In MOGUL, Codeswitching is a natural product of the real-time language representation and processing perspective.

In MOGUL, Codeswitching is a natural product of the real-time language representation and processing perspective. A Module in MOGUL: All modules have the same basic architecture. Content + module specific primitive features stored in Long term memory. Integrated processors manipulate activation levels of primitive features. Interface processors co-ordinate (chain) active features' feature bundles between modules.

Linguistic Framework

Codeswitching in Minimalism (MacSwan, 2014):
- No cross-linguistic syntactic constraints / boundaries: MacSwan’s assertion
- A Null Theory ⇒ no extra machinery

Nothing constrains codeswitching apart from the requirements of the grammars involved. MacSwan’s Formalisation of Codeswitching: \(L_x = L_y\) ⇒
- In MOGUL terms \((I_P + I_S) + (I_S + I_D)\)
- There are no universal boundaries/constaints on codeswitching.

A problem with intra-word codeswitching: PF Disjunction Theorem:
(i) The PF component consists of rules/constraints which must be (partially) ordered/ranked with respect to each other, and these orders vary cross-linguistically;
(ii) Codeswitching entails the union of at least two grammars;
(iii) Ordering relations are not preserved under union;
(iv) Therefore, code-switching within a PF component is not possible.

(MacSwan, 2005, p. 73)

The PF Disjunction Theorem places a prohibition on Intra-word codeswitching.

Intra-word Codeswitching & Distributed Morphology (Grinstead, Lohndal & Afarli, 2014)
- Words usually fit in sentences; this sentential frame provides the ‘host language’.
- The host language generates the syntactic frame/essence
- Late insertion matches lexical items from Lx to the ly exoskeletal frame
- Morphological elements are phonologically underspecified

Intra-word Codeswitching = W\[M (i.e. loanwords) which are mentally integrated into the host language

\[\text{Language Core: }\]

\[\text{Perceptual Output Structures(POPs):}\]

\[\text{Sensory perception, Affective Structures (AIS):}\]

\[\text{Value representations, e.g. } + \text{- positive}\]

Modules form complex representations by combining module specific primitive features into feature bundles which may be linked to specific languages.

Words as Representational Chains ⇒ (PS + SS + CS)

The Lexicon in MOGUL: What is a word?
- Representational chains are co-indexed representations stored in long-term memory and are associated with a context(s).

In MOGUL terms: context is taken as active conceptual chains and their associated activations.

Conceptual Chain/Context ⇒ (CS + POPs + AIFs + associations)

Factors which influence Conceptual Context:
- Linguistic landscape
- Identity of the interlocutor
- Self identity / Self-representation
- Communicative goals
- Value representations (AIFs)

These factors play a central role in establishing a denser-codeswitching context.

Goal Representations are extra-linguistic CS representations;
- Linguistically, goal representations drive social or communicative interactions.
- Activation levels for various goal representation interact with context which effect language selection.

Intra-word Codeswitching in MOGUL

- Codeswitching: the mixing of two or more languages with in a single discourse. Switching may occur between sentences, phrases or words.
- Intra-word Codeswitching: the mixing of two languages with in a single word; switching occurs at morpheme boundaries. (Grinstead, Lohndal & Afarli, 2014)

Intra-word Codeswitching = \(W_x (i.e. L_x) + W_y (i.e. L_y)\)

Crucially, codeswitched elements maintain their original form (e.g. phonological form); unlike lexical borrowings (i.e. loanwords) which are mentally integrated into the host language.

Leo on MAGAZINE [magazine’s +pron] Codeswitching

“I read a magazine"

Leo on magazine [mag ‘a” +宾] Codeswitching

“I read a magazine”

(Poplack 1980)

- Some language mixing researchers argue intra-word codeswitching is impossible (i.e. Poplack 1980, MacSwan 2014)
- However, empirical examples can be found in CANS (Corpus of American Norwegian Speech); an American Heritage community of Norwegian-English speakers show that it is possible (Aleiksdottir, et al. 2015)
- The lexical elements ‘field’ and ‘track’ are English lexical items and produced using English phonological rules but the suffix (i.e. morphology) attached to the lexical items are syntactically Norwegian.
- Norwegians is considered to be the ‘host language’ as the English lexical items are part of a larger Norwegian phrase/sentence.