

Language attitudes in south-west Germany

Christoph Hare Svenstrup

Universities of Freiburg and Copenhagen

INTRODUCTION

The consequence of linguistic varieties being subjected to social categorisations and evaluations can be that some varieties are considered less prestigious *than* others, and this may result in these varieties being avoided or abandoned by speakers. Varieties considered to be prestigious, on the other hand, may have a chance of consolidating themselves and even expanding to new groups of speakers. In short, negative attitudes can inhibit certain varieties while others prosper and spread because they are regarded as attractive. It may also happen, however, that varieties wither away surrounded by what appears to be general positivity, or prosper in spite of overtly expressed negativity in their regard. In such cases, we are led to ask whether language variation in the community is imbued with other and different social values of a more covert nature.

[...] overt attitudes are thought of as being openly present in public discourse about language, institutionally promoted in ways that make it generally accessible and reproducible. (Coupland and Kristiansen 2011: 25)

[...] covert attitudes, i.e. social evaluations of language which remain hidden when people display their attitudes overtly (for instantly in talk about language), but which reveal themselves in people's use of language. (*ibid.*: 24)

This chapter reports from a study of overt and covert language attitudes among adolescents in the Stuttgart area of Baden-Württemberg in south-west Germany. The focus of interest was the three varieties known as *Schwäbisch*, *Hochdeutsch*, and *Berlinerisch*.¹ The former two are the names which the young informants themselves use about their own speech; the latter was included in the investigation in order to see how a presumably more 'urban' variety fares in comparison to the two 'local' varieties.

¹ The variety spoken in Berlin is known as either *Berlinerisch* or *Berlinisch*. The former seems to be the more commonly used, and will be used here.

THE LINGUISTIC SITUATION IN SOUTH-WEST GERMANY

There are two different views of the actual linguistic situation in south-west Germany (and in Germany more generally).

Ruoff (1997) argues for south-west Germany as a dialectal stronghold where the dialects are both prestigious and widely used except in formal and public speech (*ibid.*: 145). He even predicts a strengthening of the psychological borders between different dialects by virtue of their role in social group formation:

Mundart ist die Sprache der Nähe, der Vertrautheit, sie gibt Sicherheit und Geborgenheit. Sie ist zugleich das einfachste Mittel zur Identifikation wie zur Abgrenzung: Sie prägt und trägt das Wir-Bewusstsein: fast nur noch durch die Mundart sind wir andere als die anderen. Das lässt eine stetige Zunahme der psychischen Sprachgrenzen erwarten, aber ebenso den Erhalt der Mundarten in Süddeutschland. (Ruoff 1997: 153)

[‘Dialect is the language of closeness, of trust, it gives safety and secureness. It is at the same time the simplest means to identification and to demarcation. It moulds and bears the We-Awareness: almost only through the dialect are we other than the others. That makes us expect the mental linguistic boundaries to steadily increase, and the dialects of Southern Germany to be maintained’.] (Editors’ translation)

This ‘we-feeling’ (*Wir-bewusstsein*) is symbolised by the larger cities, e.g. Stuttgart, which he considers to be linguistic norm centres in the area, in the sense that they are contributing to a strengthening of the dialect identity (*ibid.*: 145). Ruoff admits that the use of dialects is more restricted than it used to be, but he attributes this to the increasing number of situations in present-day society where dialects cannot be used – i.e. formal and public situations – and considers the dialects to be developing independently of the standard (*ibid.*: 143).

With regard to the whole of Germany, Schmidt (2010) is in line with this perspective, as he argues that:

[...] despite the dramatic social upheavals of the twentieth century in Germany (the transformation from an agrarian to an industrial to a relatively mobile service-based society), there is no reason to believe in a rapid decline in the currency of dialects between 1880 and 1980. (Schmidt 2010: 207)

Schmidt views the present linguistic situation in Germany as one of many different regional varieties, which he calls *regiolects*. These cover broader geographical areas than the dialects. The dialects exist alongside the regiolects, and both exist ‘beneath the standard variety’ (*ibid.*: 217), which means that German

dialect speakers of today are considered to have an ‘active bivarietal competence (in dialect and regiolect) and at least passive competence in the standard spoken language’ (*ibid.*: 218). Schmidt considers this standard to be the outcome of the pronunciation norm *Bühnenaussprache* – established in 1898 and based on ‘the regional High German of northern Germany’ – which has spread by way of the media to the entire realm of Germany since the 1930’s (*ibid.*: 216). Such an orthoepic norm means a very prescriptive standard characterised by over-articulation (Auer and Spiekermann 2011: 165). It has a close relationship to the written standard and is upheld in the institutional and educational system as a highly codified (pronunciation) standard with little or no room for variation (*ibid.*: 162). According to Schmidt (2010: 216), the orthoepic norm took over the standard status from the ‘vertical variety formations’, such as ‘regional High German’, which emerged in the cities in the second half of the 18th century. These, too, were spoken varieties oriented towards the written norm but with regional pronunciation.

Taking a different perspective, Auer and Spiekermann (2011) points to three different kinds of standard as stages in the standardisation process in Germany. As a first stage, the regional standards were closely bound to the emergence of the written standard, which was ‘firmly established and codified throughout the German speaking countries by the end of the 18th century’ (*ibid.*: 163). This standard was spoken by a small elitist part of the population and it was influenced by ‘dialect phonetics’ (*ibid.*: 163), hence the term ‘regional standard’. The next stage in the process was the emergence of an orthoepic standard developed from the aforementioned *Bühnenaussprache*. It is regarded as a media standard, as the media were the primary vehicle of its spread, which took place in the first half of the 20th century – particularly in the 1930–1940s where the ‘fascist formation of the state’ also was an important contributing factor (*ibid.*: 165). The emergence of this orthoepic standard did not mean the disappearance of the regional standards as these continued to be used alongside the orthoepic standard. The third development in the process was a pervasive language change to what Auer and Spiekermann call ‘the new standard’ (*ibid.*: 165) – a change that meant a nationwide replacement of the orthoepic standard (or old media standard) and a beginning levelling of the regional standards (*ibid.*: 165). In contrast to the regional standards and the orthoepic standard of the two preceding stages, the new standard is available to everybody and is applicable for all communicative purposes of everyday life in entire Germany (*ibid.*: 174), which also implies a levelling or decline in the use of regional features:

[...] regional forms are increasingly disappearing from the spoken standard, i.e. the standard is becoming more homogenous across Germany. (Auer and Spiekermann 2011: 174)

At the same time, the last stage represents ‘a further step in the emancipation of the spoken standard and its differentiation from the written standard’ (*ibid.*: 174). Thus, we have a spoken standard with room for (at least some) variation, which is developing more and more independently of the written standard.

Such different perspectives on the present German linguistic situation do have implications for how the local situation in south-west Germany is seen. Ruoff and Schmidt see the south-west German dialects as thriving varieties which develop independently of the standard because their definition of the German standard leaves no room for variation. In contrast, Auer and Spiekermann operate with a less prescriptive standard, and claim that ‘for many Germans, the standard is the language they grew up with’ (*ibid.*: 174).

Now, how does the present study position itself in relation to the above perspectives on the standardisation in south-west Germany? In Stoeckle and Svenstrup (2011) we discussed ‘a nation-wide language change in direction of a more standardised spoken language’ with three possible standard-language scenarios as an outcome:

1. *Standardsprache* – a very prescriptive and normative standard which allows no variation.
2. *Regionale Standardvarietäten* – a plurality of regional standards based on the base dialects and developing independently of each other.
3. *Umgangssprache* – a spoken standard which includes a certain amount of regional (and other) variation.

Furthermore, it was proposed that the third scenario, *Umgangssprache*, could be defined in such a way as to incorporate the other two scenarios and represent a nation-wide ongoing process in Germany (*ibid.*: 87). This *Umgangssprache* is in line with Auer and Spiekermann’s ‘new’ or ‘modern’ standard.

While aligning myself with Auer and Spiekermann’s view of the ongoing standardisation process in Germany, I want to stress the dynamic nature of *standardisation* as a process. The word *standard* for the object of investigation invites us to define it in terms of a prescriptive target norm. A ‘static term’ like *standard* makes it hard to account for ongoing changes in standard speech. In brief, the study presented here stems from a synchronic investigation which taps

into an ongoing standardisation process and the inherent negotiation, production, and reproduction of norms, stereotypes, and attitudes which are of importance to the process.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The investigations presented here use two different methods to operationalise the distinction between overt and covert attitudes. The method used to elicit overt attitudes is a Label Ranking Task (LRT). The method used to elicit covert attitudes is a Speaker Evaluation Experiment (SEE). The SEE was carried out before the LRT, while the participants were still unaware that the object of study was attitudes to dialectal differences.

The voice samples

In order to find voice samples for the SEE, interviews were recorded in schools (Gymnasium) in three locations: 1) Stuttgart was chosen because of its status as the largest city in and capital of Baden-Württemberg, representing the supposedly *most standardised local variety*. 2) Reutlingen was chosen as a smaller city in the Stuttgart area, representing the supposedly *least standardised local variety*. 3) Berlin was chosen because of its status as the capital city of Germany, with the speculation that Berlin speech is associated with some kind of *urban quality* that might influence listener-judges' perceptions.

Twelve voice samples², four from each of the three locations, were selected from 57 short interviews where the interviewees were asked the question *what is, in your opinion, a good teacher? (was ist für dich ein guter Lehrer?)*. The samples were selected with a view to secure representativeness; that is, the selected speakers were neither the most standardised nor the least standardised. There were two males and two females from each of the locations, and all speakers were between 14 and 17 years old – except for one of the male speakers from Berlin, B045m, who ended up being a teacher in his mid-30s due to practical problems. However, this is no big problem as the design operates with four voices for each variety exactly in order to facilitate an assessment of the influence on evaluations from dialect differences as opposed to other possible

² Each voice samples is assigned a code that expresses origin and gender, e.g. B(erlin)045m(ale).

differences (such as gender, age etc.) (see Kristiansen 2009, and the introduction to this volume). All of the voice samples were edited to be between 7 and 12 seconds long (with added pauses of 15 seconds between each of the voices). The reason for using such short samples was the assumption that there is a difference between immediate, impulsive responses and cautious premeditated answers. Garrett et al. (2005) calls it a distinction between ‘automatic and controlled information processing’, where ‘automatic’ is believed to elicit covert attitudes and ‘controlled’ is believed to elicit covert attitudes (*ibid.*: 40).

As I was the interviewer, the young interviewees may well have done what they could to speak ‘correctly’ in order to comply with me as a foreigner (a Dane), as well as with the unfamiliar situation of being interviewed by a university person. In addition, the interviews were recorded in the ‘correct-speech’ setting of their schools. It is therefore no surprising result that the interviewees are rather standardised in their speech. But they still have some regionally marked features. For instance, it is a typical feature of Schwäbisch to lower the (standard) /e:/ to /ɛ:/ (Auer and Spiekermann 2011: 168) This variable is found in the word *Lehrer* (‘teacher’) which is present in all of the voice samples. The four speakers from Berlin all have the expected (standard) /e:/ (B045m: /le:ʁə/, B048f: /le:ʁə/, B051m: /le:ʁə/, B053f: /le:ʁə/), the four speakers from Stuttgart all have an /ɛ:/ (S029m: /lɛ:ʁə/, S032f: /lɛ:ʁə/, S035m: /lɛ:ʁə/, S041f: /lɛ:ʁə/), which is also the case for three of the speakers from Reutlingen (R013m: /lɛ:ʁə/, R014m: /lɛ:ʁə/, R017f: /lɛ:ʁə/), whereas the last one have an even lower /æ:/ (R018f: /læ:ʁə/). Thus, concerning this feature the voice samples from south-west Germany are less standardised than those from Berlin.

The questionnaire for the covert attitudes

The audio-recording with the 12 voice samples was played three times during the SEE. The first time the participants just listened in order to get an idea of what was in the recording. During the second playing, the participants evaluated the voices on eight 7-point ‘semantic differential scales with bipolar adjectives’ (Garrett 2005: 1255–1256). These scales were:

1. Seriös – Unseriös (Conscientious – Happy-go-lucky)
2. Klug – Dumm (Intelligent – Stupid)

3. Ehrgeizig – Träge (Goal directed – Dull)
4. Vertrauenswürdig – Nicht Vertrauenswürdig (Trustworthy – Untrustworthy)
5. Nett – Unsympatich (Nice – Repulsive)
6. Interessant – Langweilig (Fascinating – Boring)
7. Selbstbewusst – Unsicher (Self-assured – Uncertain)
8. Cool – Uncool (Cool –Uncool)

The adjectives are the ‘same’ as the ones which were used in the Danish LANCHART studies (see Kristiansen 2009, and the introduction to this volume) and were chosen in the interest of comparisons with the Danish studies, as well as similar studies in other countries which follow the SLICE programme. The result pattern which emerges on these scales in Denmark indicate that the adjectives relate to two evaluative dimensions, one of which is said to represent social values of *superiority* (scales 1–4) while the other is said to represent values of *dynamism* (scales 5–8). In addition to the ticking off positions on the scales, the participants had the opportunity to add extra comments to each of the voice samples (which they hardly did – probably due to the time pressure).

The questionnaire for the overt attitudes

Having completed the evaluation of the voices in terms of personality traits, the participants were informed about the purpose of the experiment and were given a second questionnaire – meant to elicit overt attitudes – which consisted of several different tasks.

The first two tasks were solved simultaneously while the participants listened to the 12 voices for the third time and rated each of them on 7-point scales in terms of how Hochdeutsch they sounded and made a choice as to whether the voices were from Stuttgart, Reutlingen or Berlin.

Then followed the LRT, where the participants ranked nine different German varieties according to own preference – among which were Schwäbisch, Hochdeutsch, and Berlinerisch.

Finally, the participants were asked to give some personal information about their age, where they lived, whether they used to live somewhere else and if, then where, what they would like to be professionally. They were also asked to report what kind of German they considered themselves to be speaking.

The participants

With the aim of depicting the general language-ideological situation among young people in the Stuttgart area, using school students as informants was chosen as the easiest and best way to obtain a large and socially broad sample of young people. The participants are from the 9th and 10th grades, which are the highest class levels in the German school system with a broad social representation.

The German school system consists of an elementary school which is attended by all until the 4th grade. After that the students are allocated to three different school types according to academic ability. Those with the highest academic proficiency continue in *Gymnasium*, those with the lowest academic proficiency continue in the *Hauptschule*, and those in between continue in the *Realschule*. Data were collected from 235 participants, covering all three school types with the following distribution: *Gymnasium* 32%, *Realschule* 33%, and *Hauptschule* 34%. The average age of the participants was 15.4 (range 14 to 17). The gender distribution was 54% females and 46% males. The participants attended schools in five different locations in the Stuttgart area. Besides Stuttgart, the locations were Reutlingen, Schwäbisch Gmünd, Göppingen, and Kirchheim unter Teck, all of which are within 60 km radius from Stuttgart. Stuttgart is the largest location with 610.000 inhabitants; the smallest is Kirchheim unter Teck with 40.000 inhabitants.

The distribution of participants on the locations is as follows, in percentage: Stuttgart 38, Reutlingen 29, Schwäbisch Gmünd 8, Göppingen 18, and Kirchheim u. Teck 6. A vast majority of 83% report originating from south-west Germany (Baden-Württemberg), 4% report originating from another part of Germany, and 12% report originating from another country. In their self-reporting about what language they speak, 26% of the participants said Schwäbisch, 34% went for a mixture of Schwäbisch and Hochdeutsch, while 28% said Hochdeutsch (7% reported something else, and 5% gave no answer). This confirms that the labels Schwäbisch and Hochdeutsch are relevant for the participants and as part of the LRT.

It should be stressed that the choice of school students is motivated also, and not least, by the fact that adolescents are particularly interesting in a study of changing norms. Adolescence is a stage in life with flexible group constellations that are constantly up for negotiation, which means that things like linguistic norms and stereotyping are being negotiated as well (Jørgensen 2010: 151).

More than adults, adolescents are always in the middle of (re)negotiating and (re)producing the linguistic world surrounding them – while also being the future gatekeepers of language use. In brief, adolescents are a vital part of the ongoing linguistic development (*ibid.*: 21).

RESULTS

The anticipated outcome of the study originated in results from similar studies in Denmark (Kristiansen 2009; Svenstrup 2010), and was sustained by my experience from living in south-west Germany (Freiburg). Thus, the expectation was for the adolescents to show ‘local patriotism’ and upgrade ‘their own’ varieties Hochdeutsch and Schwäbisch in comparison with Berlinerisch in overtly expressed evaluations (in the LRT), while the expectation for the covert evaluations (in the SEE) was that the Reutlingen voices would be rated lower than the more ‘urban’ voices from Stuttgart and Berlin, and I speculated that the Berlin voices would be rated higher than those from Stuttgart if the latter were perceived as less standardised.

Overt ranking of variety labels (the LRT results)

In the LRT the participants were presented with nine German variety ‘labels’ and were asked to rank them from 1 (I like the best) to 9 (I like the least). The following ranking was obtained (means on the 1-to-9 scale in parentheses): *Hochdeutsch* (2.94), *Schwäbisch* (3.04), *Bayrisch* (4.71), *Berlinerisch* (4.86), *Schweizerdeutsch* (5.43), *Fränkisch* (5.73), *Hessisch* (5.76), *Sächsisch* (5.89), and *Plattdeutsch* (6.13).

Tabel 1: Overt ranking of Schwäbisch, Hochdeutsch, and Berlinerisch

Hochdeutsch	/	Schwäbisch	>	Berlinerisch
Wilcoxon Signed Pair Tests. > = p<.05, / = n.s.				

The ranking of the three varieties which are the focus of this study – Schwäbisch, Hochdeutsch, and Berlinerisch – was tested for significant differences (Tabel 1). Hochdeutsch and Schwäbisch are ranked on a par, and both are ranked significantly higher than Berlinerisch.

Locating voices and rating them for ‘standardness’

A majority of the voices were placed relatively correctly in the sense that the right location was chosen more often than either of the two other options. But, in general, the voices were located wrongly more often than not. (The only voice that was correctly assigned by more than 50% of the participants was the Berlin voice B053f, with 52%). Given the fact that Stuttgart and Reutlingen are geographically located so close to each other, I choose to combine the two locations and just distinguish between south-west Germany (Stuttgart and Reutlingen) and Berlin (Table 2).

Table 2: Locating voices (answering the question *woher kommt diese Person?*)
Shadowed cells show the actual location. Figures are percentages (N=235)

	Stuttgart and Reutlingen	Berlin	no answer
S029m	72	27	1
B048f	67	32	1
R013m	84	15	1
S032f	74	25	1
B045m	52	46	2
R017f	65	34	1
S035m	77	22	1
B053f	46	52	2
R014m	80	18	2
S041f	68	30	2
B051m	70	29	1
R018f	75	23	2

The local voices (from Stuttgart and Reutlingen) were all recognised as such by at least two thirds of the participants. The Berlin voices were generally not recognised as coming from Berlin; two of them were located in either Stuttgart or Reutlingen by a clear majority (67% for B048f) and 70% for B051m).

Looking at the answers to the question regarding standardness (*wie hochdeutsch klingt diese Person?*), the voices’ average scores on the used 7-point scale (1=most standardised, 7=least standardised) rank them as follows:

B045m (2.21) – B048f (2.66) – S041f (2.86) – B053f (2.93) – S032f (3.02) – S029m (3.28) – R017f (3.32) – S035m (3.69) – B051m (3.78) – R013m (4.60) – R018f (4.64) – R014m (4.92)

By and large, the Berlin voices (dark grey) were heard as the most standardised, followed by the Stuttgart voices (light grey), with the Reutlingen voices as the least standardised. Interestingly enough, B045m (i.e. the teacher in his mid-thirties) is heard as the most standardised of all. There is one clear ‘outlier’ among the Berlin voices, namely B051m. The explanation may be found in the fact that B051m was heard to be mumbling and not finishing his last sentence, according to statements about him by a selected number of students who took part in interviews and group discussions after having participated in the experiments that are reported in this chapter. Also recall that B051m was predominantly categorised as local (see Table 2). It seems likely that the generally poor evaluations of B051m were an effect of a poor editing of this voice.

Covert evaluation of voices (the SEE results)

For us to feel entitled to talk about a role for dialectal differences in the evaluation of the voices, the results should pattern in a systematic way so that the four voices representing each of the three varieties receive relatively similar evaluations. The extent of such systematicity in the data may be gleaned from Table 3.

The emerging pattern is that the Berlin voices dominate the left side of the table, which means that they generally are rated better than the Stuttgart and Reutlingen voices. The Stuttgart voices dominate the centre of the table, which means that they generally are rated better than the Reutlingen voices, which dominate the right side of the table. We will accept this patterning to be satisfactory for a pooling of voices into varieties, with one exception. The main and most serious irregularity is represented by B051m who is rated lowest of all voices on all scales. As this is in accordance with his low rating also in terms of standardness, which we argued above was probably due to a poorly edited recording, B051m will not be included as representative of Berlin speech as we now move on to compare the voices from Berlin, Stuttgart and Reutlingen pooled together as three different varieties.

But before we leave Table 3, I shall make a comment on the superiority vs. dynamism distinction, which has been found to be so important in Denmark.³ There is no overall pattern in the table which testifies to the same role for this distinction in south-west Germany. However, if we recall that the first four scales were thought to represent superiority values while the last four scales

³ Zahn and Hopper (1985) established that superiority and dynamism, together with social attractiveness, had been generally central to language attitudes research.

were thought to represent dynamism values, two of the voices seem to be treated differently in accordance with the distinction, namely B045m and R014m.

Table 3: SEE results for twelve voices on eight personality traits defined by adjectival antonyms. Figures are means on 7-point scales (1=positive trait, 7= negative trait). B=Berlin, S=Stuttgart, R=Reutlingen. f = female, m = male.

<i>goal directed</i> <--> <i>dull</i>	B 053 f 2.79	B 048 f 2.87	S 032 f 2.95	S 041 f 3.09	B 045 m 3.18	S 029 m 3.48	R 014 m 3.61	R 017 f 3.63	S 035 m 3.86	R 018 f 3.90	R 013 m 3.97	B 051 m 4.59
<i>intelligent</i> <--> <i>stupid</i>	B 048 f 2.41	B 053 f 2.50	B 045 m 2.57	S 041 f 2.68	S 032 f 2.70	S 035 m 2.86	S 029 m 3.04	R 017 f 3.20	R 018 f 3.33	R 014 m 3.51	R 013 m 3.61	B 051 m 4.22
<i>conscientious</i> <--> <i>happy-go-lucky</i>	B 048 f 2.82	S 041 f 3.09	B 053 f 3.10	B 045 m 3.12	S 032 f 3.24	S 029 m 3.30	S 035 m 3.45	R 017 f 3.52	R 013 m 3.54	R 014 m 3.74	R 018 f 3.87	B 051 m 4.34
<i>trustworthy</i> <--> <i>untrustworthy</i>	B 048 f 2.52	B 053 f 2.71	S 041 f 2.82	S 032 f 2.92	B 045 m 3.09	R 017 f 3.12	S 029 m 3.16	R 014 m 3.30	R 018 f 3.43	S 035 m 3.49	R 013 m 3.61	B 051 m 4.17
<i>nice</i> <--> <i>repulsive</i>	B 048 f 2.14	B 053 f 2.38	S 041 f 2.48	R 014 m 2.60	S 032 f 2.67	S 029 m 2.92	R 017 f 2.93	B 045 m 3.02	R 013 m 3.07	R 018 f 3.21	S 035 m 3.24	B 051 m 3.88
<i>fascinating</i> <--> <i>boring</i>	B 048 f 2.89	S 032 f 2.94	B 053 f 3.13	S 041 f 3.21	R 014 m 3.26	S 029 m 3.57	B 045 m 3.82	R 013 m 3.90	S 035 m 3.97	R 018 f 4.05	R 017 f 4.11	B 051 m 4.86
<i>self-assured</i> <--> <i>uncertain</i>	B 048 f 2.39	B 053 f 2.43	S 032 f 2.58	R 014 m 2.85	S 041 f 2.97	S 029 m 3.14	B 045 m 3.30	S 035 m 3.34	R 017 f 3.44	R 018 f 3.55	R 013 m 3.77	B 051 m 4.60
<i>cool</i> <--> <i>uncool</i>	R 014 m 3.13	S 032 f 3.26	B 048 f 3.33	B 053 f 3.52	S 029 m 3.57	S 041 f 3.64	S 035 m 3.93	R 013 m 3.95	R 018 f 4.07	R 017 f 4.21	B 045 m 4.25	B 051 m 4.46

B045m, the teacher in his mid-thirties, does systematically better on superiority values (we find him to the right in the table on the first four scales) than on dynamism values (we find him to the left in the table on the last four scales). This evaluative pattern may be said to accord well with the finding that B045m was heard as the most standardised of the voices. On the assumption that the notion of standardness (as it emerges in adolescents' overt evaluations) connects more tightly with superiority values than dynamism values (as these emerge in adolescents' covert evaluations), the relative up- and downgrading of B045m on personality traits may be explained by him being a teacher, who was 'heard as a teacher' by the school students.

R014m is evaluated the other way round: he does systematically better on dynamism values than on superiority values. In the same way as for B045m, the relative downgrading of R014m on superiority values may be said to correspond to his rating on standardness: B014m was heard as the least standardised voice. In terms of personality, he is evaluated on a par with the other Reutlingen voices on superiority traits, but differed by being evaluated more positively on dynamism traits. The explanation for this special treatment of R014m may well be that he 'has a smile in his voice' when he is speaking (which some of the interviewees also commented on).

In brief, the superiority vs. dynamism distinction is not present in these evaluations of speech from Berlin, Stuttgart and Reutlingen. However, we may cautiously suggest that the distinction seems to be operative with regard to features of a kind that make you a 'teacher' or a 'fun guy'. These features are clearly linked to a notion of standardness in language – the notion that adolescents acquire (in school and elsewhere) and reproduce in overt rating of voices for standardness – but they do not seem to be linguistic features, at least not in the sense of 'dialect difference' which the SEE was meant to operationalise.

Covert evaluation of Berlin, Stuttgart, and Reutlingen speech varieties

When we pool the voices together (four in the cases of Stuttgart and Reutlingen, three in the case of Berlin, where B051m was excluded) and in this sense treat them as representatives of three varieties, we get the Table 4 pattern.

Berlin speech is ranked significantly better than Stuttgart speech and Reutlingen speech on all scales except the *Cool* scale. Stuttgart speech is ranked significantly better than Reutlingen speech on all scales except the *Nice* scale. The different pattern on the *Cool* scale results first and foremost from an extraordi-

narily positive evaluation of R014m and an extraordinarily negative evaluation of B045m (see Table 3 and the above discussion of these two voices).

Table 4: Covert evaluations of Berlin speech, Stuttgart speech, and Reutlingen speech on eight personality traits (the left position represents the better rating)

<i>Goal directed</i>	Berlin	>	Stuttgart	>	Reutlingen
<i>Intelligent</i>	Berlin	>	Stuttgart	>	Reutlingen
<i>Conscientious</i>	Berlin	>	Stuttgart	>	Reutlingen
<i>Trustworthy</i>	Berlin	>	Stuttgart	>	Reutlingen
<i>Nice</i>	Berlin	>	Reutlingen	/	Stuttgart
<i>Fascinating</i>	Berlin	>	Stuttgart	>	Reutlingen
<i>Self-assured</i>	Berlin	>	Stuttgart	>	Reutlingen
<i>Cool</i>	Stuttgart	/	Berlin	/	Reutlingen
	Stuttgart	>			Reutlingen

Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test: > = $p < .05$ / = non-significant

CONCLUSION

In overtly offered evaluations, the preferred varieties among adolescents in south-west Germany are Hochdeutsch and Schwäbisch. As these varieties are also what they report to be speaking themselves, the adolescents simply consider their own speech as the better way of speaking – and better than Berlinerisch, to be sure (Hochdeutsch / Swäbisch > Berlinerisch; see Table 1). The language-ideology they perform overtly is *standing up for who you are and where you come from*.

Covertly, the sympathies are different: Berlin speech is a rather clear winner and Reutlingen speech the clear loser (Berlin > Stuttgart > Reutlingen; see Table 4). When we take the ratings for standardness (degree of Hochdeutsch) into account (Berlin > Stuttgart > Reutlingen), the pattern is very clear: higher ratings for standardness correspond to higher ratings for socially-valued personali-

ty traits. On the assumption that ‘less standardised’ in this part of Germany means ‘more Schwäbisch’, the result shows that the ideology of *standing up for who you are and for your region* no longer applies when it comes to covert attitudes. Covertly, adolescent language-ideology seems to be: *the more standardised the better*. Or – formulated as a conclusion more in accordance with our general questioning of what to understand by ‘standard’ – what is found to be the better language in covert ideology, seems the better candidate to the status of ‘standard’ language.

There is no doubt that knowledge and acceptance of the social values associated with Hochdeutsch is fundamental to the language ideology of adolescents in south-western Germany. In self-reporting they claim Hochdeutsch to be part of their own repertoire, and in covert evaluations they prefer the (Berlin) voices that they also rate as the most Hochdeutsch. More generally, it may be suggested that beliefs about degrees of language standardisation are associated with beliefs about degrees of urbanisation – which would make urbanisation an important factor in language standardisation.

The picture that emerges from these investigations of language ideology does support, I think, the Auer and Spiekermann (2011) account of the German standardisation process and its most recent stage, where people make no ideological distinction between the standard language and the language they grew up with.

REFERENCES

- Auer, P. and H. Spiekermann. 2011. Demotisation of the standard variety or de-standardisation? The changing status of German in late modernity (with special reference to south-western Germany). In T. Kristiansen and N. Coupland (eds.) *Standard Languages and Language Standards in a Changing Europe*. Oslo: Novus. 161–176.
- Coupland, N. and T. Kristiansen. 2011. SLICE: Critical perspectives on language (de)standardisation. In T. Kristiansen and N. Coupland (eds.) *Standard Languages and Language Standards in a Changing Europe*. Oslo: Novus. 11–35.
- Garrett, P. 2005. Attitude measurements. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. J. Mattheier and P. Trudgill (eds.) *Sociolinguistics*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter. 1251–1260.

- Garrett, P., A. Williams and B. Evans. 2005. Accessing Social Meanings: Values of Keywords, Values in Keywords. In T. Kristiansen, P. Garrett and N. Coupland (eds.) *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 37: 37–54.
- Jørgensen, J. N. 2010. Languaging – Nine years of poly-lingual development of young Turkish-Danish grade school students. *Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, The Køge Series* K16. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen.
- Kristiansen, T. 2009. The macro-level social meanings of late-modern Danish accents. In *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 41(1): 167–192.
- Kristiansen, T. 2010. Attitudes, ideology and awareness. In R. Wodak, B. Johnston and P. Kerswill (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. London: Sage. 265–278.
- Kristiansen, T. and J. N. Jørgensen. 2005. Subjective factors in dialect convergence and divergence. In P. Auer, F. Hinskens and P. Kerswill (eds.) *Dialect Change. Convergence and Divergence in European Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 287–302.
- Ruoff, A. 1997. Sprachvarietäten in Süddeutschland. In G. Stickel (ed.) *Varietäten des Deutschen. Regional- und Umgangssprachen*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter. 142–154.
- Schmidt, J. E. 2010. Language and space: The linguistic dynamics approach. In P. Auer and J. E. Schmidt (eds.) *Language and Space: Theories and Methods*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter. 201–225.
- Stoeckle, P. and C. H. Svenstrup. 2011. Language variation and (de-)standardisation processes in Germany. In T. Kristiansen and N. Coupland (eds.) *Standard Languages and Language Standards in a Changing Europe*. Oslo: Novus. 83–90.
- Svenstrup, C. H. 2010. Why does Vestjysk sound boorish and Københavnsk cool? – A language attitudes study among adolescents in the town of Holstebro in western Jutland (Master's thesis). *Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism* 57. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen.