

Servicing the body:

Placing glasses on the client's head at the opticians.

Abstract

Various forms of service work rely upon personnel undertaking activities that necessitate close, and in some cases potentially intimate, contact with a client's body. In this paper, we consider the ways in which opticians place and position glasses on the head of their clients and how they avoid, or at least ameliorate, the problems and sensitivities that might arise in this close encounter with the co-participant. The paper is based on the analysis of a substantial corpus of video-recordings, augmented by field work, undertaken both in UK and Denmark. The analysis draws on ethnomethodology and conversation analysis and contributes to our understanding of the interactional accomplishment of body work and embodied conduct and to the growing corpus of research concerned with 'multimodality' and the social organization of service encounters.

Keywords: Body work, service encounters, optometry, professional practice, multimodality

1. Introduction: placing glasses as an interactional achievement at the optician

In light of the growing service economy, service work has increasingly come into the focus of researchers in organization studies and sociology (Korczynski, 2001; Walsh and Deery, 2006). Recent research has examined service work in restaurants (Yamauchi and Hiramoto, 2016), at hairdressers (Abiala, 1999; Oshima and Streeck, 2015), and at service desks (Llewellyn and Hindmarsh, 2013) as well as in online environments where customers are put to work (Ritzer and Jurgenson, 2010; Zwick et al., 2008). Surprisingly little research is concerned with opticians, even though most people at some point in their lives visit opticians to have their eyes tested or purchase glasses. Visits to an optician happen on invitation for a regular vision test, if people feel the quality of their vision has decreased, or if they consider renewing their glasses for other reasons. The optometrist works in an examination room where s/he conducts vision tests and inspects clients' eye health. The outcome of the consultation is often a recommendation for new glasses. Clients then proceed into the shop area, where they try out and choose frames and decide on the quality of the lenses to purchase.

During any working day optometrists and opticians place frames on their clients' heads many times. For example, trial frames are placed to perform vision tests, and after the consultation opticians place different frames to compare different styles and fit (see figure 1). Observations of the activity suggest that the placing of frames on clients' heads is not unproblematic as opticians have to ensure clients are comfortable with the professional approaching them very closely and sliding the temples of the frames past their eyes to come to rest on their ear lobes. The placing of frames therefore requires cooperation between professional and client and is accomplished in interaction between them in and through the visual monitoring of embodied actions.

[insert picture]

Figure 1: two examples of clients placing glasses on the client's head. Left is a regular pair of glasses in the shop area and right is a pair of trial frames in the examination room.

This article examines the emergence of cooperation between the professional and the client when the former places frames on the latter's head. Similar to other studies in *Visual Studies* (Psathas, 1991; Mondada, 2003; Sharrock and Coulter, 2003; Carlin, 2003; Garfinkel and Livingston, 2003; Have, 2003; Hester and Francis, 2003; Hockey and Collinson, 2006; Lloyd, 2013, 2016; Smith, 2019), the analysis in this article is generally concerned with the organisation of visual order and perception in embodied activity. Two of these studies in the ethnomethodological tradition relevant to service encounters are Garfinkel and Livingston's (2003) study of queues and Hester and Francis's (2003) autoethnographic study of a walk to the supermarket. Only a small amount of work from any methodological approach has examined visual available order at the optician. We aim to contribute to the general understanding of body work as visual available order through the detailed analysis of a perspicuous case (Garfinkel, 2002), where the phenomenon is recurrently happening; at the optician.

The research is based on field observations, interviews and video-recordings of naturally occurring action and interaction at optician's shops and in consultation rooms. For this article we only provide analyses of and findings from the video recordings. It reveals in minute detail the organization of the participants' visual actions through which the placing is accomplished. This knowledge is highly relevant for the understanding of practices at the optician and more generally on body work as visual available order.

This introduction is followed by a brief discussion of relevant literature related to interaction in optometry and the passing of objects and a description of the data we have gathered at Danish and British opticians. Thereafter, we will examine our data before reflecting on the analysis and its relevance for ethnographic studies at opticians as well as research on the passing of objects and instruments.

2. Literature Review: service work and body work

In recent years, there has been a growing debate about interactive service work and the skills that workers have to deploy when providing a service (Bolton & Shankar, 2003; Bolton & Saxena-Iyer, 2009; Hanser, 2008; Leidner, 1993; Llewellyn & Hindmarsh, 2013). This research often addresses the emotional work staff perform when dealing with customers while in public spaces and while being monitored and supervised by their managers and colleagues (Hochschild, 2003). In recent years, there has been growing interest in the deployment of technology and its impact on staff, on the staff-customer relationship, and on customers and their involvement in companies (Luff et al., 2000; Szymanski and Whalen, 2011). Relatively little research, however, has been conducted on service work performed on parts of clients' or customers' bodies. The only known studies of interactive work at the optician is Due and Trærup (2018) on passing's, Due (forth.) on the use of information sheets, vom Lehn, Webb, Heath, Gibson (2013) on the practices of assessing distance vision, Webb, vom Lehn, Heath, Gibson, Evans (2013) on opening remarks in consultations, Webb, Heath, vom Lehn, Gibson (2013) on the optometrist's gesturing actions, Gibson, Webb, vom Lehn (2011) on how participants prepare for a vision test. None of these studies has dealt with placings as social actions.

2.1. Studies of service work

Studies have been conducted in beauty salons and tattoo parlors as well as at hairdressers and in dentistry. This research, however, is primarily based on interviews with service providers and customers to explore, for example, manicurists' motivations for pursuing their work and how gender, class and race intersect in their work (Kang, 2010). Sanders (1989) investigates tattooing as service work performed on customers' bodies. His research undertaken in the 1980s explores the strategies customers deploy to reduce the purchase risk of a "socially devalued product and service" (Sanders, 1985). Related research explores people's motivations to have a tattoo and how they legitimize obtaining a tattoo to others (Irwin, 2001). Despite its contribution to debates about interactive service work and body work in this sector, this research does not examine naturally organized and moment-by-moment occurring interaction in tattoo parlors and the lived mundane visual available practice of producing a tattoo on clients' bodies. Similarly, research on hairdressers is concerned with the emotional labor and with the spatial organization of their work. For example, Shortt (2015) reveals through "participant-led photography" and photo-elicitation interviews how hairdressers who work in an open-plan environment are able to create private space for their work (cf. Shortt and Warren, 2012). The actual, naturally occurring work on the clients, however, is not considered by Shortt. Other approaches by e.g. Lebaron and Jones (2002), Asmuß and Streeck (2015) and Osima and Streeck (2015) explore how customers relate to and interact with each other at a hairdresser's through detailed studies of video-recordings, but they do not investigate the practical work on customers' heads. Research of the work of dentists is likewise primarily concerned with relationships between the professionals and their clients (Nettleton, 1992) rather than with how the dentists manage to work in the intimate domain of patients' mouths (Hindmarsh et al., 2009).

2.2 Placing objects on people's heads

This article is concerned with a particular phenomenon that can be regularly observed at opticians, i.e. the placing of frames on people's heads. Placing objects on other people's heads is a mundane and everyday activity that can often be observed in sports where helmets are fitted to footballers', hockey players' or climbers' heads, and in service settings such as millineries. Whilst in sociology and related disciplines very few studies explore this activity, within anthropology there are several studies examining the different ritual practices in tribes where people place objects with symbolic meanings on person's heads. This is often done by witchdoctors or elderly people and accompanied by rituals (Aufenanger, 1965; Quartey-Papafio, 1914; Stross, 2011). These studies however do not focus on the detailed organization of the placings and their visual properties, but on the cultural practices, ceremonies and symbolic meanings of the objects being placed.

2.3 Objects in interaction and related to the body

Our study of the placing of glasses and frames on people's heads is embedded in research in the growing field that explores objects-in-interaction. Extensive reviews of interactional research on objects can be found in Haddington et al., (2014), Nevile et al. (2014a), Nevile (2015) and Day and Wagner (2019). In this paper we follow the broad definition of objects as put forth by Nevile et al. (2014b) by studying "objects as situated resources" (p. 4) understood as "elements of the physical world that we can experience sensorially" (p. 5). Often, studies of objects examine how one person uses/orients to an object in an interactional ecology or how a group of people have a joint attention or collaboration related to the object, e.g. orienting to tools (Hutchins and Palen, 1997), food (Streeck, 1996), artifacts (Nielsen, 2012), technological objects (Luff et al., 2000;

Suchman, 2007) or professional equipment (Goodwin, 2013), e.g. in the laboratory (Kawatoko and Ueno, 2003), or using them as personal aids, e.g. the white cane for the blind (Due and Lange, 2018), to name a few.

Specifically within healthcare settings, objects have been examined with regards to their use in a context of acting “upon the human body” (Nevile et al., 2014b: 13). Objects may be acted upon the body in surgery by a surgeon and without the patient knowing about it (being unconscious) (e.g. Mondada, 2003). But placing glasses at the optician is a quite different activity type. More relevant are studies like Nishizaka’s (e.g. 2007) on the use of objects in prenatal examinations where an object is acted upon a client by a professional midwife while being in conversation with the client. But Nishizaka pays only little attention to the coordination of the client’s body and its visual available properties.

2.4 Body work as visual action

We may relate to what Heath (2006) has called “*body work*”: that is, the professional’s treatment of the client’s body by acting upon it. Within the framework of body work sequentially, object understanding, visual orientation and action design are key areas of expertise. In line with this, Hindmarsh and Pilnick (2007) introduce the term *intercorporeal knowing*, i.e. practical knowledge of the dynamic bodies of others in the local ecology as they are visually engaged in an activity. Although this term is proposed in relation to anaesthetic work where surgery team members rely on timing and positioning of an instrument in their work, it may also be relevant with regards to placings. Although the surgery team is a professional-professional context, the professional-layman context where clients (who have often just walked in from the street) interact with opticians still consists of these finely coordinated actions that build on

intercorporeal knowledge about where to position the body and the head in the visual available ecology so the glasses can smoothly be placed. We will show how the timing and the positioning of the approaching frames and the client's head are members' visually available achievements.

3. Methodological approach and data

The empirical and analytical material in this paper is video recordings. This is informed by the theoretical development of video ethnography and workplace studies (Luff et al., 2000; Heath et al., 2010; Hindmarsh and Llewellyn, 2016), which draw on Garfinkel's (1967) ethnomethodology and Sacks' (1992) conversation analysis. The principle of sequentiality, or *nextness*, and the conditional relevance (Schegloff, 1972) of particular types of actions following prior actions are core concerns when it comes to placing actions. For instance, how does the movement, body position, grip, etc. visually project a placing to be a next relevant action? How are these actions visually designed to be recognized by the recipient for all practical purposes? This article focuses on the social organization and co-constructed accomplishment of these actions. This involves detailed analysis of members' accomplishment of what they do; that is, placing glasses in methodological visually recognizable ways while exhibiting and building trust moment-by-moment.

The article builds on a data set collected by the research teams in Denmark and England. The data comprise of field observations and video-recordings of interactions between opticians or optometrists and their clients. Overall, we have gathered a corpus of about 700 hours of audio-/video-recordings of interaction at optician's and in examination rooms. We scanned the recordings and noticed a mundane activity, the placing of glasses

and frames on clients' heads, that opticians and optometrists conduct numerous times in the course of each working day. Based on this observation we created a collection of recordings, and then compared and contrasted cases in our collection, which helped us to identify basic patterns in the production of the activity.

Our initial examination of the data suggested that optometrists dock the glasses onto clients' heads in different ways, for example starting from the nose or from the ears. In all cases it transpired that the activity is accomplished through a minute coordination of actions through which the placing, in most cases, comes across as unproblematic and mundane. Based on these initial observations we selected 25 cases from our corpus to examine in more detail. For the purpose of the analysis, the video-data were transcribed using Jefferson's (1984) system for the transcription of the talk, and following the guidelines for the transcription of bodily and material action developed by Heath and colleagues (Heath et al., 2010). The transcription helps to reveal the temporal organization of participants' actions and, in conjunct with the video-data, to reconstruct how each action is oriented to each prior and to each next action.

The way we have chosen to represent data is by taking a video frame, rendering it as a drawing in order to secure a high degree of anonymization while at the same time preserve details of the action for the visual analysis, and then outlining relevant body parts to more clearly frame the action. The video frames are shown with a time code, that exactly depicts the time we made the image; hence it is also analytically possible to show changes in courses of action in milliseconds. Talk is transcribed as it precisely sequentially unfolds using both line numbers, in the Jeffersonian tradition, (also showing e.g. overlap in talk), and speech bubbles to highlight who speaks in a visual fashion. When the data is from

Denmark, the first line in the transcript is the original Danish, and the second line is translated into English. This is a convention in conversation analysis. In this tradition there are many similar ways to represent data based on the key methodological notion of sequentially (For a recent discussion on transcript systems see the special issue in *Social Interaction. Video-Based Studies of Human Sociality* (Due and Mortensen, 2019)).

Our project was carried out under the strictest ethical considerations, and the employees as well as the clients who took part in the optometric consultations signed confidentially agreements and consent forms respectively. No real names are used and the transcriptions are anonymized.

4. Analyses 1 & 2: Placing and Docking Frames

Frames are placed on clients' heads in different situations related to encounters in opticians. In this section we will explore two such situations. First, we examine the placing of a new set of glasses on a client's head by an optician. The client has selected the frames at a previous visit to this store. She has returned to the store to pick the glasses up, i.e. the frames with her lenses fitted. And second, we inspect the interaction between an optometrist and a client in the examination room where the professional places a trial frame fitted with a set of lenses on the client's head. In both cases the placing of the frames on the client's head is a service critical activity as it will directly influence the client's experience in the store and may also impact their purchase decision. For the purpose of this activity the optician takes the frames in both hands and guides the temples to slide behind the client's ears and the top of the frame to dock on the client's nose.

Analysis 1: placing in the shop area

In our first fragment we can see how the process of placing a frame on the head of a client evolves. The optician has asked the client to sit at a table opposite her where the two participants then try the new glasses on. It is important that the frame fits comfortably on the client's ears and nose, and that the client can see clearly through the new lenses.

Fragment 1a (fig 1 – fig 3): Smooth placing of glasses in sales area

[insert picture]

The placing of the glasses on the head requires a careful visual available embodied procedure to ensure the client is comfortable with the optician entering the intimate space near her eyes and face. The actions through which the procedure is accomplished involve a visually displayed careful handling of the frames in front of the client's face until the optician moves it up to slide the temples behind the client's ears. The fragment begins when the optician holds the glasses in front of the client's face with a thumbs-grip and the temples pointing towards the client allowing her to see and project the subsequent movement of the object. Both participants visually orient to the glasses held by the optician in the space between them (fig 1). As the optician begins to lift the glasses she stretches out both her arms and tilts her upper body forward until the object is in such a distance from the client's head that when tilted the temples reach the sides of the client's head. This tilting of the temples is visibly available to the client and encourages her to slowly lean her head forward (fig 2), displaying a readiness to receive the glasses and engendering the optician to continue the movement of the glasses. The optician now sits upright with her arms in a position high up ready to move the glasses forward to the head (fig 3).

Throughout the movement of the glasses the optician carefully avoids touching the client's head and does not speak, visually displaying concentration and focus on the delicate task in hand. At the same time, the client cooperates with the optician by leaning forward, slightly tilting her head, then holding still before moving her head slightly backwards, thereby bodily assisting the docking behind her ears (fig 4). As the optician positions the glasses on the client's nose the client does not move her hands but keeps them firmly positioned on the table and in her lap, thereby visually displaying attentiveness to the optician's ongoing actions near her face and head. Simultaneously with the docking of the temples, the optician initiates relevant talk through which she reassures the client that they make adjustments "so that it fits" and does "not fall into your [the client's] eyes" (fig 4-6). Summing up, the example shows the body work near and on the client as a visual available order of intertwined bodies and objects carefully managed while monitoring action.

Fragment 1b (fig 4 – fig 6): Docking of glasses in sales area

[insert picture]

Analysis 2: placing trial frames

In a similar way, optometrists and clients cooperate with each other to place trial frames on the clients' heads. This cooperation requires the optometrist to treat the client's head as an object onto which the frame can be placed. Interestingly, although the object is quite different in structure and design to normal glasses, the visual order seems to be intact.

Fragment 2a: Placing of a pair of trial frames

[insert picture]

In this example, the placing begins when the optician swivels his chair around from the desk on the left towards the client. While the optometrist further adjusts his chair and orientation, the client monitors his actions. As he begins to move his hands toward the client whilst holding the trial frames, the client first lifts her right shoulder and changes her visual orientation by turning her eyes from looking at the optometrist to looking at the chart in front of her (fig. 1). The optometrist's further movement of the frame toward the client (fig. 2) occasions her to lower her head, encouraging him to quickly and without hesitation slide the frame with the temples ahead over her ears (fig. 3-5). The smooth movement is prefigured by the client's visual monitoring of the optometrist's handling of the frames.

As the optometrist begins to move the frames toward the client and begins to say, "so if I" (l. fig 1-2), the client is encouraged to bring her body noticeably into position in preparation of the arrival of the frame. She first lifts her right shoulder and then moves her body back and forth, bringing it in a position facing forward while her head is oriented toward the optometrist with her gaze turned away from him. By swiveling her eyes from facing him to looking ahead she observably turns visually away from the optometrist while being able to monitor the approaching frame. Through the movement of her head and eyes, the client displays that she changes orientation and engagement in the activity. While in the beginning she visually orients to the optometrist's material and vocal actions, i.e. the movement of the frame near her face and the continuing utterance, "pop these" (2. fig 3), she then observably changes her visual orientation and disengages from the activity. A moment later her head is held in position with the eyes looking into the middle

distance allowing the optometrist to treat the head as an object to place the frame on by sliding the temples behind the client's ears and bringing his utterance to a close, "on:" (3. fig 4). A moment later, the optometrist docks the frame on the client's nose and then turns to the adjustment of the frames on the client's head (fig. 5-8).

Fragment 2b: Docking of the trial frames

[insert picture]

While the optician shifts the frames in position on the client's nose and ears she sits still and does not observably respond to the optometrist's actions. He first brings the docking of the frames to a close (fig 5) before tightening the screws - through which the frames are fixed on the client's nose - on either side (fig 6). As the optometrist brings the docking of the frame to a close he begins an utterance, "shall there (.) is there" (4. & 5. Fig 6-7), engendering a response from the client. She lifts her head up slightly, visually engages with the chart in front of her, "yeah" (6. Fig 7), and responds to the optometrist's question, "a difference" (7. Fig 8), by saying "yeah" (8. Fig 8). As the optometrist brings the docking to a close the client displays a change of participation status in the situation. While during much of the exchange the client's head was held in a position and orientation that displayed disengagement from the interaction, at the closing of the placing the client changes her head and visual orientation and produces utterances suggesting her renewed engagement in the action.

Again, although performed with a different object than the former example, the body work of both the optometrist and the client is visual available material for them both to operate on in the achievement of the placing. The analysis suggests that the client

progressively reengages with the situation. This reengagement is principally produced by changes in the client's use of parts of her head in the activity that is visually displayed to the optometrist. As the optometrist marks the beginning of a new activity by virtue of the beginning of a new utterance and the touching of a screw on the left side of the frames (4. Fig 6) the client slightly raises her head and shoulders and voices an agreement with the optometrist, "yeah", displaying a shift in orientation to the situation (5. fig 7). She then also vocally attends to the situation by agreeing with the optometrist a second time, "yeah" (8. Fig 8) in response to the completion of him asking if she notices a difference, referring to her clarity of vision as he has inserted a new set of lenses into the frame. By virtue of her change in posture and visual orientation, as well as her vocal responses, the client displays to the optometrist her participation status in the situation.

Summary of analyses 1 and 2

The two fragments begin to explore the placing of glasses and frames. Interestingly we notice no big differences between the rather different kinds of settings (shop vs. examination room) and objects (glasses vs. trial frames), but rather an orderly activity accomplished through the detailed organization of the participants' bodies in relation to each other, hand movements and object handling that constitute the body work as a visual available order. Thus, a key finding is that placings are carefully organized and smoothly accomplished in cooperation between the professional and client through visual monitoring. This cooperation involves actions produced by the professional that allow the client to anticipate the trajectory of the movement of the frames or glasses. In response to the incoming frames or glasses clients display a partial disengagement from the situation, for example by changing their posture and visual orientation. Thus, their head is momentarily presented to be treated as an object; clients display a disengagement from

the action and the professional treats the head as an object onto which they can place the glasses or frames.

Analyses 3 & 4: Displaying readiness to assist

Participants are able to accomplish the placing of frames and glasses as smoothly as in the above fragments when the professionals design their actions in a way that allows the clients to anticipate the visual trajectory of the movement of the frames. In these cases, the client initially orients to the frames before displaying disengagement from the action and by allowing the professional to treat their head as an object to place the frames or glasses on. In some cases, however, it happens that clients respond to the approaching of glasses near their head with some kind of resistance or with assistance through gestures, displaying readiness to receive the glasses rather than having them placed upon them. There may be many reasons for these responses, but we found that typically when clients stretch out their hands to receive the glasses in a context where the optician seems to aim for a placing, it does not cause accounts or repairing action - as might have been expected. Rather, they adjust and co-ordinate their actions to accomplish the placing, which is achieved in and through the handling of the glasses as visible action.

Analysis 3: practices of displaying attempt to assist the placing

Fragment 3 shows the optician moving toward the client and then stretching out her arms (fig 1-3) to place the glasses on the client's head.

Fragment 3a: Raising Hands

[insert picture]

By moving the glasses upward toward the head of the client and by saying “so” (1. fig 2) the optician projects a change in activity. The client instantly attends to the optician’s action and produces a minimal response, “yehe” (1. fig 3), that acknowledges the change in activity. Moreover, by beginning to separate his hands that thus far rested on his lap and moving his arms upward the client displays that he is prepared to engage and participate in this activity. As the optician continues the upward movement of the glasses toward the head the client also continues the movement of his arms and says “thanks” (3. Fig 5) just when the glasses are on a level with his hands.

Fragment 3b: Raising Hands

[insert picture]

Through the movement of his arms and the acknowledging utterance the client displays attentiveness to the optician’s actions and readiness to receive the glasses. Rather than halting the movement of the glasses so that the client can complete the placing, the optician continues her action. This occasions the client to drop the arms of the glasses and hold them hovering in front of his upper body, ready to lift them again and grasp the glasses if necessary. As the optician continues the movement of the arms toward the head the client slightly drops his shoulders and tilts his head forward occasioning the optician to continue her arm movement (fig 6-8).

The analysis suggests how in the placing of glasses on clients’ heads there can be some ambivalence about which of the two participants will slide and dock the temples behind the client’s ears. In fragment 3 this ambivalence arises as the optician initiates the placing as a new activity by producing an utterance that the client treats as an encouragement to

participate in the action. Rather than presenting the head as an object from the beginning, as in the previous examples, the client presents himself as ready to take the glasses and complete the placing (fig 7). Only when the optician then does not attend to the lifting of his arms, the client disengages and through changes in posture and head position makes the head available as an object to the optician's actions (fig 7-8).

Summary of analysis 3

As in fragment 1 and 2 the placing of the glasses on the client's head is accomplished in cooperation between the two participants. The cooperation arises although the client's actions briefly suggest the possibility that the interaction may take a different trajectory (fig 3-6). Rather than attending to the client's offer to take over the frame and place the temples behind his ears himself, the optometrist continues with the movement of the frames occasioning the client to again lower his arms. The analysis proposes that the client anticipated a different trajectory for the placing of the frame from his visual analysis of the optician's actions. The professional's utterance prior to the arrival of the glasses near the client's face could be hearable as suggesting that maybe co-participation was warranted and the client was supposed to place the frame himself. The continuance of the optician's action however suggested that in fact disengagement from the client was required in order to accomplish the placing. We therefore can see that a display of disengagement from the action and display of the head as an object is necessary for the professional to visually interpret the client and place the frames on the client's head. This body work is observable as a visual available order.

Analysis 4: Full-blown assist of the placing

For the placing of glasses and frames on clients' heads it is important that on the onset of the professional's movement of the object, clients are able to visually anticipate its trajectory. In cases when the trajectory is doubted, clients display their readiness to help and invite the optician to hand them the glasses for the placing. In this section we examine two such cases from our corpus of data. Fragment 4 begins when the optometrist prepares the trial frame for placing on the client's head.

Fragment 4: Grasping Temples

[insert picture]

While unfolding the frames' temples the optometrist begins to talk about ways in which the client could compensate for a vision problem: "and you will be able to compensate it" (l. 1). At the same time, the client flicks her hair over her left shoulder and then holds her hands chest high readying herself to grasp the temples on arrival (fig 1). The optometrist continues to produce his utterance and moves the frame upward toward the client's head while she lowers her gaze and closely monitors the movement of the glasses (fig 2). Just when the optometrist brings his utterance to a close, the temples arrive near the client's face. She immediately grasps them and attends to the utterance by producing an acknowledgement, "okay" (l. 2).

Summary of analysis 4

From the beginning of the activity there is some ambivalence in how the placing will be produced. Contrary the fragment we discussed before, the optometrist's actions do not encourage the client to act as the professional displays difficulties in placing the frames on her head. Instead, it is the client whose actions suggest that she will intervene in the placing when the temples arrive near her face. As the interaction continues the optometrist

docks the glasses while the client holds the temples with both hands supporting the professional in completing the activity. This mode of assistance is a rare instance in our data corpus. If clients intervene and assist in the activity the optician may have difficulty with the placing. Fragment 5 shows such a case, which will be revealed in this final analysis.

Analysis 5: disturbing the placing

Very seldom, the placing goes wrong. We only found this once in our corpus. We suggest that the analysis of this deviant case also provides novel insights about body work as a visual available order. The fragment begins when the optician and client are standing, facing each other with the professional having one pair of glasses with the temples stretched out in her left hand whilst simultaneously holding the clients' own glasses in both hands with thumbs-grip and the temples pointing upwards while preparing to place them on the client's head (fig 1).

Fragment 5a: Disturbing the placing

[insert picture]

The optician begins to move one (out of two) pair of glasses toward the face of the client, who monitors the movement. As the glasses arrive near her face, the client starts to repeatedly blink but keeps her gaze focused on the incoming frame (fig 2). Just when the client opens her eyes after a blink, she might visibly notice that the optician changes her grip on the frame by moving her right forefinger over the glasses' temple, causing the temples to bob down and then up (fig 3). A split second later, the client raises her arms, occasioning the optician to hold and then pull the glasses a little away from her face (fig 4). A moment later both participants orient to the current status of the glasses and develop

an alternative trajectory for their placing on the client's head. First, the client produces a minute utterance, "uhm" (1, fig 6), followed by a proposal of what she will do next, "I put them on myself" (2, fig 7), while visually orienting to the glasses' temples with both hands. The optician in turn accepts the client's proposal by ensuring that the client, whose hands are still moving toward the temples, secures them in her hands, "you get them" (3, fig 7).

Fragment 5b: Intervening in the placing

[insert picture]

Both utterances are produced with low volume but are hearable as responses to the client's intervention in the placing. The client takes the glasses (image 7) and the optician releases her grip (image 8) before the client puts the glasses on herself, blinking her eyes as she moves the glasses towards her face (images 9-10). A moment later the two participants stand opposite each other while the optician inspects the fit of the client's glasses on her head.

Fragment 5c: Self-placing the glasses

[insert picture]

Summary of analysis 5

The analysis begins to reveal how a self-placing may arise from tiny disturbances in the available, observable, visual aspects of the optician's movements of the glasses toward the client's head. The disturbance occurs when the optician holding two sets of glasses in

her hands changes her grip on one of the pairs while she moves it towards the client's head. The client – observably displaying visual attentiveness to the actions - treats the change in grip coupled with the bobbing movement of the glasses as difficulties in the optician's handling of the object and intervenes in the procedure. The change in grip and bobbing movement make it difficult for the client to anticipate the trajectory of the glasses onto her head; it may be that she even is afraid the optician might drop her glasses or move the temples too close to her eyes. Her taking over the performance of the activity still accomplishes the placing of the glasses, but it subsequently requires the optician to touch the temples and check the fit of the frames on the client's head.

In both cases discussed in this section clients assist the optician in accomplishing the placing of glasses on their heads based on *their* visual analysis of the optician's embodied actions. Whilst in most cases in our corpus clients present their head as an object to the optician's actions, in these two fragments they remain involved in the activity and display a readiness to assist in accomplishing it. When the placing begins the clients do not hold their hands in their lap but early on display, by virtue of the position of their hands and the shape in which the hands are formed, that they are ready to grasp the temples and assist in the activity.

8. Discussion

At optician practices the placing of glasses on clients' heads is a mundane activity conducted multiple times each day. As we have seen throughout the analysis the placing is a cooperative achievement that involves clients disengaging from the activity allowing the professional to treat their heads as objects where the glasses are to be placed. For clients to disengage from the procedure they are not given anaesthetic drugs like the

patients in Hindmarsh's and Pilnick's (2007) study of anaesthetic practice but they are provided with visual resources that allow them to anticipate the trajectory of the glasses onto their heads and then conduct themselves in a way that renders them "peripheral" to the ongoing procedure (cf. Hindmarsh, 2010).

These visual resources include a) keeping a steady and projectable pace of the approaching glasses at head level, b) visibly displaying to the client how the glasses are handled through a firm grip, c) exhibiting orientation to the temples as possible issues of concern by expanding them and/or making the temples point upwards away from the eyes d) accomplishing the docking by letting the temples slide in and drop on the ears and e) in all cases there is a structured and fixed spatial arrangement where the client is sitting in a chair with body posture and face towards the optician.

From the analysis we have seen that as long as clients can project the trajectory of the glasses they noticeably disengage from the procedure by lowering their heads, shifting their gaze away from the professional, and by keeping their hands down in their lap or at himself the sides of their body. Minute events, however, such as a seemingly inconspicuous utterance or a slight unsteadiness in the grip of the glasses can occasion the client to raise their hands and propose to take over the placing. Only rarely, one case in our corpus, the professional passes the glasses to the client and allows them to self-place them on their head. This happened when the optician displayed difficulties in holding the glasses and moving them toward the client's head by having the frame bouncing a few times, rather than moving steady toward the head. But still this deviant case proves our main finding in this paper, that the body work is observable as a visual available order, not only for the analyst but also as an emerging, situated members

accomplishment. Both clients and opticians closely monitor and visually display to each other actions, and when these are projectable potentially troublesome (as in the deviant case), there is a change in the framework.

What counts as routinely procedure work, seen from the client's perspective, is contingent on the situation. The practical organisation of the placing of glasses on clients' heads is not written in documents, not instructed in training materials, and not discussed among opticians or communicated to clients. It is a practice that is emerging in situ through professional's "observable-and-reportable", i.e. "accountable" actions (Garfinkel, 1967). It relies on an observability of the professional's skills and competence to accomplish the procedure in a smooth and steady way without moving the temples too close to the client's face. By displaying such skills and competence opticians and optometrists allow clients to disengage and to present their head as object to the professional's actions. The disengagement is an accomplishment by the clients in response to the production and design of the professional's actions. Thus, it differs from forms of disengagement that have been initiated by medical staff through anaesthesia or other techniques (Hindmarsh and Pilnick, 2007; Koschmann et al., 2011). Because throughout the placing, clients remain aware and sensitive to events around them, opticians and optometrist cannot afford even minute lapses in the procedure as this may lead to a reengaging of the client in the activity.

There is – in the successful placings - a fascinating 'gentleness' to the body work procedure and interesting constraints on the ways such an intimate action is conducted to avoid disconcerting the client or creating minor injury or discomfort. Moreover, the nature of the object and its awkwardness (pointing temples) places particular constraints

on how the action can be and is performed and performed properly – i.e. to enable the appropriate assessment (or next action or trajectory of actions) to be performed. And even though the action is primarily performed by the optician, it requires subtle forms of cooperation from the client. The client has to both present him/herself as an ‘object’ to which equipment is attached whilst simultaneously cooperating with the optician - both in the way the head is positioned and presented and then slightly adjusted to enable the smooth application of the glasses. This reveals some of the complex forms of co-participation and orientation to details and the professional healthcare providers ability to demonstrate skill and competence, that are required by even the simplest of procedures for their accomplishment.

The observations we have made in this article in regard to an activity specific to opticians has relevance beyond this particular setting. We already have hinted at comparisons with medical settings where patients are put to sleep to avoid an engagement in the procedures undertaken on their bodies. There are however a range of service settings where comparative procedures that also require disengagement from the professionals’ activities. In beauty salons, at hairdressers, in tattoo parlors, and at dentists, to name but a few, the organization of the procedure also requires the professional to act on the client’s body while it temporarily displays disengagement from the action allowing the professional to pursue their work. Further research is required in these interactive service settings to reveal how transitions between engagement and disengagement from the action as well as peripheral engagement in the procedure are managed by professionals and clients. In all settings where there is body work going on, we expect there to also be a recognizable, observable visual available order.

Acknowledgments

To be added after review

Declaration of interest statement

To be added after review

References

- Abiala K (1999) Customer Orientation and Sales Situations: Variations in Interactive Service Work. *Acta Sociologica* 42(3): 207–222. DOI: 10.1177/000169939904200302.
- Aufenanger H (1965) The Gerua Cult in the Highlands of New Guinea. *Anthropos* 60(1/6): 248–261.
- Bolton R and Saxena-Iyer S (2009) Interactive Services: A Framework, Synthesis and Research Directions. *Journal of Interactive Marketing* 23(1): 91–104. DOI: 10.1016/j.intmar.2008.11.002.
- Bolton RN and Shankar V (2003) An empirically derived taxonomy of retailer pricing and promotion strategies. *Journal of Retailing* 79(4): 213–224. DOI: 10.1016/j.jretai.2003.09.005.
- Carlin A (2003) Pro forma arrangements: the visual availability of textual artefacts. *Visual Studies* 18(1): 6–20. DOI: 10.1080/1472586032000100038.
- Day D and Wagner J (eds) (2019) *Objects, Bodies and Work Practice*. Blue Ridge Summit, PA: Multilingual Matters.
- Due B (forth.) Respecifying the information sheet: An interactional resource for decision-making in optician shops. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice*.
- Due B and Mortensen K (2019) Special Issue: Representing data in video-based studies. *Social Interaction. Video-Based Studies of Human Sociality* 2(1). DOI: 10.7146/si.v2i1.114682.
- Due B and Lange S (2018) Semiotic resources for navigation: A video ethnographic study of blind people's uses of the white cane and a guide dog for navigating in urban areas. *Semiotica* 2018(222): 287–312. DOI: 10.1515/sem-2016-0196.
- Due B and Trærup J (2018) Passing Glasses: Accomplishing Deontic Stance at the Optician. *Social Interaction. Video-Based Studies of Human Sociality* 1(2).
- Garfinkel H (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Garfinkel H (2002) *Ethnomethodology's Program : Working out Durkheim's Aphorism*. Lanham Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Garfinkel H and Livingston E (2003) Phenomenal field properties of order in formatted queues and their neglected standing in the current situation of inquiry. *Visual Studies* 18(1): 21–28. DOI: 10.1080/147258603200010029.
- Gibson W, Webb H and Lehn D vom (2011) Re-constituting social praxis: an ethnomethodological analysis of video data in optometry consultations. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 14(3): 207–218. DOI: 10.1080/13645579.2011.563618.
- Goodwin C (2013) The co-operative, transformative organization of human action and knowledge. *Journal of Pragmatics* 46(1). Conversation Analytic Studies of Multimodal Interaction: 8–23. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2012.09.003.

- Haddington P, Keisanen T, Mondada L, et al. (2014) *Multiactivity in Social Interaction: Beyond Multitasking*. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hanser A (2008) *Service Encounters: Class, Gender, and the Market for Social Distinction in Urban China*. Stanford University Press.
- Have PT (2003) Teaching students observational methods: visual studies and visual analysis. *Visual Studies* 18(1): 29–35. DOI: 10.1080/1472586032000100047.
- Heath C (2006) Body work: the collaborative production of the clinical object. In: *Communication in Medical Care*. Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics. Cambridge University Press. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511607172.009>.
- Heath C, Hindmarsh J and Luff P (2010) *Video in Qualitative Research*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Hester S and Francis D (2003) Analysing visually available mundane order: a walk to the supermarket. *Visual Studies* 18(1): 36–46. DOI: 10.1080/14725860320001000056.
- Hindmarsh J (2010) Peripherality, participation and communities of practice: examining the patient in dental training. In: Llewellyn N and Hindmarsh J (eds) *Organisation, Interaction and Practice*. Cambridge: CUP, pp. 218–240.
- Hindmarsh J and Llewellyn N (2016) Video in sociomaterial investigations : reflections on the ‘problem of relevance. *Organizational Research Methods*. Available at: <http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/79238/> (accessed 10 July 2016).
- Hindmarsh J and Pilnick A (2007) Knowing Bodies at Work: Embodiment and Ephemeral Teamwork in Anaesthesia. *Organization Studies* 28(9): 1395–1416. DOI: 10.1177/0170840607068258.
- Hindmarsh J, Reynolds P and Dunne S (2009) Exhibiting understanding: The body in apprenticeship. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(2): 489–503. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2009.09.008.
- Hochschild AR (2003) *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling, Twentieth Anniversary Edition*. University of California Press. Available at: <http://www.amazon.co.uk/Managed-Heart-Commercialization-Twentieth-Anniversary/dp/0520239334> (accessed 27 September 2011).
- Hockey J and Collinson JA (2006) Seeing the way: visual sociology and the distance runner’s perspective. *Visual Studies* 21(1): 70–81. DOI: 10.1080/14725860600613253.
- Hutchins E and Palen L (1997) Constructing Meaning from Space, Gesture, and Speech. In: Resnick LB, Säljö R, Pontecorvo C, et al. (eds) *Discourse, Tools and Reasoning*. NATO ASI Series 160. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 23–40. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-662-03362-3_2.
- Irwin K (2001) Legitimizing the First Tattoo: Moral Passage through Informal Interaction. *Symbolic Interaction* 24(1): 49–73.
- Jefferson G (1984) Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In: Lerner GH (ed.) *Conversation Analysis Studies from the First Generation*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 13–31.
- Kang M (2010) *The Managed Hand: Race, Gender, and the Body in Beauty Service Work*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kawatoko Y and Ueno N (2003) Talking about skill: making objects, technologies and communities visible. *Visual Studies* 18(1): 47–57. DOI: 10.1080/1472586032000100065.
- Korczynski M (2001) *Human Resource Management in Service Work*. 2001 edition.

- Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave.
- Koschmann T, LeBaron C, Goodwin C, et al. (2011) 'Can You See the Cystic Artery yet?' a Simple Matter of Trust. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43(2): 521–541.
- Lebaron C (2002) Closing up closings: Showing the relevance of the social and material surround to the completion of an interaction. *Journal of Communication* 52(3): 542–565.
- Leidner R (1993) *Fast Food, Fast Talk: Service Work and the Routinization of Everyday Life*. University of California Press. Available at: <http://www.amazon.co.uk/Fast-Food-Talk-Routinization-Everyday/dp/0520085000> (accessed 27 September 2011).
- Llewellyn N and Hindmarsh J (2013) The order problem: Inference and interaction in interactive service work. *Human Relations* 66(11): 1401–1426. DOI: 10.1177/0018726713479622.
- Lloyd M (2013) 'Sudoku with buttocks': coupling images and captions in The Adventures of Naked Man. *Visual Studies* 28(1): 52–66. DOI: 10.1080/1472586X.2013.765212.
- Lloyd M (2016) 'It's on video, every second of it': a micro-sociological analysis of cycle rage. *Visual Studies* 31(3): 206–220. DOI: 10.1080/1472586X.2016.1209986.
- Luff P, Hindmarsh J and Heath C (2000) *Workplace Studies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mondada L (2003) Working with video: how surgeons produce video records of their actions. *Visual Studies* 18(1): 58–73. DOI: 10.1080/1472586032000100083.
- Nettleton S (1992) *Power, Pain and Dentistry*. Open University Press. Available at: <http://www.amazon.co.uk/Power-Pain-Dentistry-Sarah-Nettleton/dp/0335097227>.
- Nevile M (2015) The Embodied Turn in Research on Language and Social Interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 48(2): 121–151. DOI: 10.1080/08351813.2015.1025499.
- Nevile M, Haddington P, Heinemann T, et al. (eds) (2014a) *Interacting with Objects: Language, Materiality, and Social Activity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. Available at: <https://benjamins.com/#catalog/books/z.186/main> (accessed 7 February 2015).
- Nevile M, Haddington P, Heinemann T, et al. (2014b) On the interactional ecology of objects. In: Nevile M, Haddington P, Heinemann T, et al. (eds) *Interacting with Objects: Language, Materiality, and Social Activity*. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Nielsen MF (2012) Using Artifacts in Brainstorming Sessions to Secure Participation and Decouple Sequentiality. *Discourse Studies* 14(1): 87–109.
- Nishizaka A (2007) Hand Touching Hand: Referential Practice at a Japanese Midwife House. *Human Studies* 30(3): 199–217.
- Oshima S and Streeck J (2015) Coordinating talk and practical action: The case of hair salon service assessments. *Pragmatics and Society* 6(4): 538–564. DOI: 10.1075/ps.6.4.04osh.
- Psathas G (1991) Teaching visual sociology in Japan. *Visual Sociology* 6(1): 33–37. DOI: 10.1080/14725869108583681.
- Quartey-Papafio AB (1914) Apprenticeship amongst the Gã. *Journal of the Royal African Society* 13(52): 415–422.
- Ritzer G and Jurgenson N (2010) Production, Consumption, Prosumption: The nature of capitalism in the age of the digital 'prosumer'. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 10(1): 13–36. DOI: 10.1177/1469540509354673.

- Sacks H (1992) *Lectures on Conversation*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sanders CR (1985) Tattoo Consumption: Risk and Regret in the Purchase of a Socially Marginal Service. *ACR North American Advances* NA-12. Available at: <http://acrwebsite.org/volumes/6350/volumes/v12/NA-12> (accessed 9 December 2019).
- Sanders CR (1989) *Customizing the Body: The Art and Culture of Tattooing*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Schegloff EA (1972) Notes on a conversational practice: formulating place. In: Sudnow D (ed.) *Studies in Social Interaction*. New York: Free Press, pp. 75–119. Available at: <http://libra.msra.cn/Publication/1391594/notes-on-a-conversational-practice-formulating-place> (accessed 2 June 2016).
- Sharrock W and Coulter J (2003) Dissolving the “projection problem”. *Visual Studies* 18(1): 74–82. DOI: 10.1080/14725860320001000074.
- Shortt H (2015) Liminality, space and the importance of ‘transitory dwelling places’ at work. *Human Relations* 68(4): 633–658. DOI: 10.1177/0018726714536938.
- Shortt H and Warren S (2012) Fringe benefits: valuing the visual in narratives of hairdressers’ identities at work. *Visual Studies* 27(1): 18–34. DOI: 10.1080/1472586X.2012.642955.
- Smith RJ (2019) Visually available order, categorisation practices, and perception-in-action: a running commentary. *Visual Studies* 34(1): 28–40. DOI: 10.1080/1472586X.2019.1622445.
- Streeck J (1996) How to Do Things with Things. *Human Studies* 19(4): 365–384.
- Stross B (2011) Food, Foam and Fermentation in Mesoamerica. *Food, Culture & Society* 14(4): 477–501. DOI: 10.2752/175174411X13046092851352.
- Suchman L (2007) *Human-Machine Reconfigurations: Plans and Situated Actions*. Cambridge University Press.
- Szymanski M and Whalen J (2011) *Making Work Visible: Ethnographically Grounded Case Studies of Work Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Available at: <http://www.amazon.com/Making-Work-Visible-Ethnographically-Computational/dp/0521176654> (accessed 30 April 2011).
- Vom Lehn D, Webb H, Heath C, et al. (2013) Assessing Distance Vision as Interactional Achievement: A Study of Commensuration in Action. *Soziale Welt* 64(1–2): 115–136.
- Walsh J and Deery S (2006) Refashioning Organizational Boundaries: Outsourcing Customer Service Work*. *Journal of Management Studies* 43(3): 557–582. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2006.00601.x.
- Webb H, Heath C, vom Lehn D, et al. (2013) Engendering Response: Professional Gesture and the Assessment of Eyesight in Optometry Consultations. *Symbolic Interaction* 36(2): 137–158. DOI: 10.1002/symb.55.
- Webb H, Lehn D vom, Heath C, et al. (2013) The Problem With “Problems”: The Case of Openings in Optometry Consultations. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 46(1): 65–83. DOI: 10.1080/08351813.2012.753724.
- Yamauchi Y and Hiramoto T (2016) Reflexivity of Routines: An Ethnomethodological Investigation of Initial Service Encounters at Sushi Bars in Tokyo. *Organization Studies* 37(10): 1473–1499. DOI: 10.1177/0170840616634125.
- Zwick D, Bonsu S and Darmody A (2008) Putting Consumers to Work: Co-creation and new marketing govern-mentality. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 8(2): 163–196.

