

GFL



German as a foreign language

What (socio-)linguistic competences should we expect from teachers? Some suggestions inspired by German-speaking Switzerland

Winifred V. Davies, Aberystwyth

ISSN 1470 – 9570

What (socio-)linguistic competences should we expect from teachers? Some suggestions inspired by German-speaking Switzerland

Winifred V. Davies, Aberystwyth

In Switzerland there have recently been demands to improve pupils' first-language competence (*Erstsprachkompetenz*) by ensuring that correct use of the first language is cultivated consistently in all subjects, not just in classes devoted to German, French, Italian or Romansch, i.e. all teachers should act as language norm transmitters. After discussing the specific sociolinguistic situation in germanophone Switzerland, I will examine critically this aspect of teachers' work against that background and will make suggestions how teachers can (and should) fulfil that role. Studies of German teachers in Germany have shown that, although they have positive attitudes towards standard German as an idea(1), there is nevertheless substantial disagreement amongst them as to how the standard should be realised in practice. If that is the case amongst subject specialists then we are justified in asking how realistic it is to expect teachers whose specialism is in another subject to be competent to transmit the necessary (socio)linguistic abilities. I will also discuss how prescriptive teachers should be and how their role is affected by the enormous range of linguistic diversity that characterises present-day society. Many of the issues will also be relevant to DaF teachers outside Switzerland or Germany.

1. Introduction and Context

This article is based on a lecture given to German teachers in Zürich as part of a series 'Über die Bedeutung von Sprachkompetenz im Unterricht' in which the audience was asked to reflect upon the specific competences required of secondary teachers of German in German-speaking Switzerland.¹ Since some (see Berthele 2004) argue that most German-speaking Swiss consider standard German to be a foreign language, it seemed appropriate to discuss this topic in the pages of GfL and consider also if there were any issues that could be of interest to DaF teachers generally. It has been acknowledged for some time that the classic concept of 'diglossia' as defined by Ferguson in 1959 and applied to German-speaking Switzerland as well as other communities like Greece no longer accurately describes the Swiss situation, hence the use of various qualifying adjectives like 'medial' (Kolde 1981: 65), 'receptive' and 'productive' (Barbour & Stevenson 1990: 216) or 'functional' (Rash 1998: 50). According to Ferguson, the hallmark of diglossia is that two varieties of one language, one regarded as more prestigious than the other (he calls them High and Low varieties),

¹ The lecture was given in May 2009 at the Zürcher Hochschulinstitut für Schulpädagogik und Fachdidaktik. The full title of the series was 'Ohne Sprache geht nichts! Über die Bedeutung von Sprachkompetenz im Unterricht'.

co-exist within a community, each with its own clearly defined and socially accepted functions. However, the original functional distribution of the two varieties in Switzerland – Swiss standard German and the local Swiss German dialect(s) – seems to have been in flux for some time, with dialect being used more and more frequently in domains previously reserved for standard German (Schläpfer 1990). Whilst this has often simply led to the search for more suitable adjectives to qualify the noun diglossia (see above), it has also led occasionally to a radical critique of the traditional conceptualisation of the relationship between different varieties in German-speaking Switzerland. Berthele (2004: 130-1), for example, suggests that the use of the term diglossia has more to do with ideological positions relative to German and the rest of the German-speaking world than it does with the perceptions of most of the population. People who prefer ‘diglossia’ seem to fear that the use of the term ‘bilingualism’ would be a step towards isolating Switzerland from the rest of the German-speaking world. Hägi & Scharloth (2005: 22) sum up the debate as follows:

In eine soziolinguistische Terminologie übersetzt lautet dann die Frage: Ist die Sprachensituation in der Deutschschweiz als Bilingualismus oder Diglossie zu charakterisieren? Für die Vertreter der Diglossie-Position sind die in der Deutschschweiz gesprochenen Dialekte ebenso wie die deutsche Standardsprache Varietäten des Deutschen und damit keine Fremdsprache(n). Für die Verfechter der Bilingualismus-Hypothese hingegen handelt es sich beim Schweizer Alemannisch auf der einen Seite und dem Standarddeutschen auf der anderen um unterschiedliche Sprachen.

The fact that politicians have even suggested fetching German teachers from Germany (cf. Altwegg 2004; Oberholzer 2006: 247) and the fact that there are citizens’ initiatives in some cantons called ‘Nur eine Fremdsprache an der Primarschule’, which argue that learning another ‘foreign language’ in addition to standard German is too much of a burden for primary-school children,² suggest that Berthele’s claim that ‘die Sprachrealität für die grosse Mehrheit der Betroffenen aus Innen- wie Aussenansicht mit *Zweisprachigkeit* besser charakterisiert ist’ (2004: 131) has some validity. Schläpfer, who is strongly opposed to the claim that standard German is a foreign language for dialect-speakers in Switzerland, accepts nevertheless that the claim reflects ‘eine psychische Realität’, although he refuses to accept that it is based in linguistic reality (Schläpfer 1990: 195). Since the psychological reality, i.e. the perception of sets of linguistic features / varieties as ‘languages’, has often led to the political act of

² For example ‘Nur eine Fremdsprache an der Primarschule’, Thurgauische Volksinitiative, eingereicht am 22. Februar 2005, mentioned in Oberholzer (2005: 260).

acknowledging those varieties as ‘languages’ (e.g. Low German in the European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages or Luxembourgish in the Luxembourg Language Law of 1984) one should not however downplay its importance in influencing behaviours, and there are many ‘languages’ whose status as such could be questioned on purely linguistic grounds.

Hägi & Scharloth (2005) agree that the term diglossia is no longer particularly helpful, and suggest that standard German could be more aptly described as a *Sekundärsprache*, since, even if germanophone Swiss do not use it much amongst themselves, it ‘gehört jedoch im Gegensatz zu einer Fremdsprache durchaus zum Alltag’ (41). Furthermore, as they point out (ibid) standard German tends to be acquired in a more unstructured and unsystematic manner than a foreign language, and, as Häcki Buhofer et al. (1994) have shown, it is not acquired exclusively at school, although this would be typical of the L variety in a classic diglossic situation (Ferguson 1959). In germanophone Switzerland children tend to acquire passive and active competence in standard German before going to school, above all because of the influence of the audio-visual media (Häcki Buhofer et al. 1994). The attitude that standard German is a foreign language seems to be transmitted in school, with children’s attitudes changing noticeably, i.e. becoming more negative, as they get older (ibid).

For schools a major issue which has led to a heated debate about the linguistic skills of pupils (and of their teachers) has been PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment, co-ordinated by the OECD and administered to 15-year old pupils every 3 years) and what were perceived as unsatisfactory results in reading (Berthele 2004: 111; www.swissinfo.ch/ger/swissinfo.html?siteSect=43&sid=4156022&ty=, accessed 27.09.10). This has led to a raft of measures and initiatives intended to improve teaching, especially of language-based subjects, at primary and secondary level.³ University lecturers have been asked to clarify what linguistic skills they expect school leavers to have when they embark upon tertiary education, and there is now considerable emphasis on the need to ensure that ‘Die Standardsprache wird auf sämtlichen Schulstufen und in allen Fächern konsequent verwendet’ (Schweizerische Konferenz der kantonalen Erziehungsdirektoren = EDK 2003: 7), with teachers being

³ Although education is mainly the responsibility of individual cantons (there is no federal minister for education and training), much of the pressure for change has come from the centre and there are now national tests in some subjects: <http://www.sbf.admin.ch/evamar/> (accessed 27.09.10).

able and willing to transmit linguistic norms quite explicitly (Eberle et al. 2008: 389).⁴ Traditionally, it seems that teachers have been more likely to insist upon standard German in some subjects, e.g. languages, than in others, e.g. music (Sieber 2003: 8). In the canton Basel-Stadt there are now even Kindergarten which use standard German as the sole language of instruction, especially when there are large numbers of pupils whose first language is not German (Häcki Buhofer et al. 2007: 50; Oberholzer 2005: 243). This policy is not, however, universally popular and has been hotly debated in the media and in online fora (e.g. www.swissinfo.ch/ger/Home/Archiv/Mehr_Hochdeutsch,_weniger_Schwyzerduetsch.html?cid=3473820, accessed 29.09.10).

2. Theory and Practice 1

Much of my research has been devoted to examining the links between theoreticians or experts and practitioners, e.g. by trying to throw light on how norms of ‘correct’ or ‘good’ German are transmitted by teachers, and in trying to bridge the gap between professional linguists and lay people. The term ‘lay’ is used here to describe people who are not trained linguists (although this is a matter of degree) and who take an evaluative and prescriptive approach to language (cf. Davies 2008). ‘Lay’ people are often very interested in language even if they have not been trained linguistically, or have not received as much training as professional linguists, and it is important to foster a dialogue between the two groups and encourage the former to draw on and incorporate insights from the work of the latter in their classroom practice. Encouraging such a dialogue is, however, a difficult task, not least because of the very different ways in which lay people and experts conceptualise languages (cf. Davies 2008; Spitzmüller 2005), but also because of the different demands made in different contexts. Teachers, for example, are often required to solve specific linguistic or communicative problems quickly: especially when they are marking large numbers of essays or exercises life is easier when decisions about what is correct, standard or good German are clear cut and they do not have to choose from a range of possible alternatives. A need or a desire for clear yes / no answers is not, however, confined to teachers. As Davies & Langer (2006: 49) wrote:

⁴ The document (which refers to the whole of Switzerland, not just the germanophone areas) talks of the need to improve ‘Erstsprachkompetenzen’ and in relation to German it is clear that this refers to increased competence in standard German (*Hochdeutsch*).

There is a substantial amount of evidence that lay people who consult language reference works do not like works that are not normative and evaluative, and which list alternative constructions and forms [...]. This has been confirmed to us during conversations with individuals who work on the Duden telephone helpline in Mannheim: apparently many callers, if told that more than one form is correct, try nevertheless to get a single answer out of the expert by asking: ‘Aber was würden *Sie* sagen?’

Those of us who teach German in British universities have a foot in both camps: we are researchers, therefore experts, and lecture on sociolinguistic theories, but as teachers of German language we are also practitioners, and we participate every week in the production and reproduction of linguistic norms. However much our linguistic training impresses upon us the importance of descriptive linguistics (it is of course one of the central tenets of modern (socio-)linguistics that linguists describe and observe but do not engage in the evaluation and ranking of varieties), it is nevertheless not always easy to reconcile theory with practice. Durrell & Langer (2005: 313) established in their survey of DaF-teachers in GB that

heutzutage die Sprachnormvermittler sich schon der Existenz und des sensiblen und toleranten Umgangs mit regionalen und nicht-bundesdeutschen Varietäten bewußt sind, daß diese Toleranz aber i.d.R. nicht tatsächlich auf nichtstandarddeutsche Varianten angewandt wird.

As a non-native speaker of German I reflect frequently on questions such as: to what extent do I as a non-native speaker have the right or authority to question the norms of a language which is not my mother tongue? Should I be encouraging my students to do so or should I simply concentrate on transmitting to them a mastery of a few different registers and a basic awareness of what is meant by ‘situative Adäquatheit’ or ‘kommunikative Angemessenheit’? Who is allowed to decide what is correct or acceptable usage in any variety or language? The first time I, like many others of my generation, were faced with this question was in the mid 1980s when we came into contact with feminist linguistic criticism. Suddenly teachers of German had to make decisions on whether forms like *Lehrer/innen* or *LehrerInnen* were acceptable if they occurred in students’ work, and a related question was: should one be actively teaching them as acceptable variants? Today forms which then occurred rarely or only in certain (feminist) publications are the norm, and sometimes they are even prescribed by journals and publishers, for example Taylor & Francis stipulate: ‘Sexist [...] terms should not be used’ (<http://journalauthors.tandf.co.uk/preparation>, accessed 23.09.10). But twenty five years ago, if a teacher was not sure if a non-sexist construction was acceptable or not, there was no higher authority to which s/he could appeal. Although

the German language is highly codified, the codex is never totally up to date and, moreover, if a construction is controversial (and this was definitely the case with many of the alternative forms suggested by feminist linguistic critics) it will not always get the seal of approval of being accepted in the codex. Furthermore, as feminist critics pointed out, the argument that non-sexist forms were not recorded in the codex because the codex had to reflect usage was flawed, since the usage recorded in dictionaries and grammars was drawn from a relatively narrow range of texts (cf. Davies 1990; Jäger 1980): before 2005, for example, the Duden grammar did not draw on spoken data (Duden 2005: 5-6). Because of that, it would have been illogical to appeal to the codex in support of feminist arguments. One could have turned to model texts, e.g. the supraregional press (e.g. Eisenberg 2007 defines written standard German as the linguistic usage of the supraregional press), but one would quickly have established that their usage was heterogeneous (the *taz* for instance used forms like *LehrerInnen* consistently, but was the only mainstream supraregional newspaper to do so). My classroom practice in those days was based on my own commitment to non-sexist usage underpinned by my knowledge of different linguistic value systems in Germany (knowledge derived from personal experience and reading). I will return to the interplay between theory and practice below.

3. Linguistic Competence

It seems obvious that teachers of German have the task of transmitting different competences and it is generally accepted that learners of German as a foreign language need to acquire sociolinguistic as well as linguistic competence. Sociolinguistic competence means norms relating to the acceptability or appropriateness of linguistic forms in different situations and for different purposes, e.g. being aware of the different effects that could be achieved by using ‘Er ist gestern aus dem Leben geschieden’ as opposed to ‘Er ist gestern krepirt’. Since there are different linguistic value systems within the German-speaking world it is also fairly clear that transmitting sociolinguistic norms can be bound up with difficult decisions. Forms that are acceptable even in public and official situations in one region or country of the German-speaking world may be frowned upon in others, at least by some social groups (cf. Muhr 1994; Durrell 2005: 1-51). Acceptability judgements may also vary depending on factors like the age of the judges.

Teaching linguistic as opposed to sociolinguistic norms ought however to be a relatively easy task, although, as we saw above, extra-linguistic factors like feminist linguistic criticism had consequences for linguistic judgements also. The educational aim is clear even if, in my experience, rarely discussed explicitly:⁵ DaF teachers are supposed to teach their students how to write and speak correct, i.e. standard German. From 2001 to 2003 there was a debate in *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* about the sort of German to be taught to learners and about how much variation students should be exposed to. Götze (2001: 131) argued for teaching a uniform standard German, as prescribed in the codex, since it is ‘verbindlich für alle Teilnehmer der Sprachgemeinschaft’. Thurmair (2002: 8) was slightly more tolerant of variation, but only reluctantly conceded that it could be useful for learners to be actively taught some features of spoken German which ‘deviate’ (‘abweichen’) from the ‘auf dem schriftlichen Sprachgebrauch basierende Standardnorm’. Durrell & Langer (2005: 298) claim that DaF-teachers have often transmitted a ‘variationsfreie Standardsprache’ for one of two reasons: (1) pedagogic, practical, i.e. teachers do not want to confuse students; (2) ideological, influenced by what von Polenz (1988) called *Sprachnormenfrömmigkeit*, with non-standard German often being conflated with ‘bad’ German. However, Durrell, e.g. in Durrell (2003; 2004) has argued that this emphasis on transmitting a relatively uniform standard based on written German is not helpful for learners since they then encounter problems when faced with informal spoken registers in the German-speaking countries. Whilst accepting that learners do not need to be familiar with all varieties of German (e.g. *Ortsdialekt*), he argues that

Die Lerner des Deutschen als Fremdsprache müssen mit einer Vielfalt an Variation umgehen lernen, um in alltäglichen Situationen effektiv kommunizieren zu können. Auch in der Anfangsphase werden sie, wenn sie mit deutschen Muttersprachlern sprechen, mit einer reichen Variation an sprachlichen Erscheinungsformen konfrontiert. (2004: 76)

The pluricentric model, which has become the dominant model for conceptualising the sociolinguistic situation in the German-speaking world, at least amongst academic linguists, has also raised awareness of the national dimension of variation in German. However, as Durrell & Langer (2005) and Langer (2010) have shown, whilst DaF teachers in the UK and Ireland are ready enough to acknowledge the validity of the pluricentric model in theory, they are not necessarily very familiar with concrete

⁵ This may be the case in the UK because the teaching of German language at British HE institutions is still often carried out by lecturers who have not been trained in DaF.

linguistic variants belonging to the different national varieties, and many who claimed they would accept Swiss or Austrian standard German also said they would not accept *vergessen auf* (A) and/or *Trottoir* (CH).⁶

In Germany, too, the curricula require teachers of German to transmit the norms of the standard variety (cf. Davies 2000), and in germanophone Switzerland the situation is similar, e.g. one educational aim for German classes in Zürich is: ‘D[ie] Pflege der Standardsprache als Grundlage der Verständigung aller Deutschsprechenden’ (<http://www.kzo.ch/index.php?id=715>, accessed 27.09.10), and Sieber (2003: 4) writes: ‘Die Sprache des Unterrichts ist üblicherweise Hochdeutsch – oder sie sollte es, nach den Vorgaben der Lehrpläne zumindest sein’.⁷ If we agree that one of the main aims of German teachers, whether abroad or in the German-speaking world, is to teach standard German, the next question is, where does one find the rules for this variety? For native speakers of German the question is perhaps less pressing, but the fact that there are so many telephone helplines and language advice centres in the German-speaking world (see Frank-Cyrus et al. 1999) and that there are so many language advice books on the market (cf. the success of the books by Bastian Sick) implies that even native speakers cannot always (or do not want to) rely on their intuitions. Since the German language has achieved a high degree of codification, it ought to be easy to find the rules of this variety. According to Ammon (2003: 5-6), a lack of familiarity with the codex can have serious consequences, because parents for example could appeal to the codex in order to question the authority of teachers. In addition, Ammon writes that the *Bundesverwaltungsgericht* has claimed that it appeals to the codex in those rare cases where disagreement over whether a particular feature or word is standard or not has led to legal disputes (loc. cit.). But since neither Germany nor Switzerland has reference works which have been given official sanction by the state or another authoritative institution such as an academy there are certain questions which spring to mind, e.g. which works belong to the codex? Do books like those written by Bastian Sick and similar ‘lay’ linguists have the same status as the most recent Duden *Grammatik* of

⁶ At the international *Deutschlehrertagung* of 1986 in Bern it was agreed that textbooks should take account of pluricentricity in order to reflect reality better, but the extent to which they should do so would depend on the learners’ level and needs (Clalüna et al. 2007: 45). Hägi (2006) discusses the extent to which this happens in practice. For a more critical discussion of pluricentricity see Putz (2002).

⁷ Cf., too, *Mitteilungen des Bundesrates vom 15.02.2005* http://www.bildungsdirektion.zh.ch/internet/bi/de/aktuell/news_2005/0215_br_b_lp_deutsch.html (accessed 29.09.10)

2009? The Duden webpage claims that the Duden is ‘die maßgebliche Instanz für alle Fragen zur deutschen Sprache und Rechtschreibung’ (www.duden.de/ueber_duden/, accessed 24.09.10), but does this refer to the volume *Duden Basiswissen Schule. Deutsch* (Duden 2002, 287 pages) as much as it does to the 1,343-page *Duden. Die Grammatik* (2009)? Do both belong to the codex? And if we were to agree on what works are part of the codex, how would we answer the question as to the source of their authority? Ammon (2005) himself illustrates this problem. On page 32 he writes that a linguistic codex consists of ‘autoritativen Nachschlagewerken’, but a few lines further we read that, ‘In großen Sprachgemeinschaften umfasst der Sprachkodex vielerlei Werke, deren Status als Kodexbestandteil nicht immer klar ist’ (Ammon 2005: 35). Occasionally the status of particular works is explicitly debated, e.g. a series of articles about Bastian Sick’s works appeared in *Info Daf* in 2007. The debate was triggered by Hammer’s review of Sick (2006) and her recommendation that his works be used in DaF classes, implying that they had an authoritative status. Maitz & Elspaß (2007) responded with a fierce, linguistically-based critique of Sick’s work, pointing out amongst other things that ‘Die von Sick vertretene und propagierte Sprachrichtigauffassung entspringt nämlich einer spracharistokratischen vorwissenschaftlichen normativen Haltung’ (2007: 516), and they also accused him of ‘eine ausgesprochene Intoleranz gegenüber Varianten des Deutschen, die er im Regelapparat seines Idiolekts oder beim schnellen Blick in den Duden nicht orten kann’ (ibid: 519).⁸

The unclear status of the codex was confirmed in a study carried out some years ago with secondary-school teachers in Germany (teachers of German at Realschulen, reported in Davies 2000), which established that there was relatively little agreement as to where standard German was to be found. The teachers were asked what they understood by standard German and where they thought it was to be found, i.e. in which reference works or as used by which model speakers or writers (for the concept of model speakers and writers see Ammon 2005). The responses were quite varied and a range of different works and models were mentioned. In a more recent study of grammar-school teachers in Germany (Davies 2005) there was a greater degree of agreement amongst teachers and the majority were of the opinion that the rules of

⁸ There were further contributions to the debate by Roggausch (2007), who supported Hammer, and Ágel (2007) and König (2007), who contributed to the linguistic critique of Sick’s works.

standard German (at least in its written realisation) were to be found in the various Duden volumes. It was however not always clear which Duden volume the informants were referring to, and since the Duden firm publishes a large number of reference works, some of which are significantly larger and more comprehensive than others, and which can be placed at different points on a descriptive – prescriptive continuum, these findings do not throw as much light as one might have hoped on the way norms are transmitted from the codex to teachers and then to the pupils. They do however suggest that the Duden’s marketing concept as mentioned above (‘die maßgebliche Instanz ...’) is accepted by this group at least.

The situation in germanophone Switzerland is complicated by the existence of an endo- and exonormative codex, i.e. German-speaking Swiss can use reference works which have been produced in Switzerland as well as some (e.g. the Duden volumes) which have been authored and published in Germany (but sometimes with Swiss input, cf. Baigger & Sutter 2005). According to Scharloth (2005: 263), however:

Zwar existieren Kodizes des Schweizerhochdeutschen, doch haben sie bei weitem nicht die Reichweite, die Kodizes aus Deutschland haben. Ein Blick in Arbeitszimmer, Büros und Redaktionsstuben würde zeigen, dass Kodizes des Schweizerhochdeutschen nur selten vorhanden sind und noch seltener zur Anwendung kommen. Und sieht sich der Benutzer von deutschländischen Kodizes beim Nachschlagen mit schweizerischen Varianten konfrontiert, gibt er in den meisten Fällen der deutschländischen den Vorzug.

It is not clear if these claims are based on empirical investigations of the actual practice of language users, but if not, then such studies would be a welcome contribution to ‘Grammatikbenutzungsforschung’ (see Hennig & Löber 2010). One fairly small study (15 informants who were all teachers) is described by Läubli (2005): she found that most informants used an endonormative work, *Wort für Wort*, as well as the exonormative *Rechtschreibduden* in class, and that they normally used the *Rechtschreibduden* to prepare lessons (ironically the exonormative work contains more Helveticisms than *Wort für Wort*, although this is also a function of its larger size). A comparative project into the role of German teachers in Germany, germanophone Switzerland and Luxembourg, was launched in late 2010⁹ and also asks teachers about their use of reference works in the classroom and when correcting pupils’ work. It will be interesting to see what norms are transmitted in this way, and a study of this sort will also throw more light on the status of German-speaking Switzerland as a national

⁹ See http://www.aber.ac.uk/eurolangs/research/lang_norm.shtml, accessed 29.09.10.

centre. One of Ammon's criteria for describing Switzerland as a full centre is that it has what he calls a 'Binnenkodex', a codex which is compiled and published in the national centre, and that it forms its own, endonormative, norms (Ammon 1995: 96). Ammon (ibid: 246-50) and Clyne (1995: 47) list a range of works in which they claim Swiss standard German is to be found, but it is not at all clear what role, if any, these works play in the everyday practice of speakers. As we saw above, the teachers in Läubli's survey claimed to use a work from the 'Binnenkodex' as well as a Duden reference work produced in Mannheim in class, but it was the more comprehensive exonormative work they used when preparing their lessons (a work that incidentally has little information on meanings of words or on grammar). Scharloth's (2005) study of language attitudes showed that there is a discrepancy between the pluricentric model used by linguists and the model that appears to be guiding the behaviour of 'ordinary' speakers and we need more studies of this phenomenon. His informants were far less positive towards 'Swiss' standard German forms than are most sociolinguists (ibid).

Scharloth (ibid: 263) is of course right when he says in the above-mentioned article that we should not over-estimate the influence of the codex, but on the other hand, we should not overlook the fact that the existence of a codex can influence the way in which speakers perceive the varieties at their disposal. For instance, one frequently hears speakers in Germany claim that the preposition *wegen* may now be used with the dative, because – they say – the codex, specifically the Duden, has given its seal of approval. (Wagner heard similar claims in the Trier area, cf. Wagner 2009.) Depending upon which Duden reference work one consults, that claim can be proved or disproved. The *Duden Grammatik* (2009) lists *wegen* in the section 'Präpositionen mit dem Genitiv' (612), but with the comment: 'Die folgenden vier genitivregierenden Präpositionen erlauben, gerade in der gesprochenen Sprache, auch den Dativ: *statt, trotz, während, wegen.*' There is some room for manoeuvre here in interpreting the rules, although it is not clear what is meant by spoken language and whether this is still to be understood as standard German. The 2005 *Duden Grammatik* contained – for the first time – a section on spoken language, which included the dative periphrasis ('der Frau ihr Hund') but, in my view illogically, did not mention *wegen* with dative. In the volume *Duden Basiswissen Schule. Deutsch* (2002), *wegen* is again listed under 'Präpositionen mit dem Genitiv' but this time the commentary is clearly prescriptive: 'Umgangssprachlich wird "wegen" oft mit dem Dativ verwendet. Das sollte man

vermeiden [...]’ (104). Readers of the *Duden* electronic newsletter are also left in no doubt about the status of *wegen*: ‘Welcher Kasus den begehrten Platz hinter der Präposition *wegen* einnehmen darf, ist vielen klar: In der Standardsprache sollte der Genitiv stehen’ (23.03.05 archived at www.duden.de). The author of the newsletter does nothing to try to change the mind of the many that this norm is indeed correct. As an example of an endonormative Swiss work I consulted Bigler et al. (1987) and established that *wegen* was listed as a preposition taking the genitive, with the comment ‘Umgs. [= Umgangssprache] auch mit Dativ’ (242). But regardless of what is actually in the reference works, what is important are speakers’ perceptions of what is standard and correct. It is a fair assumption that, if teachers are amongst those who believe that it is now correct to use *wegen* with the dative, this norm may be transmitted in the classroom.¹⁰ A further example of how perceptions and the codex can diverge is reported in Davies (2000), Davies (2005) and Davies & Langer (2006). In two surveys of the norm knowledge of teachers of German in Germany many of the informants (52% of teachers at Realschulen and 78% at Gymnasien) rejected the temporal use of *wo*, e.g. ‘an dem Tag, wo ...’, claiming they would correct it if pupils used it. However, none of the *Duden* works stigmatises this temporal use of *wo*: on the contrary, the *Duden. Richtiges und gutes Deutsch* (2001: 944) tells us that:

Sie [the particle *wo*: WVD] kann aber auch als relativischer Anschluß gebraucht werden, wenn es sich nicht um einen räumlichen, sondern um einen zeitlichen Bezug handelt: in dem Augenblick, *wo*... (statt als oder in dem) oder zu dem Zeitpunkt, *wo* (statt: als oder zu dem).

This is a clear example of what Gloy (1975) calls a subsistent norm, i.e. a norm which is not institutionalised or codified but which nevertheless corresponds to a collective notion of what is correct.

Despite these problems, teachers, sociolinguists and education authorities have often taken for granted that teachers transmit the norms of the standard variety to their students, with Ammon (2003: 3) describing teachers as ‘Sprachnormautoritäten’, i.e. as people who have the right, or even a duty, to correct the speech and writing of others and whose corrections are usually taken seriously. The term also implies that teachers are authorities on the norm in the sense of knowing exactly what is correct (i.e.

¹⁰ The fact that investigations of newspaper corpora show that the dative is in fact used very rarely with *wegen* suggests that, in this case, language users follow different norms in writing and speech (cf. Di Meola 2009; Elter 2005) and that perceptions of the correctness of *wegen* and dative are register-specific.

standard) German. The research I carried out with teachers some years ago (see above) in southern Germany found that the norm knowledge (norm = standard norm) of teachers of German in Germany did not always correspond to what was in the codex and that teachers did not always adhere as strictly to standard (codified) norms as parents and school authorities might have expected. There was substantial intra-group disagreement as to whether certain individual words and constructions were acceptable in the classroom or not (the methods of collecting data and a detailed discussion of the findings can be found in Davies 2000; 2005), but the idea of a standard variety in the abstract and of its desirability and the need for it to be dominant in the classroom were not questioned. As the data were collected indirectly we cannot be sure that teachers do what they claim to do, but these findings suggest that the norm transmitted in the classroom may be less homogeneous than previously assumed. Läubli (2005) and Baigger & Sutter (2005) have carried out surveys in germanophone Switzerland (Läubli's is relatively small with only 15 informants, but Baigger & Sutter surveyed 85 teachers) in which they established that in Switzerland, too, there is a lack of agreement between the codex and what teachers claim to accept as Swiss standard German in the pupils' essays.¹¹

In the context of the present debate in Switzerland about whether standard German should be used consistently in the classroom (cf. Häcki Buhofer et al. 2007; Sieber 2003) it is interesting to note that many teachers in my studies claimed that non-standard varieties were acceptable for various functions and even used by the teachers themselves to achieve particular strategic aims (e.g. to tone down a reprimand or to get the pupils' attention) (see too Hochholzer 2004). The new project (mentioned above) with colleagues from Luxembourg and Switzerland will build on these studies to investigate the norm knowledge of teachers of German in Switzerland and Luxembourg, and to try to establish whether it is endo- or exonormative norms that are transmitted, or a mixture of the two, and how much agreement there is regarding what is correct (Swiss) standard German (in morpho-syntax as well as lexis).

4. Sociolinguistic Competence

Students need to acquire sociolinguistic as well as linguistic competence. For most sociolinguists and teachers, sociolinguistic competence means 'situative

¹¹ They look at lexis only.

Angemessenheit', 'situationsgerechter Sprachgebrauch' or 'kommunikative Adäquatheit', all terms that occur frequently in school curricula and sociolinguistic works. Dell Hymes coined the term 'communicative competence' in 1966 to express the fact that communication is more than just being able to produce grammatically correct sentences, and in the former GDR the concept of 'situative Adäquatheit' was an important aspect of the officially promoted theory of *Sprachkultur* (see Davies 2008). Nearly all curricula for the subject German in Germany are influenced by this model and we also find it in Swiss curricula, e.g. one of the aims of German teaching in Zürich is: 'Schüler und Schülerinnen drücken sich schriftlich und mündlich sicher, gewandt und situationsgerecht aus' (www.kzo.ch/index.php?id=715, accessed 28.09.10). This model is apparently seen as less prescriptive and more objective by linguists, educators and political policy makers than earlier models which were based more explicitly on notions of correct and incorrect or good and bad. To put it simply: different varieties are fine, as long as they know their place. This model has been criticised by proponents of Critical Language Awareness (CLA, e.g. Cameron 1995; Fairclough 1992) since it is a model that accepts the status quo (non-standard varieties are accepted in informal, private, non-official domains only) and does not question the societal power relations that have led to and maintain such a distribution. It also implies that the distribution rests on a social consensus about the values attached to each variety, although it is doubtful if such a consensus exists today, if it ever has: there are linguistic value systems not *one* linguistic value system.

Proponents of CLA encourage speakers to uncover the social nature of judgements that are often passed off as linguistic, e.g. it is a topos of the standard language ideology that mutual comprehension within a society or nation can only be achieved on the basis of a uniform standard variety (e.g. Bayer 1984: 318-19) and this is also given as a reason why the standard is the only acceptable variety in public and formal situations. Such claims however disregard completely the subjective aspect of comprehension: the fact that people are more motivated to make an effort to understand some varieties rather than others (cf. Haugen 1966: 280) or that there are political reasons for refusing to acknowledge linguistic similarities between varieties (see Wolff 1959). This is not to ignore the fact that communication problems do arise between speakers of different varieties but it is a plea to treat them as social as well as linguistic problems. The ability

to recognise links between social and linguistic structures should in my opinion be one of the sociolinguistic competences which we as teachers transmit to our students.

5. Theory and Practice 2

What do these theoretical points mean for teachers' concrete classroom practice, especially but not only in Switzerland? One can surely expect teachers of German (i.e. subject specialists) to transmit linguistic and sociolinguistic competences. I agree with the document *Hochschulreife und Studierfähigkeit. Zürcher Analysen und Empfehlungen zur Schnittstelle* that 'auf gymnasialem Niveau von allen Sprachfächern vor allem die Fähigkeit gefördert werden [soll], einige essenzielle soziale und psychologische Aspekte der Sprachanwendung zu erkennen' (2008: 46). The teaching of sociolinguistic and linguistic competences should however not be based uncritically on models of situational adequacy or appropriateness but should contribute to the production of critical language awareness. Instead of simply accepting that a given variety is or is not appropriate in a particular situation, one should subject the present domain distribution to critical scrutiny by, for example, asking students to write a job application in Swiss German dialect or to make up a fictional telephone conversation with a boy- or girlfriend in (Swiss) standard German. If there are children from an immigrant background in the class (which is very likely as 75 mother tongues are spoken in the canton of Zürich alone, cf. Meyer Rust 2007) who do not speak standard German or a Swiss German dialect as their first language then the exercise becomes even more interesting as one immediately has different linguistic value systems within the one space, and the arbitrary nature of certain appropriacy judgements on the part of the indigenous germanophone Swiss should soon be uncovered. The students should be encouraged to reflect critically on why they find it difficult to express certain contents in certain linguistic forms (if, of course, they do – we should not prejudge the results of such exercises), and should try to distinguish between linguistic and sociolinguistic reasons for such difficulties, e.g. do they find it difficult to write a job application in dialect because they do not know all the necessary vocabulary or because it sounds 'odd'? Why do they find it difficult to use standard German to express emotions? Do the pupils who do not speak dialect at home react in the same way? An element of historical linguistics should be included in the timetable, since it is important to show pupils that linguistic value systems and the relationship between different varieties

change over time. Responsible educators will also point out to students that, although conventions of appropriacy can be criticised and challenged, ‘inappropriate’ use can be risky and incur sanctions. That too is part of the sociolinguistic knowledge they need to acquire.

Students should also be aware of the different conditions of reception and production of written and spoken texts and should be encouraged to reflect on what that means for communicative success. A basic question is of course: what is meant by communicative success? Is it enough to be able to maintain that the reader or interlocutor knew what was meant, even if the utterance or text was not error-free? According to Lewandowski (1982: 20):

[wird] kommunikativer Erfolg in der Regel am besten mit Äußerungen erreicht [...], die der allgemein geltenden Norm entsprechen (oder sie gar überbieten), und [...] Fehler jedweder Art [sind] in der Lage [...], den Hörer oder Leser zu irritieren.

In that context teachers could take the opportunity to discuss the advantages of linguistic correctness, standardisation and linguistic uniformity in a differentiated way, e.g. in relation to different styles, registers or genres. An example: the advantages of a standardised spelling for the manufacturers of spell checkers is offset by the frustration many speakers feel when they ring up a call centre and find that the advisers will not (are not allowed to) diverge from a standardised script. An aspect of communication that could be given more attention in the classroom is the receptive aspect and the role of the reader or listener in communication. As pupils learn to be active readers and listeners they will become more sensitive to the dialogic nature of communication and will also learn to react and adapt to the interlocutor’s needs, abilities and willingness to understand. They should discuss whether they should (or wish to) adapt their own usage in order to be more easily understood by speakers of other varieties or non-native-speakers. Such competences are more important than ever in schools where large numbers of students have learnt or are learning German as a second language and do not necessarily speak it like native speakers.¹² The successful transmission of such competences requires teachers to be aware of the important role played by language in identity formation and as a symbol of group allegiances. The training of teachers has to

¹² Cf. Derwing & Munro’s statement that ‘The responsibility for successful communication should be shared across interlocutors’ (2009: 486). Also, Andersson & Trudgill (1990: 170) argue that schools should help pupils acquire the ability to understand a wide range of accents and that pupils should be aware of the importance of being comprehensible to speakers of other accents and to non-native speakers.

provide them not only with a knowledge of linguistic norms (in Switzerland it should also include a discussion of the validity of endo- vs. exonormative works) but should also incorporate the findings of sociolinguists, especially those relating to attitudes. Teachers whose main specialism is another subject (e.g. chemistry) can hardly be expected to attain the same level of expertise; on the other hand, the work of the subject specialists will be undermined if the reflexive skills which they pass on to students are seen as something that is only relevant in German classes. A possible solution would be for teachers of German to share their knowledge with their colleagues during in-service training days.

I would argue that much of what is described above is also relevant for DaF teachers: their students also need to be aware of communicative competence and appropriacy, not only as theoretical concepts, but also in terms of having at least a receptive competence in the most characteristic features of different registers of German, including everyday speech. Some of these features are supraregional (e.g. apocope: *ich hab, ich könnt*), while others are regional (*Tak* vs. *Tach*; *bin gestanden* vs. *habe gestanden*) (cf. Durrell 2003; 2004).¹³ Such knowledge is necessary at the latest before students spend a semester or year in a German-speaking country, but even students in ab initio courses need some communicative competence and some awareness of sociolinguistic norms if only to know when to use *du* or *Sie*. I would argue that students who do not intend to spend time in Austria or Switzerland should nevertheless be exposed to the notion that German is a pluricentric language. For beginners it is probably sufficient that they are aware of pluricentricity, which can be illustrated with a few examples, but advanced students can be expected to gain some receptive skills in more than one national variety (cf. Muhr 2000: 34). This can only enhance our students' linguistic and sociolinguistic competence.

Ironically, it appears to be the case that teachers, by giving their students the tools to be more critical users of language are also giving them the tools that enable them to be more critical and challenging regarding the role of the teachers as 'Sprachnormautoritäten'. On the other hand, if the teachers have acquired some specialist linguistic knowledge and have been trained to reflect critically on language, they can be regarded as 'Sprachautoritäten', who should be in a position to teach their

¹³ With Durrell (2003: 252) I am not arguing for transmitting a receptive or active knowledge of the most local forms which will hardly be encountered by our students.

students to be more reflexive language users and to transmit a greater degree of insight into linguistic structures and their social embeddedness. Works like those by Sick could be used with advanced learners (and native speakers) to show that lay judgements about language are often not based on linguistic criteria but reveal important beliefs about society and how it should function (Cameron 1995). I totally disagree with Rivers & Young (1996: 178), who wrote (referring to the German spelling reform): ‘Variation als solche bringt [...] die Sprachbenutzenden eher durcheinander, als ihren aktiven Umgang mit der Sprache zu liberalisieren’, and further ‘Zunächst bedeutet größere Freiheit auch größere Verantwortung für den Sprachbenutzenden, mit entsprechenden Gefahren’ (ibid: 179). They appear to believe that the speech community should be protected from a greater degree of freedom (from what Kahl 2000 called the more elastic order of possible / impossible as opposed to the more traditional order of right / wrong), since it is not able to deal with it constructively. Such an argument is patronising and far removed from reality. In our postmodern and pluralist society, in which there are diverse sources of authority and linguistic value systems, students should be enabled to make considered and conscious choices and that will only happen if teachers face up to variation and do not try to hide it or to pretend it does not exist.

Bibliographie

- Ágel, Vilmos (2007) Bastian Sick und die Grammatik: ein ungleiches Duell. *Info DaF* 35.1, 64-84.
- Altwegg, Jürg (2004) Bitte kein Hochdeutsch! Entscheidet sich das Schicksal der Reform in der Schweiz? *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 17.08.04
- Ammon, Ulrich (1995) *Die deutsche Sprache in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz. Das Problem der nationalen Varietäten*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- Ammon, Ulrich (2003) On the social forces that determine what is standard in a language and on conditions of successful implementation. *Sociolinguistica* 17, 1-10.
- Ammon, Ulrich (2005) Standard und Variation: Norm, Autorität, Legitimation. In: Ludwig M. Eichinger; Werner Kallmeyer (eds) *Standardvariation. Wie viel Variation verträgt die deutsche Sprache?* Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 28-40.
- Andersson, Lars-Gunnar; Trudgill, Peter (1990) *Bad Language*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Baigger, Katja; Sutter, Patrizia (2005) Grenzfälle des Standards. Zur Abgrenzung standardsprachlicher von nichtstandardsprachlichen Helvetismen. In: Dürscheid & Businger (eds) *Schweizer Standarddeutsch*, 49-80.
- Barbour, Stephen; Stevenson, Patrick (1990) *Variation in German*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bayer, Klaus (1984) Mündliche Kommunikation. In: Norbert Hopster (ed.) *Handbuch >Deutsch<. Sekundarstufe I*. Paderborn & München: Ferdinand Schöningh, 307-33.
- Berthele, Raphael (2004) Vor lauter Linguisten die Sprache nicht mehr sehen – Diglossie und Ideologie in der deutschsprachigen Schweiz. In: Helen Christen (ed.) *Dialekt, Regiolekt und Standardsprache im sozialen und zeitlichen Raum*. Vienna: Edition Praesens, 111-36.
- Bigler, Ingrid; Heyne, Otfried; Reichert von Sauerländer, Achilles (1987) *Unser Wortschatz. Schweizer Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Zürich: Verlagsinstitut für Lehrmittel.
- Cameron, Deborah (1995) *Verbal Hygiene*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Clalüna, Monika; Fischer, Roland; Hirschfeld, Ursula (2007) Alles unter einem D-A-CH-L? Oder: wie viel Plurizentrik verträgt ein Lehrwerk? *Fremdsprache Deutsch* 37, 38-45.
- Clyne, Michael (1995) *The German Language in a Changing Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, Winifred (1990) Language re-acquisition: teaching undergraduates about gender and language in Sociolinguistics courses. *German Teaching*, December 1990, 2-7.
- Davies, Winifred (2000) Linguistic norms at school. A survey of secondary school teachers in a central German dialect area. *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik* 67, 129-47.
- Davies, Winifred V. (2005) Deutschlehrer und Deutschlehrerinnen (in Deutschland) als Geber und Vermittler von sprachlichen Normen. In: Roggausch (ed.) *Germanistentreffen*, 323-38.
- Davies, Winifred V. (2008) Sprachkultur in lay and academic discourse in modern Germany. *German Life and Letters* 61, 435-50.
- Davies, Winifred; Langer, Nils (2006) *The Making of Bad Language. Lay Linguistic Stigmatisations in German, Past and Present*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Derwing, Tracey M.; Munro, Murray J. (2009) Putting accent in its place: Rethinking obstacles to communication. *Language Teaching* 42, 476-90.
- Di Meola, Claudio (2009) Rektionsschwankungen bei Präpositionen – erlaubt, verboten, unbeachtet. In: Marek Konopka; Bruno Streckler (eds) *Deutsche Grammatik – Regeln, Normen, Sprachgebrauch*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 195-221.
- Dittmar, Norbert (1980) *Soziolinguistik*. 4th ed. Königstein/Taunus: Athenäum.
- Duden (2001) *Richtiges und gutes Deutsch*. 5th ed. Mannheim: Duden.
- Duden (2002) *Basiswissen Schule. Deutsch*. Mannheim: Duden.
- Duden (2004) *Die deutsche Rechtschreibung*. 23rd ed. Mannheim: Duden.
- Duden (2005) *Duden. Die Grammatik*. 7th ed. Mannheim: Duden.
- Duden (2009) *Duden. Die Grammatik*. 8th ed. Mannheim: Duden.
- Durrell, Martin (2003) Register, Variation und Fremdsprachenvermittlung. Zum Problem des Deutschunterrichts in Großbritannien. In: Gerhard Stickel (ed.) *Deutsch von Außen*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 239-58.
- Durrell, Martin (2004) Variation im Deutschen aus der Sicht von Deutsch als Fremdsprache. *Der Deutschunterricht* 1/2004, 69-77.

- Durrell, Martin (2005) *Using German*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Durrell, Martin; Langer, Nils (2005) Gutes Deutsch und schlechtes Deutsch an britischen und irischen Hochschulen. Zur Akzeptanz von Variation im DaF-Unterricht. In: Roggausch (ed.) *Germanistentreffen*, 297-314.
- Dürscheid, Christa; Businger, Martin (eds) *Schweizer Standarddeutsch. Beiträge zur Varietätenlinguistik*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Eberle, Franz; Gehrler, Karin; Jaggi, Beat; Kottonau, Johannes; Oepke, Maren; Pflüger, Michael (2008) *Evaluation der Maturitätsreform 1995 (EVAMAR). Schlussbericht zur Phase II*. Eidgenössisches Departement des Innern. Staatssekretariat für Bildung und Forschung.
- EDK (2003) Aktionsplan 'PISA 2000' – Folgemassnahmen. Beschluss Plenarversammlung 12. Juni 2003.
- Eisenberg, Peter (2007) Sprachliches Wissen im Wörterbuch der Zweifelsfälle. *Aptum* 2007/3, 209-28.
- Elter, Irmgard (2005) Genitiv versus Dativ. Die Rektion der Präpositionen *wegen*, *während*, *trotz*, *statt* und *dank* in der aktuellen Zeitungssprache. In: Johannes Schwitalla; Werner Wegstein (eds) *Korpuslinguistik Deutsch: synchron, diachron, kontrastiv*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 125-35.
- Fairclough, Norman (ed.) (1992) *Critical Language Awareness*. London & New York: Longman.
- Ferguson, Charles (1959) Diglossia. *Word* 15, 325-37.
- Frank-Cyrus, Karin; Steinhauer Anja; Trabold, Annette (1999) *Förderung der Sprachkultur in Deutschland*. Wiesbaden: Gesellschaft für deutsche Sprache.
- Gloy, Klaus (1975) *Sprachnormen I. Linguistische und soziologische Analysen*. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann.
- Götze, Lutz (2001) Normen – Sprachnormen – Normtoleranz. *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 38, 131-33.
- Häcki Buhofer, Annelies; Burger, Harald; Schneider, Hansjakob; Studer, Thomas (1994) Früher Hochspracherwerb in der deutschen Schweiz: Der weitgehend ungesteuerte Erwerb durch sechs- bis achtjährige Deutschschweizer Kinder. In: Harald Burger; Annelies Häcki Buhofer (eds) *Spracherwerb im Spannungsfeld von Dialekt und Hochsprache* (= Zürcher Germanistische Studien 38). Bern & Berlin: Peter Lang, 147-98.
- Häcki Buhofer, Annelies; Schneider, Hansjakob; Beckert, Christine (2007) Mehrsprachige Jugendliche im Umgang mit Dialekt und Hochsprache in der Deutschen Schweiz. *Linguistik online* 32/3, 49-70.
- Hägi, Sara; Scharloth, Joachim (2005) Ist Standarddeutsch für Deutschschweizer eine Fremdsprache? Untersuchungen zu einem Topos des sprachreflexiven Diskurses. *Linguistik online* 24/3, 19-47.
- Hägi, Sara (2006) *Nationale Varietäten im Unterricht Deutsch als Fremdsprache*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Hammer, Svenja (2007) Rezension zu: Sick, Bastian: Der Dativ ist dem Genitiv sein Tod. Folge 3: Noch mehr Neues aus dem Irrgarten der deutschen Sprache. Köln: Kiepenheuer & Witsch 2006. *Info Daf* 34.2/3, 306-07.
- Haugen, Einar (1966) Semicommunication: the language gap in Scandinavia. *Sociological Enquiry* 36, 280-97.

- Hennig, Mathilde; Löber, Melanie (2010) Benutzung und Benutzbarkeit von Grammatiken. In: Iris Bons; Thomas Gloning; Dennis Kaltwasser (eds) *Festplatte für Gerd Fritz*. Gießen 23.05.2010. (www.festschrift-gerd-fritz.de/files/hennig_loeber_2010_benutzung-und-benutzbarkeit-von-grammatiken.pdf, downloaded 28.09.10).
- Hochholzer, Rupert (2004) *Konfliktfeld Dialekt. Das Verhältnis von Deutschlehrerinnen und Deutschlehrern zu Sprache und ihren regionalen Varietäten* Regensburg: Edition Vulpes.
- Hochschulreife und Studierfähigkeit. Zürcher Analysen und Empfehlungen zur Schnittstelle* (2008) Zürich: Arbeitsgruppe HSGYM. (www.hsgym.ch)
- Hymes, Dell (1966) Two types of linguistic relativity. In: William Bright (ed.) *Sociolinguistics*. The Hague: Mouton, 114-58.
- Jäger, Siegfried (1980) Standardsprache. In: Hans Peter Althaus; Helmut Henne; Herbert Ernst Wiegand (eds) *Lexikon der germanistischen Linguistik*. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 375-9.
- Kahl, Reinhard (2000) Eine deutsche Reaktion. *tageszeitung*. 28.07.00.
- Kolde, Gottfried (1981) *Sprachkontakte in gemischtsprachigen Städten. Vergleichende Untersuchungen über Voraussetzungen und Formen sprachlicher Interaktion verschiedensprachiger Jugendlicher in den Schweizer Städten Biel/Bienne und Fribourg/Freiburg i.Ü.* (=ZDL Beihefte, Heft 37). Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- König, Werner (2008) Welche Normen? Wessen Normen? 15 Sätze zu Info Daf 34. *Info Daf* 35.1, 61-3.
- Langer, Nils (2010) Sprechereinstellungen zur Zielsprache im britischen und irischen DaF-Unterricht. In: A. C. Anders; Markus Hundt; Alexander Lasch (eds) *Perceptual Dialectology: Neue Wege der Dialektologie*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 409-31.
- Läubli, Martina (2005) Nationale Varietäten: Eine Herausforderung für die Lexikographie. Wie deutschsprachige Wörterbücher mit Helvetismen umgehen. In: Dürscheid & Businger (eds) *Schweizer Standarddeutsch*, 113-30.
- Lewandowski, Theodor (1982) Normen im deutschen Schulunterricht. Mündliche Kommunikation und gesprochene Sprache. In: Birgitta Mogge; Ingulf Radtke *Schulen für einen guten Sprachgebrauch* (= Der öffentliche Sprachgebrauch Bd 3). Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 15-26.
- Maitz, Péter; Elspaß, Stephan (2007) Warum der »Zwiebelfisch« nicht in den Deutschunterricht gehört. *Info Daf* 34.5, 515-26.
- Meyer Rust, Kathrin (2007) Die Schweizer Antwort auf Pisa heisst HarmoS. *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* 01.04.07 (<http://www.nzz.ch/2007/04/01/ws/articleF20S9.html>, accessed 28.09.10).
- Muhr, Rudolf (1994) „Entschuldigen Sie Frau Kollegin...“ Sprechaktrealisierungsunterschiede an Universitäten in Österreich und Deutschland. In: Gudrun Held (ed.) *Verbale Interaktion*. Hamburg: Kovaè, 128-44.
- Muhr, Rudolf (2000) Österreichisches Sprachdiplom Deutsch. Abschnitt 3: Das Deutsche als plurizentrische Sprache – die Didaktik des Deutschen als plurizentrische Sprache. (<http://www-oedt.kfunigraz.ac.at/OESDCD/0INTRO/Gesamt-PDF/A03-Deutsch-a-pluriz.Sprache.PDF>, accessed 19.05.11).

- Oberholzer, Susanne (2005) Schweizer Standarddeutsch als Unterrichtssprache. In: Dürscheid & Businger (eds) *Schweizer Standarddeutsch*, 233-63.
- Polenz, Peter von (1988) Sprachkritik und Sprachnormenkritik. In: Hans J. Heringer (ed.) *Holzfeuer im hölzernen Ofen*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 70-93.
- Putz, Martin (2002) „Österreichisches Deutsch“ als Fremdsprache? Kritische Überlegungen. *GfL* 3/2002, 48-76.
- Rash, Felicity (1998) *The German Language in Switzerland. Multilingualism, Diglossia and Variation*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Rivers, Julian; Young, Christopher (1996) Wer beherrscht die deutsche Sprache? Recht, Sprache und Autorität nach der Rechtschreibreform 1996. *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik* 68, 173-90.
- Roggasch, Werner (ed.) (2005) *Germanistentreffen: Deutschland – Großbritannien - Irland. Proceedings of conference organised by German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), Dresden, October 2004*. Bonn: DAAD.
- Roggasch, Werner (2007) Antwort auf Péter Maitz / Stephan Elspaß und *Einladung zur Diskussion*. *Info Daf* 34.5, 527-30.
- Scharloth, Joachim (2005) Asymmetrische Plurizentrität und Sprachbewusstsein: Einstellungen der Deutschschweizer zum Standarddeutschen. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 33, 236-67.
- Schläpfer, Robert (1990) Standardsprache und Mundarten in der deutschen Schweiz. In: Gerhard Stickel (ed.) *Deutsche Gegenwartssprache. Tendenzen und Perspektiven*. Frankfurt am Main: de Gruyter, 192-7.
- Sick, Bastian (2004) *Der Dativ ist dem Genitiv sein Tod. Ein Wegweiser durch den Irrgarten der deutschen Sprache*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch.
- Sick, Bastian (2005) *Der Dativ ist dem Genitiv sein Tod. Folge 2: Neues aus dem Irrgarten der deutschen Sprache*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch.
- Sick, Bastian (2006) *Der Dativ ist dem Genitiv sein Tod. Folge 3: Noch mehr Neues aus dem Irrgarten der deutschen Sprache*. Cologne: Kiepenheuer & Witsch.
- Sieber, Peter (2003) *Hochdeutsch als Unterrichtssprache. Befunde und Perspektiven*. Pädagogische Hochschule Zürich. Published by Bildungsdirektion des Kantons Zürich.
- Spitzmüller, Jürgen (2005) *Metasprachdiskurse. Einstellungen zu Anglizismen und ihre wissenschaftliche Rezeption*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- Thurmair, Maria (2002) Standardnorm und Abweichungen. Entwicklungstendenzen unter dem Einfluss der gesprochenen Sprache. *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 39, 3-8.
- Wagner, Melanie M. (2009) *Lay Linguistics and School Teaching. An empirical sociolinguistic study in the Moselle-Franconian dialect area* (= ZDL Beihefte, Heft 136). Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Wolff, Hans (1959) Intelligibility and interethnic attitudes. *Anthropological Linguistics* 1, 34-41.
- Wort für Wort (2002) *Schweizer Stilwörterbuch zu den Sprachlehrmitteln der Mittel- und Oberstufe mit rund 23,000 Stichwörtern und den wichtigsten Regeln der Rechtschreibung*. 7th, corrected ed. Zürich: Lehrmittelverlag.

Biographical Information

Winifred Davies is Reader in German at Aberystwyth University. She researches in German sociolinguistics, especially processes of standardisation and attitudes towards non-standard varieties. Selected recent publications are: (with N. Langer): *The Making of Bad Language*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2006; The Nineteenth Century. In: G. Horan et al. (eds) *Landmarks in the History of German*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2009, 189-210; (with M. Wagner) The role of World War II in the development of Luxembourgish as a national language. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 33/2 (2009), 112-31; Die Rolle von (laien)linguistischen Mythen bei der Reproduktion linguistischer Normen. In: A. C. Anders et al. (eds) *Perceptual Dialectology: Neue Wege der Dialektologie*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010, 387-408.

Key Words

Switzerland, German language, pluricentricity, teachers, competences, norms