

Susanne Lippert*

The teaching of national linguistic varieties in the didactic materials used at the Goethe-Institut of Rome

German, as is known, is a pluricentric language. It is spoken not only in Germany, Austria and Switzerland, but also in Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, eastern Belgium and in many border areas of neighbouring countries (Italy, France, Denmark, Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia). There are also many German linguistic islands: the classic study by Born and Dickgießer (1989) identifies as many as twenty-five of them, spread throughout the world, in Romania, Russia, United States, Australia, in former German colonies in Africa such as Namibia (where German is even one of the national languages), Togo, Cameroon, Tanzania, in Latin America (Argentina, Brazil), and so on.

Various independent centers have developed a standard codified variety of German, producing dictionaries that serve as normative reference works¹. Thus in Austria we have the *Österreichisches Wörterbuch*, in Switzerland the *Schweizer Wörterbuch* and in Germany the *Duden*. In Germany, since the reform of German spelling, there are also other dictionaries that are used for reference such as the *Wahrig* or even small, semi-official glossaries adopted by publishing houses or newspapers. Even the Paraguay Mnemonite have, according to Ammon (2015), a reference dictionary of their own, so in some way they constitute a fourth standardized variety along with the better known ones of Austria, Germany and Switzerland.

Dictionaries codify the norms used by linguistic authorities (e.g. professors, journalists, writers) and are, according to Ammon, a central requirement for a linguistic area to qualify as a «Vollzentrum der

* Università degli Studi Roma Tre.

¹ Here we use Ammon's definition, based on Kloss, according to whom a national variety is a standard variety that is valid for the entire nation and whose use is the norm in public situations in that nation; usually it is taught in public schools and is often the language used by teachers. It is codified in dictionaries (meaning, spelling and pronunciation) or in other reference works, such as grammars. Taken together these works make up the linguistic canon (Ammon, 1995: 73-74; 2015: 111).

deutschen Sprache», that is a center that gives origin to a standard linguistic variety and a linguistic ‘canon’ that can be used to establish which forms of the variety are correct. However, in order to serve as the basis for such a ‘canon’, dictionaries must be also acknowledged in some way by authorities. For example, the *Bayerisches Wörterbuch (BWB)*, while used as reference for the Bavarian dialect, does not have the same institutional status of the *Duden*.

Der sprachliche Kodex ist das Nachschlagewerk für die richtigen Formen der Standardvarietät. Seine „Gültigkeit“ wird durch eine Hierarchie von Normautoritäten gewährleistet, die in der Regel letztlich bis zur Staatsspitze hinaufreicht, z.B. indem die Kultusbürokratie im Zweifelsfall festlegt, an welchen Nachschlagewerken sich die Lehrmaterialien für die Schulen zu orientieren haben. Im Falle der deutschen Sprache sind für Deutschland die *Dudenbände*, für Österreich das *Österreichische Wörterbuch* und für die Schweiz vielleicht das *Schweizer Wörterbuch* (K. Meyer 2006) die zentralen Bestandteile des Kodexes der jeweiligen Standardvarietät. Allerdings ist dies nicht explizit so festgelegt, sondern erweist sich erst in Konflikten um sprachliche Richtigkeit². (Ammon, 2015: 142)

In the light of the great number of national varieties of German, the question arises of how one can do justice to the pluricentric nature of German when teaching the language. In 1988 a commission of experts met to discuss the question. The commission included representatives of the teachers of the four German-speaking national states existing at the time: Austria, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Democratic Republic of Germany and Switzerland. Various institutions were behind this commission and sent their representatives including the Internationaler Deutschlehrerverband (IDV), the Sektion Deutsch als Fremdsprache of the Herder Institut in Leipzig, the association Fachgruppe Deutsch als Fremdsprache des Fachverbandes Moderne Fremdsprachen (FMF) and the Goethe-Institut, the main language and culture institution of Federal

² ‘The linguistic ‘canon’ is the reference for the correct forms of the variety. Its ‘validity’ is guaranteed by a hierarchy of norm authorities, which normally reaches up to the uppermost part of the State, for instance by a government decision over which dictionary to use for didactic materials used in schools. In the case of the German language the central elements of the canon of the standard variety are the *Duden* for Germany, the *Österreichisches Wörterbuch* [Austrian Dictionary] for Austria and possibly the *Schweizer Wörterbuch* [Swiss Dictionary] (K. Meyer, 2006) for Switzerland. This is not established officially but may be deduced from discussions over the correct form of language’.

Germany (see Hägi, 2006: 24). The proceedings of the meetings resulted in a seminal publication, the so-called *ABCD-Thesen* (published in 1990), which advocated a pluricentric approach to the teaching of German – A was for Austria, B for the Federal Republic of Germany (Bundesrepublik Deutschland), C for the Swiss Confederation (Confoederatio Helvetica) and D for the German Democratic Republic (Deutsche Demokratische Republik). The document acknowledged for the first time the importance of representing also Austria and Switzerland in the teaching of German language and culture abroad.

The emphasis was mainly on the teaching of the *Landeskunde*. The term, which has no exact equivalent in English, may be loosely translated as ‘knowledge of the country’, representing a combination of history, general culture, geography, sociology and economics. However, the authors stated that they considered the teaching of the standard national varieties of German in these countries also important. This is stated in Thesis number 12, which applied the notion of pluricentrism also to the language. In general, the document insisted on the importance of a change of perspective, of being more open towards the different situations of German speaking countries and the different language varieties: a pluricentric approach that extended also to language.

Mit den ABCD-Thesen erfolgt ein Umdenken zugunsten der Vielfalt der kulturellen und sozialen Realitäten im deutschsprachigen Raum (vgl. These 5), zugunsten einer verstärkten > Zusammenarbeit (vgl. These 7) sowie zugunsten einer Betonung der > Plurizentrik der deutschen Sprache (vgl. These 12)³. (Hägi, 2011: 7)

As an example, consider Theses number 5, 7 and 12:

Thesis 5

Im Deutschunterricht und daher auch in Lehrwerken und Zusatzmaterialien müssen Informationen über den ganzen deutschsprachigen Raum berücksichtigt werden⁴. (ABCD-Gruppe, 1990: 306)

³ ‘With the *ABCD-Thesen*, a change of perspective takes place in favor of the multiplicity of cultural and social realities of the German-speaking area (see Thesis 5), in favor of a greater collaboration (see Thesis 7), as well as in favor of the importance of pluricentrism of the German language (see Thesis 12)’.

⁴ ‘In the teaching of German and therefore also in text books and additional materials, information about the entire German-speaking areas must be included’.

Thesis 7

Die Stimmigkeit landeskundlicher Informationen sollte dadurch gewährleistet werden, daß eine Zusammenarbeit mit Experten der jeweils betroffenen Länder oder Regionen gesucht wird⁵. (ABCD-Gruppe, 1990: 307)

Thesis 12

Die Vielfalt von regionalen Varietäten der deutschen Sprache stellt eine wichtige Brücke zwischen Spracherwerb und Landeskunde dar. Diese Vielfalt darf nicht zugunsten einheitlicher Normen (weder phonologisch, noch lexikalisch, noch morpho-syntaktisch) aufgegeben, sondern soll für die Lernenden am Beispiel geeigneter Materialien und Texte erfaßbar gemacht werden⁶. (ABCD-Gruppe, 1990: 307)

Since then more than 30 years have gone by. The ABCD theses have contributed to the development of DACHL⁷, which like the *ABCD-Thesen* on which it was based, consists basically in a commitment to teach also the *Landeskunde* and the national varieties of the German language of Austria, Switzerland and Liechtenstein, when teaching German abroad:

⁵ ‘The appropriateness of the general knowledge of a country must be ensured through an effort to collaborate with the experts of the countries or regions involved’.

⁶ ‘Regional varieties of German can serve as an important bridge between language acquisition and the students’ general knowledge of German-speaking countries. This diversity must not be ignored in favor of uniform norms (phonological, lexical, or morpho-syntactical), but should be pointed out to students using appropriate texts and materials’.

⁷ The acronym DACHL derives from the combination of the automobile plates of the countries involved (D stands for Germany, A for Austria, CH for Switzerland and L for Liechtenstein). The DACHL working group at the IDV, founded in 2007, officially became the DACHL Committee of the IDV in 2018 (*DACHL-Gremium des IDV*), a committee with its own rules of procedure (cf. idvnetz.org/dachl-online). A Special Interest Group (SIG) was established shortly before the IDT 2017 (*Internationale Deutschlehrertagung*) and presented its work report at a workshop during the same event. Thesis 5 of the Freiburg Resolution on Language Policy (*Freiburger Resolution zur Sprachenpolitik*) emerged from the results of this work report and workshop. All of these efforts culminated in the symposium *The DACH Principle in Practice (Das DACH-Prinzip in der Praxis)* in Munich in 2018. Thirty years after the inaugural meeting of the ABCD group, this significant conference took place in Munich to commemorate the ABCD theses and to develop further research. Members of the DACHL working group, comprising representatives from the IDV, FaDaF, ÖDaF, AkDaF, and participants from the IDT 2017, gathered there with members of the SIG (Special Interest Group) and other researchers interested in the topic. (cf. Shafer *et. al.*, 2020: iv).

Dieses [DACH-Prinzip] steht für die „grundsätzliche Anerkennung der Vielfalt des deutschsprachigen Raumes“ und für eine ideell „gleichwertige Einbeziehung der unterschiedlichen sprachlichen und landeskundlichen Dimensionen des deutschsprachigen Raumes“ – sei es in der Praxis des Deutschunterrichts, bei der Entwicklung von Lehr- und Lernmaterialien, im Rahmen der Aus- und Weiterbildung von Lehrpersonen oder in der Fachwissenschaft Deutsch als Fremd- und Zweitsprache⁸. (Shafer *et al.*, 2020: iii)

While the issues in question have been the subject of many conferences and studies since then, and there has been a growing interest in the teaching of different language varieties, in practice the Austrian and Swiss varieties of German continue to be scarcely represented in didactic materials used in the teaching of German abroad. As an example, in the present article I will examine the didactic materials used at the Goethe-Institut of Rome as well as the general attitude of teachers and students in this regard.

The Goethe-Institut is the most important institution for the teaching of German language and culture abroad. Although it is an autonomous non-profit cultural association, most of its budget comes from the German Foreign Ministry with which it has a formal agreement. It is present worldwide with 151 institutes in 98 countries, 12 of which are located in Germany. Furthermore, the Goethe-Institut indirectly finances or coordinates about one thousand other institutes. It is also the main referent for the Foreign Cultural Policy of the Foreign Ministry. Besides offering courses and exams in German Language, it has the responsibility of developing new teaching materials and examination systems. The Goethe-Institut also trains language teachers, awards study grants and organizes seminars and conferences. Obviously its policy in regard to the teaching of standard national varieties of German is highly influential.

In the present study I have examined the didactic materials used at the Goethe-Institut in Rome in the courses typically attended by students⁹.

⁸ ‘This [DACH principle] stands for the “fundamental recognition of the diversity of the German-speaking world” and for an ideally “equal inclusion of the different linguistic and regional dimensions of the German-speaking world” – be it in the practice of teaching German, in the development of teaching and learning materials, in the context of initial and further teacher training or in the discipline of German as a foreign and second language’.

⁹ The time frame examined here extends until 2016, when my activities at the Goethe Institute of Rome came to an end. It would be intriguing to delve into post-2016 devel-

Furthermore, a questionnaire was submitted to the teachers of the institute and another one to the students of two classes I taught in order to gather information on their attitude towards pluricentric language teaching. Unfortunately, I was able to administer the questionnaire only in the two classes I was directly involved with (a B2 and a C2 group, totaling 22 students), because I was not authorized by the former director of the *Sprachabteilung* (Language Department) to submit the questionnaire to other students attending courses at the institute.

The result of the study was that the topic of language variety is rarely addressed in course books and that examples of national variants are scarcely discussed in didactic material. Teachers and students at the Goethe do not consider it an important topic and generally believe that students should focus on the standard variety of the language used in Germany.

Course books, especially at the A1 level, contain a few references to language variants, but there are no chapters that explicitly discuss the subject from a more theoretical perspective. Examples are limited almost exclusively to greetings and food. Following are all the cases found in the six books of the *Schritte* series (1 to 6, ranging from A1 level to B1 level) in which attention is explicitly drawn to variants.

Schritte international 1 (level A1.1)

- 1) «Wer ist das Song» (lesson 1: 16 – 17), song (different greetings are mentioned, such as *Griëzi! Guten Tag! Grüß Gott!* etc.)¹⁰;
- 2) Langenzersdorf (lesson 2: 18 – 19), story with photos introducing the lesson; the pronunciation of the toponym Langenzersdorf is discussed; the Austrian variant *leiwand* is also introduced¹¹;
- 3) *Erdäpfel*¹² are potatoes (lesson 3: 28 – 29), story with photos

opments. It is noteworthy that the textbook employed at the time, *Schritte international*, albeit in its updated edition, *Schritte international NEU*, was consistently used until Autumn 2022. At present, *Momente* (A1, A2) and *Spektrum* (B1) have taken its place.

¹⁰ In *Schritte international NEU* this has been substituted with a map featuring greeting formulas from Austria, Germany and Switzerland and another map illustrating nations where German is spoken.

¹¹ A note says «Corinna spricht österreichisches Deutsch» ('Corinna speaks Austrian German').

¹² *Erdäpfel* is the Austrian word used for potatoes (literally 'earth apples', similar to the French *pomme de terre*), while the Teutonic German form is *Kartoffel*. The entire episode revolves on the misunderstanding created by this difference.

- introducing the lesson; the entire story revolves around a misunderstanding created by the Austrian variant *Erdäpfel*¹³;
- 4) Potato salad (lesson 3: 36 – 37), illustrated recipe, where on one page references are made to the variants of four regions: Northern Germany, Southern Germany, Austria and Switzerland¹⁴;
 - 5) Audio exercise with two people, one speaking with a strong Austrian accent and the other with a strong Swiss accent (lesson 2: 24);

Schritte international 2 (level A1.2)

- 6) Carnival (lesson 9: 26 – 27), text with photos; contains the Swiss variant *Fasnacht* and the Austrian (i.e. Bavarian) variant *Fasching* for the Teutonic German variant *Karneval*. (In the present article I will be using the expression Teutonic German variant to refer to the standard German variants used only in Germany, as opposed to other standard national variants used in Austria and Switzerland);

Schritte international 4 (level A2.2)

- 7) Saying goodbye *Servus*, *Salü*, *Auf Wiederluege* are mentioned along with other forms of greeting (lesson 14: 76 – 77).

From the B1 level (*Schritte international 5*) upwards, the printed material contains no reference to language pluricentrism, though Austrian and Swiss accents are occasionally found in the audio material. In the 1080 total pages of the *Schritte international 1* to *Schritte international 6* books, only 12 pages present national variants, while the general question of national varieties is never explicitly discussed. We might add that these books were the only ones used by the Goethe-Institut of Rome for levels A1, A2 and B1 (i.e. for the first six courses)

¹³ Not included in *Schritte international NEU*.

¹⁴ One should note that, although this is the only section where the distinction is made between Teutonic, Austrian and Helvetic variants, the topic is not properly presented. For example, in the text we also find the Teutonic German variant *Brötchen*, which is not relativized. *Brötchen* is in fact a variant typical of Northern Germany, which is not used in Austria, Switzerland or even in Southern Germany for that matter, but is here presented as the norm. It would have been important to explain that some words are Teutonic German variants, i.e. that they are not used everywhere. In *Schritte international NEU*, this section is presented exclusively in Standard German, without any regional variants.

and they have been in use from 2006 to 2016. From 2016 until autumn 2022 the *Schritte international NEU* series has been used for the same three linguistic levels.

Going up from the *Schritte* series to *Aspekte 2* (B2) and to *Aspekte 3* (C1), no mention is found of national standard varieties. One should note, however, that for levels B2, C1 and C2, a wider range of books was used, and *Aspekte* was only one possibility among others¹⁵. In *Aspekte 3* there is a section (lesson 3, module 4: 48-49) on the dialects spoken in Germany, which however does not deal at all with the Austrian and Swiss national varieties. In the audio exercises that accompany the lesson, eight dialect samples are presented, among which one in *Schwyzerdütsch*. No description is offered of the peculiar linguistic situation of Switzerland; the *Schwyzerdütsch* is treated just like the other dialects in Germany; no mention is made of the diglossia in Switzerland between Swiss standard and *Schwyzerdütsch*.

The result is that even students who have taken C2 courses are unaware of the existence of different standard national varieties in Austria, Germany and Switzerland. They assume there is only one standard variety, the Teutonic, and that in Austria and Switzerland a dialect is spoken. In the two classes examined in the present study, 32% of the students stated they were interested only in the culture, history and literature of Germany, 41% were interested in Germany and Austria, and only 27% were interested also in Switzerland. As for the language, 57% stated they wanted to study only Teutonic German, 35% stated they wanted to study both the Austrian and German national varieties and only 4% wanted to study both the German and Swiss varieties, and surprisingly, only 4% all three varieties.

As for the exams, the situation is somewhat different insofar as speakers from Austria or Switzerland are included in B1, because experts from the three main German-speaking countries collaborate to prepare this exam. This presence however remains limited to the audio tracks, in which speakers from Austria or Switzerland speak using their standard variety. None of the books being used at the Goethe-Institut of Rome until 2016 explicitly states that in Switzerland and Austria varieties of German are spoken that have the same representative status as the Teutonic variety, insofar as they are national standard varieties of autonomous countries. As a result even many students who are studying at the C2 level know nothing about this topic. From the questionnaire

¹⁵ In Rome, until 2016, for levels B2 and C1 also the books *Ziel* and *Sicher* were used.

and from the discussion with students (including those of the C2 class), it emerged that only one person was aware that Austrian and Swiss standard varieties have the same official value as the Teutonic variety. All students focus on the Teutonic variety and believe other national varieties to be of little importance. In general, students believe that what is spoken in Austria or Switzerland is a dialect among others, of little importance given the cultural and economic dominance of Germany. One questionnaire compiled by a student was particularly hostile towards Switzerland and contained a number of prejudices in regard specifically to the language. The student spoke of *Schwyzerdütsch* and said he could not stand this *variant* (the term he used instead of *variety*), that it has a horrible sound, and that while he knew it was used on radio and television, in his opinion only the Teutonic standard should be used. He added that he would not have been happy having a Swiss teacher and that the Swiss and the Austrians should take lessons in order to correct their pronunciation and accent. The student might have had a less intolerant attitude if the question of national varieties had been explicitly dealt with in his course books.

The lack of interest of students for the German spoken in the smaller nations is a consequence of the dominance of Germany at a political, economic and cultural level. The Austrians and Swiss themselves perceive this disparity, which is expressed at various levels, and especially at a socio-linguistic one. Eva Menasse, a famous Austrian writer, who has been living for more than 20 years in Berlin, and is the author of the bestselling novel *Quasikristalle* (Spiegel Bestsellerliste 2014)¹⁶, describes the situation in the following terms:

Das bestimmende Element der nachbarlichen Beziehungen ist zweifellos die Spannung zwischen deutscher Arroganz und österreichischem Minderwertigkeitsgefühl¹⁷. (Menasse, 2015: 70)

This sense of inferiority is the result of power relations, as Menasse explains through the following metaphor:

Stellen wir uns eine Schulklasse vor, in der die Körpergröße der einzelnen Kinder der Größe und politischen Bedeutung ihrer

¹⁶ Several books by Eva Menasse have been translated into Italian, cf. Menasse (2019, 2021, 2023).

¹⁷ ‘The distinctive element of neighbour relations is certainly the tension between German arrogance and Austrian sense of inferiority’.

jeweiligen Nation entspricht. Der großgewachsene Deutsche blickt sich um, sieht einen Briten, einen Franzosen, einen Spanier, und wenn er sich ein bisschen reckt, dann nickt ihm vielleicht sogar der lange Lulatsch von Amerikaner zu. Dass er mit den unter ihm wuselnden kleinen Österreichern, Belgiern, Schweizern oder Tschechen spielt, kommt ihm gar nicht in den Sinn¹⁸. (Menasse, 2015: 70-71)

This disparity is reflected in the Austrians' perception of their language:

Der Österreicher jedoch, und hier spielt nun die gemeinsame Sprache eine unselige Rolle, fühlt sich, frisch in Deutschland, wie ein Kuhhirt in der Oper. Wenn er nicht gerade in Bayern, Sachsen oder Schwaben gelandet ist, kommt ihm die eigene Sprache plump und peinlich vor gegenüber den klaren harten Konsonanten und den schwingeneden Diphthongen der deutschen Hochsprache – und gegenüber »Mülleimer« (statt Mistkübel) und »Reinigung« (statt Putzerei) sowieso¹⁹. (Menasse, 2015: 71)

This psychological disparity thus extends also to language: the disparity between Germany and Austria or Switzerland influences the self-esteem of the speakers of these two countries, including their perception of the variety of German they speak.

A similar situation exists for Switzerland. There are also many testimonies of people discriminated against because they speak Swiss German:

[...] und immer noch werden Muttersprachlerinnen und Muttersprachler aufgrund ihrer vermeintlich unzulänglichen Varietät belächelt oder gar diskriminiert (vgl. Ransmayr 2006 > weiterführende Literatur) – und zwar auch von Fachleuten, wie

¹⁸ 'Let's imagine a class in Elementary school where the height of children is proportional to the importance of their nation. The tall German looks around, and spots the British, the French, the Spaniards. If he stands on his toes, maybe even that gigantic American will say hi to him from above. He won't even consider playing with the short Austrians, Belgians, Swiss or Czechs milling about at his feet'.

¹⁹ 'An Austrian, newly arrived in Germany, feels like a farmer at the opera, and here the common language plays an unfortunate role. Unless, by accident, he has landed in Bavaria, Saxony or Swabia, his language will feel embarrassingly clumsy, compared to the clear-cut hard consonants and vibrant diphthongs of standard German. And even more when he calls garbage *Mistkübel* instead of *Mülleimer* or if he calls laundry *Putzerei* instead of *Reinigung*'.

Begegnungen auf der IDT 2009 in Jena oder auf DaF-Tagungen weltweit zeigen²⁰. (Hägi, 2011: 11)

Given this context, it is no surprise that both teachers and students of German have not much interest in the topic of national varieties. On the other hand, one could hope for a more in-depth treatment of the topic in didactic materials.

Overall, the line of the Goethe-Institut appears to be the following: all students must be aware that Swiss and Austrian variants of German words exist. Some of these are actually presented in *Schritte international 1* and *2*, the two books used for beginner levels A1.1 and A1.2, and in *Schritte international 4* (level A2.2), but the question is never fully explored. Students are never informed that there are at least two other countries in which varieties of German are the official language and have therefore, at least in theory, the same status as the Teutonic variety.

The results of the questionnaire distributed to the teachers of the Goethe-Institut showed that they were open to the teaching of these varieties, but not particularly interested in the subject. I must add that of the 15 teachers to whom the questionnaire was submitted, only 5 actually returned it. This is in itself an indication of the scarce interest in the topic. Of the five teachers who responded, only one considered the question of the varieties of German to be an important topic, while the other four judged it to be not particularly important. Only one teacher responded correctly to the question whether in Austria and Switzerland a standard variety of German exists. The other four did not understand the question. None of the five knew whether there was a national standard variety in Liechtenstein or Luxemburg. When asked what the students should know about Austrian and Swiss variants of German words, all agreed that they should know of their existence. In conclusion, the teachers of the Goethe-Institut of Rome have neither a great interest, nor a great knowledge of the topic. Considering the fact that the Goethe-Institut in Italy organizes at least one workshop per year for its teachers on topics it considers important, it is evident that the question of national varieties is not one of those.

This is not surprising, considering that even in the more important journals in this field the importance of national varieties is often denied:

²⁰ [...] 'and also native speakers are made fun of or even discriminated against (see Ransmayr 2006 > research literature) and this even by experts, as shown by meetings of the IDT 2009 in Jena or of the DaF conferences on German as a foreign language'.

Wenn Österreicher ein bisschen anders sprechen, ist ihr Deutsch bestimmt nicht falsch. Aber für die meisten Deutsch-Lerner ist es vielleicht besser, wenn sie ein Standard-Deutsch lernen²¹.
(*Deutsch Perfekt*, 3/2007)

As noted by Sara Hägi (2011: 7), the above passage while admitting that the Austrian way of speaking German cannot be considered incorrect, implicitly suggests it is not a *standard* insofar as the only standard mentioned is the one spoken in Germany. We can conclude that the notion of DACH(L) is not embodied in didactic materials and therefore remains a formal position that is not translated into a practice.

It would be important instead that didactic materials devote lessons to the question of national linguistic varieties, in which the topic is studied in depth, to help students understand that these national varieties exist, that they are part of the culture of the nations in which they are spoken, and that they are all equally legitimate. To truly enact a pluricentric approach to the teaching of German it would also be important to develop the listening skills of students in regard to these varieties, and to help them develop also a degree of active competence. At least this would help them avoid the common mistake of starting a conversation with an Austrian or a Swiss with an expression like *Guten Tag* instead of *Griüßgott* or *Gruezi*, and therefore being at once noticed as a stranger, who not only doesn't know how to speak appropriately, but also acts like a German. We should always bear in mind that linguistic variation can be a means to achieve social identification and integration into a social group, but, in the same way, it can create social exclusion or marginalization.

References

- ABCD-GRUPPE. (1990). ABCD-Thesen zur Rolle der Landeskunde im Deutschunterricht. *Deutsch als Fremdsprache*, 5, 306-308.
- AMMON, U. (1995). *Die deutsche Sprache in Deutschland, Österreich und der Schweiz. Das Problem der nationalen Varietäten*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

²¹ 'While Austrians may speak a little differently, their German is certainly not incorrect. But for most students of German it might be better to learn a standard form of German'.

- AMMON, U. (2015). *Die Stellung der deutschen Sprache in der Welt*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- AMMON, U., BICKEL, H., & LENZ, A.N. (eds.). (2016). *Variantenwörterbuch des Deutschen. Die Standardsprache in Österreich, der Schweiz, Deutschland, Liechtenstein, Luxemburg, Ostbelgien und Südtirol, sowie in Rumänien, Namibia und Mennonitensiedlungen*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- BWB = BAYERISCHE AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN. *Bayerisches Wörterbuch*. <<https://bwb.badw.de/das-projekt.html>>
- BORN, J., & DICKGIESSER, S. (1989). *Deutschsprachige Minderheiten. Ein Überblick über den Stand der Forschung für 27 Länder*. Mannheim: Institut für Deutsche Sprache.
- DEMMIG, S., HÄGI, S., & SCHWEIGER, H. (eds.). (2013). *DACH-Landeskunde. Theorie – Geschichte – Praxis*. Munich: Iudicium.
- ENDER, A., KASBERGER, G., & KAISER, I. (2017). Wahrnehmung und Bewertung von Dialekt und Standard durch Jugendliche mit Deutsch als Erst- und Zweitsprache. *ÖDaf-Mitteilungen*, 33 (1), 97-110.
- ENDER, A., KASBERGER, G., & WIRTZ, M.A. (2023). Standard- und Dialektbewertungen auf den Grund gehen: Individuelle Unterschiede und subjektive Theorien hinsichtlich Dialekt- und Standardaffinität bei Personen mit Deutsch als Zweitsprache im bairischsprachigen Österreich, *Zeitschrift für Deutsch im Kontext der Mehrsprachigkeit*, 39 (1-2), 8-25.
- FINK, I.E., RANSMAYR, J., & DE CILLIA, R. (2017). Also grammatisch würde ich fast sagen, dass die Österreicher inkorrekt sind, aber sonst eigentlich gar nicht. Wahrnehmung von und Einstellungen gegenüber Varietäten des Deutschen bei österreichischen Lehrerinnen und Schülerinnen. *ÖDaf-Mitteilungen*, 33 (1), 79-96.
- Freiburger Resolution zur Sprachenpolitik*. 11 Thesen zur Stärkung und Weiterentwicklung von Deutsch als Fremd- und Zweitsprache. In B. FORSTER VOSICKI, C. GICK, & T. STUDER (eds.), (2019), *IDT 2017, Bd. 3: Sprachenpolitik: Expertenberichte und Freiburger Resolution*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 225-233. <<https://www.esv.info/978-3-503-18165-0>>
- HÄGI, S. (2006). *Nationale Varietäten im Unterricht Deutsch als Fremdsprache*. Frankfurt: Lang.
- HÄGI, S. (ed.). (2007). Plurizentrik im Deutschunterricht. *Fremdsprache Deutsch: Zeitschrift für die Praxis des Deutschunterrichts*, 37.
- HÄGI, S. (2011). Das DACH(L)-ABCD kurz vorgestellt. *AkDaF Rundbrief*, 62, 6-12.

- HARTMANN, S., & HOLZMANN, T. (2020). „Was interessiert Sie in Ihrem Deutschunterricht?“ Eine Umfrage mit DACH-Bezug unter den Kursteilnehmer/innen des Österreich Institut. In N. SHAFER, A. MIDDEKE, S. HÄGI-MEAD & H. SCHWEIGER (eds.), *Weitergedacht. Das DACH-Prinzip in der Praxis*. Materialien Deutsch als Fremd- und Zweitsprache, 103. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen, 163-182. <<https://doi.org/10.17875/gup2019-1245>>
- HILPERT, S., NIEBISCH, D., PENNING-HIEMSTRA, S., SPECHT, F., REIMANN, M., & TOMASZEWSKI, A. (2006). *Schritte international 3. Kursbuch + Arbeitsbuch*. Ismaning: Hueber.
- HILPERT, S., NIEBISCH, D., PENNING-HIEMSTRA, S., PUDE, A., SPECHT, F., REIMANN, M., & TOMASZEWSKI, A. (2017). *Schritte international NEU 3. Deutsch als Fremdsprache. Kurs- und Arbeitsbuch*. Munich: Hueber.
- HILPERT, S., KERNER, M., NIEBISCH, D., SPECHT, F., WEERS, D., REIMANN, M., & TOMASZEWSKI, A. (2007). *Schritte international 4. Kursbuch + Arbeitsbuch*. Ismaning: Hueber.
- HILPERT, S., NIEBISCH, D., PUDE, A., SPECHT, F., REIMANN, M., & TOMASZEWSKI, A. (2017). *Schritte international NEU 4. Deutsch als Fremdsprache. Kurs- und Arbeitsbuch*. Munich: Hueber.
- HILPERT, S., KALENDER, S., KERNER, M., ORTH-CHAMBAH, J., SCHÜMANN, A., SPECHT, F., WEERS, D., GOTTSTEIN-SCHRAMM, B., KRÄMER-KIENLE, I., & REIMANN, M. (2007). *Schritte international 5. Kursbuch + Arbeitsbuch*. Ismaning: Hueber.
- HILPERT, S., KERNER, M., ORTH-CHAMBAH, J., PUDE, A., SCHÜMANN, A., SPECHT, F., WEERS, D., GOTTSTEIN-SCHRAMM, B., KALENDER, S., KRÄMER-KIENLE, I., NIEBISCH, D., & REIMANN, M. (2018). *Schritte international NEU 5. Deutsch als Fremdsprache. Kurs- und Arbeitsbuch*. Munich: Hueber.
- HILPERT, S., ROBERT, A., SCHÜMANN, A., SPECHT, F., GOTTSTEIN-SCHRAMM, B., KALENDER, S., & KRÄMER-KIENLE, I. (2008). *Schritte international 6. Kursbuch + Arbeitsbuch*. Ismaning: Hueber.
- HILPERT, S., KERNER, M., PUDE, A., ROBERT, A., SCHÜMANN, A., SPECHT, F., WEERS, D., GOTTSTEIN-SCHRAMM, B., HAGNER, V., KALENDER, S., & KRÄMER-KIENLE, I. (2018). *Schritte international NEU 6. Deutsch als Fremdsprache. Kurs- und Arbeitsbuch*. Munich: Hueber.
- KAISER, I. (2019). Dialekt-Standard-Variation in Deutsch bei mehrsprachigen Kindern in Österreich, *ÖDaf-Mitteilungen*, 35 (1-2), 68-84.
- KOITHAN, U., SCHMITZ, H., SIEBER, T., SONNTAG, R., & LÖSCHE, R.-P. (2008).

- Aspekte. Mittelstufe Deutsch. Lehrbuch 2.* Berlin: Langenscheidt.
- KOITHAN, U., SCHMITZ, H., SIEBER, T., SONNTAG, R., & LÖSCHE, R.-P. (2010). *Aspekte. Mittelstufe Deutsch. Lehrbuch 3.* Berlin: Langenscheidt.
- KOITHAN, U., SCHMITZ, H., SIEBER, T., & SONNTAG, R. (2014). *Aspekte neu. Mittelstufe Deutsch. Lehrbuch mit DVD, B1 plus.* Munich: Klett-Langenscheidt.
- MENASSE, E. (2015). *Lieber aufgeregt als abgeklärt. Essays.* Köln: Kiepenheuer & Witsch.
- MENASSE, E. (2019). *Animali per esperti.* Milano: Bompiani.
- MENASSE, E. (2021). *Peccati capitali veniali* (S. LIPPERT, ed.). Milano: Mimesis
- MENASSE, E. (2023). *Il paese dei fiori oscuri.* Milano: Bompiani.
- NIEBISCH, D., PENNING-HIEMSTRA, S., SPECHT, F., BOVERMANN, M., & REIMANN, M. (2006). *Schritte international 1. Kursbuch + Arbeitsbuch.* Ismaning: Hueber.
- NIEBISCH, D., PENNING-HIEMSTRA, S., SPECHT, F., BOVERMANN, M., PUDE, A., & REIMANN, M. (2016). *Schritte international NEU 1. Deutsch als Fremdsprache. Kurs- und Arbeitsbuch.* Munich: Hueber.
- NIEBISCH, D., PENNING-HIEMSTRA, S., SPECHT, F., BOVERMANN, M., & REIMANN, M. (2006). *Schritte international 2. Kursbuch + Arbeitsbuch.* Ismaning: Hueber.
- NIEBISCH, D., PENNING-HIEMSTRA, S., SPECHT, F., BOVERMANN, M., PUDE, A., & REIMANN, M. (2016). *Schritte international NEU 2. Kurs- und Arbeitsbuch.* Munich: Hueber.
- RANSMAYR, J. (2006) *Der Status des Österreichischen Deutsch an nicht-deutschsprachigen Universitäten. Eine empirische Untersuchung.* Frankfurt: Lang.
- SCHMIDLIN, R. (2011). *Die Vielfalt des Deutschen: Standard und Variation. Gebrauch, Einschätzung und Kodifizierung einer plurizentrischen Sprache.* Berlin: De Gruyter.
- SHAFER, N. (2018). *Varietäten und Varianten verstehen lernen: Zum Umgang mit Standardvariation in Deutsch als Fremdsprache.* Materialien Deutsch als Fremd- und Zweitsprache, 99. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag. <<https://univerlag.uni-goettingen.de/handle/3/isbn-978-3-86395-383-6>>
- SHAFER, N. (2018). *Wohin der Wege? Das DACH-Prinzip zwischen Theorie, Politik und Praxis, ÖDaf-Mitteilungen, 34 (1), 109-121.*
- SHAFER, N., MIDDEKE, A., HÄGI-MEAD, S., & SCHWEIGER, H. (eds.). (2020). *Weitergedacht. Das DACH-Prinzip in der Praxis.* Materialien Deutsch als Fremd- und Zweitsprache, 103, Göttingen:

- Universitätsverlag Göttingen. <<https://doi.org/10.17875/gup2019-1245>>
- SHAFER, N., & BAUMGARTNER, M. (2017). Mehr als Länder- oder Landeskunde: Ansätze eines weitergedachten DACH-Prinzips. *IDV-Magazin*, 92, 67-71. <<https://www.idvnetz.org/publikationen/magazin/IDV-Magazin92.pdf>>
- SHAFER, N., BAUMGARTNER, M. (2019). Die Pluralität von DaF als Plus: Zu einem weitergedachten DACH-Prinzip. In B. FORSTER VOSICKI, C. GICK, & T. STUDER (eds.), *IDT 2017, Bd. 3: Sprachenpolitik: Expertenberichte und Freiburger Resolution*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 98-114. <<https://www.esv.info/978-3-503-18165-0>>
- SUTTER, P. (2017). *Diatopische Variation im Wörterbuch. Theorie und Praxis*. Berlin: deGruyter. <<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110482263>>
- WERNER, J. (2023). Welchen Stolpersteinen begegnen Spracher*innen des Deutschen als Zweitsprache im österreichischen Dialekt-Standard-Kontinuum? *Zeitschrift für Deutsch im Kontext der Mehrsprachigkeit*, 39 (1-2), 117-131.