Heike Havermeier (Göteborg)

The multiple tasks of noun insertion: Definiteness and Gender Allocation in German-Swedish Codeswitching

1 Introduction

It is a commonly reported fact that, in every speech contact situation, the most frequent speech contact phenomena are insertions of single foreign words into speech formulated in the other language, and that among these foreign words, the most common type are nouns (see e.g. Eisenberg, 2011:28, Gardner-Chloros, 2009:30, Matras, 2009:133, Myers-Scotton, 2002:240). This article does not contradict the frequency of the phenomenon, but contradicts some claims concerning the reasons for the frequency of noun insertion, and concerning its degree of difficulty.

On the one hand, there are clear, content-related reasons for adopting foreign nouns. As summarized by Matras:

> The high borrowability of nouns is thus primarily a product of their referential functions: nouns cover the most differentiated domain for labeling concepts, objects, and roles. This includes industrial and agricultural products, artifacts, institutions and institutional agents, procedures, conceptual innovations, as well as technical innovations and instruments. It is not a coincidence that institutional, social and technical innovations are often expressed by loanwords in the language of cultures that absorb foreign influences. (Matras, 2009:168)

On the other hand, it has also been suggested that, in addition to the content-aspect, the codeswitching (or borrowing)[1] of nouns is especially simple due to their form. Aitchison for example argues that nouns are subject to fewer syntactic restrictions than other word classes, especially verbs (Aitchison, 2000:62); Myers-Scotton states that they bear the least syntactical and morphological "baggage" (Myers-Scotton, 2002: 76). Based on this, Gardner-Chloros draws the conclusion that a speaker would need only a very low bilingual competence to produce codeswitching in the form of noun insertion (Gardner-Chloros, 2009: 30).

All these arguments might be convincing when nouns are compared with certain other word classes, in particular verbs. However, it is not always correct that nouns can be switched or borrowed without morphological operations and the problems associated with those. In many languages, nouns are subject to inflection. In order to transfer one inflected element from one language into another, a speaker would need a relatively high competence in both languages, especially in the one into which the noun is inserted. This is the case when codeswitching between Swedish and German.

---

[1] In this article, the term *codeswitching* is used as a generic term for any case in which lexical matter from two different languages is used in the same text or conversation, as it is defined by e.g. Gardner-Chloros (2009: 13) and Myers-Scotton (2002: 22). The distinction between *codeswitching* and *borrowing*, made in other traditions (e.g. Poplack, 1980, Poplack & Sankoff, 1988) does not contribute anything to the study presented here, therefore it can be ignored. The more important point is to distinguish between spontaneous codeswitching and loan words. Loanwords have got a consistent inflection in the receiving language and are an integral part of that language. In that case, a speaker (bilingual or not) does not have to face any of the difficulties described in this article.

1.1 The determiner systems in Swedish and in German

German and Swedish are closely related languages, which should facilitate codeswitching. However, they differ considerably when it comes to noun inflection. In German, noun inflection consists mainly of plural inflection and minor case inflection. In Swedish, there is also plural inflection, even less case inflection[2], and determiner inflection. This means that the definite article is expressed by a noun suffix, which is a characteristic feature of the Northern Germanic languages (cf. Viberg, 2006: 5). Definite article words exist as well, but are only used as a complement to the definiteness suffix in certain syntactical circumstances, mostly dependent on attributes attached to the noun (cf. Teleman, Hellberg & Andersson, 1999: 96 and 301). In this case, the result is a double definite marking, or even a multiple marking, since even attached adjective will appear in their definite form. In German (as in English), all determiners, the definite article included, are free grammatical morphemes, i.e. independent words that occur to the left of their nouns (cf. Eisenberg, 2009: 138f). The two systems are illustrated in Example 1.

Exampel 1[3]:

	a/one horse,	the horse		
German:	*ein Pferd*	*das Pferd*		
Swedish:	*en häst*	*häst-en*	*den*	*häst-en*
		horse.DET	this (very) horse.DET/	
			the ATTR horse.DET	

Thus, a bilingual speaker faces already two tasks when (s)he wants to insert a noun from one language into the other. First, if the noun is in the plural or needs a specific case form, (s)he has to decide whether to use grammatical morphemes from the noun's original language or to combine the noun with grammatical morphemes from the base language. Second, if the noun phrase is supposed to include a determiner, a decision has to be made whether this determiner follows the German or the Swedish system. In fact, there are two additional options: Both systems can be combined resulting in a double definite marking construction[4] or the noun can be used as a "bare form" without any article.

To complete the multiple tasks of noun insertion, both German and Swedish nouns have gender, necessarily expressed by the determiner. When a borrowed noun receives a determiner from the surrounding language, it automatically receives a gender in this language. This holds not only when the determiner is a definite article, but also when it is an indefinite article, a possessive article or a similar element. The gender decision can only be avoided in the plural, since neither German nor Swedish expresses gender in plural forms. As a result, the speaker has to fit the noun into a new gender system. Even though both languages have gender, they have different categories. While German differentiates between feminine, masculine and neuter nouns, Swedish differentiates only between common and neuter ones.

1.2. Previous research

The multiple tasks of noun insertion in the Germanic languages constitute a relatively unexplored area of research within contact linguistics. Boyd (1997) mentions it very briefly in connection with Swedish-English codeswitching. This language constellation confronts

---

[2] It is controversial whether or not the Swedish genitive can be described as a case at all, or rather as a clitic (see Delsing, 1993: 150f, Norde, 2001). I will not go further into this discussion since the aspect is not relevant for the analysis presented here. Anyhow, the genitive marker is a bound morpheme attached to nouns.

[3] An explanation of the abbreviations in the glossed lines can be found at the end of this paper, as well as an explanations of the signs for non- and paraverbal elements in the subsequent transcripts.

[4] In example 1, the result would be *das hästen*.

the speakers with the same decision between bound morpheme determiner and free morpheme determiner (Boyd, 1997:270). However, the question of grammatical gender is not discussed in Boyd's study.

Another study on codeswitching involving the same conflict is Kühl's (2008) work on the language constellation German and Danish. In Danish, nouns are marked as definite with an article suffix or with an article word. Like in Swedish, these free article words are restricted to special syntactic circumstances, but other than in Swedish, the two articles forms are never combined to a double article in monolingual Danish. Kühl's study concerns codeswitching among teenagers in the German-Danish bilingual boundary region and shows that these speakers avoid the determiner suffix by using article words instead. What appears to be a tendency towards the German system does, however, not necessarily mean that the articles themselves are German. The use of Danish article words increases even in circumstances in which it would not be acceptable in monolingual Danish (Kühl, 2008:113). In other words, the noun insertion leads to convergence of the two grammatical systems in the language use of the German-Danish teenagers (Kühl, 2008: 98). Regarding gender allocation, Kühl describes that the gender is derived from the German equivalent when Danish nouns are inserted into German (Kühl, 2008:114).

1.3. Research questions

This article presents a case study based on a corpus of conversations in bilingual German-Swedish workplaces in Sweden which was compiled in connection with a PhD-project (Havermeier 2015). Professional bilingual academics were chosen as the research subject because they form a relatively homogeneous community. In other professional categories with large amount of German immigrants, e.g. the health sector or engineers, there is a greater range of bilingual competence.

The study focuses on the question of whether bilingual speakers solve the task of noun insertion spontaneously and individually or if there are general patterns that govern the choices. If there are such patterns, an interesting question concerns whether these are generated by the language systems or whether they are associated with practices established in specific speaker communities.

2 The research material

The analysis is based a corpus consisting of approximately 30 hours of German-Swedish conversations, which was compiled in the context of a dissertation project on multilingual practices in academic working contexts (Havermeier 2015). All informants hold degrees in German and have typically spent some time working or studying in German-speaking countries, but now live and work in Sweden. Most of them are expatriates from Germany or Austria, but there are also Swedish L1-speakers among them. This means that the informants are L2-speakers of one of the languages, but are functional multilinguals, since both German and Swedish are frequently used in their working environments and they are fluent in both languages. As a research subject, this community has the advantage of being very homogeneous in regards to linguistic competence.

The recordings in the corpus conclude different communicative situations of the informants' everyday working life, including administrative meetings, academic seminars and workshops, classes, consultative conversations with students, and socializing conversations during the lunch or coffee break.

In this corpus, there are 402 instances of German and Swedish nouns inserted into speech otherwise formulated in the other language. In 127 of these instances, the nouns are accomplished by articles, of which 101 are definite articles realized as article words or as suffixes.

3 The choice of inflection morphemes

In a first step of analysis, the inserted nouns were examined with regard to which inflection morphemes are combined with them, those of their original language (becoming the embedded language) or those of the language they are inserted into (becoming the matrix language). The terms *embedded language* and *matrix language* were originally introduced by Myers-Scotton (1993, 2002), in the context of the Matrix Language Frame Modell. According to this model, in codeswitching there is always one languages providing the syntactical frame for an utterance, while the other one can only contribute with content morphemes (cf. Myers-Scotton 2002: 15f and 90). However, the terms have become wider spread in contact linguistics, and are used even by authors who do not agree with the MLF-model on the whole, since it is not accurate for all instances of bilingual speech (e. g. Muysken, 2000: 3 and 64). The model provides a terminology highly suitable to describe speech in which items from one language actually are embedded in utterances that otherwise are formulated in another language. In this sense, *matrix language* and *embedded language* are even used in this paper, even though my findings often are in contrary with Myers-Scottons' prediction about which language can provide grammatical morphemes, as it will be shown below.

The results of the corpus analysis are presented in table 1. As it shows, the inflectional morphemes are normally chosen from the same language as the inserted lexemes. This does not only hold for nouns, but also for other inflectable inserted words in the corpus, i.e. adjectives and verbs. The fact that nouns and adjectives are not combined with any inflection morphemes at all in a majority of the instances does not mean that those instances are irregular bare forms, but that the demanded form is identical with the base form of the lexeme. This is common in many syntactical contexts in both languages.

Table 1: Inflection morphemes used with insertions of inflectable words

	Total		Nouns		Adjectives		Verbs	
no inflection	393	70,6 %	328	81,6 %	65	61,3 %	0	0,0 %
inflection according to matrix language	3	0,5 %	1	0,2 %	1	0,9 %	1	2,0 %
inflection according to embedded language	144	25,9 %	71	17,7 %	27	25,5 %	46	93,9 %
not determinable[5]	17	3,1 %	2	0,5 %	13	12,3 %	2	4,1 %
Total	557	100,0 %	402	100,0 %	106	100,0 %	49	100,0 %

Thus, the first task in noun insertion, the choice of bound morphemes for numerus and case marking, is solved quite consistently by the speakers. The data suggests that there is a practice in the examined speech community not to combine inserted lexemes with grammatical morphemes of the other system. However, this does not hold for articles.

4 The choice of articles

As mentioned above, there are different possible ways to realize an article when inserting Swedish nouns into German and vice versa into e definite noun phrase:
1) Follow the surrounding language (allocate a matrix language article)
2) Follow the embedded language (codeswitch the whole noun phrase)
3) Combine both systems (double definite marking)
4) Insert a bare form
5) Convergence, i.e. development of a new system (as described e.g. by Kühl 2008).

---

[5] Due to breakoffs or homophone suffixes in both languages.

In the corpus, examples of the first three patterns can be found. Examples 2, 3 and 4 are quotes from the corpus in which speakers incorporate Swedish nouns (marked in italic letters here and in the following examples) into otherwise German utterances. In the first utterance, the Swedish noun *pentry* has got a German definite article. In contrast, *vetenskapsråd* appears without a German article, but with a Swedish determiner suffix[6]. Finally, in example 4 the same noun, *vetenskapsråd,* is furnished with both a Swedish and a German determiner, the latter appearing as a clitic together with the preposition *von*.

Ex. 2: und da kannste servIERen. danach. in der *pentry* da.
and   then can.2SG=youSG   serve   afterwards   in   the   *kitchen*   there
'Then you can serve in the *staff kitchen* there [on that floor] afterwards.'

Ex. 3: also *vetenskapsrådet* wenn man sich da bewirbt
well   *research council.DET*   if   one   REFL   there   apply.3SG
'Well, *the research council*, if you apply there'

Ex. 4: es gibt so neue Richtlinien vom *vetenskapsrådet*
there are   such   new   guidelines   from=the   *research council.DET*
'There are some new guidelines brought out by the *Research Council*.'

The first two realizations are the most common ones in the corpus, appearing in 44 % and 50% of all definite nouns phrases. In only 6 %, the nouns are supplemented by determiners from both systems, building a double article. Bare forms, which means constructions in which inserted nouns contrarily to the rules stand without any article, are not found in this corpus. All examples of nouns occurring without any article are explainable by the rules of one or both of the involved languages. Hence, the speakers do not avoid the decision for one system by using a form without an article. Neither do they develop a convergent system, e.g. by using Swedish article words that are used in violation of the rules of monolingual Swedish grammar. Not either do they only use one system, such as for case und numerus marking, where only embedded language morphemes are common.

This leads to the question why the speakers choose a particular system in the different utterances. As shown by the examples 3 and 4, the embedding does not seem to be related to specific lexemes. Nevertheless, it was assumed that there are regularities that govern the choice of one of the constructions. The insertions were therefore tested regarding to factors that might influence the article realization.

The first factor that was tested is the L1 of the respective speaker. It could be suspected that speakers might prefer the system of their first language or may be especially careful when dealing with lexemes from a foreign language. However, the analysis shows that this is not the case. Table 2 presents an overview about the article choise in definite noun phrases containing noun insertion.

Table 2: Article realization in relation to the speaker's L1

	Article system in accordance with L1		Article system not in accordance with L1		Double article		Total	
L1 German	40	47,6 %	40	47,6 %	4	4,8 %	84	100,0 %
L1 Swedish	10	58,8 %	6	35,3 %	1	5,9 %	17	100,0 %
Total	50	49,5 %	46	45,5 %	5	5,0 %	101	100,0 %

---

[6] In this case, the suffix is *-et* and not *-en* because the noun in question is a neuter, whereas *häst* in example 1 is common gender (see also section 5).

The relation between article use according to the L1 and according to the respective other language is nearly balanced. Among the Swedish L1-speakers, there is a slight tendency towards the L1, but it is clearly not strong enough to explain the findings in the corpus. Thus, individual and L1-related factors are not decisive for the choice of the article system.

Three further factors were tested. One is the motivation for the use of a second language in the conversation, or for this specific language. Nouns that are inserted due to different causes and purposes might be integrated differently. The next factor is the communicative situation in which the utterance is made. As described in chapter 2, the corpus contains different types of conversations that are typical for the informants' working life. In these different communicative situations, the informants fulfill different social roles, e.g. as teachers in classes and consultative meetings, as researchers in seminars and conference talks, or as workmates in casual socializing conversations. Previous research has shown that social roles influence linguistic behavior such as codeswitching (see Matras, 2009:114f, Meyerhoff, 2002:539). Therefore, it might also influence their choice regarding the determiner system. Another factor that was tested is the syntactic integration of the respective noun phrase. There might be differences depending on whether or not the phrase is a constituent of a clause, and which constituent it is.

The results of the analysis are shown in table 3.

Table 3: Correlation between definite article realization and mastication, communicative situation, and syntactical factors

	Article according to surrounding language	Article according to embedded language	Double article
Motivation for codeswitching[7]			
linguistic domain	32	21	5
metalinguistic	3	23	0
other	8	14	0
Communicative situation			
teaching	10	26	2
administrative	22	13	2
academic/research related	6	8	0
socializing	5	5	1
student consultation	0	1	0
Syntactic position of the NP			
prepositional phrase	26	19	4
clause constituent	14	6	1
syntactically independent	3	28	0

As the table shows, none of the factors entails a clear decision for one of the constructions, but still, there are obvious tendencies. In regards to the motivation for the use of a second language, there is a tendency to insert the whole noun phrase, i.e. to also realize the determiner in the embedded language, when the noun is inserted due to metalinguistic purposes. This motivation is exceptionally frequent in the corpus, which is caused by the communicational context: Talking about linguistic items and about texts is an essential part of bot linguists' and literary scholars' work.

An opposite, but less distinct tendency becomes visible when the noun is inserted because its referent belongs to a domain associated with a specific language. As in most speaker communities (see Matras' 2009 quote in the introduction of this paper), this is the most frequent cause for noun insertion in general. The expressions are chosen because

---

[7] Multiple classifications possible.

the speakers got to know their referents in a context where only one of the languages is spoken. As a result, the speaker associates them with the expressions used in that context. The involved lexemes can be names for holidays, food etc. that are typical of one of the country. A domain that is very specific for this community is entities that belong to the university organization or to working world in general. In this community, this is a Swedish domain, because most of the speakers were still students when emigrating from or living in German speaking countries. As a result, they did not talk much about neither faculty councils and similar committees, nor about scheduling meetings or maintaining copiers. These are topics that became relevant to them when they became employees in Sweden.

When the data is assorted according to communicative situations, the tendencies are even less distinct. In teaching situations, there is a tendency towards embedded language articles. This is related to the motivations for the codeswitching. In this situation, metalinguistic explanations account for a disproportionately large number of the insertions. When talking to language learners, nouns that are subject to metalinguistic explanations are often mentioned together with their original articles. This has the advantage that the learners even get information about the gender. An example of this can be seen in example 5. In this classroom conversation, the professor explains the relation between the German word *Gesellschaft* (which can mean both 'society' and 'company') and the Swedish words *samhälle,* meaning 'society', and *sällskap,* menaing 'company'.

> Ex. 5: das ist das wort hier. *samhället.* die gesellschaft.
> that   is   the   word   here   *society.DET*   the   society
> 'What you mean is this word over there. *The society*. The society.'

Furthermore, the embedded language determiner often occurs when the codeswitching is used as a scaffolding technique. *Scaffolding* means that language teachers repeat important and possibly unknown words in their own speech in a language that the learners are more familiar with (see e.g. Kirkebæk, 2013:152). This technique can be seen in example 6.

> Ex. 6: ne beschwerde (-) *klagan* ne? sich beSCHWEren. ein wichtiges
> a   complaint   complaint.DET right   REFL   complain   a   important
> Wort auch.
> word   also
> 'A complaint. *Complaint,* right? To complain is an important word as well.'

However, even in teaching situations, noun phrases with embedded language articles, and even double articles, are built when the motivation for the individual codeswitching is not related to metalinguistic explanations or scaffolding. Thus, the role of being a teacher does not affect the determiner pattern directly but only indirectly. This is confirmed by the fact that there is not preference for one article system in social situations where no motivation for codeswitching is considerably typical, e.g. socializing.

As for the syntactic position of the noun phrase, there is a more distinct pattern: if the nouns are not integrated into a clause or prepositional phrase, they tend to take the article from their original language. When they are embedded into a larger syntactic construction, the language of this construction also tends to provide the article system. An explanation for this could be that noun phrases which are part of a syntactic structure, such as a prepositional phrase or a clause, are morphosyntactically dependent on either the preposition or the finite verb[8]. This dependency also determines the case of the noun phrase, both in German and in Swedish, even though case is only visible in personal

---

[8] Examples for noun phrases which are not part of a clause will be discussed in 3.2.

pronouns in the latter. Double articles occur only in syntactically depended positions, and most considerably often in prepositional phrases.

In summary, even if there are no distinct rules for solving the task of definite marking of noun insertion, there are circumstances that make it more likely that an inserted noun appears together with an embedded language article or an matrix language article. Considering the tested factors, it is explainable why the speaker has chosen a specific article realization in individual utterances in the corpus. This will be illustrated with corpus examples in the following:

4.1 Allocating a matrix language article

In the conversion in which example 2 appears, two colleagues are planning a little celebration after a final examination. The Swedish noun *pentry* ('kitchenette, staff kitchen') is allocated a German definite article. In example 7, a professor is explaining the rules for the final oral examination to the examinee. In this utterance, the Swedish noun *betygsnämnd* ('grading committee') is marked as definite with a German article[9].

Ex. 2: und da kannste servIERen. danach. in der *pentry* da.
      and then can.2Sg.=zouSG serve afterwards in the *kitchen* there
      'Then you can serve in the *staff kitchen* there [on that floor] afterwards.'

Ex. 7: aus dem *betygsnämnd* muss EINer *examinator* sein.
      From the g*rading committee* must one *examiner* be
      'One from the *grading committee* has to be the *examiner*.'

Both 2 and 7 are typical examples for noun insertions that are combined with a matrix language article. The utterances share a number of characteristics. To begin with, the occurrence of Swedish in otherwise German conversations has the same reason. The Swedish expressions denote entities that belong to Swedish domains in these speakers' life. As described above, Swedish university's institutions such as the grading committee are customarily referred to by their Swedish names by the informants. Entities that are typical for the working world, such as the staff kitchen, are also part of the Swedish domain in this speech community. As shown above, insertions motivated by linguistic domains are commonly realized with a matrix language article, also in these examples.

Additionally, there are parallels concerning the syntactic position. Both noun phrases are subject to morphosyntactic dependencies, more precisely, they are dependent on prepositions. For *betygsnämnd*, it is *aus* (here 'of'), and for *pentry*, it is *in* ('in'), that governs the case of the noun phrase. Also this is in line with what we have seen for the whole corpus in the analyses above.

4.2 Insertion including the embedded language article

In example 3 and 5, which were already given above, an embedded language article, more specific a Swedish article suffix, is realized in utterances which are otherwise formulated in German.

Ex. 3: also *vetenskapsrådet* wenn man sich da bewirbt
      well *research council.DET* if one REFL there apply.3SG.'
      Well, *the research council*, if you apply there'

---

[9] The third occurring Swedish noun, *examinator*, does not need an article in neither German nor Swedish, since it is a person's role.

Ex. 5:`das ist das wort hier.` *samhället.* `die gesellschaft.`
   that is the word here *society.DET* the society
   'What you mean is this word over there. *The society*. The society.'

At first sight, these examples seem to have less in common than those mentioned as typical examples for matrix language article realization in the previous chapter. Example 5 is, as discussed above, a metalinguistic explanation in a classroom conversation, whereas in example 3, the codeswitching is motivated by the linguistic domain the referent belongs to, and the communicative context is a research related communication.

 What the two examples do have in common is that the noun phrases are uttered independently of any clause structure. Syntactical independent codeswitching of this type can by classified as *alternational code-mixing* or short *alternation* according to a classification presented by Muysken (2000), which is widespread in contact linguistics (see e.g. Kallmeyer et al. 2002, Edel 2007). *Alternation* is defined as a type of codeswitching in which linguistic units appear inside sentences, but remain separate from units from the other language (cf. Muysken, 2000: 96f). Typically, alternations belong to word classes such as discourse particles or adverbs, while "[c]ontent words such as nouns and adjectives are likely to be insertions" (Muysken, 2000: 97). The counterpart to *alternative code-mixing* is *insertive code-mixing*, where the foreign language units are integrated into clauses (cf. Muysken, 2000: 3). In most examples in this paper, e.g. 2, 4, and 7 in the chapters above, the nouns form the embedded language represent *insertion* according to Muysken, but as it can be seen in examples 3 and 5 as well as in example 6, even noun phrases can be subject to *alternative code-mixing*. Concerning the article realization, embedded nouns tend to be uttered together with an embedded language article under these syntactical circumstances (see table 3 above).

 In example 3, the noun phrase has the potential to become the subject of the clause when it is uttered in the first place. It can only be speculated whether this is interrupted because of the Swedish article. It is not impossible for a noun phrase formulated completely in the embedded language to become a clause constituent. As shown in table 3, there is evidence for noun phrases with embedded language articles that are integrated into clauses. However, a disproportionate number of them are not.

 In the case of *vetenskapsråd*, another factor for realizing the embedded language article becomes evident: The expression is a proper name. The speakers analyzed here prefer not to translate Swedish and German proper names when talking in the respective other language. This concerns even translatable names as *vetenskapsråd*, which is *Research Council* in English and would be *Wissenschaftrat* in German. At the same time, there is also a tendency towards choosing the embedded language when the noun in question is a proper name. This is not only the case when the names are uttered syntactically independent, as in example 3, but also when they are integrated into clauses or prepositional phrases, as in example 8.

Ex. 8: `wenn man sich` […] `um die post-docs dann bewirbt`
   when one REFL   for the post-doc.PL then apply.3SG.
   `eben bei` *vetenskapsrådet*
   just at   research council.DET
   'When you apply for a postdoc, especially at the *Research Council*'

To summarize, there are two or maybe three typical types for realizing an embedded language article: Metalinguistic utterances concerning the inserted noun, morphosyntactically independently uttered noun phrases, and proper names containing an article.

4.3 Double definite marking

In the corpus, there are very few pieces of evidence for noun phrases with both the embedded language article and the matrix language article. However, all of these examples share characteristic features. The utterance in example 4 concerns the Swedish Research Council again. In fact, this lexeme is one of the most frequently switched nouns in the corpus. The Research Council plays a big role in the context in which the corpus was collected, because it is a sponsor of research funds as well as an authority in e.g. matters of research ethics.

> Ex. 4: es gibt so neue Richtlinien vom *vetenskapsrådet*
> there are   such new   guidelines   from.the *research council.DET*
> 'There are some new guidelines brought out by the *Research Council*.'

Since the noun is a proper name, there are good reasons to choose the embedded language article in this utterance, as we have seen it in example 3. On the other hand, there are good reasons to allocate an article from the matrix language in this utterance, since the noun phrase is dependent on a preposition.

In addition, the preposition and the article are melted into a clitic from. This is a very common phenomenon for many frequent prepositions in pragmatically unmarked use in German (see Eisenberg, 2009: 196ff). The strong connection between article and preposition may influence the tendency of using the German article system when inserting Swedish nouns into German prepositional phrases. A closer look into the data shows that, when articles from both the languages appear, there is a clear pattern in all instances but one: the constructions consist of proper names being dependent upon a preposition. All of them are Swedish insertions into German, and the German article is always realized as a clitic together with the preposition. Thus, there is strong evidence for the influence the preposition has on this type of article realization.

There is only one counterexample, example 9, in which articles from both languages appear without a preposition. However, this utterance is affected by several interruptions, breaks and self-corrections, even inside the very noun phrase. Therefore, it is unclear if both determiners are really thought to be part of the same construction.

> Ex. 9: ich bin auch= bin auch sch= ä n bisschen=äh f=
> I   am   also   am   also ?   uhm a   bit   uhm ?
> skeptisch was d= dieses *kandiDAt*
> sceptical   what th= this   bachelor
> *programm= äh SPRÅK (1) språkprogrammet* was das
> bringt.
> program   uhm linguistic   linguistic program.DET   what   that.N
> bring.3Sg
> 'I am also= am also uhm a bit uhm skeptical about this bachelor program uhm linguistics program, if it is beneficial.'

It is important to point out that none of the instances with bilingual double determiners would demand double definite marking in monolingual Swedish speech (cf. Teleman, Hellberg & Andersson, 1999: 96 and 301). Thus, the construction has nothing to do with the Swedish double determination construction, but is solely the result of the codeswitching.

Hence, the combination of the two conflicting systems appears when there also are two conflicting patterns for article realization: The proper name provides a tendency towards an embedded language article, and the preposition towards a matrix language article. As a result, both articles are realized. In that way, the double article is a compromise.

4.4 Indefinite noun phrases

Considering these results, the question arises whether the decision to use an embedded language article or a matrix language article actually dependents on the different systems that realize articles as free morphemes and bound morphemes. Only for the third construction pattern, the double article construction, the data suggests that the decision is connected to the specific form that article take in the two languages: On the one hand, the two articles can only appear as smoothly together because they have different positions in the noun phrase. On the other hand, these constructions appear only when Swedish proper names are integrated into German speech, but never when German proper names are integrated into Swedish. This could have to do with the fact that the Swedish word form is perceived more strongly as a fixed form, in which all the morphemes constitute the proper name. In German, even an article that obligatorily belongs to a proper name is subject to case inflection, with the result that it varies in its form. Maybe that is why it is perceived as a minor fixed part of the name by the speakers and can be substituted more easily in the context of another language.

Regarding the other two construction types, in which only one system contributes to the article realization, the factors governing this choice seem to have nothing to do with the different forms of the article. To test this assumption, the noun phrases containing indefinite articles were analyzed concerning the same factors. As shown above, both languages have the same system to mark indefinite phrases. The results of this analysis are shown in the table 4.

Table 4: Correlation between indefinite article realization and mastication, communicative situation, and syntactical factors

	Article according to surrounding language	Article according to embedded language	Double article
Motivation for codeswitching[10]			
linguistic domain	13	1	-
metalinguistic	1	2	-
other	4	5	-
Communicative situation			
teaching	3	5	-
administrative	10	3	-
academic/research related	4	0	-
socializing	1	0	-
student consultation	0	0	-
Syntactic position of the NP			
prepositional phrase	5	0	-
clause constituent	11	2	-
syntactically independent	2	6	-

In indefinite noun phrases, there are no double article constructions. This is no surprise, since both articles would claim the same syntactic slot. In addition, there is no evidence at all for proper names. This lack is no surprise either, since proper names contain indefinite articles only in very rare exceptions (examples would be titles such as *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, which happens not to be mentioned in the recorded conversations). Neither are there many metalinguistic utterances beyond the indefinite phrases. It is therefore hardly possible to compare the relations with the results regarding the definite phrases.

---

[10] Multiple classifications possible.

Nevertheless, some of the patterns that were described in the analyses of the definite noun phrases can be found for the indefinite noun phrases as well. If the inserted noun phrase is subject to dependency structures, i.e. integrated into a clause or e prepositional phrase, the article tends to be realized in the same language as the preposition or the finite verb that it is dependent on. Conversely, if the noun phrase in question is syntactically independent, an embedded language article is found disproportionately often.

Regarding the motivation for using nouns from the embedded language, the most frequent one is that the referents of the nouns are connected to the domain of one language. Here, a clear pattern becomes visible: Nearly all of those nouns are combined with an indefinite article from the surrounding language, exactly like it was found for the definite articles.

To summarize, the speakers do not make spontaneous and individual choices concerning the article system every time they insert nouns from the embedded language. In many cases, the choices are predictable because they follow patterns that seem to be established practices in the community. However, these practices are not as strongly established that they would provide rules for each and every occasion of noun insertion, and sometimes they are even contradictory to each other. In those cases, a spontaneous decision is demanded. The speakers seem nevertheless not to be insecure in their choice, since most of the utterances are fluent and smooth. Even if there are pauses, corrections, and abruptions in some examples, these do not appear disproportionately more often than in other positions in the corpus, so they seem not to be related to the article choice, but to the usual verbalization and formulation difficulties always occurring in spoken language.

5 The choice of gender

If a noun comes in via codeswitching and the speaker decides to build a construction containing a matrix language determiner, (s)he is forced to allocate a gender as well. This concerns not only noun phrases including a definite article. Gender also has to be expressed by indefinite articles, possessive pronouns, anaphoric pronouns, etc.

In this point, the necessity to carefully distinguish between loanwords and codeswitching (including nonce borrowing) becomes major important. While loanwords already have a fixed gender in the receiver language, it is part of the actual speaker's task to allocate this category when codeswitching.

Gender allocation is normally something internal to the language system. To find out whether the choices in the corpus are generated by these systems, it is therefore necessary to look separately at the mechanisms of German and Swedish incorporating nouns from the other language. The two languages have different systems for gender. German differentiates between three classes: feminine, masculine, and neuter (in the following also marked as *f*, *m*, and *n*). In Swedish there are only two genders, the common gender called uter (*u*), and neuter (*n*).

5.1 German gender allocated to Swedish nouns

The question of how the gender of a noun is determined or rather identified has been subject to intensive research about the German language, both regarding the whole lexicon (Köpcke, 1982; Köpcke & Zubin, 1996) and foreign or loanwords in specific (e.g. Eisenberg, 2011:212-35).

Köpcke & Zubin found three possible sources of gender allocation in German, which hold both for native words and for loanwords:

1) Morphology: A large number of nouns receive their gender automatically because they are morphologically complex. Derivational affixes are very frequent in German and always come along with a fixed gender, e.g. *-ung, -heit, -keit* demanding feminine; *-er*, *-ling* demanding masculine etc. (cf. Köpcke & Zubin 1996: 475f).

2) Phonology: As Köpcke showed in his pioneering work (Köpcke, 1982), the gender of morphologically simple words is not arbitrary either. There are clear regularities allocating a gender to a noun, depending on e.g. its ending and, in the case of monosyllabic words, its amount of consonants and their combination (cf. Köpcke, 1982: 81-106).

3) Semantics: The most obvious semantic factor is the so called natural gender when referent of a noun is a person. Female persons are normally identified with feminine grammatical gender, and male persons with masculine grammatical gender. However, there are further semantic fields that have gender regularities for the nouns belonging to them (cf. Köpcke & Zubin, 1996:480).

In the case of nouns that are taken directly from another language, there are two more options:

4) Adoption of the original gender: If both languages involved have gender, which is the case for German and Swedish, the gender of borrowed nouns can theoretically be adopted. However, German and Swedish do share only one category, neuter.

5) Analogy with native semantic equivalents: Actually, this is no entirely new aspect but a special case of semantic allocation. Even in this case, it is the referent or the meaning of the noun that is crucial for the gender allocation, and that sorts nouns belonging to a specific semantic field into the same gender category (cf. Eisenberg, 2011: 229).

6) Parallel loans: In the corpus, a considerable amount of noun insertions consist of loanwords from third languages (Latin, Greek, and French). Often there are loanwords existing in both German and Swedish, but have a different phonology and often a slightly different meaning, so the used form can be identified as codeswitching. These loans are often scientific fields such as *grammatik/Grammatik* ('grammar') which appear as titles of courses or books, and in compounds with native modifiers. When a gender has to be allocated to a noun which has a parallel loan in both languages, this can be used as a source for the gender allocation.

Köpcke (1982) presents a hierarchy of regularities for German nouns, predicting that a lower ranked rule only comes into effect if there is no higher ranked rule fitting. This hierarchy ranks semantic rules as the highest, followed by morphological rules and at least the phonological rules. Among the phonological rules, there is in turn a hierarchy ranking the coda as the most powerful aspect (Köpcke, 1982: 111).

What about the nouns in our bilingual corpus? To find out what criteria underlie the speakers' choices, all lexemes which got a foreign gender were examined in regards to their form (morphological and phonological features) or to their meaning, to see if one of these factors demands a certain gender. Additionally, it was examined whether there is a parallel loan, and which relationship there is between their original gender and the allocated gender. Concerning the phonology, the analysis relies on the principles presented in Köpcke (1982: 105f) and Köpcke & Zubin (1996: 476). In cases where the inserted noun is a compound, only the head of the word was examined, since the head of a compound governs the gender both in Swedish and in German.

The analysis shows that parallel loans have the strongest impact on gender allocation. In all instances in which there are loans from the same source in both languages, the Swedish nouns never receive a different gender than their equivalents in German. This also holds when the expression does not have the same meaning in both languages. In fact, this difference is often the motivation for the codeswitching, e.g. in the case of *programm* in the compound *kandidatprogramm* (‚bachelor program') and *nivå* in the phrase *avancerad nivå* ('advanced study level'). The German equivalents cannot be used with the meanings intended in these contexts. Nevertheless, the gender allocation is orientated towards the etymological equivalent, not on the semantic equivalent. This is visible at least in the example *(studie)programm*, were the German translation *Studiengang* is masculine, but the Swedish compound is treated as a neuter.

Ex. 9: was d=dieses *kandiDAt programm*=[…]äh was das bringt.
what   that.N   *bachelor*   *program*   uhm   what that.N bring.3Sg.
'if that *bachelor program*, if that is beneficial.'

However, the gender suggested by the parallel nouns is often the same gender that is suggested by other factors as well. Most often, this is the semantic field. As mentioned above, the parallel loans are often names of scientific disciplines, such as *grammatik* ('grammar'), *lingvistik* ('linguistics') or *syntax*. Nouns belonging to this very field are regularly feminine in german. In the case of the Swedish expressions, it is not possible to tell if the allocation of the feminine gender is cause directly by the semantic field or via the parallel loans, which of cause also belong to the field. It is only possible to constitute that rule for the semantic field is not broken either in the corpus. A further semantic field that some of the inserted nouns belong to is designations of persons. Items in this field are regularly masculine in German, unless they are marked as feminine by suffixes or describe a role only a female person can have (i.g. mother, sister,) (cf. Köpcke, 1982: 75). The Swedish designations for persons also receive masculine gender when they are inserted into German in this corpus, regardless of whether they have a natural male gender, e.g. the king in example 8, or if the natural gender is not specified, e.g. that of the examiner in example 9.

Ex. 10: hat der *kung* dann wieder zurückgeworfen.
has   the.M *king*   than   again   retorted   .
'…retorted the *king* than.'

Ex.11: es muss da hier nen *examinator* geben.
it   must   there here a.M/N[11] *examiner*   be.
'There has to be one *examiner* here.'

It appears that semantic fields are a factor that cannot be outplayed by others also in case of embedded language nouns in the speaker community, just as it was found for established German nouns by Köpcke.

The second strongest factor according to Köpcke is the morphological one. Even though the suffixes of embedded language nouns do naturally not have native German affixes, codified rules exist for some affixes from usual donor languages like Latin, Greek, and French (Eisenberg, 2011: 234f and 287f). Some of those suffixes occur frequently in the parallel loans, e.g. *–ik* in *grammatik* or *lingvistik*. Foreign suffixes from these third languages can even be found in non-parallel loans, e.g. *-or* in *examinator* ('examiner'). The Swedish latinism does not have a Latin equivalent in German, but is expressed with the native word *Prüfer*.

Even Swedish word endings can be considered to be morphologically relevant. The Swedish suffix *-ing* can be associated with the English suffix *–ing*, which is frequent in loanwords in German and in that cases is allocated with neuter. This fact can explain the choice of m/n-gender for *tillämpning* ('tutorial') in example 10.

---

[11] The case forms for masculine and neuter are in most cases identical in form (Eisenberg 2009: 140). When a noun was uttered with such an ambivalent article alone, it was not possible to see if masculine or neuter is the intended gender. This is noted as "m/n" in the analyses.

That masculine and neuter are quite close to each other is also visible in the fact that many of the phonological rules demand one of the two genders, but not necessarily a certain one (Köpcke 1982: 79f and 105f). Feminine, in contrast, is totally separate from the other two genders, both in terms of form and of rules demanding it.

Ex. 12: `H. hat es wahrscheinlich gesagt. im` *tillämpning*.
       (name) has it   probably   said   in=the.M/N   *tutorial*.
       'H. has probably told you that in the *tutorial*.'

A further example is the ending -a, which has the status of a pseudo-suffix in German, because it is very frequent in Romanic loanwords and many first names. Even though it cannot be used for word formation (therefore called "pseudo" by Eisenberg, 1998) it is clearly associated with feminine, or, in the case of personal proper names, even female (Eisenberg, 1998: 394). The ending is also frequent in Swedish and even in the inserted nouns in the corpus, for example in *fika* (a meal/snack eaten at tea time or in a coffee break, normally including coffee). *fika* is allocated a female determiner in the corpus, probably as a consequence of its ending.

Ex. 13: `also die haben ja auch die schwedische` *fika*.
       well   they have   PART also   the.F   swedish   *coffee break snack*.
       'Well, even they have the Swedish *coffee break snack tradition*.'

Morphological factors are never outplayed in this corpus, just like the factors parallel loans and semantic fields. However, it is not possible to tell which of the factors has the strongest impact, since they never get into conflict with each other among the analyzed inserted nouns.

    The factor that is found most often in the corpus is a semantic equivalent in the other language. Since it is a semantic factor, it could be stronger than the morphology according to Köpcke's hierarchy. However, this seems not to be the case in case of German-Swedish codemixing. Even if the translation is the relevant factor in many cases, it can also be ignored in favor of others. This other factor can be a parallel loan (as shown in example 9 above), but even phonological factors can be favored. Translation, phonology, and original gender seem to be the crucial factors only if no other factor applies. If they get into conflict, it is mostly the semantic factor that tips the scales. An example of this is *bokmärke* ('bookmark'), which is treated as neuter or maybe masculine, even though the ending -*e* would suggest feminine. However, the German word for *bookmark* is *Lesezeichen*, which is a neuter. This is probably the reason why the speaker chooses a neuter article even for the Swedish *bokmärke*.

Ex. 14: `da hat er mir jetzt äh. son` *bok= bokmärke* `gemacht.`
       there has he me   now   uhm such=a.M/N   *bookmark*   done.
       'Now he adjusted such a *bookmark* (in the browser) for me.'

On the other hand, in the case of *prov* ('exam'), it is the phonology, or maybe the original gender neuter, which has a stronger influence than the gender of the translation. The German equivalent *Prüfung* is a feminine. As a monosyllable with a long vocal and no special requirements in the onset and the coda, its phonological form thus points towards m/n-gender, and this is what the speaker allocates.

Ex. 15: `aber das` *prov* `in den l=.`
       but   the.N *exam*   in   the.PLURAl l= (break of)
       'But the *exam* in the...'

It is interesting to note that, when just these two factors come into conflict, the speakers' choices can differ from each other inside the community. An example for that is *grupp* ('group, team') in *beredningsgrupp* ('preparation group', often in the meaning of 'committee'). *Grupp* and its German equivalent *Gruppe* are very close cognates, but just their slight phonological difference would categorizes them as candidates for a different gender. In example 16, the noun receives an m/n-gender, as it is demanded by its

phonology as a monosyllable with the onset *gr-*. In example 17, it is treated as a feminine, as its semantic (and etymological) German equivalent *Gruppe*.

> Ex. 16: in unserm *beredningsgrupp* für forschung.
>   in our.M/N   *preparation group*   for   research
>   'in our *committee* for research'

> Ex. 17: dass ich in dieser *be=beredningsgrupp* war.
>   that   I   in   that.F   *preparation group*   was
>   '…that I was part of this *preparation group*.'

Thus, the choices for gender in this corpus are by and large in line with the rules applied in the German lexicon on the whole. It could therefore be argued that the patterns are not established in the bilingual speaker community, but generated by the language system. However, it must be taken into account that it is not self-evident that multilingual speakers, particularly those not living in German speaking countries, follow monolingual rules when allocating gender for embedded language nouns. Clyne's (2003) work on bilingual speech of German immigrants in Australia shows other tendencies: In some communities, feminine is the preferred choice for all English nouns. In other communities, the semantic equivalent is the most commonly applied factor (cf. Clyne, 2003: 122 and 147f). Semantic equivalents are also identified as the main source for gender for Danish nouns in German in Kühl's corpus (cf. Kühl, 2008:114). Hence, every pattern for Gender-allocation, even the compliance of the German monolingual rules, has to be negotiated by the bilingual speakers.

5.2 Swedish gender allocated to German nouns
In the corpus, there are much fewer German nouns inserted into Swedish utterances than the other way round. The findings may therefore not represent all practices existing in the community. In the literature, it is mostly semantic fields that are described as a reason for gender allocation in monolingual Swedish (Teleman, Hellberg & Andersson, 1999: 37), but none of the German nouns in the corpus belongs to any of these fields. However, some of Köpcke's and Zubin's findings for German can also be applied for an analysis of the Swedish data. Factors like semantic equivalence and parallel loan can be considered as well as suffixes or pseudo-suffixes.

The analysis shows that morphology actually seems to have the strongest influence. Many of the German nouns that are subject to insertion end with *–en*, e.g. *Haken* ('hook') and *Fettnäpfchen* (literally 'little pot of grease', but here in the figurative meaning 'risk for a faux-pas'). This ending has exactly the same form as the definite article suffix for Swedish common nouns, so it can be interpreted as morphologically relevant when appearing in a Swedish environment. Actually, uter is indeed the gender allocated to German nouns in nearly every example in the corpus. However, the lexeme *Fettnäpfchen* does not behave consistently. In one utterance, it appears with an uter article, in another utterance with a neuter one.

> Ex. 18: den här *fettnäpfchen* har blivit ganska så SKÄLVständigt.
>   this.U   *pot of grease*   has   become   rather   independent
>   'This *pot of grease* [the expression] has become rather independent.'

> Ex. 19: man behöver inte trampa i det här *fettnäpfchen*.
>   one   needs   not   step   into   this.N   pot of grease
>   'You don't have to step into this *pot of grease*.'/
>   'You don't have to make this mistake.'

The choice in example 19 is presumably influenced by the original gender. German demands neuter here because the word is a diminutive, in other words due to morphological reasons. As we have seen above, morphological endings pointing out a specific gender are "stronger" than any other factor for gender allocation and are very strictly followed in the German system.

Regarding the nouns that do not have any morphological or pseudo-morphological specifications, it can be stated that they are all treated as uters. An explanation for that could be that the common gender is indeed the more common one. In other words: In case of doubt, the speakers always tend to choose uter. However, this is only an assumption. Since only five German lexemes are allocated a Swedish gender in the corpus, there are far too few cases to claim regularities.

6 Conclusions

The analysis of noun insertion in the German-Swedish corpus has shown that this kind of codeswitching is by no means easy, since there are multiple decisions to make concerning how to fit the noun into the formulation. At the same time, the results show that the speakers in the studied community do not make spontaneous and heterogeneous choices when it comes to this task, but orientate on certain practices. Nevertheless, there are not practices available for each and every occasion of noun insertion, and the pattern might even get into conflict sometimes, so the task remains demanding.

Concerning grammatical morphemes that are realized as bound morphemes in both languages, the decision seems to be certain in this speaker community. Contrary to the MLF-models predictions (see Myers-Scotton 2002), it is not the matrix language, but the embedded language that provides case and numerus suffixes for embedded language nouns.

Concerning gender allocation, there is also a relative strict pattern. It was found that at least for Swedish nouns in German, the same regularities are applied as for German nouns and established loanwords from other languages. The hierarchy of regularities that Köpcke (1982) has found for the German lexicon can be retraced among the Swedish insertions in the corpus. Additionally, regularities concerning parallel loans and semantic equivalents can be added to this hierarchy. Parallel loans are among the most powerful factors, whereas semantic equivalents may be a frequent factor, but do not have a high hierarchical status, which means that they are ignored whenever other sources for gender are available. Still, these rules are not as comprehensive as they would not leave cases of doubt. In the corpus, there is evidence for different gender allocated to the same lexeme at different occasions. Additionally, it has to be emphasized that the findings do not mean that gender allocation is so deeply rooted in the linguistic competence that it would not become a problem in case of codeswitching. Other corpora show that that appliance of the monolingual system is specific for the community and not self-evident (see Clyne 2003, Kühl 2008).

Definiteness marking is certainly the most challenging part of the task of noun insertion in the studied community and language constellation. Due to the significant differences between the German and the Swedish system of definiteness marking, there is a variety of possible article realizations that the speakers are forced to pick between. The findings suggest that the speakers' decisions are orientated towards prototypes demanding one system or the other. Crucial factors are the motivation to use the embedded language and the syntactical dependency of the noun phrase in question. This holds both for definite and for indefinite articles. In the case of definite noun phrases, there is even the possibility of combining the two systems due to the different morphological status and position of the article in the noun phrase. Double articles seem to be built when the patterns get into conflict. These findings deviate from the patterns found in other bilingual corpora concerning the same or closely related languages. The Danish-German teenagers that

were studied by Kühl (2008) solve the task completely differently than the speakers in the study presented here. As described above, they normally use article words, and neither the Danish definiteness suffix is used nor double article constructions are build (cf. Kühl, 2008: 113). The findings in Boyd's (1997) study on Swedish-English codeswitching are more similar to those found here: In her corpus, Swedish proper names normally take their determiner suffix with them when inserted into English speech, while this is not observed for common nouns (Boyd, 1997: 270f).

Unfortunately, there is no previous research on noun insertion concerning the same language constellation, German and Swedish, so that my results could be compared to those in another speaker community. In the light of the results presented here, it is nevertheless assumable that Swedish and German are mixed in a different way when the languages come into contact under different circumstances. Each speaker community has to establish practices to solve the multiple tasks.

References

Aitchison, Jean (2000): Language Change: Progress or Decay? 3. ed. Cambridge University Press.

Boyd, Sally (1997): Patterns of Incorporation of Lexemes in Language Contact: Language Typology or Sociolinguistics? In: Gregory Guy et al. (eds.): Towards a Social Science of Language. Vol. II. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 259-84.

Clyne, Micheal (2003): Dynamics of Language Contact. English and Immigrant Languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Edel, Kristina (2000): Strukturen des Bilingualismus – untersucht am Codeswitching Deutsch/Spanisch. Frankfurt a.M./London: IKO Verlag für interkulturelle Kommunikation.

Delsing, Lars-Olof (1993): The Internal Structure of Noun Phrases in the Scandinavian Languages. A comparative study. Lund: Department of Scandinavian Languages University of Lund.

Fishman, Joshua A. (1965): Who speaks what language to whom and when? In: Li Wei (ed.) (2000): The Bilingualism Reader. London/ New York: Routledge. 89-106.

Gardner-Chloros, Penelope (2009): Code-switching. Cambridge University Press.

Eisenberg, Peter (2009) Grundriss der deutschen Grammatik. Vol. 2. Der Satz. Stuttgart/Weimar: Metzler.

Eisenberg, Peter (2011): Das Fremdwort im Deutschen. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.

Havermeier, Heike (2015): Deutsch-schwedisches Codeswitching an der internationalen Universität. Disputationsupplag. Institutionen för språk och litteraturer, Göteborgs universitet.

Kallmeyer, Werner; Keim, Inken; Aslan, Sema; Cindark, Ibrahim (2002): Variationsprofile. Zur Analyse der Variationspraxis bei den Powergirls. http://www.ids-mannheim.de/prag/sprachvariation/fgvaria/Variationsprofile.pdf

Kirkebæk, Mads Jakob (2013): "Teacher! Why Do You Speak English?" A Discussion of Teacher Use of English in a Danish Language Class. In: Hartmut Haberland, Dorte Lønsmann, Bent Preisler, (eds.): Language Alternation, Language Choice and Language Encounter in International Tertiary Education. Heidelberg/New York/London: Springer. 143-159.

Köpcke, Klaus-Michael (1982) Untersuchungen zum Genussystem der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Köpcke, Klaus-Michael; Zubin, David (1996): Prinzipien für die Genuszuweisung im Deutschen. In: Ewald Lang & Gisela Zifonum (eds.): Deutsch – typologisch. Berlin/ New York: de Gruyter. 473-491.

Kühl, Karoline (2008): Bilingualer Sprachgebrauch bei Jugendlichen im deutsch-dänischen Grenzland. Hamburg: Kovač.

Matras, Yaron (2009): Language contact. Cambrigde: Cambrigde University Press.

Meyerhoff, Miriam (2002): Communities of Practice. In: J.K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill & Nathalie Schilling-Estes (eds.): The Handbook of Language Variation and Change. Malden, Massachusetts/Oxford: Blackwell. 526-548.

Muysken, Pieter: (2000): Bilingual speech. A Typology of Code-Mixing. Cambrigde University Press.

Myers-Scotton, Carol (1993): Duelling Languages. Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, Carol (2002): Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes. Oxford University Press.

Norde, Muriel (2001): The History of the Swedish Genitive: the Full Story: A Reply to Delsing. In: Nordic Journal of Linguistics 24. S. 107-117.

Poplack, Shana (1980): Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESNAÑOL: towards a typology of code-switching.In: Linguistics 18. 581-618.

Poplack, Shana; Sankoff, David (1988): Code-Switching. In: Ulrich Ammon, Norbert Dittmar, Klaus J. Mattheier (eds.): Sociolinguistics. Soziolinguistik. An international Handbook of the Science of Language and Society. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Wissenschaft von Sprache und Gesellschaft. Vol. 2. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter. 1174-1180

Romaine, Suzanne (1989): Bilingualism. Oxford: Blackwell.

Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson (1999): Svenska Adademins grammatik. Vol. 2: Ord. Stockholm: Nordstedts Ordbok.

Viberg, Åke (2006) The typological profile of Swedish – an introduction. In: STUF - Language Typology and Universals 59.1. 3-11.

Appendix:

Transcription conventions:

normal font	German
italic font	Swedish
.	falling intonation
?	rising intonation
,	slightly rising intonation
=	intonation break-off
(.)	falling intonation + pause shorter than 0.5 seconds
(-)	pause, shorter than 0.5 seconds
(1.5)	longer pause, length in seconds
< >	description of paraverbal activities, vocal color etc. (e.g. <laughs>)
majuscule	emphasized syllable
+	raised volume
°	lowered volume

Abbreviations in the Glossing:

acc	accusative
dat	dative
def	definite
idf	indefinite pronoun
m	masculine
n	neuter
part	modal particle
pl	plural
q	question particle
refl	reflexive pronoun
sg	singular
u	uter (common gender)