Introduction

Although the purpose of all second language acquisition research is ultimately to discover how people actually learn language, much of the research has resulted in describing only the product of language learning at various stages. There appear to be basically two reasons for this. First, it is difficult to ascertain which features of interlanguage to examine in order to address the question of how one learns language. Second, for a considerable amount of time, second language (L2) learning was assumed to be determined predominantly by first language (L1) transfer. Therefore, the emphasis of studies at this time was on how the process of transfer affected language learning, rather than on whether transfer was indeed the only process involved.

A lack of confidence in the theory that L1 transfer was primarily responsible for L2 learning motivated a substantial body of research, initiated by Burt and Dulay (for a summary see Burt and Dulay 1980) called the morpheme order studies. The goal of these studies was to readdress the question of how second languages were acquired. In an effort to discover alternative explanations for the processes of L2 learning these studies analyzed the order of acquisition of target morphemes in the
interlanguages of learners with different Ll's. Although the morpheme order studies succeeded in delivering second language acquisition research from its Ll transfer "bond" as learners with different Ll's were found to have a similar English morpheme acquisition order, they were not successful in addressing the question of how language is acquired. Their approach, which attended only to about 12 target-like forms in the interlanguage, ignored the remainder of the interlanguage, which constitutes the majority of the interlanguage.

In addition, although the intent had been to determine the acquisition order of forms that had a target form-function correspondence, the methodology of the studies limited the researchers to form alone. Studies by Anderson (1982), and Bahns and Wode (1980), amongst others, showed that a more comprehensive examination of the interlanguage, including the learner's use of the form being investigated in non-target-like contexts, revealed that learners did not, in fact, always have only a target form-function correspondence, but were using the form to express other semantic functions, as well. Consequently, "the order-of-acquisition approach to language acquisition research fail(ed) to Standard English functions" (Huebner 1979:22).

A further problem with these studies was that they resulted in being language specific. Although the research suggested the existence of a universal natural order, what was actually posited was a natural order for the acquisition of English morphemes only. The fact that the results of the studies could not be applied to other languages, and that the focus of the studies was
on target-like forms, prevented the discovery of second language acquisition processes (Hatch 1980).

In an effort to proceed beyond the limitations of the target oriented approach of the morpheme studies, various second language acquisition researchers have attempted to refocus on the processes of language acquisition by studying the interlanguage from the perspective of the learner her/himself. (See Huebner 1979, and in press, Bahns and Wode 1980, Slobin 1981, Dittmar 1981 and 1982, Meisel 1982, Pfaff 1982.) These researchers view the developing stages of the interlanguage as analyzable evidence of universal second language acquisition processes. Study of the interlanguage "assumes that the systematicity of the interlanguage is realized in speaker output. It also assumes that the systematicity of the interlanguage reflects acquirer hypotheses about the nature of the target language" (Huebner in press). Rather than analyzing the surface products reflecting acquired forms, these studies have attempted to analyze the "underlying pragmatic and linguistic functions and semantic intentions speakers are attempting to communicate" (Pfaff 1982:1). A further benefit of researching second language acquisition processes through pragmatic, linguistic and semantic functions is that these are universal features of language which can be tested cross-linguistically with a view to revealing universal processes, whereas surface L2 forms are language specific.

Semantic Analysis

The interlanguage studies which have used semantic analyses
to research second language acquisition have dealt so far with gender (Anderson 1982), articles in the semantic field for noun phrase reference (Huebner 1979, and in press, Pfaff 1982), temporality (Slobin 1981, Meisel 1982, Sato 1982), and various other semantic categories (Dittmar 1982). These studies generally have dealt with early interlanguages, or, as in the case of Slobin (1981), child L1 acquisition.

Meisel (1982:2) refers to a semantic analysis as a "functional approach". He used this approach to study the interlanguages of Spanish, Portuguese, and Italian workers learning German naturalistically. Certain observable communication strategies appeared to be used systematically by all of his subjects. One such strategy, "scaffolding" (Slobin 1981, Meisel 1982), is concerned with the negotiation of meaning between the native speaker and the learner. Scaffolded discourse is discourse in which the native speaker provides the semantic domain in his/her speech to the learner. This permits the learner to respond without having to locate the response in the specific semantic domain him/herself.

The other strategies Meisel (1982:11-12) discusses include "implicit reference", "contrasting two or more events", and "order of mention follows the natural order". Implicit reference refers to the learner's relying on the native speaker to use world knowledge to decode the learner's utterance, rather than the learner using linguistic devices to encode his/her meaning. The other two strategies refer to ways learners encode their messages. These four strategies are referred to as "principles of discourse organization" (p.23). Meisel also notes the use of
such linguistic devices as connectives and adverbial expressions for establishing semantic functions. Slobin (1981) and Dittmar (1982) report finding these same strategies being used by the subjects in their studies.

These linguistic devices and communication strategies can be used in isolation, or in conjunction with each other, Meisel notes. But as the interlanguage approaches the target language and the learner has more access to complex structures and linguistic features, the strategies are used less frequently. However, as these strategies are not unique to non-native discourse their use becomes more target like and is supplemental to acquired linguistic devices. Givón (1979, cited in Meisel 1982, and Dittmar 1982), discusses a similar phenomenon. He claims that there exist two modes of communication; the pragmatic mode and the syntactic mode, and that learners progress from the pragmatic mode to the syntactic mode as their interlanguages develop. This applies equally to L1 and L2 learners.

The pragmatic mode can be characterized by the proximity of the forms used to encode meaning and the meanings they are encoding. Semantic functions can also be characterized by the transparency, or opaqueness of the forms used to express them (Pfaff 1982). A transparent form-function correspondence would be one in which the form had a simple, clear correlation to the message from the perspective of the real world. The English gender system is an example of a transparent form-function correspondence in that masculine and feminine gender are assigned primarily to humans and animals, and representations of humans
and animals which possess the characteristic of gender. Inanimate objects having no gender are referred to with a neuter pronominal. An opaque form-function correspondence, then, is one in which the form-function correspondence is complex and less direct, as in languages which refer to objects that have no physical gender as either masculine or feminine. Anderson (1982) contends that the opaqueness of the marking of gender of Spanish nouns is in part accountable for the problems many Spanish L2 learners have in acquiring them. Pfaff (1982) makes this same observation concerning German determiners and the German reference system. An additional characteristic of the pragmatic mode is that "loose conjunction" is used in discourse rather than the "tight subordination" of the syntactic mode (Givón 1979, cited in Dittmar 1982:14). It would appear, then, that an investigation of interlanguage which examines the development of learners' ability to encode semantic domains requiring subordination, and which are expressed by an opaque form-function correspondence, could result in indicating how learners attempt to internalize target language forms.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to describe the form-function correspondences one "intermediate" learner uses to express the semantic domain of conditionality, and to compare the linguistic devices and the observable strategies this learner uses to those reported earlier in this paper. Although the ultimate function of this type of research is to provide explanations, the purpose of this study was simply to explore one aspect of the
interlanguage of one learner for the purposes of experimenting with this type of research. An additional objective of the study was to try out the research approach on an intermediate rather than beginner level learner. It was for this reason that I chose to examine the domain of conditionality, which has an opaque form-function correspondence as is explained below, which is expressed through subordination, and which is often acquired late.

Research Questions

1. How does one learner, who has not yet acquired the target form-function correspondence for the semantic domain of conditionality, express conditionality?

2. Does an intermediate learner exhibit the use of the same strategies as those used by beginner level learners?

3. How does the learner's apparent difficulty with subordination affect the encoding of the semantic domain of conditionality whose target form requires the subordination of one clause to another.

Conditionality

The notion of conditionality can be summarized as expressing the dependence of one hypothetical event, or concept, on the occurrence of another hypothetical event. The dependent event is expressed in the main clause, and the condition on which the event is dependent is expressed in the If/When clause. These events may, but do not have to be located temporally despite the
fact that they have not happened, or may not happen. The temporal location is when the event could, or could not have happened. Furthermore, the occurrence of the events ranges from probable to impossible.

Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1981) categorize the semantic functions of conditionality into three groups (p.392):

1. Factual conditional relationships.
2. Future (or predictive) conditional relationships.
3. Imaginative conditional relationships.

Imaginative conditional relationships are further divided into hypothetical and counterfactual conditional relationships. For the purposes of this study Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman's third category is replaced by the two categories of hypothetical and counterfactual conditional relationships. Although there is a fair amount of overlap within these categories, they form a useful "semantic taxonomy" (p.396) for discussing how conditionality is encoded.

Depending on which type of conditionality is being expressed, Standard English requires the use of different structures in the two clauses. The possible Standard English form-function correspondences are outlined in Table 1 (adapted from Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman 1981).

(Insert Table 1 here)

While there are several different combinations that can be used to express conditionality, the seven combinations in Table 1 were found by Hwang (1979, cited in Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman 1981) to be the most frequently occurring combinations in the spoken and written discourse Hwang analyzed.
The expression of conditionality in a target form has been found to be a late acquired form-function correspondence (Covitt 1976, cited in Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman 1981). This may be due in part to the differences in meaning being difficult to distinguish, and to the distance between the forms used to encode conditionality, and the message being conveyed. Despite the fact that the events discussed often have an indirect relationship to temporality, the structures used refer directly to temporality. In fact, the past is used to represent improbability in the present or future, and the past perfect is used to refer to impossible events that didn't happen in the past. In other words, the syntactic forms used to express conditionality do not correspond to the meaning being expressed. This is an opaque form-function correspondence. In addition, as mentioned earlier, one clause is subordinated to another. However, subordination is only characteristic of fairly advanced learner varieties.

The notion of conditionality, and the various forms used to express it are far more complex than the above description implies. However, for the purposes of this study, the above will suffice.

Method
Subject: The learner in this study (L) is a 43 year old single Japanese woman who lives alone. At the time of the study she had been living in Hawaii for 13 years, and planned to remain there. L works as a beautician in a large department store in an upper class neighborhood of Honolulu. According to L, both
the staff and the clients are evenly split between native English speakers and non-native speakers. L speaks English for most of the time at work, but her social life is spent primarily with other Japanese speakers.

Although L is not a true naturalistic learner, as she has had English instruction at various times in her life, it appears that a large part of her English ability has been acquired through her communicative network. L received six years of instruction while still in school in Japan, three years of private tutoring upon arriving in Hawaii, and was being tutored at the time of the study. L claims that she could speak and understand virtually no English when she arrived in Hawaii 13 years ago despite her instruction at school. The tutoring L received in the past, and was receiving at the time of the study, was primarily conversation, with no emphasis on grammar. L's level is intermediate as it is described by Dittmar (1981). He described intermediate learners as those whose speech "is characterized by absence of some verb phrases and subordinate clauses" (139-140).

Data: The data consist of three audio recorded conversations amounting to 90 minutes. The recordings were made approximately one month apart, and were recorded at the researcher's home. The conversations were between L and the researcher who were fairly friendly with each other. The conversation was free, and dominated heavily by L. L's narrative style resulted in there being a minimal amount of interaction between L and the researcher. This limited the type of strategies that L could
employ. The topics of the conversations were chosen by both the researcher and L, and included frightening experiences, changing careers, summer plans, holiday pay, and the death of L's landlady.

The conversations were transcribed and analyzed. The analysis involved determining first the meaning of the utterances, then the type of conditional relationships that were being expressed, followed by how L was communicating her meaning, and finally, how a native speaker would convey the same meaning. One other native speaker was consulted on the first and last portions of the analysis.

Results

L expressed conditionality 52 times. Almost 2/3 of the conditional utterances expressed were factual (n=33, 64%, see table 2). Factual conditionals are marked in Standard English by when, or if, and either the present tense or the past tense in both clauses. (A discussion of L's form-function correspondences for the factual conditional use of when and if is provided below). A majority of L's factual conditional utterances required the use of the present tense. L successfully used the target form-function correspondence for this type of conditional. However, this is the only target form-function correspondence L seems to have acquired. When expressing the past factual (n=1, 2%), future (n=4, 8%), hypothetical (n=14, 27%), or counterfactual (n=2, 4%) conditional, L used either the present tense, or no verb at all. She consistently marks the fact that she is expressing conditionality by beginning her utterances with
if, or when appropriate, when. However, basically, L is not marking within the same utterance whether or not the conditionality she is expressing is factual, future, hypothetical, or counterfactual, as will be illustrated below. Nonetheless, there were only two occasions when there was a serious need for clarification or repair.

How does L communicate the different types of conditionality she is expressing if she does not mark them within the same utterance? L appears to rely heavily on three communication strategies; extralinguistic context, either L's previous discourse or the interviewer's previous discourse, and implicit reference (see table 3). These strategies, however, are often used in conjunction with each other and, as a consequence, overlap exists between the categories. Examples of each strategy are given below. These examples were chosen because they illustrate an apparent dependence on one strategy over the others.

The communication strategy of using extralinguistic context involves the dependence on shared knowledge of a temporal reference of a specific event to communicate meaning. The following extract is an example of L's using extralinguistic context to convey past time in a factual conditional relationship. L was relating an experience she had had some years ago in which she applied for a job with an airline. Here she explains that the company was not concerned with the ages of the applicants.

L. Yeh / Anyway / uh even uh 30 something ne? / or 40 //
I. // Yeh/ It would be O.K. /  
L. If they need, / they hire /  
As this extract was within a story that has already been established as having taken place some years ago, L has shown that this condition does not still hold despite her use of the present tense.

Using previous discourse to communicate involves the dependence on a specific utterance or utterances to establish the semantic domain of another utterance. In the following example L uses her own previous discourse to express unlikelihood. L is discussing changing jobs. She has mentioned that she tried once to change her job, but that she will never try again. The discussion of changing jobs began with the following exchange:

I. You said once you wanted to change jobs/  
L. Yeh/ just I told him/ but what I I can do (laugh)/ so it's hard for me I guess/ um I didn't try again/  
The following exchange occurred after L told the story of her attempt to change jobs.

I. So now you're not interested in changing anymore /  
L. But if I can get big money / And then If I can do something / I rather have a different job /  
I. Well, do you keep an eye out for job possibilities/  
L. No/ not um/ no/  
The fact that L has previously stated that she does not expect to change jobs allows the hearer to interpret this statement as unlikely despite L's use of the present tense, once again.

The following is another example of L using previous discourse to express hypothetical conditionality.
L. I cannot work like office work / typing or //
I. // Why not? /
L. Because I didn't study /
I. Oh / It doesn't take long to learn /
L. I guess so / But even if I work office /
the salary cheap /
I. Oh yeh / I'm sure your salary's // better than that]
L. // And then] I have to stay 8 hours at the office hm? /
The hypothetical relationship in L's last two utterances are made
clear by L's previous statement concerning her inability to be an
office worker.

The third strategy, implicit reference, involves the speaker
relying on the hearer to use world knowledge to decode the
speaker's utterance. The following is an example of this
strategy. L is talking about an occasion when she was frightened
because someone knocked on her door very early in the morning.
L. First I just didn't open / then after a while I um checked
um from bottom of the door / he still there so I checked
uh with the small hole / then I opened / if man I I don't
open /
Because we know that a woman who is alone is likely to be
cautious about letting a strange man into her apartment, we can
assume that this is why L was frightened. The fact that she did
open the door in the end tells us that the person was a woman.
Her last statement, then, is expressing a counterfactual
conditional relationship.

This study did not include an analysis of the intonation,
but on two occasions, L appeared to use stress to express hypothetical conditionality. The following is an example.

L. If um minimum hour pays 3.50 now / no I I don't know / but if if / They just give us this 3 weeks /

Note also the use of I don't know to clarify the hypothetical nature of the conditionality being expressed.

Included in the total of 52 conditional utterances are 17 elliptical utterances (see table 2) in which only one of the two clauses is explicitly expressed. 13 of these 17 utterances are main clauses. The condition the main clause is dependent on is either implied in one of L's or the interviewer's previous utterances, or built onto an earlier conditional clause. A majority of these utterances are factual conditionals. 10 of the 17 ellipted conditionals could be similarly expressed by native speakers, as well. The following is an example of an elliptical utterance which uses the interviewer's previous utterance as the condition, but which probably would not be expressed by a native speaker without an additional if clause.

I. Our impression of Japanese people, here in America, is that all Japanese people are hard-working and that they stay at their jobs for their whole lifetime /

L. Oh yes / Some of the Japanese people / But that /

uh / You have to join big company /

The target version of the If clause L ellipted would be as follows:

if you want to stay at your job for your whole lifetime

Or alternatively:
to keep your job for your whole lifetime.

It is interesting to note that the conditional utterances in the first two conversations are relatively evenly divided between complete conditionals (If/When clause + Main clause) and ellipted conditionals. However, the third conversation has only one ellipted conditional utterance.

The communication strategy of scaffolding played a minor role in this discourse. There were four occasions when L was asked a conditional question. L needed only to answer "yes" or "no", which is what she did. The minimal role scaffolding played is probably a consequence of the limited amount of interaction between L and the researcher due to L's narrative style. It appears, however, that this is not a strategy that L still needs to employ, perhaps due to her higher proficiency level. Further research is needed to determine this.

Although L uses mainly the simple present tense when expressing conditionality, she uses the simple past, and occasionally the present perfect, to mark past time in other parts of the discourse. L does not, however, use the past perfect or the modal perfective. Indeed, L uses modals quite infrequently. Apart from her use of can (n=12), the only modals L used were should (n=1) in the utterance Why should I ask her? might (n=1) in I might go, and couldn't (n=1) in she couldn't believe it. L uses other devices to encode her meaning in contexts requiring past perfect, modal perfectives, or modals.

L used four past tense forms of verbs (came, became, wanted, graduated), and one future form (won't) in her conditional
utterances. However, none of them were used in appropriate contexts.

Regarding L's form-function correspondence of If an additional finding was that L used if to express functions other than conditionality 3 times. If was used twice to express contrast, when a native speaker would have used although, or even though.

L. Yeh that's why / I knew why she didn't want to
tell me / Not only me / But just she / I figure
out ne? / She / if in case / I I was feeling it's
in case if her mother passed away / she doesn't
want to say / Cause she doesn't want to believe/
The third non-target use of if was in a context in which a native speaker would have used a relative clause construction.

L. Yes / That's uh / if uh the student from Japan
um? / And then graduated (x) uh university in
America / When they go back to Japan / hard to
get job /
A target version of the above might be:
The students from Japan who graduate from a
university in America, find it hard to get jobs
when they go back to Japan.
These additional uses of If are a further indication of L's not having fully acquired If at the time of the study. None of the remaining uses of if in the transcripts were used in a non-target form-function correspondence.
Discussion

Despite the limited amount of data collected, the results of this study offer some preliminary answers to the research questions.

1. L relies on three communication strategies and two linguistic devices to express conditionality. The strategies are as follows:
   1. Extralinguistic context (the temporal reference of the event).
   2. Either L's or the interviewer's previous discourse are used.

The linguistic devices include:

   1. If
   2. When

2. Although if is a linguistic device which is unique to the domain of conditionality, the three communication strategies used are used in a similar way to those described by Meisel (1982). It would appear, then, that despite the learner's higher proficiency level, when conveying a meaning for which the target form-function correspondence has not yet been acquired, an intermediate learner uses some of the same strategies as a beginner learner. However, it is interesting to note that L does not use two of the strategies Meisel (1982) discusses; "contrasting two or more events" and "order of mention follows the natural order" (p.11-12). Presumably L's higher proficiency level permits her to use linguistic devices instead of these
strategies. Further research is needed to determine how communication strategies are used differently by different learners and in different contexts, and what role they play in the developmental stages of the interlanguage.

3. Regarding the third research question, on the basis of the data it would appear that L's difficulty with subordination leads her to use ellipted conditional utterances, rather than expressing the conditional relationship with the If/When clause and the main clause joined together. Moreover, on three occasions L used *if* in non-target contexts in place of a subordinator or a subordinate clause. It is possible that this use of *if* is a developmental stage in the process of acquiring the ability to subordinate. However, the occurrences of this phenomenon are far too few to suggest any interpretations.

The strategies used by L are clearly communication strategies. They assist L in conveying her message. Although communication strategies provide a means for learners to engage in discourse, they do not necessarily promote second language acquisition. Further research is needed to determine the differences between communication strategies and learning strategies.

A comparison of the total occurrences of the different types of conditionality expressed by L raises the further question of why the function of factual conditionality occurs so much more frequently than the other types of conditionality. One possible explanation is that the form-function correspondence for factual conditionality is more transparent than for the other types of conditionality and so is acquired before the others, and
that L is more comfortable expressing functions for which she has acquired the form-function correspondence. However, the data clearly shows that L is both able and willing to employ non-target-like linguistic devices and communication strategies to encode functions for which she has not yet acquired the form-function correspondence. Moreover, the nature of the topics of conversation was such that future, hypothetical, and counterfactual conditional utterances should have been elicited. A further possible explanation for this question is that there exists a universal acquisition order for functions, and that factual conditionality is acquired earlier than other types of conditionality. The limitations of this study do not permit the drawing of any conclusions concerning this possibility. However, further research of this nature including many more subjects, learners of different L1's learning different L2's, and the use of elicitation tasks should be able to address this issue.

Conclusion

Studying interlanguages through the means a learner uses to express functions yields a view of the development of both functions and forms. Further research of this type will enable researchers to ascertain whether there is a universal acquisition order for functions, whether functions precede form, or vice versa, and whether learners of different L1's and L2's encode semantic functions in similar ways. An additional area of research might investigate the relationships of learners'
proficiency levels with the communication strategies they employ.

The results of this study support the need for further research of this nature, consisting of longitudinal studies supplemented by cross-sectional studies. Determining how interlanguages change as they approach target languages should lead to conclusions concerning what learners actually do when they learn languages, and what the universal second language acquisition processes are.
Table 1

Standard English Conditional Form-Function Correspondences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Category</th>
<th>If/When Clause</th>
<th>Main Clause</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Factual</td>
<td>present present</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>When it rains, we get wet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>past past</td>
<td></td>
<td>When she cried, he cried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>present or past modal</td>
<td></td>
<td>If she called him, she must have known him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>present future</td>
<td></td>
<td>If it rains, you will get wet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Future</td>
<td>present modal</td>
<td></td>
<td>If they ask you, you should go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hypothetical</td>
<td>past modal</td>
<td></td>
<td>If they were here, we would know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Counterfactual</td>
<td>past perfect modal</td>
<td></td>
<td>If I had known, I would have told her.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Distribution of Conditional Relationships Expressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tape</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Complete Conditional</th>
<th>Ellipted Conditionals</th>
<th>Type of Conditional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If/When Clause</td>
<td>Main Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tape 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tape 2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tape 3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Strategies Used When Meaning Not Expressed In Utterance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tape</th>
<th>Previous Discourse of L</th>
<th>Previous Discourse of I</th>
<th>Extralinguistic Context</th>
<th>Implicit Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tape 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tape 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tape 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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