uni0เ02 /uni0เ49 ...  /uni0เ44/uni0เ14 /uni0เ49      /uni0เ1B/uni0เ30                     ˚/uni0เ16 /uni0เ2B˚

*C1 turns right to talk with C2, who is concentrating on the game player in her hands.*

C2 ((shakes the head a bit))

A2 stops temporarily working when hearing C1’s question.+

A2 ˚

A2 ˚ be color or brand OK never mind FPF FPM be (what) OK

(you can tell me) about either (its) color or brand never mind (you can คือ)

FPF

tell) whatever (about it)

C1 จะ  จาก  กท  หรือ จะ  จะ::

FTM remember BK or FTM remember::
(you want) BK (=car license) or ::

A2 ไม่เป็นไร  แต่  อะไรก็ได้  นะ

Never mind FPF whatever FPF

Never mind (you can give) whatever

A1 walks from the office behind to the front desk. When she arrives at the front desk, she sits down near A2.+

A2 *ได้  มา  โนสมค  มาคับ  หรือเปล่า  นะ: ((smile voice))

*PTM bring notebook with Q-YN FPF: ((smile voice))

*Have (you) brought a notebook with (you)?: ((smile voice))

*A2 types on the keyboard while speaking.*

C1 โนสมค:: เข้ามา

Notebook:: bring

Notebook:: (I) have brought it

A2 ที่ เครื่อง  นะ: ((smile voice))

How many CL FPF: ((smile voice))

How many notebooks?: ((smile voice))

C1 *เครื่อง เต็ม

*CL one

*one notebook

*C1 looks at the registration form while speaking.*

*When finishing answering the question, C1 turns right to ask a question to C2.*

C1 *เ/uni0เ04/uni0เ23/uni0เ37/glyph1143/uni0เ2D/uni0เ07  เ/uni0เ14/uni0เ35/uni0เ22/uni0เ27

*Q-YN (colloquial) *

*isn’t it? *
**notebook Q-YN
*notebooks, aren't they?
*C2 stops playing the game on the phone and looks at C1."--->

"orno (.) Pāa ได้เอ๊ะ ма บ๊ะอะ"
"er" (.)"Papa PTM bring Q-YN (colloquial)= "
"er" (.)"Papa's brought his, hasn't he?="
*C1 turns back to consider the form in front of her."--->

"Didn't you bring it? [I] don't know (you) must ask Papa"

Don't you? (I'm) not sure (we) must ask him (=NTP) whether he has

+C2 goes out of the front desk.+
hundred: 75 baht  
cost 5,775 baht  

(0.05)  
+A1 looks at the computer screen.+

Mean PTM come stay already “remainder for tomorrow”  
(I) mean (I) have been here “the remainder is to be paid tomorrow”  

(.)  
+A1 continues looking at the computer screen.+

“องค์” ((nods)) “3 วัน หรู อยู่ ที่ 5,775 บาท ค่ะ”  
“ah FPF” ((nods)) “3 day room be at 5,775 baht FPF”  
“ah” ((nods)) that’s 5,775 baht for 3 days”  

“คะ” ((nods)) สุปรี  
“FPF (=Yes) ((nods))” “deal”  

*C1 gives the forms back to A1.*  

(0.05)  
+C1 puts the purse into the handbag.+  
+C3 walks into the waiting area.+  

("สัทร")  
("Pat")  
("Pat")  

*C1 turns to look at C3, who is walking to the front desk.+  

Papa, did you bring a notebook (with you)? You brought it, didn’t you? She (NTP) asked whether (we) brought the notebook  
NTP ask that bring Q-YN use wi-fi Q-YN NTP have service you? She (NTP) asked whether (we) brought the notebook  
ฟรี  
(and whether we wanted to) use wi-fi it’s free of charge  

+C3 stands near C1, who is sitting on the chair. Then, C2 sits on the chair next to C1 when arriving at the front desk.+  

"อ้อ หรอ"  
“Ah Q-YN”  
“Ah really?”  

"อ้อ (ต้อง มี เอา มี)”  
Um (must have er have)
Um ((you) must have er have)

+A2 gives a piece of paper to C1.+

+C1 considers the piece of paper sent by A2 for a while before passing it onto C3.+

A3  จากนั้นก่อนจะเป็นข้าแสวงค่ะ

Eat water first FPF be tea passion fruit FPF

Please have a glass of tea (it) is passion fruit tea

*A3 puts the tray which contains three glasses of passion fruit tea on the front desk.*

C3 ("แต่เครื่องชาแล้วนั้นไม่ค่อยดีนั้นเล่นเกมกับใช้"

("but it (=notebook) is old it does not work well it (is used to)

เยาะก็ไม่ได้"

much DM not can")

play games and cannot be used long and hard")

C2  ไม่ได้อูมแล้วนะคะ

Not can PTM FCoq

(it) could not be used

A1 ((smiles while listening to C2 and C3))

(.)

C1 เราระหว่างที่อยู่เป็นห้องเดิม"

("room that stay be room same")

("the room that (we will) stay at is the same room?")

A1 "ใช่เลยค่ะ เราระหว่างที่อยู่เป็นห้องสุดท้าย"

"FPF (=Yes) yes FPF left be room last"

"yes yes (it is) the last room"

C1 (° °)

(0.03)
If we had called you late

If (you) had called (us) later than this no room would have been available ((smiles)) now (it's) fully booked, not available at all ((smiles))

+C3 walks to sit on another chair on C1's right hand side.

C1

แล้ว ("ราคา") เอาแล้ว จะมากนี้ ละ
Then ("price") same whatever FCQ

Then the same ("price"), isn't it?

A1

เต็มหมดแล้ว ค่ะ ((nods slightly and smiles))
Full already FPF ((nods slightly and smiles))

(it's) fully booked ((nods slightly and smiles))

+A3 puts a file under the one that C1 gives it back to A1.

C1

อีก หรือ เช็ค หมดเลย ((surprising voice))
Ah Q-YN full completely ((surprising voice))

Ah really? (it's) fully booked ((surprising voice))

C3

อีก หรือ [เต็มหมด] หรือ
Ah Q-YN [full completely] Q-YN

Ah really? [fully booked, isn't it?]

C1

[อีก เราโชคดี จัง]
[ah we lucky very]

[ah we are very lucky]

C3

อ่า::

Ah::

Ah::

A2

[สวัสดี ค่ะ: ลงอะไร ไว้ ซึ ยัง คะ]
[good morning FPF: book what PTM Q-YN yet FPF]

[good morning: have (you) booked a room yet?]

C1

["คือ แนวว่า ตอนแรก ยัง ไม่ ตัดสินใจ พอ: [เพิ่งมา ตัดสินใจ41]

41 C1 and C3 talk about the impact of political unrest in Bangkok on their decision to have a holiday in Hua Hin.
I mean sort of first (we) had not make a decision yet when: [(we've) just made a decision]

+A new customer (C4) does "wai" to A2 as a greeting.+

 Duangkamon

+A3 stands in the waiting areas.+

+A3 gives a form to A3.+

*(please wait a moment*)

*(A3 walks out of the front desk with the form in her hands.)--->

+C4 walks to C5, who is sitting on the chair in the waiting area.+

+C4 walks to the place where C4 is standing and where C5 is sitting.+

Uh yes because my (PFP/M) house is located in the forbidden zone

*C3 shows the entrance ticket to the forbidden zone at the period of emergency state.--->

have an entrance ticket and the entrance was subject to be changeable

+A1 takes the file where C1 fills in the form and smiles while listening to C3.+
Because normally (it has) never closed but oh today (it’s) closed.

A1 holds the file in her hands and walks out of the front desk to talk to C4, who is standing at the waiting area.

Each day DM FTM close not same Q-YN FPF ((smiles))

(I) mean (it=the road) in front of my (PFP/M) home has been also closed

Ah ((little laughs and smiles))

˚close not all alley˚

˚not all the alleys are closed (just some of them)˚

More (roads) were closed even though (they were open and) (I) had here ever passed “(I) need to go here”

A1 answers the phone.+

˚FPF (=yes)˚

˚yes˚

“It’s an excessively indirect route ((little laughs and smiles))
Cars were stuck in front of my house every day (I) mean (the government) did not allow (anyone) to enter (the forbidden zone) ((very little laughs))

"pass not allow pass"
"(they allow to) either pass (they) or do not allow to pass"

Um now mean now DM: better PTM Q-YN FPF better PTM
Um now (I) mean (the unrest situation) has been getting better, isn’t it? Better?

Cars have not been allowed to enter (the forbidden zones)
Better but
Better but (cars) have not been allowed to enter (the forbidden zones)
(cars) have not been allowed to enter (the forbidden zones) at all
"better" at least DM still calm more FCoq
"(the unrest situation) is better" at least (it) is getting calmer
(cars) have not been allowed to enter (the forbidden zones) yet nothing’s changed
(cars) have not been allowed to enter (the forbidden zones) yet

But yesterday was the first day when the garbage truck came to collect litter in 7 days
But yesterday be day first that car litter enter to collect litter
in 7 day
litter in 7 days

("little smiles")
"Opps" ((little smiles))
"Opps" ((little smiles))
*A1 makes the face surprised but her eyes concentrate on the computer screen.*

Because it be day first mean 8 day actually not 7 not Q-YN
Because actually it was the first day in 8 days not in 7 days, wasn’t it?

(,.) day um:: mean day Thur(sday)
(,.) day um:: (I) mean Thur(sday)

(litter it much very"
"there is very much litter"

8 day
8 days

Think also that FTM go where good
(We) also thought where (we should) go

Think go think back DM come place same
(I) thought forth and back (finally I decided to) come to the same place

+A2 stands up.+

+A1 stands up and takes a bunch of keys to unlock a drawer.+

Done all PTM FPF
All things have been done

Pay price room done FPF ((nods))
The rooms have been already paid ((nods))

+C1 and C3 stand up and leave the front desk.+
A1 leaves the front desk.
Appendix 7.14: [7:1] 40 copies of maps (B2601) Bangkok Tourism Division

Length: 1.37 minutes

A1 = male agent 1

A2 = female agent 2

C1 = female Thai customer 1

1 +C1 walks into the office and then straight to the corner where a variety of brochures is placed. A1 walks inside the counter to the place where C1 is standing.

2 A1 <What are you looking for?>

3 C1 ( )

4 A1 แผนที่ กระชับ  Map FPM

5 *A1 walks from the corner to look for a map for C1, who walks to the counter where A1 is standing.*

6 *A1 unwraps the map and starts speaking.*

7 A1 ตรงนี้ จะเป็น ภาษา ไทย *ภาษา อังกฤษ กระชับ Here be language Thai *language English FPM

8 C1 ถ้า

9 A1 *กี่ เวลา จะอยู่ ตรงนี้(.) อยาก ไป ตรงไหน ริบป่าว กระชับ *DM we be here(.) want go where Q-YN FPM

10 C1 --->Ah no

11 A1 *We are here(.) Where do you want to go? *A1 points to a position on the map.--->

12 C1 --->ไอ บารา

13 A1 *I mean can I have this one?= *C1 waves slightly her right hand.*

14 A1 [*ไค กระชับ]  [can FPM]
[yes, you can]

C1 *=เด็ก นักเรียน เค้า ขอ จะขอ เบื้องต้น*
*=kid  student they ask for ask for many [a bit=
*=students would like to have (it) can (I) have a bit many (maps)?=
*={C1 holds the map in her hand.--->

A1 *[ขอ
*[ask for
*{(you) want

C1 *=เค้า จะ ไป ทำ รายงาน*
=NTP FTM go do report
=they (=NTP) will (use them) to do a report

A1 *=ประมาณ กี่ คู่ ละครับ*
=approximately Q-WH CL FPM
=How many copies approximately (do you want)?

C1 *=สัก 40 จะ ได้ ไหม คะ ((smiles))
*=approximately 40 DM can Q-YN FPF ((smiles))
*approximately 40 (copies) is that OK? ((smiles))
*C1 bends forwards and looks at A1 while speaking. Then, she smiles to
both A1 and A2.---->

A1 *=โอ :=*
=O[h:=
*O[h:=
*A1 looks quickly at A2.---->

A2 *=โอ :=*
=O[h:=
*O[h:=
*A2 looks at A1.---->

A1 *=ถ้า [40 ต้อง งบประมาณ ทำเป็น หนังสือ หนังสือ ทางราชการ =
*if [40 must ADV do letter letter official=
*if (you want) 40 could (you) please write an official letter=
*A1 glances at A2 a second and touches the hair a bit. Then, he turns
to look at C a second.---->

A2 *=ถ้า เป็น อย่าง นั้น ต้อง ทำ หนังสือ มา] *
*=[if be like that must do letter DM]*
*=[if so (you) must write a letter]*
*=[A2 looks at C1.---->

A2 *=ส่ง ถึง -->พ่อ นะคะ นะคะ [แล้ว 3 วัน ทำกรณ =
=send to --->Director FPM* [then 3 day working=
*sent to the Director? After that we will=
*---When saying the word "Director", A1 raises his left hand
to the level of his chest and moves it to the right side, signifying the
inside of the office.*
C1 [ยิ้ม]
[Ah]
[Ah]

A1 =เราจะ จะ ดำเนินการ ต่อไป
=we FTM deal with after that
=deal with it in 3 working days

C1 [แล้วก่อน] 20 นะ
[if (equivalent to 'what about') 20 FCoq
[what about 20?

+A2 looks at C1 and listens to the ongoing interaction between C1 and A1.+

A1 *ก่อน เกิน 5 กี่ ต้อง อย่างนี้ แล้ว อะครับ
*If more than 5 DM have to do this DM FPM
*If (you want) more than 5 (copies) (you) have to do so
*A1 puts his hands together in front of the stomach.---->

C1 หรอ
Q-YN
Don’t I?

A1 ให้ เดิมที่ ได้ 5 ครับแม่ ((nods))
Give maximum can 5 FPM ((nods))
(I) can give you at most 5 (copies) ((nods))

C1 5 หรอ 10 ไม่ได้ หรอ น้อง ((little laughs and smiles))
5 Q-YN 10 cannot Q-YN KPJ ((little laughs and smiles))
5 (copies)? Can’t (I) get 10 (copies)? ((little laughs and smiles))

A1 *ไม่ได้ จริงๆ ครับ ((smiles))
*Cannot really FPM ((smiles))
*No (you) really can’t do either ((smiles))
*A1 shakes the head.---->

C1 ((little laughs)) จะเอา ให้ได้ ((little laughs and smiles)) พอดี
((little laughs)) Er OK ((little laughs and smiles)) because
((little laughs)) Er OK ((little laughs and smiles)) they will use it
เอา จะ เอา ไป ทำรายงาน
they FTM take to do report
to do a report

A1 ลักษณะ ครับ
A moment FPM
A moment (please)

*A1 leaves the counter where the interaction occurs to the end of the counter in order to find the maps.*

*C1 walks to the end of the counter where A1 is.*

(0.08)

A1 *นี้ ฉัน จะ ขายorna (.) ขายorna แล้ว นี้ อะครับ
*This it be big very (.) bigger CL this FPM
*This (map) is very big (.) bigger than that map
*A1 shows a map on the desk.--->

มัน จะรวม บริเวณเขต ด้วย ขอบเขต
it include boundary areas (of Bangkok) as well FPM
it includes boundary areas around Bangkok as well

*A1 walks slightly to the inside of the counter and opens the whole map to show to C1.*

C1 อ่าน นี่
C1 this
This one

A1 *จะรวม ระดับเขต บริเวณเขต รอบๆ ไปด้วย
*Include region boundary around (Bangkok) as well
*This includes boundary regions around Bangkok as well
*A1 circles his finger on the map.--->

เพราะว่า เสียงกี่ แผนที่ เมื่อว่า มัน จะมี แค่นี้
because previous map previous it include only this
but the previous map includes only (details)

ออกครับ ในเมื่อ เท่าๆ นี้ มัน จะ รอบ เลย แล้ว
in the city but this one includes all around (Bangkok)
ถ้า มี สาย เมล็ด
also include number bus
including bus numbers

+A2 nods all the time when listening to A1’s speaking.+

(0.2)

*A1 wraps the map.*

C1 *<กี่ใบ แบบนี้ มี ที่ อ่าน>
*<OK CL this have Q-WH CL>
*<OK how many (copies of) this type are there?>
*<C1 raises a map near her and shows it to A1.--->

A1 อ่าน นี่ มี ไม่เยอะ
A1 this have not many
There are not many (copies of) this type (of maps)

*A1 takes some maps under the counter and gives them to C1.*

(0.05)

C1 *<ขอบคุณ มาก>
*<thank you much>
*<thank you very much>
*C1 collects all the maps.--->

A1 ครับแม่
A1 FPM (=yes)
Yes

+C1 leaves the office.+
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