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In conversation analysis, repair has often been used as a broad cover term which refers to practices for dealing with problems or troubles in speaking, hearing, and understanding the talk. This research explores types and functions of a special type of non-error self-repair, here termed as retroactive elaboration, in English conversation from an interactional perspective. This study discusses types of retroactive elaboration in the following three categories: (i) replacement repair, (ii) replacement repair of pronominal elements, and (iii) retroactive elaboration with unattached NPs or adverbial elements. After discussing types and functions of retroactive elaboration, this research explores interactional motivations for the occurrence of retroactive elaboration in terms of lack of recipient uptake and recipient design. In sum, through an examination of types and functions of retroactive elaboration, this research shows an interactive nature of conversation manifested in the act of retroactive elaboration, which reflects how negotiation among participants is made in shaping forms of TCUs and determining TRPs.
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1. Introduction

In naturally occurring conversation, speakers monitor each other's speech in the course of producing utterances, constantly negotiating in determining the place to start their turn. Thus, the shape of a turn-constructional units (TCUs) is interactionally achieved, and it is always nego-
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In conversation analysis, the term repair has often been used as a broad cover term which refers to practices for dealing with problems or troubles in speaking, hearing, and understanding the talk in conversation, including phenomena such as change of topic, a word search, fault starts, and so on. Among these diverse phenomena of repair, this research will deal with a special type of non-error self-repair, here termed as retroactive elaboration, in which current speaker backtracks to an earlier part of the on-going turn, and elaborates, expands, revises, or reformulates it retroactively to fulfill the contingent needs of participants such as the need for additional specific information.

The purpose of this research is to explore types and functions of retroactive elaboration as a particular type of non-error repair in English conversation from an interactional perspective. The database that will be used is Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English (SBCSAE). This research will deal with retroactive elaboration in the speaker's on-going turn in which speakers revise, replace, or elaborate the repairable segments in the prior utterance with repairing segments. Some instances of the retroactive elaboration phenomena that will be dealt with in the present research can be found in (1).

---

1) As shown below, current speaker often makes repair to make correction of the words or phrases which (s)he has produced, as shown in (1):

(i) Harold: that had this really ... disproportionately high= .. propor- .. <----- A
  ... um,
  ... percentage.
  And then like,
  ... r- rural areas,

  ←—— B

In (1A), Harold breaks away from producing the word ‘propo[tion],’ and he produces another word (i.e., percentage) after the hesitation marker ‘um.’ Likewise, in (1B), he makes a false start in producing the phrase ‘rural areas.’ This type of repair will be termed as error repair, compared to non-error repair which will be discussed in this paper.
In (1), the two participants, Mother and Daughter, are talking about how to put horseshoes to horses' hooves. Here, Lynne, the daughter, talks about how she learns to do horses' feet by starting with dead horses' hooves. In the intonation unit (IU) marked as A in the excerpt, she first produces a TCU with the unspecified adverbial noun phrase (NP) 'a long way' and the pronoun '(th)em.' Immediately after producing the TCU, she makes repair in the following TCUs retroactively. That is, in the IUs marked as B and C, she revises her prior utterances 'a long way' and 'them' into 'back East somewhere' and 'these horse hooves,' respectively. Furthermore, she adds an adverbial element as in the IU marked as D. After that, in the IUs marked as E and F, she repeats what she has said in the IUs marked as A and B in a revised way. Based on this observation, I will discuss types and functions of retroactive elaboration in English conversation.

In this research, retroactive elaboration, as a special type of non-error self-repair, will be discussed in the following three categories: (i) replacement repair of prior repairables with another lexical segments, (ii) replacement repair of pronominal elements, and (iii) retroactive elaboration with unattached NPs or adverbial elements. Next, this research will discuss motivations for the occurrence of retroactive elaboration in terms of lack of recipient uptake and recipient design. Instances of retroactive elaboration in the next intonation unit which function as turn increments will be explained in terms of lack of recipient uptake (Ford, Fox and Thompson 2002, K. Kim 2001, H. Kim 2003, Schegloff 2000). As an-
other motivation, recipient design will be presented to explain occurrence of retroactive elaboration (cf. Sacks and Schegloff 1979). Based on these motivations, this research will attempt to explain occurrence of retroactive elaboration that is used to fulfill the demand for more clear and specific information signaled by the recipient.

Finally, this research will show an interactive nature of conversation manifested in the act of retroactive elaboration performed in the manner of revising, specifying, extending what has been said in the host TCU. Particularly, the explanation of the occurrence of retroactive elaboration in terms of lack of recipient uptake and recipient design shows that interactive motivations are at work in the course of producing utterances, while speakers are constantly negotiating with each other in shaping TCUs and determining transition-relevance places (TRPs).

2. Context of the Research

Since the research on repair in conversation done by Jefferson (1975) and Schegloff et al. (1977), a great amount of research has been carried out to characterize repair phenomena in conversation from an interactional, conversation-analytic perspective. In conversation analysis, as Jefferson (1975) and Schegloff et al. (1977) state, repair is not viewed as mere correction of 'errors' or 'mistakes' caused by speaker's sloppiness or carelessness. Rather, Schegloff et al. (1977) and Schegloff (1997:503) define repair as "practices for dealing with problems or troubles in speaking, hearing, and understanding the talk in conversation." Such a definition provides a new way of examining repair phenomena in conversation in terms of interactional needs and motivations (Jefferson 1975, Schegloff et al. 1977, Fox, Hayashi, and Jasperson 1996, Fox and Jasperson 1995, Jasperson 1998, Schegloff 1979, 1997, among others).

Jefferson (1975) is one of the early studies which claims that error correction should be viewed as a repair activity in conversation. Schegloff (1979) shows that same-turn self-repair and syntax are interdependent and co-organizing, illustrating how forms of syntax are determined by the operation of same-turn repair. Fox and Jasperson (1995) and Jasperson (1998) explore types and functions of first-position self-repair in English conversation, showing the relationships between repair and syntax. In particular, Jasperson (1998) classifies self-repair into thirteen types, show-
ing functions of those types.²) Fox et al. (1996) is a cross-linguistic study of syntax and repair between English and Japanese, showing how repair is shaped by the syntactic practices of the speakers of a language, and the ways in which repair shapes these practices. Banno (1998) is a study of elaboration repair with a marked rising pitch movement. She tries to explain elaboration repair in terms of repetition, reformulation, and definitions. Another research that is closely related to the present study is the one on turn extensions or increments (Ford, Fox, and Thompson 2002, K. Kim 2001, H. Kim 2003, Ono and Suzuki 1992, Schegloff 2000). These researchers show that turn increments are closely related with interactional contingencies, including lack of recipient uptake.

As discussed above, interaction-based research on the organization of repair has provided a way of exploring how forms of syntax are interactionally determined by the negotiation between participants in the process of performing a social action of repair. In this regard, it is necessary to examine instances and types of retroactive elaboration in their sequential and interactional contexts as a way of understanding the organization of repair.

3. Database and Methodology

The conversational data that are used in this research come from the Santa Barbara Corpus of Spoken American English. The conversations in the database were collected and transcribed by the Discourse Group in the Department of Linguistics, University of California, Santa Barbara. The database consists of fourteen dyadic and multi-party conversations, each lasting approximately 20 to 30 minutes. Based on the database, I will explore the questions of in what contexts retroactive elaboration occurs, what types of non-error repair structures are constructed, and what interactional motivations are involved in the production of retroactive elaboration. Based on the instances of non-error self-repair in the

database, I will try to characterize retroactive elaboration from an inter­
actional perspective.

In the database, each conversation is transcribed by the transcription
convention proposed by Du Bois et al. (1993).3) In this system, each line
ends with a punctuation mark that indicates the shape of the in­
tonation contour. That is, a comma is used to indicate a continuing con­
tour, a period a final contour, and a question mark an appeal contour, as shown in Excerpt (2).

(2) Doris: I was telling [~Mae ~Lynne],
         Lynne: [Hunh].
         Doris: ... Uh,
              ... day before yesterday,
              it was the most weird day I've ever seen
              in my entire adult l-life.
              ... It was um,
              ... the wind was blowing real hot when I first got up.
              ... And it was early.
              ... Real early,
              like seven o'clock in the morning,
              that --
              ... that wind was just hot.

As illustrated in (2), the transcription convention in the present data
takes an intonation unit (IU) as a basic unit of spoken language, each
line representing one intonation unit.

---

3) The following are transcription conventions used in the Santa Barbara spoken English cor­
pus (Du Bois et al. 1993):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intonation unit</th>
<th>{carriage return}</th>
<th>Pause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>truncated IU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>truncated word</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech overlap</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition continuity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Latching (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality &lt;Y Y&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appea</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Quotation &lt;Q Q&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriber's perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td>Laugh @@</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher's comment</td>
<td>(( ))</td>
<td>Vocal noises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain hearing</td>
<td>&lt;X X&gt;</td>
<td>Vocal noises ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecipherable syllable</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Inhalation (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lengthening</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>Exhalation (Hx)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In characterizing retroactive elaboration as a type of non-error repair in conversation, I will examine types and functions of instances of retroactive elaboration in conversation, paying attention to the exact placement of the instances in their sequential contexts. Based on the examination, I will explore interactional motivations for the occurrence of retroactive elaboration in conversation.

4. Types and Functions of Retroactive Elaboration

4.1. Preliminary Remarks on Retroactive Elaboration

In naturally occurring conversation, speakers repeat, reformulate, elaborate, or specify what they have said by backtracking to preceding TCUs of the turn-in-progress. Bearing this in mind, let us consider the following excerpt.

Excerpt (3) illustrates a few instances of repair. That is, in the first turn, Lynne first says that ‘(he is such) a weirdo,’ and then she revises the TCU into ‘(this is) the type of person,’ which is also replaced by another term ‘(that is like) a hermit.’ After that, Doris says that ‘(they were
raised) backward,’ and she makes repair by revising the word ‘backward’ into ‘backwoods.’ This is again revised into ‘back woodsy’ by Lynne, the next speaker, functioning as a third-turn repair. Then, Doris provides additional information about the person being referred to, in the IUs marked as F and G which function as instances of progressive expansion of the prior turn.

As Excerpt (3) shows, speakers revise, expand, reformulate, or repair what they have said in the preceding TCUs in a variety of ways. Among many instances of self-repair, this research will focus on the types and functions of non-error self-repair, here termed as retroactive elaboration. Retroactive elaboration, as a type of non-error repair, can be schematized as [repairable segments (trouble sources) ... (intervening elements) ... + repairing segments].

In discussing types and functions of elaboration-repair, Banno (1998) deals with “elaboration with a marked ‘Rising Pitch Movement (RPM),’ in which speaker elaborates the utterance, using an abrupt rise in pitch on the final syllable of the prosodic unit.” She claims that there are three types of elaboration-repair marked with RPM: (i) repetition, (ii) reformulation, and (iii) definitions. However, her research is limited to a particular construction in Japanese conversation, discussing it with a limited number of categories. As noted earlier, Jasperson (1998) provides a more detailed types of self-repair in English conversation.

In this research, I will classify types of retroactive elaboration into the following three types: (i) lexical elements followed by repairing lexical elements which are revised, replaced, or reformulated, (ii) pronominal elements followed by repairing lexical elements, and (iii) added non-constituent segments, usually occurring as unattached NPs. Based on this categorization, this research will examine interactional functions of the three types of retroactive elaboration in their sequential contexts in the following sections.

4.2. Replacement Repair

The first type of retroactive elaboration as a kind of non-error repair can be termed as replacement repair in the sense that repairable lexical elements are reformulated, rephrased, recycled, or revised by repairing elements. In this case, the repairable segments are either partially repeated with added elements or replaced by another lexical elements. In
another cases, the repairables are reformulated into repairing segments, being specified by additional information. In some other cases, the repairable segments are replaced by another term, which is more transparent to the listener. As another instances, in English conversation particular, speakers sometimes make replacement repair by using the fixed expression 'I mean.'

First, in the course of producing an utterance, when current speaker realizes that (s)he needs to make repair, (s)he revises or reformulates what (s)he has said before by partially repeating or replacing the repairable elements.

(4) Pete: ... So these are just the spices that are
    .. black and green and stuff?
Marilyn: .. I guess.
    .. Where's the black.
    .. I don't see any black.
Pete: ... Well,
    I don't know.
    ... Well %it's -
    .. maybe just [the light,
Marilyn: [It's kinda,
    .. I think it's oregano]. ← A
Pete: I guess it's just really dark],
    .. it's oregano [2and stuff yeah2].
Marilyn: [2Dark oregano2]. ← B
    ... [3X That famous black oregano3]. ← C
Pete: [3X XX XX3].
Alright.

In (4), the speakers are talking about spices, preparing dinner for a party. In their talk about a spice being referred to, Marilyn first says, 'I think it's oregano.' Then, Pete produces an assessment utterance and an affirmative remark. In response to that, Marilyn makes repair by revising her previous utterance into 'dark oregano,' which results in partial overlapping with Pete's utterance. Because of the simultaneous production of the utterances, Marilyn produces another revised utterance 'that famous black oregano,' providing some more additional information. As this excerpt illustrates, current speaker revises or reformulates retro-
actively what (s)he has said before by partially repeating or replacing the repairable segment\(^4\). This fact shows that speakers often reformulate what they have said before into more specific elements by providing additional, specific information retroactively.

Second, speakers sometimes replace what they have said before with another related, more transparent terms for the benefit of listener's understanding.

(5) Alina: ... Okay.

(H) .. Two weeks ago I'm watching TV,
.. and David Horowitz is going to have,
this former car .. radio thief on?

Lenore: ... It's her boyfriend?

Alina: (H) .. Yeah,
her ex-boyfriend. \(\leftarrow A\)
... !Mike. \(\leftarrow B\)
... He's the one that stole 'Hector's radio. \(\leftarrow C\)

Lenore: ... How do you know.

As shown in (5), speakers sometimes produce a common noun, which is not specific, and thus leaving the referent in an unidentifiable condition. In such a context, the current speakers often revise or replace their previous utterance into a more specific term. That is, in (5), the common lexical NP 'her ex-boyfriend' is replaced by the proper name 'Mike,' which is more specific and transparent to the lister. As this excerpt shows, speakers often make elaboration-repair by replacing problem segments with another related terms retroactively.

As another instance of replacement repair, current speaker provides a specific example of the prior utterance to make it more transparent to the recipient. Such a case can be found in the following excerpt.

(6) Kathy: [2But if you give them rewar=ds2],

Sharon: [2Well I gave them st- --
I gave2] sticker=,

\(^4\) An anonymous reviewer points out that this may not be an instance of retroactive elaboration on the ground that the production of repairing segments is an instance of bit-by-bit reformulation triggered by the interaction between the speakers. This opinion can be justified depending on the nature of the next speaker's utterance.
In (6), the speakers are talking about how to teach students at an elementary school. In this context, Sharon says that she gives stickers to students who get good grades on exams, as the TCU marked as A shows. However, her utterance 'good grades' is rather vague to the recipients. Realizing such a problem, she revises her prior utterance into a more specific term, saying that "good grades" refer to "one hundreds, ninety-eights, and ninety-sixes".

Third, as another instance of replacement repair, speakers often use the fixed expression 'I mean' as a way of reformulating or revising retroactively what they have said before (H. Kim 2004). Such a case can be found in the following excerpt:

(7) Pete: that like .. filter it and all, and then it -- ... They're going to like, .. pump it into their .. watering system, for the .. [apartment complex].
Roy: [Gray water systems] are local to, .. I mean you get your own. .. You don- -- It's not like a .. big [system] some[2where2].
Pete: [Right]. [2Yeah2].
Roy: You get your own [3gray water3] system.
Pete: [3Right3].
.. Yeah.
In (7), the speakers are talking about water systems in the apartment complex in their talk about environmental problems. In this context, Roy produces the utterance 'gray systems are local to' (the IU marked as A), which would not be clear to the recipient. Then, Roy, with the phrase 'I mean,' reformulates his prior utterance into 'you get your own' to clarify what he meant (the IU marked as B). As this excerpt shows, speakers often make replacement repair with the use of the phrase 'I mean.'

As has been discussed so far, speakers often reformulate, replace, revise, or elaborate retroactively what they have said before in the host TCU. Such an action of retroactive elaboration is performed as a kind of non-error self-repair in conversation to meet the contingent needs such as better understanding and clarification of the referents being talked about.

4.3. Replacement Repair of Pronominal Elements

In conversation, speakers often produce utterances with pronominal elements, assuming that the hearer shares the information with the speaker or infers the information from the context or world knowledge. But such a use of pronominal elements often calls for repair because of lack of sharedness of information between speaker and hearer. In such a case, the opaque pronominal elements are replaced by transparent lexical full NPs in repairing segments, providing more explicit information. Let's first consider a case in which current speaker's use of a pronominal element causes a problem in the next speaker's turn.

(8) Marilyn: .. Let's eat outside.
   .. Ju- --
   But you still have to clean off that table, cause it's grody.
Roy: .. Which table.
   .. This table here?
Marilyn: ... No,
   [the table outside.
Roy: [I have to clean-] --
   .. the table outside.
In (8), the speakers are having a dinner party. In the first turn, Marilyn uses the NPs ‘that table’ and ‘it’ in the IUs marked as A and B, assuming that Roy, the recipient, shares the knowledge with her. However, Roy responds with a question, asking which table she referred to. Then, she specifically points to the table which she has in mind, as in the IU marked as C. As this excerpt shows, current speaker’s use of pronoun elements sometimes causes problems in next speaker’s understanding when there is a lack of sharedness of the information being talked about.

In discourse, it is normal for the speakers to use lexical full NPs first. In the following discourse, the lexical full NPs are usually replaced by pronominal forms. However, sometimes, such a way of using pronominal elements is reversed in conversation. In such a context, the pronominal elements function as repairables, and the problem sources are repaired either by the current speaker initiated by a next-turn repair initiator (NTRI) as shown in (8), or by the current speaker’s self-initiation. Here, let us take a look at excerpts as instances of the latter case:

(9) a. Mary: ... God,
    I said I wasn’t gonna do this anymore. ← A
    ... Stay up late. ← B
    ... Kinda defeats the purpose of getting up
    in the morning.

Alice: ... I know.
    .. And it’s a hard habit to break=. 
[Usually I don’t] --
    (following IUs are omitted)

b. Pamela: [2<% Remember2],
    remember it in the movie %>, ← C
    in Beetlejuice?
    The h=andbook for the recently deceased? ← D

Darryl: Yeah?

Pamela: <X I mean X> books,
    wor=ds.
    I mean,
    ... n- they just become handbooks.
    You distill them,
    and use them in your own way.
Darryl: ... <P No P>,
... no,
... no I don't.
... I don't.
... (H) I,
... I come up with my own ideas about that stuff.

As shown in (9), in conversation, speakers sometimes use pronominal elements first, then they backtrack to the repairable pronomininals and replace them with lexical full NPs. That is, in (9a), Mary, talking about her habit, first produces the deictic pronominal 'this' in the IU marked as A, and then she replaces it with another element '(To) Stay up late' in the next IU marked as B. Likewise, in (9b), Pamela produces the clausal IU 'remember it in the movie,' in which the pronoun 'it' and the definite NP 'the movie' in the IU marked as C. Then, she replaces the definite NP with the name of the movie (i.e., Beetlejuice), as shown in the IU marked as D. After that, she produces the lexical full NP 'the handbook for the recently deceased' (marked as E) which refers back to the pronoun 'it'. As these excerpts show, in conversation, speakers sometimes use pronominal elements based on the assumption that the information being delivered is shared between speaker and hearer. However, when such an assumption fails or when the current speaker feels the need to provide more explicit information, (s)he replaces the pronominal elements with more informative expressions such as lexical full NPs as a way of elaborating prior TCUs retroactively.

4.4. Retroactive Elaboration with Unattached NPs

In conversation, speakers often add certain elements which are not constituents of the preceding TCUs. In classifying turn increments, Ford et al. (2002) classify turn increments into extensions and unattached NPs. They define unattached NPs as noun phrases that occur as increments after a possible completion point but that are not interpretable as syntactic constituents, or syntactically integrated continuations, of that immediately prior turn (cf. Ono and Thompson 1994). Examination shows that unattached NPs are often used after a possible completion point or in the next turn, as shown in Excerpt (10).
(10) Miles: ... But I'm sure those guys get a lot of attention from women. They travel all over the world.
   ... I'm sure a lot of women throw themselves at em, so that's what they expe-=ct from women.
   Harold: ... A lot of groupies. ←
   Miles: ... Yeah.
   ... Fringe benefits. ←
   Pete: Hm.
   Miles: .. @@@ (H)
   Jamie: .. The only fringe benefit <X of X> being a dancer, probably.
   Harold: .. Well [in San Francisco,
   Miles: [But then again],
   Harold: .. @you never know if it's a benefit or not, either.
   Jamie: That'[s] true.
   Pete: [@]

In (10), the participants in the excerpt are talking about a dance group. In this excerpt, Miles talks about a dance group, saying that they get a lot of attention from women. In response to Miles' utterance, Harold produces an NP which functions as a collaborative component, which replaces the lexical NP ‘women’ in the end of the prior turn. Immediately in response to that, Miles produces an attached NP, as a turn increment of his prior turn. In this case, the NP is not a constituent of the prior turn, but it functions as a non-constituent of the prior turn which is used as an assessment component (cf. Ono and Thompson 1994). As this excerpt shows, speakers often produce unattached NPs after a possible completion point or in the immediately following turn. Such NPs are used to elaborate or justify retroactively what they have said immediately before.

5. Motivations for Retroactive Elaboration

In Section 4, we have discussed types and functions of retroactive elaboration. Here, let us explore interactional motivations for the occurrence of retroactive elaboration. This research will show that two im-
Important motivations for the occurrence of retroactive elaboration are: (i) lack of recipient uptake (Ford et al. 2002, Schegloff 2000, K. Kim 2001), and (ii) recipient design (Sacks and Schegloff 1979).

First, instances of retroactive elaboration in the next intonation unit which function as turn increments can be explained in terms of lack of recipient uptake. As has been suggested in Ford et al. (2002), speakers add segments which occur after a possible completion point in the absence of recipient uptake as a way of providing another possible transition-relevance place (TRP), inviting uptake from the recipient, as shown in (11).

(11) Alina: [2They are into all this clothing2].
   Lenore: [2He has a .. r-estaurant2] or something,
   [3or what does he do3],
   Alina: [3(H)=3]
   Lenore: or wh- --
   [Who is he].
   Alina: [He's a waiter].
       .. He's a waiter at Rosa's.
       out there [in Ontario].
       --- A
       --- B
       --- C
   Lenore: [(Hx)]
   Alina: which is a very nice restaurant I'm sure,
       but,
       .. he wants to open his own restaurant someday,
       and he thinks,
       .. we're gonna finance it.

In (11), the two speakers are talking about a man. When Lenore was wondering about the person's job, Alina responds to her, saying that he is a waiter, as shown in the TCU marked as A. But her utterance is overlapped with Lenore's previous question. Then, Alina repeats what she said, providing some additional information, as shown in the TCU marked as B. However, she does not receive a response from Lenore, the recipient. Then, Alina provides another additional information about the location of the restaurant, as shown in the TCU marked as C. Still, Alina does not get a response from the recipient except an exhalation. In such a context, she keeps providing another additional information about the quality of the restaurant, as in the TCU marked as D. As this
excerpt illustrates, TCUs are added in an escalating manner to modify, revise, modulate, or extend the immediately preceding host TCU. Such added segments produced by a lack of uptake from the recipient function as devices for creating renewed TRPs, providing another opportunity for the recipient to take a turn (Ford, Fox and Thompson 2002, K. Kim 2001, Schegloff 2000). This excerpt shows that one of the important interactional motivations for the occurrence of retroactive elaboration is to provide a renewed opportunity for the next speaker to take a turn.

Next, another motivation for the occurrence of retroactive elaboration can be explained in terms of recipient design (cf. Sacks and Schegloff 1979). Recipient design is a motivation which is at work when speakers produce turns to be understood in terms of what the speaker knows or assumes about the existing mutual knowledge among participants. Before we discuss an instance of recipient design, let us first consider a case in which the next speaker asks for specific information.

(12) Lynne: (H) And you know what we start out with? [This is the] grossest of everything.
    Lenore: [<X What X>].
    Lynne: (H) We start out,
       (H) .. with,
       .. dead horse hooves.

In (12), Lynne, the daughter, talks to her mother about doing horses' hooves. Lynne says that they start out with 'the grossest of everything', which is new and not shared with her mother. In such a context, Lenore uses the next-turn repair initiator (NTRI) 'what' to signal for more specific information. In response to that, Lynne says that they 'start out with dead horse hooves' as beginners of doing horses' hooves.

In conversation, current speaker often provides additional information in an escalating manner as a way of adopting the interactional motivation recipient design, the motivation which is adopted by the current speaker to make the recipient understood with additional information.

(13) Lynne: (47 intonation units of this turn omitted)
    that's just kinda= how it happens,
    you know,
because he kinda has to tell you,
(H) ... they go over=,
.. the who=le,
... the who=le part .. of the horse. *(← A)*

.. I mean,
(H) .. all the skeleton= .. part of it you know=, *(← B)*
and- --
and they go through .. %every kinda ligament.
and I mean,
there's,
... (H) millions of ligaments,
and millions of .. tendons,
you know,
well not millions,
but,
.. I mean,
Lenore: yeah,
[I bet].

As can be seen in Excerpt (13), the current speaker provides additional pieces of information one by one. That is, in the TCU marked as A, the prior utterance 'the whole' is repeated with added information. In the TCU marked as B, which is preceded by the phrase 'I mean,' the prior TCU marked as A is replaced by another TCU with another term. After that, Lynne talks about the farriers' job of going through every kind of ligament. Then, she provides additional information in the TCU marked as C to provide and justify what she said in the preceding TCU. As this excerpt shows, current speaker revises or reformulates what (s)he has said before to make it understood by the recipient out of the motivation of recipient design.

As has been discussed above, when these motivations are at work, current speaker elaborates, modifies, revises the-turn-so-far or provides additional information to fulfill the demand for more clear and specific information signaled by the recipient.
6. Summary and Conclusions

So far, this research has explored types and functions of retroactive elaboration in naturally occurring English conversation. In the present research, retroactive elaboration is defined as a particular type of non-error self-repair, in which current speaker backtracks to an earlier part of the on-going turn, and elaborates, revises, or reformulates it to fulfill the contingent needs of participants. Based upon this definition, this research has shown types of retroactive elaboration in the following three terms: (i) replacement repair, (ii) replacement repair of pronominal elements, and (iii) retroactive elaboration with unattached NPs.

As a first type of retroactive elaboration, this research has discussed replacement repair, classifying them into three subtypes. The first case of replacement repair is that the repairable segments are either partially repeated with added elements or reformulated into repairing segments, being specified by additional information. The second case is that the repairable segments are replaced by another specific term. As a third case, speakers sometimes make replacement repair by using the fixed expression 'I mean.' As a second type of retroactive elaboration, this research has shown that pronominal elements are replaced by lexical full NPs retroactively. In conversation, speakers sometimes produce utterances with pronominal elements according to the assumption that the hearer shares the information with the speaker. However, such a use of pronominal elements often calls for repair because of lack of sharedness of information between speaker and hearer. In such a context, the pronominal elements are replaced by lexical full NPs in repairing segments, providing more explicit information. As a third type of retroactive elaboration, this research has shown the role of unattached NPs as a device for retroactive elaboration. In conversation, speakers sometimes produce unattached NPs after a possible completion point. Some of such unattached NPs are used to elaborate or justify preceding TCUs retroactively.

Based on the types and functions of retroactive elaboration, this research has discussed interactional motivations in terms of lack of recipient uptake and recipient design. First, as Ford et al. (2002) and Schegloff (2000) show, speakers add segments which function as retroactive elaboration after a possible completion point in the absence of recipient uptake. Such instances of retroactive elaboration can be explained as an
action of providing another possible transition-relevance place, inviting uptake from the recipient. As another motivation, this research has shown that occurrence of retroactive elaboration can be explained in terms of recipient design (cf. Sacks and Schegloff 1979). Speakers produce turns to be understood in terms of what the speaker knows or assumes about the existing mutual knowledge among participants. In this respect, retroactive elaboration can be understood as an action of performing recipient design.

In sum, through an examination of types and functions of retroactive elaboration, this research has shown an interactive nature of conversation manifested in the act of retroactive elaboration. Particularly, explanation of the occurrence of retroactive elaboration in terms of lack of recipient uptake and recipient design shows an interactive nature of retroactive elaboration, reflecting how negotiation among participants is made in shaping forms of TCUs and determining TRPs.
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