

Sacks et al. (1974) stressed that through the sequential organization of interaction participants display to each other their understanding of prior turns in next turns. They also pointed out that this mutual display of understanding can be used by analysts as a "search procedure" in order to discover "what a turn's talk is occupied with" (pp. 728–9). Building on this, Wootton (1989) has singled out five types of evidence that can be drawn on in order to discover what a turn at talk is doing. These types of evidence can also be appealed to in discovering interactionally relevant language forms and functions (see also Couper-Kuhlen and Selting 1996b:31–8; Selting and Couper-Kuhlen 2001b:278):

i. Relationship to prior turns

Evidence for the interactional relevance of a linguistic phenomenon can be found in the relationship of a turn featuring this phenomenon to just prior turns. For instance, a turn built with a phrase can be shown to stand in a different relationship to the prior turn than a turn built with a clause (Chapter 6).

ii. Co-occurring evidence within the turn

The interactional relevance of a linguistic phenomenon can be corroborated through co-occurring evidence within the turn or in neighboring turns. For example, "dense" syntactic constructions (Günthner 2011c) as found in many story climaxes frequently co-occur with extreme formulations (see also Pomerantz 1986) and marked, salient prosody (Selting 1996b; Online-Chapter D §2). Alternatively, prosodic configurations may have verbal formulations in their vicinity that shed light on their function (see, e.g., Reber 2012:149–50).

iii. Discriminability

The interactional relevance of a linguistic phenomenon may be discoverable through a comparison of the action it is used to perform with the action performed by other forms in the same or similar contexts. In response to news deliveries and informings, for instance, a comparison of English "do you?" to "you do?" reveals that these responses lead to different participant interpretations, suggesting that two distinct interactionally relevant categories are involved (Thompson et al. 2015).

iv. Treatment in subsequent talk

The function or interactional meaning of a linguistic phenomenon may be discoverable through an analysis of the treatment that the turn featuring the phenomenon receives in subsequent talk. If question words are used to initiate repair with both falling and rising final pitch, the way the repair operation is accomplished in next turn will help determine what work falling and rising final pitch accomplish in this sequential environment (Chapter 3).

v. Deviant case analysis

At first sight, deviant cases appear to be exceptions; they are other-than-expected usages of the phenomenon in question. However, on closer analysis, deviant cases can often be shown to be treated *as* deviant, thus providing evidence that participants orient to non-deviant usage as the expected norm. The deviant cases can then be seen as noticeable departures from the norm, giving rise to special interpretations and inferences. For instance, if phrasal forms are established as the norm for responding to information-seeking question-word or content questions, then the use of a clausal form instead can be said to trigger inferences that go beyond the simple provision of information (Chapter 4).

4.5 Claims Warranted through Participant Orientation

Interactional linguistic claims can be validated by showing that and how participants observably orient to the phenomenon under analysis. To give an example: the analysis of a phrasal response as being the norm for responding to an information-seeking question-word question can be validated by showing that recipients do not delay in producing it, do not initiate repair on it, and in general give no indication that it is in any way problematic for them, while a clausal response is often produced with delay and leads to an expanded sequence dealing with its implications. The strongest kind of warrant for an interactional linguistic claim comes by way of speakers' explicitly problematizing the use of the phenomenon in question or the inferences it gives rise to.

Thus, all the types of evidence for claiming the interactional relevance of a phenomenon listed in §4.4 above can at the same time serve to warrant such a claim. For instance, the category of sentence or clause can be warranted by showing that speakers and recipients orient to it by timing their follow-up TCU and actions accordingly, by waiting for or even pursuing its completion, and/or by interpreting its break-off or abandonment as a source of inferences. It is thus crucial in interactional linguistic research to show participant orientation to the phenomenon under analysis, i.e., that it functions according to an interactional logic that can be reconstructed from the data. This, of course, does not mean that participants are necessarily aware of the logic or its relevance, or that they have a category name or conscious knowledge of or about it.

Warranting claims in terms of the methods discussed above has an advantage over other methods of validation: having recourse to the empirical data themselves frees researchers from having to rely on introspective and subjective judgments and/or statistical calculations of validity, whose relevance for participants is unproven. The outcome of warranting claims as proposed here is an empirically