

Conversation Closing Dynamics in Thai News Interviews: Strategies and Challenges¹

Nuengruthai Pankaew^a and Supakit Buakaw^{a*}

^a*Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen, Thailand*

^{*}*Corresponding Author. Email: supakitb@kku.ac.th*

Received: April 13, 2024

Revised: September 12, 2024

Accepted: December 30, 2024

Abstract

Conversation closing is essential in determining the outcome and conclusion of an interaction. In news interview programs, such closings differ from those in institutional or organizational settings due to the structured and preplanned nature of the interviews. Closing a conversation, particularly in conflict situations, presents a challenging task for interviewers. This article presents the results of a study on conversation closing in Thai news interview programs. Data were collected from 25 episodes of five Thai news interview programs via a digital TV channel. The verbal data obtained were transcribed into written form. To analyze the data, the researcher utilized conversational analysis along with the conversation closing framework. The findings reveal that the conversation closing process consists of two main parts: pre-closing and closing. Interviewers employed three strategies for pre-closing: 1) providing time notifications, 2) asking interviewees to provide a short summary, and 3) posing a final question to signal that the conversation was coming to an end. For the closing part, interviewers used five strategies: summarization, thanking the interviewees, reiterating the time, reiterating the program title, and saying goodbye. The process of closing conversations proved to be complicated, as interviewees often expressed a desire to continue talking. Thus, determining when to end the conversation presented a challenge for interviewers in efficiently concluding conversations.

Keywords: conversation, conversation closing, pre-closing, news interview program

Introduction

Conversation closing plays a crucial role in shaping the outcome and conclusion of an interaction, as highlighted by Sacks et al. (1974) in their conversation analysis framework. The closing phase marks the final step of a conversation and involves specific strategies that signal the speaker's intention to bring the exchange to an end. This process can take various forms, depending on the context of the conversation and the relationship between the participants. Several factors influence how a conversation is closed, including the nature of the situation and the degree of familiarity among the participants. Research by Greatbatch (1988), Paltridge (2000), Thornborrow (2001), and Intachakra (2007) suggests that these factors play a significant role in shaping the closing strategies used. Furthermore, speakers from different cultural backgrounds may utilize distinct strategies for conversation closure, with variations influenced by social and cultural norms as well as by the physical environment in which the conversation occurs.

¹ This article is part of a Ph.D. dissertation entitled "Conversational Structure and Interruption in the News Interview Program," Department of Thai, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Khon Kaen University, Thailand.

A news interview is a form of interactive conversation broadcast to the public. Unlike general interviews or traditional news programs, news interview programs have distinct characteristics, as noted by Clayman and Heritage (2002:19). These programs are unique in terms of participants, conversation topics, and the structure of the interaction. Typically, the interviewer is a professional journalist who engages with individuals knowledgeable about current news trends, such as experts who provide informed insights. The focus of news interview programs is on issues that are of significant public interest. The format is formal, primarily structured around a series of questions and answers.

The news interview was initially developed by American print journalists and gained popularity in the late 19th century. By the early 20th century, British and other European journalists began adopting this format (Schudson, 1994), largely due to its emphasis on presenting facts over opinions. Over time, the news interview evolved into its modern form, combining elements of both interviews and news reporting. An interview is a purposeful exchange between an interviewer and an interviewee, designed to elicit accurate and specific information. Most interviews follow a formal structure with clear objectives, requiring preparation and planning (Siriraj, 2006; Yamaphai and Anwachsiriwong, 2004; Chaudnuch, 2019). By contrast, news reporting combines storytelling with event reporting (Bird and Dardenne, 1987) and is often presented as a news program in which an interviewer narrates events while engaging with the audience. This format incorporates engaging storytelling techniques and structured program components (Grabe et al., 2003). Therefore, the format of the news interview program combines the characteristics of both formats.

The rise of digital transformation has introduced new formats for news reporting. Research on media discourse has analyzed a range of formats, including radio and television interviews (Greatbatch, 1988; Bell and Van Leeuwen, 1994; Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Al-Rojaie, 2001; Montgomery, 2008; Craig, 2007; Craig, 2008; Craig, 2010; Kong and Ting, 2014; Feng, 2016; Yanualifa Telomensi Sitepu, Hanafiah and Thyrhaya Zein, 2020; Meidiarto, 2021), celebrity interviews and talk shows (Hutchby, 2006; Tolson, 2006; Azalan, Sahira and Nabilah, 2019), and televised telephone conversations (Thornborrow, 2001). In Thailand, research has explored discourse across various media formats, including radio broadcasts (Wongkhat, 2012), celebrity interviews and talk shows (Wongsuwan, 1999), online live broadcasts (Khuenkaew, Sereechaikul, and Bamrungsuk, 2021), and television broadcasts (Leelachewasit, 2006; Bunnag, 2016; Praditsorn, 2017; Sirisai, 2006; Sapabsri et al., 2018; Ochaphan, 2022). Research by Bunnag (2016), and Ochaphan (2022) has highlighted the dynamics of the modern news interview format. This format allows participants to express opinions or engage in debates, while the interviewer ensures a smooth, goal-oriented conversation. Unlike everyday interactions, news interview discourse is characterized by a clear purpose, structured sequences, and specific language strategies. It often uses informal, conversational language to narrate stories while maintaining a moderate level of formality to engage the audience effectively. Although narrative remains a core element of news content, every conversational situation, including news interviews, follows the fundamental structure of a conversation, which includes both an opening and a closing (Clayman and Heritage, 2002).

The influence of news interview programs within Thai society has grown significantly, driven in part by advancements in digital television. The transition from analog to digital television represents a major milestone in Thailand's communication technology development. Beginning in 2013, this ongoing shift aimed to improve media quality while addressing technological advancements and evolving consumer behaviors. Initially, digital television gained widespread popularity due to its superior signal quality and

the expanded range of available channels (National Broadcasting and Telecommunications Commission, 2012). Over time, digital TV became the preferred platform for broadcasting news interview programs, owing to its accurate rating system, which enhances credibility for advertisers (Amphai, 2013). In response to this shift, operators have revamped program formats to introduce fresh and innovative content, thereby increasing viewer engagement and improving the overall viewing experience. These efforts have not only contributed to the success of news interview programs, but have also solidified digital television's position as a dominant medium in Thailand's media landscape.

Conversation closings in news interview programs differ from those in institutional or organizational settings due to the unique and preplanned nature of these interviews. Both the interviewer (IR) and the interviewees (IEs) are required to follow a structured set of questions, adhering to systematic regulations. The conversation must be carefully organized within a specific time frame, in alignment with the institutional or organizational framework (Heritage, 1985; Greatbatch, 1988; Clayman, 1988; Heritage and Greatbatch, 1991). While Clayman and Heritage (2002) suggest that closing segments may not be considered particularly significant, as they are often seen as peripheral to the 'main plot' of the interview, the substantive content of conversation closings in conflict situations between IEs may require adaptation. In such cases, the closing must address the tension appropriately and respond to the evolving circumstances.

Past research has explored conversation closures across a variety of contexts, ranging from everyday interactions to institutional settings. Studies in international academic circles have examined general conversations (Pardede, 2011), telephone conversations (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973; Hopper and Doany 1989; Sifianou, 1989; Hopper, 1992; Hopper and Chen, 1996; Coronel-Molina, 1998), conference room dialogues (Barnes, 2007; Mansson, 2015), business interactions (Shen, 2006), doctor-patient exchanges (Boyd and Heritage, 2006), and conversations in media such as television programs and online platforms (Greatbatch, 1988; Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Kong and Ting, 2014; Yanualifa Telomensi Sitepu, Hanafiah and Thyryhaya Zein, 2020; Meidiarto, 2021). In Thailand, research on conversation closures spans various contexts, including interactions on the Line application (Panyametheekul, 2020), job interviews (Vattanasiriporn, 2016), and conversations between government officials and ethnic groups or migrant workers (Nanthakanok, 2012; Krisathain, 2012). Additional studies have focused on exchanges between police officers and victims (Sathum, 2006), doctor-patient dialogues (Sathum, 2017), as well as radio broadcasts (Wongkhat, 2012) and television programs (Leelachewasit, 2006; Praditsorn, 2017). These studies demonstrate that conversation closures vary significantly across different communication contexts, reflecting the unique nature of each interaction.

Previous studies on conversation closing in news interview programs conducted in the United Kingdom, the United States, and Australia have identified internationally-recognized closing strategies (Greatbatch, 1988; Clayman and Heritage, 2002; Yanualifa Telomensi Sitepu, Hanafiah and Thyryhaya Zein, 2020). However, within the Thai context, only one study, Bunnag (2016), has examined conversation closings, and its findings align with those of non-Thai studies. Bunnag's research found that in news interviews, the IR primarily managed the interview process, typically closing the interview by expressing gratitude to the IEs. Notably, Bunnag's study focused more on interview management as a whole, rather than specifically exploring conversation closing strategies. This underscores a gap in the literature, as there is a clear lack of studies dedicated to examining the closing of news interviews, especially within the Thai context. This gap may reflect the distinctive nature of news interviews in Thailand, where

interviewers often face challenges in managing conversations when interviewees resist or become uncooperative, possibly due to cultural and linguistic factors. Understanding how to effectively close conversations is essential to ensuring smoother interactions and reducing conflicts in future interviews.

Closing a conversation presents a challenging skill for IRs, particularly in conflict situations between two parties. The IR is required to conclude the interview within the allocated time for telecast and other online channels while also adhering to the program's objectives and ensuring a comprehensive closure. Therefore, the researchers expressed interest in investigating conversation closing in Thai news interview programs, specifically focusing on the strategies employed by the IR during conflict situations of communication between invited IEs. The findings of this study can provide valuable insights into the process of conversation closing in news interviews, serving as a guideline for managing conflict communication effectively.

Methodology

The data for this study were sourced from Thai news interview programs, selected on specific criteria derived from survey findings of the "Hard Talk" segment on digital television (<https://www.tvdigitalwatch.com>). For analysis, only interviews from episodes uploaded to YouTube were included. The selection was guided by the following criteria:

- 1) The interview must involve participants with opposing viewpoints on a single topic.
- 2) The interview format must include either one representative per side or a total of three participants, comprising two interviewees and one interviewer.
- 3) If more than three participants were involved, one must be a phone-in guest or an expert invited to provide additional insights or specialized knowledge.
- 4) There were no restrictions on interviewees regarding gender, age, occupation, or social standing.

A total of five programs met the criteria. For each program, the five most-viewed episodes on YouTube, aired between 2018 and 2020, were selected. This resulted in 25 episodes with a combined runtime of 1,022.28 minutes, as detailed in Table 1.

Table 1 Selected Thai news interview programs

No.	News Program	Interviewer	Number of episodes	Time (mins)
1	<i>Tam Trong Trong</i> with Jomquan, Thairath TV channel	Jomquan Laopet	5	279.06
2	<i>Tang Khon Tang Khit</i> , Amarin TV channel	Phuttha Apiwan	5	198.77
3	<i>Jaw Praden</i> , Channel 8	Phakaphong Udomkalayalux Chanitnun Punnanihi	5	219.04
4	<i>Pen Ruang Pen Khao</i> , PPTV channel	Satien Viriyapanpongsa Chuenjit Charoenpongchai	5	129.16
5	<i>Hone Krasae</i> , Channel 3 SD	Kanchai Kamnerdploy	5	197.25
Total			25	1,022.28

The interview conversation data revealed that conflict issues can be categorized into two types: those caused by individuals and those caused by events. The content of these conflict topics primarily focused on political issues, such as political campaigns, political debates, education reform, military reform, and political party policy proposals, which were observed in 13 episodes. Conflicts stemming from ideological differences were found in four episodes, while problems related to donation money appeared in two episodes. Additionally, economic problems, issues involving borrowing money, quarrels, love disputes, professional conflicts, and criminal cases were found in one episode each, resulting in a total of 25 episodes. These conflicts often centered on disparities in benefits, with one party gaining or losing significantly. Such situations frequently had severe impacts and, in some cases, escalated to legal proceedings.

The data obtained from the news interview programs were transcribed into a written format using the transcription system developed by Jefferson (1979). (See the appendix.) The transcribed data were analyzed using both the framework for conversational analysis developed by Sacks et al. (1974) and the framework for conversation closing by Clayman and Heritage (2002).

Closing a conversation is divided into two parts: pre-closing and closing. The pre-closing phase occurs when the IR makes an utterance to signal to the IE that the program is nearing its end. During this phase, the IR allocates time for participants to summarize their points or make closing remarks, preparing for the transition to the closing phase. The closing phase begins when the IEs finish their turn. The IEs do not have the authority to close the conversation; this responsibility lies solely with the IR. The IR initiates the closing by summarizing the key points of the conversation and delivering a final remark. The frequency and forms of strategies used by the IR to successfully close the conversation in a news interview program will be analyzed. Regardless of whether the IEs wish to end the conversation, the IR is responsible for ensuring that it concludes smoothly and that the program ends successfully.

Results

The presentation of the results is divided into three main parts: conversation pre-closing strategies, the complete closing of the conversation as employed by IRs, and the challenges in closing conversations during news interviews.

Conversation Pre-closing Strategies

As an interview nears its conclusion, the IR must close the conversation on time, even if summarizing the discussion proves challenging. To achieve this, IRs employ various strategies to signal to IEs that the conversation is approaching its final stage. This phase, known as “pre-closing,” precedes the actual “closing” and serves as a signal to the IEs that the discussion is about to end. In the context of pre-closing in Thai news interview programs, IRs use specific strategies to manage the conversation effectively and ensure a timely, organized conclusion. Table 2 outlines the strategies employed by IRs during pre-closing.

Table 2 Strategies used by interviewer for pre-closing in Thai news interview programs

Program	episodes	Strategies			Total frequency	Percentage
		Time notification	Asking for shortening	Asking a final question		
<i>Tam Trong Trong</i> with Jomquan	1	3	3	2	38	44.7
	2	4	3	2		
	3	1	1	2		
	4	9	2	2		
	5	2	0	2		
<i>Tang Khon Tang</i> <i>Khit</i>	1	3	1	1	8	9.4
	2	0	0	0		
	3	2	1	0		
	4	0	0	0		
	5	0	0	0		
<i>Jaw Praden</i>	1	0	1	1	10	11.8
	2	0	1	1		
	3	2	0	0		
	4	0	1	1		
	5	0	1	1		
<i>Pen Ruang Pen</i> <i>Khao</i>	1	1	1	1	13	15.3
	2	2	1	1		
	3	0	2	1		
	4	0	1	0		
	5	0	1	1		
<i>Hone Krasae</i>	1	2	0	1	16	18.8
	2	1	1	1		
	3	0	2	1		
	4	0	1	2		
	5	1	1	2		
Total frequency		33	26	26	85	100
Percentage		38.8	30.6	30.6	100	

Table 2 illustrates how the pre-closing phase is a crucial part of the conversation, during which the IR informs the IEs about the impending conclusion before transitioning to the official closing. During this phase, the IR may provide additional opportunities for each IE to speak or allocate extra time for responses, leading to the conversation's closure. The study recorded 85 instances of pre-closing strategies used by the IR to signal the approaching end of the discussion. Among these strategies, time notification was the most frequently employed, appearing 33 times (38.8 percent). This was followed by asking for shortening and posing a final question, each used 26 times (30.6 percent). These strategies were instrumental in securing the IE's cooperation in concluding the conversation.

Smooth coordination of the conversation was not always achieved, as some IEs were less responsive to the IR's attempts to guide them toward the closing phase. Certain IEs attempted to extend the time,

negotiate for more time, continue speaking, or engage in arguments with each other due to differing opinions. In such cases, the IR might need to employ strategies such as time notifications, requests to shorten responses, or repeatedly asking final questions to halt the IEs' prolonged speaking turns. Alternatively, the IR might need to intervene and interrupt to effectively close the conversation. It was observed that the pre-closing phase did not follow a strictly linear structure, as illustrated in the following example. (See the Thai language example in the appendix.)

Example 1

Program: *Tang Khon Tang Khit*; Interviewer: Phuttha Apiwan; Episode: Debate the Palang Pracharath Party and Thai Raksa Chart Party: Which will you choose to change the country?; broadcast on February 20, 2019.

In this scenario, the IR employed the pre-closing strategy of "time notification" to signal to the IEs that the interview was coming to an end, and they needed to wrap up their responses. The IR aimed to ensure that the conversation stayed within the allocated time and concluded smoothly. In this situation, the IR was asking both IEs to share their thoughts on the scenario in which one of them would come in second in an election. The IR is seeking a final statement or comment from each IE before concluding the interview.

The IE1 in this example is the chairman of the election campaign committee of the Thai Raksa Chart Party. The discussion focuses on the conflict within the democratic system, emphasizing that such conflicts are not a valid excuse to seize power. The IE2 is the spokesperson for the Palang Pracharath Party in the Northeast. Their discussion centers on Prime Minister Prayut Chan-o-cha's alleged neutrality before the coup and blaming politicians for inciting mobs and causing problems in the country. The IEs present conflicting opinions on these topics. The discussion revolves around key issues in Thai politics, including elections, conflicts, coups, and the drafting of new constitutions.

- 1 IR If you get second place, will you form a government?
- 2 IE1 (6-line answering) ...We won't monopolize, but we'll listen to our people's voice
- 3 IR 30 seconds left.
- 4 =please
- 5 IE1 (4-line answering)
- 6 IR Yes, You also have one minute.
- 7 IE2 The Rice Act is for the benefit of the farmers...
- 8 IR What will the Palang Pracharath Party do?
- 9 IE2 (6-line answering)
- 10 IR Thank you both very much. And with all of this, the future of Thailand is in your hands.
- 11 =Listen today and decide how to shape your future on March 24th. That's all for today.
- 12 =Goodbye.

This example illustrates a challenging situation during the closing of a conversation in a Thai news interview program. The IR attempted to provide each IE a turn to speak, starting with IE1 (line 1). However, IE1's response was lengthy (line 3), prompting the IR to intervene and inform IE1 that there were only 30 seconds remaining for his turn. After the reminder, the IR allowed IE1 to finish speaking. Next, the IR gave IE2 a one-minute turn, similar to the first guest (line 6). However, it became evident that IE2 was

deviating from the intended topic. In response, the IR decided to interrupt and guide IE2 to answer the right question (line 8). Once IE2 completed his turn, the IR proceeded to close the conversation. This example highlights the challenges that IR face in managing the closing of a conversation. It demonstrates how the IR may need to employ various strategies, such as time notifications and interruptions, to ensure a smooth and efficient conclusion to the discussion, especially when IEs tend to extend their speaking time or get off track during the closing phase.

Example 2

Program: *Pen Ruang Pen Khao*; Interviewer: Satien Viriyapanpongsa; Episode: Listen clearly to the debate on the problems of Thai education! From the Future Forward Party and the Palang Pracharath Party; broadcast on March 4, 2020.

The IR is asking each IE to conclude by sharing their opinion on the biggest educational challenge in Thailand. In this example, the IR employs two strategies: “time reiteration” to indicate that the conversation is limited in time and “thanking the interviewees” to show appreciation for their contributions. By using these strategies, the IR efficiently manages the conversation, allowing both IEs to provide their concluding remarks on the educational challenge.

The IE1 represented the Future Forward Party, while the IE2 represented the Palang Pracharath Party. The discussion focused on the topic of education reform from the perspective of the new generation. Both parties addressed the current problems in Thailand’s education system and presented their respective policies to resolve these issues effectively.

- 1 IE1 ...Which subject or skill do they require to reach their goal?
 2 IR
 3 IE1
 4 = at separately.
 → 5 IR Ah, so we don’t have much time. Really, I’d like you all to speak briefly. Each one of you
 6 =can say a little about the big problem.... What are the biggest obstacles
 7 =in education in Thailand?
 8 IE2 Administration.
 9 IR Administration.
 10 IE2 Yes.
 11 IR Ah, you? What are the biggest obstacles?
 12 IE1 Yes, our country’s administration. And how we as a new generation have a chance
 13 =to present, or give teachers more opportunities to get involved in assessment.
 → 14 IR O.K., we don’t have enough time. Hopefully, a new generation will be involved in
 15 =our country’s administration, especially education reform. Thank you both.

Example 2 depicts a situation in which the conversation is approaching its conclusion. After IE1 finished speaking, the IR emphasized to both IEs that there was limited time remaining and asked them to summarize the topic of educational administration in Thailand (line 5-7). IE1 responded to the question comprehensively, and then it was IE2’s turn to speak. Finally, The IR reiterated the timing and immediately brought it to a close (line 14-15). This example demonstrates how IRs use pre-closing strategies, such as emphasizing time constraints and requesting summaries, to signal the conclusion of the

conversation. Although the IEs had another turn to speak, the interviewer efficiently closed the discussion once the relevant information was obtained. In this way, the IR skillfully managed the conversation closing, ensuring that the key points were addressed and the discussion concluded within the allocated time frame.

Example 3

Program: *Tam Trong Trong* with Jomquan; Interviewer: Jomquan Laopet; Episode: Confronting “Pareena-Mind” to Overcome the Country’s Crisis; broadcast on October 28, 2020.

In this example, the IR utilized the strategy of “asking the final question” to prompt both IEs (Pareena, IE2 and Mind, IE1) to provide one last recommendation on requests for the government. This strategy allows the IEs to offer concise and conclusive responses, bringing the conversation to a thoughtful conclusion. The IR effectively guides the IEs to share their final thoughts, ensuring that the audience receives meaningful and actionable recommendations for the government.

IE1 was a Palang Pracharath Party MP from Ratchaburi, who suggested that Prime Minister Prayut Chan-o-cha should remain in power for a longer period to address the country’s problems. IE2 was one of the leaders of the Free People group, who argued that Prime Minister Prayut should resign and that the people have the right to take to the streets when the government fails to listen. The discussion focused on topics such as the demands for democracy from the new generation, constitutional amendments, and the reform of Thai politics.

- 1 IR Well, Pareena, do you have anything to say?
- 2 IE2 (5-line answering)
- 3 IR (Ending with Mind.) Is there anything you want to ask Ae [Pareena’s nickname] to say about the government?
- 4 IE1 (11-line answer)
- 5 IE2 Could you protest without blocking the traffic, Mind?
- 6 (43 turns in responding to each other continuously)
- 7 IR I’ll end up with her. Khun Ae, please don’t interrupt. I’m afraid we can’t end our talk. Please.
- 8 IE1 (4-line answering)
- 9 (10 turns in responding to each other continuously)
- 10 IR Again? You always interrupt. Let her talk...
- 11 IE2 I haven’t finished my talk yet. Hey, again?
- 12 IR she... she... she mentioned
- 13 IE2 hey
- 14 IR but
- 15 = you said you had to end the talk five minutes ago. Why are you still....
- 16 IE1 Yes. I cannot ah.. uh... defend or ah... uh...explain anything about
- 17 =suitability, so I am trying to tell audience to make their
- 18 =own decision.
- 19 IE2 Yes, Thai people decide who is suitable. Who is not suitable?
- 20 IR Thank you for help
- 21 =in closing the program. Program time has expired. Thank you both. Thank you.

Example 3 illustrates a challenging situation in the closing moments of a conversation. The IR posed the final question to both participants (line 1). Starting with IE2 responding to the last question, when IE2 finished answering, the IR gave IE1 a turn to address the final question (line 3). However, IE2 raised a new issue, leading to a prolonged exchange of 43 turns of responses between the two IEs. Despite the IR's attempt to restate the last question (line 7), there were 10 additional turns of responses between the IEs even after the question was answered. Interruptions were frequent throughout these responses. It became evident that IE2 was determined to continue talking and was reluctant to end the conversation. In an effort to give IE1 a turn, the IR encountered interruptions from IE2, who insisted she hadn't finished speaking. The IR intervened and granted IE1 another turn (lines 10 and 12). However, IE2 interrupted once again, attempting to prolong the conversation and expressing concern about exceeding the expected time. Eventually, IE2 was given another opportunity to summarize (lines 14-15). As IE1 started summarizing, IE2 interrupted again. In response, the IR decided to intervene, thanked IE2 for her input in concluding the program (lines 20-21), and eventually brought the conversation to a close.

Conversation Closing Strategies

In the closing phase of news interview programs, the IR takes the lead as the sole speaker. In the present study, the IR employed five strategies for closing the conversation: summarization, thanking guests, time reiteration, program title reiteration, and saying goodbye (see Table 3).

Table 3 Strategies used by the interviewer for closing in Thai news interview programs

Program	episodes	Strategies				
		Summarization	Thanking interviewees	Time reiteration	Program title reiteration	Saying goodbye
<i>Tam Trong Trong</i> with Jomquan	1	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	2	N/A	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	3	N/A	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	4	N/A	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	5	N/A	✓	✓	N/A	✓
<i>Tang Khon Tang</i> <i>Khit</i>	1	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓
	2	N/A	✓	N/A	N/A	✓
	3	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓
	4	N/A	✓	N/A	✓	✓
	5	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓
<i>Jaw Praden</i>	1	N/A	✓	N/A	✓	✓
	2	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓
	3	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	4	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	5	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 3 Strategies used by the interviewer for closing in Thai news interview programs (cont.)

Program	episodes	Strategies				
		Summarization	Thanking interviewees	Time reiteration	Program title reiteration	Saying goodbye
<i>Pen Ruang Pen Khao</i>	1	✓	✓	N/A	✓	✓
	2	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	3	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	4	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	5	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<i>Hone Krasae</i>	1	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
	2	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓
	3	✓	✓	N/A	N/A	✓
	4	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	5	✓	✓	✓	N/A	✓
Total frequency		18	25	15	12	25
Percentage		72	100	60	48	100

As Table 3 indicates, it was evident that thanking the IEs and saying goodbye were strategies employed in all five interview programs (100 percent). These strategies were essential and unavoidable, as they were dictated by the organizational regulations governing interview arrangements. In situations where the conversation became intense or quarrelsome, the IR could use the “thank you” strategy to gracefully interrupt the IEs’ speech and proceed to close the conversation. However, in many instances, the conversation could not be concluded or resolved due to its complexity. In such cases, the IR used the “today’s talk is only one part” strategy (frequency = 18 or 72 percent) to acknowledge that the topic would require further analysis and continued coverage. This strategy allowed the audience to understand that the discussion was part of an ongoing and evolving issue. Additionally, the IR utilized the time reiteration strategy (frequency = 12 or 48 percent) to emphasize the constraints of limited on-air time when dealing with IEs who attempted to prolong the conversation or raise new issues. The program title reiteration strategy (frequency = 15 or 60 percent) was also employed to remind both the IEs and the audience of the program’s title and the importance of following the program in the future.

The closing of the conversation involved a systematic application of these strategies. These strategies enabled the IR to manage complex conversations effectively and conclude the program with clarity and professionalism. The IR used strategies such as summarization, thanking interviewees, time reiteration, program title reiteration, and saying goodbye in a step-by-step manner, demonstrating a linear structure, as exemplified in the following examples.

Example 4

Program: *Pen Ruang Pen Khao*; Interviewer: Chuenjit Charoenpongchai; Episode: Arresting a Monk at a Political Rally—Leave the Monkhoo; broadcast on November 12, 2020.

The IR is briefly summarizing all the discussion points and leading into interview and program closing.

The IE1 was the secretary-general of the Association for the Protection of the Thai Constitution, while the IE2 was an independent Buddhist scholar. After images emerged of a group of monks participating in a rally and delivering political speeches, some viewed it as an expression of free speech, while others deemed it inappropriate for the Sangha. The two interviewees discussed the public interest surrounding monks and novices joining the rally and debated whether such participation was permitted and appropriate.

- 1 IR We expect that it won't be to that extent or else there might be more people coming out in the 2.
 2 = future This matter is still debated and we may still see monks and novices keep coming out. Today,
 → 3 = thanks to both of you.
 4 IE1 My pleasure.
 → 5 IR Thank you.
 6 IE2 Take care. Good bye.
 → 7 IR Time is up. This is Pen Ruang Pen Khao. Come back and see us again tomorrow.
 8 = Goodbye for today.

Example 4 illustrates a successful and smooth closure of the conversation in a Thai news interview program. The IEs cooperated well with the IR, leading to a complete and conclusive conversation (lines 1-2). However, the IR acknowledged that the issue raised was complex and would require further discussion in the future. The conversation, in essence, was not entirely conclusive. Therefore, the IR encouraged the audience to stay engaged and continue following the topic. After summarizing the main points, the IR promptly expressed gratitude to both IEs (lines 3 and 5). Both IEs responded and said good-bye (lines 4 and 6). Subsequently, the IR reiterated the limited on-air time and the program title, concluding with a farewell (lines 7-8). This example demonstrates an effective conversation closure, as the IEs and IR collaborated smoothly to address the topic within the expected time frame. The IR skillfully utilized closing strategies, allowing the program to conclude in a professional manner, leaving the audience with a clear understanding of the ongoing nature of the topic and its relevance for future discussions.

Example 5

Program: *Hone Krasae*; Interviewer: Kanchai Kamnerdploy; Episode: Oh no! Mom Thanat Daek "Was Reported for Cruelty to Chickens;" broadcast on August 13, 2020.

Both IEs attempted to continue speaking and resisted ending the conversation, prompting the IR to signal the conclusion and take control to ensure the conversation ended within the broadcast schedule.

The IE1 is the secretary of the Thai Animal Protection Association, while the IE2 is an influencer who presented a clip showcasing a sadistic menu, describing it as a bizarre and traditional way of cooking in a rural community. This issue has sparked widespread discussion and become a highly dramatic topic in society. The IEs hold conflicting opinions: one views the practice as animal cruelty and has filed a legal complaint, while the other argues that it simply represents a long-standing tradition in rural life, with no intention to harm animals. Instead, it is presented as another perspective on cultural practices.

- 1 IR Okay?
 2 IE2 Yes.
 3 IE1 But you shouldn't say I was wrong.
 4 IR Okay, so.....
 5 IE2 Where did I say you were wrong?
 6 IR Okay. You just

- 7 =did.
 8 IE2 I said...
 9 IE1 Just you wait!
 10 IE2 I'll report you to the police
 → 11 IR do something
 12 IE2 I didn't say you were wrong.
 13 IE1 It's okay.
 → 14 IR Are you okay?
 15 IE1 No problem.
 → 16 IR Have a nice day.

This example shows the last part of conversation. The IEs were still arguing (line 1), so the interviewer said, “Okay?” to ask both of them to finish their talk. However, IE2 still kept talking and IE1 continued his third turn, but was suddenly interrupted by the interviewer, and asked to wrap up. Then IE2 interrupted to show disagreement with IE1 (two turns of response), and again the interviewer tried to stop the exchanges and wrap up (line 11). IE2 interrupted again to disagree with IE1. When the IE’s continued responding, interviewer said, “Are you okay?” (line 14) to tell the guests that the time was up. After that the interviewer thanked both guests and said goodbye to the audience (line 16).

Challenges in Closing Conversations in News Interviews

Closing a news interview is often challenging, particularly during the pre-closing phase, as arguments between the IEs can disrupt the transition to closure. To address this, the IR must employ one or several tactics repeatedly to signal that the conversation is nearing its end (see Table 2 for the frequency of strategies used in each episode). When IEs refuse to yield their turn or disagreements escalate, the IR may need to interrupt and cut off the discussion to steer the conversation toward closure. In cases where arguments persist and the IEs attempt to prolong the discussion, the IR may skip summarizing the key points and instead thank the participants directly. This action, often delivered without waiting for a response, signals that the program is concluding. Occasionally, the IEs acknowledge the expression of thanks, recognizing that the session is ending. The IR then quickly says goodbye to definitively end the conversation (see Table 3 for a breakdown of strategies used in each episode).

Managing the closing becomes increasingly difficult when conflicts intensify. The IR initially uses polite and gentle tones, but as tensions rise and participants try to dominate the discussion, the IR may resort to firmer, louder, and more emphatic interventions, sometimes accompanied by subtle sarcasm, to regain control. The IR employs various strategies to manage these situations, including highlighting inconsistencies in the interviewees’ statements, using indirect and conciliatory approaches to de-escalate confrontations, and asking targeted questions to redirect the discussion and reduce tension. The effectiveness of the IR’s strategies varies depending on the severity of the conflict. By implementing these strategies, IRs can better manage conflicts, stay within time constraints, and improve the overall effectiveness of interviews. Furthermore, understanding the interaction patterns and questioning strategies in news interviews provides valuable insights for professional journalists, enabling them to refine their skills for news interviews and other professional contexts.

Discussion

The findings of this study on conversation closing in Thai news interview programs align with the research conducted by Clayman and Heritage (2002), which demonstrated the universality of conversation closing features and strategies. However, closing the conversation in this context seems to pose more challenges due to the interviewees' (IEs) tendencies to prolong their responses, engage in retorts against each other, and attempt to take each other's turn. To manage such situations, interviewers employ various strategies to convey to the IE that the conversation is approaching its end. Pre-closing strategies are frequently used, and when successful, they enable the IR to effectively conclude the conversation. However, in cases where IEs continue talking beyond the allotted time, the IR may need to interrupt them to bring the conversation to a close. The act of thanking the IEs serves as a signal that the interview is concluding, and saying goodbye is the final step to formally close the conversation, allowing the IR to fulfill their duty within the expected time frame.

In news interview programs, IRs play a crucial role as representatives of the organization and leaders of the conversation. They bear the responsibility of conducting the program and conveying messages to the audience. Consequently, IRs employ specific strategies for conversation closing, which are integral aspects of the interview process. Closing strategies, such as thanking IEs and bidding farewell, serve to conclude the conversation and formally end the program. These strategies are not only necessary but also unavoidable, aligning with organizational specifications and ensuring the smooth flow of the news interview program. As highlighted in studies by Drew and Heritage (1992), Clayman and Heritage (2002), and Waiyaraphutra and Abhakorn (2017), the role of the IR is vital in guiding the conversation and maintaining its structure. The strategies used for conversation closing are highly relevant, creating a structured and professional environment for the news interview program. These strategies effectively establish a connection with the audience and contribute to achieving the program's objectives.

News interviews in Thailand are notably different from those conducted in countries such as the United Kingdom (Greatbatch, 1988), the United States (Clayman and Heritage, 2002), and Australia (Yanualifa Telomensi Sitepu, Hanafiah and Thyrhaya Zein, 2020). In these countries, news interviews typically feature prominent figures, such as prime ministers and politicians, serving as interviewees (IEs). The discussions often aim to inform or influence a broad audience, resulting in a formal and structured approach throughout the interview process. Closing strategies in these contexts are highly formal, emphasizing the summarization of key points or reiteration of central messages. By contrast, Thai news interview programs adopt a distinctly diverse and dynamic format. These programs frequently invite a wide range of guests, including individuals directly or indirectly involved in conflicts, as well as unrelated figures offering their perspectives. This format fosters more informal and emotionally charged interactions, as the discussions often revolve around interpersonal or group conflicts rather than purely policy-driven or informational topics. Additionally, Thai interview programs often feature returning interviewees who appear in multiple episodes to discuss different issues, creating a sense of continuity and familiarity for the audience.

A significant difference lies in the role of conflict during interviews. In Western contexts, while conflict may arise, it is typically moderated within a framework of formal discourse and strict time constraints, with a focus on professionalism. Conversely, Thai programs often embrace conflict, with some discussions intentionally amplifying it to captivate viewers. This reflects the creative and dynamic storytelling strategies of Thai media, as noted by Leelachewasit (2006) and Praditson (2017), which

emphasize informal, engaging, and narrative-driven approaches by interviewers. Furthermore, Thai interviewers frequently adopt a friendly and approachable demeanor, particularly when engaging with first-time guests or individuals unaccustomed to public speaking. This contrasts with the formal and often challenging questioning styles seen in Western interviews, where interviewees are typically well-prepared for media scrutiny. By creating a relaxed and conversational tone, Thai programs help reduce guests' anxiety and foster a relatable atmosphere for viewers.

Time management presents another area of contrast. In countries like the United States and the United Kingdom, interviews are rigorously timed to fit specific broadcast slots, often necessitating abrupt or formulaic closing strategies to adhere to schedules. In Thai programs, however, greater emphasis is placed on the organic progression of discussions, sometimes allowing interviews to extend beyond their planned duration. This flexibility is supported by the use of modern digital platforms, such as YouTube and Facebook Live, which enable live broadcasts to run slightly longer while ensuring accessibility for viewers after the program has aired. This adaptability allows Thai programs to explore topics in greater depth while accommodating the natural flow of conversation. It also presents challenges for IRs, who must skillfully manage interruptions, maintain structure, and steer the discussion toward a coherent conclusion.

The comparative analysis underscores the unique characteristics of the Thai media environment, where informal, creative, and conflict-driven dynamics distinguish it from the more formal and structured formats common in Western contexts. These distinctive features highlight the Thai media's ability to engage audiences through relatable storytelling, flexibility, and an emphasis on diverse perspectives, offering valuable insights into cross-cultural communication practices.

The study found that the presence of digital platforms has led to changes in the formality of conversation. The digital format allows for more flexible endings, enabling the IR to address key points while still engaging the audience. This shift aligns with current audience behavior, where viewers may pause, rewind, or rewatch an interview at their convenience. As a result, the formality of the closing strategy may adapt to these viewing styles, leading to a more informal and flexible conclusion that resonates with online audiences. Traditional news interviews often end with a professional conclusion or a clear reiteration of key points. In contrast, digital interviews may adopt a more conversational tone, reflecting the informal nature of the platform and audience expectations for relevant, interactive exchanges. Live interviews frequently include audience comments and reactions, which can influence the direction of the conversation. The IR may acknowledge or respond to these inputs, creating a less formal environment than traditional formats. However, despite the significant role of the broadcast platform in Thai-language news interviews, it was found that each program still adheres to the TV station's broadcast schedule and time control, except in cases where a topic garners significant public interest, which may be extended to other digital platforms. Real-time audience feedback does not impact the IR's closing of the conversation, as the IR typically concludes the conversation at the station's appointed time. The show's closing summary is presented in an open-ended manner, allowing the audience to decide whether to believe one side or continue following the situation.

News interview programs often feature frequent interruptions from participants, sometimes escalating into continuous disruptions. These interruptions frequently underscore the intensity of the conversation, especially during discussions on political issues where participants hold strongly opposing views. In such instances, one participant might attempt to raise sensitive societal issues or mention specific individuals, while the other might seek to avoid addressing them. When participants hold conflicting

opinions, they often compete for dominance in the conversation, resulting in struggles over speaking turns. This dynamic frequently escalates into heated arguments, with participants attempting to reject or override each other's right to speak. To manage these conflicts, the IR, must actively regulate the conversation, often interrupting to distribute speaking turns fairly. This responsibility poses a significant challenge, requiring the IR to carefully phrase their interventions to maintain decorum. Expressions like, "Excuse me for interrupting," or "Please let the other person finish speaking first," are commonly used to signal that the IR's intent is to ensure a smooth flow of conversation and equitable turn-taking. However, in some instances, particularly toward the end of the conversation, participants refused to yield their turn, even when the IR requested it politely. In such cases, the IR sometimes resorted to repeated interruptions to regain control and close the conversation promptly. This occasionally required setting aside considerations of politeness or the speaker's "face" to maintain the program's structure. This approach contrasts with the findings of Krutnate (2014) and Ongwuttiwat (2016), who noted that Thai people generally value consideration, compromise, and avoidance of conflict in conversation. These cultural traits emphasize humility and respect for conversational partners, reflecting the Thai concepts of "face" and "seniority," which discourage confrontation. However, the communication dynamics in news interview programs, shaped by the format and purpose of the interaction, often deviate from these cultural norms. The nature of the conversation may vary significantly depending on the context and the topics discussed.

Conclusion

This research illuminates the nuanced strategies employed in closing conversations in Thai news interview programs, particularly when dealing with conflicting opinions. The study underscores the fact that IRs utilize specific strategies to structure the conclusion of discussions, setting the stage and providing context for the audience. Challenges arise in Thai news interview programs where IEs often engage in heated debates and attempt to prolong their speaking turns. To address this, the IR employs pre-closing strategies, such as time notifications and requests for conciseness, signaling the impending end of the conversation. Despite the dynamic nature of IEs' interactions and potential difficulties, the IR consistently follows a step-by-step process, effectively managing the closing phase and aligning with the program's objectives.

The communication dynamics in news interviews do not always resolve conflicts between the participants. Toward the end of the conversation, during the pre-closing phase, the IR typically provides a summary, leaving it to the viewers to reflect on or follow up as they see fit. News interview programs enjoy immense popularity in Thailand, particularly among individuals who lack power or face injustices within the legal system. During conflicts, audiences often actively participate by leaving comments and contributing to the discussion. Notably, the public exposure of discussion points frequently accelerates the legal process. As a result, news interview programs are seen as a refuge for individuals who have suffered or are currently experiencing conflicts. They serve not only as platforms to highlight societal issues but also as tools for educating the broader community by imparting valuable lessons. Further research into how the communication styles of politicians or political figures influence the conversation-closing strategies in Thai news interview programs could provide valuable insights into the broader communication dynamics within this context.

References

- Al-Rojaie, Y. I. (2001). **A discourse analysis of interruption, moderator role, and address terms in Arab and American panel news interviews**. Ph.D. Dissertation, Graduate College, Oklahoma State University.
- Azalan, M., Sahira, A., and Nabilah, A. N. (2019). Exploring multi-party interaction in TV talk show: non-verbal as resources for cooperative interruption. **International Language and Tourism Conference (ILTC 2019)**. Sustaining global development goals through language, education and tourism kulliyah of languages and management. (pp. 121-132). Malaysia: International Islamic University Malaysia, Pagoh Edu Hub.
- Barnes, R. (2007). Formulations and the facilitation of common agreement in meetings talk. **Text & Talk**, 27(3), 273-296.
- Bell, P. and van Leeuwen, T. (1994). **The media interview: Confession, contest, conversation**. Sydney: UNSW Press.
- Bird, E. S. and Dardenne, R. W. (1987). Myth, chronicle and story: Exploring the narrative qualities of news. In James W. Carey (Eds.), **Media, myths and narratives: Television and the press**. (pp. 67-86). London: Sage.
- Boyd, E. and Heritage, J. (2006). Taking the patient's medical history: Questioning during comprehensive history taking. In J. Heritage and D. Maynard (Eds.), **Communication in medical care: Interactions between primary care physicians and patients**. (pp. 151-184). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bunnag, O. (2016). Impoliteness strategies for interviewing celebrities by alternative television channel hosts. **Chophayom Journal**, 27(2), 13-24.
- Chaudnuch, W. (2019). **Kanphut nai achip sueamuanchon**. (In Thai) [Speaking in mass media profession]. 6th ed. Bangkok: Ramkhamhaeng University Press.
- Clayman, S. (1988). Displaying neutrality in television news interviews. **Social Problems**, 35(4), 474-492.
- Clayman, S. and Heritage, J. (2002). **The news interview: Journalists and public figures on the air**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coronel-Molina, S. M. (1998). Openings and closings in telephone conversations between native Spanish speakers. **Working papers in educational linguistics (WPEL)**, 14(1), 49-68.
- Craig, G. (2007). Moving through discourses: An assessment of the New Zealand 2005 election televised leaders' debates. **Media International Australia**, 123(1), 18-33.
- Craig, G. (2008). Kevin Rudd and the framing of politics and political leadership in news media interviews. **Communication, Politics and Culture**, 41(2), 84-99.
- Craig, G. (2010). Dialogue and dissemination in news media interviews. **Journalism: Theory, Practice & Criticism**, 11(1), 75-90.
- Drew, P. and Heritage, J. (1992). Analyzing talk at work: An introduction. In P. Drew and J. Heritage (Eds.), **Talk at work**. (pp. 3-65). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Feng, D. (2016). Doing "authentic" news: Voices, forms, and strategies in presenting television news. **International Journal of Communication**, 10, 4239-4257.
- Grabe, M. E., Lang, A., and Zhao, X. (2003). News content and form: Implications for memory and audience evaluations. **Communication Research**, 30(4), 387-413.
- Greatbatch, D. (1988). A turn-taking system for British news interviews. **Language in Society**, 17(3), 401-430.
- Heritage, J. (1985). Analyzing news interviews: Aspects of the production of talk for an overhearing audience. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), **Handbook of discourse analysis**. (pp. 95-119). New York: Academic Press.
- Heritage, J. and Greatbatch, D. (1991). On the institutional character of institutional talk: The case of news interviews. In D. Boden and D. H. Zimmerman (Eds.), **Talk and social structure**. (pp. 93-137). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hopper, R. (1992). **Telephone conversation**. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hopper, R. and Chen, C. H. (1996). Languages, cultures, relationships: Telephone openings in Taiwan. **Research on Language and Social Interaction**, 29(4), 291-313.
- Hopper, R. and Doany, N. K. (1989). Telephone openings and conversational universals: A study in three languages. In S. Ting-Toomey and F. Korzeny (Eds.), **Language communication and culture: Current directions**. (pp. 157-179). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

- Hutchby, I. (2006). **Media talk: Conversation analysis and the study of broadcasting**. Glasgow: Open University Press.
- Intachakra, S. (2007). *Naeokhit phuenthan dan watchanapatibattisat*. (In Thai) [Fundamental concepts of pragmatics]. Bangkok: Thammasat University Press.
- Jefferson, G. (1979). A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance/ declination. In G. Psathas (Ed.), **Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology**. (pp.79-96). New York: Irvington Publishers.
- Khuenkaew, S., Sereechaikun, T., and Bamrungsuk, S. (2021). The structure of the conversation on selling cosmetics in online live broadcasting (In Thai). **Proceedings of the national academic conference on the topic of Thai language and culture in the New World**. (pp. 123-146). Bangkok: Ramkhamhaeng University.
- Kong, R. and Ting, S. (2014). An analysis of conversation structure in Ellen show. **Studies in Literature and Language**, 9(2), 37-42.
- Krisathain, W. (2012). *Khrongsang botsonthana phasa phama rawang chaonathi hai borikan khomun chaothai kap lukkha chaophama*. (In Thai) [An analysis of Burmese telephone conversational structures between Thai call center operators and Burmese customers]. Master's thesis, Department of Linguistics, Graduate School, Mahidol University.
- Krutnate, P. (2014). *Konlawithi thang phasa thi chai yutti kansonthana thi mi khwamkhatyaeng nai phasa thai*. (In Thai) [Strategies used for terminating conflict talk in Thai interactions]. Master's thesis, Department of Thai, Chulalongkorn University.
- Leelachewasit, P. (2006). *Kanwikhro paritchet raikan thorathat "Hua Mo Cho Khaw"*. (In Thai) [A discourse analysis of "Huamochokhao" TV program]. Master's thesis, Department of Thai, Chulalongkorn University.
- Mansson, L. (2015). **Pre-closing formulations in meeting talk: A study of a cross-functional team meeting at Ericsson in Sweden**. Bachelor's thesis, Södertörn University, Sweden. DiVA: Digitala Vetenskapliga Arkivet.
- Meidiarto, A. (2021). Conversational structure analysis in conflict zone interview. **LingPoet: Journal of Linguistics and Literary Research**, 2(2), 38-47.
- Montgomery, M. (2008). The discourse of the broadcast news interview: A typology. **Journalism Studies**, 9(2), 260-277.
- Nanthakanok, K. (2012). *Kanwikhro khrongsang botsonthana rawang chaonathirat kap chonklumchatiphan*. (In Thai) [An analysis of conversational structures between local government officials and ethnic people]. Master's thesis, Department of Linguistics, Graduate School, Mahidol University.
- Ochaphan, S. (2022). Simultaneous speech in Thai conversation: A case study of *Honekrasae* television program. **Thai Language and Literature**, 39(1), 94-137.
- Ongwuttiwat, S. (2016). "I think it might not be what you think...": An emancipatory pragmatics study of linguistic devices used for disagreement in Thai conversation. **Thammasat Journal**, 35(1), 71-129.
- Paltridge, B. (2000). **Making sense of discourse analysis**. Making sense of language series-Book 3. Brisbane: Merino Lithographics.
- Panyametheekul, S. (2020). Closing a conversation in communication via LINE application. **Journal of Thai Language and Literature**, 37(1), 1-30.
- Pardede, P. (2011). Using short stories to teach language skills. **JET (Journal of English Teaching)**, 1(1). 14-27.
- Praditsorn, P. (2017). *Paritchet kanlaokhao nai raikan thorathat: "Rueang Lao Chao Ni" lae "Rueang Lao Sao-A-thit"*. (In Thai) [Discourses of news talk television programs: "Rueng Lao Chao Ni" and "Rueng Lao Sao-A-thit"]. Master's thesis, Department of Thai and Applied Thai, Prince of Songkla University.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., and Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. **Language**, 50, 697-735.
- Sapabsri, O., Dhanesschaiyakupta, U., Ackrapong, T. T., and Phimswat, O. U. (2018). An analysis of gender and status affecting conversational interruptions. **PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences**, 4(1), 257-271.
- Sathum, S. (2006). *Paritchet kansoppakkham rawang phanakngan sopsuan kap phusiahai nai kanrongthuk hai pen khadi-aya*. (In Thai) [A study of the inquiry discourse between the inquisitor and the injured person in complaint of criminal cases]. Master's thesis, Department of Thai, Chulalongkorn University.

- Sathum, S. (2017). *Kansueksa paritchet kansonthana rawang chittaphaet lae phupuainok nai kantruat raksa rok thang chitawet bueangton*. (In Thai) [A study of conversational discourse between psychiatrists and out-patients in primary psychiatric consultation]. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Thai, Chulalongkorn University.
- Schegloff, E. A. and Sacks H. (1973). Opening up closings. *Semiotica*, 7(4), 289-327.
- Schudson, M. (1994). Question authority: A history of the news interview in American journalism, 1830s-1930s. *Media, Culture and Society*, 16(4), 565-587.
- Shen, L. (2006). Computer technology and students' reading habits. *Chia-nan Annual Bulletin*, 32, 559-572.
- Sifianou, M. (1989). On the telephone again! Differences in telephone behaviour: England versus Greece. *Language in Society*, 18(4), 527-544.
- Siroj, N. (2006). *Kanchatraikan witthayu thorathat*. (In Thai) [Television programming]. Bangkok: Ramkhamhaeng University Press.
- Sirisai, S. (2006). *A study on turn-taking and floor management in Thai TV talk*. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Linguistics, Graduate School, Mahidol University.
- Thornborrow, J. (2001). Questions and control: The organisation of talk in calls to a radio phone-in. *Discourse Studies*, 3(1), 119-143.
- Tolson, A. (2006). *Media talk: Spoken discourse on TV and radio*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Vattanasiriporn, M. (2016). *Krabuankan sang khwam nachueathue phan kansuesan khana samphatngan khong phuthuksamphat nai tamnaeng phuchatkan faikhai borisat Modern Cass International Cosmetics Chamkat*. (In Thai) [The process of building credibility through communication in a job interview for the post of sales manager, Modern Cass International Cosmetic Limited]. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Management, Graduate School, Silpakorn University.
- Waiyaraphutra, K. and Abhakorn, J. M. L. (2017). Conversation analysis of interviewer's cooperative tasks during news interviews. *Phranakhon Rajabhat Research Journal (Humanities and Social Sciences)*, 12(2), 143-156.
- Wongkhat, P. (2012). *Kanwikhro khongsang botsonthana rawang nakchatraikan witthayu khluen 94.0 EFM*. (In Thai) [Analysis of the structure of conversation between radio hosts of 94.0 EFM]. Master's thesis, Department of Linguistics, Graduate School, Mahidol University.
- Wongsuwan, W. (1999). *Kanwikhro paritchet "Talk Show" khong Thinawat Maruekkaphithak*. (In Thai) [Discourse considerations of Tinawat Marukapitak's "Talk Show"]. Master's thesis, Department of Thai, Chulalongkorn University.
- Yamaphai, S. and Anawajsiriwongs, T. (2004). *Lakkanphut: Nathi chumchon suemuanchon lae nai ongkon*. (In Thai) [Principles of speaking: Community, media and organization duties]. 10th ed. Bangkok: Wandeedee Group.
- Yanualifa Telomensi Sitepu, E., Hanafiah, R., and Thyrhaya Zein, T. (2020). A conversation analysis on interview with Prime Minister Julia Gillard in Sky News Australia Channel. *JELTL (Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics)*, 5(3), 441-455.

Websites

- Amphai, C. (2013). *The future of alternative Thai TV in the era of transition to digital TV*. Retrieved February 2, 2022, from <https://www.scbeic.com/th/detail/product/337>
- National Broadcasting and Telecommunications Commission. (2012). *Executive summary 1: The process of transition to digital television in Thailand*. Retrieved November 1, 2024, from <https://nbt.go.th/data/document/tv/file/executivesummary1.pdf>

Appendix

Symbols used for transcribing verbal data in this research

Symbol	Meaning	
IR	Abbreviation IR	Interviewer
IE ₁	Abbreviation IE and numbers	Interviewee 1
IE ₂		Interviewee 2
→	Arrow	Displays the turns of utterances used in the analysis.
<u>utterance</u>	Underlined words	Displays utterances that the speaker emphasizes markedly.
utterance	bold letters	Displays utterances that the speaker pronounces especially loudly.
Z		Displays the conversation between interlocutors without any pauses.
[]	Square bracket	Displays the overlap of interlocutors' utterances.
[	Left square bracket	Displays interrupted utterances of the interlocutor.
	Space apart	Displays pauses in the breathing rhythm.
::	Double colon	Expressing a lengthy, pronounced speech, either emphasizing or rendering speechless.
=	Equal sign	Displays the uninterrupted speech of a single speaker.
1 2 3	Each line number	Shows only lines of the speech sequence.

Example 1

(ตัดตอนจากรายการต่างคนต่างคิด พิธีกร: พุทธ อภิวัฒน์ ตอน ดีเบต พปชร. กับ ทษช. เลือกใครประเทศเปลี่ยน ?)

- 1 พ. ถ้าได้ ถ้าได้อันดับ 2 ควรจัดตั้งรัฐบาลมั๊ย
- 2 ร₁ (ตอบคำถาม 6 บรรทัด) ...เราจะไม่ให้มีการผูกขาดทางธุรกิจ เราจะรับฟังประชาชนในการแก้ไขปัญหา
- 3 พ. อีกสามสิบวิเศษ
- 4 =เชิญ
- 5 ร₁ (ตอบคำถาม 4 บรรทัด)
- 6 พ. ครับ สั้น ๆ 1 นาทีเหมือนกัน
- 7 ร₂ กฎหมาย พรบ. ข้าวเป็นการทำเพื่อประโยชน์ของพี่น้องชาวนา
- 8 พ. จะทำอะไรหลังประหารรัฐ
- 9 ร₂ (ตอบคำถาม 6 บรรทัด)
- 10 พ. ขอบคุณทั้งสองท่านมาก และทั้งหมดนี้อนาคตประเทศไทยอยู่ในมือของท่าน
- 11 =ฟังวันนี้แล้วตัดสินใจอย่างไร 24 มีนาไปกำหนดอนาคตตัวเอง วันนี้เท่านั้นก่อนนะ
- 12 =สวัสดีครับ

Example 2

(ตัดตอนจากรายการเป็นเรื่องเป็นข่าว พิธีกร: เสถียร วิริยะพรรณพงศา ตอน ฟังกันชัด ๆ “ดีเบต” ปัญหาการศึกษาไทย! จาก อนาคตใหม่ และ พลังประชารัฐ)

- 1 ร₁ ...วิชาอะไรที่กะอะไรที่เขาจะเพิ่มเพื่อไปสู่เป้าหมายของเขา
- 2 พ. ครับ
- 3 ร₁ กะ มันก็จะมอง
- 4 =แยกกันไปเลย
- 5 พ. โอ เพราะฉะนั้นเวลาไม่มีแล้วนะฮะ จริง ๆ เอาสั้น ๆ
- 6 =คนละนิดเดียว ปัญหาใหญ่ที่มัน มันจะไปไม่ถึงตรงที่ว่ามา คืออะไร
- 7 =อุปสรรคใหญ่ในการศึกษาไทย
- 8 ร₂ การจัดการ
- 9 พ. การจัดการ
- 10 ร₂ ไข่

- 11 พ. อา เอาทางนี้อุปสรรคใหญ่ที่สุด
 12 ร₁ ก็คือ ก็คือ ก็คือการบริหารจัดการในการบริหารจัดการของประเทศเรานี้ละ แล้วทำยังไงให้โอกาส
 13 =ของพวกเราคนรุ่นใหม่ ได้เข้าไปนำเสนอ หรือจริง ๆ การวัดผลต่าง ๆ ให้ครูเข้ามามีส่วนร่วม ให้มาก
 → 14 พ. อะ เวลาไม่พอแล้วนะอะ ก็ติดตามกันก่อนนะครับแล้วหวังว่าคนรุ่นใหม่จะได้เข้าไป
 15 =มีส่วนในการบริหารประเทศโดยเฉพาะการเปลี่ยนแปลงการศึกษานะครับ ขอบคุณทั้งสองท่าน

Example 3

(ตัดตอนจากรายการถามตรงตรง พิธีกร: จอมขวัญ หลาวเพ็ชร ตอน เผชิญหน้า “ปารีณา-มายด์” ฝ่าวิกฤตประเทศ)

- 1 พ. อ่า ที่นี้คุณปารีณาก่อนจบรายการ คุณปารีณาเสนออะไรบ้าง
 2 ร₂ (ตอบคำถาม 5 บรรทัด)
 → 3 พ. ปิดท้ายที่มายด์ละ อยากให้รัฐบาลหรืออะฝากที่เอไปอะ อะไรบ้าง
 4 ร₁ (ตอบคำถาม 11 บรรทัด)
 5 ร₂ แล้วแล้วมายด์จะไปชุมนุมในที่ที่ไม่ทำปิดถนนได้มัย
 6 (พูดคุยตอบโต้กันอย่างต่อเนื่องอีก 43 ผลัด)
 → 7 พ. คึ้นปิดท้ายที่เขานะ คุณเอามาแล้วนะอะ จบที่เขานะ เคียวไม่ได้จบรายการ เอ้า เชิญอะ
 8 ร₁ (ตอบคำถาม 4 บรรทัด)
 9 (พูดคุยตอบโต้กันอย่างต่อเนื่องอีก 10 ผลัด)
 → 10 พ. เนี่ยเราอะ ตลอดเลย อะอะ เอาเขาพูด
 11 ร₂ ยังพูดไม่หมดเลยเมื่อก็ อะ อีกแล้ว
 → 12 พ. เขาพูด เขาพูด เขาพูดถึงคุณ
 13 ร₂ อ้าว
 → 14 พ. ก็คุณพูด คึ้น
 15 =ต้องจบรายการตั้งแต่ 5 นาที่ที่แล้ว อ้วยยังงี้ละ
 16 ร₁ อะ ตัวหนูเองไม่สามารถที่จะไป อ่า อ่า defend หรือว่า เอ่อ หรือ เอ่อ จะพูดอธิบายอะไรได้ใน
 17 =ในเรื่องของความเหมาะสมนะ หนูเลยถึงบอกว่าให้พี่น้องประชาชนที่อยู่ทางบ้านเป็นคน
 18 =ตัดสินใจ
 19 ร₂ ใช่ พี่น้องประชาชน ตัดสินใจนะอะ ว่าใครเหมาะสมใครไม่เหมาะสม
 → 20 พ. ขอบคุณที่ปิดรายการให้ละ
 21 =หมดเวลาของรายการ ขอบคุณทั้งสองท่านนะอะ ขอบคุณอะ

Example 4

(ตัดตอนจากรายการเป็นเรื่องเป็นข่าว พิธีกร: ชันจิต เจริญพงศ์ชัย ตอน จับสีกพระ ชุมชุมการเมือง)

- 1 พ. ซึ่งเราคาดหวังว่าจะไม่ถึงขนาดนั้นไม่อย่างนั้นอาจจะมีคนออกมาเยอะขึ้นหรือเปล่าในอนาคตนะอะ เรื่องนี้ยังคงถกเถียง
 2 =กันและอาจจะยังเห็นพระภิกษุสงฆ์และสามเณรออกมาเรื่อย ๆ
 → 3 =วันนี้ขอบคุณทั้ง 2 ท่านนะอะ
 4 ร₁ ยินดีครับ
 → 5 พ. ขอบคุณอะ
 6 ร₂ หวัดดีครับหวัดดีครับ
 → 7 พ. หมดเวลาแล้วนะอะเป็นเรื่องเป็นข่าว กลับมาพบกันได้ใหม่วันพรุ่งนี้ละ
 8 =วันนี้ลาไปแล้วสวัสดิ์ละ

Example 5

(ตัดตอนจากรายการโหนกระแส พิธีกร: กรรชัย กำเนิดพลอย ตอน เอาแล้ว! หม่อมถนัดแดก “โดนแจ้งความทารุณโก”))

- 1 พ. โอเคนะ
 2 ร₂ ใช่ นะ
 3 ร₁ แต่พี่ไม่ควรจะมามบอกว่าผมคิดไป แล้วไง
 4 พ. อะไม่เป็นไร เอาเป็นว่า
 5 ร₂ ผมบอกตรงไหนมาคุณคิด
 6 พ. เอาเป็นว่า เคียวคุณก็ไป

- 7 = คำเนนการ อะไรก็ว่ากันไปนะ
8 ร2 ผมบอก
9 ร1 เดี่ยวก็รู้ เดี่ยวก็รู้
10 ร2 ผมไปแจ้งความดำเนินคดีกับคุณ
→ 11 พ. ดำเนินการอะไรก็ว่ากันไปนะ
12 ร2 ผมไม่ได้บอกว่าคุณผิด
13 ร1 ไม่เป็นไร ๆ
→ 14 พ. โอเคนะครับ
15 ร1 ยินดีครับพี่
→ 16 พ. วันนี้สวัสดิ์คุณผู้ชมครับ