



HAL
open science

Lexical innovations in the speech of adolescents in Oslo, Norway: How far can multilingual environments impact on language practices?

Sarah Harchaoui

► **To cite this version:**

Sarah Harchaoui. Lexical innovations in the speech of adolescents in Oslo, Norway: How far can multilingual environments impact on language practices?. ConSOLE XXIII: Proceedings of the 23rd Conference of the Student Organization of Linguistics in Europe , 2016. hal-04002356

HAL Id: hal-04002356

<https://hal.science/hal-04002356>

Submitted on 23 Feb 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Lexical innovations in the speech of adolescents in Oslo, Norway:
How far can multilingual environments impact on language practices?

Sarah Harchaoui

Based on a series of examples from the UPUS-Project (*Linguistic Development in Urban Environments*), this paper provides an overview of the main innovative lexical forms, e.g. neologisms, use of slang, loan words especially from non-European languages, in the speech of adolescents living in Oslo, Norway and determines in which communicative settings they have appeared. Recent studies (cf. Drange 2002; Johannessen 2008) have identified two linguistic ‘varieties’, one of which is located in the Eastern parts of the city and is affected by multilingual environments. I argue that the multilingual dimension is both decisive for predicting the forms innovation takes and for justifying the motivations of speakers to innovate in their speech.

1. Introduction

Since the late 1990s, sociolinguistics has shown great interest in the linguistic practices or styles¹ occurring in culturally and linguistically diverse urban areas, not only in English-speaking cities but also in capital cities in Scandinavia (cf. Nortier & Svendsen 2015: 5). The Oslo case study is, in this regard, particularly relevant to analyze in demographic terms since Oslo represents the fastest growing city in Europe (cf. Urban Europe 2014) where much of the country’s growth is due to immigration.

The empirical material in this paper is drawn from the UPUS-Project, the purpose of which was to a) study linguistic practices among adolescents in multilingual and multicultural communities of practice in Oslo, and b) discuss a possible identification of one or more new varieties of Norwegian which might be traced to influences from a multilingual environment. The corpus consists of video-recorded interviews and peer-group conversational data from adolescents all born and raised in Oslo, living in either of the areas Old Oslo or Southern Nordstrand (both located in the Eastern parts of the city), with an immigrant population of 34% and 44%, respectively. According to the results of UPUS’s initial works (cf. Svendsen & Røyneland 2008; Quist & Svendsen 2010), a specific way of speaking Norwegian, better

¹ The issue of labelling linguistic practices among adolescents depends on the respective research approach. Two basic approaches have been adopted in current research. Through the variety-oriented approach, terms derived from –lect such as ‘dialect’, ‘sociolect’ (cf. Kotsinas 1988) or ‘multiethnolect’ (cf. Clyne 2000; Quist 2000; Svendsen & Røyneland 2008) are frequently used. From the practice-oriented approach, terms such as ‘multi-ethnic youth language’ (cf. Aarsæther 2010), ‘late modern urban speech style’ (cf. Møller 2009) or ‘multi-ethnic urban heteroglossia’ (cf. Rampton 2011) are preferred.

known as *multiethnolectal style* has been confirmed and located in the Eastern parts of the city, which is mainly made up of third world immigrants and their descendants. Non-European borrowing and innovative verb placement are features, which are regularly put forward to describe this speech style (cf. Opsahl & Nistov 2010).

The above-mentioned facts have led me to focus on the speech style developed in the Eastern parts of Oslo essentially because it is spoken in urban areas where multilingualism is very high, and its situation is unique with respect to the rest of the country. I also rely on the practice-oriented approach to analyzing the current phenomenon as a speech style because the notion carries the idea of a social meaning according to the definition of style given by Eckert (2001:123) as “a clustering of linguistic resources, and an association of that clustering with social meaning”.

This paper aims to discuss the impact of multilingual environments on contemporary language practices among adolescents in Oslo and to consider the motivations of the speakers who use these specific features. The first section reviews the main innovative lexical forms and pinpoints the specificity of the speech style located in the Eastern parts of the town. With its two recording modes, the UPUS-Project has allowed us to see behavioral differences among adolescents and determine specific communicative settings in which innovative forms occurs. The second section is devoted to social meaning and assumes that speakers resort to innovative language features in order to show solidarity towards a new urban reality tinged with multilingualism.

2. Overview of most common lexical innovations

During the past 30 years, an increasing number of Anglo-American and Scandinavian studies (cf. Andersson & Trudgill 1990; Kotsinas *et al.* 1997; Stenström *et al.* 2002; Aasheim 1995; Eckert 1997, 2001; Drange 2002; Hasund 2006a; Jørgensen & Quist 2008; Johannessen 2008) have correlated youth language with novelty, creativity and innovation. In the case of Norwegian, this correlation does not only concern the lexicon but also morphological, syntactic and phonetic features (cf. Quist & Svendsen 2010), as well as the interface between pragmatics and grammar (cf. Opsahl 2009, Harchaoui 2015b). Beyond the saliency of some lexical forms that sound and appear innovative to a community of speakers, it would be interesting to raise the question as to whether adolescents are really more prone to inventing new words and phrases or whether they rather recycle and adapt literary and stylistic devices to new circumstances of their everyday life.

In the following section, I argue that most lexical forms in teenage speech can be analyzed as neologisms and come from the slang tradition whereas real innovative features (such as non-European loan words) seem to result from multilingual urban environments where speakers grow up.

2.1. Around the concept of neologism

2.1.1. An act of innovation

According to Pruvost & Sablayrolles (2003:3), the concept of neologism consists of creating a new word or adding a new meaning to an existing word in a language. Neologisms are recognizable because they are caught up in a process of entering common use while the entire linguistic community has not yet accepted them. Starobová (2010: 170) explains that the process of neologism can be divided into three stages: (i) its strict creation, (ii) its resurgence after the feeling of novelty has disappeared, and (iii) its integration to the language. However, Sablayrolles (2006:141), who has investigated corpus-based semantic neology in

contemporary French, points out three key obstacles when identifying neologisms. The nature of lexical units (*logos*) should be questioned, as well as the notion of novelty (*neos*). When and to what extent should a lexical form be considered as new? At least, what criteria should be used to determine when a lexical unit becomes a neologism?

Sablayrolles (2006:142) argues that no satisfactory answer has yet been brought forth because “the innovative nature of neologisms varies by scope and rapidity of its spread. The timelife of a neologism is variable (but can still be evaluated through human lifespan and human memory abilities) and its evaluation is therefore as much, if not more, of the intuitive mind”.²

Fagyal (2004: 51), who has investigated linguistic practices of adolescents in working-class neighbourhoods in Paris, considers that the innovative nature of a lexical unit should only be determined by the manner in which the linguistic community perceives it. She defines lexical innovations as the “use of lexical unit which may or may not be attested by the linguistic community [...] but of which the signifier, the signified or both are regarded as new by the group of young people who use it”³ and adds that the act of innovation is rather motivated insofar as the lexical unit is perceived as innovative by the group rather than by etymology or by its generally accepted meaning. In that sense, Sabalyrolles’ notion of neologism can be compared with Fagyal’s lexical innovation.

2.1.2. *Typology of neologisms*

In his article “Néologismes: une typologie des typologies”, Sablayrolles (2006) establishes a ranking of the main typologies that have been used in French works on neologisms. This includes a dichotomous model that I have selected to analyze lexical innovations in the Oslo case study. Cases which belong to formal neologism (*néologie formelle*) are considered separately from semantic neologism (*néologie sémantique*). The issue of borrowing will be discussed in the following section.

Sablayrolles (1996:26) defines cases of formal neology as “the creation of a signifier which has never been attested in previous states of the language regardless of denominations adopted in specific ranking” whereas cases of semantic neology consist of “a new meaning for a lexical unit whose signifier already existed with another signified”.⁴

2.1.3. *Empirical data*

2.1.3.1. *Formal neologism*

The UPUS-Project, as well as previous studies on teenage speech in Norway (cf. NoTa, UNO), have provided many instances of formal neologism. To achieve innovation, speakers use literary devices in order to change word forms attested in Norwegian, i.e. the Bokmål Reference Dictionary, *Bokmålsordboka*. Below are some examples provided from peer-conversations in the UPUS-Project that reflect the most valued strategies among adolescents.

² Sablayrolles (2006:142): “C’est que le statut de “néologisme” est variable en fonction de l’ampleur et de la rapidité de la diffusion du néologisme. La durée est donc variable (mais toujours mesurable à l’aune de la durée de la vie humaine et des capacités mémorielles de l’homme) et son appréciation relève donc autant, sinon plus, de l’esprit de finesse [...]”

³ Fagyal (2004: 51) : “Le terme ‘innovation lexicale’ réfèrera donc à l’usage d’une unité lexicale attestée ou non dans la communauté linguistique [...], mais dont le signifiant, le signifié ou les deux sont perçus comme une nouveauté dans le groupe des jeunes qui l’emploie.”

⁴ Sablayrolles (1996:26) : “Les typologies dichotomiques distinguent la néologie formelle (i.e. la création d’un signifiant non attesté dans un état immédiatement antérieur de la langue, quelle que soit la dénomination adoptée dans tel ou tel classement) et la néologie sémantique (i.e. un nouveau sens pour une lexie dont le signifiant existait déjà avec un autre signifié).”

Numbers at the beginning of sentences refer to speakers, in line with rules of confidentiality of juveniles in Norway.

a) Prefixation in *drit-*

Substantive *drit*, which literally means ‘shit’, ‘crap’ in Norwegian, is often used as a prefix and can be combined with both positive and pejorative adjectives in order to enhance the semantic content of the adjective. However, prefixation in *drit-* does not carry neutral connotations and could be moved closer to slang (Hasund 2006a: 63; 1-2).

- (1) 001 *ja men sikkert barne- (.) barnebarnet deres har*
 yes but sure.ADV child- grandchild.DEF their has
kanskje en dritgod venn som er (.) utlending jo
 maybe a drit.goodADJ friend which is foreigner
 ‘Yes but surely ... their grandchild has maybe a very good friend which is foreigner, obviously’

- (2) 002 *fordi det er så mye og det er så*
 because there is so much and there is so
d- kjedelig stoff (.) dritkjedelig stoff
 d- boring stoff drit.boringADJ stuff
 ‘Because there is so much and there is so boring stuff, very boring stuff’

Hasund (2006a: 63), who has conducted previous research in teenage speech (1998-2006) in Norway, notes that speakers concurrently used prefixes such as ‘fuckings’, ‘giga’, ‘mega’ or ‘ultra’ in this period. As far as I can tell, none of them have been found in the UPUS-project. This indicates that speakers who live in the Eastern parts of Oslo have since stopped using them.

b) Truncation

Cases of truncation in the form of removal of one or several syllables at the beginning or end of a word (i.e. apocope or apheresis) have been found in the UPUS-project. This can be illustrated briefly by examples (3) and (4), where *serri* ‘serious’ is the truncated form for *seriøst*, lit. ‘serious’, ‘seriously’, and *digg* ‘good’, the truncated form of *diggbart*, a slang form for *deilig, godt*, lit. ‘delicious’, ‘good’ in Norwegian.

- (3) 012 *det er serri M16 har fa- faen meg sagt det*
 it is serious M16 has fa- fucking me said it
 ‘It is serious, M16 has damn said it to me’

- (4) 035 *det er litt digg da (.) og så er*
 it is a little bit good then and then is
det ikke så jævla lang vei til skolen liksom
 it not so damn long way to school- DEF like
 ‘It is quite good then and after all it is not like so damn far to the school’

c) Truncation and suffixation in *-is*

After being truncated, lexical units are often suffixed with *-is*. In example (5), *fjortis* consists of the truncation of *fjortenåring* ('14 year-old') and suffixation in *-is*. As for example (6), *kompis* consists of truncation of *kompanjong* 'comrade, mate' and of suffixation in *-is*.

(5) 002 *lø* *altså* *jeg* *føler* *meg* *skikkelig* ***fjortis*** *altså*
 no-LOANWORD thus I feel me properly 14 year-old thus
 'No, well, I feel like I really was 14 years old'

(6) 003 *for eksempel* *(.)* *en* ***kompis*** *av* *meg* *skjønner*
 for example a mate of me you know
hva jeg mener *det* *er* *alle* *bruker* *det*
 what I mean it is all use it
 'For example, one of my comrades, you know what I mean, everybody uses it (the word)'

Tryti (1984: 51-53), who published the first global summary of slang words used in Oslo from the 1930s to the 1980s, reports that suffixation with *-is* in Norwegian has been borrowed from Swedish. For instance, *tjenis* (or *kjenis* and *kjens*), which literally means 'good day', comes from the Swedish form *tjänis*. However, the suffix *-is* can also find its origin in Latin and English (*laddis*, cf. ladies; *mablis*, cf. marbles). However, Tryti (1984: 51-53) claims that this suffix *-is* has become so productive in Norwegian that many words have been created with no Swedish counterparts. Moreover, its popularity can be explained by the fact that *-is* is easily combinable with all sort of lexical and morphological units (adjectives, substantives, proper names) and can be used to qualify all kind of persons both positively or negatively.

Even if lexical units suffixed with *-is* (e.g. 6) are nowadays commonly used and attested in Norwegian, some of them still have a connotation which is not neutral and is not accepted by the entire linguistic community. In that sense, such lexical units can be analyzed as neologisms according to Sablayrolles (2006).

2.1.3.2. *Semantic neologism*

Based on diverse material (UNO, *Slangordboka* 2005, 2006), Hasund (2006b: 43-46) has collected significant instances of semantic neologisms in teenage talk in Norway. Semantic neologism consists of adding a meaning to an existing word or using it in unexpected contexts. These processes involve essentially metaphor, puns and irony (Table 1).

Lexical units found in the material		Semantic extents	
Norwegian form	Translation	New meaning in Norwegian	Translation
apoteket	‘pharmacy’	vinmonopolet	‘liquor store’
fossiler	‘fossils’	foreldre	‘parents’
kinderegg	"Kinder Surprise", chocolate egg containing a small toy	<i>brun utenpå, blond inni</i>	‘brown on the outside, blonde inside’
pottet	‘potato’	nordmann	‘native Norwegian’
konge	‘king’	bra	‘good’
einstein	‘Einstein as proper name’	dum	‘foolish’

Table 1: Instances of semantic neologisms in teenage talk, Norway

Interestingly, the UPUS-project provides few instances of semantic extensions of existing Norwegian lexical units in comparison with previous studies. Only one occurrence of *pottet* ‘potato’ has been found. In addition, the neuter form *døvt* from the adjective *døv* ‘deaf’ occurred three times with a pejorative sense, whereas the neutral form *fett* from the adjective *fet* ‘fat’ occurred four times. Its meaning is close to *konge* ‘king’ and designates something positive as shown in example (7).

- (7) 002 *ja* (.) *jeg har lyst til å se roma* (.) *det ser*
 yes i want to see Roma it looks
jævlig fett ut altså det
 damn fat like actually it
 ‘Yes. I am tempted to see Roma. It really looks like amazing actually’

Taken together, these findings suggest that neologisms represent an important part of lexical innovations in teenage speech in Norway. Yet, they may not be considered specific to the speech style in the Eastern parts of Oslo. Among the previously mentioned examples, some have been identified as close to slang (Tryti 1984, Hasund 2006b).⁵ Because slang is defined as “peculiar to a particular group” (cf. Webster’s International Dictionary, 2015), my next point is dedicated to the use of slang as an adolescent practice.

2.2. Adolescent slang lexicon

2.2.1. Definition

According to the Cambridge Dictionary (2015), the concept of slang covers “words and expressions that are used by small groups of people and that are not easily understood by other people”. Similarly, the Merriam Dictionary (2015) defines slang as “words that are not considered part of the standard vocabulary of a language and that are used very informally in speech especially by a particular group of people”. In short, slang is a group-related language usage (i.e. a social phenomenon) typical of informal situations and spoken language. Besides,

⁵ The specificity of a neologism lies in the fact that speakers who use and do not use (the entire community of speakers) the lexical unit perceive it as innovative/unique. This perception of novelty can also be coupled with slang that is to say that the lexical unit carries non-neutral connotation.

it only concerns lexical units that are hence regarded as below the neutral stylistic level. Since adolescents can be regarded as a whole, I refer to the term *adolescent slang lexicon* first suggested by Labov (1992:341).

More broadly, the difficulty of defining slang comes from the ambivalence and subjectivity of the notion. Hasund demonstrates in her book *Slang* (2006:11-12) that speakers of all ages rely on their sociocultural and linguistic background to delimit lexical units, which belong to slang. Their perceptions also fluctuate depending on time factors. Lexical units can thus evolve over time and become ordinary element of a language.

To date, several studies have revealed a correlation between slang and creativity, as claimed by Andersson & Trudgill (1990:78, 84) “creativity is an essential aspect of slang, to a greater degree than with other types of language use”. Andersson & Trudgill (1990:84) add “the use of slang is conscious, with the user being aware of the form of expression, as well as the content”. This perspective indicates that slang is not only a way to attract attention or to color daily speech, but rather that it is a stylistic practice with a social bearing.

2.2.2. *Slang and adolescents*

Peer groups involved in the UPUS-project regularly use slang as shown by examples (1, 2, 5, 6). In addition to prefixation in *drit-* and suffixation in *-is*, Hasund (2006b:76, 91) mentions vulgarity and swearing as typical for adolescent slang in Norway before 2006. Most of the collected ‘bad words’ are related to taboos which during adolescence correspond to a) the opposite gender (breasts, sexual organ), b) relationships and sexuality (flirting), and c) forbidden phenomena (alcohol, drugs, theft, fights).

In order to validate the assumption upon which adolescents from the Eastern parts of Oslo also use vulgarity and swearing at the time of the UPUS-project, I compared the terms Hasund collected with data from UPUS. To achieve it, I used the X-tag function, which, at the time of the codification of the corpus, was associated with all lexical forms that did not appear in the Bokmål Reference Dictionary. By selecting the X-tag function, I have isolated non-standard lexical forms that occurred in the UPUS-project.

The single most striking observation to emerge from the data comparison is that 144 out of a total of 233 X-tag words in the UPUS-project were borrowed from Arabic. The results obtained are set out in Table 2.

Transcription according to Norwegian phonetic	Origin	Translation	Topic
---	--------	-------------	-------

rules			
<i>Sjpa</i>	Berber	Good	Express Approval
<i>Lø</i> <i>Bejsti</i>	Arabic/Kurdish Unknown	sth. negativ Bad, idiot	Express Disapproval
<i>Bæhmen</i> <i>Kæbe</i>	Unknown Arabic / Berber	Kamerat Lit. prostitute girl	Speak about Other
<i>Tæsje</i> <i>Avor</i> <i>Sjofe</i> <i>Baosj</i> <i>Floser</i> <i>Gærro</i>	Unknown Berber Arabic Arabic Arabic Arabic	Theft To run away/leave quickly To look Police Money Tobacco, hashish	Taboo
<i>Wolla</i> <i>Kåran</i>	Arabic Arabic	I swear by Allah The Coran	Express Involvement

Table 2: Most salient X-tagged words in the UPUS-project

The terms have been summarized under four different topics that partially cover topics highlighted by Hasund:

- a) express approval or disapproval
- b) mention the Other in the broad sense of the term
- c) talk about forbidden phenomena
- d) express personal involvement

Interestingly, adolescents from the Eastern parts of Oslo prefer Arabic loanwords when talking about legal or moral prohibitions in order to encrypt exchanges between peers. This implies that speakers are aware of the inaccessibility of these terms to the majority of speakers. Moreover, adolescents from the Eastern parts of Oslo often refer to Muslim culture, even if they are not Muslim (cf. Opsahl 2009). The use of *wolla* in order to attest the veracity of statements or personal involvement in the exchange is widespread among adolescents from the Eastern parts of the city (cf. Harchaoui 2015b). With regard to previous empirical material (cf. the NoTa-project - Norwegian Spoken Language Corpus, the Oslo part/ *Norsk Talespråkskorpus, Oslodelen*) and UNO - Corpus of Teenagers and language contact in Scandinavia, see 2.3.1), I consider that non-European borrowings constitute a real lexical innovation contrary to cases of semantic neology or slang.

2.3. Loan words

2.3.1. Disparate practices in the city

Aasheim (1995) published a pioneering work dedicated to a new language variety identified among adolescent peer groups living in Oslo. The title of her thesis "Norwegian-Kebab": influence of foreign languages on teenage speech in Oslo (in Norwegian "Kebabnorsk":

framandspråkleg påverknad på ungdomsspråket i Oslo) highlights the crucial place of both English and non-European borrowings in Norwegian contemporary practices. Non-European borrowings actually refer to languages brought by recent immigration, such as Berber, Arabic, Turkish, Punjabi and Urdu. It is incidentally after this cultural aspect that the "Norwegian-Kebab" was named. The term 'kebab' explicitly refers to eating habits introduced in Norway by non-Western immigrant populations. The "Norwegian-Kebab" variety described by Aasheim (1997:238) is thus novel because of the regular use of "words that are borrowed from languages far from Norwegian".⁶ By 'far', Aasheim indeed implies languages which do not belong to the Indo-European family or which belong to it but whose lexicon is far from Germanic and Scandinavian branches (i.e. Pashto).

It should however be noted that in Aasheim's study case, only 60% of respondents have Norwegian as their mother tongue (1997:236), in contrast to the UPUS-project (100%). This fact led Aasheim to consider the variety as "a mixture between common Oslo-slang, pidgin and a form of argot, where rebellion against parents and the "established community" is central".⁷ In this case, non-European borrowings are compared with creative lexical processes involved in the formation of pidgins, in that "if a foreign speaker does not find a word in Norwegian, then the word in question will almost automatically be replaced by a word of the native language or a language mastered by the speaker in question".⁸ In this study, all respondents are native speakers of Norwegian (Svendsen & Røyneland 2008: 67). I argue that even if non-European loan words have been found in the UPUS material, they cannot result from code switching/mixing situations, nor cannot result from code switching/mixing situations, or from pidginization with regard to speakers' proficiency in languages other than Norwegian, as well as with the frequency of words use.⁹ The phenomenon could rather be brought closer to poly-languaging¹⁰ (Jørgensen et al. 2011; Ritzau 2015).

Aasheim's pioneering findings (1995) remain relevant on the one hand because they attest new language practices marked by a diversification of lexical roots, and on the other hand because the results clearly point out non-European loanwords as typical for the Eastern parts of Oslo.

Similar results have been provided by the NoTa-project (Norwegian Spoken Language Corpus, the Oslo part/ *Norsk Talespråkskorpus, Oslodelen*) conducted between 2004 and 2006. It consists of interviews and conversational data from 62 respondents aged 16 to 25, all born and raised in Oslo and surrounding areas. Unlike the UPUS-project, NoTa does not target multiethnic areas. I use this additional material as a baseline in order to pinpoint the specificity of the Eastern variety/speech style. Results from NoTa support a bipartite teenage talk depending on areas in Oslo (varieties vary according to areas and social backgrounds). Since the Industrial Revolution, the Western neighbourhoods (e.g. *St. Hanshaugen, Frogner,*

⁶ Aasheim (1997:238) "*De ordene som er lånt inn fra språk som ligger langt fra norsk*"

⁷ Aasheim (1997: 238) "*Kebab-norsk ser ut til å være en blanding av vanlig osloslang, pidgin og en form for argot, hvor opprør mot foreldre og « det etablert samfunn » står sentralt*"

⁸ Aasheim (1997: 238) "*Der et sannsynlig, at om en fremmedspråklig ikke kommer på et ord i norsk, så vil et ord fra morsmålet eller et annet språk han behersker, nesten automatisk erstatte dette*"

⁹ The 56 adolescents involved in the UPUS-Project were between the ages of 13 to 19 and came all from Old Oslo (located in the inner city) and Southern Nordstrand (located in the peripheral region). Both belong to the Eastern parts of the city that for almost four decades have been known for their cultural and linguistic diversity. Old Oslo and Southern Nordstrand had a migrant population of approximately 35% at the period when data were collected. The adolescents have various backgrounds. Some have Norwegian-born parents and some have foreign-born parents. The majority consider Norwegian to be their mother tongue, either as their sole mother tongue or in addition to another language (see Svendsen 2009).

¹⁰ Ritzau (2015: 660) defines polylinguaging as "the phenomenon that speakers employ linguistic resources at their disposal which are associated with different "languages", including the cases in which the speakers know only few features associated with a given "language"".

Ullern, Vestre Aker, Nordre Aker and Nordstrand) have enjoyed a higher socio-economic status, which has enhanced their reputation. The West side of Oslo is also known to generally have fewer immigrant groups that mainly come from the Nordic countries, the European Union and North America (cf. *SSB*, Statistics Norway).

According to Hasund (2006b:18-19), adolescents growing up in those areas predominantly borrow words from English, Spanish or German, which result from “cultural contact”, i.e. indirect contact from one language to another via cultural and linguistic influence conveyed by literature, music, art or the fashion industry. As described by Johansson & Graedler (2002:270), English creates a stylistic effect “by which the speaker implicitly refers to the Anglo-American popular culture knowledge of his/her interlocutor, that emphasizes and reinforces his/her message”. Moreover, European loanwords seem to be found in other major cities in Norway such as Bergen, Tromsø and Kristiansand.

On the contrary, the Eastern parts of Oslo (e.g. Gamle Oslo, Grünerløkka, Sagene, Bjerke, Grorud, Stovner, Alna, Østensjø and Southern Nordstrand) are described as multiethnic areas and have provided for conditions that are more unfavourable than in the rest of the city. Statistics Norway, which annually publishes official statistics about Norwegian society, reported that Southern Nordstrand comprised 44% immigrant population at the time of the UPUS-project. Based on empirical material from NoTa’s corpus, Opsahl, Røyneland & Svendsen (2008:33) have compared the lexicon of the Western and the Eastern varieties. It can be seen from the data in Table 3 that among a total of 663 lexical forms, 245 examples fall within the Norwegian slang group, 353 are categorized as borrowings from English while the remaining come from other languages, including non-(Indo-)European languages (Berber, Arabic) and Indo-European languages other than Norwegian and English.¹¹

	Female speakers from Eastern areas (16)	Female speakers from Western areas (14)	Male speakers from Eastern areas (13)	Male speakers from Western areas (18)	Total
Slang (Norwegian)	32	72	99	42	245
English loan words	31	68	147	107	353
Other Languages loan words	5	3	53	4	65

Table 3: Occurrences of slang and loan words in NoTa among adolescents under 26 (In number, $T = 663$)

¹¹ Opsahl, Røyneland & Svendsen (2008:33)

	Female speakers from Eastern areas (16)	Female speakers from Western areas (14)	Male speakers from Eastern areas (13)	Male speakers from Western areas (18)	Total
Slang (Norwegian)	4,80%	10,70%	15,00%	6,30%	36,8%
English loanwords	4,70%	10,30%	22,00%	16,20%	53,2%
Other Languages Loan words	0,80%	0,60%	8,00%	0,60%	10%

Table 4: Occurrences of slang and loan words in NoTa among adolescents under 26 (In percent, T = 100%)

Together these results indicate that male adolescents from the Eastern areas in Oslo are the most innovative speakers since a) they resort more frequently to Norwegian slang, b) they also borrow more from English. But the most striking difference concerns borrowings from other languages where once again male adolescents from the Eastern areas borrowed 53 words from other languages whereas speakers from the Western parts only did it 4 times. According to Hasund (2006b: 18-19), words borrowed by adolescents from the Eastern parts of Oslo would be caused by a language contact situation resulting from a prolonged cohabitation of several languages. Despite multiethnicity and multilingualism, which have reigned in the Eastern parts of Oslo, I argue that the present situation is far from that described by Weinreich (1968) because both respondents in the NoTa and UPUS-projects are fully competent in Norwegian¹². Their use of other languages loan words does not result from a lack of linguistic competence.

In order to follow how language practices have developed over time in the Eastern parts of Oslo, the next section presents the findings of my research across UPUS, focusing on non-European loanwords.

2.3.2. Non-European loan words

As noted above, non-European words in NoTa's material represent 9.8% of all lexical forms (65 out of a total of 663) and in the great majority of cases (81.5%) they were produced by male adolescents from Eastern parts of Oslo (53 out of a total of 65). This seems to confirm the assumption that non-European words are a specific feature of language use in the multiethnic areas of Oslo (see Svendsen, 2008). Through the X-tag function within informal situations (conversations among friends), I found 26 lexical forms (N=400) that were borrowed from Arabic, equivalent to 6.5% of all X-tags. They consist of a dozen units that are repeatedly occurring and could be summarized as follows:

¹² See Svendsen & Røynealand (2008:67) where they take Anders as an example. "Anders (...) claims to be a multiethnolectal user, and has also been identified as such by other adolescents in a perception task. Anders is raised bilingually in Norwegian and Arabic (...) He reports to have better productive and receptive competence in Norwegian which he identifies as his first language and his "mother tongue"."

- *sjpa* ‘good’ / *dritsjpa* ‘very good’
- *taz* ‘joke’ / *drittaz* ‘very joke’
- *sjmø* ‘bad’ / *dritsjmø* ‘very bad’
- *tasja* ‘theft’
- *kæbe* ‘girl’
- *volla-språk* ‘wallah language’, *wallah* ‘I swear by Allah’
- *jallanorsk* ‘jalla Norwegian’

When it comes to the UPUS-project, I identified 149 Arabic loan words (N=233 X-tags). These results indicate that the number of non-European borrowings has seriously increased over one year, and moreover that teenage speakers from the Eastern areas have broadened the use of some lexical units. Interestingly, the denomination *wallah* ‘[I swear] by Allah’ transcribed as *wolla* in the UPUS project occurred 113 times (N=149) in informal situations. Beyond the corroborative value of the term, adolescents who are not Arabic speakers seem to multiply the use of *wolla* as an intensifier, a discourse marker or, in extreme cases, as an adjective or a noun when there are Norwegian counterparts such as *sverg*, *jeg sverger* and *helt ærlig* ‘swear’, ‘I swear’ and ‘quite honestly’ (see Harchaoui 2015b). The use of *wolla* may thereby be linked to the multiethnolectal speech style where the term has become an emblematic word.

Before I reach the symbolic use of *wolla*, I would like to provide some stretches of peer conversations from the UPUS-project, which illustrate how non-European loanwords, are used in discourse and integrated to Norwegian language practices (8-9).

- (8) 003 **lø** *jeg var med hva heter hun* (.) **lø** *jeg har alltid vært*
 no-ARABIC I was with what is her name no-ARABIC I have always been
litt sånn brutal ikke sant
 little like brutal not true
 ‘No, I was with what is her name. No, I have always been a bit like brutal, right?’

- (9) 009 **lø** *det er ikke* (.) (.) *det er ikke våre penger* (latter)
 no-ARABIC it is not it is not our money (laughter)
 ‘No, it is not our money’

Examples (8) and (9) are good illustrations of the use of *lø* which in these contexts means ‘no’. *Lø* is directly borrowed from Arabic and functions as an interjection. However, loanwords can undergo morphological integration as shown by my next example. To briefly situate the context, respondent number 012 was waiting in the recording room, pointing at the screen of the camera. On the video, he said to an adult who was off-camera that he must first be videotaped and also asked if the camera had started filming. Right after, he commented that all (the adults) are bad (10).

- (10) 012 *la meg bare bli filma først de hører oss* (.) **lø**
 let me just be videotaped first they hear us no-ARABIC
altså alle sammen er løe
 so all together are no-ARABIC.PL
 ‘Let me just be videotaped first. Do they hear us? No! So all together are bad’

The first mention of *lø* refers to the interjection ‘no’ where the next instance *lø-e* carries an adjectival function and is inflected according to Norwegian adjective patterns, where plural adjectives end with *-e*.

As shown by example (11), inflection of non-Europeans loanwords is also possible with nouns. The following conversation took place between respondents 009 and 010 who were talking about their plans for the next day. The conversation starts when adolescent 010 suggested 009 joining him to go downtown but the latter felt annoyed by the fact that he had to work that day.

- (011) 010 *skal møte mæba mi*
 shall meet mæb.DEF.SG.FEM my.FEM
 ‘I am going to meet my girl’
- 009 *(latter)*
 (laughter)
- 010 *(latter) vær med bli med da*
 (laughter) be with be.PROG with then
 ‘Join us then’
- 009 *lø jeg jobber hva faen jeg orker ikke det tuller der*
 NO-ARABIC I work whatever the hell I can.stand not this joke there
 ‘No! I work whatever the hell I can’t stand this joke there’
- 009 *jeg har jobb faen*
 I have work damned
- 010 *ja ok da*
 yes ok then
- 009 *(latter) jeg går og deler ut brosjyrer møter*
 (laughter) I walk and hand out brochures meet
- 009 *bare mæber bare vær så god*
 just mæbe.IND.PL just be so good
 ‘I just walk and hand out brochures, I just meet some girls, just you’re welcome’
- 010 *faen det er flaut herregud*
 damned it is embarrassing my goodness
- 009 *det var en gang jeg møte den mæba*
 It was one time I met this mæb.DEF.SG.FEM
- 009 *hun gikk med faren sin*
 she walked with father her
 ‘Once upon a time I met this girl, she was walking with her father’

Both respondents use the loan word *mæbe* to refer to the substantive *jente* ‘girl’. At line 1, *mæbe* is inflected for definiteness and feminine according to Norwegian morphology and ends with *-a*. It is followed by the possessive pronoun *mi* ‘my’ which is also inflected in singular feminine. In line 6, the speaker is talking about girls in general and uses *mæbe* as an indefinite plural which takes the *-er* ending in Norwegian. Finally, at line 9, the term occurs preceded by *den* which indicates that the person spoken about is distant in time or in space. According to Norwegian, the substantive is also inflected in singular feminine definite (*-a* ending).

Instances of borrowed verb inflection have been found in another conversation between respondents 009 and 010 (12). In this peer conversation, adolescent 010 gives standard Norwegian counterparts to some expressions in Norwegian-kebab (see 2.3.1.).

- (12) 010 *røyker* *du*
 smoke you
 ‘Do you smoke?’
- 009 *hva heter det igjen*
 what calls it again
 ‘What is it called again?’
- 010 *kif-*
 009 ***kifer*** *du*
 kif.PRES you
 ‘Do you smoke?’

The question *kifer du* corresponds to *røyker du* in Norwegian ‘do you smoke’. Interestingly, adolescent 009 conjugated the Arabic root *kif* in the present tense by adding *-er*, the common inflexion for present tense in Norwegian.

2.3.3. A question of context

As pointed out in the introduction to this paper, the UPUS-project comes in two recording modes: peer conversations on the one hand and video-recorded interviews on the other. During the interviews, adolescents talk about lexical items that characterize the multiethnolectal speech style. In example (13), the interviewer asks respondent 021 about a specific way of speaking among Norwegian adolescents in multiethnic areas. Here is the answer.

- (13) 021 *de sier sånn derre (.) istedenfor å si (.) altså*
 they say like instead of to say then
å så bra så sier de å så sjpa
 oh so good so say they oh so good.ARABIC
 ‘They say like instead of saying ‘oh so good’ so they say ‘oh so sjpa’
- INT *ja sier du det eller*
 yes say you it or
 ‘Yes. Do you also say it?’
- 021 *ja når jeg tuller så sier jeg det men ikke når*
 yes when I joke so say jeg it but not when
jeg snakker med sånn voksne som deg da sier jeg ikke
 I talk with some adults like you so say I not
å det var sjpa liksom ikke sånn
 oh it was good.ARABIC somehow not like
 ‘Yes when I am joking so I say it, but not when I am talking to adults like you.
 There, I do not say ‘oh it was sjpa’, not in this way’

Respondent 021 also explains in which communicative situation she uses non-European loan words. Moreover, she highlights the process through which this speech style has occurred (14).

- (14) 021 *det merker jeg også selv* (.) *når jeg snakker med*
 it notice I too self when I talk with
søsteren sier jeg hele tiden ja ja liksom liksom
 sister.DEF say I all time yes yes like like
hun står sånn her ikke sant
 she stands that.way here not true
 ‘I notice it myself too. When I talk to my sister, I say all the time ‘yes, yes, like, like’. She stands like that, right.’

ja og så sier vi (.) *for eksempel se på den*
 yes and then say we for example look at this
kæba der det er liksom se på den dama
 lady.ARABIC there it is like look at this lady
guttene sier ikke sant
 boy.DEF.PL say not true

‘Yes and then, we say for example ‘look at this kæba there’ it is the same as ‘look at this lady’ the boys (usually) say, right’

- INT *ja ja*
 yes yes
 021 *istedenfor å si se på den dama så bare*
 instead of to say look at this lady so just
sier du det sånn (.) *så bare begynner du*
 say you it like so just begin you
å veksle ut ord og det sånn (.) *da kaller du det*
 to change word and it like then call you it
Holmlia-språk
 Holmlia language

‘Instead of saying ‘look at this woman’ so you just say it like that. So you just begin to change the word and this so you call it the language of Holmlia’

- INT *ja hvor kommer de orda fra*
 yes where come the words from
 ‘Yes. Where do these words come from?’

- 021 *jeg vet egentlig jeg tror for eksempel kæbe så*
 I know really I think for example lady.ARABIC so
tror jeg det kommer fra sånn arabisk eller noe sånn
 think I it comes from like Arabic or something like
(.)du bare (.) *putter det inn*
 you just put it in
 ‘I really know.. I think for example *kæbe*, so, I think it comes from like Arabic or something like... You just put it in’

This stretch is highly relevant for my analysis because the adolescent reveals that the use of Arabic loan words such as *kæbe* is common among male speakers in Holmlia, a multiethnic suburb in the Eastern parts of Oslo. Moreover, respondent 021 confirms that speakers who use ‘the language of Holmlia’ (implying the multiethnolectal style) *just* (in Norwegian “bare”) replace loan words with other Norwegian words.

Another interview including respondent 002 illustrates the attitude of speakers towards non-Europeans borrowings (15).

- (15) INT *kan du gi eksempel på ord og uttrykk fra
can you give example of word and expression from
språkbruken der eller språket
language use.DEF there or language.DEF*
'Can you give example of words or expressions from the language use there or from the language?'
- 002 *i hvert fall det jeg ikke liker er sånn uttrykk sånn
in any case it I not like is like expression such as
lø og sjå og wolla og sånn det
no.ARABIC and good.ARABIC and swear by god.ARABIC and like it*
'In any case, what I don't like, is expressions such as lø and sjpa and wolla, and things like that'
- INT *men det er eksempel på uttrykk fra
but it is example of expression from
det språket du tenker
this language you think*
'But do you think there are examples of expressions from this language?'
- 002 *ja (.) men det blir veldig mye brukt på norsk da
yes but it becomes very much used in Norwegian then*
'Yes. In addition, there are frequently used in Norwegian'

Comparing the two recording modes, it can be seen that adolescents react differently to borrowing depending on the communicative setting. In peer conversations, loan words are used in discourse and are, in some cases, totally or partially inflected according to Norwegian grammatical rules. On the contrary, during interviews, speakers talk about loan words but never use them. Moreover, they distance themselves from this process, and tend to deny or reject it (i.e. 'the boys say', 'what I don't like'). Yet, these results suggest that Arabic words are the first feature pointed out when describing the language use of Eastern parts of Oslo, and that speakers are aware of using loan words in specific situations (i.e. 'I notice it myself', 'when I joke', 'not when I am talking to adults'). From a language use perspective, self-awareness attitudes can thus be interpreted as an ability of the speakers to choose to resort to linguistic features depending on non-linguistic settings. This idea has been supported by Opsahl & Nistov (2010) who demonstrated that the violation of the V2 constraint¹³ occurred more frequently during peer conversations whereas speakers resort to the XVS-structure in formal situations.

Having determined in which communicative settings non-European loan words have appeared, the question of motivations still remains unanswered. The last section of this paper

¹³ Among syntactic features, the multiethnolectal style can be characterized by occurrence of XSV order in contexts where standard Norwegian has verbal inversion. This process is usually called 'violation of the V2 constraint'. Norwegian, like other Germanic languages is a V2 language, constraining the appearance of the finite verb to the second position in declarative main clauses. Apart from SVO, which is the canonical word order, itself exhibiting V2, XVS word order is obligatory where X is a topicalized element, V the finite verb and S the subject. Opsahl & Nistov (2010) analyzed all declarative main clauses introduced by a nonsubject in the UPUS-Project and found out that a total number of 194 instances of XSV-structure was found, constituting 22% of the total number of declarative main clauses with a nonsubject as the clause-initial element. In the peer conversations the proportion of XSV is as high as 38% whereas in the interviews the proportion is 12%. Opsahl & Nistov (2010: 58-59) claimed that violation of the V2 constraint is characteristic of language use in peer conversations and more broadly a structural aspect of language use in youth in-group settings.

takes into account the multilingual dimension in order to explain why speakers use other languages in their speech.

3. *From lexical innovation to social meaning* 3.1. *Micro perspective*

More recent research into youth language has correlated language use and identity. As claimed by Hasund (2006a: 34), “while belonging to different linguistic communities, we are also individuals. But also our individual identity has a social or collective side, and is linked to our linguistic interactions with others. Through language we can express who we are or want to be. Through linguistic feedback from others, we also learn how we are perceived, which affects our own perception of ourselves”.¹⁴ Moreover, sociolinguists generally agree that adolescence is the life stage in which language change is most clearly visible (Kerswill 1996).

Relative to adolescent slang lexicon, Hasund (2006b: 4) adds that slang is the most common adolescent practice and offers youngsters a way to play with words, which better reflects their personality. Considering all of these lines of evidence, lexical features such as loan words seem to have several functions in my case study.

Firstly, speakers can estimate that the language from which a word is borrowed has greater prestige than the dominant language (Norwegian). Tryti (1984:91) gives the example of the English word *girlsa* used instead of the Norwegian *jentene* ‘the girls’: “the point (...) [is] not only that one will express ‘a young person in feminine plural’. By using *girlsa*, the speaker conveys that he/she is young, cool, trendy, funny, urban, international, language conscious, ironic, creative, norm-breaking and expressive”.¹⁵

Then, during the life stage of adolescence, speech innovations contribute to express values that the speakers deem prestigious¹⁶ but they also indicate that speakers want to be perceived positively inside the peer-group. However, the results I have provided show that English is not specific to the Eastern parts of Oslo.

If we consider the non-European roots of loan words found in the speech style of adolescents from the Eastern parts of Oslo, I argue that innovation can be used in order to encrypt the message delivered and to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the community. Non-European loan words are promoted when speakers talk about legal and moral prohibitions (cf. 2.3.1.) because they are aware of the inaccessibility of the terms by the majority. This implies that speakers not only innovate in order to perform but rather to develop cryptic practices. Hasund (2006a: 35) explains that in this case, “their individual speech is adapted to the social community, moreover, that the speech helps to determine this

¹⁴ “Men også vår individuelle identitet har en sosial eller kollektiv side, og henger sammen med vår språklige samhandling med andre. Gjennom språket kan vi uttrykke hvem vi er eller ønsker å være. Gjennom språklige tilbakemeldinger fra andre lærer vi også hvordan vi blir oppfattet, noe som igjen påvirker vår egen oppfatning av oss selv”.

¹⁵ “Poenget (...) ikke bare at man vil uttrykke ‘ungt menneske av hunkjønn, flertal’. Ved å bruke *girlsa* kan den som snakker i tillegg formidle at hun er ung, kul, trendy, morsom, urban, internasjonal, språkbevisst, ironisk, kreativ, normbrytende og ekspressiv”.

¹⁶ Hasund (2006a: 35) “Om man tilpasser språket sitt ved å nærme seg samtalepartnerens stil (konvergerer) eller fjerne seg fra den (divergerer), kan best forklares ut fra sosialpsykologiske prinsipper, som i korthet går ut på at det er større sjanse for at man tilpasser språket sitt dersom det er knyttet noe positivt å gjøre det”. (If one adapts his/her language by approaching the speech style of his/her interlocutor (converge) or by removing from it (diverge), it can best be explained by social psychological principles, which briefly are that there is a greater chance that convergence appears if language is related to something positive).

community". The multiethnic dimension of the Eastern areas widens the scope of language available for borrowing form. Based on the notion of *bricolage*¹⁷ (see Levi-Strauss 1971, Hedbige 1979), I argue that individual resources can be combined with other resources in order to construct a more complex meaningful entity.

An interesting question should then be: what kind of positive values do speakers from the Eastern parts associate with the use of non-European loanwords that lead them to promote Arabic words instead of English or Norwegian ones? Moreover, how could the multiethnic dimension impact their speech and disseminate a more complex identity?

3.2. Macro perspective

Furthermore the UPUS-project has provided instances where speakers define their identity in relation to the locality and to the multiethnic dimension of the Eastern parts of Oslo in order to contrast themselves with adolescents from Western areas that they consider being pretentious and superficial. This can be illustrated by Line (Quist & Svendsen, 2010:117-118), an adolescent who was interviewed in the UPUS-project. Both of her parents are from Norwegian backgrounds. In the following conversation, she affirms her pride in coming from the Eastern parts of Oslo and openly criticizes the speakers from the Western areas (16).

- (16) INT *hva synes du om den språkformen i forhold til andre utgaver av norsk?*
 'What do you think about this language form compared to other versions of Norwegian?'
- Line *jeg synes den er mye bedre enn sånn vestkant*
 'I think it's much better than the form from the Westside'
- INT *hvordan er vestkant?*
 'How is the Westside?'
- Line ***jålete***
'Posh'
- Line *sånn skikkelig sånn *knekker håndleddet* (.) homospråk*
 'Like really like *cracking knuckles* homo language'
- Line *selv om jeg ikke har noe imot homser altså*
 'Although I do not have anything against gays'
- INT *nei*
 'No'
- Line *men det blir bare litt sånn rart*
 'But it just gets a little weird'
- INT *så du kunne ikke tenke deg å (.) snakke vestkant*
 'So you could not imagine.. talking Westside'
- Line *nei *rister på hodet**
 'No' *shakes head *
- INT *det sier jo litt om hvem du er også hvordan du snakker, gjør det ikke*
 'The way you speak tells about who you are, does'nt it?'

¹⁷ Hedbige (1979:104) "Together, object meaning constitutes a sign, and, within any cultures, such signs are assembled, repeatedly, into characteristic forms of discourse. However, when the bricoleur re-locates the significant object to a different position within that discourse, using the same overall repertoire of signs, or when that object is placed within a different total ensemble, a new discourse is constituted, a different message conveyed".

- Line *jo når du snakker hvis xxx snakker vestkantdialekt skjønner man du er fra vestkanten (.) snakker du østkant (.) dialekt så kommer du fra østkanten på en måte*
 ‘Yes. When you talk if xxx talk the Westside dialect, so one realizes you are from the Western areas.. if you talk the Eastside.. dialect so you come from the Eastern parts, in a way’
- INT *men er du stolt av å komme fra*
 ‘But are you proud to come from where you are?’
- Line *ja*
 ‘yes’
- INT *østkanten?*
 ‘the Eastside’
- Line *jeg er kjempestolt*
 ‘I am very proud’
- INT *ja nettopp*
 ‘Yes, exactly’
- Line *østkanten er det beste*
 ‘Eastside is the best’

Another interview (17) offers a broader perspective to connect the multiethnolectal style (labelled Kebab-Norwegian in the excerpt) with the expression of the status of minority adolescents. Svendsen & Røynealand (2008:69) describe Anders in these terms: “Anders [...] claims to be a multiethnolectal user, and has also been identified as such by other adolescents in a perception task. Anders is raised bilingually in Norwegian and Arabic [...]. He reports to have better productive and receptive competence in Norwegian, which he identifies as his first language and his “mother tongue”. Thus, Norwegian may be classified as his dominant language”.

- (17) INT *hvilket navn har det*
 ‘What name does it have?’
- Anders *jeg kaller det på en måte jeg har ikke noe navn for det jeg har b- jeg f- ser på det som en refleksjon av mangfold og felleskap*
 ‘I call it in a way I don’t have any name for it. I have b- I f- look at it as a reflection of diversity and togetherness’
- INT *Men avisene mediene bruker uttrykket kebab-norsk hva syns du om det ?*
 But eh the newspapers the media use the term Kebab-Norwegian what do you think about that?
- Anders *ja jeg helt ærlig (.) det er noe dem har sagt de jeg ser ikke jeg har aldri (.) eneste jeg sier det her er vår dialekt (.) jeg trenger ikke å si kebabnorsk eller (.)*
 Yes I honestly (.) that is something they have said they I I don’t look I have never (.) only thing I say is this is our dialect (.) I don’t need to say Kebab-Norwegian or (.)
- INT *Og hvem er vi hvem er vår (.) dialekt hvem er vi ?*
 ‘and who are we who is our (.) dialect who are we ?’
- Anders *det er minoriteten*
 ‘it is the minority’
- INT *ehmm (.) minoritetsungdom*
 ‘minority adolescents’

Anders *ja*

‘yes’

INT *men du sa også at det var eh (.) andre ungdommer med norsk bakgrunn*

‘but you also said that there were eh (.) other adolescents with Norwegian background

Anders *(.) ja*

‘yes’

During the interview, Anders shows a “reflective view on this spoken variety” and “connects the dialect to a “generalized” minority; the minority’s dialect. The fact that he uses the term ‘dialect’ is interesting and may be seen in connection to the special position dialects have in Norway” (cf. Røyneland, 2008; cf. Svendsen & Røyneland, 2008: 70). More interestingly, Anders confirms that adolescents with a Norwegian background also use the speech style.

These results match my argument that adolescents search for social meaning through language that is to say they attempt to negotiate their identity and find a place in the social context according to Le Page & Tabouret-Keller’s (1985:14) notion of acts of identity “in which people reveal both their personal identity and their search for social roles”. This idea is also confirmed by Eckert (1997:52) who claims “adolescents are the linguistic movers and shakers, at least in western industrialized societies, and, as such, a prime source of information about linguistic change and the role of language in social practice.”

In the Oslo study case, it now seems obvious that speakers’ use of specific lexical units expresses their belonging to areas, which have become the symbol of “a late-modern urban, multiethnic reality” (Opsahl, 2009:239). Recently, Madsen (2015:3) put forward this idea when analyzing a similar phenomenon into Danish environments. She explains besides that “at a first order indexical¹⁸ stage, linguistic signs such as vocabulary from Turkish, Kurdish and Arabic combined with non-standard grammar and non-standard prosody could index second-language speakers of Danish and thereby speakers with an immigrant background. More recently, however, these signs have become enregistered¹⁹ as a contemporary speech style associated with urban youth, cultural diversity and toughness more generally”.

4. Concluding remarks

The evidence from this study suggests that non-Europeans loan words constitute the most innovative part of the lexicon in the speech of adolescents from the Eastern parts of Oslo, not only because of their linguistic features but also because of their indexical field. The UPUS-Project has enhanced our understanding of contemporary speech practices in Norway taking into account the social dimension. It has also shown how language can serve speakers to express solidarity toward a new multilingual urbanity.

Further research should also be conducted in order to determine the relevance of the age-specific feature of these speech practices in order to pursue the study of Rampton (2011) on contemporary urban vernaculars through similar examples in other European countries.

¹⁸ According to Eckert (2008: 454) “the meanings of variables are not precise or fixed but rather constitute a field of potential meanings – an indexical field, or constellation of ideologically related meanings, any one of which can be activated in the situated use of the variable. The field is fluid, and each new activation has the potential to change the field by building on ideological connections”.

¹⁹ Based on Agha’s definition of enregisterment (2007: 81) “processes and practices whereby performable signs become recognized (and regrouped) as belonging to distinct, differentially valorized semiotic registers by a population”.

Acknowledgements

I want to thank Bente Ailin Svendsen from the Center for Multilingualism in Society across the Lifespan (MultiLing) in the University of Oslo, for support and allowing me to work on the UPUS-Project. Thanks also go to Karl Erland Gadelii for his helpful comments and ideas.

Sarah Harchaoui

Université Paris-Sorbonne

EA 7332 « Centre de Linguistique en Sorbonne » (CELISO)

sarah.neslie.harchaoui@gmail.com

<https://paris-sorbonne.academia.edu/SarahHarchaoui>

References

- Aarsæther, F. (2010). The use of multiethnic youth language in Oslo. In: Quist, P. & B.A, Svendsen (eds.). *Multilingual Urban Scandinavia: New linguistic Practices*. Multilingual Matters, pp.111-126.
- Aasheim, S.C. (1995). "Kebab-Norsk": framandspråkleg påverknad på ungdomsspråket i Oslo. Ph-D thesis. University of Oslo.
- (1997). "Kebab-Norsk": fremmedspråklig påvirkning på ungdomsspråket i Oslo. In: Kotsinas, U.B ; A.B, Strenström & A.M, Karlsson (eds.). *Ungdomsspråk i Norden. Föredrag från ett forskarsymposium*, pp. 235-243.
- Agha, A. (2007). *Language and Social Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2005). Voice, Footing, Enregisterment. In: *The Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15(1), pp. 38-59.
- Andersson, L.G. & Trudgill, P. (1990). *Bad language*. London: Penguin books
- Calvet, L.J. (2007). *L'argot*. 3e éd. « Que sais-je ? », Paris: Presses Universitaires de France
- Clyne, M. (2000). Lingua franca and ethnolects in Europe and beyond. In: *Sociolinguistica* (14), pp.83-89
- Doran, M. (2004). Negotiating Between Bourgeois and Racaille: 'Verlan' as Youth Identity Practice in Suburban Paris. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*, Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 93-124.
- Drange, E.M. (2002). Fremmedspråklige slangord i norsk ungdomsspråk. In: Strenström, A.B (ed.). *Jallaspråk, slanguage og annet ungdomsspråk i Norden*, pp. 9-17.
- Eckert, P. (2008). Variation and the indexical field. In: *Journal of Sociolinguistics*(12), pp. 453-476.
- (2001). Style and social meaning. In: Eckert, P. & J. Rickford (eds.). *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, pp. 119-128.
- (1997a). Age as a sociolinguistic variable. In: Coulmas, F. (ed.). *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford, pp.151–167.
- Fagyal, Z. (2004). Remarques sur l'innovation lexicale: action des médias et interactions entre jeunes dans une banlieue ouvrière de Paris. In: *Cahiers de sociolinguistique*(9), pp.41-60
- Gadet, F. & Hambye, P. (2014). Contact and ethnicity in "youth language" description: in search of specificity. In: Nicolai, R. (ed). *Questioning language contact. Limits of contact, Contact at its limits*. Leiden, Brill Academic Pub, pp. 183-216.
- Harchaoui, S. (2015a) La notion de multiethnolecte dans le contexte scandinave, In: *Diversité des langues - Les universaux linguistiques à l'épreuve des faits de langue, Actes de COLDOC 2014*, (Nanterre, 13-14 novembre 2014), pp. 61-77.
- (2015b) Les valeurs sémantiques de l'expression *Wolla* dans le discours d'adolescents à Oslo, Norvège. In: *Revue des jeunes chercheurs en linguistique de Paris-Sorbonne*(3) pp. 72-109.
- Hasund, I. (2006a). *Ungdomsspråk*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- (2006b). *Slang*. Oslo: Kunnskapsforlaget.
- Hedbige, D. (1979). *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. Routledge: London and New York.
- Johannessen, J.B. (2008). Oslospråket i tall, In: Johannessen, J.B & K, Hagen (eds.). *Språk i Oslo. Ny forskning omkring talespråk*. Novus forlag. Oslo, pp.235-242.
- Irvine, J.T. and S. Gal. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In: Paul V. Kroskrity (ed.) *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*. Santa Fe, New Mexico: School of American Research Press, pp.35–83.
- Irvine, J. (2001). Style as distinctiveness: The culture and ideology of linguistic differentiation. In: Eckert, P. and

- J.Rickford (eds.) *Style and Sociolinguistic Variation*, Cambridge, UK:Cambridge University Press, pp.21–43.
- Johansson, S. & A.N, Grædler. (2002). *Rocka, hipt og snacksy. Om engelsk i norsk språk og samfunn*. Kristiansand:Høyskoleforlaget, pp. 260-270.
- Jørgensen, J. N. & P, Quist. (2008). *Unge sprog*. København : Reitzel.
- Jørgensen, J. N et al. (2011). Polylinguaging in Superdiversity. In:*Diversities* 13(2), UNESCO, pp.23–38.
- Kerswill, P. (1996). Children, adolescents and language change. In: *Language Variation and Change* 8(2), pp.177–202.
- Kotsinas, U.B.; A.B, Strenström & A.M, Karlsson. (1997). *Ungdomsspråk i Norden:föredrag från ett forskarsymposium*. Stockholm: Institutionen för Nordiska Språk
- Kotsinas, U.B. (1988). Immigrant children's Swedish—a new variety? In: *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 9(1-2), pp.129-140.
- Le Page, R. & A, Tabouret-Keller. (1985). *Acts of Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1966). *The Savage Mind*. Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Madsen, L-M. (forthcoming). Investigating a register label: Integrated speech in Copenhagen. In Agha, A. (ed.) *Registers of Communication*. Studia Fennica Linguistica. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
- Madsen, L. M., J. S, Møller & J. N., Jørgensen. (2010). "Street Language" and "Integrated":Language Use and Enregisterment Among Late Modern Urban Girls. In:Madsen, L. M., J. S. Møller, J. N. Jørgensen (eds.). *Ideological Constructions and Enregisterment of Linguistic Youth Styles*. Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism (55), pp. 81-113.
- Møller, J.S. (2009). *Poly-lingual interaction across childhood, youth and adulthood*. Copenhagen:University of Copenhagen.
- Nortier, J. & B.A, Svendsen. (2015). *Language youth and identity in the 21st Century*. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- Nortier, J. and M. Dorleijn. (2008). A Moroccan accent in Dutch: A sociocultural style restricted to the Moroccan community? In: *International Journal of Bilingualism*,12(1-2) pp. 125– 142.
- NoTa. (2006). Corpus of spoken language across Oslo. Developed by Tekstlaboratoriet at the Department of Linguistics & Scandinavian Studies, University of Oslo. <<http://www.tekstlab.uio.no/nota/oslo/index.html>> (02.6.2014)
- Opsahl, T. & I, Nistov. (2010). On some structural aspects of Norwegian spoken among adolescents in multilingual settings in Oslo, In: Quist, P. & B.A, Svendsen (eds.) *Multilingual Urban Scandinavia: New linguistic Practices*. Multilingual Matters, pp. 49-63.
- Opsahl, T., U, Røyneland & B.A, Svendsen. (2008). 'Syns du jallanorsk er lættis, eller?' – om taggen [lang=x]" In:Johannessen, J.B. & K, Hagen (eds.). *Språk i Oslo. Ny forskning omkring talespråk*. Novus forlag. Oslo, pp. 29-42.
- Opsahl, T. (2009). Wolla I swear this is typical for the conversational style of adolescents in multiethnic areas in Oslo. In: *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, 32(2), pp. 221-244.
- Pruvost, J. & J.F, Sablayrolles. (2003). *Les néologismes*. 2^{ème} éd. « Que sais-je ? », Paris : Presses Universitaires de France
- Quist, P. & B.A, Svendsen. (ed.) (2010). *Multilingual Urban Scandinavia*. New Linguistic Practices. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Quist, P. (2008). Sociolinguistic approaches to multiethnolect: Language variety and stylistic practice. In: *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 12(1/2), pp. 43–61.
- (2000). Ny københavnsk 'multiethnolect'. Om sprogbrug blant unge i sprogligt og kulturelt heterogene miljøer. In: *Danske talesprog* 1, pp. 144–211.
- Rampton, B. (2011). From 'multi-ethnic adolescent heteroglossia' to 'contemporary urban vernaculars'. In: *Language & Communication*, 31(4), pp. 276 – 294.
- Ritzau, U. (2015). Learner language and polylinguaging: how language students' ideologies relate to their written language use. In: *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 18 (6), pp. 660–675.
- Sablayrolles, J.F. (2006). La néologie aujourd'hui, In: *À la recherche du mot : De la langue au discours*, Gruz Claude Gruaz, Lambert-Lucas, Limoges, pp. 141-157.
- (1996). "Néologismes : une typologie des typologies". In : *Cahier du CIEL*, pp. 11–48
- Silverstein, M. (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In: Cline, R et al. *The Elements: A Parasesion on Linguistic Units and Levels*, Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 193-247.
- Starobová, S. (2010). La création néologique en français contemporain. In: *Études romanes de Brno*, 1, pp. 169-176
- Stenström, A-B. (2002). *Jallaspråk, slanguage og annet ungdomsspråk i Norden*. Kristiansand : HøyskoleForlaget.

- Svendsen, B.A. (2008). Nyere språkutvikling i multietniske miljøer i Oslo (Linguistic development in multiethnic settings in Oslo). In: *Det norske videnskaps-akademiets årbok for 2007*. Oslo: Novus, pp. 179-197.
- Svendsen, B.A & U, Røynealand. (2008). Multiethnolectal facts and functions in Oslo, Norway. In: *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 12(1-2), pp. 63–83.
- SSB, CENTRAL BUREAU OF STATISTICS, Norway. (2008). <http://www.ssb.no/emner/02/> (02.6.2014)
- Tryti, T. (1984). *Norsk slang*. Oslo: Universitetsforlag
- UNO. (2001). Corpus of Teenagers and language contact in Scandinavia. Developed by UNO's network <<http://www.uib.no/uno/>> (02.6.2014)
- UPUS/OSLO. (2008). Corpus of spoken language in multilingual areas in Oslo. Under development by I. Nistov, T. Opsahl, U. Røynealand, B. A. Svendsen & F. Aarsæther, transcription assistants: I. I. Ims, H. Haug & Y. Sandanger. <http://www.hf.uio.no/iln/forskning/forskn-ingsprosjekter/upus/english/> (26.12.2014)
- Vikør, S.V. (2010). Norsk. In *Store norske leksikon*. <https://snl.no/norsk> (29.10.2015)
- Wenreich, U. (1968). *Languages in contact: findings and problems*. The Hague; Paris: Mouton & Co.