

Inclusive Historical Knowledge: Concepts of History Education Lacking in Special Needs Schools

Domain-Specific Knowledge for History Education

In recent decades various strands of discourse in history education have dealt intensively with the question of knowledge for historical learning.¹ These strands could be bundled around the buzzword »powerful knowledge«. ² However, the terms *second-order concepts* and *core concepts* used in earlier stages of this debate are also relevant.³

This paper – anchored in the German-language discourse – begins by looking at different types of knowledge for historical learning and proceeds to address the question which types of knowledge characterize school curricula in Austria. I first discuss whether or not an inclusive historical knowledge can be identified and, if so, how to frame it. In doing so, I use a broad notion of *inclusion*: that is, I consider various forms of diversity. I conclude with a case study comparing the curricula for teaching history at Austrian general compulsory schools and special needs schools, focusing on the relationship between history education and special needs education. In this paper I make a proposal for the establishment of an inclusive historical knowledge in the school curricula, highlighting the problem of the on-going unequal treatment of Austrian students at special needs schools in comparison to general compulsory schools.

What is Knowledge? Approaches to Different Types of Knowledge

The common understanding of the term knowledge is typically shaped by everyday ideas, lacking clarity and precision. Even in educational contexts this term often remains ambiguous. For example, some people claim that students today »don't know anything anymore« or that too little knowledge is being taught. When it comes to the teaching of history, the

1 This contribution is strongly based on my work already published in German (Kühberger 2020) and extending it with specific case studies relating to curricula at general compulsory schools (Allgemeinbildende Pflichtschule/ ABS) with those of Special Needs Schools (*Sonderschulen*) in Austria.

2 See Young 2009; Nordgren 2017; Chapman 2021.

3 See Bruner 1960; Lee 2005; Kühberger 2021.

criticism is that students no longer learn dates, facts and straightforward narratives about the past.⁴ However, this simplistic view disregards of course the rich academic discussions about the nature of knowledge. In fact, various theoretical models have been developed in the field of knowledge psychology that provide a precise and systematic way to classify different types of knowledge, enabling learning processes to be structured more effectively. These models enable educators to structure learning processes more effectively, identifying which specific areas of knowledge are needed for subject-specific thinking.⁵

Ryle defines three types of knowledge: declarative knowledge (›knowing that‹), strategic knowledge (›knowing how‹) and metacognitive knowledge (›knowing why‹).⁶ Anderson and Krathwohl distinguish between factual knowledge, conceptual knowledge, procedural knowledge and metacognitive knowledge (Table 1).⁷ Of course, there is some overlap among these models. However, each systematization identifies the central dimensions of knowledge and allows us to see what they have in common.

Different waves in history education and in educational policy have drawn on various aspects of these models,⁸ reflecting the diverse intentions and goals attributed to the teaching of history. In recent decades, a notable tension has emerged between content orientation and skill or competence orientation.⁹ Content-oriented approaches present a historical account as a master narrative, while competence-oriented approaches focus on case studies to examine processes of historical thinking, enabling learners to acquire a critical approach to understanding the nature of history.¹⁰ This tension often leads to a hybrid orientation in school curricula for history learning, where traditional approaches to teaching have not been set aside and coexist alongside newer ones. The acquisition of critical historical thinking is linked to content that is not infrequently oriented towards cultural, often national, ideas about the present. However, it should be noted that when dealing with the past and history, different types of knowledge are needed to understand historical reconstructions (i.e., history)¹¹ and, ideally, to deconstruct them, as well as to produce one's own historical representation (i.e., history).

4 For Germany, see Schulze Wessel 2016 or for Austria, see Helmberger 2015.

5 Fischer/Wecker 2006, 65–66. See, for example, Ryle 1948; Anderson et al. 2001.

6 Ryle 1948; Gautschi 2009, 20; Gautschi 2009, 69; Fiebig 2013, 204.

7 Anderson/Krathwohl (eds.) 2001; Kühberger 2012b.

8 See Kühberger 2012a; Ammert 2015.

9 In Austria, empirical studies have shown that not all history teachers in lower secondary schools have implemented the transition from content-oriented teaching to a skills- or competence-oriented teaching. Older, experienced male teachers in particular tend to reject a skill or competence orientation. See Kipman/Kühberger 2020, 92f. For the changing international debate, see Ercikan/Seixas 2015.

10 Bernhardt et al. 2012, 104–105.

11 On »reconstruction«, see Körber 2011, 146.

<p>Factual knowledge</p> <p>Factual knowledge is about easily definable pieces of information. However, it is impossible, even for experts, to acquire and retain all elements of factual knowledge. This type of knowledge includes terminological knowledge and knowledge about specific details, such as dates, growth rates and historical relationships.</p>
<p>Conceptual knowledge</p> <p>Conceptual knowledge is a more complex and organized type of knowledge that focuses on concepts, models and theories. It represents abstract elements of knowledge. For example this concept clarifies the ideal typical elements of revolutions, but it does not refer to specific instances of revolution, such as the 1905 Russian Revolution, which would be classified as factual knowledge.</p>
<p>Procedural knowledge</p> <p>Procedural knowledge is about the performance of specific skills, techniques and methods. It includes, for example, the knowledge of a specific method for dealing with historical sources. This type of knowledge includes knowledge of how to use subject-specific methods.</p>
<p>Metacognitive knowledge</p> <p>Metacognitive knowledge is knowledge about cognitive processes of thinking, perceiving and understanding. Reflection on knowledge and its use is a kind of strategic knowledge or knowledge about oneself.</p>

Tab. 1: Types of knowledge according to Anderson and Krathwohl (see Kühberger 2014, 23).

Michele Barricelli's definition of historical knowledge encompasses the fine-grained typologies derived from the psychology of knowledge. He follows a narrativist theory of history and emphasizes the narrative character of history without elaborating on the types of knowledge necessary to realize history: »Historical knowledge is [...] always narrative knowledge, i.e. it is always in the form of a narrative, i.e. a linguistic construct that meaningfully connects previously related facts (>events<) in a particular way.«¹² It is nevertheless important not to neglect the specific dimensions of knowledge.

Which Historical Knowledge?

Discussions repeatedly arise about which historical content is to be taught and about whether there is a canon of historical knowledge. In the call for a canon, one can recognize the desire to order, determine and pass on a crucial stock of narrative knowledge to the next generation.¹³ This is nothing other than the outdated nineteenth-century concept of encyclopedic knowledge and the tradition of preserving knowledge through schooling. The concept of canonized historical knowledge itself assumes that bodies of knowledge have a lasting validity. However, this is impossible. Bodo von Borries has shown that even well-researched historical

¹² Barricelli 2008, 7.

¹³ Greyer/Stuurman (eds.) 2007; Ammerer 2012.

questions of the French Revolution have been interpreted very differently, illustrating the problem of canonizing knowledge.¹⁴ Historical knowledge is after all a complex, changing and contradictory entity in need of constant revision. It is not a *transferable good*, but the result of a social construction – even in the classroom.¹⁵

History education is increasingly dealing with different types of knowledge as it focuses on moments that touch on the domain-specific organization of learning. Susanne Popp, for example, speaks of ›orientation knowledge‹, a concept that sharply contrasts with ›classical‹ canonical knowledge. This type of knowledge provides orientation for »elementary classifications and the development of contexts«. Orientation knowledge

»should, on the one hand, be organized in relation to epochs and, on the other hand, represent fewer collections of ›canonical‹ individual terms (in the sense of detailed knowledge, such as ›important places‹, dates, people, events) than a coarse-meshed, temporally structured, and rudimentarily systematic ›conceptual network‹ that [...] can become useful as a frame of reference for classifying new information.«¹⁶

Popp describes this knowledge as an ›instrument‹ with which newly acquired information can be processed and contexts can be developed.¹⁷ This approach, which is based on a Dutch concept,¹⁸ supports a general educational understanding of historical learning processes that follows a chronological structure of history teaching in order to integrate all epochs as far as possible. It does not aim at teaching formal or constantly recurring patterns, as is typical in historical thinking, but focuses on epoch-specific historical knowledge that students should retain from history classes as a »residual«¹⁹ in order for them to be able to orient themselves in different historical epochs. Ideal-typical characteristics of an epoch are thereby condensed into ›distinguishing characteristics‹ that provide a frame of reference for history learning.²⁰

»As, for example, in the time of monks and knights: students should know that at that time it was about the spread of Christianity in Europe, the rise of Islam, the emergence of feudalism, and the autarkic system of lords and serfs.«²¹

14 Borries 2012, 21–22.

15 Fischer/Wecker 2006, 66.

16 Popp 2009, 653.

17 Popp 2009, 654.

18 Popp 2006.

19 Counsel 2000, 66.

20 Wilschut 2009.

21 Wilschut 2009, 638.

Similar to the conception of orientational knowledge is Michael Sauer's temporal-chronological orientational knowledge, which help students classify case studies of history learning.²² A critical position towards a canonically structured ›orientational knowledge‹ is taken by Maria Galda, who argues that it is based on the unquestioned acquisition of certain given historical facts. Following Gilbert Ryle, however, she states:

»If orientation knowledge is seen rather as an accumulation of the perspectives of factual knowledge (›knowing that‹) with strategic knowledge (›knowing how‹) under the increased emphasis of metacognitive knowledge (›knowing why‹), then orientation knowledge means knowing how to orient oneself with history. This goes hand in hand with the knowledge of the constructional character of history, which consequently cannot be a canon, as a canon is a construct of itself. Based on the cognitive psychology term meta-knowledge (also second-order knowledge or control knowledge), orientation knowledge can be used to describe knowledge about how history works.«²³

Galda's position is therefore highly compatible with considerations that have been developed in the Anglo-American discourse on history learning²⁴ and in the German-speaking discourse on civic and history learning linked to conceptual knowledge.²⁵ Such an approach sees historical thinking as the primary goal of history teaching and questions the disproportionate emphasis on subject-specific knowledge.

However, the focus of orientation knowledge is not on the *case knowledge* or actual knowledge students need when encountering specific historical situations, but on domain-specific ›intelligent knowledge‹²⁶ that can be applied by the students independently to a variety of (ideally) unanticipated situations outside the contexts taught in the classroom.²⁷ The focus then is on students learning domain-specific concepts independent of the case study that are essential to historical thinking and can be transferred between different cases. These fundamental concepts can be called *basic concepts* or *central domain-specific concepts*.²⁸ They are structuring and formative for a specific domain, quite similar to what science didactics has previously done.²⁹

22 Sauer 2009, 54–55; see also Erdmann 2012. Sauer considers timelines as the appropriate methodological tool to achieve this.

23 Galda 2013, 42.

24 Lee 2005, 31–77; Seixas/Morton 2013.

25 Sander 2007, 19–24; Weißeno et al. 2009; Kühberger 2010, 43–59; Kühberger 2012b.

26 Weinert 1998, 115.

27 Popp 2009, 647.

28 Kühberger 2023.

29 Kühberger 2012b, 39; Demuth et al. 2005; Nachreiner 2015; Nerdel 2017, 19.

Concepts of historical thinking, I would argue, can be categorized in three sets:³⁰

1. *Epistemic basic concepts* reflect on how historical knowledge arises and provide insights into how to understand the past and history. They serve to establish and develop a student's ability to reflect critically on history. Epistemic basic concepts include *perspective, constructivity, selection* and *evidence*.
2. *Historical basic concepts* support the processes of meaning creation through the experience of time. Its central concept of *time* as it is used in historical thinking is structured by understanding *points in time, courses of time* and *divisions of time*.
3. *Basic societal concepts* reflect the interrelationships of human coexistence. These concepts (pre)shape and structure perceptions, interpretations of and judgments on the historical. Basic societal concepts include, for example, *power, norms, distribution, agency, communication*, among others.

These concepts, however, should not be understood as an academically oriented deduction from the top down, but rather as basic points of orientation that mediate between students' pre-concepts (prior knowledge, prior understanding) and the demands of historical learning as an academic subject.³¹

In addition to these structural considerations, however, *case knowledge* is always necessary in history teaching to enable students to think about specific case studies in a balanced and informed way. This working knowledge can be related to occasions and topics related to individual cases, which allows students to engage in mental processes of historical thinking on a specific case.

Although this is an important basis, working knowledge should not be conflated with *factual knowledge* or *outline knowledge (lexicon knowledge)*, which, once acquired, is permanently accessible to the student:

»Working knowledge is, therefore, of a quality that exhibits situational effectiveness and makes a competent examination of clearly outlined thematic parts of the past possible. This means that working knowledge cannot be clearly and universally defined (»canon of knowledge«), as it depends on the question posed in the lesson as to which bodies of knowledge need to be created, activated or expanded.«³²

Working knowledge, which is made available to the students in learning situations for further use, cannot be constantly reproduced.

30 Kühberger 2012b, 51–58; Kühberger 2016a, 25.

31 Massing 2015, 229; Kühberger 2016a, 23.

32 Kühberger 2015, 91.

Is There Any Inclusive Historical Knowledge?

In Austria the national curriculum is the normative basis of historical knowledge to be taught in history classes – here understood as the sum of the various types of knowledge listed in the document.³³ It regulates detailed aspects of conceptual knowledge (i.e., core concepts like ›power‹, ›perspective‹, ›time‹, etc.) and procedural knowledge (e.g., historical thinking skills) to be acquired. The national curriculum also has a significant influence on the production of textbooks as well as on societal perceptions of the past through compulsory education. However, as history is always selective, perspectival and particular, there is the persistent question as to »how in each case decisions are made about the choice of topics and interpretations, which influence types and content of the desired knowledge.«³⁴ Curricula also function in democracies as guardians of politically legitimized historical knowledge. Consequently they must always be subjected to a critique of power – not least in order to avoid discrimination but also to ensure their sensitivity toward a diverse society: Which historical knowledge is privileged? Who is not part of this historical knowledge? Which narratives are missing? Who decides? And other questions. Curriculum development must also be evaluated in terms of who its *gatekeepers* are and how much power they have. The outcomes of the negotiations and compromises in the curriculum development process should be critically questioned in relation to different categories of diversity.³⁵

In societies that are characterized by migration, it is particularly important to reflect on how historical knowledge is taught in history classes. In a fast-changing society in which people of different social and cultural backgrounds live together and share their experiences, there is little place for the so-called desirable knowledge which perpetuates a Western perspective. For over a century, Western societies have followed a *parade of civilizations* approach to history education. In an evolutionist approach civilizations emerge and are then replaced by others in a kind of linear sequence. The European *master narrative* defines the sequence as beginning in Ancient Egypt, followed by Ancient Greece, the Roman Empire, then the European Middle Ages, the Renaissance, European Empires, and so on. However, this master narrative ignores the prehistoric dispersal of humankind and its flourishing in civilizations around the world. A dominant Eurocentric narrative strand has been created and maintained, which serves to continuously marginalize and exclude non-European cultures and regions.³⁶ A critique of this narrative of a spatial preference for Europe and of Eurocentric terms (e.g. the Middle Ages) needs to play a greater role in the classroom, as does a discussion about the agencies of different societal groups: »Whoever examines age groups, migration processes, gender relations,

33 See BGBl., Jg. 2008, Teil II, 18.5.2016, 113. Verordnung der Bundesministerin für Bildung und Frauen, mit der die Verordnung über die Lehrpläne der Hauptschulen, die Verordnung über die Lehrpläne der Neuen Mittelschulen sowie die Verordnung über die Lehrpläne der allgemeinbildenden höheren Schulen geändert werden.

34 Borries 2012, 13 [translated by the author]; see Fina 1969.

35 Empirical insights for Germany can be found in Barsch 2024 and for Austria in Kühberger 2016b.

36 Schisster 2005, 36.

ownership structures brings completely different actors into play.«³⁷ For instance, in history textbooks nineteenth century workers are often portrayed as part of an underclass in a society experiencing a social ascent:

»When speaking of ›the poor‹ of the nineteenth century, textbooks mainly use categories such as poverty, toil, dirt and misery. Everyday life is set in an earthly vale of tears, showing the misery of others to elevate [...] the present over a darker past. This is an expressive image within the framework of every master narrative of ›progress‹, be it of leftist (Marxist-Leninist or social democratic), rightist, or liberal provenance.«³⁸

In this portrayal, social romanticism and social voyeurism are often intertwined.³⁹ To address this issue, it is essential to adopt the paradigm of *post-colonial studies* and ask which social groups are addressed in history lessons (*Who is allowed to speak?*). How social groups are spoken about in historical narratives shapes the cultural knowledge passed on to next generations.⁴⁰ This is illustrated by the role of gender in history teaching, which has been an issue since the 1970s. While there has been considerable progress, particularly since the second women's movement,⁴¹ the place of women in history teaching is by no means secure. It can be threatened by biased structural representations of the past and by historical narratives focusing one-sidedly on ›great men‹.⁴² Other aspects of diversity, such as those explored in *queer history*⁴³ or *disability history*,⁴⁴ are even less likely to be included in the body of knowledge of German-speaking countries. There are often still taboos towards the ›other‹, which must be overcome if inclusive historical knowledge is to be implemented in an open democratic society.⁴⁵ An intersectional perspective on the past and history – that is, a perspective that does not analyze isolated categories of difference but rather their interrelatedness – still needs to be established.⁴⁶ This unbalanced treatment of categories of difference in the historical narratives of history education can be countered by reflection on power structures in historical knowledge and its media in history teaching. A knowledge system is, after all, based on disputable understandings of social reality and on the »historical traditions of those who contributed to this system in the past and shape it in the present«.⁴⁷

37 Borries 2012, 16.

38 Sieder 1997, 15–16.

39 Kühberger 2004, 19.

40 Spivak 2007.

41 Borries 2013; Bennewitz 2016; Harding 2008; Harding 2015.

42 Windischbauer 2012.

43 Lücke 2015.

44 Barsch 2016.

45 Haydn et al. 2015, 210; Rupp/Freeman 2015.

46 Walgenbach 2014.

47 Schissler 1993, 10.

The Same Historical Knowledge for All?

The question arises whether all students should acquire the same historical knowledge in the same depth. Selective school systems already separate students into different groups who then attend different types of schools with different curricula (external differentiation) and thus determine who needs to acquire what (historical) knowledge. This stratification of the student population has negative social effects, but the threads of discourse in German history education from the 1970s calling for an emancipatory knowledge for the *underprivileged strata* were not systematically pursued. Indeed, the debate has been largely marginalized or even lost for history education in the twenty-first century.⁴⁸

Given institutional differentiation, the question of how to deal with different learning paces, capacities and performances in heterogeneous learning groups (*internal differentiation*) becomes more pertinent. Assigning learning materials to students with special needs that differ in content from those offered to other students is problematic, as it would promote cultural exclusion by depriving a priori those students of access to knowledge. Nevertheless, not all learning objects appears to be equally suitable for all types of students. However, mechanisms of exclusion can be minimized by differentiating content according to student interests, for example, by giving students the opportunity to select the case studies to be worked on. This would allow different perspectives in terms of gender, ethnicity, sexuality, among others to be taken into account (see Georgi/Musenbergs 2020). In addition, learning opportunities can be created that allow students to learn at their own pace. A didactically appropriate reduction of the number of case studies would also be useful, provided that historical events and contexts – often based on a content orientation – are not reduced in such a way that they have no benefit for critical historical thinking and the »zone of proximal development«⁴⁹ is prevented rather than promoted. It is therefore crucial to ensure that the subject matter is not altered in a way that reduces the complexity of the learning object.⁵⁰

Austrian Curricula for Historical Learning at General Compulsory Schools and Special Needs Schools

A comparison of aspects of the curricula for *general compulsory schools* (*Allgemeinbildende Pflichtschule*) from 2016 with those of *special needs schools* (*Allgemeine Sonderschule*) from 2008 – grades 5 to 8 – in Austria would be useful to find out how these types of schools cope with the challenges discussed above. Three examples illustrate these differences.

The curriculum for special needs school claims to follow a domain-specific competence orientation (see first example below). However, only superficial guidance is provided, and

48 Kuhn 1997, 30–31.

49 See Vygotskij 1987.

50 Musenbergs 2015, 209; Anwar 1994, 149–150; Lehner 2012.

the details on how to apply this mode of teaching, which are given in the curriculum of the *general compulsory school*, are not included. It can be reasonably assumed that the intent of the Austrian ministry of education is not to demotivate special education teachers without training in history teaching. However, the consequence is that the crucial importance of procedural knowledge in teaching history, such as knowing how to analyze historical narratives or sources, is ignored. Unfortunately, historical thinking was intentionally left out of the curriculum for special needs schools. This policy decision is misguided, as historical thinking is possible on different levels.

This finding is in line with the observation that all parts of the *general compulsory school curriculum on the nature of history* have been ignored in recommendations for special need schools.

Special needs schools	General compulsory schools
<p>»Lessons in history and social sciences/civic education deal with past, present and future perspectives.</p> <p>It therefore makes an important contribution to the orientation of pupils in time and space and to finding their identity in a pluralistic society. Particular attention should be paid to teaching historical and political skills.«⁵¹</p>	<p>»Lessons in history and social sciences/civic education deal with past, present and future perspectives, in particular in connection with human coexistence.</p> <p>It thus makes an important contribution to students' orientation in time and space, to critically reflect on finding their identity in a pluralistic society and to the development of independent historical and political thinking and acting.«⁵²</p>

Tab. 2: First example.

The *general compulsory school curriculum's* linkage of procedural knowledge with conceptual knowledge is also lacking (see second example below). Instead, the *special needs school curriculum* works with container terms from the late twentieth century and gives teachers no information on how to put them into practice.

51 Official German text from the curriculum: »Der Unterricht in Geschichte und Sozialkunde/Politische Bildung beschäftigt sich mit Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunftsperspektiven. Er leistet somit einen wichtigen Beitrag zur Orientierung der Schülerinnen und Schüler in Zeit und Raum und zur Identitätsfindung in einer pluralistisch verfassten Gesellschaft. Dabei ist der Vermittlung von historischen und politischen Kompetenzen besonders Beachtung zu schenken.« Bundesgesetzblatt (BGBl.), Jg. 2008, Teil II, 12.8.2008, 290. Verordnung der Bundesministerin für Unterricht, Kunst und Kultur, mit der die Verordnungen über die Lehrpläne der Volksschule, der Sonderschulen, der Hauptschulen und der allgemeinbildenden höheren Schulen geändert werden.

52 Official German text from the curriculum: »Der Unterricht in Geschichte und Sozialkunde/Politische Bildung beschäftigt sich mit Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunftsperspektiven, damit in Verbindung insbesondere mit dem menschlichen Zusammenleben. Er leistet somit einen wichtigen Beitrag zur Orientierung der Schülerinnen und Schüler in Zeit und Raum, zur kritischen Identitätsfindung in einer pluralistisch verfassten Gesellschaft sowie zur Entwicklung selbständigen historischen und politischen Denkens und Handelns.« BGBl., Jg. 2008, Teil II, 18.5.2016, 113. Verordnung der Bundesministerin für Bildung und Frauen, mit der die Verordnung über die Lehrpläne der Hauptschulen, die Verordnung über die Lehrpläne der Neuen Mittelschulen sowie die Verordnung über die Lehrpläne der allgemein bildenden höheren Schulen geändert werden.

Special needs schools	General compulsory schools
»Napoleon and the French Revolution« ⁵³	<p data-bbox="595 232 989 293">»Module 7 (historical and civic education) Revolutions, resistance, reforms</p> <p data-bbox="572 311 879 336">Concretization of competencies:</p> <p data-bbox="595 351 1088 511">Question orientation offerings from representations and confront them with alternative offerings; lead discussions on the use of historical knowledge for the present and future; analyze the structure of representations.</p> <p data-bbox="572 533 807 558">Thematic concretization:</p> <p data-bbox="595 571 1110 857">Distinguish and define the terms revolution and reform; explain selected aspects of the Enlightenment and analyze their significance for revolutions and reform movements; evaluate the impact of the Enlightenment on contemporary societies (democratic constitutional state, separation of powers, human rights); compare and evaluate political upheavals known as revolutions.«⁵⁴</p>

Tab. 3: Second example.

The third example focuses on content left out of the curriculum of special needs schools. Unfortunately, topics that would address diversity in an explicitly inclusive approach to history teaching are omitted as inappropriate for special needs education. This includes thematic case studies on race, class or gender in the nineteenth century or topics such as »violence, feelings and attitudes in the societal context between the Renaissance and the nineteenth century« or »dealing with mental and physical impairments.«⁵⁵ The thinking behind the decision by the *Austrian Federal Ministry of Education* to exclude this content remains unclear, since the curriculum for special needs schools should actually place great emphasis on the students' everyday life experiences.

53 Official German text from the curriculum: »Napoleon und die Französische Revolution«, BGBl., Jg. 2008, Teil II, 12.8.2008, 290. Verordnung.

54 Official German text from the curriculum: »Modul 7 (Historisch-politische Bildung): Revolutionen, Widerstand, Reformen. Kompetenzkonkretisierung: Orientierungsangebote aus Darstellungen hinterfragen und mit alternativen Angeboten konfrontieren; Diskussionen zur Nutzung von historischen Erkenntnissen für Gegenwart und Zukunft führen; Aufbau von Darstellungen analysieren; Thematische Konkretisierung: Die Begriffe Revolution und Reform unterscheiden und definieren; Ausgewählte Aspekte der Aufklärung erklären und ihre Bedeutung für Revolutionen und Reformbewegungen analysieren; Die Auswirkungen der Aufklärung auf gegenwärtige Gesellschaften (demokratischer Verfassungsstaat, Gewaltentrennung, Menschenrechte) beurteilen; Politische Umbrüche, die als Revolutionen bezeichnet werden, vergleichen und bewerten.« BGBl., Jg. 2008, Teil II, 18.5.2016, 113. Verordnung.

55 See Module 6 of the *general compulsory school* curriculum. BGBl., Jg. 2008, Teil II, 18.5.2016, 113. Verordnung.

These three examples clearly reveal differences in how domain-specific knowledge is integrated in the curricula of general compulsory schools in contrast to the special needs schools in Austria. The *special needs school curriculum* has largely ignored developments in history education that have been widely discussed since the turn of the century.

Conclusion

In Austria the discussion about historical knowledge for *special needs schools* has taken place without consulting or collaborating with any representatives of history education. In fact, the developers of the *special needs school curriculum* remain anonymous, even though the members of the curriculum commission for the *general compulsory school curriculum* are well known. Furthermore, no policy paper has been published, which means that it is unclear who adapted the previous curriculum of the *general compulsory school* (2008) for the curriculum of the *special needs schools* (2008). The intentions behind this adaptation are also unknown, making it impossible to engage in a professional discussion about the matter. This is a poor starting point for cooperative collaboration between special needs educators and history educators. It is essential that the Austrian federal educational administration raise awareness that inclusion is not only a concern of special education, but also a broader issue that requires the involvement of systemic representatives in discussion about the role of historical knowledge in *special needs schools* in the future.

References

- Ammerer 2012 = Heinrich Ammerer, Alles was man wissen muss. Überlegungen und Beobachtungen zu Sinn, Form und Umfang des historischen Wissenskanons, in: Christoph Kühberger (ed.), *Historisches Wissen. Geschichtsdidaktische Erkundungen über Art, Umfang und tiefe für das historische Lernen*. Schwalbach/Ts. 2012, 237–248.
- Ammert 2015 = Niklas Ammert, *History as Knowledge. Ethical Values and Meaning in Encounters with History*. Frankfurt/M. 2015, <https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-05614-3>.
- Anderson/Krathwohl 2001 = Lorin Anderson/David Krathwohl (eds.), *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing. A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. New York 2001.
- Anwar 1994 = Sjaeful Anwar, *Untersuchungen zur didaktischen Reduktion – Bedeutung, Möglichkeit und Grenzen*. Dissertation Universität Dortmund 1994.
- Barricelli 2008 = Michele Barricelli, *Historisches Wissen ist narratives Wissen*, in: Landesinstitut für Schule und Medien Berlin-Brandenburg (ed.), *Historisches Wissen ist narratives Wissen. Aufgabenformate für den Geschichtsunterricht in den Sekundarstufen I und II*. Potsdam 2008, 7–12.
- Barsch 2016 = Sebastian Barsch, *Silent Stories of Exclusion – Teaching Deaf History*, in: *International Society for Didactics of History Yearbook* 35, 253–261.
- Barsch 2024 = Sebastian Barsch, *Addressing diversity: An analysis of German curricula for history*, in: *Hungarian Educational Research Journal* 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1556/063.2023.00261>.
- Bennewitz 2016 = Nadja Bennewitz, *Gender in Geschichtsdidaktik und Geschichtsunterricht. Einig in der Kontroverse?* in: Dies./Hannes Burkhardt (eds.), *Gender in Geschichtsdidaktik und Geschichtsunterricht. Neue Beiträge zu Theorie und Praxis*. Berlin 2016, 9–54.
- Bernhardt et al. 2012 = Markus Bernhardt/Ulrich Mayer/Peter Gautschi, *Historisches Wissen – was ist das eigentlich?* in: Christoph Kühberger (ed.), *Historisches*

- Wissen. Geschichtsdidaktische Erkundungen über Art, Umfang und Tiefe für das historische Lernen. Schwalbach/Ts. 2012, 103-117.
- Bruner 1960 = Jerome S. Bruner, *The process of education*. Cambridge 1960, <https://doi.org/10.4159/9780674028999>.
- Borries 2012 = Bodo von Borries, Historische Kenntnisse – historische Kategorien – historische Kompetenzen, in: Christoph Kühberger (ed.), *Historisches Wissen. Geschichtsdidaktische Erkundungen über Art, Umfang und Tiefe für das historische Lernen*. Schwalbach/Ts. 2012, 9-31.
- Borries 2013 = Bodo von Borries, »Zauber des Anfangs«? Zum Debut von ›Geschlechtergeschichte‹ in Geschichtsdidaktik und -unterricht. Die Beispiele Geschichte und Deutsch. Berlin et al. 2013, 159-198.
- Chapman 2021 = Arthur Chapman (ed.), *Knowing History in Schools. Powerful knowledge and the powers of knowledge*. London 2021, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv14t477t>.
- Counsell 2000 = Christine Counsell, *Historical knowledge and historical skills*, in: James Arthur/Robert Phillips (eds.), *Issues in History Teaching*. London 2000, 54-71.
- Demuth et al. 2005 = Reinhard Demuth/Bernd Ralle/Ilka Parchmann, *Basiskonzepte – eine Herausforderung an den Chemieunterricht*, in: *Chemkon 12/2*, 2005, 55-60.
- Düvel/Körber 2012 = Sarah Düvel/Andreas Körber, *Historisches Handlungswissen? in: Christoph Kühberger (ed.), Geschichtsdidaktische Erkundungen über Art, Umfang und Tiefe für das historische Lernen*. Schwalbach/Ts. 2012, 153-171.
- Ercikan/Seixas 2015 = Kadriye Ercikan/Peter Seixas, *New directions in assessing historical thinking*. London 2015, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315779539>.
- Erdmann 2012 = Elisabeth Erdmann, *Historisches Lernen oder die Fähigkeit zur Orientierung und zeitlichen Einordnung? in: Christoph Kühberger (ed.), Historisches Wissen. Geschichtsdidaktische Erkundungen über Art, Umfang und Tiefe für das historische Lernen*. Schwalbach/Ts. 2012, 189-211.
- Fiebig 2013 = Tim Fiebig, *Textquellenarbeit auf Schulbuchbasis. Analyse, Vergleich, Kritik*, in: Bernd Schönemann/Holger Thünemann (eds.), *Kompetenzorientierung, Lernprogression, Textquellenarbeit. Aktuelle Schulbuchanalysen*. Berlin et al. 2013, 191-338.
- Fina 1969 = Kurt Fina, *Geschichtsdidaktik und Auswahlproblematik. Vom Sinn des Exemplarischen im Geschichtsunterricht*. München 1969.
- Fischer/Wecker 2006 = Frank Fischer/Christof Wecker, *Wissen. Erwerb und Anwendung*, in: Karl-Heinz Arnold/Uwe Sandfuchs/Jürgen Wiechmann (eds.), *Handbuch Unterricht*. Bad Heilbrunn 2006, 65-69.
- Galda 2013 = Maria Galda, *Geschichtsbewusstsein, historisches Wissen und Interesse. Darstellung von Zusammenhängen und Repräsentationen in semantischen Netzwerken*. Dissertation Frankfurt/M. 2013.
- Gautschi 2009 = Peter Gautschi, *Guter Geschichtsunterricht. Grundlagen, Erkenntnisse, Hinweise*. Schwalbach/Ts. 2009.
- Georgi/Musenbergs 2020 = Viola B. Georgi/Oliver Musenbergs, *Diversitätserfahrungen im Geschichtsunterricht*, in: Sebastian Barsch/Bettina Degner/Christoph Kühberger/Martin Lücke (eds.), *Handbuch Diversität im Geschichtsunterricht – Inklusive Geschichtsdidaktik*. Schwalbach/Ts. 2020, 37-53.
- Greger/Stuurman (ed.) 2007 = Maria Greger/Siep Stuurman (eds.), *Beyond the Canon. History for the twenty-first century*. Basingstoke 2007, <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230599246>.
- Harding 2008 = Sandra Harding, *Science from below. Feminisms, Postcolonialities, and Modernities*. Durham 2008, <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11smmtn>.
- Harding 2015 = Sandra Harding, *Objectivity and Diversity. Another Logic of Scientific Research*. Chicago 2015, <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226241531.001.0001>.
- Haydn et al. 2015 = Terry Haydn/Alison Stephen/James Arthur/Martin Hunt (eds.), *Learning to teach history in the secondary school*, 4. ed. London 2015, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203796412>.
- Helmberger 2015 = Doris Helmberger, *Lernen sie Geschichte? Module, Kompetenzen – aber keine Maria Theresia mehr? Der Entwurf für einen neuen Geschichtslehrplan sorgt für Unmut. Eine Annäherung*, in: *Die Furche*, 24.9.2015, <https://www.furche.at/bildung/lernen-sie-geschichte-1305992> (last accessed May 15, 2024).
- Kipman/Kühberger 2020 = Ulrike Kipman/Christoph Kühberger, *Nutzung und Einsatz des Geschichtsschulbuches. Eine Large-Scale-Untersuchung bei Schülern und Lehrern*. Wiesbaden 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-24447-7>.
- Körber 2011 = Andreas Körber, *Historical consciousness, historical competencies – and beyond? Some conceptual development within German history didactics*, in: Helle Bjerg/Claudia Lenz/Erik Thorstensen (eds.), *Historicising the Uses of the Past: Scandinavian Perspectives on History Culture, Historical Consciousness and Didactics of History Related to World War II*. Bielefeld 2011, 145-164, <https://doi.org/10.1515/transcript.9783839413258.145>.
- Kühberger 2004 = Christoph Kühberger, *Historische Armutsforschung*. Berlin 2004.
- Kühberger 2010 = Christoph Kühberger, *Vorhandene Vorstellungen von SchülerInnen als Ausgangspunkt. Zur Konzeption eines konstruktivistischen Wissens-*

- erwerbs im frühen politischen Lernen, in: Ders./ Elfriede Windischbauer (eds.), Politische Bildung in der Volksschule. Innsbruck et al. 2010, 43–59.
- Kühberger 2012a = Christoph Kühberger, Historisches Wissen. Geschichtsdidaktische Erkundungen zu Art, Tiefe und Umfang für das historische Lernen. Schwalbach/Ts. 2012.
- Kühberger 2012b = Christoph Kühberger, Konzeptionelles Wissen als besondere Grundlage für das historische Lernen, in: Ders. (ed.), Historisches Wissen. Geschichtsdidaktische Erkundungen über Art, Umfang und Tiefe für das historische Lernen. Schwalbach/Ts. 2012, 33–74.
- Kühberger 2014 = Christoph Kühberger, Leistungsfeststellung im Geschichtsunterricht. Diagnose – Bewertung – Beurteilung. Schwalbach/Ts. 2014.
- Kühberger 2015 = Christoph Kühberger, Kompetenzorientiertes historisches und politisches Lernen. 3. ed. Innsbruck 2015.
- Kühberger 2016a = Christoph Kühberger, Lernen mit Konzepten. Basiskonzepte in historischen und politischen Lernprozessen, in: Informationen zur Politischen Bildung 38, 2016, 20–29.
- Kühberger 2016b = Christoph Kühberger, Intersektionalität – ein Weg für den geschlechtersensiblen Geschichtsunterricht? In: Nadja Bennewitz/Hannes Burkhardt (eds.), Gender in Geschichtsdidaktik und Geschichtsunterricht. Neue Beiträge zu Theorie und Praxis. Münster 2016, 55–86.
- Kühberger 2020 = Christoph Kühberger, Historisches Wissen als inklusives Wissen, in: Sebastian Barsch/Bettina Degner/Ders./Martin Lücke (eds.), Handbuch Diversität im Geschichtsunterricht. Frankfurt/M. 2020, 270–284.
- Kühberger 2021 = Christoph Kühberger, ›Kategorie‹ oder ›Konzept‹. Zur Formierung des historischen Wissens zwischen den Jahrhunderten, in: Lars Deile/Peter Riedel/ Jörg van Norden (eds.), Brennpunkte heutigen Geschichtsunterrichts. Joachim Rohlfes zum 90. Geburtstag. Frankfurt/M. 2021, 228–232.
- Kühberger 2023 = Christoph Kühberger, Zentrale fachliche Konzepte. Zur Tiefenstruktur von schulischem Wissen als Teil der reflexiven Grundbildung, in: Erziehung & Unterricht 173/1–2, 2023, 23–30.
- Kuhn 1977 = Annette Kuhn, Einführung in die Didaktik der Geschichte, 2. ed. München 1977.
- Lee 2005 = Peter J. Lee, Putting Principles into Practice. Understanding History, in: National Research Council (ed.), How Students learn. History, Mathematics, and Science in the Classroom. Washington, D.C. 2005, 31–77.
- Lehner 2012 = Martin Lehner, Didaktische Reduktion. Stuttgart 2012.
- Lücke 2015 = Martin Lücke, Unnatürliche Sünden – lasterhafte Lustknaben. Didaktische Aspekte einer Geschichte von Männlichkeiten und Sexualitäten am Beispiel von Homosexualität und männlicher Prostitution, in: Sarah Huch/Ders. (eds.), Sexuelle Vielfalt im Handlungsfeld Schule. Bielefeld 2015, 113–150, <https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839429617-006>.
- Massing 2015 = Peter Massing, Kompetenzorientierung im inklusiven Politikunterricht, in: Judith Riegert/Oliver Musenberg (eds.), Inklusiver Fachunterricht in der Sekundarstufe. Stuttgart 2015, 225–238.
- Musenbergs 2015 = Oliver Musenberg, Veranschaulichung der Vergangenheit – Ansprüche heterogener Lerngruppen an inklusiven Geschichtsunterricht, in: Judith Rieger/Ders. (eds.), Inklusiver Fachunterricht in der Sekundarstufe. Stuttgart 2015, 206–220.
- Nachreiner 2015 = Katharina Nachreiner, Begründung eines an Basiskonzepten orientierten Unterrichts, in: Der mathematische und naturwissenschaftliche Unterricht 68/3, 2015, 172–177.
- Nerdel 2017 = Claudia Nerdel, Grundlagen der Naturwissenschaftsdidaktik. Berlin 2017, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-53158-7>.
- Nordgren 2017 = Kenneth Nordgren, Powerful knowledge, intercultural learning and history education, in: Journal of Curriculum Studies 49/5, 2017, 663–682, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2017.1320430>.
- Popp 2006 = Susanne Popp, Geschichtliches Überblickswissen aufbauen – ein konzentrisch-longitudinales Geschichtscurriculum aus den Niederlanden, in: Elisabeth Erdmann/Robert Maier/Dies. (eds.), Geschichtsunterricht international – Bestandaufnahmen und Visionen. Worldwide teaching of History – Present and Future. L'enseignement de l'histoire dans le monde – Bilan et visions. Hannover 2006, 269–300.
- Popp 2009 = Susanne Popp, Orientierungswissen und ›nachhaltiges Lernen‹ im Geschichtsunterricht, in: Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht 60/11, 2009, 646–657.
- Rupp/Freeman 2015 = Leila J. Rupp/Susan K. Freeman, Understanding and Teaching U.S. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender History. Madison 2015.
- Ryle 1948 = Gilbert Ryle, Concept of Mind. Chicago 1948.
- Sauer 2009 = Michael Sauer, Geschichte unterrichten. Eine Einführung in die Didaktik und Methodik. 8. ed. Seelze-Velber 2009.
- Sander 2007 = Wolfgang Sander, Vom ›Stoff‹ zum ›Konzept‹ – Wissen in der politischen Bildung, in: POLIS 4, 2007, 19–24.
- Schissler 2005 = Hanna Schissler, Weltgeschichte als Geschichte der sich globalisierenden Welt, in: Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte 1–2, 2005, 33–39.

- Schissler 1993 = Hanna Schissler, Soziale Ungleichheit und historisches Wissen. Der Beitrag der Geschlechtergeschichte, in: Dies. (ed.), Geschlechterverhältnisse im historischen Wandel. Frankfurt/M. 1993, 9–36.
- Schulze Wessel 2016 = Martin Schulze Wessel, Wie die Zeit aus der Geschichte verschwindet, in: Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung 14.9.2016, N4.
- Seixas/Morton 2013 = Peter Seixas/Tom Morton, The Big Six. Historical Thinking Concept. Toronto 2013.
- Sieder 1997 = Reinhard Sieder, »Alltag« – irdisches Elend oder analytische Perspektive?, in: Beiträge zur Historischen Sozialkunde, Sondernummer, 1997, 13–22.
- Spivak 2007 = Gayatri C. Spivak, Can the Subaltern Speak? Postkolonialität und subalterne Artikulationen. Wien et al. 2007.
- Vygotskij 1987 = Lew Vygotskij, Ausgewählte Schriften. Bd. 2. Köln 1987.
- Walgenbach 2014 = Katharina Walgenbach, Heterogenität – Intersektionalität – Diversität der Erziehungswissenschaft. Stuttgart 2014, https://doi.org/10.30965/9783657778379_004.
- Weinert 1998 = Franz E. Weinert, Neue Unterrichtskonzepte zwischen gesellschaftlichen Notwendigkeiten, pädagogischen Visionen und psychologischen Möglichkeiten, in: Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Unterricht, Kultus, Wissenschaft und Kunst (ed.), Wissen und Werte für die Welt von morgen. Dokumentation zum Bildungskongress. München 1998, 101–125.
- Weißeno et al. 2009 = Georg Weißeno/Joachim Detjen/Ingo Juchler/Peter Massing/Dagmar Richter (eds.), Konzepte der Politik. Ein Kompetenzmodell. Schwalbach/Ts. 2009.
- Wilschut 2009 = Arie Wilschut, Ein Referenzrahmen für den Unterricht im Fach Geschichte, in: Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht 60, 2009, 629–645.
- Windischbauer 2012 = Elfriede Windischbauer, Frauen – Männer – Geschlechterverhältnisse in österreichischen Geschichtsschulbüchern, in: Linda Erker/Alexander Salzmann/Lucile Dreidemy/Klaudija Sabo (eds.), Update! Perspektiven der Zeitgeschichte. Zeitgeschichtstage 2010. Innsbruck et al. 2012, 201–207.
- Young 2009 = Michael Young, Education, globalisation and the »voice of knowledge«, in: Journal of Education and Work 22/3, 2009, 193–204, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080902957848>.

Author

Christoph Kühberger

Professor of History Education and Civic Education at the University of Salzburg (Austria). Current research interests: curriculum studies; historical culture; decolonization of historical knowledge; digital humanities; ethnography.

christoph.kuehberger@plus.ac.at

Open Access

This paper is published under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>). Please note that individual, appropriately marked parts of the paper may be excluded from the license mentioned or may be subject to other copyright conditions. If such third party material is not under the Creative Commons license, any copying, editing or public reproduction is only permitted with the prior consent of the respective copyright owner or on the basis of relevant legal authorization regulations.