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A Cognitive Approach to Sociolinguistic Variation in Austria: Diglossia or Dialect-Standard-Continuum in Speakers’ Awareness and Usage

Abstract
The potential range of speech variation in the Bavarian- and Alemannic-dialect regions of Austria is traditionally characterised differently. The former is described as comprising a standard-dialect-continuum whereas the latter is allocated to the diglossic language area. The present paper investigates the existence and the quality of intermediate varieties between dialect and the standard variety in the two dialect regions of Austria. Furthermore, speakers’ awareness of varying their speech and the correspondence between their mental representations and actual language behaviour is examined. The analyses are based on data from an online-survey on the one hand and on actual language use by speakers from both dialect regions in telephone conversations with different interlocutors on the other hand. Preliminary analyses seem to contradict traditional assumptions about the two dialect regions but also the speakers’ self-reports to a certain extent, as there seem to be Bavarian speakers who only make little use of intermediate forms between dialect and the standard language and speakers from Vorarlberg who seem to be able to create an intermediate variety by varying the relative proportion of dialect and standard features in their speech. These results can be considered as first hints regarding the form and scope of lectal variation in the two dialect regions.

1 Introduction
The Bavarian-speaking part of Austria is traditionally described in terms of a dialect-standard-continuum. In contrast, the comparatively small Alemannic-speaking part is allocated to the diglossic language region (Ammon 2003). A recent survey has shown that speakers in the respective areas also have different conceptualisations of their patterns of sociolinguistic variation, which roughly correspond to these traditional linguistic models: Bavarian speakers’ statements indicate the extensive use of the linguistic range between the standard language and the local dialects, the so-called ‘Umgangssprache’, whereas Alemannic speakers barely state that they use such an intermediate form (Ender/Kaiser 2009). To date however, data on the actual sociolinguistic variation, e.g. on the mechanisms and forms of linguistic accommodation to different addressees (cf. Giles/Coupland/Coupland 1991 et al.) in these two regions is still scarce.

In the present paper, we will present both data on the actual form and scope of sociolinguistic variation in these two Austrian regions and on speakers’ awareness of
varying their speech according to ‘external’ factors. The research questions we pose include the following: Do speakers use different varieties when speaking to another speaker of the local dialect, to a speaker of the standard variety, or to a person with a foreign-sounding accent, and if so, how can these varieties be described? Are speakers aware of (not) adjusting their speech? Do speakers of the Bavarian- and the Alemannic-speaking regions actually exhibit the different patterns of variation posited in the literature? How far do the cognitive representations of linguistic variation in speakers’ minds correspond to actual usage?

2 Sociolinguistic Variation in the Alemannic- and Bavarian-Speaking Parts of Austria

In most parts of Austria, Bavarian dialects are spoken. Only the westernmost part, the state of Vorarlberg and a few Tyrolean villages, belongs to the Alemannic dialect region. The Bavarian-speaking part of Austria is traditionally described in terms of a ‘dialect-standard-continuum’ – like a large part of Southern Germany. This term refers to the fact that one can hear a great number of intermediate forms between dialect and standard German, which make up the somewhat undefined and little-researched ‘Umgangssprache’. Researchers have repeatedly discussed the adequacy of the term ‘continuum’ for describing the sociolinguistic situation in Austria and some of them have posited several (more or less) distinct ‘speech levels’ structuring the range of variation between dialect and standard German (cf. Kranzmayer 1953; Dressler/Leodolter/Chromec 1976; Wiesinger 1992). In fact, linguistic analysis has shown that the combination of linguistic elements (deriving from dialect, or the standard variety, or some ‘intermediate’ form) is not arbitrary, but follows certain restrictions of co-occurrence (cf. Felix/Kühl 1982; Auer 1986 for Bavarian speakers in Germany; Scheutz 1985 for Bavarian speakers in Austria). It is not entirely clear, however, if these combinations actually form distinct linguistic systems or ‘speech levels’. The possible range of combinations is so vast that the term ‘continuum’ seems more adequate (cf. for this discussion Reiffenstein 1973, 1982; Martin 1996; Durrell 1998; Scheuringer 1997; Scheutz 1999). Thus, a number of questions still remain open as to the exact linguistic nature of the intermediate range between the dialect and standard varieties.

In contrast to the Bavarian-speaking region, the comparatively small Alemannic-speaking part of Austria is allocated to the diglossic language region (Ammon 2003, 164), with two distinct systems (dialect and the standard language) covering the linguistic repertoire, and no forms in-between. The special status of Vorarlberg stems from the fact that it is part of the Alemannic dialect region, but is also part of a primarily Bavarian-speaking country, which means that the Austrian form of the German standard language, which is characterised by Bavarian elements, is the ‘roofing’ standard language also of Vorarlberg. It has repeatedly been stated that Vorarlberg ‘is going its own way’ (cf. Wiesinger 1992, 297). Wiesinger (1986) states that despite the geographical and linguistic closeness to the
diglossic region of Switzerland, certain intermediate forms seem to evolve between the Alemannic dialect and Austrian standard German. However, the question of what exactly this means for the forms and dynamics of sociolinguistic variation in Vorarlberg still remains to be researched.

Generally speaking, linguistic variation in Austria depends on social and situational/pragmatic factors, such as the social status of the speaker, age, gender, interlocutors and (in)formality of the situation (cf. Wiesinger 1992; Ammon 2003). We must keep in mind, however, that, according to a survey by Wiesinger/Patocka/Steinegger in 1984/85 and 1991/92 (cited in Steinegger 1998), 78% of all Austrians consider themselves capable of speaking dialect. Only 5% stated that their everyday speech was standard German, whereas 49.5% said they spoke ‘Umgangssprache’ in everyday situations, and another 49.5% stated that they spoke dialect (cited in Steinegger 1998, 90). Obviously, the ‘intermediate’ forms between standard and dialect have a considerable part to play in the everyday linguistic reality in Austria. At the same time, the special status of the Alemannic-speaking region is reflected by the fact that, out of all Austrian federal states, people in Vorarlberg declare that they speak dialect most frequently, most competently and their attitude towards dialects is the most positive (Steinegger 1998, 201ff.). On the other hand, 64% of all Austrian informants in Wiesinger/Patocka/Steinegger’s survey state that they consider the dialect spoken in Vorarlberg as being ‘hardly comprehensible’ (Steinegger 1998, 361). Apart from that, however, we know only little about sociolinguistic variation in Vorarlberg, especially as far as the exact linguistic characteristics of the different forms of variation are concerned.

3 IntraperSONAL VARIATION AS A CONSEQUENCE OF LINGUISTIC ACCOMMODATION

Our interest in this study is focused on the spectrum of varieties an individual speaker – as a representative of the respective area in Austria – has at his/her disposal. The basis of these varieties – at least in Austria – is primarily characterised by the diatopic dimension, i.e. by regional varieties or dialects. But as we know, the exact characteristics of the individual linguistic spectrum are influenced by diastratic/social factors. Hence the individual spectrum of variation can only be a partial reflection of the collective spectrum of the speech community. Diaphasic factors determine which parts of the individual spectrum of varieties are used in a specific situation. They thus lead to intrapersonal variation, different instantiations of one’s personal repertoire of linguistic varieties (cf. Huesmann 1998, 34ff.). One of the many parameters that can vary from one communicative situation to another is the type of interlocutors. A number of sociological, psychological and ethnolinguistic paradigms have dealt with the nature of human verbal interaction and conceptualised it in different ways. The notion of cooperativity has been central in most of these approaches, such as the Gricean maxims and the cooperative principle (e.g. Grice 1975),
accommodation theory (e.g. Giles/Powesland 1975; Giles/Coupland/Coupland 1991), the theory of ‘audience design’ (e.g. Bell 1984, 2001), or of ‘interactive alignment’ (e.g. Garrod/Pickering 2009). In all of these approaches, one of the dimensions along which cooperativeness can express itself is linguistic convergence to the listener/interlocutor. Speech convergence implies reducing the linguistic differences between oneself and one’s interlocutor in terms of accent, dialect, paralinguistic features, or the language of choice. Even though a certain amount of convergence in the choice of linguistic means can be necessary to ensure basic comprehension, linguistic convergence frequently goes beyond that.

Giles/Powesland (1975) in their seminal work on ‘speech accommodation’ draw on different sociopsychological theories in order to explain this phenomenon. They attribute speech convergence to the fact that perceived similarities make people approve of each other (similarity-attraction theory). On the other hand, convergence also has its drawbacks for the speaker. Accommodating to the speech of one’s interlocutor may constitute a threat to or even loss of one’s integrity and identity, and it might involve a certain amount of effort and strain. As a consequence, speakers assess (not necessarily consciously) the rewards and costs of linguistic convergence on each new encounter. If the rewards promise to be higher than the costs, the speaker converges to the speech of the partner (social exchange theory; cf. Giles/Powesland 1975). The choice of a certain language or linguistic variety carries socio-symbolic meaning in the sense that a linguistic variety is related to certain social categories and/or groups (cf. also Kristiansen 2008). The cost of converging might thus be a socio-symbolic one (i.e. loss of (group) identity) and a speaker might refuse to converge or might even diverge from his/her interlocutor in order to maintain intergroup distinctiveness (theory of intergroup distinctiveness; cf. Giles/Powesland 1975). Furthermore, convergence is evaluated differently according to the motives the hearer attributes as the cause of this behaviour (causal attribution theory; cf. Giles/Powesland 1975).

In the present study, our primary interest does not lie in the motivations and functions of linguistic accommodation, however. In fact, the mechanisms of linguistic accommodation in our study serve the purpose of triggering the linguistic varieties we are interested in. By varying the interlocutor and thus motivating interphasic/intrapersonal variation, we wanted to get a glimpse at the individual range of varieties the speakers in the respective areas of Austria have at their disposal.

4 Methodology

This paper is based on data from two different sources, which provide insights into the use of German varieties and the basis for a comparison of lectal variation in the two different dialect regions of Austria.
**Study 1: Online-Survey**

By means of an online-survey, we collected information on how people in the Alemannic- and Bavarian-speaking parts of Austria assess their proficiency in the standard and in the dialect variety as well as their use of different varieties in several everyday situations. The questionnaire was also distributed in Switzerland, but the data gathered from Swiss subjects are neglected for the present paper. The survey was conveyed via different mailing-lists and further distributed through the ‘snowball effect’; the questions were mainly closed-ended, but we offered the possibility to add comments (cf. Ender/Kaiser 2009 for more details on the survey).

30 informants from the Alemannic-speaking part of Austria (Vorarlberg) and 82 informants from the Bavarian-speaking region completed the questionnaire. Almost 60% of the informants were female; subjects were aged from 11 to 73 years (with an average of 33 years) and came from different educational backgrounds. Overall, young, female and well-educated informants were slightly overrepresented. Since other studies have pointed out that dialect is used to a more limited extent by socially and educationally advantaged people, we can at least assume that the results regarding the use of dialect are not exaggerated in comparison to a more balanced sample.

The questionnaire provides subjective data on assessments and opinions of the informants, but no objective measurement of actual individual linguistic variation. Therefore, this information will be complemented by a small-scale study on actual language behaviour.

**Study 2: Telephone Conversations**

This study aims to examine individual linguistic variation in the same communicative situation but with different conversational partners. To this end, we recorded telephone conversations between owners of holiday apartments in Vorarlberg (Alemannic region) and in Salzburg (Bavarian region) and four different interlocutors. The person who made the first contact came from the same dialect region as the owners. In the subsequent days/weeks, three conversations with ‘potential guests’ took place, dealing with the holiday apartments and the respective holiday region, each with a person speaking another variety of German: one person from the other Austrian dialect region (i.e. Alemannic or Bavarian, respectively), one from Northern Germany, and one non-native speaker (with Rumanian as L1). The procedure was finished with a call from the person who originally established the contact and who then shortly interviewed the person on the assessment of their personal speech variation.

This procedure should maintain the context and the topic of the conversation as far as possible. Due to the fact that the two conversational partners do not know each other, cannot see each other, but can only classify each other based on the verbal interaction, uncontrollable influencing factors should be reduced to a minimum; the person called reacts
and responds on the basis of a swift categorisation of the person calling. At the same time, it is assumed that the respective landlords and landladies are used to conversations of this kind. As it is in their interest to be understood by potential guests, they will choose the form of speech they consider to be the most appropriate in each case. Thus an insight into the individual forms of lectal variation should be given.

The sample of apartment owners consists of four women from Vorarlberg, and two women and one man from Salzburg. They were aged from 39 to 52 years and originated from the respective region. For the present paper, preliminary results for one speaker from each region are analysed.

In order to measure speech variation, the degree of dialectality (cf. Herrgen et al. 2001) is calculated for each of the different conversations. The degree of dialectality, by Herrgen et al. (2001) is a measure of the phonetic distance between a certain form of speech and a moderate standard variety (for the Austrian standard variety we refer to Muhr 2007). By assigning points to the phonetic distance in vowels and consonants and adding them up, the phonetic dialectality of individual words can be defined. The phenomena considered include: differences in the levels and classes of the vowel diagram; substitution of monophthongs with diphthongs and vice versa; differences in the manner or place of articulation of consonants; omission of segments, etc. The mean value, which is then calculated over 150 words in a free speech situation, should represent the general degree of dialectality. The different degrees of dialectality from different speakers and from the same speaker with different interlocutors can then be compared and give insights into intra- and interindividual variation in the use of the standard, dialect or perhaps some variety/varieties in between. Further qualitative analyses will examine what the varieties used look like in detail.

5 Results

Study 1: Online Survey

The subjects from the Alemannic-speaking part, i.e. Vorarlberg, and the subjects from the Bavarian-speaking part of Austria answer differently to questions regarding the distance of their dialect from the standard variety and to questions concerning their standard and dialect proficiency. Informants from both regions have a high awareness of the difference between their local dialect and the standard variety, but informants from Vorarlberg consider the difference to be bigger than their Bavarian-speaking compatriots: 47% of the Alemannic-speaking informants state that the difference is ‘big’ and another 47% that it is ‘rather big’, whereas 15% of the Bavarian-speaking subjects opt for ‘big’ and 54% for ‘rather big’. Hence, the Alemannic speakers consider their dialect to be more distant from the standard variety than the Bavarian speakers do; this difference in assessment is statistically
significant\(^1\) in a chi-square test for which we grouped together the values ‘big’ with ‘rather big’ and ‘small’ with ‘rather small’.

Even though the two varieties are mostly considered to be rather dissimilar, approximately 90\% of the subjects rate their own proficiency in the standard variety as ‘high’ or ‘rather high’. As regards the proficiency in the standard variety, there is a gap between our informants’ self-assessment and the assessment of their compatriots since the compatriots’ skills are judged considerably more critically (see the comparison in figure 1). This corresponds well to the results from a previous Swiss study by Hägi/Scharloth (2005) and a general belief about the language proficiency of dialect speakers may be the reason for this.

![Figure 1](image)

**Figure 1** Assessment of informants’ own proficiency in the standard variety and the proficiency of their compatriots (Alem.: \(n=30\); Bavar.: \(n=82\))

Interesting differences appear in the assessment of dialect proficiency. Only approximately 50\% of the subjects from the Bavarian-speaking part indicate that they have ‘good’ skills in the local dialect, and 16\% assume that they have ‘bad’ or ‘rather bad’ dialect skills. In contrast, 83\% of the Alemannic informants indicate that they have a ‘good’ knowledge of the local dialect. How the different perception of dialect competence relates to the use of the different varieties can be gathered from the following results concerning language use in different everyday situations.

---

\(^1\) Chi-square (Pearson): \(\chi^2(1)=7.345; p<.01\). Tests of significance are only reported if they yielded significant results.
For language use with colleagues at work, we distinguished between colleagues from the same dialect region, colleagues from other German-speaking regions, and foreign colleagues. First, we asked the questions: “How often do you use (1) dialect, (2) the standard variety, (3) the so-called ‘Umgangssprache’ (an intermediate form) with colleagues from your region?” (see figure 2).

96 % of the subjects from Vorarlberg report using the local dialect ‘frequently’ or ‘almost always’ with colleagues from the same region, while only 75 % of the informants from the rest of Austria state doing so. The standard variety is not used very often in either region, as 83 % (Bavarian-speaking part) or 91 % (Alemannic-speaking part) of the informants report using the standard variety ‘rarely’ or ‘almost never’. The informants from the two regions differ significantly\(^2\) in their use of the intermediate form (Umgangssprache), as 58 % of the Bavarian-speaking informants declare that they use this form ‘almost always’ or ‘frequently’, but only one informant from Vorarlberg states using a kind of intermediate form ‘frequently’ (no one chooses the category ‘almost always’). Given the fact that such an intermediate form is not supposed to exist or is disapproved of in the diglossic situation in Vorarlberg, more detailed information on this kind of intermediate form would be desirable. Altogether, their language use with colleagues from the same region at work, as it is described here, is very similar to the language use with friends from the same dialect region (cf. Ender/Kaiser 2009 for more details).

\(^2\) Chi-square (Pearson): \(\chi^2(1)=19.144\); \(p<.001\) (answers pooled: ‘almost always’ and ‘frequently’, and ‘almost never’ and ‘rarely’, respectively).
The difference between people from Vorarlberg and the Bavarian-speaking parts concerning the use of an intermediate form between dialect and the standard variety is also remarkable and statistically significant\(^3\) in their language use with colleagues from other German-speaking regions. In both dialect regions, the use of the dialect decreases in conversations with people from other German-speaking regions – at least according to our informants’ self-reports: In the Bavarian-speaking part of Austria, 26% of the informants report using dialect ‘almost always’ or ‘frequently’; for the subjects in Vorarlberg the numbers are even smaller, as only 15% indicate that they use dialect to this extent. Probably, the informants from Vorarlberg are aware of the fact that their dialect is ‘hardly comprehensible’ (Steinegger 1998, 361) for people outside the Alemannic region. However, the decrease in the use of dialect in conversations with people from other German-speaking areas has different effects in the two areas. 70% of the informants from Vorarlberg ‘almost always’ or ‘frequently’ make use of the standard variety, whereas 70% of the informants from the major part of Austria ‘almost always’ or ‘frequently’ use the so-called ‘Umgangssprache’ in these situations. Somewhat astonishing is the relatively high amount of this form of speech among the informants in Vorarlberg. 5 subjects (25%) report using (‘frequently’ or ‘almost always’) an intermediate form with colleagues from other German-speaking regions. As

\(^3\) Chi-square (Pearson): \(\chi^2(1)=12.784; p<.001\) (answers pooled: ‘almost always’ and ‘frequently’, and ‘almost never’ and ‘rarely’, respectively).
such a form is neither expected nor described in detail for a diglossic region, we can only assume that the informants were talking about a ‘kind of mixture between high German and dialect’, which is a description from one informant from Switzerland.

![Figure 3. Language use at work with colleagues from other German-speaking regions (Alem.: n=20; Bavar.: n=69)](image)

Language use at work with foreign colleagues shall only be mentioned shortly. The use of dialect again decreases considerably. 95 % (Alemannic-speaking region) and 92 % (Bavarian-speaking region) of the subjects declare that they use their dialect ‘rarely’ or ‘almost never’ and over 70 % of the informants in both regions indicate that they use standard German ‘almost always’ or ‘frequently’. Moreover, the use of an intermediate form is again strongly represented in the answers from the Bavarian-speaking informants (42 % opt for ‘almost always’ or ‘frequently’). This is again a statistically significant difference to the Alemannic-speaking informants.4

The scenario ‘language use with customers in professional everyday life’ in the online-survey is very similar to the situation with which we are confronted in study 2 (telephone conversation with owners of holiday apartments and potential guests). The main differences to the situations described above lie in the fact that the interlocutors are not familiar with each other and that the situation is more formal. Interestingly, in this situation the preference for one special variety is not as pronounced as in the situations already mentioned. The

---

4 Chi-square (Pearson): $\chi^2(1)=8.257; p<.05$ (answers pooled: ‘almost always’ and ‘frequently’, and ‘almost never’ and ‘rarely’, respectively).
reason for this may be that we do not specify the origin or the language background of the interlocutor. Some subjects mention in their comments that their choice of one particular variety depends on the behaviour of the interlocutor, on what they consider to be the most appropriate form, etc. Without any specification of the interlocutor, the informants from Vorarlberg declare that they prefer dialect (58 % ‘almost always’ or ‘frequently’) to the standard variety (42 % ‘almost always’ or ‘frequently’). The informants from the Bavarian-speaking region rate their use of the standard variety (49 % ‘almost always’ or ‘frequently’) slightly higher than their use of dialect (43 % ‘almost always’ or ‘frequently’). For them, the most frequent choice seems to be the intermediate form (70 % ‘almost always’ or ‘frequently’), which they opt for significantly more often than the informants from Vorarlberg.

![Figure 4](image)

Figure 4 Language use with customers (in professional life) (Alem.: n=19; Bavar.: n=71)

As all varieties (except the intermediate form for the informants in Vorarlberg) attain remarkably high values, it seems to be interesting to study this kind of situation in more detail. Furthermore, the fact that some informants from the Alemannic-region opt for a kind of intermediate form indicates the need to get more information on this kind of speech. At the same time, these results underline the significance of the so-called ‘Umgangssprache’ in the Bavarian-speaking region. Many subjects from this region report using this variety also with their children, and in many everyday situations (e.g. in shops), where subjects from the

---

5 Chi-square (Exact): p<.001 (answers pooled: ‘almost always’ and ‘frequently’, and ‘almost never’ and ‘rarely’, respectively).
Alemannic-region rather choose dialect (cf. Ender/Kaiser 2009). The characteristics of this variety/these varieties in-between should be analysed in more detail since little is known about them at the moment.

Study 2: Telephone Conversations (Preliminary Results)

As mentioned above, Bavarian speakers are assumed to use language forms covering more or less the entire range between dialect and the standard language, whereas Alemannic speakers are supposed to use either dialect or the standard variety. Furthermore, an unexpected minority from Vorarlberg reports also using some kind of intermediate form. In our research design, we tried to elicit different forms by varying the addressee. Some preliminary results from one speaker from each dialect region (named A1 and B1) shall now be discussed in detail.

![Figure 5. Comparison of d-values for two speakers with different interlocutors](image)

Speaker B1 and A1 did in fact vary their speech according to the person they were speaking to. For B1, the Bavarian speaker, the range of speech used spans 1.55 points on the dialectality-scale. Her form of speech which is closest to the standard language is at a level of 0.32, which is in fact rather close to the Austrian standard also in objective terms. She uses this form of speech when talking to the caller with a foreign accent. There is a considerable difference between this form and the forms of speech she uses in the three other telephone conversations. With the German caller, speaker B1 resorts to a form of
speech which is distinctly more dialectal (d-value=1.58). Obviously, she assumes that this form of speech can be understood by the German interlocutor and, in fact, the German caller does not give any sign to the contrary. The forms of speech employed with the two other interlocutors, both from Austria but from different dialect regions, are again slightly more dialectal. With the caller from Vorarlberg, the dialectality value is 1.76, reaching the maximum in B1’s personal dialectality scale with the caller from her own dialect region (1.87). What we find, then, with this particular speaker, cannot in fact be called a real ‘continuum’ of speech forms, if we draw on the degrees of dialectality of varieties chosen. Rather, there seems to be one near-standard variety on the one hand and a certain amount of variability in the realm of dialectal speech on the other hand.

A1, the Alemannic speaker, uses forms of speech at dialectality values from 0.54 to 1.83. Her range of speech amounts to 1.29 points on the dialectality-scale and is therefore slightly smaller than that of speaker B1. At the same time, the forms of speech she produces spread over the whole span more evenly. She produces the most standard-like form of speech (d-value=0.54) with the interlocutor from Germany. This form of speech is already considerably above the limit of about 0.2 (cf. Lameli 2004) below which one would identify someone as a speaker of the standard variety. There is a considerable difference between this form and the form she uses with the person with a foreign accent, where she resorts to a form of speech that is significantly more dialectal at a d-value of 0.94. There is another clear gap between this form of speech and the one she uses with the Bavarian speaker where she reaches a d-value of 1.54. Finally, she reaches the highest degree of dialectality (d=1.83) with the interlocutor from the same region. However, the difference between these two forms turns out not to be statistically significant (t-test). Nevertheless, with this particular speaker we can find an important amount of variability, which is even more like a ‘continuum’ than the forms produced by speaker B1.

There are different possibilities how these results can come about. First, the differences in the degree of dialectality may be due to different relative proportions of dialect and standard features in the different conversations, i.e. also to different degrees of ‘code mixing’ or ‘switching’. Second, differences in d-values may be due to the use of intermediate forms, which are neither fully standard nor fully dialectal. The Bavarian standard-dialect continuum is said to comprise a number of intermediate forms of this kind. When analysing the data from speaker B1, however, we can only find a very limited number of such forms.

Examples of these include the verb <hat> (‘has’), which is realised in different forms in the conversations. In the conversation with the L2 learner, a phonetic realisation close to the standard is used: [hat]. In the conversation with the German interlocutor, speaker B1 uses the somewhat more dialectal form [hɔt] with the a-raising typical of Bavarian dialects. However, there is an even more dialectal form, which can be heard in the conversation with the two Austrian callers: [hɔːd], where both the vowel is lengthened and the final consonant
is an unvoiced lenis. Similarly, the preposition <mit> (with) can be pronounced in standard-like form [mit], with an (unvoiced) lenis at the end [mið], or with additional lengthening of the vowel: [miːd] by speaker B1.

As mentioned above, such intermediate forms seem to be rather rare with speaker B1. It must be added, however, that only certain words can be used at all in such intermediate forms. Quite frequently, such forms are not ‘available’. For example, for the diphthong /aɪ/, which is frequently changed to /ɔɪ/ in Bavarian dialects, there is no form ‘in-between’. Thus, the word <heißt> (‘is called’) only exists in two forms in speaker B1’s repertoire: [haɛst] or [haʊst].

But even when certain intermediate forms seem possible, speaker B1 rarely makes use of them. For example, the word <Stadt> (‘city’) is used in two variants in her conversations: either as the standard-like variant [ʃtat] or as the dialectal variant [ʃtɔːd] with the lengthened and raised a-vowel and the final unvoiced lenis. The standard-like variant is used in the conversations with both the L2 learner and the German speaker. With the Austrian speaker from Vorarlberg, speaker B1 uses the dialectal variant. There does exist another possible form, which can be frequently heard in Austrian ‘Umgangssprache’: [ʃtʊt], where only vowel quality is different from standard pronunciation. This form, however, is not used by speaker B1. In a similar fashion, the pronoun <Ihnen> (formal ‘you’, Dat./Akk.) is only used in two different forms in our corpus from speaker B1: the standard-like [iːnən] or the dialectal form [ɛgna]. The potential intermediate form [iːna], which would be possible in Austrian ‘Umgangssprache’ cannot be found in our data. This further confirms the tendency sketched by the analysis of the d-values from speaker B1. This speaker does not make use of the full range of linguistic forms between dialect and the standard language.

The different degrees of dialectality in the speech of speaker A1 seem to be the product of different patterns in the use of dialect and standard features in the different conversations and of a certain amount of ‘code switching’ and ‘mixing’. The relatively high d-value in the most standard-like form of speech addressed to the German speaker is mostly based on the apical realisation of the r-allophones, missing r-vocalisation (e.g. [fiːr] for <vier> (‘four’) or [miːr] for <mir> (‘me’ Dat.) instead of the standard variants [fiː] and [miː]), and s-palatalisation in [ʃf] instead of [ʃt] for <ist> (‘is’). However, not all of these dialectal features are equally present in the conversation with the non-native speaker, as A1 also produces the more standard-like variant [is] without palatalisation in this conversation. Furthermore, she produces more variants with full [ɛ] or [ɛ] instead of schwas as in [iːnən] instead of [iːnən] for the above mentioned pronoun <Ihnen> or [gebɪ:t] instead of [gɛbiːt] for <Gebiet> (‘region’) or [tage] for <Tage> (‘days’) instead of [taga]. Such forms can often be heard in Austrian ‘Umgangssprache’ and also standard-near varieties, but they could also arise due to A1’s effort to speak very clearly. However, speaker A1 also produces more
obvious dialectal forms than with the German person, e.g. the monophthong [a] for the indefinite article <ein>.

The form of speech she uses with the Bavarian speaker and the speaker from her dialect region are both characterised by a high amount of dialectal variants. Speaker A1 uses the typical Middle High German monophthongs as in [bru:xə] instead of [bra:oχn] for the word <brauchen> (‘need’ 1st P.Pl.) and variants with a-raising, e.g. [jɔ] for <ja> (‘yes’). The reason for the lower d-value in the form of speech with the Bavarian speaker could lie in the fact that speaker A1 sometimes switches to a more standard-like variety for short utterances and produces some forms that could be characterised as intermediate: She pronounces, for example, the word <Donnerstag> (‘Thursday’) as [dɔnəʃtɐ:k] even though the dialectal form would be /dɔnəʃtik/ and the standard form is realised with r-vocalisation and without s-palatalisation [dɔnəʃtɐ:k]. However, such forms are scarce. Even if her d-values suggest some kind of continuum, the existence and the quality of an intermediate form between dialect and standard variety remains uncertain.

These results correlate with A1’s self-report in some points. She declares that she adapts to the form of speech that is used by the person calling. But according to her, this accommodation is expressed by the use of the standard variety – what she calls ‘written German’ or ‘high German’ – in conversations with tourists from Germany and other parts of Europe. In her self-report, she thus makes a sharp distinction between the standard and the dialect variety and does not mention forms in-between. In fact, she accommodates to the different interlocutors, but she uses more than two discrete forms. Due to this discrepancy between her own statements and the linguistic analysis of her speech, it remains difficult to ascertain whether the different forms of adaptations in her speech are consciously applied intermediate forms.

To a certain degree, the linguistic analysis of speaker B1’s variation patterns corresponds well to the self-assessment of her linguistic behaviour with potential clients on the telephone. According to her self-report, she only resorts to standard German if the other person obviously does not understand her dialect. Thus, her choice of the standard variety in the conversation with the L2 learner seems to be a conscious one. What she does not mention, however, are the more subtle adaptations in the language she uses with Germans, which we can observe in our data. On the contrary, she emphasises that German tourists want her to speak dialect when she is talking to them. Judging from this self-report, we might say that this speaker is consciously using only two varieties: a standard-like variety and her dialect. She does not appear to be aware of the more subtle (and admittedly minor) accommodation processes affecting her dialectal speech when she is speaking to people from other German-speaking areas (Germany or Vorarlberg).

It remains to be seen if these patterns of linguistic variation are exceptional ones for speakers in the Bavarian and Alemannic dialect regions. Insights into the data from more speakers from both regions can probably reveal, whether there is, in fact, a substantial group
of speakers in the Bavarian region who do not make use of the entire spectrum of variation theoretically possible on the one hand, and of speakers from the Alemannic region who produce rather unexpected intermediate forms on the other hand. Our analyses have not advanced far enough at the moment to answer these questions.

6 Conclusion

The aim of the present study was to investigate sociolinguistic variation in the Alemannic- and the Bavarian-speaking region of Austria. Interesting discrepancies have arisen from the analysis of survey data on the one hand and of linguistic data of actual language use on the other. A considerable number of speakers from the Bavarian dialect region in Austria report the extensive use of some intermediate variety between standard and dialect, especially in conversations with people from other German-speaking areas or from foreign countries, and with potential clients. Our speaker does not seem to make much use of this intermediate range, however. We must keep in mind that the analysis of one speaker’s linguistic variation is not enough to provide representative patterns of variation for this particular speech community. It suggests, however, that there are different types of speakers, some of which make little use of the potential intermediate range between dialect and the standard language, even though the language system would allow for this kind of variation.

In the survey data from Vorarlberg, a certain number of answers gave indications that there might be an intermediate range of speech even in this supposedly diglossic language region. In fact, the analysis of our speaker’s variation pattern confirms this. This intermediate form of speech primarily comes about through code-mixing (of dialect and standard) and different patterns in the use of dialectal features. Again, it remains to be seen in further research whether this pattern is representative for the Alemannic dialect region in Austria.

A comparison of our speakers’ self-reports and their linguistic data suggests that they are aware of their linguistic variation, but only to a certain extent. Their conscious motivation for convergence to the interlocutor seems to be a functional one – assuring comprehension. More subtle instances of variation, i.e. those which are not directed at the two rather clear-cut varieties, standard and dialect, do not seem to be accessible to conscious perception.

Further analyses of linguistic data are necessary, some of which will be conducted in the present project. The detailed investigation of intrapersonal linguistic variation, however, is a very time-consuming task. In order to come up with representative insights into the patterns of sociolinguistic variation in the respective areas, however, it will be crucial to collect data on a considerably larger scale, which means that this work can only be done within a more comprehensive project. The present paper, we hope, has given some hints as to what questions further research should address and what might be possible methods to answer them.
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