

Summary

The motivation for my research was my personal teaching experience in the subject of history. In this context, I frequently observed students reproducing marked distinctions whenever historical contents were particularly relevant to them, yet not addressed in history lessons (here: The Ottoman Empire). However, history lessons are institutionally intended as a space for the joint historical learning and thinking of all participating students. The observed gap between the intentions of the institution, on the one hand, and the relevance for students, on the other, has been the starting point for my work.

Based on my observations, I assumed that student perspectives are not sufficiently taken into account in the institutional teaching of history. However, in order for all students to be able to relate school contents relevant to personal and social concern and everyday life (Jeismann 2000; Gautschi/Hodel/Utz 2009), contents relevant to the students (here: The Ottoman Empire) should also be addressed in history lessons. A history class that intending to relate to the experiences, concepts and knowledge of all students must take into account all students' reality of life, which is, in late modernity, the continuous reality of migration (Mecheril 2016).

The students' conceptions of the Ottoman Empire therefore formed the core object of my research. In historical-didactic discourse, the students' conceptions are regarded as the starting point for historical learning, which enables the "Verstehen der im Geschichtsunterricht behandelten historischen Sachverhalte" (Günther-Arndt 2006, p. 274). Thus, learning in history lessons can be understood as the development, change and modification of conceptions into "Auschnitt[en] aus dem Universum des Historischen" (Gautschi 2011, p. 49). This leads to the conclusion that addressing the content of the Ottoman Empire can also lead to the construction of meaning through time experience (Rüsen 1997). For my object of research, this raises the following questions: what knowledge do students have about the Ottoman Empire? Is this content addressed in history lessons and its media, and how is this done? In addition, the focus is on the accordance or mismatch between (as individually habitualized structure) and institutionally regulated contents.

Based on these preliminary considerations I generated my research questions, these in turn relating to the institution of school, on the one hand, and the reality of migration society, on the other. The resulting accordances and mismatch between society, institution and the individual have shaped the framework for my analysis, leading to an innovative approach for the *theoretical part*.

Starting with the connection between school and educational inequality from a socio-educational, sociolinguistic and socio-cultural perspective (e.g. Bourdieu 1982), the emphasis was placed on the subject of history teaching with its core dimensions of historical consciousness as a mental (Jeismann 2000) and historical culture as a collective (Rüsen 1995) system. It was followed by a discussion of the core competence of history teaching, narrativity as historical narrative (Barricelli 2005). Historical narrative and the formation of a historical identity (Meyer-Hamme 2008) was also a part of the analysis. The comparative view of history teaching from the perspective of migration pedagogy and the so-called intercultural perspective was also central. In further concretization the discourse of textbook research and the consideration of migration-related reality were also discussed. Analogously, the discussion on students' conception as a significant part of migration-related reality was also included. The theoretical part was concluded by a scientific discussion of selected topics concerning the Ottoman Empire.

Thus, the framework of the analysis required an interdisciplinary consideration of three theoretical discourses: history didactics and science, sociolinguistics (Brizić 2007; Morek/Heller 2012) and migration pedagogy (Mecheril 2004, 2016; Heinemann/Dirim 2016). It is only through this interdisciplinarity that the connection between society, institution and the individual can be viewed from a perspective that is critical of power and difference in order to analyze accordances and mismatches.

The empirical part of the work comprises a pre-study (substudy A) and a two-part main study (substudy B and C). With the pre-study the explorative development of a new research field was made possible by means of guided interviews. In the main study first, institutional guidelines were collected followed by the students' conception through guided interviews and group discussion. Therefore, *Substudy A* represents the first scientific approach to the research of student conceptions of the Ottoman Empire. The inductive approach enabled the development of categories from the interviews which resulted in the topic areas for the planning of the main study.

Within the framework of *Substudy B* a descriptive review of the core curricula used in North Rhine-Westphalia followed by a frequency analysis of selected history textbooks at secondary education level I and II was carried out. The core curricula were reviewed at a structural and content level. At the structural level it appeared that the core curricula of secondary education level I predominantly use a chronological structuring principle whereas the core curricula of secondary education level II mostly structure the contents according to a diachronic longitudinal section. The content review of the core curricula revealed that the

Ottoman Empire is not mentioned in secondary education level I at all. In secondary education level II it only appears in content field 2. The results show that

- on a structural level an openness of the core curricula to the Ottoman Empire needs multi-perspective structuring principles and
- on the level of content, a religiously marked image of the Ottoman Empire is constructed. The concepts *Ottoman Empire*, *Islam*, *Muslims* are hardly differentiated so that it can lead to an order of difference between *we* (Christianity) and *non-we* (Islam).

For the frequency analysis two categories of terms were generated and the chapter on World War I was selected from competence-oriented history textbooks. The frequency of terms was considered for the individual chapters, the respective stages of education and cross educational stages. The results of the analysis of the cross educational review of textbooks show i.e. that the terms from category 1 are found more frequently in secondary education level II books and the terms from category 2 in secondary education level I books. From these results it can be concluded that

- it is hardly possible to address the concept of nations in lower secondary schools
- but the analyzed chapter offers reasons for the reception of both categories of terms.

Substudy C allowed a reconstructive-hermeneutic exploration of individual (individual interviews) and collective (group discussion) knowledge structures about the Ottoman Empire. The group discussion served as a central tool.

In both interaction constellations the subjective concept of Islam plays a central role in the construction of conceptions about the Ottoman Empire in its historical context and its position in the students' reality. The concept of Islam is used to justify social structures and contexts and as a strategy for legitimizing the own conceptions. In contrast to the individual interviews, in the group discussion the dynamics of the interaction enables a construction of the conceptions in a comparative way almost consistently. For this purpose, the students were using the topos '*Everything was better back then*'. It is also noticeable that the group discussion reproduced positions and attributions that are marked more strongly by society.

The central results of the group discussion are dichotomous superordinate concepts (perpetrator-victim concept, then-today concept, positive-negative concept, power-weakness concept), which the students construct their conceptions on. These superordinate concepts extend the so-called basic concepts

(“rich/poor” and “up/down”) that exist in the didactics of history and enable students’ conceptions to be analyzed with regards to social affiliations and differences. The perpetrator-victim concept in particular is used by students to produce concepts of social difference that they often assume to be legitimate and only question critically to a limited extent.

Through a formal reconstruction and discourse-structuring steps of the documentary method negative and positive horizons could be worked out in which the overarching concepts are reflected. It is shown that the students use the positive-negative concept in a negative horizon to construct the role of Muslims in contemporary society. This construction is based, among other things, on the collective guilt of Muslims who are attributed as ‘uneducated’. At many points the discourse among students it becomes apparent that the group of Muslims or foreigners and the group of non-Muslims is mainly produced on the basis of a subjective concept of Islam and thus, in the words of Messerschmidt (2014), the socially produced disposition of descent comes into play.

With extending the analytical perspective by functional reconstruction it was possible to analyze the purpose of the linguistic actions of the students’ conceptions. It becomes apparent that the students* realize the reference to collective knowledge and common frames of orientation as well as the focusing, restructuring and expansion of collective knowledge through operative particles. The fact that the conceptions are homologous experiential backgrounds and subjunctive knowledge becomes clear through the use of pragmatic quantifications. Their conceptions of the then-today concept are verbalized through time deixis. It becomes clear that time-wise the students can only orient themselves from their collective space of action. Interestingly, the use of personal deixis which can be interpreted as a social difference marker stands out. The personal deixis ‘we’ is used to produce the group of Muslims or foreigners which is juxtaposed in opposition to the socially legitimate group of non-Muslims or ‘*German-influenced persons*’.

It was only through the intertwining of the documentary method (Bohnsack 2007) and the language-theoretical approach of Functional Pragmatics (Ehlich/Rehbein 1986) that precisely these concepts could be worked out. On the basis of the students’ internal statements the concepts of *Islam*, *religion*, *nationalism* and *ethnicity*, i.a. could be reconstructed. The concepts are transferred from the present into the past without reflection and are thus shaped subjectively. At the center of the explanations is an undifferentiated reference to the present.

This analytical perspective allows for the reconstruction of subjunctive frames of orientation and knowledge of action on the Ottoman Empire to uncover those schemas and practices which in Mecheril’s words produce natio-ethno-cultu-

rally and religiously coded mechanisms of attribution and distinguish between a 'we' and a 'non-we'. Results from the analysis of the procedures and linguistic actions show that in the group discussion the students negotiate their knowledge structures in the form of sentences and maxims by repeatedly discussing social presuppositions.

My work provides implications on the importance of interdisciplinarity in research that can be derived from the theoretical, methodological and empirical part. Through the theoretical framework the relevance of interdisciplinarity becomes clear, especially for the analysis of accordances and mismatches which arises from the mesh of society, institution, the individual and can be made useful for all subject didactics. Moreover, it becomes clear that migration education must be considered as a cross-sectional field of work. The methodological interweaving has proven to be suitable for the reconstruction of individual and collective student conceptions. The reconstructed superordinate concepts can create a reflexive space for all students and therefore make a history lesson that is critical of power and differences possible.

The results of my research illustrate the relevance of follow-up studies critical of power and difference for historical-didactic discourse.