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1. Introduction
Within the field of Applied Linguistics the vast majority of studies have been concerned with issues related to language learning that goes on in the classroom, whereas less attention has been paid to language use in actual situations outside the classroom. This is perhaps understandable since the classroom is bwhere teachers spend most of their time and an environment where learning is assumed to take place. On the other hand, even though a lot more second language use occurs outside the classroom, there seems to be far less concern with how our students fare “in the wild” (Hutchins, 1995). At least part of the reason for this must be that it is simply easier for teachers to collect data in their classrooms.

This paper will therefore examine some of the ways speakers communicate in real situations outside the classroom, specifically in a hairdressing salon setting in which non-native speakers of Japanese must make themselves understood to an L1 speaker of Japanese who is cutting their hair. The hairdressing salon is one service encounter in which extended periods of mundane talk are interspersed within the service talk (Oshima, 2007, 2009; Toerien & Kitzinger, 2007), and building rapport through conversation is one means that stylists use to establish repeat business from their clients (Garzaniti, Pearce, & Stanton, 2011). While teachers may ready their students for this kind of situation to a certain extent via role-play activities and the like, careful grounded observation of the interaction that goes on in actual hairdressing encounters reveals a much more finely nuanced range of multimodal challenges for the learners, including codeswitching, physical proximity, obscured and inverted gaze patterns and restricted access to the normal range of available gestures. While paying close attention to some of these multimodal constraints and affordances, this paper will examine ways that L2 users of Japanese circumvent the limitations of their environment, such as the mirror, the cape and the sink, in order to maintain communication within the hairdressing setting.
2. Second language talk “in the wild”: Classroom talk vs. real world talk

Before we examine the hairdressing talk in detail, it is worth taking a moment to reflect on some of the differences between classroom talk and “real world” talk. First of all, a classroom usually has an expert (or native) speaker who knows how to adapt his or her language to suit the needs of the learner. Unlike many L1 speakers outside the classroom, teachers usually speak slowly and clearly to language learners, using simple words and explanatory gestures that help maintain intersubjectivity (Lazaraton, 2004; Teleghani-Nikazm, 2008). In addition, the physical environment of the classroom is often more conducive to learning; it is quieter and has textbooks, whiteboards and computers that provide visual backup to support the spoken language that goes on. On the other hand, talk outside the classroom usually has real world implications, which can motivate the learner to take a more active role in attempting to communicate. If you know someone is about to cut your hair, for instance, you might strive harder to make yourself understood than you would in a classroom roleplay of the same setting.

So how do learners do in the real world? The current study makes use of Conversation Analysis (CA) to investigate a corpus of naturally occurring L2 interaction outside the classroom.

3. Participants and setting

As mentioned above, the talk analyzed in this paper took place in a hairdressing salon and consisted of a mix of both Japanese and English. The hairdressers were Yoh and Yumi, both L1 Japanese speakers who had only very basic English proficiency. Conversational data were collected from four customers on four separate occasions over a period of five months. The two customers that appear in the current analysis are (1) Emil, a graduate student from Bolivia (L1=Spanish) who spoke English proficiently as a second language but whose Japanese was only rudimentary and (2) Tye, an American undergraduate (L1=English) who spoke Japanese at an intermediate level.

There are obviously a number of features of a hairdressing salon that are unlikely to be found in a language classroom, including the mirror, the sink and the cape that the hairdresser puts around clients to protect their clothes. These physical objects can have an impact on the way the people communicate within this particular environment. The remainder of this paper will examine several extended extracts from the video-recorded data in order to consider some of the ways that these physical objects can constrain the interaction for these L2 users.

In short, this will necessitate a multimodal analysis of embodied interaction, rather than just an analysis of the talk alone (Streeck, Goodwin & LeBaron, 2011). If the participants were communicating over the phone, they would not be able to see each other and so the talk alone would become the most important aspect of their communication. However, since they are co-present they are also orienting to a number of other mutually available interactional resources, including their gestures, gaze direction, the physical objects in their surroundings, their bodily alignment and relative distance from each other. At other times the language they choose to use
can be consequential for the interaction, as can intonation and other prosodic features of the talk. Charles Goodwin (2013) has characterized this kind of multimodality as lamination; various layers of communication that map seamlessly on to each other. He stresses that these layers are simultaneously separate and connected, not so much like the lamination on a poster but like that on a surfboard, where it becomes difficult to separate one layer from another, and they all work to produce a coherent whole. Gestures, gaze and the interactants’ incorporation of physical objects can all play a role in the way an instance of interaction happens.

4. Analysis

4.1. Prior to the cut

Before we examine some of these constraints and affordances within the physical environment, it is worth considering how conversation goes prior to the haircut, before things like the cape or the sink have come into play. In the following extract, Emil has just come into the salon for his first haircut. Yoh has asked him to complete a client profile card, but Emil realizes he cannot write his address from memory but has it in his bag, which Yumi has placed in a back room.

Extract 1. Ato de: Emil is filling out a simple profile form.

03 Emil: I don’t-

04 Yoh: Arigatoh gozai[ma:::s

Thank you very much

05 Emil: [u::mm (.)

06 Emil: jusho?

Address

07 Yoh: Hai, [daijobu des.]

Yes Okay COP

---

2 Extracts have been transcribed according to Jeffersonian transcription conventions as outlined in Jefferson (2004) with the following additions: (1) Supra-scripted numerals indicate the approximate point in the talk where the framegrab was taken, (2) Second tier dashes indicate constant gaze direction toward the person/place in parentheses and the tilde (~) indicates shifting gaze direction.
08 Emil: [I don’t-](.)

09 remember [but,]=

10 Yoh: [Hai.]

11 Yumi: [Hai.]

Yes

12 Emil: =I have it (.) ah(2) in my, (3) bag.

13 Yumi: ((nodding)) Oh

14 Yoh: Ah- oh wakarimashta.

Understand-PST

15 Emil: ((gaze at Yumi)) Okay?

16 Yoh: Daijobu des yo

Okay COP IP

17 Yumi: [Okay. Heh heh ha

18 [((Hand gesture: Okay))

19 Yumi: Ato de.((RH points right))

later

20 Emil: Ato de? Ah, ato de.

later oh later

21 Yumi: ((nods))[Un. Heh-[heh hun.
22 Yoh: [ ( ) ] [Ha:i.

   yes

Framegrab 6

It might seem obvious, but note that Emil turns and looks directly at Yoh and Yumi when he talks to them. He does not particularly orient toward the mirror at this point. In lines 8 to 12, Emil gives an account for why he has not written his address on the card. He accompanies the initial part of his turn “I don’t remember” with a gesture that points to his temple. His gaze shifts directly to Yoh on the word remember at the same moment that he points to his head. Note that this is the final part of this TCU, and then speaker transition happens as Yoh acknowledges it with hai (yes). Emil further specifies the location of the address, again ending his turn with a gesture and direct gaze. He does not use the mirror, but instead turns his back in order to look up at Yoh.

However, since Yoh seems preoccupied with reading the card, he does not immediately reciprocate this gaze, and Emil looks instead at Yumi, who is also within his general line of sight. She follows up Yoh’s minimal turns with a clarification, ato de (later) in line 19. As can be seen from the framegrab in line 19, she is pointing to the room where Emil’s bag is and her downward intonation indicates this is a telling. Emil then repeats her words in next turn, but with upwards intonation and a raised palm, initiating a confirmation sequence. He then immediately makes public his receipt of the information by repeating it with downward intonation.³ His writing gesture provides additional information at this point making the message not just “later” but “I will write it later”.

This brief segment demonstrates how natural face-to-face communication between these people is accomplished without the constraints of the haircut: they do not need the mirror to communicate and their hands are free to make gestures that fine tune what they are saying.

4.2. Constraints on gaze direction: The mirror

Contrast that with the way the participants communicate once the haircut begins. This section will consider how the mirror can aid communication within this setting, and therefore act as an affordance for establishing gaze in a situation where one person is situated physically behind the other.

Extract 2 happens a moment or two after the one analyzed above. The cut is about to start and Yoh is asking Emil about how he wants his hair done.

³ See Greer, Bussinguer, Butterfield & Mischinger (2009) for detailed discussion of the interactional practice of receipt through repetition among second language learning.
Extract 2: Just a little

01 Yoh: [Dono gurai katto shimas ka.
How much cut do-pres-pol Q
How much do you want off?

02 Yumi: [((takes mirror from tray))

03 Emil: U::hm. (0.9) um ((rubs nose))

04 Not, so short.\textsuperscript{FG1}

05 Yoh: ((nods)) °un° ((nods))

06 Emil When it's short,=\textsuperscript{FG2}

07 Yoh: [Hai.
Yes

08 Emil: =my hair is like this\textsuperscript{FG3} right?

09 Yoh: ((nods))

10 Emil: So:, just a liddle\textsuperscript{FG4} bit.

11 (0.5)

12 [Like-

13 Yoh: [Skoshi dake.
Just a little.

14 Emil: Yes.
This time Yoh is positioned directly behind Emil. Both Yoh and Yumi are paying careful attention to what Emil is saying, and Yoh punctuates the explanation with uptake tokens of “hai” (yes). The client’s iconic gestures provide the stylist with important details about the length he wants the hair to be cut and enable him to illustrate what he means, for example, by “not so short” in this context. Without any instruction, all three of the participants have begun orienting to this mirror-mediated form of communication as normative within this setting. Indeed, anyone who has been to a hairdresser will know that this is the case. Clients use the mirror to talk to the stylist behind them, as well as to check on the progress of the cut.

However, this is not the sort of gaze practice that Emil would have likely experienced in the language classroom. That is not to say that he has never had to talk to someone behind him in class: he probably has. However, since there is no mirror in the classroom and the person he wants to talk to is unlikely to be as proximally close as the hairdresser is, in those sort of situations he would simply turn his head and look directly at the classmate behind him, much like he did in Extract 1 before the haircut began. There might be other situations where Emil has to use a mirror to talk to someone behind him though, such as in the car; however, again this places similar limitations on the communication. Another important point to note is that both a driver and a hairdresser are engaged in other base activities while talking so their gaze cannot be totally focused on their interlocutor (Goodwin & Goodwin, 2012; Toerien & Kitzinger, 2007). From the hairdresser’s perspective, the talk is usually secondary to the job of cutting the hair.

4.3. Constraints on gesture: The cape
In this section we will examine another segment of talk in order to consider a further physical constraint on the interaction that goes on at a hairdresser—the cape. In Extract 3, Yumi is preparing a cape to go around Emil. This will protect his clothes, but it will also restrict his gestures, making it harder for him to communicate. At this point in the cut, Yoh also asks Emil where he is from. Rather than answer directly, in line 3 Emil turns it into a kind of a game by reformulating Yoh’s question as a counter-question—“where do you think I am from?”; and so the two hairdressers begin to guess.

Extract 3: Where are you from?

01 (3.1) ((Yoh looks to paper, receives cape from Yumi))

02 Yoh: Emil san\textsuperscript{FG1} wa, (0.5) doko no shus\textsuperscript{FG2} shin des ka\textsuperscript{FG3}.

\begin{verbatim}
   AT TOP      where POS origin COP QP
\end{verbatim}

03 Emil: Ah— eh *Doko kara\textsuperscript{FG4}, [to omoimasu ka
were from QT think-POL QP

04 (*Yoh places cape around Emil))

05 Yoh: [Hai.]

Yes

06 Emil: heh heh ha

07 Yoh: E:::h (1.2) eh where're you from. des ne.

COP IP

08 Emil: (uhum,)

09 (0.3)

10 Yoh: doko des ka

where COP QP

11 (0.5)

12 Emil: Um-

13 (0.8)/((Yoh adjusts cape))

14 Yoh: (o)kuni wa=

POL-Country TOP

15 Emil: =Do you: thi:nk-

16 (0.4)

17 [Where do you: [think.

18 Yumi: °doko da [(to omou° ne(h)n)

where COP QT think
There is insufficient space here to discuss the entire transcript in detail; however, with regard to multimodality the section worth noticing is around line 35, where Yumi guesses Argentina. Emil looks to her via the mirror, smiles, nods deeply and points to her under the cape as he says “close”. Here the head nod and smile seem to be a little bit exaggerated—longer, deeper, slower than normal. This could be related to the fact that cape is constricting much of the multimodal resources that Emil has available. Even though his hands cannot be seen, he uses them to point to Yumi as he says “close”. It is unclear whether or not the ripple under the cape is visible to her but the fact that Emil does it anyway underscores the notion that gestures are as much about speech production as they are about reception (Goodwin, 1986; McNeil, 1992). Of course, for second language learners in particular, binding one’s hands amounts to taking away a large amount of one’s ability to communicate, since learners often rely on gestures to augment and sustain their spoken interaction (Gullberg, 2011; Olsher, 2004). Again, this is something that Emil is unlikely to encounter in his language classroom, yet it is paradoxically an element of the world outside the classroom.

### 4.4. Constraints on gaze: The sink

Finally, there is one further constraint on the multimodal practice of gaze establishment that is somewhat unique to this setting. It happens this time at the shampoo basin, at a point where the
This time the client is an American, Tye. He has just explained how he writes his name in kanji and is discussing the notion that there are certain stroke counts for kanji that are considered unlucky when choosing a name. He is trying to convey the concept of an “unlucky number” but owing to his somewhat limited vocabulary at this point he is using the word suu (stroke) instead of suuji (number).

*Extract 4: Lucky seven. Tye has been explaining to Yoh how he writes his name in kanji.*

01 Tye: (hai) (0.6) sore (mo) wa rakii:::↑ (0.4) [suu] no [strokku  
yes that PT TOP lucky number CON stroke]

02 Yoh: [un.]

RT

03

[((writing gesture))]

04 (0.8)/ ((Tye looks up to Yoh. Yoh looks up from basin.))

05 Yoh: ((nods)) oh. ((Stops shampooing and looks at Tye))

06 Tye: juu:::↑ (0.6) [lucky suu wa nani nihongo de  
ten number TOP what Japanese in]

07

[((writing gesture, gaze to Yumi))]

08 Yoh: ((turning head to Yumi)) lucky [suu  
number of strokes]

09 Tye: [sore wa  
that TOP]

---

4 Japanese pictographic characters that derive from Chinese
10 Yoh: Wa-

11 (0.5)/((Yoh repositions Tye's head, looks to rt))

12 Tye: Eigo de, Lucky Seven. to[ka ]

   English in etc

13 Yoh: [Hai.] Lucky Seven.

   Yes

14 Tye: Aa::h (.) warui juusan. [Ju u s a n ga warui. ]

   bad thirteen thirteen SUB bad

15 Yoh: [Hai juusan toka ne. Hai.]

   Yes thirteen etc IP yes

16 Tye: ( ) Nihongo de aru?

   Japanese in COP

   (HP)------------------(~ Y)----

17 [(0.5)

   Tye: [(Y)----

18 Tye: Chigau:: [no suu

   Different CON number

19 [((Gesture: writing))

   (Y)----- (HP)---
The analysis that follows will consider some of the features of Tye’s gaze patterns and how they play out in this particular setting. Like the cases we have looked at with Emil, the stylist is standing behind the client so it is difficult for him to be seen by Tye. In fact, Yoh often repositions Tye’s head in order to facilitate the shampooing, but in ways that restrict Tye from establishing eye gaze. At the sink, the client also does not have access to the mirror, so his gaze movements become exaggerated.

Goodwin (1986) has shown that gaze direction becomes highly salient during word search sequences. In line 6 we can see that Tye’s gaze is directed toward the left as he extends the vowel sound on the word juu (ten). He is conducting a solitary word search in that he is not looking at anyone in particular at that point, and neither are his eyes in home position, toward the front. He then abandons the turn-in-progress and shifts his gaze to his right where Yumi is standing as he invites her to participate in the word search, asking for specific examples of unlucky numbers in
Japanese. Notice that he cannot shift his entire head to make it clear that he is selecting Yumi as next speaker because Yoh is holding his head down. This is another constraint on multimodal features of talk that is unlikely to happen in the classroom.

A few moments later, Tye is providing some examples of unlucky numbers in English-speaking cultures, hearably as a prompt that Yoh and Yumi can reciprocate on during the pursuivant talk. Combining his specification with hand gestures that indicate he is writing numbers, he starts with “lucky seven” in line 12 and then contrasts that with the number 13, which he formulates as warui juu san in line 14. The two framegrabs here show Tye’s gaze at the start and the finish of this TCU. He begins the turn with his eyes toward the front, but ends it with them looking upward and behind him at Yoh, in what can be seen as a move to check whether or not Yoh is following. Stivers and Rossano (2010) have shown that directing the end of a turn to a particular recipient helps mobilize a response from the interlocutor. This is exactly what happens in this case as Yoh acknowledges Tye’s turn with uptake tokens and repetition in line 15.

After the two examples, 7 and 13, have been established, Tye then goes on to select Yoh as next speaker in a more direct way, by asking a question in line 16 (nihongo de aru?)“do you have that in Japanese?” Asking a question has a built in grammatical expectation that speakership will change, and this particular question privileges the recipient’s expertise with respect to language knowledge, so Yoh, should be aware that he has been selected. Despite his restricted posture, Tye strains his neck even further back to attempt to establish eye contact with Yoh at the end of this question. He may be aware from his earlier attempts that Yoh is looking away, even though he is responding appropriately. Moving his head back is a tactile or haptic form (Streeck, 2012) of indicating the selected-next speaker, since Yoh is touching Tye and can feel the neck movement as Tye looks at him.

5. Discussion and conclusions

There are obvious constraints to the way that multimodal interaction happens at the hairdressing salon. Eye gaze is mediated through the reflection of the mirror, or at times via stretching and straining to look at the person behind. The cape can also physically restrict the use of the sort of iconic gestures that beginning second language learners frequently rely on. On top of this, another omnirelevant constraint is the fact that one of the participants, the hairdresser, is dealing with multiple involvements and is therefore occupied with what (for him) is the more important task of cutting hair. In other words, the mundane conversation is embedded in the base activity of cutting hair (see Goodwin, 1984; Toerien & Kitzinger, 2007). This can mean that the hairdresser is not fully available in ways that he would be in other situations. His gaze, for example, may be directed at the client’s head or his tools at a point where the client might be expecting recipiency.

These are all aspects of the multimodal interaction that may hinder the participants’

5 Tye’s syntax does not conform to standard Japanese conventions at this point, but the way both he and Yoh treat this turn indicates that he was trying to say something like “nihongo ni mo aru?” (Do you have it in Japanese too?).
communication; however, this does not mean that the interactants are unable to find ways around them. They clearly do, as is evident in the data we have examined in this paper.

This sort of talk warrants attention because it has been under-researched in Applied Linguistics to date. There needs to be more focus not only on interaction that takes place in hairdressing salons, but also on any conversational data in which people are using their second language in real situations. It is all too easy to gather recordings of students talking in class, but the classroom is not as richly varied as the world outside those walls. Even the fact that the speakers were not directed to talk in any particular language (English or Japanese) has meant that they have the full range of their linguistic resources available for maintaining communication— which may not have been the case in classroom data, where English is often mandated as the language of communication.

In addition, another rationale for analyzing this sort of data is that it has real world consequences. If Emil cannot get his message across, he may end up with a haircut shorter than he wanted.

The aim of this paper has been to observe and account for some of the constraints on communication “in the wild”, not in the classroom. Ultimately, that is where the language we teach will eventually be used.
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