Assessment, tutorial structures & initial teacher education of trainee students in the subjects Political/Civic Education, Social/Cultural Studies & History in Europe–a comparative study– ITTP, 2009-12025

Falk Pingel

Interdisciplinarity in Initial Teacher Training for the Teaching of History and Civics, and in the Teaching of History and Civics in schools[1]

Why deal with interdisciplinarity?

The CHE project strives to acquire an overview of the objectives, main content areas and methods as developed in the programmes for teacher trainee students of the school subjects of History and Civics. Although initial teacher training is the focus of the project, it also attempts to shed light on the relationship between initial training at university/academic level and the school curriculum framework for these subjects. At school level, both subjects form often part of a wider cluster of social studies comprising political or democracy education, economics, geography, law etc. Often, they are taught alternately. However, whereas history has been a well-established university discipline and school subject for centuries, the social studies are a relatively new field of research and school teaching. Furthermore, the disciplinary status of Civics is ambiguous and cannot easily be defined. In one of the first conceptual discussions of the new subject in the United Kingdom Denis Lawton (1968: 8) stated that „One difficulty is knowing what is meant by civics – it is a subject without a discipline.“ This poses still a challenge to the planning and coordination of initial teacher training courses as well as challenges cooperation between school curriculum development and university education.

At some universities, faculties for Social Sciences exist; at others, no such comprehensive academic institutional structure has been created but social studies are integrated into departments or faculties of sociology, political science, economics etc.[2]
Following its concept of history as a social science and the university' s commitment to interdisciplinary studies as expressed in the foundation of a Centre for Interdisciplinary Research, the Faculty of History of Bielefeld University made an initially successful attempt at establishing interdisciplinary courses for the initial training of social studies teachers in the 1970s. The general course programme as well as individual courses were jointly planned and conducted by scholars from the Faculties of History and Sociology. Thus, the students were

[1] This report is edited by Falk Pingel. Particular contributions have been made by:
Bärbel P. Kuhn/ Kirsten R. Seelbach, Siegen University/ Germany-North Rhine-Westphalia
Christian Fendt/ Susanne Popp, Augsburg University/ Germany-Bavaria
Bettina Alavi, Heidelberg University/ Germany-Baden-Württemberg
Béatrice Ziegler/ Vera Sperisen/ Nicole Wälti, University of Applied Sciences/ Northwestern Switzerland-Aarau
Yvonne Sinclair, Institute of Education, Manchester Metropolitan University/ United Kingdom

[2] In Germany, the University of Bremen has established a Centre for the Didactics (meaning: the Teaching of...) of the Social Sciences that is devoted to dealing with teaching Economics, History, Political Education and Geography at school. However, as the only full professor is specialised in Political Education, the disciplines are not represented on equal level and they are not yet networking. Also at this Centre, an additive approach to cooperation prevails (Information provided by Bettina Alavi, see also http://www.uni-bremen.de/de/zedis/ueber-uns.html). A similar centre exists at Giessen University (*??).* The University of Vienna has established a Centre for Subject Didactics (www,didactics.eu) with a Department for the Didactics of History, Social Studies ("Sozialkunde") and Civic Education (www.geschichtsdidaktik.eu).

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme (KA1) of the European Union.

exposed to a real dialogue between researchers of the two disciplines and could participate in it. However, as time went by, the disciplinary structures of research and teaching became stronger and with the change of generations of researchers joint courses were replaced by a variety of separate introductory courses into the different disciplines now participating in the social studies programme for teachers, mainly offered by the Faculties of Sociology and Economics.[3]

According to the latest Eurydice report Finland has apparently found a way to give particular weight to civics as part of history education. Here, "becoming a history teacher requires degrees and qualifications in both history and social studies (which include social sciences, citizenship, politics, law education and economics). Future teachers must first obtain a Master's degree in these subjects and then they must complete a teacher education programme which covers the pedagogy and didactics of history and social studies ..." (Citizenship Education, 2012: 88). In Austria, after a new school curriculum for citizenship education had been established which is now taught at school as a distinct but integrated topic, some universities started to offer Master's programmes for citizenship or civic education. Yet, these are exceptions to the general rule that "the area of citizenship education is integrated within initial teacher education courses for specialists in history, geography, philosophy, ethics/religion, social science or economics." (Ibid.) In a survey conducted after the introduction of the new curriculum in 2008, only 11% of the respondents said that they enjoyed a systematic and multidisciplinary university education for citizenship education ("Politische Bildung" as it is called in Austria, see Hämmerle/ Sander/ Sickinger, 2009: 361). Teachers regarded particularly a linkage of theory and practice as well as the handling of controversial themes as desiderata or objectives to be strengthened in their training. As a result, the self-assessment of their own competence in teaching civic education was very low. Furthermore, only teachers of history, language, geography and economics could relate their subject to civic education whereas teachers of other school subjects denied that they were able to integrate the topic into their subject. This shows that curricular changes at school level should be accompanied by a corresponding reformation of initial or at least in-service training.

The information available on initial training of civics teachers is often incomplete or distorted. The Eurydice report states that "opportunities to be trained as a specialist teacher of citizenship education are still not common; they are available only in Austria, Slovakia and the United Kingdom (England) ...." (Citizenship Education, 2012:15)[4] Whereas the first part of the sentence is certainly true, the second part may be true only if one refers strictly to the term "citizenship education" and does not take into account similar denominations such as

[3] Christian von Ferber, expert in the sociology of education, made in one of the planning meetings the critical remark that the social sciences have developed standards only for research but they failed to set standards from which teaching aims and contents can be derived for an academic profession which is not related to research (Ferber/ Hesse, 1972: 54).

[4] The contradictions, ambiguities and mistakes in the report reflect the often ambiguous and regionally or locally differentiated curricular conditions. Germany is counted as a country where citizenship is not a separate subject at either primary or secondary level; Austria mentioned as a country with specialist teacher training of citizenship education does not teach it as a separate subject (Citizenship Education, 2012: 19).

"political education", "social studies" or "civics"; in the latter case, Germany also would fall into this category. In contrast to history, disciplinary university structure and subject-oriented school curricula framework do not match. The Eurydice report criticises correctly that only a "few countries ... revised the content of initial teacher education following a reform of citizenship curricula." (Ibid.)

What Ross (1997a: 3) stated in his essay about the beginnings of Social Studies in the United States during the second decade of the last century is still true: "The content of the social studies curriculum is the most inclusive of all school subjects." The different names for the subject emphasise different content approaches and objectives that should be transmitted through the teaching of the subject: democracy education, political education, social studies, civic or citizenship education. In this essay, Civics will be used as a comprehensive term comprising all these different denominations.

In Europe, Civics was introduced into the school curriculum in the course of the 20th century. At first, it did not enjoy the status of an independent subject but was just an aspect of the teaching of other subjects, mainly of history and geography. Only after the Second World War with an increasing tendency after 1990, it became a stand-alone subject in a number of European countries. The emerging concept of a self-responsible citizen acting in a democratic, open society required a new form of citizenship education. Up to then history education was expected to help the young generation identify with the political system and the society they live in. Yet, focusing on delivering historical legitimacy, history teaching failed to prepare the young generation for coping with the challenges of fast social change, political ruptures and the rapid economic development European countries had to experience in the 20th century. Thus, citizenship education became particularly important where democratic tendencies increased or democracies were established but not yet secured or where they remained endangered.

However, also the way history is taught altered.[5] Contemporary history, which was left out of the history curriculum in most European countries till well into the post-Second-World-War period, has meanwhile become a compulsory part of the curricula. Nowadays, history teaching in the last year of compulsory schooling is often devoted to this period which ranges traditionally from the (end of the) First World War till today. However, the situation is still differs across Europe. For example, History is not a compulsory subject in the last years of compulsory education in the United Kingdom. Following curriculum reforms after 1990, some countries give even more weight to the teaching of the most recent history and devote the last year of compulsory schooling in history to the time period from the end of the Second World War up to our days. Thus, one could say, history has caught up with civics again. No wonder that both subjects overlap to a certain extent in content and objectives.

[5] See Harris/ Harrison/ McFahn (2012: 12): „The reasons for teaching history have therefore also undergone a transformation. No longer is the emphasis on developing a shared sense of a common heritage or promoting some form of patriotism. History is seen as important in developing a sense of identity and helping young people understand the world in which they live. The extent to which the past ‚teaches' us lessons for today is highly dubious, and there are arguments within the history community about the extent to which history enables students to engage with moral issues..."

As both subjects are historically and systematically inter*related*, is seems to be legitimate to take into examination to what extent they inter*act.* This is all the more appropriate as initial training courses in Civics are often made up of a number of elements that are developed by other departments, and particularly the history department. Raising the issue of interdisciplinarity within a research project that deals with history and civics education as two distinct entities may help us to become conscious of the somewhat artificial separation of the two subjects due to disciplinary academic traditions and subject-oriented school curricula.

Concerning History the disciplinary university structure corresponds, as a rule, with the subject-oriented school programme. This is, however, not always the case for Civics. The school subject is studied in courses offered by a number of different university departments. Vice versa, a student teacher may attend integrated social studies courses at university but does not have the chance to teach Civics as a stand-alone subject at school. Furthermore, History is taught as a stand-alone subject in secondary schools in almost all the countries surveyed. In contrast, Civics enjoys an independent status as a school subject only in a minority of countries. The curricular approaches initial teacher training offers and the teaching concepts applied at school are often not harmonised. They may match by chance, but often they differ.

Drawing on relevant entries in the project's questionnaire and taking account of studies on interdisciplinarity in history and civics education, this report examines to what an extent a systematic co-operation takes place between history, civics and other disciplines at university and school. Are history and civics treated as separate disciplines? If yes, how is the planning of academic courses and school curricula organised? If not, how is the specific civic or history dimension made visible in an integrated curriculum? Of particular interests here are items dealing with the professional profiles of history and civics teachers, with methodological characteristics of the two subjects as well as commonalties and differences between them. Do the programmes/courses deal with limitations of a disciplinary approach? Do they expressly make clear in which way the different disciplines/subjects contribute to the programme? Do they raise an awareness of interdisciplinary cooperation? Do they deal with interdisciplinarity expressly?

This report starts with a short theoretical chapter offering definitions of interdisciplinarity as outlined in scholarly literature. Then, examples and models of separation or integration of the two disciplines/subjects will be reported referring mainly to Germany, Switzerland and England because detailed reports in addition to the results of the questionnaire were received from these countries only. Achievements and shortcomings of interdisciplinary approaches in university and school curricula will be discussed. The report closes with concluding suggestions for raising awareness of interdisciplinary cooperation in the social sciences.

Defining interdisciplinarity - theoretical considerations

It is almost unanimous opinion in scholarly literature that interdisciplinarity represents a continuum of cooperation between different disciplines. Co-operation is mostly used as the

broader or more general term. Not every form of scientific cooperation is called interdisciplinary. Interdisciplinary cooperation needs a systematic form of mutual exchange between research teams or individual researchers of different disciplines over a longer time span. Although authors differentiate between different levels of interdisciplinarity, there are no clear-cut boundaries between these levels. Roughly speaking, the following distinctions are made:

- Multi-disciplinarity,
- Inter-disciplinarity,
- Trans-disciplinarity.

All the three concepts overlap and are sometimes even used interchangeably.
For analytical purposes, here the following distinction is proposed:
Multi-disciplinarity can be explained as an additive concept where different disciplines contribute to a task without much concrete cooperation; each discipline has a particular subtask which can be solved without referring to methods or particular concepts of the other disciplines. Cooperation is mainly restricted to coordination of the workplan.
Example: The report about the state of North Rhine-Westphalia from Siegen University states that "at some universities, Social Science cannot be studied as an integrated subject but only in the three sub-disciplines"; the study programme for the Social Science is, as a rule, constructed according to a model of multi-disciplinarity. Also the statement "Each subject is to add its own views and methods which are then combined to form a full picture of the issue in question" refers to multi-disciplinarity rather than to interdisciplinarity proper.

Interdisciplinarity proper includes active communication about the objectives and methods of all the disciplines involved in order to solve the task and to create a common, “interdisciplinary” understanding of the object of research .
An example may serve the concept of "cause" in an interdisciplinary course or research project on economic crises: an economic crisis may be caused by psychological factors (avarice or addiction to speculation and accumulation), economic reasons (overproduction; consumption crisis), political conditions (high taxes to protect regional markets) etc. To understand the causes of or reasons for a crisis, all scholars must develop an understanding of motivations, cause-effect relations and contextual conditions. It is important not just to add up all the factors as they do not play the same role in different crises but to understand their interplay.[6]

The German WIKI makes the following distinction between multidisciplinarity and interdisciplinarity: "Wichtig in Abgrenzung zur Multidisziplinarität ist, dass Methoden zwischen den Disziplinen vermittelt werden und sich damit Lösungsstrategien nicht nur durch einen Austausch der Ergebnisse ergeben. Interdisziplinarität bedingt das Zusammenführen verschiedener Teilaspekte, ein reines Nebeneinander dieser Aspekte reicht hierfür nicht aus".[7]

[6] Ghisla/ Bausch (2006) offer a collection of interdisciplinary teaching models. Problems related to a number of disciplines are analysed taking into account different scientific dimensions. Herzmann/ Artmann/ Rabenstein (2011: 39) recommend to compare literary and historical sources dealing with the same issue. Also Harris/ Harrison/ McFahn (2012) provide practical advice. Savage (2011) deals with methodological issues.
[7] „It is important...to develop an awareness of the different methods applied; solutions cannot be reached through just taking note of each others' results. To put things in juxtaposition is not sufficient; they must be seen in an

Bromme (2000) uses the expression "defining/searching for common ground" and underscores that a „shared referential context for concepts used“ and a "common language" must be developed (Bromme, 2000: 127). Different disciplines represent different styles of thought or different epistemic styles ("Denkstile").
Oliver/ Shaver (1972) state that the scientific paradigms of history and the social sciences are different: history follows a fact-oriented paradigm, whereas the social studies apply a structural or functional paradigm. Even if one adheres to the concept of history as a social science, it is important to be aware of these two different approaches. Historical research could test the applicability of an abstract model to a certain event or time period but would not abstract from this event. As far as the school subjects are concerned, Civics draws more and more on concepts taken from the behavioural sciences. In recent years, the EU has underscored the importance of transmitting the concept of active citizenship to the young generation (Citizenship Education, 2012). Interdisciplinary work could then mean that a chronological approach matches with a structural, functional or participatory one. Accordingly, Calhoun/ Rhoten (2000: 106) state that “... social problems cannot be adequately analyzed through the contributions of any single discipline.“ In more general terms Rabenstein/ Herzmann (2011: 98, referring to Stübig/ Ludwig/ Bosse, 2008) define interdisciplinary teaching as a problem-oriented approach which makes use of the perspectives of at least two school subjects to solve the problem. The inter-relatedness of the different disciplinary perspectives should be clearly emphasised and explained to the pupils at least once in the teaching module.[8]

Becker (1979) has developed a theoretical scheme for the definition of interdisciplinary work on school level. He is of the opinion that a science-oriented approach impedes cooperation between different school subjects. According to him, central for teaching the social studies at school is the inculcation of behavioural attitudes (“Handlungsorientierung”), not of teaching objects. Cooperation that crosses disciplinary borders sheds light on all the different aspects of acting in a societal context. Political education (or civics) shows how people act in different contexts; it deals with the concrete norms and rules of behaviour in a given society.

Transdisciplinarity is the most difficult and ambiguous concept. For some researchers, it implies a holistic approach. The methods of different disciplines are merged and take on a new quality. They can even be combined into a new discipline; often, one refers here to biophysics. However, the holistic concept is contested and sometimes called "mystical". The philosopher Jürgen Mittelstrass who advocates transdisciplinarity writes "...transdisciplinarity is first of all an integrating, although not a holistic, concept. It resolves isolation on a higher methodological plane, but it does not attempt to construct a ‘unified’ interpretative or

integrated way.“ (http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interdisziplinarit%C3%A4t)

[8] „Fächerübergreifender Unterricht ist ein problemorientierter Unterricht, der die Perspektive von wenigstens zwei Schulfächern zur Lösung eines Problems ... heranzieht und an mindestens einer markanten Stelle im Unterrichtsverlauf das Zusammenwirken der unterschiedlichen Fachperspektiven deutlich hervorhebt.“
Referring to the particular pedagogical dimension, Savage (2011: 8-9) states that “A cross.curricular approach to teaching is characterised by sensitivity towards, and a synthesis of, knowledge, skills and understandings from various subject areas. These inform an enriched pedagogy that promotes an approach to learning which embraces and explores this wider sensitivity through various methods.”

explanatory matrix." (Mittelstrass, 2001: 498) However, this sounds a bit unclear, if not mystical as well.

An interesting concept has been developed by Nicolescu. According to him a transdisciplinary understanding is needed when we transgress from one level of reality to another: "...two levels of Reality are different if, while passing from one to the other, there is a break in the laws and a break in fundamental concepts (like, for example, causality). No one has succeeded in finding a mathematical formalism which permits the rigorous passage from one world to another." (Nicolescu, 1998: 385) Nicolescu aims at overcoming "a strong sense of existential dissatisfaction with the fragmentation of knowledge and the resultant loss of meaning that occurs in the university, while at the same time recognising the necessity of specialisation for the advancement of knowledge" (Janz, 1999: 2). Although he argues from a physicist's point of view, his criticism of fragmented scientific approaches could be interpreted as an appeal to foster a comprehensive understanding of "society" which cannot be seen as either an economic or political or cultural etc. unit but as a social community whose reality is different from all its diverse dimensions.

Taking the above mentioned different notions of interdisciplinarity as a point of departure, Julie Thompson has developed the following typology of interdisciplinarity:
- "Multidisciplinarity: juxtaposing, sequencing, coordinating",
- „Interdisciplinarity: integrating, interacting, linking, focusing, blending",
- „Transdisciplinarity: transcending, transgressing, transforming" (Thompson, 2010: 16).

Different forms of interdisciplinarity are:
- Concerning methods: „borrowing methods" from other disciplines,
- Concerning theory: forming "a more comprehensive general view", common „conceptual frameworks for analysis" (Ibid.: 20)

History and Civics: integrated, separated, combined ? – Some curricular approaches

Examples from Germany:
School education in Germany is federalised meaning that each of the 16 states issues its own school curricula and employs its own system of school book adoption. Nevertheless, the Standing Conference of Ministers of Education takes measures to keep the school systems interchangeable and provide a common general structure. Although the federal government has a limited say in higher education and a federal Framework Law on Higher Education regulates general objectives and institutional structures of higher education, the responsibility for the foundation, control, and funding of universities and other institutions of higher education is with the "Länder" (states). Since universities enjoy autonomy and freedom of research, they develop their individual study programmes within the framework provided by federal and state legislation.

As a rule, Civics is taught at school as a separate subject at secondary level but it alternates with history and geography. It is called "Politische Bildung" (political education), "Staatsbürgerkunde" (citizenship education) or "Sozialkunde" (social studies), "Politik und Wirtschaft" (politics and economics). As the German school system is not only federalised but

after elementary school also divided into different streams according to the level of comprehension, History and Civics (and partly also Geography) are taught in an integrated way at lower secondary level (approx. grade 5-10) for comprehensive schools ("Gesamtschule") and general-education secondary schools ("Hauptschule"). The official education philosophy towards the status of Civics in the curriculum and its educational objectives has changed over time. It was introduced as "Staatsbürgerkunde" (citizenship education understood as acquiring knowledge about political institutions; also the term "Gemeinschaftskunde" was used emphasising the societal aspects of forming a "community" of citizens) in the Federal Republic of Germany as part of re-education and democratisation efforts in the 1950s which were influenced by US social studies programmes. It made its way into the teaching programmes first as a particular "civic dimension" ("Unterrichtsprinzip" that should be integrated into other subjects, mainly history, with the exception of the states of Hessia, Schleswig-Holstein and West-Berlin where it was established as an independent subject). In the beginnings, it followed an institutional approach focusing on the political structure, and the political as well as social institutions of the young West German state. It gained the status of an independent subject in more states since the 1960s and even threatened the up to then unchallenged status of History when Hessia turned the table in the 1970s and issued the framework programme for a new integrated subject "Gesellschaftslehre" which was more oriented to social studies whereas history became downgraded to a mere dimension of the new subject. The institutional approach was replaced by a participatory one. After a decade-long, heated professional as well as public debate and with the change from social democratic to Christian democratic led governments the two subjects were re-established, in some states at the same footing, in others with a dominance of history in the school programme. Nowhere, as regarding independence and number of lessons taught, does civics have a dominant position (Weidinger, 1999).

Notwithstanding the short Hessian love affair with a left-wing, emancipatory social studies approach, the position of History in the school programme remained relatively stable. This is all the more relevant as the education of History teachers was and is well-established at most German university history departments. The student teachers follow to a great deal the same programme as those students who do a "scientific" bachelor or master in history. Therefore, German history teachers have a strong professional self-image; if one would like to stress the negative side of this image, one could say that they see them more as history experts than as pedagogues (Gies, 1998). Just the contrary is the case with civics teachers. Specialised subject courses were established at some West German universities only at the end of the 1950s, in most cases at the departments of Political Science. Particularly in the forming years, these courses could not cover the wide range and changing content as well as methodological patterns of the school subject. Often, Civics teachers – and this applies particularly to states where Civics was just one dimension included in other subjects – had no specific subject-oriented initial training at all but attended courses in further education. As the subject became more established with the 1970s and the social science paradigm gained ground at universities, more departments offered specialised courses for Civic teachers in addition to their regular programme. As German teachers for secondary schools have to teach (and to study) two subjects, one can say that they study one discipline for teaching the first and a mixture of multi-disciplinary courses for teaching their second subject if they choose History

and Civics. It is understandable, that their professional awareness has been mostly informed by their "disciplinary subject". As unsatisfactory it may be that a school subject does not have a firm basis in university-based initial teacher training, the relation between disciplinary university structures and subject-oriented school systems is not a one-way street. The establishment of a new subject at school has forced academic institutions of initial teacher training to broaden the thematic of courses they offer in the longer run. This process contributed considerably to the expansion of departments for Political Science at university since the 1960s (Detjen, 2007: 130). It is not a new thing that cooperation between academic disciplines creates a new one as is the case with biochemistry, for example. What could be new is that cooperation between a school subject and divers university disciplines could generate a new, separate department or at least institution for civic education at academic level.

The examples which follow will offer a closer look into the kind of cooperation already established, recommended or missed out through the university programmes. Of particular interest here is whether:

- a new disciplinary concept of civics is emerging,
- systematic interdisciplinary work is being implemented or
- an additive, multi-disciplinary approach to cooperation is prevailing.

Initial teacher training in Germany (Siegen University/North Rhine-Westphalia; Augsburg University/Bavaria; Heidelberg University/Baden-Württemberg)

As regarding History the professional profile of a history teacher as a historian is highlighted by the fact that the objectives of History as a school subject do not differ much from the objectives described in the study programme for History as a an academic discipline. Central to the understanding of History on both levels are developmental processes that shape societies in a certain time period and geographic area. Students should be enabled to recognise those historical processes which are still at work today and influence the forming of current social relations as well as economic and political structures. It is this impact of history on present structures that establishes the link between historical and civic knowledge. However, often when this link is referred to the curricula explicit explanations of how this link could be made a specific topic in teaching courses are missing. Surprisingly, the ability to work in an interdisciplinary way is expressly mentioned as an objective in the Subject-oriented Requirements for Teaching History at Grammar and Comprehensive Schools ("Fachspezifische Bestimmungen für das Fach Geschichte/ Lehramt an Gymnasien und Gesamtschulen") but also here the concrete study programmes give students hardly any help of how to acquire this ability.

At Siegen University, two subjects are taught which deal with "Political Education" as the overarching subject is called here: Social Sciences and Economics/Politics.
Economics/Politics is taught for future teachers at vocational schools only; they should put more emphasis on the economic sector of the society. Students are expected to gain abilities in using the language of sociology, political science and economics adequately in order to

understand basic research works conducted in these disciplines. The subject-specific methods of analysing systems and structures, using statistics and evaluating analyses are also part of the curriculum. Subject-specific objectives include learning about political and economical systems in Germany and Europe, knowing about economical theories, being able to use micro- and macro-economical views to analyse social phenomena.

At school, Politics/Economics is taught as an integrated subject. Pupils are expected to learn about social, political and economic structures and be able to judge them on the basis of their knowledge in theories and relations. The subject is meant to help pupils develop the ability to actively participate in democracy.
Social Science is a combined subject consisting of the three disciplines of Sociology, Political Science and Economics. Therefore, students are expected to learn about systems and theories in all three disciplines. At first glance, this three-fold disciplinary structure seemingly makes the study of Social Sciences an ideal example of interdisciplinary teaching. However, interdisciplinarity is not mentioned as a topic of particular training for the students who have to bring together basic methodologies and content areas of three different university disciplines in order to teach one school subject. Interestingly, school curricula mention that, at some universities, Social Sciences cannot be studied as an integrated subject but only in the mentioned three disciplines.

Also Social Sciences is taught as an integrated subject at school. It is conceptualised as a combination of Sociology, Economics and Politics because of the complexity of social reality. Therefore, the three disciplines serve to explain better difficult societal processes with their methods combined rather than to build on one discipline only.
For general secondary schools (Hauptschulen), the combined curriculum for History/Politics suggests to cooperate with the subjects German, Maths and Arts in order to learn working with sources, statistics and visual media, respectively. Since the pupils at these schools often have difficulties in reading and writing, such interdisciplinary work can be helpful to them.
In Bavaria, History, Social Studies and Geography form one subject in General Secondary Schools (Hauptschulen). They are taught as stand-alone subjects at Grammar Schools (Gymnasien) but there is some kind of coordination between the subjects, particularly at grade 10. It is said that Social Studies ("Sozialkunde") builds on what has been learned in previous classes of Religious Instruction, History, Geography etc. and puts this in a general political context. The general objectives of the curriculum underscore the importance of processes of active learning. Pupils should become prepared to take over political responsibility for the society they live in. To this aim the teaching of Civics should train students to develop the ability to multiperspectival thinking, to empathy and intercultural tolerance.

It is recommended to develop teaching units which encompass Civics and History ("Fächerübergreifendes Unterrichtsprojekt mit Geschichte"). Appropriate thematic areas for such projects are, for example, the development of the Federal Republic of Germany, European integration, globalisation, peace building processes in international politics.
In contrast, the teaching of History transmits knowledge about influential individual people and structures, developments, events which had an imprint on the past, and, therefore,

influence also life in present societies. It is stated that studying the relation between past and present contributes to defining one's own position in society.

Learning History prepares pupils to understand important features of their own world. For example, through being exposed to different ways of living and mentalities in the past they develop an understanding of foreign cultures in the world of today.
In grammar schools, the curriculum for History suggests cooperation with other subjects to reveal the interrelation between the subjects especially concerning issues such as environment, peace and conflict, globalisation and social inequality. Each subject is to add its own views and methods which are then combined to form the full picture of the issue in question. It is the task of the individual teacher to offer pupils the chance to take part in such multi-disciplinary projects.

These examples show that some of the learning objectives of History and Civics are closely interrelated. However, also the differences are underscored. Whereas the Civics curriculum puts emphasis on the training of democratic attitudes and active political engagement, historical knowledge makes familiar with the constraints that set limits to the range of human social, economic and cultural activities in a particular historical epoch. Through the understanding of key terms, the knowledge of dates, names and broad contexts the pupils acquire a basic subject-specific terminology and chronology that serves to develop their historical consciousness and to understand historical structures characteristic of a certain period of time.

It may be of interest to shed light on how these subject areas are treated at primary level. In German primary schools (grade one to four or to six), only one such subject is taught called „Sachunterricht" (Teaching about the real world) combining even elements of the natural sciences (biology, life studies, environmental studies) with social sciences as well as geography and history. Students studying this primary school subject can select, as a rule, one or two university disciplines as core academic subjects. At Siegen University, for example, if their priority is with the social sciences they can either choose History or Social Sciences as their main area of interest. Although they are expected to know about subject-specific methods, they have to focus on a vast variety of aspects and dimensions that their school subject „Sachunterricht" covers and that are offered by the different university disciplines.

At the Pedagogical University of Heidelberg (located in Baden-Württemberg where initial teacher training is studied at academic institutions with specialised pedagogical streams) students have to choose one specialised core subject area. If they opt for History, they have to take specialised courses in "Social Sciences" (Sozialwissenschaften) in the second and third term to be trained for the teaching of "Sachunterricht". In this case, the courses for primary school teachers with a specialisation in "Sachunterricht" refer in their specific methodological and content issues predominantly to history, less to specific methods and contents issues of the social sciences. If they opt for Political Sciences, their specialised courses in "Social Sciences" deal with the matter predominantly from the viewpoint of political education.

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme (KA1) of the European Union.

Conception of Political Education at the University of Applied Sciences Northwestern Switzerland (FHNW)

The study of the school subject Political Education is integrated in the History Department. Although subordinated to History, Political Education plays an important role in the concept of the History study programme (subject portrait). Political Education is not taught as a stand-alone subject but is part of the subject History and specially mentioned therein. This conception corresponds with the current way of teaching the subject at Swiss schools.

It is noticeable that the position of Political Education is more prominent in the subject portrait than in the concrete description of modules of the different courses. It takes apparently time and needs particular efforts to translate the general guidelines and objectives into course structures that coherently combine a historical approach with strong elements of political education.

The principal objectives of history as a science follow the thread already described above. Students should become aware of the structural factors that determine human existence at a certain time on the one hand and of the individual freedom of taking action and making decisions on the other hand. They should become familiar with different dimensions of human existence at a certain time such as the political, economic, social, and ecological conditions, the history of ideas and cultural circumstances. Also in this study programme, past and present are linked. To understand the factors that have set limits to the range of human actions in the past helps to gain insight into limitations and perspectives of one's own abilities in the present. Also, students are encouraged to take other disciplinary approaches into account; explicitly mentioned in this regard are sociological, political or ethical approaches. These approaches represent obviously different scientific paradigms historians should be aware of. However, these paradigms are not explained in any detail and it is obviously left to the students to discover the disciplinary limits of a pure "historical" approach whatever this may mean. Again, a definition of interdisciplinarity or any concrete dealing with disciplinary borders and interdisciplinary approaches has been avoided in the study programme.

The conception of Political Education in the subject portrait is ambiguous. It alternates between Political Education as a subject of its own and Political Education as an ancillary discipline of the subject History. In the latter case, Political Education serves as an ancillary discipline for a better understanding of historical processes. The subject portrait of Political Education describes basic principles of the subject, subject didactics and practical training.
With regard to content, Political Education is guided by enlightened values such as tolerance and openness, participation, acceptance of democratic values and human rights. The view of the world shall be a self-reflexive one. In contrast to the conception of History, the study programme does not develop particular epistemological and methodical approaches for Political Education. This again indicates that the professional profile of a teacher who has to integrate Political Education into History is predominantly shaped by history as a disciplinary concept because Political Education is not developed as an independent epistemological paradigm in the programme.

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme (KA1) of the European Union.

As regarding the school curriculum, Political Education is taught rarely as a stand-alone subject in the German-speaking part of Switzerland thereby following the German curricular structure. Since the curricula vary from canton to canton, subjects, which cover aspects of history, politics, ethics or the like are even called differently in the cantonal curricula e.g. "History and Politics" (Canton of Schwyz), "Nature, Human Beings, Contemporaries" (Canton of Bern), "General Studies" (Canton of Solothurn), "Social Studies and the Natural Environment" (Canton of Thurgau) or "Individual and Society" (Canton of Basel-Land). The different names are reflections of different cantonal concepts of the mixed subject. Some set priority to a natural science approach, others favour a social studies paradigm or give important weight to elements taken from religious instruction. Nevertheless, besides this variety in approaches, the subject History exerts by far the most important influence on the teaching of Political Education. This is not only manifested in the curricula but also observed in practice, as initial studies show. Thus, History lessons at Swiss-German schools can definitely (also) be categorized as Political Education (Hodel/ Waldis, 2007).

Institute of Education, Manchester Metropolitan University (United Kingdom)
Like in most other countries taking part in the project, History can be studied as a single subject as well as jointly with other subjects. A preferred combination seems to be with English literature but it is also studied, for example, jointly with Sociology or Geography; another common combination is History and Politics.[9] In contrast, the school subject Citizenship Education is not normally represented as a separate discipline at university level. Citizenship Education as a school subject was included in the National curriculum first as a subsidiary dimension to other subjects mostly the teaching of History before it became a separate subject. Universities now train teachers for Citizenship Education, and it may happen that Civics will become a university discipline.

When studying subjects jointly at university level, the subjects are usually planned, delivered, and studied separately as two distinct and stand-alone subjects, with the students left to make the links and connections. When studying History as a single subject (Single Honours History) specific courses can be chosen which reflect the different dimensions of history such as Political or Social History as mentioned also already above in the Swiss programme. This means, that, as a rule, studying History implies at least using multi-dimensional approaches to a historical phenomenon taking into account content areas and methods that are characteristic of other disciplines.

Furthermore, sometimes subjects are studied in combination with one another "Combined studies" - here one would see integrated planning, more explicit links and connections being made between subjects so that one could speak of an interdisciplinary approach proper. This is probably most often seen for example at Masters level. Thus, on a Masters programme at Manchester Metropolitan University entitled "Women's Studies" a history lecturer contributes

[9] In Gearon (2010) particular essays are devoted to the issue of how to link citizenship to English, History and Religious Education, see Part IV: Citizenship across the Curriculum.

primarily to the history strand of the programme but also works closely with English, Sociology, Psychology colleagues to deliver combined modules/ courses of study.[10]

History is taught as a single subject in both Primary and Secondary school, across all ages (ISCED). However, it is compulsory at Primary level (Key stage 1 and 2) and at Secondary level at Key stage 3 only (students aged 11 to 13). At Key stage 3 Citizenship Education is the only Social Science taught (but one also finds Personal and Social and Health Education here, and of course Religious Education and Geography as a single subject). At post-14-16 one finds Psychology, Sociology, Citizenship and History taught as single, optional subjects. At post-16 Sociology, Government and Politics (one subject), Law and Citizenship, History, Religious Education are taught as single subjects. There are also recent courses in Anthropology offered at post-16.

The History curriculum for Key stage 3 includes a statement about the importance of history and here it makes links to enthusing pupils for developing a sense of identity and understanding their heritage, from local, national and international perspectives. Students are expected to develop an understanding of their own communities and worlds and to make links with the wider world and global history world. They should also learn to understand the nature of history as a discipline, how one studies history and the skills of the historian. Through looking at the past pupils learn understanding the present. To this aim, transferable skills, and an understanding of diversity and living in a diverse world should be transmitted. This again shows that the specific disciplinary status of history is addressed in the curriculum and a link between past and present should be established. This implies a kind of citizenship dimension within the teaching of history.

The general objectives of the Secondary History Curriculum are translated into 6 Key concepts:
- Chronological Understanding
- Cultural, ethnic and religious diversity
- Change and Continuity
- Cause and Consequence
- Significance.
- Interpretation

Three Key Processes are highlighted and explained:
- Historical Enquiry
- Using Evidence
- Communicating about the Past.

[10] Yvonne Sinclair refers here to her own experiences when conducting her Master study at York University in Medieval Studies with specialisation in its history components. The separate disciplines were taught separately (History, English and Art History). Nevertheless, the students were encouraged to make links and connections between their studies, to see the common themes, and the tutors did the same both in their planning and delivery, thus enabling a coming together of the three disciplines.

The general concepts are either specific to history (chronological understanding, for example) or so general that they can be applied to a number of sciences (cause and consequence, for example). The linkage between past and present is not reflected in most of these concepts. However, there is a strong emphasis on making links between present and past when addressing the concept 'historical significance' here - and in practice teachers do try to make link between past and present when addressing some of the other concepts too e.g. diversity. The more specific the aims become, the more the relationship between past and present, history and citizenship education fades away. This has also been observed in the curricula of other countries.

With the revision of the Secondary curriculum at Key stage 3 in 2007, if considering the wider curriculum, one can note a move towards a more integrated curriculum with the potential for a more interdisciplinary approach to the whole curriculum. The 2007 curriculum introduced the notion of 'The Big Picture'. Cross curricular themes of the curriculum i.e. the 'Global Dimension', 'Sustainability', 'Citizenship' were seen as areas that could bring the curriculum together. The Big Picture encouraged some schools and some teachers of the Humanities, for example, to adopt a collaborative, creative and innovative approach to the curriculum. In some contexts then, teachers of Geography, Religious Education, History, for example, would come together and plan for teaching and learning across their subjects as a cross subject team. This might sometime mean addressing big themes i.e. Human Rights; Diversity; Social Justice, collaboratively.

It should be noted that similar cross-curricular themes are mentioned in curricula of many other countries as well but they figure as general objectives with no specific advice about how to make these aims operational and bring together the knowledge of the different subject-oriented teachers. The introductory remarks to the school curricula of Hessia state that lessons which combine different subjects ("fächerübergreifender Unterricht) and which relate to other subjects ("fächerverbindender Unterricht") are part of the curriculum. However, the curriculum does not provide teachers with interdisciplinary or multi-disciplinary teaching units nor does it offer any methodological guidance of how those units could be developed. It only refers to thematic issues in the teaching programmes which could be used for interdisciplinary or multi-disciplinary teaching in order to "foster – in addition to the acquirement of disciplinary knowledge – the understanding of complex interrelations".[11]

Multi- vs. inter-disciplinary approach - curricular structures and practical experiences

[11] „Die Verbindlichkeiten für den fachübergreifenden und fächerverbindenden Unterricht wurden in die Lehrpläne aufgenommen. Bei den Querverweisen werden keine wünschbaren Verbindungen zu anderen Fächern angegeben, sondern ausgerichtet an den verbindlichen Themen der anderen Fächer desselben Jahrgangs konkrete Möglichkeiten in Bezug auf die Ausgestaltung von projektorientiertem Unterricht aufgezeigt. Auf diese Weise werden die Lehrpläne der methodischen Bedeutung des fachübergreifenden und fächerverbindenden Lernens gerecht und fördern außer dem Erwerb von fachlichem Wissen die Einsicht in komplexere Zusammenhänge."
Hessisches Kultusministerium, *Erläuterungen zu den Lehrplänen* http://www.hessisches-kultusministerium.de/irj/HKM_Internet?uid=6c43019a-8cc6-1811-f3ef-ef91921321b2, accessed 28 July 2012.

According to the entries in the project's questionnaire cooperation between disciplines (mostly history and political science, but also sociology and economics) takes place mainly on the practical level – that is the organisation of courses. This kind of cooperation, as a rule, aims at agreeing upon thematic areas each discipline should offer to the joint curriculum as well as the allocation of time slots, the distribution of mandatory and supplementary courses etc. Departments or faculties working together in Civics/Social Studies courses have to find regulations for granting the credits. Therefore, the definition of objectives and criteria for credits are most often mentioned as aims of cooperation. Thus, it is no wonder that cooperation takes place mainly on the level of faculties. It goes without saying that individual university teachers from different disciplines may plan courses together but such cooperation is not institutionalised. Special institutions for planning, conducting and evaluating joint course programmes do not exist with only a few exceptions. Some curricula address expressly the need for interdisciplinary concepts and the training of different methodologies that are characteristic for the disciplines referred to in the curriculum. However, it is not detailed how these interdisciplinary concepts should be implemented. More often, however, interdisciplinarity - if it is mentioned at all - is only dealt with in passing. For example, students are called upon to make the connection between the disciplines that contribute to the joint curriculum. So far, the curricula neither seem to provide students and university teachers with an interdisciplinary concept of teaching and learning, nor do they prescribe courses that expressly deal with the issue of interdisciplinarity. Nevertheless, such courses can be offered from time to time depending on the interests of students and professors, but the data collected by the project do not allow us to make a more systematic statement on this issue. According to the definition of levels of interdisciplinarity as developed above an additive or multi-disciplinary concept of cooperation prevails.

One item in the questionnaire inquires the position of interdisciplinarity in the didactics of History (E3.2.1). As often, the results cannot easily be interpreted because answers vary considerably: 9 times only one or two points are given meaning that interdisciplinarity is not mentioned at all or only randomly. However, also 9 times it is indicated that the didactical programmes deal with interdisciplinarity sometimes (3 or 4 points) and three institutions gave even the highest number of points (5 and 6). The latter institutions put also great emphasis on interactive learning, developmental and/or learning psychology and theories of didactic whereas institutions with small scores in interdisciplinarity almost neglect these fields so that interdisciplinary work seems here to be related to a close connection between general didactics and psychology.

The revised English National Curriculum 2007 expressly stimulates teachers to address "cross curricular themes" in classroom. Obviously, this approach has particular relevance for the social sciences as teachers feel encouraged to cooperate and plan their lessons together with colleagues from other subjects. It remains to be seen whether the planning of "big picture" lessons goes beyond an additive approach and reaches the level of interactive cooperation also in terms of content, methodology and teaching concepts.
On elementary school level the social sciences are taught, as a rule, in an integrated way. However, this does not yet entail an interdisciplinary approach. Rather, it may be called pre-disciplinary as the teaching for many subjects is not yet differentiated according to the

established academic disciplines. Interdisciplinarity presupposes disciplinary knowledge (Wellensiek/ Petermann, 2002; Weingart, 2000). The holistic approach often applied in primary classes (Alavi, 2004) cannot easily be transferred to secondary classes. Teachers are faced with the problem of getting the momentum for introducing interdisciplinarity. They feel uncomfortable with being confronted with two contrasting aims: to develop a sense for the specific methodology of a particular subject and to train interdisciplinary thinking. Whereas the first aim is the preferred way of teaching in lower secondary classes, the second one may be more appropriate for higher secondary schools. One has also to take into account that disciplinary awareness is more developed with history teachers than civic teachers who in some countries have often attended only supplementary courses in addition to their main subjects history or geography.

The answers given to the items of the questionnaire dealing with the relationship between History and Civics (E5.1 – K5.1) show that university history curricula cover more topics that are also dealt with in Civics than vice versa. There are a lot of issues addressed in History curricula - such as "political institutions" (most often mentioned), "diversity", "law", "political and human rights", "power", "active(!) citizenship", "responsibility", "critical thinking", "conflict (resolution)" - that are also treated in Civics or even represent core areas of teaching Civics. In contrast, Civics curricula refer seldom to history. Topics mentioned are conflict, gender, political and contemporary history, and the global dimension.
Therefore, History teachers are often convinced that the teaching of their subject contributes to deepening the understanding of issues like peace and war, citizenship, governance, economic developments etc. They think that they cover civic education to a certain extent anyway.

Although many historians, at least in Germany, regard history as a "Historische Sozialwissenschaft"[12], some topics which one could have been expected to be included in such a concept are obviously non or only seldom covered by History curricula. In the list of Civic issues that are dealt with also in History items such "intercultural education", "diversity", "solidarity", "globalisation", and "democracy" are rarely mentioned according to the entries in the questionnaires. In contrast, "active promotion of multicultural knowledge, skills and understanding for all, including the study of other cultures in the curriculum" and „support for minority groups" form traditionally part of Civics curricula (Kerr, 1999: 10). Also when it comes to methods trained, History and Civics university programmes show a divided profile. "Classical" hermeneutic methods are always trained in History whereas social theories and methodological tools of the social sciences (quantitative methods, working with statistics) are only sometimes or randomly referred to – and vice versa.

Teachers of Civics are less sure about the specific methodology and core of their subject. Summarising international studies, Torney-Purta/ Richardson/ Barber (2005: 35) contend that "substantial disagreement exists even within a single country about the specific content of

[12] "Historical social science" - the term is a preferred self-definition of the so-called Bielefelder Schule at the History Department of the University of Bielefeld (see Wehler, 1980), but has not been accepted in English speaking historiography where one speaks still of the application of historical methods in the social sciences or of social science approaches in historical research.

civics and social studies." The more diverse the disciplinary structures of Civics courses at university are, the less coherent tend to be the structures of the school curricula. This applies particularly to countries which were in transition from a socialist to a democratic system and where de-politicised social sciences had to be installed on university as well as on school level. As it was expressed by one participant referring to Croatia: The curriculum would look like a "strange collection of different issues". It takes time to give a new subject a fixed structure which is acknowledged by the teachers. In Hungary, for example, new subject clusters (such as „People and Society") were introduced during the reforms of the 1990s implementing an integrated way of teaching History and Civics without providing appropriate textbooks and teacher training.[13] This led to a revision of too radical changes. Hasty and far-reaching reforms, followed by backlashes, contributed to feelings of insecurity within the teachers' body and re-established, to a great extent, in the end the traditional profile of History teaching and left Civics teachers in search for a durable concept of their subject. Kerr et al. (2007) summarising „key findings" of their evaluation of citizenship education in the United Kingdom define, amongst others, the following "main impediments" for effective citizenship education: „the general lack of status and visibility of citizenship education, ... the lack of trained specialist staff, ... competing policy priorities".
Although a participatory approach is widely acknowledged in Civics curricula meanwhile, often neither the curricula nor school management offer practical opportunities to train participation in school democracy nor involvement in community matters. Consequently, an institutional approach remains still the only safe ground for many teachers to teach citizenship education. However, according to Kerr (2006: 21; almost unchanged also in Kerr, 2010: 221) international surveys have shown that "schools that model democratic practices are most effective in promoting civic knowledge and engagement."[14] The description of civics teacher training in the United Kingdom still holds true for the majority of European countries: "There are no easy descriptions of, or generalisations about, citizenship teachers. The variety within the subject, the breath of experience people bring to it and the subject's recent formalisation in the curriculum mean that we are likely to encounter more variation than with other subjects." (Lee/ Hayward/ Young, 2006: 228)

Teachers' reports from schools which adopted an integrated Social Studies/Humanities' curriculum focus on organisational matters (www.history.org.uk/resources/secondary).[15] They do not provide sufficient information regarding the extent to which teachers discussed their different approaches to the theme they teach in a cooperative way. One report states clearly: "There was some confusion over the level of integration ... On the one hand, there was the feeling that integrated humanities meant full integration, and yet on the other hand, the units were organised in such a fashion that the subjects still kept their individuality." (Ibid.) This statement addresses the crux of the matter: can interdisciplinary teaching create a new level of insight into the various aspects of the subject matter which the separate teaching of different disciplines is not able to generate? Is interdisciplinary cooperation just a more efficient way of organising lessons, or does it also bring about more efficient knowledge and learning

[13] Kerr (1999: 20) mentions that only after the new clusters were implemented „some universities are beginning to introduce specific initial training courses for citizenship education."
[14] For a relevant case study see Leung/Yuen (2009).
[15] This is confirmed by German teachers interviewed by Stübig/ Ludweig/ Bosse (2006, S. 81).

strategies on the side of the students? The empirical basis is too small to definitely answer these questions.
Many reports about cross-curricular or inter-disciplinary teaching underscore that it is helpful to start with a thematic approach in order to demonstrate how different disciplines can contribute to explaining a certain phenomenon (Savage, 2011: 16): Inter- or multi-disciplinary teaching "shall revolve around a theme or a centre of interest" (Coulon, 1969: 19). Such an approach comes close to holistic ideas to teaching the Social Studies as developed when the Social Studies curriculum was firstly introduced in the United States almost one century ago (Evans, 1997). "What makes an issues-centred focus the most promising alternative for creation of an interdisciplinary and vital social studies curriculum? Issues are the proper focus for social studies because they pose real-life problems, raise areas of doubt, motivate reflection, stimulate the need to gain knowledge, and highlight problematic areas of culture." (Ibid., p. 200*)* The teachers must be able to reflect on the impact of their own disciplinary point of view: "How do my perceptions about my subject affect my choice of pedagogy and the opportunities for learning that I present to my pupils?" (Savage, 2011: 22)

The same reports underscore problems of assessment. On one hand no assessment criteria for interdisciplinarity were at hand, on the other hand, when students were assessed – obviously according to single subject-oriented criteria -, they scored hardly better than those classes who did not participate in integrated teaching. Furthermore, teachers felt uncomfortable "to deliver lessons in subjects outside of their specialism" (www.history.org.uk/resources/secondary). This proves that new approaches require appropriate initial training or supplementary in-service courses respectively.
Maier (2005) comes to the following conclusions in his study about the implementation of the reformed curriculum in Baden-Württemberg that underscores the need for interdisciplinary work across all subjects[16]: "Integrated curricular units are frequently organized as project-based teaching or group instruction. Teachers favour subjects as fine arts, music or social studies for their interdisciplinary thematic units.[17] Mathematical and scientific topics were neglected for the most part. Another problem is a coherent integration of the disciplinary subtopics to one interdisciplinary perspective. In many cases the only linkage between school subjects is the title of the interdisciplinary thematic unit. Contrary to the educational reform programs for the 'Hauptschule', a real integration of the curriculum has not yet been attained." Researching the same issue, Stübig et al. (2006: pp. 40) report that only a third of all units that were counted as "interdisciplinary" were jointly developed and taught by two teachers. Also in a third of all units, the same theme was taught in two different subjects in parallel. In this case, pupils often neglect in interviews that they have been taught in an interdisciplinary way (Häsing, 2009: 56). This is in accordance with the English Wiki stating that "... the most common complaint regarding interdisciplinary programs, by supporters and detractors alike, is the lack of synthesis - that is, students are provided with multiple disciplinary perspectives, but are not given effective guidance in resolving the conflicts and

[16] His study is based on interviews with teacher students for general secondary schools at the Pedagogical Academy in Schwäbisch Gmünd.
[17] According to Stübig/ Ludwig/ Bosse (2006: 36) interdisciplinary teaching („Fächerübergreifender Unterricht") was performed mostly within the subjects Political Education and Economics ("Politik und Wirtschaft") and History.

achieving a coherent view of the subject." (http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/ Interdisziplinarit %C3%A4t)

Another stumbling block is teachers' fear that pupils do not have appropriate basic knowledge to make connections between different disciplines (Budde, 2011: 74). To meet this challenge, Rabenstein/ Herzmann (2011: 100) recommend firstly, formulating the problem in colloquial language and then comparing the different scientific approaches to the problem. Nevertheless, it seems to be difficult to teach inter-disciplinarity proper on lower secondary level when pupils start to think in disciplinary categories. Rogers, in his plea for an interdisciplinary social studies approach, remarks self-critically: „I am not at all sure at what stage it would be necessary for pupils to be aware of the distinctions between the various disciplines." (Rogers, 1968: 11)

Conclusions

Although History and Civics are connected in most school curricula, and Civics teachers have often studied History as their main discipline, the connection between history and Civics is apparently not so close that interdisciplinarity could be regarded unproblematic and would not need particular courses and institutional support. It is noteworthy that the Eurydice report underscores the close relationship between history and citizenship education[18] but does not refer to the issue of cooperation between the two subjects.

In particular, a closer cooperation between the two subjects could be very productive when it comes to explaining the complexity of the modern world such as migrant- and multi-cultural societies. History teaching addresses migration flows in the past but it seldom discusses the consequences for the receiving societies. Most History textbooks still transmit an image of the 19th/20th century nation-state in which minorities, asylum seekers etc. are almost absent. Yet, the diversity of one's own present society is addressed in Civics lessons leaving the students with the impression that multi-cultural societies are a modern phenomenon their forefathers had not to cope with. Only a comprehensive view bringing together past and current events reveals that the phenomenon has also historical roots but the strategies to cope with it, and the status of minorities as citizens in a modern state changed as compared to the position that they had in a pre-modern, feudal society.
Before engaging in truthful cooperation, however, teachers must have a clear notion of the subjects they want to cooperate with. When first European and world-wide surveys about teaching Civics were conducted in the 1990s, a constant reminder for enhancing the quality of civic education was to strengthen its professional profile. Summarising the findings of international surveys Kerr (1999: 26) states that „The main challenges for citizenship education are to:

- Achieve a clear definition and approach
- Secure its position and status in the curriculum
- Address teacher preparedness and teacher training...".

[18] „European history, culture and literature" is mentioned as one of the broader themes included in European curricula for citizenship education (Citizenship Education, 2012: 30).

Taking into account the various positions allotted to Civics in European curricula one conclusion can be drawn from the results of international surveys: If Civics is not taught as a separate subject but integrated into others, the civic education approach should be made visible and recognisable to the teacher students in their initial training as well as to the pupils in their lessons as a distinct objective requiring specific methodologies. Otherwise, the impact of the reference disciplines will be overwhelming and neither a proper civics nor an interdisciplinary approach will be implemented. Therefore, Kerr et al.(2004) conclude:

- „Ensure, where possible, that CE [Civic Education] learning is delivered in discrete timetable slots and for more than 45 minutes per week“ (p. VII)
- Promote the practice that CE lessons should be developed by the teacher who is delivering the citizenship lessons and not conflated with" other subjects (p. VIII).

More specific university training courses for Civics teachers have been installed since the 1990s, so that the status of Civics as a school subject has been improved considerably in many European countries. In his most recent survey of Civic Education, Kerr formulates the requirements for effective Civics teaching in a more positive manner but he still refers to the issue of clarity and status of the subject:

"Factors ... that underpin the most successful provision of citizenship education in schools and colleges ... include

- a clear and coherent understanding of what citizenship education means;
- high status of citizenship" guaranteed through expert teachers (Kerr, 2010: 215).[19]
-

These requirements can best be met if overlapping areas as well specific content issues and methodological approaches of Civics are defined in reference to the subjects and disciplines which contribute to the study and the teaching of the subject. The interdisciplinary and cross-curricular dimensions of Civics vis-à-vis the established university disciplines and school subjects are fundamental for an understanding of the subject's profile and should actively and expressly be dealt with in initial teacher training instead of taken for granted. Herzmann/ Artmann/ Rabenstein (2011: 28) conclude from their empirical research that the experience of crossing disciplinary borders must be trained and explicitly explained in an interdisciplinary teaching course. Also Torney-Purta/ Richardson/ Barber (2005: 37) stress that „initial teacher preparation programmes might provide student teachers with opportunities to tap relevant background knowledge or explore cross-curricular links.“ To this aim, cooperation between universities, schools, ministries and in-service training institutions should be enhanced. This claim stood already at the beginning of the development of a conceptual framework for teaching Civics in the United Kingdom. In 1968 Vincent Rogers (1968: 6) asked in an effort to give citizenship education more weight in the curriculum „It is possible to interest and involve university scholars – historians, sociologists, political scientist, etc. – in a meaningful way in the work of lower schools? Can really effective curriculum revision be carried out

[19] Kerr contended also in his most recent United Kingdom survey that

„The main challenges for citizenship education are to:

- Achieve a clear definition and approach
- Secure its position and status in the curriculum
- Address teacher preparedness and teacher training...“ (Kerr, 2010a: 26)

without their help.“ Clarifying the status of Civics in relation to other disciplines helps to sharpen its profile. To foster interdisciplinary awareness and competence is a basic requirement for reaching this aim.

References

Alavi, Bettina (2004) *Das Verhältnis von Disziplinarität und Interdisziplinarität in Fächerverbünden der Hauptschule am Beispiel Geschichte,* in: Saskia Handro/ Bernd Schönemann (eds.) *Geschichtsdidaktische Lehrplanforschung. Methoden – Analysen – Perpektiven,* Münster: LIT, pp. 137-149

Artmann, Michaela/ Petra Herzmann/ Kerstin Rabenstein (eds.) (2011) *Zum Zusammenspiel der Fächer – Didaktik, Forschung und Praxis fächerübergreifenden Unterrichts der Sekundarstufe I und II*, Immenhausen bei Kassel: Prolog-Verlag

Becker, Franz Josef E. (1979) *Fachübergreifender Unterricht: Geschichte, Geographie, Politik,* Düsseldorf: Schwann

Bromme, Rainer (2000) *The Psychology of Cognitive Interdisciplinarity*, in: Weingart/Stehr, pp. 115-129

Budde, Jürgen (2011) *Fächerübergreifender Projektunterricht. Lernbezogene und soziale Auswirkungen von geöffnetem Unterricht in der Sekundarstufe I,* in: Artmann/ Herzmann/ Rabenstein, pp. 66-93

Calhoun, Craif/ Diana Rhoten (2000) *Integrating the Social Sciences: theoretical knowledge, methodological tools, and practical applications*, in: Weingart/Stehr, pp. 103-118

Citizenship Education in Europe (2012), Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA P9 Eurydice) http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice (accessed 30 July 2012)

Coulon, Marion (1969) *Values and Limitations of Unidisciplinary Teaching in the Countries of the French Tradition*, in: *Interdisciplinary Studies in Secondary Schools*: Report of the 7th Atlantic Study Conference on Education Organized by the Atlantic Information Centre for Teachers at the Centro Europeo dell'Educazione, Villa Falconieri, Frascati, Italy. 19-25 September, 1968, London: Atlantic Information Centre for Teachers, pp. 14-26

Detjen, Joachim (2007) *Politische Bildung*, München: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag

Evans, Ronald W. (1997) *Teaching Social Issues: Implementing an Issues-Centered Curriculum*, in: Ross (1997), pp. 197-212

Ferber, Christian von/ Hans Albrecht Hesse (1972) *Gedanken zur Curriculum-Planung "Sozialwissenschaften"*, in: *Geschichte und Sozialwissenschaften: ihr Verhältnis im Lehrangebot der Universität und der Schule; Diskussionsbeiträge einer Tagung des Zentrums für Interdisziplinäre Forschung der Universität Bielefeld in Rheda am 30. April und 1. Mai 1971,* ed. Peter Böhning, (Neue Sammlung: Sonderheft 6), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 54-60

Gearon, Liam (ed.) (2006) *Learning to Teach Citizenship in the Secondary School: a companion to school experience*, London: Routledge, 2006; 2nd ed. (2010)

Gies, Horst (1998) *Geschichte, Geschichtslehrer, Geschichtsunterricht: Studien zum historischen Lehren und Lernen in der Schule,* Weinheim : Deutscher Studien-Verlag

Ghisla, Gianni/ Luca Bausch (2006) *Interdisziplinarität: ein Mehrwert für die Disziplinen*, in: *Interdisziplinarität im Unterricht auf der Sekundarstufe II*/ Institut für Gymnasial- und Berufspädagogik, Zürich, ed. Albert Zeyer, Zürich: Verlag. Pestalozzianum, pp. 10-34

Hämmerle, Kathrin/ Günther Sandner/ Hubert Sickinger (2009) *Politische Bildung in der Perspektive von Lehramtsstudierenden*, in: Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft, pp. 357-372

Häsing, Petra (2009) *Fächerübergreifender Unterricht in der gymnasialen Oberstufe aus Sicht der Lehrenden. Eine qualitative Studie*, Kassel, Kassel Univ. Press, quoted *http://www.uni-kassel.de/upress/online/frei/978-3-89958-620-6.volltext.frei.pdf* (accessed 22 July 2012)

Herzmann, Petra/ Michaela Artmann/ Kerstin Rabenstein (2011) *Forschungen zum fächerübergreifenden Unterricht in der Sekundarstufe I und II: Ausgangspunkte, Befunde und Perspektiven*, in: Artmann/ Hermann/ Rabenstein, pp. 23-45

Hodel, Jan/ Monika Waldis (2007) *Was unterscheidet Geschichtsunterricht von politischer Bildung? Erfahrungen bei der Schweizer Videostudie «Geschichte und Politik im Unterricht»,* in: Gesellschaft für Politikdidaktik und politische Jugend- und Erwachsenenbildung (GPJE) (ed.) *Wirkungsforschung zur politischen Bildung im europäischen Vergleich,* Schwalbach: Wochenschau Verlag, pp. 61–79.

Janz, Bruce B. (1999) *Transdisciplinarity as a Model of Post/Disciplinarity,* quoted from http://pegasus.cc.ucf.edu/~janzb/papers/transdisciplinarity.pdf

Lee, Jerome/ Jeremy Hayward/ Helen Young (2006) *Professional Development in Citizenship Education*, in: Gearon (2006), pp. 227-245

Kerr, David/ Joana Lopes/ Julie Nelson et al. (2007) *Vision versus Pragmatism: citizenship in the secondary school curriculum in England, Research summary*, http://www.nfer.ac.uk/nfer/publications/CEE04/CEE04_home.cfm?

publicationID=265&title=Vision%20versus%20pragmatism:%20citizenship%20in%20the%20secondary%20school%20curriculum%20in%20England (accessed 30 July 2012)

Kerr, David et al. (2004) *Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study: Second Annual Report. First Longitudinal Survey. Making Citizenship Education Real,* Research Report RR531, quoted https://www.education.gov.uk/publications//eOrderingDownload/RR531.pdf (accessed 22 July 2012)

Kerr, David (2010) *Research in Citizenship: International, European and National*, in: Gearon (2010), pp. 214-229

Kerr, David (2006) *Citizenship: Local, National and International*, in: Gearon (2006), pp. 5-27

Kerr, David (1999) *Citizenship Education: an International Comparison,* London: QCA

Lawton, Denis (1968) *The Contribution of Sociology to the Teaching of the Social Sciences*, in: *The Social Sciences in Secondary and Further Education,* pp. 7-13

Leung, Yan Wing/ Timothy Wai Wa Yuen (2009) *Participatory Citizenship and Student Empowerment: Case Study of a Hong Kong School*, in: International Journal. Citizenship Teaching and Learning, 5 (1): 18-34

Maier, Uwe (2005) *Formen und Probleme von fächerübergreifendem Unterricht an baden-württembergischen Hauptschulen,* in: Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung 7, 1, quoted from http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs060130 (accessed 22 July 2012)

Mittelstrass, Jürgen (2001) *On Transdisciplinarity*, in: *Science and the Future of Mankind,* Vatican City: Pontifical Academy of Sciences, pp. 495-500, quoted from http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_academies/acdscien/documents/sv%2099%285of5%29.pdf (accessed 10 May 2012)

Nicolescu, Basarab (1998) *Gödelian Aspects of Nature and Knowledge*, in: *Systems: New Paradigms for the Human Sciences* , eds. G. Altmann/ W. Koch, Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 385-403, quoted from: http://perso.club-internet.fr/nicol/ciret/bulletin/b12/b12c3.htm (accessed 10 May 2012)

Oliver, Donald/ James Shaver (1972) *Politische Fallstudien-Didaktik und ihr Stellenwert innerhalb der Social Studies*, in: Antonius Holtmann (ed.) *Das sozialwissenschaftliche Curriculum in der Schule*, Opladen: Leske, pp. 155-173 (English ed. *Jurisprudential Teaching and Prospects for the Social Studies,* in: Oliver/Shaver: *Teaching Public Issues in the High-School*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966, pp. 228-242)

Rabenstein, Kerstin/ Petra Herzmann (2011) *Fächerübergreifender Unterricht in der gymnasialen Oberstufe. Zur Notwendigkeit der Reflexion von Fachperspektiven*, in: Artmann/ Herzmann/ Rabenstein, pp. 95-111

Rogers, Vincent (1968) *Approaching the Social Sciences: the picture in the United Kingdom*, in: *The Social Sciences in Secondary and Further Education*. pp. 1-6.

Ross, E. Wayne (ed.) (1997) *The Social Studies Curriculum: purposes, problems, and possibilities*, Albany: State University of New York Press

Ross, E. Wayne (1997a) *The Struggle for the Social Studies Curriculum,* in: Ross (1997), pp. 3-19

Savage, Jonathan (2011) *Cross-curricular Teaching and Learning in the Secondary School,* London: Routledge

Stübig, Frauke/ Peter H. Ludwig/ Dorit Bosse (2008) *Problemorientierte Lehr-Lern-Arrangements in der Praxis. Eine empirische Untersuchung zur Organisation und Gestaltung fächerübergreifenden Unterrichts*, in: Zeitschrift für Pädagogik, 54 (3), pp. 376-395, http://www.pedocs.de/volltexte/2011/4357/pdf/ZfPaed_2008_3_Stuebig_Ludwig_Bosse_Problemorientierte_LehrLernArrangements_Praxis_D_A.pdf (accessed 22 July 2012)

Stübig, Frauke et al. (2006) *Bestandsaufnahme zur Praxis fächerübergreifenden Unterrichts in der gymnasialen Oberstufe im Bundesland Hessen*, Kassel: kassel university press, 139, 12 quoted from http://www.uni-kassel.de/upress/online/frei/978-3-89958-229-1.volltext.frei.pdf (accessed 22 July 2012)

The Social Sciences in Secondary and Further Education (1968), Four papers given at a conference held at the University of York by the Association for the Teaching of the Social Sciences and the General Studies Association, August 1967, London: Longmans

Thompson, Julie (2010) *A Taxonomy of Interdisciplinarity*, in*: The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity*, ed. Julie Thompson Klein, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 15-30

Torney-Purta, Judith/ Wendy Klandl Richardson/ Carolyn Henry Barber (2005) *Teachers' Educational Experience and Confidence in Relation to Students' Civic Knowledge across Countries,* in: citized. International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education, 1 (1): 32-57 http://www.citized.info/pdf/ejournal/vol_1_no_1.pdf (accessed 30 July 2012)

Weidinger, Dorothea (1999) *Die Situation des Politikunterrichts in der Schule,* in: *Handbuch politische Bildung,* ed. Wolfgang Sander, Schwalbach/Taunus: Wochenschau Verlag, 2nd ed., 501-518

Weingart, Peter (2000) *Interdisciplinarity: The Paradoxical Discourse*, in: Weingart/ Stehr, pp. 5- 41

Peter Weingart/ Nico Stehr (eds.) (2000) *Practising Interdisciplinarity*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press

Wehler, Hans Ulrich (1980) *Historische Sozialwissenschaft und Geschichtsschreibung. Studien zu Aufgaben und Traditionen deutscher Geschichtswissenschaft,* Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Rupprecht

Wellensiek, Anneliese/ Hans-Bernhard Petermann (eds.) (2002) *Interdisziplinäres Lehren und Lernen in der Lehrerbildung. Perspektiven für innovative Ausbildungskonzepte*, Weinheim: Beltz

With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme (KA1) of the European Union.