

Project application

**The role of Austrian Standard German
and its socio-linguistic varieties
as
a language of instruction and education**

Description of project

Principal Investigator:

Ao. Univ.-Prof. Mag. Dr. Rudolf de Cillia

Scientific assistants:

Dr.in Mag.a Jutta Ransmayr

Mag.a Elisabeth Fink, neé Heinrich

Contents

1.	Scientific aspects	3
1.1.	Background information.....	3
1.2.	Stocktaking Part I: The status quo	3
1.2.1.	Austrian German: theoretical and practical aspects.....	4
1.2.2.	Significance for training and follow-up training of Austrian teachers	4
1.2.3.	Customary tolerance and correction habits among teaching professionals	4
1.2.4.	Consideration of varieties in curricula and in teaching practice	5
1.2.5.	Loss of identity, internal multilingualism and functionality	5
1.2.6.	Codification of Austrian Standard German	6
1.3.	Stocktaking Part II: Gaps/Desiderata in scientific and teaching-related fields.....	7
1.4.	Hypotheses and research questions.....	7
1.5.	Theoretical approaches and research methods.....	9
1.6.	Co-operations.....	14
1.7.	Innovative aspects.....	15
1.8.	Dissemination of results and strategies for implementation.....	15

1. Scientific Aspects

1.1. Background information

Austrian German plays a multi-faceted role in the context of Austrian identity. Both in private life and in public discussions the language spoken by an Austrian citizen constitutes an essential element of his or her identity, strongly based on emotions as repeatedly reported in philological studies (*Moosmüller 1991, Wodak 1994, de Cillia 2000, de Cillia/Wodak 2006*). This phenomenon has become all the more obvious since Austria's accession to the European Union (popular key phrase „Erdäpfelsalat bleibt Erdäpfelsalat“¹), see *de Cillia 1998*). Experts simultaneously refer to inferiority complexes vis-à-vis German as spoken in Germany (*Clyne 1995, Moser 1999*) and downright schizoid features as regards attitudes adopted vis-à-vis the Austrian variety (*Muhr 1989*). With the exception of Protocol 10, elaborated subsequently to the Maastricht Agreement in respect of Austria's accession to the EU in 1994 and containing a mere 23 terms relating to food, a singular act in terms of language policy on the part of the Austrian government, no further official activity was undertaken in order to enhance language concerns and national prestige (*Linke 2002, de Cillia 2006a*). On the basis of relevant information on confusion among well trained teachers as regards the use of pluricentric varieties and their appropriate role in teaching (*Ammon 1995*), and allusions to the lack of an active knowledge of, and repeated doubts about, the standard version of Austrian German, it can reasonably be assumed that students receive little encouragement to develop an interest in the manifold versions of German in the course of their curricula (*Legenstein 2008, Muhr 2005b*). A concerted research initiative would therefore appear highly desirable in order to identify current problems in the practices of the educational sector and detect deficits in research and teaching.²

1.2. Stocktaking Part I: The status quo

All available published literature was examined for information on the status quo of research in the field of Austrian German. For „Austrian German and German as mother tongue (DaM)“ relevant sources are scarce, therefore guided interviews were carried out with 11 approved experts from universities and other institutions dealing with teaching German, German didactics (DaM and DaZ) and also variational linguistics, in order to collect data on the entire spectrum of current research and actual practice. A list of these experts and their professional functions is given in the Appendix, their expert opinions are included in the stocktaking and the formulation of hypotheses, and are given in *italics*.

1.2.1. Austrian German: theoretical and practical aspects:

¹ “Potato salad will always be potato salad”

² A current related project by Dr. Winifred Davies: “Deutsch im gymnasialen Unterricht: Deutschland, Luxemburg und die deutschsprachige Schweiz im Vergleich.“ (http://www.aber.ac.uk/~eulwww/research/lang_norm.shtml)

In line with almost all publications on variation within the German language (see *Ammon* 1995, 2005, *Clyne* 2005, *Dittmar/ Schmidt-Regener* 2001, *Spiekermann* 2005, *Variantenwörterbuch* 2004), we postulate that German is a pluricentric and/or plurinational language with three main centres (Germany, Austria, Switzerland) as defined by *Michael Clyne* and *Ulrich Ammon*. For the indepth description of theoretical concepts see chapter 1.5..

Although theoretically accepted and professionally applied, Austrian German has not yet been fully adopted in actual practice: investigations of the language attitudes of both teachers and students of German in Austria and abroad (*Ammon* 1995, *de Cillia* 1997a, *Markhardt* 2005, *Ransmayr* 2006) have shown that Austrian German meets with national and international prestige problems. It is very often not accepted as a standard variety but has to struggle with its alleged dialect status and is often incorrectly regarded as non-standard variety (*Ransmayr* 2005:374).

1.2.2. Significance for training and follow-up training of Austrian teachers

The results of our expert interviews show that the Austrian variety plays a very inferior or no role at all in Austrian teachers' training institutions (universities and pedagogical institutes): "*Austrian German very often is a marginal item at institutes for German studies*" (*Glaboniat*). In the course of their training, prospective teachers are hardly ever confronted with the subject of the Austrian standard language nor with the varieties of the German language (with the exception of the subjects DaF and DaZ). Consequently, teachers at Austrian schools can hardly be expected to be well versed in the pluricentric aspects of German, a fact unanimously considered a deficit by all experts interviewed. *Boeckmann* states: "*Teachers-to-be need theoretical bases since they are far from familiar with the phenomenon of pluricentric languages.*" (*translation*). Experts such as *Wiesinger* recommend more consideration be given to Austrian German in all educational matters: "*Austrian German must become part of all forms of tuition, of the training of teachers and at school in general. To do so will also require teaching materials. Current text books are not useful.*" (*translation*)

1.2.3. Customary tolerance and correction habits among teaching professionals

Apart from a pilot study (*Heinrich* 2010) showing that Austrian teachers tend to prefer German variants to Austrian ones, no comprehensive scientific study of customary tolerances and correction habits adopted by Austrian teachers as regards Austriacisms/Deutschlandisms/Helvetisms has as yet been undertaken. A pilot study undertaken in 1995 (*Ammon* 1995: 423-445) among Austrian, German and Swiss teachers confirms a tendency towards correcting foreign national variants. *Ammon*, however, simultaneously refers to significantly less tolerance shown by all the groups sampled when confronted with Austriacisms and Helvetisms as compared to Deutschlandisms, evidence of a poorly developed language loyalty on the part of Austrian and Swiss teachers towards their own languages. *Ammon*, furthermore, points towards a connection between correction habits and knowledge of national varieties, a connection supported by *Ransmayr* in her survey among university professors in non-germanophonic countries

(Ransmayr 2005:236). And a pilot study elaborated by *Legenstein* (2008:113) reveals that Austrian teachers when in doubt while correcting German texts rely on the Duden (and not the *Österreichisches Wörterbuch*) and in general manifest uncertainty as regards norms.

1.2.4. Consideration of varieties in curricula and in teaching practice

According to the experts, the complex theme of “varieties of German and socio-linguistic variation (standard language/colloquial speech/dialect)“ has not yet been given due consideration in the respective curricula nor is it referred to in text books. This is to be understood as a clear indication that the subject of varieties is not taken into consideration in class. All the experts interviewed emphasize that despite the formative influence of the media, transmitting a standard is of elementary importance for all subjects dealt with. *Wintersteiner* opines that teachers need a particularly comprehensive amount of reflection knowledge as regards German language teaching. Experts agree that a vital step should be the definition of specific norms. They deplore the deficit caused by the lack of a stabilising factor for “creating awareness for norms“. *Griesmayer* stipulates: “*Austrian standards are at best hinted at in the curricula, with timid reference to the Österreichische Wörterbuch. The language concept these curricula are based on is a fairly foggy one, happy and contented with a reference to the existence of a “correct German“. The decisive element, though, are the individual ideas of the teachers concerned. It is nowhere written down where this “correct German” could be found.*”

1.2.5. Loss of identity, internal multilingualism and functionality

“*We are Austrians but as regards our language we do not know who we are (translation).*“ (*Muhr*). According to expert opinion on the attitudes adopted by the Austrian population (*Steinegger* 1998, *Muhr* 2005b, *Legenstein* 2008, *de Cillia* 2009) and their experience Austrians are vaguely aware of the „otherness“ of the Austrian language variety as compared to the German one but knowledge of the Austrian standard variety is pitifully scarce indeed. (“*The population does not have sufficient knowledge of the existence of an Austrian standard, perhaps to be explained by the fact that there is no definition of this Austrian standard*” (*Moser*)), and extensive uncertainty is the common phenomenon. *Muhr’s* (1989) observations indicate that the majority of Austrians consider Austrian German to be a dialect. The experts unanimously confirm uncertainties in respect of standard/educated language and dialect. Analytical findings also point out that the lack of colloquial language concepts for a flexible pluricentric norm of language(s) leads to confusion about the correct attribution of Austrian language varieties (*de Cillia* 2009). This confusion is usually not overcome in the course of educational curricula and deficits in the use of correct and adequate norms remain, as *Boeckmann* laments. *Muhr* (2005b: 18) implies that Austrian teachers very often take refuge in a monocentric language concept as an unofficial guideline, offering but one uniform language and one correct norm and that this standard norm very often is not identical with one’s own ideas, an attitude resulting in a

widespread lack of knowledge of the linguistic and communicative properties of one's own variety, which in turn leads to a depreciation and avoidance of the linguistic characteristics of this variety.

Uncertainty, according to *Muhr* (2005:18), leads to insufficient language loyalty, inferiority complexes and, ultimately, a loss of identity. Most of the experts share this argument whenever the connection between internal multilingualism and identity and the ability to differentiate between standard language and dialect are at stake. Since socio-linguistic varieties, above all as regards dialect, are hardly ever referred to in pre-school and school environments in an awareness-creating and reflective manner, dialect is very often considered to represent a deficient form of language, thus having a negative effect on one's ego: *"An essential prerequisite would be the promotion of awareness of the differences and a clarification of the differentiation possibilities in dialect as compared to the standard language (at school) in order to strengthen awareness and the conscientious use of dialect and standard language and, as a consequence, the person's very identity"* (*Boeckmann*).

1.2.6. Codification of Austrian Standard German

The *Österreichische Wörterbuch* (*ÖWB* = *Back et al. 2007*) – elaborated in 1951 as a means of creating identity, commissioned by the Federal Ministry for Education and published by *Österreichische Bundesverlag* – an entirely Austrian achievement, represents the central Codex of Austrian Standard German. No information is available as to the position *ÖWB* enjoys at Austrian schools, whether or not it is used as reference by teachers and students, to which extent it might be used in Austrian households following its distribution as a free of charge text book. No other reference publication has officially been launched. No official publication on phonetics or grammatical aspects of Austrian German is offered to supplement the codified lexis. The presentations of Austrian German by *Wiesinger* 1988, *Ebner* 1998 and *Muhr* (*Characteristics of Austrian German on all levels*) and his learning target catalogues (2000), but also *Moosmüller's* socio-phonological investigations on educational language and dialect, dating back to 1991, and *Muhr's* publication „*Österreichisches Aussprachewörterbuch, österreichische Aussprachedatenbank*“ (*Muhr* 2007) have thus become all the more important. A significant contribution towards the codification of Austrian German was achieved with *Variantenwörterbuch* published in 2004. Nothing has as yet been reported on the extent to which these works of reference might be used at schools or by language norm minded parents.³

1.3. Stocktaking Part II: Gaps / Desiderata in scientific and teaching-related fields

- **Teacher training:** No comprehensive analysis is available whether and, if so, how the aspects of varieties (Austrian German/awareness of varieties/socio-linguistic variation) are documented in curricula.

³ A further item for data collection in the course of this project will be a survey to determine in how far *Österreich-Duden* (the comprehensive Austrian Dictionary for schools), published in the autumn of 2008, has become accepted.

- **Curricula for Austrian schools:** Curricula of respective school types would have to be systematically analysed for due consideration of linguistic variation (plurinational and other socio-linguistic varieties) for all types of schools concerned.
- **Teaching material:** On the basis of stocktaking and expert interviews it can be concluded that the current text books for both DaM and DaZ are to a large extent based on monocentric concepts so that a respective analysis would be necessary.
- **Teaching practice:** With the exception of an outdated version and one new pilot study (*Ammon 1995, Legenstein 2008, Heinrich 2010*) no comprehensive investigation has been undertaken to examine the attitudes of Austrian teachers and students towards Austrian German, their respective knowledge and correction habits.
- **Reference books:** No information is available on reference literature possibly used by teachers and students, nor has the role that the *Österreichische Wörterbuch* might play ever been investigated.

1.4. Hypotheses und research questions:

The above stocktaking and the documented lack of research undertaken justify the following hypotheses:

Hypotheses as regards teaching, teaching equipment, curricula and teachers training:

Attention is not paid to the concept of German as a pluricentric language in teaching, neither in DAZ nor SLG, and not in curricula, equipment or in actual practice. Curricula adopted at Austrian schools do not offer clear-cut instructions on language reflection and awareness of the plurinational and other socio-linguistic varieties. It can be assumed that this subject is not taken into consideration at all during teaching. Creating student awareness essentially depends on the „dedication“ and competence of the respective teacher and on the instruction equipment offered.

Hypotheses on the knowledge and attitudes of teachers and students

Knowledge of the pluricentric feature of German, in particular the differences between Austrian Standard German and the standard in Germany, has proved a rare phenomenon with teachers and students who tend to go in for the monocentric version. The obvious contradiction between the central importance of one's own variety for constructs of national identity and the socio-linguistic attribution of this variety as colloquial or dialectal cannot be ignored.

The curricula of training institutions for future teachers (universities, pedagogical institutes, BAKIP = Bildungsanstalt für Kindergartenpädagogik/Training institute for kindergarten pedagogics) contain no or very limited information on national or socio-linguistic varieties. Teachers-to-be are not provided with sufficient basic knowledge about practical handling of Austrian German and the other German varieties nor about suitable didactic applications of socio- linguistic variation.

Hypotheses on reference literature:

The official codification of Austrian German must be considered as insufficient in all fields except the lexical one. There is no reliable evidence, furthermore, of the use and recommendation of the Österreichische Wörterbuch (ÖWB) at schools and teachers institutes. Teaching professionals are poorly equipped with material or publications on the characteristics of Austrian German in the fields of lexis, phonetics, morphology, syntax or pragmatic aspects.

These hypotheses permit the formulation of the following research questions:

Questions on curricula at schools:

- Are socio-linguistic varieties stated as teaching goals in the curricula? In which grades and at which schools?
- Do curricula contain questions of standards and norms and/or knowledge of national varieties as teaching goals? In which grades and at which schools?
- Which language concepts are curricula based on?

Questions regarding the training of teachers in the curricula of pedagogic institutes and universities:

- Is dealing with diverging national norms taken into consideration in the training of teachers? In which subjects?
- How is dealing with dialect/colloquial speech/standard language taken into consideration in the training of teachers? In which subjects?

Questions regarding the training of kindergarten teachers:

- What are the focal items in language didactics at BAKIP?
- What is the role varieties play in every day life in Austria and how are these varieties dealt with in the training for daily kindergarten practice?
- How are the requirements kindergarten teachers must fulfil for children with a first language other than German taken into consideration in curricula and in practice?

Questions concerning the teaching practice:

- What is the role of Austrian German in teaching at secondary grammar schools?
- Is socio-linguistic variation (Austrian standard, colloquial language, dialect) being considered in teaching German as a Mother Tongue and German as a second language?
- Is the functionality of different varieties transmitted in class?
- Which reference books are used?
- Which materials are used when dealing with the varieties of German?
- How is the question of norms handled? What are norms based on and how is this explained?
- Are there any requirements or communicative contacts not covered in the text books?

- What training is given to teachers before they teach SLG at schools (elementary, secondary and secondary grammar schools)?

Questions about of the attitudes adopted vis-à-vis language varieties, knowledge of pluricentric languages and/or Austrian German:

- What is the opinion of Austrian teachers about Austrian German and how much do teachers know about the pluricentric nature of German and its varieties, in particular about Austrian German?
- What are the language norm concepts (pluricentric, monocentric) followed by teachers/students and/or how do they conceptualise varieties?
- Is there a difference in the attitude adopted vis-à-vis the language between older and younger and between male and female teachers?

Questions regarding the Codex:

- Which reference literature is consulted by Austrian teachers and for what purposes (ÖWB, Duden, Ebner, Variantenwörterbuch, Das große österreichische Schulwörterbuch)?
- Which reference literature and internet sites are recommended to students by their teachers and why?
- What information (books, internet) is consulted by students when in doubt?
- When/at what level/at which institutes does the ÖWB no longer suffice?

1.5. Theoretical approaches and research methods

This research project is geared to the following theoretical approaches: **Variational linguistics** as a part of socio-linguistics (*Dittmar 1997, Dittmar/Schmidt-Regener 2001, Clyne 2005, Eichinger/Kallmayer 2005*), in particular the theory of pluricentric languages; **research on multilingualism with an integrative approach** to learning and teaching languages (*de Cillia 2010*).

a. Variational linguistics: Various authors emphasize that, due to its historical development, the German language is particularly rich in varieties and multi-faceted (e.g. *Barbour/Stevenson 1998, Löffler 2005, Földes 2002*; see also *Eichinger/Kallmayer 2005*).⁴ In accordance with *Dittmar/Schmidt-Regener (2001)* varieties are to be understood as separate constitutive subsystems of an overall system of a language; these varieties theoretically represent idealised constructs offering an inventory of the realisations of the language in the context of its practical use systematically to be expected in a certain situation and can, consequently, be described on all levels of the language system (phonology, grammar, lexis). The extra variables used for classification are geographic, diatopic (areal) criteria, diastratic (layer-specific) criteria, diachrone (time dependent) and diatopic (situation-relevant) dimensions of the varieties (*loco citato 521*). The delimitations of the varieties from each other can be modelled on a horizontal level as a continuum with core and transition zones; the core zones are to a certain extent characterised by stability and homogeneity and are usually referred to as the standard variety/educational language/colloquial language/dialect. The standard variety represents the very extreme of the continuum – the continuum from local via regional dialects to the standard language is customarily referred to as “non-standard“ (occasionally also as “Substandard”) and the different varieties sometimes overlap. In the context of this project in which the pluricentric aspect is to be addressed, we are primarily concerned with the standard varieties but are fully aware that the delimitations are blurred. “Standard Variety” is to be understood as the subsystem of a language “the norms of which offer maximum binding character for all speakers of a politically defined community concerned since the norms are codified and thus prescriptive. It is a written language of supra-regional scope and validity, primarily used in institutional contexts and official communications, and is never encountered in its ideal-typical codified norm in colloquial speech“ (*Dittmar/Schmidt-Regener 2001, 521bis*). The following four elements are constitutive for standard varieties (*Ammon 2005*): they are codified, are officially taught, enjoy official status, and adherence to the norms is verified by language standardisation authorities, teachers and also senior employees at official institutions (*Ammon 2005: 32*). Standard German is conceptualised as a pluricentric language by most authors⁵, i.e. a language extending over several countries and having several centres of development resulting in several varieties of their own with

⁴ Contrary to English (London), French (Île de France), Italian (Toscany and Florence) or Spanish (Castilia with Burgos) and Portugal (Portugal County and Porto) German lacks the political and cultural centre of a court or capital (*Protze 2001: 505*).

⁵ *Glauninger 2001* goes so far as to speak of a “genetically inherent pluricentric language“ (29)

norms of their own and a certain individuality.⁶ A plurinational language is defined as a pluricentric language if it has centres in at least two nations. Centres of pluricentric languages are countries or regions having produced characteristic standard versions of their own. A differentiation is made between “full centres” – when the characteristic standards are written down in reference books and authorised (e.g. Germany, Austria, Switzerland) – and „national semi-centres“ in the absence of such centres, as encountered in Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, East Belgium and South Tyrol.⁷ Ammon refers to a “national variable” (and we adopt his terminology) as “a certain amount of corresponding individual forms accepted by several nations“. The term "variant" has been chosen for the diverse forms a variable can offer, permitting a differentiation between onomasiologic and semasiologic variables. Variants, variables (and even varieties) may vary subnationally, too, exist in parts of a nation as e.g. in Eastern Austria only or across nations. National variants in Austria are called Austriacisms, in Switzerland Helvetisms and in Germany Teutonisms (Ammon 1995) or *Deutschlandisms* (von Polenz, Muhr 2000). In literature on pluricentric languages it is stated that an asymmetric relationship very often exists between the different varieties of pluricentric languages - Clyne refers to D(dominant)-Nations und A(anderen=other)- National Varieties (Clyne 1992: 3, 2005: 297). Clyne 2005 offers 10 asymmetries for pluricentric languages, Ammon (1995:484bis) altogether differentiates twelve "widespread asymmetries" in the varieties of German. This is based on the assumption that speakers of non-dominant varieties often suffer from an inferiority complex (Muhr 2005, 18, Scharloth 2005)⁸. Besides the conceptualisation of German as a pluricentric language there is another approach to define this language as pluriareal (Wolf 1994, Scheuringer 1996, Pohl 1997). The representatives of this concept reject the pluricentric approach and point in particular to the differences between the northern and the southern parts within Germany and between the western and the eastern provinces in Austria and emphasize the multiple common expressions across borders, i.e. the mutual reconnaissance met with in South Germany, Austria and Switzerland or in Western Austria and South Germany or in Vorarlberg, Liechtenstein and Switzerland. This mutual reconnaissance across national borders is, in our opinion, certainly a fact but we would point out that one and the same variant can be standard language in one country and non-standard language in the other; e.g. “heuer” (this year) and “Jänner” (January) are standard language in Austria but not in (South) Germany (see. Clyne 2005, 296; Pfrehm 2006). Yet another argument for the pluricentric and plurinational concept is, in our opinion, to be seen in the fact that standard varieties (see above) are not confined to the purely descriptive level. A variety is not upgraded to rank as standard language because of its superiority but represents a language-political and language-sociological phenomenon

⁶ See Ammon 1995, 42.

⁷ Clyne 2005 proposes another differentiation: He distinguishes between „full centres of a pluricentric language (e.g. Britain, Germany), with their own endonormative standards, and „semi-centres (e.g. Australia, Austria)“, partly adhering to exonormative standars, and partly to endonormative ones, and also speaks of „rudimentary centres (e.g. Liechtenstein), having adopted all their norms from outside 2005, 298).

⁸ Muhr refers to “schizophrenia“ (Muhr 2005, 18)

controlled by codification, standardisation and official institutions.⁹ A pluricentric-plurinational modelling of a language such as German is thus by all means justified – and neither does it contradict the pluriareal concept, situated at another level of the analysis (*de Cillia* 2006). In this context attention should also be drawn to other conceptualisations of the variation in recent German, attempting to summarize the extensive systematic variations as regards standard and regional dialect (see *Nina Berend's* (2005) „regionale Gebrauchstandards“ and *Helmut Spiekermann's* (2005) „regionale Standardvarietäten“). For the purposes of the research project as presented we will, for the reasons explained above, concentrate on the concept of plucentric/plurinational aspects. For the concrete description of varieties we rely on the publications available (*Ammon* 1995, *VWB* 2004, *ÖWB* 2006, *Ebner* 2008, *Fussy* 2003, *Muhr* 2000, *Wiesinger* 1988, *Duden* 2008).

b. Integrative approach to learning languages/ Research on multilingualism:

When teaching languages at school a differentiation is usually made on the basis of legal, organisational and political arguments. A detailed analysis shows that the analytical separations undertaken are problematic. The differentiation between mother tongue, second language and foreign language, between primary and secondary language, between first language, second language, third language and also the neutral designation of L1, L2, L3 does not always, on closer investigation, is not always useful for the individual concerned. Dynamic models of multilingualism (such as *Herdina/Jessner* 2002) are elaborated on the principle that the importance of individual languages may change in the course of their biographies. The language acquired during primary socialisation may recede in favour of the second language, in the event of a change of language L1 can be entirely lost. In the institutional school context, however, the “language of instruction“ is usually determined (in Austria according to section § 16 para 1 of the respective legal act German) and/or it is stated which languages may be used (for different models of bilingual teaching; CLIL). In this context the function of German as a “language of education” gains importance and may be L1, L2 or L3, depending on the student. It is important to note here that the language taught as a foreign language may, although, be L1. Teaching the national language, in our case German, may be the first/mother tongue language instruction for a majority of students but also a second or third language (the percentage of students with a migration background amounted to 21,7% in Austria, 54,2% in Vienna in 2008/09).

Focusing increased attention on languages of schooling in discussions concerning language policy and language teaching has also recently become an aim of the Council of Europe's language policy (see http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/schoollang_EN.asp?). An integrative approach in language instruction in schools should begin by incorporating “internal multilingualism” (*Wandruszka* 1979) into the discussion (i.e. varieties in the context of pluricentricism as well as the diglossia between dialect and standard language, which in Austria plays an important role at least in Vorarlberg, the country's westernmost province). Furthermore, an integrative model for

⁹ A particularly impressive example of the socio-linguistic aspect of language standardisation is Serbo-Croat: within a very short time four socio-linguistic languages were deconstructed, for better or worse in line with the system of a pluricentric language. (see *Bugariski* 2004)

language instruction in schools should include plurilingualism – as a consequence of language teaching and learning or of life experiences in multilingual environments – and in the context of teaching the language of schooling, German, develop concepts that integrate native-, second-, and third-language instruction in order to optimally promote the role of German as the language of education for the acquisition of knowledge and to provide all students with the greatest possible opportunity to participate in education (see *de Cillia* 2002, 2010, *Reich* 2009). In practice German as a school subject can represent a student’s primary language, or his second or third language, and it can and should be the subject in which “general language competences” across individual languages should be developed.

With regard to the present project, an important step is the exploration of the internal multilingualism within the German language, the role of dialectal varieties and, above all, the pluricentric varieties of German. The aforementioned findings from both Austria and Switzerland (*Scharloth* 2005) reveal that speakers of the Austrian and Swiss varieties of German have a poorly developed loyalty towards their own languages. And results of studies on the use of dialect in Swiss schools (*Lüdi /Werlen* 2005, 83) as well as observations of in-service teacher training in Vorarlberg indicate that internal multilingualism represents an important aspect of language use in schools in certain regions of Austria as well. A second step is the analysis of the teaching of German, the language of schooling, not only as native-language instruction but also as second-language instruction, and against the backdrop of plurilingualism resulting from life experiences in multilingual environments (see *Wojnesitz* 2009).

Research methods:

Data collection: Data will be collected in line with the data and methods of triangulation¹⁰ (the “supplementary model of triangulation“, see *Meyring* 2001, *Fielding/ Schreier* 2001, *Vetter* 2008), in order to scrutinize several different bodies of data by means of different methods to gain a widely differentiated picture of the research subject and achieve an extension of recognition possibilities on the basis of multiple perspectives. When interpreting the data, special attention will have to be paid to possible divergences in attitudes discovered and/or contradictions in the construction of the research subject.

Data material		
Study of sources: analysis of curricula analysis of courses of study analyses of text books and	Qualitative and quantitative methods of interviews: Questionnaires Guided interviews	Participatory observation in class

¹⁰ Four different forms of triangulation are usually referred to: Data-Triangulation, Methodological Triangulation, Investigator-Triangulation, Theory-Triangulation, (*Flick* 2007, 310) – of which the last two are not suitable for our purposes.

equipment	Group discussions	
-----------	-------------------	--

Since data of a corpus consisting of interviews with teachers and students (and also university lecturers and teachers of pedagogic institutes) are to be collected, written interviews by means of questionnaires would be the method of choice, particularly with geographically widespread addressees (*Schlobinski 1996:40*). Furthermore, qualitative guided interviews appear necessary in order to obtain in-depth data on attitudes, opinions and, to a limited extent, on the reaction of those interviewed to investigation-relevant questions. The guided interview as target-oriented conversation represents one of the most important linguistic methods in order to determine the perception and interpretation of facts by individuals (*Schlobinski 1996:45bis, Friedrichs 1997*). Group discussions are used as a method of collecting opinions and attitudes of individual participants in semi-open discussions, on the one hand permitting the collection of information on a relatively great number of persons in a relatively economical way, which is in our case also useful for the communicative validation of data collected in interviews and participatory observation, and on the other hand simultaneously permitting the documentation of joint discursive constructs of concepts and norms. (*see Lamnek 1989:121, Wodak/de Cillia/Reisigl/Liebhart/Hofstätter/Kargl 1998*). Finally, contrary to individual interviews, participatory observation in class permits a direct observation of behaviour, thus supplementing the perspective of individual perception on the part of teachers and students (*Schlobinski 1996:50; Atteslander 2000:98*).

Data evaluation: consists, in a first step, of a discussion-analytical interpretation of the contents of the material collected, of transcribed guided interviews and group discussions, and notes taken during participatory observations, related to each other in accordance with data triangulation (*Wodak/Krzyzanowski 2008, Friedrichs, Lamnek 1989, Dörnyei 2007*). The statistical evaluation of the quantitative data obtained from interviews will be carried out using the SPSS (*Statistical Package for the Social Sciences*) program, as well as the specialized software MaxQDA for the evaluation of the interviews.

1.6. Co-operations

The following colleagues have agreed to support the project in an advisory capacity and will be invited to a workshop in order to discuss the preliminary project results.

Univ. Prof. Dr. Klaus-Borge Boeckmann: Institut für Germanistik, Universität Wien

Univ. Prof. Dr. Gerhard Budin: Institut für Translationswissenschaften, Universität Wien und österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Institut für Corpuslinguistik und Texttechnologie (ICLTT)

Prof. (em.) Dr. Martin Durrell, German Studies, SLLC, University of Manchester

Prof. Dr. Christa Dürscheid, Deutsches Seminar, Universität Zürich

Prof. Dr. Johann Drumbl: Fakultät für Bildungswissenschaften, Freie Universität Bozen

Dr. Jakob Ebner: Lexikograph, Duden

Prof. Dr. Werner Kallmeyer: Leiter der Abteilung Pragmatik und stellvertretender Leiter am Institut für deutsche Sprache IDS Mannheim i. R.

Dr. Stefan Krammer: Fachdidaktikzentrum Deutsch, Universität Wien

Ass. Prof. Dr. Rudolf Muhr: Forschungsstelle Österreichisches Deutsch, Universität Graz

Univ. Prof. Dr. Werner Wintersteiner: Fachdidaktikzentrum für Deutsch (AECC), Universität Klagenfurt

Em. Univ. Prof. Dr. Peter Wiesinger: Sprachwissenschaft, Institut für Germanistik, Universität Wien

Prof. Dr. Winifred Davies: Dept of European Languages, Aberystwyth University

1.7. Innovative aspects

Subject-oriented aspects:

- No qualitative or quantitative data have so far been collected to investigate the role of Austrian German as a language of instruction and education in the framework of the educational „landscape“ in Austria. As explained in the project description, the aspects of attitudes, loyalty and norm tolerance have so far been covered in pilot studies only. Furthermore, an analysis of the text books most commonly used for teaching German as a mother tongue, based on scientific research, with a view to national and socio-linguistic variation is still missing.
- Combining and integrating the results of a comprehensive, Austria-wide investigation of attitudes adopted towards languages with an sample analysis of text books and a critical analysis of teachers training at universities and pedagogic institutes will contribute towards a transfer of theories relating to variational linguistics in the field of teaching – an entirely new subject for research in Austria.
- Investigating the connection between acceptance of the pluricentric feature of German and Austria's identity can also be regarded as novel and will contribute towards creating an awareness of and consolidating the concept of „Austrian German“ outside the purely scientific context.

Methodological aspects

- Combining and integrating the research project described with the new integrative approach towards teaching languages (as explained in 1.5.) also represents new scientific ground.

1.8. Dissemination of results and strategies for implementation

In order to disseminate the findings of the project, two different kinds of activities are planned: recommendations will be given for implementing the applicable results into teaching practice as regards development of text books and consideration of the issue of linguistic variety into school and university curricula. Furthermore, it is planned to develop concepts for teacher training concerning information and creating an awareness for matters of linguistic

varieties (workshops, SCHILF), which can be offered to universities and teacher training institutes and through ARGEs Deutsch.

Results should be disseminated scientifically on conferences (i.e. Österreichische Linguistiktagung, verbal Workshops, Deutsch-Didaktik Tagungen) and through publications: at least one monograph, articles in peer reviewed journals for linguistics, didactics and German studies (IDE, "Erziehung und Unterricht", "Schulheft", "Deutschunterricht", "Praxis Deutsch", "Journal of Language and Politics", "Language and Society" among others). A close co-operation with the "Gesellschaft für deutsche Sprache" seems useful for a wide-spread dissemination (presentations abroad, publications in "Muttersprache").