

Grammatical gender marking in New Denmark Danish (Canada)

Caroline Cecilie Kuhlmann & Jan Heegård Petersen*

Abstract. This article presents a corpus linguistic study of grammatical gender marking in New Denmark Danish (New Brunswick, Canada). The data consist of 2,242 examples of common and neuter gender marking, on (1) the definite suffixes, (2) the indefinite articles, (3) the pronominal definite modifiers, and (4) the possessive pronouns. 39 speakers are represented in the dataset, encompassing 1st-4th immigrant generation speakers. The analysis reveals relatively little deviation from Standard (European) Danish gender marking as only 19 out of the 39 speakers altogether have 47 instances of non-expected gender marking. In spite of the small amount of variation, there are some clear tendencies in the data in comparison with Standard Danish: The definite suffix is extremely stable, neuter nouns in Standard Danish get common gender marking, and ‘complex’ noun phrases with an attributive adjective between the initial gender-marking determiner and the head word show more variation than ‘simple’ NP’s.

Keywords. Heritage Danish; grammatical gender; complexity; corpus linguistics; heritage linguistics; Canadian Danish

1. Introduction. This paper investigates grammatical gender marking in Danish as spoken in New Denmark, a small town in New Brunswick, Canada (henceforth ‘New Denmark Danish’). The paper compares the use of grammatical gender marking in New Denmark Danish on articles and other determiners with standard Danish spoken in Denmark (henceforth ‘Modern Danish’).

Previous research on heritage languages has pointed out that morphology is particularly vulnerable in language contact situations and in relation to other grammatical domains such as phonetics, phonology, and syntax. For example, Polinsky (2018: 206) notes that “[t]he main errors in heritage speakers’ production are observed in agreement in gender” and she refers to, among others, studies on heritage Scandinavian American Norwegian to back up the statement. Along similar lines, Montrul (2012: 174) concludes that “[h]eritage speakers of languages with overt (...) gender, number, and case marking produce a significant number of errors as compared to native speakers or even their own parents”. Other studies do not find that grammatical gender is particularly vulnerable in heritage languages. For example, Johannessen & Larsson (2015) do not see major changes in gender agreement in American Norwegian and American Swedish, and Kühl & Heegård Petersen (2021: 91) conclude for Argentine Danish that “Argentine Danish grammatical gender conforms to StDkDan [: ‘Modern Danish’] to a very large extent”.

Anticipating the main result of the present study, grammatical gender is relatively stable in New Denmark Danish, as half of the speakers in our dataset do not produce any non-target forms at all, i.e., they do not have gender marking that is different from Modern Danish. The other half produce occasional non-target forms.

Other results from this study concern the sociolinguistic and linguistic factors that may contribute to the production of non-target forms. One such factor observed in the literature is the ‘default gender’ factor, according to which nouns with non-default gender marking may shift to the default gender. For example, neuter and feminine nouns receive masculine gender

* This article is based on the work by Caroline Cecilie Kuhlmann (2023), but is the result of joint authorship. Authors: Caroline Cecilie Kuhlmann, University of Copenhagen (nvr627@alumni.ku.dk) & Jan Heegård Petersen, University of Copenhagen (janhp@hum.ku.dk).

marking in American Norwegian (e.g., Johannessen & Larsson 2015 and Lohndal & Westergaard 2016, 2021), and in American Swedish and Argentine Danish neuter nouns receive common gender marking (Johannessen & Larsson 2015; Kühl & Heegård Petersen 2021; see also Polinsky 2018: 206ff. and Björnsdóttir et al. 2020). Another observation is that gender marking on suffixes is more stable than gender marking on prenominal determiners and modifiers (Johannessen & Larsson 2015; Kühl & Heegård Petersen 2021; but see discussion in Lohndal & Westergaard 2021). Another factor observed in the literature is what we will refer to as ‘the complexity factor’. Both Johannessen & Larsson (2015) and Kühl & Heegård Petersen (2021) find more non-target genders in noun phrases where the gender marker is separated from the head noun than when it immediately precedes it (*mit røde hus* ‘my red house’ vs. *mit hus* ‘my house’; see also Polinsky 2018: 165).

The present investigation is motivated by the observations in these previous studies. More specifically, we ask the following research questions: Do we observe a “significant number of errors” in New Denmark Danish when compared to Modern Danish? If so, what factors, whether linguistic or sociolinguistic, contribute to these ‘errors’?

The paper is structured as follows: In §2 we give an outline of the history of the Danish colony in New Denmark. In §3 we provide a sketch of the Danish gender system. In §4 and §5 we present our data and the methods used in the study. §6 contains the analysis, and §7 some concluding perspectives.

2. New Denmark and New Denmark Danish. From 1870 to 1900, around 20,000 Danes settled in what is now called New Denmark, located on the northwestern edge of the Canadian province of New Brunswick (Bojesen 1991). Motivated by the desire to attract immigrants, the Canadian government encouraged the Danish immigrants to settle down in Canada by offering the opportunity to own smaller farming properties. Most of the Danish immigrants were engaged in agriculture based on potato farming. This enterprise fostered a sense of community, since the immigrants were colleagues and knew other farmers and their employees. The colony attracted further Danish immigrants up to the end of the Second World War. This resulted in an immigrant community with strong bonds to Denmark and Danish culture, and at the same time motivated a continued use of Danish. Over the years, the immigrants and their descendants established a number of associations and institutions that consolidated the Danish community and contributed to language maintenance, for example, a Danish-speaking public school for the children, later to be replaced by a summer school where the children would learn and sustain the Danish language. Danish associations were also established within the network, such as the Danish-Canadian Youth Association and the Danish Women’s Association (Kühl 2019; Kuhlmann 2023).

Today, there are still visible traces of the Danish colony, for example, in terms of street names influenced by Danish, such as King Kristian Road and Christiansen Road. Furthermore, there is The New Denmark Immigrant Memorial Museum run by volunteers, a museum dedicated to the first immigrants and their stories about settling in New Denmark.

3. Grammatical gender in Danish. Danish distinguishes between common gender and neuter gender. 75% of Danish nouns fall under common gender, in writing marked with ‘n’. The remaining 25% belong to the neuter gender, in writing marked with ‘t’. Grammatical gender is indicated on definite suffixes, prenominal articles, demonstrative and possessive determiners, as well as on adjectives (adjectives are not included in the present study). Table 1 gives an overview of the system.

	Common gender	Neuter gender
Definite suffix	<i>sønn-en</i> ‘the son’	<i>hus-et</i> ‘the house’
Indefinite article	<i>en god søn</i> ‘the good son’	<i>et godt hus</i> ‘a good house’
Definite article	<i>den gode søn</i> ‘the good son’	<i>det gode hus</i> ‘the good house’
Demonstrative determiner	<i>den/denne gode søn</i> ‘this/that good son’	<i>det/dette gode hus</i> ‘this/that good house’
Possessive determiner	<i>min/din/sin gode søn</i> ‘my/your/(his/her/its) good son’	<i>mit/dit/sit gode hus</i> ‘my/your/(his/her/its) good house’

Table 1. The Modern Danish gender system

The definite article and the demonstrative determiner are distinguished in the pronunciation; the demonstrative pronoun is stressed, [dɛn?], the definite article is pronounced [dɛ]. Since we work with transcriptions of spoken language, we are not able to distinguish between these two grammatical categories, and we therefore collapse them to ‘Prenominal determiner’.

4. The data. The data are extracted from the sub-corpus CanDa (Canadian Danish), which forms part of CoAmDa, Corpus of American Danish (Kühl et al. 2019). The CanDa corpus consists of sociolinguistic interviews with speakers of Danish in various locations in Canada. For this study, we only use data from New Denmark speakers.

The interviews were conducted by the Danish linguists Iver Kjær and Mogens Baumann Larsen in 1973 and 1982 as well as by the Canadian linguist Christopher Hale. The speakers were born between 1891 and 1941, and at the time of recording they were between 50 and 91 years old. The speakers born in Denmark emigrated from Denmark between 1907 and 1951. The immigrant speakers had lived in Canada between 47 and 91 years. Table 2 gives an overview of the speaker distribution across gender and generation.

	Men	Women	Total
1 st generation	4	6	10
2 nd generation	2	6	8
3 rd generation	14	5	19
4 th generation	2	0	2
Total	22	17	39

Table 2. New Denmark speakers distributed according to gender and immigrant generation

Despite the interviews being conducted by different researchers and up to 25 years apart, they are very similar in nature, as they include topics such as families’ immigration history, language use in school and in daily life, the colony’s history, and relation to Denmark and Danish culture. There is frequent mention of other speakers, indicating that the total group of speakers constitutes a close social network (see also Kühl 2019 and Foget Hansen et al. 2018: 123).

5. Method. As mentioned above, the data for this analysis were extracted from this corpus of Canadian Danish. For each gender marker, *en*, *den*, *mit*, *-en*, etc., we searched for their occurrence with left and right contexts of 50 words. Each search string generated a csv file, and all of these were collapsed into one spreadsheet for further analysis. This resulted in 21,196 rows. These then underwent an extensive sorting procedure. (See Kuhlmann 2023 for a more detailed description of this procedure.)

This sorting resulted in 2,424 grammatical gender markers distributed across 39 speakers. These examples of gender marking were then annotated by sociolinguistic and linguistic parameters. The sociolinguistic parameters include speaker initials, birthplace, immigration generation, gender, and age. The linguistic parameters include the gender of the lemma in Modern Danish, type of gender marker, noun phrase complexity, i.e., whether there is one or two/several words between the gender marker and the head noun, and, whether the gender marking corresponds to Modern Danish, i.e., ‘target-like’ or ‘non-target-like’. The latter annotation is the dependent factor in the statistical analysis, the other annotations are the independent factors.

6. Analysis. As mentioned above, there is very little overall non-target Modern Danish gender marking in the dataset. This is shown in Table 4, which breaks down the 2,424 tokens in the four types of gender-marking morphemes.

	Tokens not like Modern Danish	Tokens like Modern Danish	Total
Definite suffix	2 (0.2%)	869 (99.8%)	871
Possessive pronoun	4 (1.0%)	403 (99.0%)	407
Indefinite article	24 (3.3%)	705 (96.7%)	729
Prenominal determiner	17 (4.1%)	400 (95.1%)	417
Total	47 (1.9%)	2,377 (98.1%)	2,424

Table 4. Manifestation of grammatical gender in New Denmark Danish on the definite suffix and on free morphemes; full dataset, 39 speakers

Table 4 shows that there are extremely few non-target items for the definite suffix. The prenominal determiner is the category with the highest proportion of non-target items, followed by the indefinite article and then the possessive determiners. The difference between the possessive pronoun and the indefinite article is statistically significant ($\chi = 5.7942$, $df 1$, $p = .016079$). The differences between the definite suffix and the possessive pronoun and between the indefinite article and the prenominal determiner are not statistically significant.

What is hidden in Table 4, however, is that only 19 out of 39 speakers show non-target gender marking. This indicates a general picture of a relatively *stable* gender system, where half of the immigrant population upholds the Modern Danish gender-marking system. Within the group of speakers that have a non-target gender marking, we see some individual variation, as shown in Table 5.

Speaker	Gender	Immigrant generation	Tokens not like Modern Danish	Tokens like Modern Danish	Total no. of tokens / Non-target rate
BSH	Woman	2 nd	1	51	52 / 1.9%
RUH	Woman	2 nd	1	51	52 / 1.9%
GOC	Man	3 rd	1	45	46 / 2.2%
EJN	Man	2 nd	1	39	40 / 2.5%
HEO	Woman	3 rd	1	33	34 / 2.9%
GRH	Woman	1 st	1	30	31 / 3.2%
AOH	Man	3 rd	1	24	25 / 4.0%
INS	Woman	1 st	1	24	25 / 4.0%

Speaker	Gender	Immigrant generation	Tokens not like Modern Danish	Tokens like Modern Danish	Total no. of tokens / Non-target rate
ALV	Man	3 rd	2	46	48 / 4.2%
BAH	Woman	3 rd	1	20	21 / 4.8%
HNI	Man	1 st	4	79	83 / 4.8%
SIL	Woman	2 nd	3	58	61 / 4.9%
AOP	Man	4 th	5	93	98 / 5.1%
ROJ	Man	2 nd	2	33	35 / 5.7%
KUN	Man	1 st	8	127	135 / 5.9%
REY	Man	3 rd	5	67	72 / 7.0%
AUA	Man	2 nd	1	13	14 / 7.1%
STR	Man	3 rd	3	37	40 / 7.5%
JLS	Man	3 rd	3	14	17 / 17.6%
Total			45	884	929 / 4.8%

Table 5. Individual variation; 19 out of 39 speakers

We see in Table 5 that both men and women and speakers from all four immigrant generations have examples of non-target gender marking. 10 speakers have only one instance of non-target gender marking, and the three speakers who produce the highest proportion of non-target gender marking are all men and 3rd generation heritage language speakers. This gives rise to speculation about whether speaker's gender and immigrant generation may correlate with the tendency for non-target gender marking. We explore this question in the following.

6.1. SOCIOLINGUISTIC FACTORS. The distribution of gender-marked tokens on the sociolinguistic factors 'gender' and 'immigrant generation' is shown in Tables 6 and 7.

	Tokens not like Modern Danish	Tokens like Modern Danish	Total
Men	37 (2.7%)	1,355 (97.3%)	1,392
Women	10 (1.0%)	1,022 (99.0%)	1,032
Total	47 (1.9%)	2,377 (2.1%)	2,424

Table 6. Grammatical gender in New Denmark Danish and immigrant generation; full dataset, 39 speakers

	Tokens not like Modern Danish	Tokens like Modern Danish	Total
3 rd and 4 th generation	9 (1.3%)	693 (98.7%)	702
1 st generation	16 (2.1%)	755 (97.9%)	771
2 nd generation	22 (2.3%)	929 (97.7%)	951
Total	47 (1.9%)	2,377 (2.1%)	2,424

Table 7. Grammatical gender in New Denmark Danish and immigrant generation; full dataset, 39 speakers

Table 6 shows that men have more non-target gender marking than women, and Table 7 shows that speakers of 3rd and 4th immigration generation seem to have slightly *less* non-target gender marking than the speakers of the 1st and 2nd immigrant generation. These patterns of distribution can of course be tested for statistical significance. However, as we learnt from Table 5, there is an important *individual* aspect to consider, as half of the speakers have only target-like gender marking. In order to test whether the sociolinguistic factors gender and immigrant generation in general have a significant effect, we have therefore used a generalized linear mixed model regression test in the R environment (R version 3.5.3, package *lme4*). With this method we can test the effect of any factor (independent factor) on variation in the dataset (the dependent factor) while at the same time controlling for, for example, individual speaker variation (random factor). As shown in Table 6, we find that gender can explain some of the variation in the dataset, i.e., gender is a significant factor. However, immigrant generation is not. This is shown in Table 8.

	Estimate	Standard error	z value	p value
(Intercept)	3.678	0.255	14.415	<2e-16 ***
Gender: Woman	0.977	0.391	2.498	0.013 *

	Estimate	Standard error	z value	p value
(Intercept)	4.177	0.418	9.989	<2e-16 ***
Generation, 3Ways: 2 nd	0.252	0.551	0.457	0.648
Generation, 3Ways: 3 rd and 4 th	-0.229	0.459	-0.499	0.618

Table 8. The effects of gender and immigrant generation on the variation in the dataset; random factor ‘speaker’ (39 speakers); 2,424 tokens. (3rd and 4th generation speakers collapsed as ‘3rd generation’)

In row 3 from above, Gender: Woman, the figures in the column Estimate tell us that the category Woman has ‘a positive effect’ on gender marking, in other words, that women have more target-like gender marking than men. The rows at the bottom of the table compare the effect of 2nd generation and 3rd (and 4th, collapsed) generations to first generation speakers (‘immigrant generation’). The p values show that there is no difference between the three generations with respect to the tendency to produce non-target gender marking. This is a surprising finding considering the literature reviewed in §1.

6.2. LINGUISTIC FACTORS. In this sub-section we turn to an analysis of possible linguistic factors. We exclude from the dataset the 20 speakers who follow the pattern of Modern Danish, and we ignore the two examples of non-target definite suffix. This leaves us with a total of 929 tokens, with 45 examples of non-target gender marking, distributed across 19 speakers. However, the data are too sparse for statistical testing like that reported in Table 8; there are too many parameters for the small amount of variation.

When only considering the 19 speakers with non-target gender marking, we have a distribution of gender marking on the prenominal determiners as shown in Table 9.

	Tokens not like Modern Danish	Tokens like Modern Danish	Total
Possessive pronoun	4 (1.9%)	206 (98.1%)	210
Indefinite article	24 (5.4%)	418 (94.6%)	442
Prenominal determiner	17 (6.1%)	260 (93.9%)	277
Total	45 (4.8%)	884 (95.2%)	929

Table 9. Manifestation of grammatical gender in New Denmark Danish on the free morphemes; reduced dataset, 19 speakers

Table 9 repeats the pattern from Table 2: indefinite articles and prenominal determiners are a bit more inclined to deviate from Modern Danish than possessive pronouns; the difference is statistically significant ($\chi = 4.3042$, $df = 1$, $p = .038$).

When examining the variation in the reduced dataset, we find that three other linguistic factors can explain some of the variation in the dataset. This is shown in Tables 10–12.

	Tokens not like Modern Danish	Tokens like Modern Danish	Total (100%)
Complex	26 (8.3%)	287 (91.7%)	313
Simple	19 (3.1%)	597 (96.9%)	616
Total	45 (4.8%)	884 (95.2%)	929

Table 10. The effect of complexity on the variation in New Denmark Danish; reduced dataset, 19 speakers

	Tokens not like Modern Danish	Tokens like Modern Danish	Total
Common	16 (2.1%)	755 (97.9%)	771
Neuter	29 (18.4%)	129 (81.7%)	158
Total	45 (4.8%)	884 (95.2%)	929

Table 11. The effect of grammatical gender in Modern Danish on the variation in New Denmark Danish; reduced dataset, 19 speakers

	Tokens not like Modern Danish	Tokens like Modern Danish	Total
Animate	3 (0.9%)	322 (99.1%)	325
Inanimate	42 (6.9%)	562 (93.1%)	604
Total	45 (4.8%)	884 (95.2%)	929

Table 12. The effect of animacy on the variation in New Denmark Danish; reduced dataset, 19 speakers

Table 10 shows that both simple and complex NP's show non-target gender marking but that complex NP's are more likely to result in non-target marking. The difference is statistically significant ($\chi = 12.28$, $df = 1$, $p = .000458$). Table 11 clearly shows that neuter nouns in Modern Danish are much more likely to receive non-target gender marking in New Denmark Danish than common nouns. The difference is statistically significant ($\chi = 75.3926$, $df = 1$, $p < .00001$). Finally, Table 12 shows that inanimate nouns show more non-target gender marking than animate nouns. This difference is also statistically significant ($\chi = 16.672$, $df = 1$, $p = .000044$).

From the above analysis, the question now arises whether these factors are equally important, or whether the factors are also predictors of non-target gender marking when the individual factor is considered. However, this question cannot be answered with the same statistical accuracy as above because there is too little variation in the data when the 929 tokens are measured according to tendencies of individual speakers, complexity, the noun's gender in Modern Danish, as well as the animacy of the noun.

7. Concluding perspectives. In this study, we approached the question of the vulnerability of grammatical gender in heritage language from a corpus-linguistic perspective. We extracted 2,424 instances of grammatical gender marking in New Denmark Danish and scrutinized the distribution of target-like and non-target-like gender marking in terms of frequency and a number of possible sociolinguistic and linguistic factors.

Overall, we found 1.9% non-target gender marking. This does not strike us as a “significant number” (Montrul 2012: 174). It is less than what Kühl & Heegård Petersen (2021: 79) report as an overall proportion in Argentine Danish (3.8%) and what Johannessen & Larsson report for American Norwegian and American Swedish. It is, though, a little more than reported for (written) American Icelandic, 1%, for which the authors conclude that “[o]verall (...) the gender system was maintained” (Björnsdóttir et al. 2020: 347). However, there are two notes of caution to be raised for the ‘how-much-is-much’ question. First, there are arguments against considering suffixes as gender markers. Proponents of this argument follow Hockett’s (1958) definition that “[g]enders are classes of nouns reflected in the behavior of *associated words*” (our emphasis), and as a consequence, they see suffixes as declension class markers and not exponents of gender (see Lohndal & Westergaard 2021: 100–103 for a discussion). If we do not consider suffixes as gender marking morphemes, the overall amount of non-target gender marking increases to 4.8% (Table 9), as it also would in Kühl & Heegård Petersen’s (2019) and Johannessen & Larsson’s (2015) studies. Second, we need, of course, numbers for non-target examples in other phonological and grammatical domains to say whether morphological gender is ‘more vulnerable’. We therefore encourage future studies of heritage languages to compare target-like and non-target-like tokens in different grammatical domains.

Like in other studies of heritage languages, we find inter-speaker variation, as shown in Table 5, ranging from 1.9–17.6%. However, we *also* find that 19 out of 39 speakers show no variation at all, i.e., their system of gender marking is like Modern Danish. This points in a direction of a solid maintenance of the language, and it is tempting to relate that to the close cultural network that the Danish speakers in New Denmark were part of, where Danish has been used to a very large degree, see also Kühl (2019) and Foget Hansen et al. (2018) for a similar interpretation of other linguistic analyses. We suggest that the lack of a difference between the four immigrant generations can be attributed to this sociolinguistic factor. It is often claimed and shown in studies of heritage languages that the language of the homeland changes, or ‘attrites’, and that this attrition correlates with immigrant generation. While this may be so for individual speakers, it is not generally so for New Denmark Danish.

Turning now to the linguistic factors, the study also observed a statistically significant hierarchy between the type of gender markers, where the definite suffix is the most stable, followed by the possessive determiner, and then by the indefinite article and pronominal determiners together. We find it striking that the same hierarchy was also found for Argentine Danish (Kühl & Heegård Petersen 2019: 79), and we may only speculate as to why. One explanation, for New Denmark Danish, may be that the possessive pronouns often occur with kinship terms that are highly frequent in the data (172 out of 201 examples, see Table 9), for example, *min bror* ‘my brother’, *min mor* ‘my mother’, *min bedstemor* ‘my grandmother’, etc., and that these nouns are never coded with a non-target gender marker. Hence, the ‘positive’ effect for possessive pronouns may be due to the choice of conversation topic (daily life, family history) and perhaps a general frequency effect. This effect is probably also part of the

explanation for animate nouns having more target-like gender marking than inanimate nouns. Family terms are, of course, animate, and most of the highly frequent nouns are animate (and common nouns). (Notable exceptions, though, are *(et) hus* ‘house’ and *(et) barn* ‘child’.) Related to this interplay of grammatical factors is also the clear tendency for non-default neuter gender nouns to be marked with the default common gender. This pattern of non-target gender marking towards the default, or most frequent, is repeatedly found in all the studies we have access to.

Finally, the study observed that complex NP’s, i.e., NP’s with an attributive adjective (*et rødt hus* ‘a red house’) show more non-target gender marking than simple NPs (*et hus* ‘a house’). This observation is in accordance with what Kühl & Heegård Petersen (2021) find for Argentine Danish and what Johannessen & Larsson (2015) find for American Norwegian and American Swedish (see also Polinsky 2018, Ch. 5).

With the corpus-linguistic approach in this article, our findings do not fully support the claim raised elsewhere for heritage languages that morphology, or gender marking specifically, is particularly vulnerable. A large part of the population of New Denmark Danish speakers, comprising 1st-4th generation immigrants, do not have any non-target tokens at all, and on average, the amount of non-target gender marking among the other half of speakers does not strike us as particularly high. Our examination of the variation produced by 19 out of 39 speakers has pointed to correlations with sociolinguistic and linguistic factors. These observations are in accordance with what we find in other studies, except for the overriding effect of social network for the factor immigrant generation. The fact that we observe linguistic factors similar to other studies suggests that grammatical changes in heritage languages are not random but follow structural criteria.

References

- Björnsdóttir, Sigríður Mjöll, Marit Westergaard & Terje Lohndal. 2020. The effects of attrition on grammatical gender: A view from North American Icelandic. *Heritage Language Journal* 17(3). <https://doi.org/10.46538/hlj.17.3.2>.
- Bojesen, Palle Bo. 1991. New Denmark – The oldest Danish colony in Canada. In Henning Bender & Birgit Flemming Larsen (eds.), *Danish emigration to Canada* (Udvandrerhistoriske skrifter 3), 49–70. Aalborg: Danish Emigration Archives.
- Foget Hansen, Gert, Jan Heegård & Karoline Kühl. 2018. Kan nordamerikadansk betegnes som en varietet af dansk? In Tanya K. Christensen, Christina Fogtmann, Torben Juel Jensen, Martha Sif Karrebæk, Marie Maegaard, Nicolai Pharao & Pia Quist (eds.), *Dansk til det 21. århundrede – sprog og samfund*, 121–134. Copenhagen: U Press.
- Hockett, Charles F. 1958. *A course in modern linguistics*. New York, NY: MacMillan.
- Johannessen, Janne Bondi & Ida Larsson. 2015. Complexity matters: On gender agreement in Heritage Scandinavian. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01842>.
- Kuhlmann, Caroline Cecilie. 2023. Genus i arvesprog. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen BA thesis.
- Kühl, Karoline. 2019. New Denmark, Canada: An exceptional case of language maintenance in a Danish immigrant settlement. *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics* 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jhsl-2017-0042>.
- Kühl, Karoline, Jan Heegård Petersen & Gert Foget Hansen. 2019. The Corpus of American Danish: A language resource of spoken immigrant Danish in North and South America. *Language Resources and Evaluation* 54. 831–849. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10579-019-09473-5>.

- Kühl, Karoline & Jan Heegård Petersen. 2021. Argentine Danish grammatical gender: Stability with strongly patterned variation. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 33(1). 67–94. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542720000069>.
- Lohndal, Terje & Marit Westergaard. 2016. Grammatical gender in American Norwegian heritage language: Stability or attrition? *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00344>.
- Lohndal, Terje & Marit Westergaard. 2021. Grammatical gender: Acquisition, attrition, and change. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 33(1). 95–121. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1470542720000057>.
- Montrul, Silvina. 2012. Bilingualism and the heritage language speaker. In Tej K. Bhatia & William C. Ritchie (eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism and multilingualism*, 168–189. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Polinsky, Maria. 2018. *Heritage languages and their speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.