

AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF BILINGUAL COUPLES' COMMUNICATION

*Ingrid Piller*¹
Universität Hamburg, Germany

1. Introduction

The enormous success of titles like *You just don't understand* (Tannen, 1990), which according to the blurb was on the *New York Times* bestseller list for more than four years and has more than 1.5 million copies in print, or self-help book *Men are from Mars and Women are from Venus* (Gray, 1992) demonstrates that many people take an interest in intimate communication. As people's understanding of intimate relationships changes, spousal communication gains in importance. While in former times couples mainly came together to form an economic unit and to raise a family, today they tend to come together for "romantic" reasons, to share their free time and be friends. A "good spouse" is no longer just a good housekeeper, breadwinner, or sexual partner but a good communicator. According to Fitzpatrick (1990: 433), communication difficulties are the major cause of marital unhappiness and marital failure. A certain way of communicating and using language has thus become a constitutive factor in the make-up of a modern romantic relationship. This social change opens up a new area of investigation for linguistics: the way how language makes or breaks relationships (cf. Tannen, 1986).

One type of couples that has received particularly little scholarly attention are cross-cultural or bilingual couples. A bilingual couple is defined as one in which the spouses have different first languages. This is the more surprising as these couples are the smallest social unit in which language contact can occur. Although it has been argued that all communication between females and males is cross-cultural, and thus a locus of language contact, as both have their own gender-specific code (cf. e.g. Tannen, 1990), the focus of this study will be on different languages, English and German, and not different varieties of one language. To my mind, the biggest problem in such an endeavor is to obtain the data. So, in the following, I propose to give a brief overview over the various methods one might use to study language contact in the family, and I will look at some studies that have applied these methods. Then, I will go on to propose a research design of my own, and I will look briefly at the type of data this research design yields.

2. Methods in the study of intimate cross-cultural communication

The main reason why there are so few studies of the language of couples in general, and bilingual couples in particular, is probably the fact that by its very nature this type of language is not readily available for observation and investigation. Because of this difficulty a review of all the various possibilities available is indispensable. The following methods could be taken into consideration.

2.1. Census data

The interpretation of census data has the enormous advantage that it is basically the only method in which the size of the sample will allow observations that are statistically relevant. All other possibilities will never make it beyond a hundred respondents at the very best –most studies on the language usage of bilingual couples seem to involve between five and 30 respondents. This quantitative advantage is –as in all social research– set against the qualitative drawbacks of census data. They may not ask the right questions, they may not allow for scaled answers (“yes/no-possibilities”), and if they allow for answers of degree, the rating might be up to the respondent, respondents may over –or underreport, etc.². Even if these problems did not exist, the one or two questions in a census on language practices simply could not yield a full picture of the richness of communication practices in any type of social unit.

Census data have mainly been used in the Canadian context to study bilingual couples' communication patterns. One particularly prolific author in this type of demolinguistics is Castonguay (e.g. 1979, 1982). Using census data, he is able to study huge samples: Castonguay (1982: 266) presents in one single table information on the language practices of more than 400,000 bilingual couples. The drawback is that the information basis, i.e. the language practices investigated, cannot be but small: it relies exclusively on two census questions, the one on *mother tongue* (which was defined as “language first spoken and still understood”), and the one on *home language* (“what language do you most often speak at home now?”). He shows that a couple's linguistic environment will influence their language

¹ Seminar für Englische Sprache und Kultur, Universität Hamburg, Von-Melle-Park 6, D-20146 Hamburg; phone: +49-40-4123-4855, fax: +49-40-4123-4856; e-mail: fs7a001@rrz.uni-hamburg.de

² Cf. e.g. Fasold, 1984: 113ff, or Romaine, 1994: 36ff on the shortcomings of census data in sociolinguistic research.

choices as “the frequency of the French option declines more rapidly than that of bilingual behavior as distance from Quebec increases” (Castonguay, 1982: 266). Castonguay (1979: 405) shows that in most age groups the rate of shift towards English (from “mother tongue” to “home language”) is higher than the rate of intermarriage. Thus, a certain number of Francophones will shift whatever their marital situation.

2.2. Questionnaires

Like censuses, questionnaires have the advantage that they can, comparatively easy, be administered to large-size samples. And, unlike census data, the questions can be tailored to the particular research interest. All the problems of what to ask, and how to interpret answers still persist, though. Fasold (1984) compares self-reports on language usage to the weather forecast: sometimes it is right, sometimes it is wrong. All self-reports on language usage “are subject to variance in relation to factors such as prestige, ethnicity, political affiliation, etc.” (Romaine, 1994: 37).

A scholar using questionnaires in her study of the language practices of couples with a Dutch-speaking and an English-speaking partner in Australia is Pauwels (1985), who administered a language use questionnaire to 60 Dutch-born post-war (1945) migrants in Melbourne and elsewhere in Victoria. The sample consisted of three different groups: (G1) involving two Dutch-born partners, (G2) involving one Dutch and one Anglo-Australian partner, and (G3) involving one Dutch and one non-Anglo-Australian partner. The author was interested in the following four aspects:

- 1) Is there a systematic difference in the language maintenance rate among the three groups?
- 2) Which domains (areas of language use) are greatly affected by the marriage situation and which domains are not?
- 3) Are there sex- and age-related differences?
- 4) Are there significant differences with regards to language shift in the second generation due to the marital situation of the parents? (Pauwels, 1985: 4)

Her results show that Dutch is less well maintained in bilingual than in monolingual couples. Her most interesting finding in relation to bilingual couples is that no interviewees claimed to use one language exclusively with their spouse.

2.3. Recorded interviews

Interviews and interviews can be quite different research tools: they may have various forms, aims, and be used in various interpretations (cf. Briggs, 1996). As far as form is concerned the interview may be located somewhere on a scale between “questionnaire

administered by the researcher” and “unstructured, open-ended”. The interview may be conducted with one partner only, with one after the other, or with both simultaneously. Questions may either try to elicit direct self-reported information on the couple’s language usage, or they may address totally different topics and try to glean information about the couple’s language practices from the form of the interview and the language used later on. Furthermore, “hypothetical situations and communications [can be presented] as ‘given’” (Romaine, 1994: 44), and respondents can be interviewed about their interpretation of, or attitudes towards it (an approach used by Tannen, 1994: 175ff in her study of Greek/Anglo-American couples). The information obtained through interviews may be described as patterns for the whole sample, or as individual case studies, or as a combination of both.

As far as the use of this tool in the study of bilingual couples’ communication is concerned, the most noteworthy studies are those by Heller & Lévy (e.g. 1994; 1996). Although these studies, like the ones by Castonguay, focus on French-English couples in Canada, the approach is totally different. The study is based on interviews with 28 French-speaking Canadian women married to English-speaking Canadian men in three Ontario cities. The topics of the semi-structured and open-ended interviews concerned mainly the life of the interviewees: “leur scolarisation et celle de leurs enfants, leur emploi, leur vie familiale et sociale ainsi que leur utilisation du français et de l’anglais et celles de leurs mari et enfants” (Heller & Lévy, 1994: 57). On the basis of the interviews the respondents were placed into attitudinal groups. Then, the following factors were analyzed and put in relation to the attitudinal types: language choice in daily life, opinions about the usage of English and French, the notion of identity held by the interviewees, and the form of the interview discourse (i.e. code-switching, metaphorical expressions, or the characteristics of the French used).

2.4. Experimental studies

Experimental research designs are most commonly employed by students working in the tradition of the social psychology of language (cf. Auwärter, 1988)³. For the present purpose, one could, for instance, ask a bilingual couple to communicate for a certain time, possibly on a given topic, and to tape themselves as they do so. A study of this type is the one by Notarius & Johnson (1982), who were interested in marital communication about

emotions. They asked couples “to work toward a mutually satisfactory solution to a salient relationship issue” for thirty minutes while being videotaped. Boucher (1995) studied conflict talk between spouses in exactly the same way, only in this case the couple were asked to discuss “un thème conflictuel”. This research design obviously has the advantage of yielding real communication between the partners, while most of the other possibilities involve a certain amount of self-reporting. However, it has the disadvantage of being artificial and making subjects feel very self-conscious. Ethnographers of communication, who will only accept observation of naturally occurring conversations as valid data, generally deny the validity of experimental approaches. Nevertheless, the presence of an observer is in many social situations in a way “unnatural”, and in the case of the intimate dyad simply not feasible most of the time. And, as Tannen (1994: 130) argues in favor of experimental designs, a communication is natural to the situation in which it is produced. Thus, experiments elicit speech that is natural to the odd situation in which it is produced.

2.5. Ethnography of communication studies

Apart from the interview method in sociolinguistics, participant observation in the ethnographic tradition is another important method in the study of language in social groups. In our case, this would involve as much social contact with as many bilingual couples as possible, and observing, note-taking, taping... However, the extent to which a researcher can be a participant-observer in an intimate dyad is fairly limited. The ethnographic approach has mainly been used with the bilingual couples of the Tucanoan in the Vaupés region (cf. e.g. Grimes, 1985). The Tucanoan peoples, who live in the North West Amazon Basin in Brazil and Colombia, are of interest to linguists because these peoples have a strong taboo against endogamy, they have to choose a spouse from another group, and group membership is defined through the language one speaks. Thus, all the couples in the area are bilingual.

Husband and wife each speaks his or her own language to the other. Each understands the language of his or her spouse, but does not speak it except in circumstances where it is necessary in order to communicate with other people who do not understand the primary language. A child becomes fluent in the language of both parents, yet considers his father’s language to be his own (Grimes, 1985: 391).

³ Role-play, which is also frequently used in the study of cross-cultural communication (cf. e.g. Clyne, 1994: 17ff), can be regarded as a particular type of experimental setting.

Couples maintain dual-linguality throughout their lives, and the language maintenance of the indigenous languages is a lot better than in many other comparable communities around the globe (cf. Holmes, 1992: 88).

2.6. Fictional sources

One further possibility that recommends itself by the comparatively easy availability of the data is the study of bilingual couples in fiction. Leisi (1993), for instance, gets most of his information on the language of couples from literature. Of course, there is no way around the fact that fiction is not “the real life” –but it offers something that is in a way even better than “the real life”: the models of reality.

[...] artificial dialog may represent an internalized model or schema for the production of conversation - a competence model that speakers have access to. If, then, we are interested in discovering the ideal model of conversational strategy, there is much to be gained by looking at artificial conversation first, to see what these general, unconsciously-adhered-to assumptions are; and later returning to natural conversation to see how they might actually be exemplified in literal use (Tannen, 1994: 139).

Literary discourse does not represent reality but speakers may derive some of their communicative competence from it. This may even be more so as far as “love talk” is concerned, which is often said to contain a certain amount of re-enactment of literary models anyway (cf. e.g. Leisi, 1993: 74ff).

3. Research design

It has become clear that each approach represents a certain trade-off, and while a combination of as many methods as possible might yield the richest information, the data and their collection should also be kept within manageable limits. This is the compromise between these conflicting demands I have come up with: the first part of the research is a study into the ways how the communication of bilingual couples is represented in fiction. Based on the issues emerging as “models” and also on the issues that have already been addressed in comparable research a one-page “discussion paper” was developed in German and English. This paper has been given to German-English couples who are willing to spend some time discussing the issues addressed in it, and tape themselves as they do so. The rationale for this design is that it should, on the one hand, elicit self-reported information on the couple’s language practices like in a semi-structured interview, but on the other hand, really yield samples of couple talk without the presence of a researcher. Although the design is experimental, it is “not too unnatural” as the couple has the choice of the setting. All the

participants have also been asked to fill in a short demographic questionnaire on rather unambiguous variables such as age, education, or occupation so that the results can be related to the analyses of the tapes.

3.1. The “discussion paper”

The discussion paper serves participating couples as a basis for the discussions which they are to self-record. Both, the questionnaire and the discussion paper, have been prepared in English and German to give the couples the choice of their preferred language. However, I have only routinely sent out the English version, offering the possibility to request the German one. So far, no one has asked for it. Altogether the discussion paper consists of 23 questions in four sections: language usage and skills (8 questions), language and culture (5 questions), language and identity (4 questions), perceived and self-reported attitudes towards bilingual and binational couples, and their children (6 questions). The questions are not numbered but presented as a running text with four paragraphs. In the following they are numbered for ease of reference.

The questions on language usage and skills are the following:

1. As a bilingual couple, which language do you usually speak together?
2. Under which circumstances do you use another language?
3. Has your language use changed in the course of your relationship?
4. How well do you speak each other's language?
5. How did you learn it?
6. Do you speak other languages, and do they play a role in your relationship?
7. What do you think about each other's slang and dialect?
8. Have you created something like a “private language” for yourselves?

The questions on language and culture are the following:

1. Does the fact that you are a bilingual and cross-cultural couple influence your relationship?
2. How?
3. Do you have some stories to show that it is good fun to have different languages and cultures?
4. Do you have some stories to show that having different languages and cultures can be quite frustrating?
5. Which cultural traits of each other do you really like or really hate?

The questions on language and identity are the following:

1. It has been said that “one's language is one's inheritance and one's secret code”. Has your relationship affected your sense of identity?
2. How?
3. How do you feel about English, German, or other languages and cultures?
4. What do you really hate or love about Britain, Germany, the US or any other country?

The questions on perceived and self-reported attitudes towards bilingual and binational couples, and their children are the following:

1. Do you have any stories about official institutions and how they deal with bilingual and binational couples?
2. What do your families and friends think about your relationship?
3. Do you have some stories about their reactions?
4. Are you passing on both languages and cultures to your children?
5. Why, or why not?
6. How does it work?

3.2. The sample/informants

After I had “tried out” the proposed method in a pre-study with two couples, who are personal friends, I started advertising for my research in various bilingual interest publications in June this year. The sample is thus being drawn on a voluntary, self-select basis from bilingual couples who can be reached through advertisements in bilingual interest publications, radio shows, or internet sites. I have been intending to enlist a sample of about 30 couples. Half of them should live in a German-speaking community, and the other half in an English-speaking community. So far, about 150 couples have responded and asked for the materials (information sheet, discussion sheet, questionnaires, tape), and 18 tapes have been returned to me. Eight wives returned only the questionnaire because their husbands refused to participate in a taped conversation of this type.

4. Analysis

In the following I will look briefly at only one single conversation in my corpus to introduce you to the type of data I am getting. This is the tape of Christine⁴ (32) and Brendan (34), who live in A-Stadt, a medium-sized city (100,000 - 500,000 inhabitants) in Lower Saxony with a large British army base. They met 14 years ago in another German town nearby. Since then they have lived wherever Brendan’s military service took them: the south of England, where they plan to settle down for good sometime in the future, Northern Ireland, where Brendan originally came from, Cyprus, and Germany. Brendan works as an army policeman, and Christine as a shop assistant. Both completed ten years of formal schooling. They have got two daughters, Barbara and Angela. Due to Brendan’s military service they live in a largely English-speaking environment, even while in Germany, and the two daughters attend English-medium schools.

⁴ All the names are pseudonyms.

4.1. Referential content

In turns 1-21, Brendan and Christine address the questions on language usage and skills. They report that their common language is English, the language they use on the tape. Although they live in Germany, as a military policeman Brendan needs little German for his work. What he needs for his work, he has learnt. Christine, on the other hand, speaks German at her work place and to her two daughters. That this self-reported information is correct is supported by an aside when Christine tells one of her daughters to open the door in German. Brendan dislikes German because he finds it a harsh language, and because there are too many synonyms.

In turns 22-73, addressing the questions on language and culture, Brendan mainly reports negative feelings about German culture because of the language, the bureaucracy, and the lack of neighborliness. Nevertheless, he also tries to come up with some positive aspects like the New Year Celebration, the roads, the North Sea Coast, and the Black Forest. He finds that the quality of the roads and the work ethic is really a thing of the past, though. The fact that the only story told about the fun of a bilingual relationship is set in England, while all the frustrating ones are set in Germany supports the self-reports of likes and dislikes as far as the two countries are concerned.

In turns 74-120, addressing the questions on language and identity, Christine reports feelings of alienation from German culture for two reasons: for one thing, Brendan doesn't like to join her with her friends and family as he doesn't understand enough not to get bored during family gatherings. On the other hand, other Germans regard her as an outsider (81).

- 81 Christine I was always proud to be a German. and when I was abroad it's always nice to say, yes! I am German. I am different. but- uh and I always look forward to coming back to England. but I think over the years, over fourteen years, living with the British communities uhm I can't consider myself German anymore. now, having German colleagues at work. and I can see a big difference. I am not one of them anymore. they actually call me Chris. the English woman. {laughs}

While she reports feelings of alienation from the German part of her identity, she feels extremely positive about England.

In turns 120-198, addressing the last set of questions on the discussion paper, they narrate stories of difficulties they have encountered with institutions such as the German embassy in London, and a local bank because they are a binational couple. They also tell stories about their families' initial lack of enthusiasm for their union, and how they have been won over. They try to bring up their children bilingually by using the "one person, one

language approach” (cf. Edwards, 1994: 62) in spite of educators who advised them to drop German for the children’s sake. Their reason for doing so is the fear that the children might be discriminated against in either country if they didn’t speak the language fluently. The method is only partly successful as the daughters understand German but refuse to use it.

4.2. Formal aspects of the taped conversation

The conversation lasts 27 minutes, during which time 5,126 words are being uttered. This count is computer generated and based on the definition “anything between two spaces”. This, obviously, results in the inclusion of hesitation markers such as *uh* and *hm*, back channeling behavior such as *aha* or *yeah*, and false starts. Of these 5,126 words, 3,254 are uttered by Brendan, who clearly dominates the conversation, and 1,872 by Christine. The longest turn is 158, when Brendan talks about the importance of knowing a number of languages in modern Europe. To support this, he tells of his experiences of being discriminated against in service encounters in Germany because he doesn’t speak the language fluently.

158 Brendan =it’s important to speak all the languages possible. there are occasions, and I’m sure it happens when uhm Germans go to the UK, or England, or whatever. where you go into a shop or something of that kind in Germany, and when you try to speak a little bit of German. and they realize obviously that you are not German but that you are English in fact. they are sometimes reluctant to deal with you ... and tend to ignore you. it’s not always the case, but it gives me a bad feeling when that occurs. cos, again this is from where I was brought up, and my background uh if I was asked to help out or do something, then I would do as much as possible. if I couldn’t, then I’d explain why, and leave it at that. I suppose the language barrier is the problem. that’s why it happens. /????/

To single out the longest utterance(s) is not only interesting for the sake of counting. Rather, the length of an utterance may be an indicator of the speaker’s involvement, defined as “an internal, even emotional connection individuals feel which binds them to other people as well as to places, things, activities, ideas, memories, and words” (Tannen, 1989: 12). On the basis of utterance length, discrimination against non-native speakers, and bilingual education can be identified as topics Brendan and Christine are particularly involved with.

Basically, their whole conversation is in English, the language they report as their everyday language. Brendan’s English has some features of a Tyrone accent (cf. Gramley & Pätzold, 1992: 322f) such as rhoticity, lack of dark [ɣ], some glottalization of voiceless stops before sonorants, some leveling of vowel length, and the merger of /a:/ and /æ/. There are no special grammatical markers, and the only local lexical item is *jocks* in 16:

- 16 Brendan =German dialect which I use occasionally, too ... tell people off, uh some German language- the German language I find is a very harsh language! it's not uh a soft language. you need to be like the old jocks to learn it. you know. it's a rough language uh it has been difficult. but it shouldn't be difficult for me? from my background. coming from a Cel- [sel-], a Celtic [keltɪk] background.

The pronunciation of *Celtic* in this utterance is also noteworthy as he starts out with the local Scottish or Northern Irish pronunciation [sel-], but corrects himself, and then uses the form that is standard in England and Wales (cf. Wells, 1990 s.v. "Celt" and "Celtic"). Christine actually reports this convergence towards standard English as a general process in his language, and as an effect of their adaptation towards each other. Christine's English is native-like although she retains a slight German accent in rhythm and intonation. Brendan relates his wife's high level of proficiency in English to the length of their relationship. Shortly after their marriage she enrolled in an English evening class and passed the GCSE English exam.

Although most of the conversation is in English, some switches to German occur when they talk about Brendan's imperfect attempts at using German, when a German institution is referred to, or when Christine quotes herself as talking to their daughters. One switch is particularly interesting as it supports Christine's self-report about her using German to her daughters consistently. Labov (1966) noted that he got less formal, or "more natural" registers from his informants when their attention was drawn away from the interview situation towards another event. The same happens during this switch: the ringing of the doorbell temporarily draws Christine's attention out of the taping situation. The fact that she uses German in this situation "with her guards down" supports her self-report.

Further formal aspects of my data that will be investigated are conversational style. The overlaps, the latching, the back channeling behavior, the use of repetition, the use of personal pronouns, the use of metaphorical expressions, the expressions of consent and solidarity that occur in Brendan's and Christine's conversation identify them both as cooperative conversationalists, who are highly involved with each other and the topics they talk about; Christine even more so than Brendan. They sometimes say exactly the same thing at the same time, and enjoy the rapport derived from knowing what the partner will say in advance, as in 135-137.

- 135 Christine shocked! but=
 136 Brendan you know, shocked but ...
 she didn't say anything. {laughs}
 137 Christine she didn't say anything. {laughs}

5. Conclusion

This paper starts out with the reasons why the language practices of bilingual couples should be investigated. As a major problem in studying couple talk is the availability of the data and the nature of the data that can be obtained through various methods, the article then goes on to list the various sociolinguistic methods that could be used, and looks at some of the studies of bilingual couples' communication using this or that method. Then, an experimental approach that combines a number of methods is proposed, and one set of data obtained with that method is discussed. The couple whose conversation is discussed use English with each other although they live in Germany. However, as they are affiliated with the British army, it could be argued that they still use the community language. Their conversation demonstrates clearly that their choice of English is not only a result of the pressure of the majority language but also of their feelings towards the various communities. While both have been discriminated against in Germany, they both love England, and the husband also Northern Ireland. The couple's language choice is clearly influenced by the behavior of the two language communities towards them as a cross-cultural couple, and how they feel about the two language communities.

References

- Auwärter, M. (1988), "Das Experiment in der Soziolinguistik", in U. Ammon (ed.), *Sociolinguistics: An international handbook of the science of language and society*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 922-31.
- Boucher, C. (1995), "Développement et évaluation d'un nouveau système d'analyse des interactions verbales pour les couples", *Dissertation Abstracts International* 55(8), 3634-B.
- Briggs, C.L. (1996), "Interviewing", in H. Goebel (ed.), *Kontaktlinguistik: ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 744-50.
- Castonguay, C. (1979), "L'Exogamie Précoce et la Prévision des Taux de Transfert Linguistique", *Recherches Sociographiques* 20(3), 403-08.
- ___ (1982), "Intermarriage and Language Shift in Canada, 1971 and 1976", *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 7(3), 263-77.
- Clyne, M. (1994), *Inter-cultural communication at work*, Cambridge, CUP.
- Coates, J. (1996), *Women Talk. Conversation Between Women Friends*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Edwards, J. (1994), *Multilingualism*, London, Penguin.
- Fasold, R. (1984), *The Sociolinguistics of Society*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- Fitzpatrick, M.A. (1990), "Models of Marital Interaction", in H. Giles, W.P. Robinson (eds.), *Handbook of Language and Social Psychology*, Chichester, John Wiley, 433-50.

- Grämley, S., K.-M. Pätzold (1992), *A Survey of Modern English*, London, Routledge.
- Gray, J. (1992), *Men Are from Mars, Women Are from Venus: A Practical Guide for Improving Communication and Getting What You Want in Your Relationships*, New York, HarperCollins.
- Grimes, B.F. (1985), "Language Attitudes: Identity, Distinctiveness, Survival in the Vaupes", *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 6(5), 389-401.
- Heller, M., L. Lévy (1994), "Les contradictions des mariages linguistiquement mixtes: stratégies des femmes Franco-Ontariennes", *Langage et Société* 67, 53-88.
- ___ (1996), "Petit groupe II: Le couple", in H. Goebel (ed.), *Kontaktlinguistik: ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 385-91.
- Holmes, J. (1992), *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, London, Longman.
- Labov, W. (1966), *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*, Washington, Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Leisi, E. (1993), *Paar und Sprache. Linguistische Aspekte der Zweierbeziehung* (4th edition), Heidelberg, Quelle & Meyer.
- Notarius, C.I., J.S. Johnson (1982), "Emotional expression in husbands and wives", *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 44, 483-89.
- Pauwels, A. (1985), "The effect of exogamy on language maintenance in the Dutch-speaking community in Australia", *ITL Review of Applied Linguistics* 66, 1-24.
- Stubbs, M. (1996), *Text and Corpus Analysis*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Tannen, D. (1986), *That's Not What I Meant. How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Relationships*, New York, Ballantine.
- ___ (1990), *You Just Don't Understand. Women and Men in Conversation*, New York, Ballantine.
- ___ (1994), *Gender and Discourse*, Oxford, OUP.
- ___ (1989), *Talking Voices. Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*, Cambridge, CUP.
- Wells, J.C. (1990), *Longman Pronunciation Dictionary*, Harlow, Longman.