investigations starting from linguistic resources choose to restrict the object of study to some sequential context. The drawback, however, is again that we cannot make generalizations about the resource beyond the particular context studied.

In effect then, studies of language in social interaction, no matter what the starting point, are always studies of the sequentially specific deployment of linguistic resources conceived of as practices in particular sequential contexts. Analysts often fare best by moving back and forth between the analysis of form and the analysis of function. It is only after we have compiled a large body of research on the situated deployment of resources within various sequential contexts that we can expect to be able to come up with generalizations across sequential contexts. For this, the detailed study of participants' situated use of linguistic resources and the warranting of analytic categories as participants' categories (see below) is indispensable.

> Interactional Linguistics pursues three objectives: (i) it aims at a *functional description* of linguistic structures as interactional resources mobilized in practices designed for the accomplishment of recurrent tasks in social interaction; (ii) it aims at *cross-linguistic analysis and comparison* of these practices in order to determine both how interactional exigencies shape language structure and use in social interaction, and how language and language type impinge on the details of the organization of social interaction; (iii) it aims at drawing *general linguistic* conclusions for a theory of language in social interaction which explains how language is organized and practiced in social interaction. The goal of Interactional Linguistics is a realistic reconstruction of the linguistic structures and practices that participants themselves deploy and orient to in the conduct of social interaction.

It could be argued that a separate field of inquiry called Interactional Linguistics is not necessary, because its purview lies within CA. However, at least two sets of arguments speak in favor of actively continuing to develop and articulate the approach advocated here.

i. Conceptions of language and linguistics

Most non-interactional approaches to linguistics share what Linell (2005) calls the "written language bias"; examples, if used at all, are typically constructed ones. Non-interactional conceptions of language and linguistics conceive of language use as the mere application (*performance*) of knowledge concerning an abstract linguistic system (*competence*). However, since the seminal work by C. Goodwin (1981, 1995), interactionally oriented linguists have shown that linguistic units such as sentences, clauses, phrases, etc., when used in interaction, are situated

accomplishments, actively produced and reproduced in real time, in a context-sensitive fashion. They are both context-dependent and context-constitutive, and must be treated as fundamentally flexible entities that are adapted to the local exigencies and contingencies of interaction. Linguistic units can be constructed collaboratively and are therefore distributed across speakers (Lerner 1991). In consequence, these units must be conceived of as emergent in use (Hopper 1988, 1998), being interactively achieved in talk. This is only one example of how language as used in interaction cannot be adequately conceptualized as the simple application of an abstract and context-free system. As the following chapters will show, there are many others.

In order to describe language as used in interaction, it needs to be carefully examined in its natural habitat, in a radically empirical fashion and on the basis of fundamentally constructionist and interactionist premises. This will show how linguistic resources and practices are adapted to and designed for carrying out routine tasks in the management of interaction. The context of language use, especially its sequential interactional context, must be an integral part of linguistic theory and practice (see also Duranti and Goodwin 1992). An interactional linguistic description of language as used in social interaction will lead to a more realistic and therefore improved basis for, among others, grammars of spoken language; courses on language awareness, language teaching, and intercultural communication; speech analysis and synthesis programs in computerized interactive dialog systems; and counseling and training programs in rhetoric and communication skills.

ii. Relationship to CA

Although they overlap in many respects and build on each other's results, CA and Interactional Linguistics have partly different goals and objectives: both are interdisciplinary endeavors but CA is grounded in sociology, Interactional Linguistics in linguistics. CA is primarily interested in sequential and social order; on occasion it is also concerned with explaining the "macro"-sociological phenomena that are reproduced through everyday and institutional practices in social interaction (see Schegloff 1987d). Often this ensues without close attention to the details of linguistic structure. By contrast, linguists working in an interactional perspective are concerned with reconstructing the phonetic-phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic details of sequences of social interaction. Interactional Linguistics is primarily interested in the use of language and linguistic structures in social interaction. In the long run, it seeks to contribute to changing the way we think about language within linguistics, applied linguistics, and language pedagogy. The interactional perspective has already led to the development of new approaches in sub-areas of linguistics: among these "interactional semantics" (Deppermann, esp. 2007, 2011a; Norén and Linell 2007), "interactional stylistics"