



Disciplinary Barriers between the Social Sciences and Humanities

National Report on Germany

**Rebecca Krebs, Irini Siouti, Ursula Apitzsch, Silke Wenk
Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität, Frankfurt/Main
und Carl Ossietszky Universität, Oldenburg**

January 2005

Introduction

In Germany, the education system is predominantly affected by the federal organisation of the state. The respective federal states differ in their education policy depending on their state governments (*Bundesländer*).

Even though there exist some frameworks coordinating the respective education policies, the legislative prescriptions and organisation of education contents is very heterogeneous. The higher education system is subdivided into universities and “*Fachhochschulen*” (Universities of Applied Science, akin to the former polytechnics in the UK), which implies a division into more theory- and more applied-oriented approaches. There are all together 333 higher education institutions: besides 117 universities or equivalent higher education institutions, there are 160 *Fachhochschulen* (Universities of Applied Sciences) and 56 Colleges of Art and Music. Normally only the universities have the right to confer doctoral degrees.

A still important point of reference for the recent German debates about higher education politics is the university ideal formulated in the 19th century by the state-theoretician, language researcher and diplomat Wilhelm von Humboldt. One can describe the German reception of the Humboldtian ideas as a growing “myth”, which has become especially important in the debates since the 1960s. (Palatschek: 2001, 77). The proclaimed ideal of Wilhelm von Humboldt was marked by:

1. freedom of “teaching and research”, that is, the freedom of the researcher “to himself choose the questions and the methods within the defined subject methodology, and to publish his results, even if these were uncomfortable” and the freedom of the lecturers to “plan the content and methods of their own teaching”(Kjørup: 2001, 33);
2. the idea of the university as a site, in which both the teacher and the learner conducted research (unity of research and teaching);
- 3.”the idea, that all scientific disciplines should be represented in the university, and that philosophy and the Faculty of Philosophy should function as an umbrella unit” (Palatschek: 2001, 76).¹

As Palatschek shows (2001, 77), the Berlin Humboldt University was by no means a radical new model, and nor was it perceived as such in the 19th century, since its structure followed that of the formerly established “universities of the Enlightenment”², Halle (1694) and Göttingen (1734). These were rooted “in rationalism, in the philosophy of idealism and in a neo-humanist ideology of education”(Müller: 1990, 67). Thus the founding of the Berlin University is to be regarded not as radical reform but as a modernisation of the concept of the German university which already existed (Palatschek: 2001, 87). It “remained true to the historically inherited German university tradition insofar as it did not follow the ‘French specialist school model’” (ibid).

Once the German university was conceived as a site of research the *Geisteswissenschaften* were “professionalised” with systematic fields of research and agreed methods, which led to the formation of “disciplines” (cf. Hark 2004: 337ff.; Shils 1982 und Stichweh 1994).

¹ Cf. Rainer A. Müller: 1990, 67; Rainer A. Kjørup: 2001, 32-3.

² Müller: 1990, 64.

The identity of the *Geisteswissenschaften* in Germany appears to be closely linked with the tradition of idealism. Mittelstraß (Denkschrift: 1991, 26) stresses the specifically German development of the *Geisteswissenschaften* from idealism, which to this day determines the discussion and the concept of the *Geisteswissenschaften*:

The philosophy of German idealism is, to a certain extent, the original philosophical background to the modern controversy around the *Geisteswissenschaften*, or more specifically, around the theory of the *Geisteswissenschaften*. In the case of the *Geisteswissenschaften*, and this is what distinguishes the German tradition from the Anglo-Saxon history of the Humanities and the French history of the Human Sciences, the *history of the disciplines* is also a *history of theories*. The concept of *Geisteswissenschaft* was first named in the scientific systematic context of the Schelling school: 'natural philosophy' was supplemented by a 'spiritual philosophy', also described as the 'science of the spirit', and as '*Geisteswissenschaft*' (Mittelstraß, Denkschrift: 1991, 26, author's italics).³

This division emerged around 1825 (Kjørup: 2001, 1; cf. Geldsetzer, in Rombach 1974).

At the level of the university however the concept was broadened by the 1849 translation of John Stuart Mills' *System of Logic*, in which "moral science" was translated with *Geisteswissenschaften* and "thereby placed in an idealistic system" (Mittelstraß, Denkschrift: 1991, 27). While Mills' concept encompassed both the "normative-oriented 'practical' disciplines of morals, politics and aesthetics" and the descriptive and nomological oriented disciplines of psychology, ethnology and sociology (Mittelstraß: Denkschrift: 1991, 27), the latter broke away from the idealistic scientific knowledge of the German *Geisteswissenschaften*. The *Geisteswissenschaften* partially shook off the Hegelian idea of the science of the spirit, in that they turned towards "historicism" and thereby became "a science in a post-idealistic sense" (Mittelstraß, Denkschrift: 1991, 31). Nevertheless, Mittelstraß thinks that idealism remained decisive for the identity of the *Geisteswissenschaften*: "It is not only the terminology that continues to have an effect [...]; it is also the idea that culture is a product of the spirit, and the *Geisteswissenschaften* are themselves a part of this culture, which they investigate, allowing their idealistic origins to remain." (31) At the end of the 19th century there was a further differentiation between subjects and subject fields, with the natural sciences splitting away from the faculties of philosophy⁴, a split that remained in its effects in the 20th century. Similarly the social science subjects (such as sociology and political science) were placed in the law faculty or in a specialist social science faculty (Kjørup: 2001, 35, 36). Wolf Lepenies (1985) refers to a differentiated "third culture", "in which since their emergence scientific and literary disciplines have been at odds with each other" (Lepenies: 1985, 11). Similarly, Hans Robert Jauß (Denkschrift 1991) defines the foundation of the social sciences as a product of the conflict between the natural sciences and the *Geisteswissenschaften*, between humanist and scientific culture.

In the recent debates on higher education reforms controversial issues have often been related to "the Humboldtian ideas". They can be used both as legitimation for reforms or for the maintenance of the existing situation. Examples are the discussion of the "autonomy" of universities or the forms and contents of teaching (connected to the *Bildungsbegriff* and the articulated ideal of the 'unity of teaching and research'). The underlying question is, which

³ Transl. Judith Inggs. If not marked differently all the following translations into English are by the researchers.

⁴ A unification of the natural science disciplines took place between ca. 1830-1880 (partially also located in medical faculties). From the 1860s the natural science disciplines gradually began to split away from the faculties of philosophy (Palatschek: 2001, 85). Müller (1990, 85) speaks of a process of independence of the natural science faculties during the second half of the 19th century in accordance with the "Strasbourg model of 1871".

tasks universities should fulfil. Interdisciplinarity, like “autonomy” seems a flexible term, which both market-oriented and critical positions use. Interdisciplinarity is proclaimed everywhere, but the question is, in how far and how it is being realised. We will try to distinguish different understandings of interdisciplinarity and possibilities of realisation.

1. The relationship between state and education

“The Federal Republic of Germany belongs to those Western European countries which are traditionally accustomed to a strong governmental role regarding higher education.” (Teichler: 1991, 29). The regular costs of higher education as well as most research grants (Teichler 1991) were until recently covered by the state. At the same time, academic freedom is traditionally held in high esteem in the Federal Republic of Germany. The Humboldtian idea of the university (see Teichler: 1991, 29) is often referred to, with its implication that the state should guarantee independence from economic interests. After the capitulation of the NS-State, academic freedom was incorporated in the constitution of the Federal Republic⁵ (the freedom of research and teaching).

With only a few exceptions, the universities in Germany are state institutions.

Because of the federal structure of Germany universities are controlled and financed by the respective Ministries of Education. The relationship between the Ministries of the *Länder* (federal states) and the universities is regulated by the different Acts of Higher Education of each federal state. But these federal legislative regulations are determined and coordinated by the Framework Act of Higher Education, the *HRG* (*Hochschulrahmengesetz*), (which is in force for all the federal states) (see glossary). The *HRG* was not passed until 1976, as a consequence of higher education initiatives at federal level, which started in the 1960s and 1970s (see Teichler 1991; Kehm 2004): “The Framework Act of Higher Education may well be the most significant document in explaining the supervisory role of government and showing the essentials of government steering in higher education.” (Teichler: 1991, 36). The Framework Act articulates the relationship between the federal government and universities only insofar as it defines “how far *Länder* (federal states) legislation ought to be homogeneous or might differ” (Teichler: 1991, 37).⁶

There are a few institutions that represent either a more governmental position, a university view or a mediating position, as the *Ständige Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (abbreviated *KMK*, 1948) (Standing Conference of the Ministers of Culture)⁷, the *Hochschulrektorenkonferenz* (German Rectors’ Conference

⁵ “*Kunst und Wissenschaft, Forschung und Lehre sind frei.*” („There is freedom of art and science, research and teaching“) (Artikel 5 Abs. 3 Satz 1 *Grundgesetz* (basic law)), see also §4 of the Frame Work Act *HRG*, which came 1976 into force.

⁶ An example of a possible conflict which might appear, when the central juridical framework is becoming stronger than the federal legislation, is the discussion around the changes in the *HRG*, which introduced the *Juniorprofessur* in the 5th amendment of the Framework in 2002. This has been declared as unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court in 2004, following a complaint from some of the federal states that this would restrict their legislation.

⁷ The *KMK* is important for the coordination of higher education policy of the federally organised higher education system of the sixteen German federal states, the *Bundesländer*. Recently the president of Lower Saxony Christian Wulff (CDU, Christian Democrats) has threatened to resign from the conference, because he criticised its inefficiency in promoting reforms (see Wulffs *KMK* Schelte. Politiker warnen vor Rückfall in Kleinstaaterei, 27.9.2004 www.spiegel.de/unispiegel/studium). In the 307th plenary session on 15th October 2004, the ministries of culture of all *Länder* (included Lower Saxony) had decided, that the *KMK* is

abbreviated *HRK*, which was originally founded as the West German Rectors' Conference, *WRK* in 1949 and was renamed after the reunification in 1990) and the *Wissenschaftsrat* (Science Council, established in 1957), who are up to the present important actors in the process of higher education policies.

Generally speaking, since the 1960s and 1970s the influence of government on universities in Western Germany has grown:

During the 1960s and the 1970s, the 'balance of power' shifted towards government in the Federal Republic. Three closely interlinked changes emerged. First, government set up grand planning mechanisms to provide the necessary external conditions for higher education by acting strategically and with long-term perspectives. Second, the net of laws, decrees and administrative supervision became more tightly knit. Third, previously disentangled zones of state control and university autonomy were blurred by changes of higher education administration (for example the changing functions of the rectors or presidents) and by the establishment of various mechanisms of formal communication and negotiation. (Teichler: 1991, 45)⁸

Some major changes took place in the 1990s, for a number of reasons, such as reduced public funds, which made economizing necessary as well as increasing internationalisation and competition (the Bologna Process). One important aspect in the specific case of Germany was also the German reunification in 1991. This can be considered as an important factor for provoking and favouring university reforms (see Kehm:2004, 11). The transformation of the East German universities created a momentum when innovation could be introduced, and they can generally be considered more open to experiments due to their relatively newly established structures. These transformations can be illustrated by looking at the following three issues:

- the status and the appointment of professors (1.1),
- study regulations (*Studienordnungen*) and examination regulations (*Prüfungsordnungen*) (Kehm: 2004, 15; Teichler: 1991, 36) (1.2) and
- the regulation of finances (1.3).

1.1. The status and appointment of professors

Teichler (1991, 30) points out that as a result of the German university system that guarantees the university relative academic freedom, the position of a professor is stronger than, for example, the position of a professor in countries influenced by the "Napoleonic traditions of government". Professors in Germany are civil servants, with a series of attendant rights and benefits, for instance regarding job security, medical insurance and pensions. This status of professors as civil servants has come under fire in recent years. Newly appointed professors will from 2005 or earlier (depending on the *Bundesland*, i.e. the federal state) be subject to performance-related pay (W-salary instead of C- or H-salary, which increased in correspondence with age).

indispensable for the coordination of higher education policy. leb.bildung-rp.de/info/presse/2004/2004-10-15_1.htm

⁸According to Teichler and Kehm, the development of higher education can be divided into different periods to describe the changes of governmental influence.

Kehm (2004) suggests the subdivision of this development into five periods until 1989, periods which Teichler (1991) divided in a similar way earlier on: -"decentralised reconstruction" in the fifties (Teichler, 31: period of 1945-1956, "dezentralisierte Rekonstruktion" Kehm, 7) -"system-wide initiatives" in the sixties ("systemumfassende Initiativen" Kehm, 7 and) -"co-operative federalism" around 1970 (Teichler, 31: period of 1957-1968, "kooperativer Föderalismus" Kehm, 8) -"dynamic of reform and legislation" ("Reform- und Gesetzgebungsdynamik", Kehm, 8) in the early and middle of the seventies-"a post-experimental armistice" ("post-experimenteller Waffenstillstand", Kehm, 8), which lasted from the late seventies until 1989.

Until recently, universities that wanted to appoint a professor drew up a ranked list of three candidates which they presented to the relevant ministry for final decision. If the proposed candidates did not meet the expectations of the government of the respective state, the ministry could ask the university to present a new list.⁹ (see Teichler: 1991, 29). A possible change to this procedure is evident in the draft of the new Higher Education Act of Hesse. According to the explicit goal of more “autonomy” for universities postulated by politicians in charge of higher education and members of the German *Hochschulen*, Hesse plans to give the *Präsidium* (steering committee of the university) the right to appoint professors, rather than the ministry making the final decision.¹⁰

1.2. Course content and examination regulations/accreditation of new courses of study

The authorisation of examination regulations and of new courses of study was until recently handled by the state. This is changing, due to legislative modifications in the context of the Bologna process, through introducing accreditation agencies. Regarding course regulations, one needs to distinguish between the courses that lead to a state exam (to become a teacher, a lawyer, or a medical doctor) and the university exams, we will focus on in the following. Generally it can be stated that course and examination regulations pertaining to university exams are closely intertwined. The course regulations (*Studienordnungen*) are designed and agreed on by the relevant discipline, but on the basis of the examination regulations (*Prüfungsordnungen*).¹¹ Since the examination regulations have to be agreed by the responsible ministry¹², in effect the course regulations, too, are influenced by the state. The legislative definition of the examination regulations can be very vague and general¹³ or more detailed¹⁴.

The Bologna Declaration of 19th June 1999 has provoked one of the largest reforms of course structures in Europe (Kehm: 2004, 15). In Germany, 1200 Bachelor and Masters courses have been set up since 1999 (ibid.). Kehm states that ministries are no longer responsible for the authorisation of university courses. Instead, a couple of general or discipline specific (“*allgemeine oder auf spezielle Fächergruppen gerichtetete*”, Kehm: 2004, 15) *Akkreditierungsagenturen* (accreditation agencies) have been established. As the *HRK* (German Rectors’ conference) states in a publication from 2003, the accreditation system replaces the former system of the framework regulations of examinations.¹⁵

⁹ Compare for example *NHG* § 26. The *HRG* leaves it to the federal state to decide who decides on the appointment of the professors, ministry or university.

¹⁰ Compare draft 25.6.2004, Nr. 39, modification of §72, in the case of tenured positions the decision have to be made in consultation with the ministry. More freedom in universities means generally a change of the university structures towards a more hierarchical system of decision processes. This has been regarded critically in the political discussion.

¹¹ See *NHG* §6, *BbHG* §45, *Hessisches HG* §26, *UG Baden-Württemberg* §45, *BerlHG* §24.

¹² *HRG* §16 (2). Zum möglichen Eingriff von staatlicher Seite steht z.B. im *NHG* unter § 7 Prüfungen und Leistungspunktesystem; staatliche Anerkennungen Absatz 3, Satz 3 „Das Fachministerium kann zur Wahrung der Einheitlichkeit und Gleichwertigkeit von Hochschulprüfungen durch Verordnung allgemeine Bestimmungen für Ordnungen, die Prüfungsverfahren regeln, erlassen.“

In some *Länder* the ministries are allowed to fix general rules for the examination regulations, e.g. *BbHG* §13, *UG Baden-Württemberg* §51.

¹³ *NHG* §7.

¹⁴ *UG Baden-Württemberg* §51, Abs. 4-5.

¹⁵ Accreditation thus dissolves the system of framework regulation of examinations, which was coordinated by the „Joint Commission for the Coordination of Studies and Examinations“; as well as the concomitant authorization of study courses by the ministries (Wegweiser 2003, 8).

The system of accreditation is above all intended to guarantee transparent quality standards for the newly introduced Bachelor and Masters degrees and at the same time to allow universities to establish more profiled and innovative courses. In 2002, this was extended by the *KMK* to all non-state regulated courses that did not have a framework exam regulation (*Rahmenprüfungsordnung*).¹⁶ Until now only some *Länder* have decreed, that all courses must be accredited (such as Lower Saxony).

How does the newly established system of accreditation work? The *KMK* (Standing Conference of Ministers of Culture) nominated on 3rd December 1998 the *Akkreditierungsrat* (Accreditation Council)¹⁷, which has the function to accredit accreditation agencies and to define and coordinate standards of accreditation.¹⁸ The accredited agencies¹⁹ then work decentralised by accrediting new courses from universities applying for accreditation. The *Akkreditierungsrat* defines itself as an “independent institution”.²⁰

The members of the *Akkreditierungsrat* were appointed by the *HRK* (German Rectors’ Conference) and the *KMK* (Permanent Conference of Ministers of Culture). The Council took up its work on 7 July 1999.²¹ In 2001, it also defined a framework that the universities need to follow if they want their Bachelor and Masters degrees to be accredited.²² We shall discuss this in our eighth section, when analysing the changes caused by the Bologna agreement.

The agencies set up by the accreditation council have to have amongst other things the following:

- a mission statement;
- a declaration of the independence of the agencies;
- an encompassing approach to accreditation procedures beyond the borders of states and kinds of higher institutions of learning, - and preferably also beyond the limits of study courses and disciplines;²³
- the involvement of the higher institutions of learning and of professional work;
- transparency of method (an example is peer review).²⁴

¹⁶ Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (ed.): Wegweiser 2003, 2003, 9 u. ZevA: Qualitätssicherung in Lehre und Studium: 2003, 51.

¹⁷ See also www.accreditation-council.de

¹⁸ See www.akkreditierungsrat.de/kriterien.htm and Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (ed.): Wegweiser 2003. Qualitätssicherung an Hochschulen. Sachstandsbericht und Ergebnisse einer Umfrage des Projektes *Qualitätssicherung*: 2003, 8.

¹⁹ A list of the agencies can be found in Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (ed.): Wegweiser 2003: 2003, 9.

²⁰ www.akkreditierungsrat.de/kriterien.htm, I. Vorbemerkung, 11.10.2004. At the 307th plenary session on 15th October 2004, the *KMK* decided that the *Akkreditierungsrat* should work in future as a “*Stiftung des Öffentlichen Rechts*”. (This is a foundation established by a “*hoheitlicher Verwaltungsakt*”, or sovereign administrative act. A ‘*Stiftung des öffentlichen Rechts*’ is a public legal body which has been made independent.) This transformation ensures, as the *KMK* puts it, the independence of the *Akkreditierungsrat*. The foundation is financed by the federal states (cf. Eckpunkte für die Weiterentwicklung der Akkreditierung in Deutschland. Beschluss der Kultusministerkonferenz vom 15.10.2004, www.akkreditierungsrat.de/KMK_Eckpunkte.pdf, 11-13).

²¹ Akkreditierungsrat Work report July 2001. The *Akkreditierungsrat* was established by the *Kultusministerkonferenz* and *Hochschulrektorenkonferenz*. It is financed by donations of the *Stifterverband für die Deutsche Wissenschaft*. www.accreditation-council.de, 10.11.2004.

²² www.akkreditierungsrat.de/referenzrahmen.htm

²³ “übergreifender Ansatz der Akkreditierungsverfahren über die Grenzen von Ländern und Hochschularten und möglichst Studiengängen und Fächergrenzen hinweg”

²⁴ Beschlüsse des Akkreditierungsrates – Mindeststandards und Kriterien- 1999: A II. Anträge auf Akkreditierung von Akkreditierungsagenturen www.akkreditierungsrat.de/kriterien.htm)

A concrete example of an accreditation agency is the ZEvA (*Zentrale Evaluations- und Akkreditierungsagentur Hannover*), which both accredits and evaluates higher education teaching.²⁵

The process of accreditation is divided into three different stages²⁶:

Following the application of the universities for accreditation (sometimes checked by the responsible ministry), a cost estimate is produced by the agency. After the *Hochschule*, the university, has agreed to pay, the assessment can start. The ZEvA organises the necessary “*Fachgutachter*” (peer experts, or evaluators), who may also be proposed by the applying *Hochschule*. This team is proposed to the SAK (*Ständige Akkreditierungskommission*, Permanent Accreditation Commission), which has to nominate the experts (*Gutachter*). This “Permanent Accreditation Commission” (translation R.K.) is divided into different disciplinary fields and consists of one representative for each disciplinary field. Interesting for our research question is that the Social Sciences are combined with Economy and Law, but divided from the Human Sciences. The nominated experts then assess the draft for the course of study. At this stage, peer-review is applied. The university has to respond to this assessment. Finally the expert commission writes a final report (*Abschlussbericht*), which the SAK has to agree on.

Essential in the decision process seems to be the SAK which is composed of representatives of the academic community (professors and students of the universities and technical colleges) and of professional practitioners.²⁷ The government of the respective *Länder* can take part in the accreditation process, if they wish to. In this case universities have to consider in their application the correspondence between the planned degree and the so-called *Strukturvorgaben* (guidelines) of the *Land*.

Even if governments seem less preoccupied with the regulation of the content of teaching in higher education, especially concerning the new established Bachelor and Masters courses, there still seem to be different degrees of state regulations and interference which remain.²⁸ The question that can not be answered by us, but will prove crucial, is in which way the new accreditation system is going to influence the contents of the study courses. Peer review is becoming more important in this new system and the question arises, whether there will be a standardisation of disciplines instead of further diversification and which parts of the academic community will influence the main disciplinary changes.

²⁵ ZEVA was established in 1995 as a joint institution to serve higher education institutions in Lower Saxony. On 4th February 2000, the Accreditation Council certified ZEvA as the first German accreditation agency. See ZEvA (Ed.): *Akkreditierung neuer Studiengänge mit dem Abschluss Bachelor und Masters*, Hannover 2002 (3. überarb. Auflage)

²⁶ ZEvA (ed.): *Qualitätssicherung in Lehre und Studium*: 2003, 53.

²⁷ The commission gets appointed by the board of directors (or executive board – Vorstand) of the EIQUA, European Institute for Quality Insurance.

²⁸ The *Akkreditierungsrat* states in the introduction to its statements concerning standards and criteria of accreditation that the accreditation of a course leaves the state permission of the courses “untouched”: “Die staatliche Genehmigung eines Studienganges bleibt von seiner Akkreditierung unberührt.” (www.akkreditierungsrat.de/kriterien.htm, I, 1). The exact procedure of governmental authorization is handled differently according to the respective laws of the federal states. Some *Länder* do not specify the permission and regulation to introduce new or altered courses, as in Hesse and North Rhine-Westphalia. Lower Saxony considers explicitly agencies as the most important actors in coping with the setting up of new university courses. It is therefore the only *Land* of our chosen examples that corresponds explicitly in its legislation with the development mentioned by Kehm. New courses of study are introduced on the basis of the target agreements between university and ministry (*NHG* 2002, §6).

1.3. Economic university conditions – growing economisation in the 1990s

The relationship between the state and the *Hochschulen*²⁹ has changed since the 1990s. Increasingly “autonomy” was claimed against traditional bureaucratic structures. This has been discussed mainly in terms of “efficiency“ and “competitiveness“ (see Kehm: 2004, 13), two keywords originating from the field of economics. These keywords indicate the direction in which the financial (and maybe also the substantial) restructuring of German universities is going and one may call it “paradigmatical changes” (Hoyningen-Huene: 2002, 3). Heinz-Dieter Loeber is typical of those critical voices that speak out against viewing American universities as a role model for Germany. He states that American universities cannot be seen as generally better, as there are major quality differences between them, depending on their financial strength. Length of study is not much longer in Germany, if one considers the *Diplom* and the *Magister* as equivalent to the MA. The older age of the German alumni is due to the longer school system of 13 years and also to the obligatory military service (for men). (*Deutscher Anglistenverband* 2000, according to Loeber: 2003, 10). Any problems of teaching in the German university system cannot be explained only by a lack of autonomy - an overload of students has been created by giving access to the universities in the late 1970s without increasing state funding for the universities.³⁰

The call for more autonomy was met by the amendment of the Framework Act in 1998³¹ (see glossary). The conditions for an intended stronger “autonomy“ were “evaluation, accountability, performance-related pay as well as conditional state funding in the context of so-called ‘global budgets’ (*Globalhaushalte*)”(Kehm: 2004, 13).³² With regard to the internal structures of the universities, we can therefore observe a change from “*Kameralistik*” (fiscal accountancy) to a form of business management, known as “global budgeting” („*Globalhaushalt*“).³³

With a *Globalhaushalt*, the university is allocated and has to administer and distribute annual funds, provided by the state.³⁴ Until now this operational autonomy has not been implemented in equal measure in the different universities and federal states. The transformation of the financial structure has many implications for the university. As a consequence, more hierarchical models of university and department structures have been installed that are influenced by hierarchical management structures (Kehm: 2004, 14). Dieter Sterzel and Joachim Perels (2003, 22) have argued that the reforms in Lower Saxony contradict the *Grundgesetz*, the basic law that guarantees the academic freedom of the individual researcher. Reducing the power of the *Senat* as elected representative committee of all members of the university and strengthening the power of the president probably diminishes the individual freedom of the single researcher. The shift from state control and

²⁹ We use here the German term, because it comprises the different types of institutions in higher education, as the *Fachhochschule* and the *Universität*, the principal two different forms of higher education, one defining itself more as an institution directed towards the “application” of knowledge, while the other stresses “theory”.

³⁰ Loeber: 2003, 20; Uwe Schimank et. al.: 1999, 179.

³¹ Cancellation of §§ 60-69 of the *HRG*. Compare also Sterzel/Perels: 2003, 19.

³² An example is here the *HG Nord-Rheinwestfalen* §5 Abs. 1 u. 2: State funding is tied to “fulfillment of outcomes”. The global budget is intended to accompany the introduction of a cost- and outcome account, of reporting and controlling („Einführung einer Kosten- und Leistungsrechnung, eines Berichtswesens und eines Controllings“).

Compare for the model projects of the „‘global’ university budget“ also Schimank et.al.: 1999, 183.

³³ „*Kameralistik*“ is a specific system of accountancy used in German public administration. It fixes the budget of a public institution for a certain period (generally one financial year). What has been regarded as problematic in this system is the fact that money which has not been spent in one year cannot be carried forward into the next year.

³⁴ See Michael Daxner (1999, 90), who was president (*Präsident*), when the *Globalhaushalt* was introduced in 1995 at the university of Oldenburg. See also Herbert Sievers (1998) about the pilot project in Lower Saxony.

regulation towards more market orientation thus brings about within the organisation a shift from the domination of professors to an increased importance of the organisation itself.³⁵

The growing economisation is connected to new control instruments of ‘quality management’, accreditation, evaluation³⁶ and target agreements have been introduced in the German higher education system.³⁷ Evaluation is at this point important to look at because it is connected to money distribution. We shall therefore discuss how the different actors of higher education policy in the context of the new “autonomy” take part in this evaluation of study and research content. Since 1994,³⁸ a growing number of agencies (sometimes also responsible for accreditation) has been set up either by the government or by associations of higher education institutions (*Hochschulverbände*) to develop instruments and methods of evaluating teaching (Kehm: 2004, 15; she does not discuss research evaluation). The major evaluation principle in Germany according to Kehm (2004, 15) is measuring the results of teaching in terms of self-defined goals and standards. Nearly all *Länder* of the universities we are analysing regulate by law an evaluation of teaching and research, some in much more detail than others.

One example of how evaluation functions is Lower Saxony. Here the evaluation of teaching is carried out by the ZEvA (already mentioned above), while the *Wissenschaftliche Kommission Niedersachsen* (WKN, Scientific Commission Lower Saxony) is responsible for the research evaluation. The WKN³⁹, which has organised the evaluation of all university disciplines in Lower Saxony since 1999, consists of one chairperson, ten members with voting rights and an additional six consultative members (they have to come from another *Bundesland*, not Lower Saxony). All are appointed for a period of three years by the *Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Kultur* and the *Ministerpräsidenten*, the ministry for science and culture and the prime minister.⁴⁰ The WKN plays an important role in higher education policy in advising the ministry on concepts of evaluation and making recommendations on the structural development in higher education (*Strukturempfehlungen*). It leads the evaluation process, which is then followed up by an appointed commission, which has to be proposed by the WKN and is then appointed by the Ministry of Higher Education. The whole process is guided by a steering committee, the *Lenkungscommission*, which consists of a member of the ministry, representatives of the *Hochschulen* and members of the WKN with different disciplinary backgrounds.

³⁵ Compare also Hoyningen-Huene: 2004, 4.

³⁶ See Kehm: 2004, 15.

³⁷ Neither the Higher Education Act of Baden-Württemberg, nor the one of Berlin stress the point of evaluation by having a separate paragraph about evaluation.

The *Länder* that give more attention to this point through legislative regulation can be subdivided into different types. Concerning the influence government has on the evaluation procedure, a difference can be observed between the *Länder*. In some *Länder* evaluation is structured and defined entirely by internal university rules, as is the case in Brandenburg and North Rhine-Westphalia. In Hessen, research evaluation is organised by the universities without interference from the ministry, while the evaluation of teaching has to be co-ordinated with the responsible ministry. Aspects of evaluation of research are regulated by § 35 relating to scientific procedures of qualification, awards, publications, funded research projects. The most detailed description of the procedure can be found in the Higher Education Act of Lower Saxony: the *NHG* §5 sections 1 and 2 decree that there has to be an internal evaluation in regular intervals followed by an external evaluation at longer intervals, at least every seven years. The external evaluation has to be pursued by an independent organisation (“eine vom Land und von der Hochschule unabhängige und wissenschaftsnahe Einrichtung“ Abs. 1). Similar to the cases mentioned above, evaluation of the teaching every semester is to be regulated by rules set up by the university.

³⁸ Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (ed.): *Qualitätssicherung 2003*: 2003, 5-6. The two-phase evaluation was introduced in 1994 by an EU-project „Qualitätsbewertung im Bereich der Hochschule“. Based on this the *HRK* decided in 1995 to introduce evaluation on a larger scale in German higher education, followed by similar decisions from the *Wissenschaftsrat* (Science Council).

³⁹ *Wissenschaftliche Kommission Niedersachsen* (ed.): *Tätigkeitsbericht 1997-2003*: 2003, 5-11.

⁴⁰ See *ibid* for the list of members, 83-4.

The *WKN* lists⁴¹ several criteria to evaluate research, one of them being interdisciplinarity. ‘Target agreements’ (*Zielvereinbarungen*) are established both between the government of the *Länder* and the universities, and sometimes between faculties and the *Präsidium* (university steering committee). These target agreements are often part of the ‘follow-up’⁴² of internal and external evaluations. The new control instrument of the „target agreements“ (*Zielvereinbarungen*) have not been introduced in all *Länder* equally. Some *Länder* just mention very generally that there is the option to have target agreements⁴³ or to set up some kind of structured plans which have to be agreed by the state secretary.⁴⁴ North Rhine-Westphalia⁴⁵ and Lower Saxony dictate target agreements, whereby the legislation of the latter is again especially detailed. The contents of the target agreements are according to the *NHG* (Lower Saxony) § 1, Abs. 3, Satz 1-4 “strategic development and efficiency goals” (transl. R.K.), which include planning of course structures, numbers of students admitted, the shortening of the study periods, the support of young academics, the agreement on areas of scientific enquiry, internationalisation, gender mainstreaming and the equalisation of women (“*Erfüllung des Gleichstellungsauftrages nach § 3 Abs.3*”).

1.4. Summary

‘Academic freedom’ in universities, guaranteed by the *Grundgesetz* has always been limited by state control through relevant legislation affecting academic contents (above all of teaching) and university finances. The last two have been modified by the reforms of higher education in the 1990s. Universities now are increasingly allowed to decide by themselves where to spend their money and are enabled to react more flexibly to changes. This has led to greater financial efficiency.

But the status of “autonomy” is ambivalent. Although the relationship between state and university has been changed by the development towards an „entrepreneurial university” (Hark: 2004, 366), the influence of the state on universities has not diminished since new control systems have been introduced⁴⁶. Hark argues that universities are only autonomous on an operational level, which is defined by the ‘target agreements’ (*Zielvereinbarungen*) between state and university. The legitimisation of university expenditure and politics are increasingly geared to market forces. The bureaucratic tasks of universities increase because of their accountability (“universitäre Rechenschaftspflicht”). From our point of view this is critical insofar as it can be feared that energies and money will be shifted to presentation and accounts (e.g., the costs for accreditation) at the expense of teaching and research.

Beside the lasting control of the state (especially through the target agreements) other actors of influence have appeared, concerning the control of universities. Evaluation agencies and accreditation agencies are prominently under academic control, but also intertwined with state control as we have shown above. Therefore on the one hand academic interests can increasingly be pursued, but it could also be asked, *which* academic interests and possibly hegemonies are being pushed by these to some extent centralised procedures of accreditation and evaluation. This is important in the case of the evaluation of Sociology at the university of Hannover, which we shall consider shortly in our second section. A disciplinary division

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 10.

⁴² Compare *Verband Norddeutscher Universitäten: Zielvereinbarungen als „Follow up“ der Evaluation von Studium und Lehre*. Hamburg 2000.

⁴³ *BbgHG* § 2, Abs. 6. See list of abbreviations at the end of the document.

⁴⁴ *UG Baden-Württemberg* § 36, Abs. 3.

⁴⁵ *Hg Nordrhein-Westfalen* § 9.

⁴⁶ Hark calls it “neue staatliche Steuerungsinstrumente” (2004, 367).

between Social and Human Sciences seems to emerge in the SAK, the accreditation commission in Hannover (see above).

Kreckel (2003, 8) argues that the reforms taking place in Germany can be described as an „oblique economisation“. Utility and reduction of costs gain high significance. Academic freedom is here limited not only by state control but also by the ‘market’.⁴⁷ This could be reinforced by the accreditation process, which in the case of the ZEvA always includes a professional practitioner as an expert (*Gutachter*). Academic freedom could therefore be limited increasingly in the future by the utilitarianism of the market and through state control.

2. Infrastructural definitions of disciplines

To analyse how disciplines are defined by infrastructure, we will focus in the following on the teaching and research funding.

2.1. Teaching

The German higher education system is presently involved in a process of transformation where the former degrees *Magister*, *Diploma* and *Staatsexamen* are replaced by a two-phase system of consecutive degrees: Bachelor and Masters. This new graduation system was established on a trial basis by amendment of the HRG in 1998.⁴⁸ Traditionally there was a division between a more applied and a more theoretical approach through a binary higher education system of *Fachhochschulen* (Universities of Applied Sciences) and *Universitäten* (universities). At least as an ideal the German university has been based on the concept of the Humboldtian idea of the unity of research and teaching.

University structures

Another aspect concerning the infrastructural definition of disciplines is the division of universities into different disciplinary fields, i.e. faculties. In the universities we analysed, generally speaking a trend can be observed, which started in the 1990s. While in the 1980s universities tended to split their organisational structure into smaller entities, the “departments” (*Fachbereiche*), sometimes reducing them to just one discipline (as, e.g. in Frankfurt/Main), in the 1990s the reorganisation (in Oldenburg) or complete overhaul (as at Berlin Humboldt, Frankfurt/Oder) of university structures meant unifying disciplines to larger entities (at a first glance without any uniform system). These larger units were sometimes called again, according to the traditional university model of the 19th century, “faculties” (*Fakultäten*).⁴⁹

The following illustrates the diverse German faculty structures in selected universities. We first describe the old universities of Heidelberg and Köln with their traditional faculty structures. Then the University of Frankfurt/ Main and the Institute for Social Research, the Universities of Hannover and Oldenburg, all restructured or founded since the 1960s. The

⁴⁷ Clark (1983) assumed three main powers limiting academic freedom: the state, the market and the academic oligarchy. These have to be extended nowadays to internationalisation and academic hierarchy (compare Kreckel 2003).

⁴⁸ We will describe it more in detail in section 8.

⁴⁹ Our examples illustrate this development, e.g. in 1993 the *Akademische Senat* of the Humboldt University decided to reduce the twenty-four *Fachbereiche*, which had been established in 1990 after the fall of the Berlin Wall as an internal structure. They established 11 entities, from now on called *Fakultäten*. In 2003 the Carl-von-Ossietzky University consolidated its eleven *Fachbereiche* (which had existed since 1987) into five *Fakultäten*. The youngest (founded in 1991) of our sample, the European University Viadrina in Frankfurt/Oder has only three faculties, the last one, the *Kulturwissenschaftliche Fakultät* having been established in 1994.

universities of Hannover and Oldenburg can be described as “reform universities” of the first period of restructuring universities after 1945 which included a more democratic structure (in contrast to the “*Ordinarien-Universität*”). Both were transformed out of older higher education institutions which are in the traditional hierarchical order less highly regarded because of their orientation towards applied knowledge: the Hannover University was formerly a “*Technische Hochschule*” (College of Higher Technical Education) and the Oldenburg University was developed out of a “*Pädagogische Hochschule*” (Teacher Training College). These two universities are similar to one another and combine only to a certain extent Social and Human Sciences. Subsequently we will turn to the case of Berlin, which embraces also Social Sciences and Human Sciences, with a limited effect on interdisciplinary cooperation. Finally we look at the Europa-Universität Viandra in Frankfurt/Oder, the youngest of our chosen universities. This university is an interesting case where an interdisciplinary concept (between the Social and Human Sciences) has an equivalent in structural entities.

Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg

The *Ruprecht-Karls-Universität* is the oldest university in Germany. Since its foundation in 1386, the university has consisted of four Faculties. In 1890 Natural Science was added as the fifth faculty. In 1969 the university was subdivided into 16 faculties. Since 2002, the faculty structure has reduced from 16 to 12 faculties.⁵⁰ The Institute for Sociology and the Institute for Political Sciences are located in the Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, the (old) faculty of economics. The Humanities are divided into the Faculty of Philosophy, the Faculty of Modern Languages, and the Faculty of Behavioural and Cultural Studies (*Fakultät für Verhaltens- und Empirische Kulturwissenschaften*). The Institute of Art History is included in the Faculty of Philosophy. In the Faculty of Behavioural and Cultural Studies are included: the Institute for Psychology, Educational Studies, the Institute for Sports, Gerontology and Ethnology.

Universität Köln

The university of Köln is also one of the largest and oldest universities in Germany, founded in 1388 and closed in 1798. In 1919, the city council of Köln re-established the College of Commerce, which had been founded in 1909, into a Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences. The Faculty of Philosophy and the Faculty of Law were founded in 1910. In 1955, the Faculty of Philosophy was divided into a Faculty of Philosophy and a Faculty of Natural Sciences. To this day, the university of Köln has seven faculties: Economics; Business Administration and Social Sciences; Law; Medicine; Arts; Mathematics and Natural Sciences; Educational Sciences; and Remedial Science with a traditional university structure. The Humanities are located in the Faculty of Arts and the Social Sciences in the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration.

J.W. Goethe Universität Frankfurt Main and the Institute for Social Research

Frankfurt University was founded in 1914 and re-named after Frankfurt’s most famous citizen in 1932, thus becoming the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University. It was the first German university with a united Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, while on the other hand there was no Faculty of Theology. In 1967 the five traditional faculties – Jurisprudence, Medicine, Philosophy, Natural Sciences and Economics and Social Sciences - were divided into 19 smaller departments. At the same time, teacher training was integrated into the university. The formerly endowed university becomes a state university administered by the

⁵⁰ The Faculty of Medicine consists of the medical faculties of the *Universität Heidelberg* and the *Universität Mannheim*. See: www.uni-heidelberg.de/fakultaetsstruktur/htm.

Hessen government. Since the 1970s the university has had 16 Departments which are not structured logically but came about by default.

The Humanities are divided into different departments, i.e., History, Philosophy, Modern Languages and Linguistics, Cultural and Civilization Studies. The Department of Social Sciences was split at the beginning of the 1970s, into the disciplines Sociology⁵¹ and Political Sciences. It has a long tradition of social research and teaching with a strong connection between sociology and political sciences, but also to philosophy, social psychology, psychoanalysis and economics. Among the intellectual traditions which have had a lasting influence on the questions posed and the theoretical approaches adopted in the Faculty of Social Sciences, is the Frankfurt School associated with the names of Max Horkheimer, Theodor W. Adorno and Jürgen Habermas at the Institute for Social Research. The Institute for Social Research (*Institut für Sozialforschung, IfS*) was founded in 1923 on the private initiative of the Weil family.⁵² The IfS was and still is an institutionalised cooperation partner of the Social Sciences and Humanities at the J.W. Goethe University. The orientation towards interdisciplinary research at the Department of Social Sciences is rooted in this cooperation. The intellectually rich interdisciplinary perspectives of critical social theorists in the 1920s and early 1930s were continued in a certain sense when the Institute was rebuilt and several of the exiled researchers returned after the end of the NS regime. Accordingly, interdisciplinarity between the Social Sciences and the Humanities has played a vital role, including in the establishment of the interdisciplinary Centre for Women's Studies and Research on Gender Relations (*Cornelia Goethe Centrum*). There is a close cooperation between the department of Social Sciences and other research institutes in Frankfurt that are active in related fields, e.g., the Institute for Social Research, the Sigmund Freud Institute, the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt, the Center for North America Studies, and the Academy of Labour at Johann Wolfgang Goethe University.

Universität Hannover

The Universität Hannover was founded in 1978. Previously the Technische Hochschule Hannover had already become a *Technische Universität*, (Technical University) in 1968. The Departments (*Fachbereiche*) were not reorganised. They were defined in 1980 and only slightly restructured in 1997. Since then there have been 16 *Fachbereiche* and one *Fakultät*. The Human and Social Sciences are split into two entities, one being *Fachbereich Literatur- und Sprachwissenschaften* (Department of Literature and Linguistics) the other one *Fachbereich Geschichte, Philosophie und Sozialwissenschaften* (Department of History, Philosophy and Social Sciences). Therefore the second can be regarded as a case of an at least structural combination of Human and Social Sciences. The Department of History, Philosophy and Social Sciences (*Fachbereich Geschichte, Philosophie und Sozialwissenschaften*) of the University of Hannover established towards the end of the 1990s different interdisciplinary "*Schwerpunkte*" (priorities): "Gender Studies", "European Studies" and the so-called "Periphery and centre" with the intention to connect History, Sociology, Political Science, Psychology and Philosophy. Gender Studies was founded in the spring of 1999. Its specific profile is determined through a combination of history of science and societies with a focus on historical and social science research.

Carl-von-Ossietzky-Universität Oldenburg

The Carl-von-Ossietzky-Universität was founded in 1974. After its recent restructuring it is in principle similarly structured as Hannover, having a Faculty of Linguistics and Cultural

⁵¹ The first *Soziologisches Seminar* was established in 1930.

⁵² See: www.ifs.uni-frankfurt.de/english/history.htm

Sciences (*Fakultät III, Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaften*) and a Faculty of Human and Social Sciences (*Fakultät IV Human- und Gesellschaftswissenschaften*). The first contains all Language and Literature Studies and Music and Art/Visual Studies, the second similar disciplines such as Philosophy, Social and Political Sciences, Psychology, History (and additionally Sports). Explicit interdisciplinary institutionalised structures in the field of Social Sciences and Humanities are the *IBKM (Interdisziplinäres Zentrum für Bildung und Kommunikation in Migrationsprozessen, Interdisciplinary Center for Education and Communication in Migration Processes)* and since 2001 the *ZFG (Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung [Centre for Interdisciplinary Women and Gender Studies])* which also aims to build cooperation between social sciences and natural sciences. Current research projects are “Gender and Science Policies: Procedures of Assessing, Selecting and Promoting Participants of PhD Programmes at the Universities of Lower Saxony”, “The Status of Women in the Scientific Discipline Mathematics” and “Constructing Gender and Violence – Ambiguities of Modernity in Processes of Globalization” (in cooperation with researchers in political science, sociology and art history/cultural studies).⁵³

Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

The Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin was founded in 1810 by the Prussian state during the famous reforms called after Humboldt. After the Second World War it was situated in the eastern part of the city, governed by the Russian part of the allied administration. After the reunification it is again in the centre of Berlin. It underwent major restructuring at the beginning of the 1990s, after the German unification and the disbandment of GDR-universities. The newly structured Humboldt University has some affinities with old German university traditions (regarding the new re-established structure of the old faculties) but at the same time it can be considered as a “reform university” of the 1990s. The Humanities and Social Sciences are divided into four “Philosophical” faculties (*Philosophische Fakultäten*). The *Philosophische Fakultät II* is a faculty that only contains disciplines of the Human Sciences (Linguistics and Literature – even if the study of foreign languages such as *Anglistik*, *Amerikanistik* und *Slawistik* is traditionally connected with a broader range of subjects of Social- and Political Sciences, the so-called *Landeskunde* (i.e. regional studies). The *Philosophische Fakultät I* and *III* in comparison to the second contain both Human and Social Sciences. In the case of the first faculty they offer an explanation, why they established a structural unit of the “institutes” (*Institute*) of Philosophy, History, European Ethnology and Librarian Sciences (*Bibliothekswissenschaft*). They define the subject “Europe – Idea, History, Culture”⁵⁴ as a common focal point of the four disciplines and as the exploratory focus of each discipline.

Different from Hannover and Oldenburg, Berlin combines Social Sciences, and Visual and Cultural Studies together in *Philosophische Fakultät III*.⁵⁵ The faculty consists of the Institute of Social Sciences, the Institute of Cultural Studies (*Institut für Kulturwissenschaften*, which comprises different smaller unities, the seminars (*Seminare*), e.g. art and music history, aesthetics, cultural studies etc.) and the Institute of Asian and African Studies. In this structural unit there is also the *Zentrum für transdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien* a

⁵³ http://www.uni-oldenburg.de/zfg/research_projects.htm.

⁵⁴ Under the title „Forschungsschwerpunkt“ the faculty writes: „Für alle vier in der Philosophischen Fakultät I versammelten Institute bildet das Thema „Europa – Idee, Geschichte, Kultur“ sowohl einen eigenständigen Fachschwerpunkt in Forschung und Lehre als auch einen gemeinsamen Schnittpunkt mit den anderen Instituten der Fakultät“ www2.rz.hu-berlin.de/geschichte/phifak1/profil.htm Stand: 7.5.2002, Ansicht: 11.8.2004.

⁵⁵ There is no self-definition on their website such as the one from *Phil. Fakultät I*.

“transdisciplinary” Centre of Gender Studies, formerly (until 2003) the *ZIF, Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien*. This faculty seems the most heterogeneous unit concerning our question about interdisciplinarity between Social and Human Sciences. But while the research projects in the Human Sciences seem to open up to subjects and methods that come from the Social Sciences, such openness is less evident with regard to the Social Sciences.

Europa-Universität Viadrina

The European University Viadrina was founded in 1991 (there existed a university called Viadrina until 1811). It explicitly strives for an integration of the Humanities and Social Sciences in the “Faculty of Cultural Studies” (*Kulturwissenschaftliche Fakultät*). It has a special research and education structure (see case study section 4) to support interdisciplinary work from the very beginning of any programme of study. (The Viadrina can be regarded as a realisation of the in the 1990s programmatically formulated reorientation towards an integration of Social Sciences and Humanities as “Kulturwissenschaften” – see section 6.) There is no institutionalised Gender Studies program.

Summary

Traditionally in the older universities (Köln, Heidelberg), Social Sciences and Economics have been closely connected. This strong connection was dissolved in some of the universities that have been founded since the 1970s in the context of major restructuring. Our examples demonstrate that university structures tend to differ from one another due to the fact that its structure can be defined more or less autonomously by every university. The development towards larger entities, embracing in some cases Humanities and Social Sciences (particularly Berlin, Frankfurt/Oder, to a certain extent also Hannover and Oldenburg) might facilitate and encourage interdisciplinary work. But above all, the reasons for any change, as is characteristic for the recent university reforms, are often effectiveness and financial reasons. Concerning the impact of legislation on the faculty structure two different tendencies can be observed in the cases we analysed. Some of the *Länder* underline in general the need to combine similar subjects in one faculty while others in contrast stress the need for interdisciplinarity.⁵⁶

Evaluation

New developments in higher education including evaluation and accreditation⁵⁷ seem to have had an impact on the content of research and teaching. Since this has been a recent phenomenon one can only guess what the long-term effects of evaluation and accreditation will be. We shall discuss the case of Hanover as an example. Sociology and Political Sciences in Hanover were evaluated negatively in 2004 by the *WKN*⁵⁸. The report thought their focus on Critical Theory outmoded and stressed the need for “empirical- analytical sociological research” as core to the discipline. The evaluation commission also complained about a lack of teaching of methods.⁵⁹ One might argue that this indicates simply a difference in

⁵⁶While Brandenburg (§ 71) and Baden-Wuerttemberg (§21) prescribe that faculties should contain similar or related disciplines, North Rhine-Westfalia (§25) and Lower Saxony (§36) advise an interdisciplinary structuring of faculties, to favour interdisciplinary working. Hesse prescribes only the quantitative minimum of professorships which should be included in one entity. A similar comment can be found in the case of North Rhine-Westphalia (§ 25, Absatz 2) which explicitly states that the structure should encourage interdisciplinary working.

⁵⁷ See Section 1.

⁵⁸ See Section 1.

⁵⁹ „Die Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung zählen zum Kernbereich der Soziologie. Sie stellen eine Klammer zwischen verschiedenen Teildisziplinen und ‚Bindestrich-Soziologien‘ dar und spielen zudem eine wichtige Rolle in Nachbardisziplinen wie Politikwissenschaft und empirischer Wirtschaftsforschung. Ein Blick

disciplinary perspective. In 2003 the Institute of Sociology in Hannover stressed the importance of theory in Sociology as a critical science, instead of reducing Sociology to a mere methodology. In its evaluation of Sociology and Political Sciences in Lower Saxony the WKN suggested a particular version of the discipline Sociology. Referring to the German Sociological Association, the *DGS*, they applied a disciplinary course content standard which should contain General Theory and empirical sociological research methods.⁶⁰ Additionally, the evaluation commission stated that Gender Studies should be considered as a „*Querschnittsaufgabe*“ (general obligation) of the Social Sciences⁶¹, a positive development that they noted had already taken place at the universities of Hannover, Oldenburg and to some extent Braunschweig.

2.2. Research funding

The bulk of German Social Sciences and Humanities research takes place within the university system. Usually the research is attached to professorial chairs in faculties or research institutes. Research and teaching are connected.

In Germany there is one main national research foundation, the German Research Community *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)*. The *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* is financed by the government. It is self-governing and promotes research at universities and other publicly financed research institutions.⁶² The *DFG* is the most important resource for externally funded projects for the Humanities and Social Sciences. It serves all branches of the social sciences and the humanities by funding research projects and facilitating cooperation among researchers. The Humanities and the Social Sciences are in one panel (*Gruppe Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften*). The *DFG* supports younger academics and international institutional cooperation (*DFG Bericht 2002, 4*).

In 1996 the *DFG* established four Centers for Human Sciences (*Geisteswissenschaftliche Zentren*) in the new federal states, with the target of developing interdisciplinary, cooperative, project-oriented, international research in the Humanities with a focus on Cultural Studies⁶³. In 2002, a working group was founded by members of the panel (*Fachgruppe*) „*Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften*“ of the *DFG* boards⁶⁴.

According to the *DFG*, interdisciplinarity is an important aspect of their research politically. Research with an applied perspective (*anwendungsrelevanten Bezug*) is supported, especially in the Social and Behavioural Sciences. In cooperation with the German Academic Exchange

in international führende Zeitschriften zeigt: Die typische soziologische Studie ist empirisch-analytisch, d.h. sie geht von einer theoretisch inspirierten Fragestellung und Hypothese aus und untersucht diese mit kontrollierten empirischen Methoden.“ In: *Forschungsevaluation an niedersächsischen Hochschulen und Forschungseinrichtungen. Politikwissenschaft und Soziologie. Ergebnisse und Empfehlungen*. Herausgegeben von der Wissenschaftlichen Kommission Niedersachsen und dem Niedersächsischen Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Kultur, Hannover März 2004, 41 ff..

⁶⁰ *Forschungsevaluation an niedersächsischen Hochschulen und Forschungseinrichtungen. Politikwissenschaft und Soziologie. Ergebnisse und Empfehlungen*. Edited by the *Wissenschaftlichen Kommission Niedersachsen und dem Niedersächsischen Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Kultur*, Hannover März 2004, p. 52.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² www.dfg.de

⁶³ „Die Einrichtung von Geisteswissenschaftlichen Zentren in den neuen Bundesländern dient nach Empfehlungen des Wissenschaftsrates der Förderung und der Entwicklung interdisziplinärer, kooperativer, projektorientierter sowie kulturwissenschaftlich und international ausgerichteter Forschung in den Geisteswissenschaften“. *DFG, Jahresbericht 2002: 1, DFG Bericht 2002-2006: 72*.

⁶⁴ See Bundesministerium für Forschung und Technologie (eds.): „Geisteswissenschaften heute: Empfehlungen“ 2003 eine *Förderinitiative Geisteswissenschaften*, 2003 (www.dfg.de/aktuelles_presse/download/foerderinitiative_gw_vorschlaege.pdf).

Service (*DAAD*), the DFG supports international PhD programmes initiated in order to stimulate the development of graduate schools.⁶⁵ The programmes support PhD students and especially foreign PhD students through workshops, consultations, seminars and access to research networks. The idea is to limit the time a doctoral degree takes and to provide optimal supervision by firmly defining the university's institutional responsibility for doctoral students.⁶⁶ The goals of these programmes at German universities are to implement the relevant recommendations given by the German Science Council (*Wissenschaftsrat*) and the German Rectors' Conference (*Hochschulrektorenkonferenz*) on reforming doctoral training. Their aim is to increase the international appeal and competitiveness of doctoral degrees gained in Germany by highly qualified postgraduate students from Germany and other countries through clearly structuring and intensifying doctoral studies.

Another form of doctoral programmes of special interest concerning interdisciplinarity are Graduate Courses (*Graduiertenkollegs*). Graduate Courses are interdisciplinary collaborations between several faculties. They are initiated and financed by the *DFG* to support younger scientists. The concept of the Graduate Course is influenced by the Anglo-American model of postgraduate studies. The idea is to cross disciplinary borders and to support interdisciplinarity (*Wissenschaftsrat* 1994: 4ff, Enders 1996: 77). The goal of Graduate Courses is to promote highly qualified scientists and researchers and to prepare doctoral students for positions in interdisciplinary and international research contexts.

Besides these kinds of doctoral programmes there are long-term research programmes at universities in which scientists and researchers collaborate within cross-disciplinary programmes called *Special Research Centres* (*Sonderforschungsbereiche*) and funded for up to 12 years.⁶⁷

Besides the public *DFG* the private Volkswagen Foundation (*Volkswagenstiftung*) has also initiated projects focused on subjects, which are meant to encourage internationality and interdisciplinarity both between the Human and Social Sciences, and the Human/Social Sciences and Natural Sciences. Examples of these kinds of projects are "*Zukunftsfragen der Gesellschaft*" (Questions of the Future of Society), "*Innovationsprozesse in Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*" (Innovation in the Economy and in Society), "*Tandemprogramme für Post-Docs*" (Parallel Programms for PostDocs) and "*Schlüsselthemen in den Geisteswissenschaften*" (Key Themes in the Humanities).

At a meeting on sustainability and networking⁶⁸ in the Human and Social Sciences, Szöllösi Brenig, the representative (*Referentin*) of the VW-Foundation, stated that in 2001, 920 research projects were proposed and 465 were granted, 214 of in the Human Sciences. Concerning Human Sciences the program initiated in 1998, "Key Issues for the Human Sciences" in particular is of interest. The goal of this program is to strengthen the Human Sciences by encouraging interdisciplinarity, internationality and public resonance of research

⁶⁵ Applications are not possible for individuals but only for universities.

⁶⁶ A list of the 49 International Postgraduate Programmes (IPP) is available at: <http://www.daad.de/ipp/>

⁶⁷ We focused on the Doctoral Studies for Human and Social Sciences. Besides the *Graduiertenkollegs* and *Sonderforschungsbereiche* there are other programmes for doctoral studies, e.g. the International Max Planck Research Schools, which are "Centres of scientific excellence in selected innovative and interdisciplinary research fields", like neuro sciences, molecular biology, computer sciences (see: <http://www.mpg.de>). There also exists a network of over ten international PhD programs in the biological and medical field (see: <http://www.mh-hannover.de>).

⁶⁸ Dr. Szöllösi-Brenig: „Förderung und Vernetzung in den Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften“ 12. Juni 2002 Oldenburg, Quelle/Daten Peter Bremer Kopie

in the Human Sciences.⁶⁹ In addition to internationality, innovation concerning content and structure of the discipline and questions of current interest, interdisciplinarity - above all in connection with Medicine, Natural and Technical Science – is encouraged.⁷⁰ The program is open to the Human Sciences “in the narrower sense”, such as Philosophy and the philological-historical disciplines⁷¹, but also to the disciplines of Social Sciences, Economics and Jurisprudence.

3. Disciplinisation: Process and Problematics

3.1. Definitions of Disciplinarity and Disciplines

Disciplinarity is a prominent aspect, if not the most important aspect of academic science. Yet it seems hard to grasp what disciplinarity exactly is or means. Its character can be described as ambiguous. On the one hand it enables research and teaching by creating free spaces and continuity in the development of knowledge (also connected to financial resources). On the other hand it determines and regulates the production of knowledge. Sabine Hark (2004, 343) has shown, that both aspects are part of one process, in which “disciplines regulate by producing”. This ambiguous character affects also the controversial discussion of Women and Gender Studies becoming a discipline, a subject we will focus on in section 4.

Although it can be stated that disciplinarity is one of the most important aspects of science in that it establishes “stabilizing routines” (Clark: 1983, 21),⁷² different authors note that the boundaries of disciplines are vague and cannot be defined precisely (Knapp: 1998, 45 f.). There are two main reasons for this. One reason is that they change over time. (Julie Thompson Klein: 1993, 186, quoted by Hark: 2004, 335). The second reason is, that there are no theoretical and methodological paradigms that define a discipline. Therefore Hark questions whether disciplines must be seen as a heterogeneity of methods and theories, i.e. an “internal specialisation and differentiation in ‘Hyphen-Fields’” (Hark: 2004, 335).⁷³

Taking this as a starting point, disciplines can be understood as “ensembles of heterogeneous elements“(Hark: 2004, 337)⁷⁴ that become differentiated “discursive formations” (Hark: 2004, 335)⁷⁵ in the process of producing knowledge. The production of knowledge is governed/informed by the interaction of multiple elements – social and political, cognitive and institutional. “Disciplinarity, understood in this way, names the produced coherence of otherwise disparate elements”⁷⁶ (Hark 2004: 338). Edward Shils (1982) developed three pragmatic elements to define disciplines: students, journals, financing (Hark: 2004, 338). According to Rudolf Stichweh, disciplines are forms of social institutionalisation of a process of cognitive differentiation in science with relatively fuzzy borders (Stichweh 1994:17). From a system-theoretical perspective Rudolf Stichweh (1994: 17) identifies five defining elements to characterize a “discipline”:

1. a sufficiently homogenous scientific community;

⁶⁹ www.volkswagen-stiftung.de/foerderung/foerdi..., Einsicht: 6.7.2004.

⁷⁰ ebd., Merkblatt für Antragsteller, II Thematischer Rahmen, Einsicht 6.7. 2004.

⁷¹ ibid., III Bearbeitung der Themen – Fächerspektrum.

⁷² Clark calls it “the first principle”, quoted by Hark: 2004, 334.

⁷³ „interne Spezialisierung und Differenzierung in ‚Bindestrich-Felder‘“

⁷⁴ „Ensemble heterogener Elemente“

⁷⁵ „diskursive Formationen“

⁷⁶ Transl. Josh Hoenes.

2. a corpus of scientific knowledge, which is represented through textbooks, i.e. it is characterized through codification, consensual acceptance and teach-ability;
3. a sufficient number of up-to-date questions addressing problems;
4. a set of research methods and paradigmatic approaches and problem solving;
5. a career structure specific to the discipline and institutionalised processes of socialisation, which serves the selection and indoctrination of junior fellows and prospective scientists.

With the exception of the institutionalised socialisation – at least until recently - all these mentioned characteristics of “disciplines” can be found not only in disciplinary, but in interdisciplinary contexts e.g. in Women and Gender Studies.

Disciplinarity thus can be understood as a mechanism of regulating knowledge by a hegemonically determined process of inclusion and exclusion, which affects memorisation (Mary Douglas: 1991).

Those elements that did not fit into disciplinary categories were excluded in the historical process of establishing disciplines (Stichweh: 1994). These problematic effects cannot be undone by self-definition as “anti-disciplinary” or interdisciplinary (Hark: 2004, 343). There is rather, as Sabine Hark accentuates, a need for reflexivity to cope with this problematic aspect of disciplinarity. One important problem that constrains reflexivity is the fact that claiming universal relevance is an important strategy for legitimising disciplines. Wallerstein et al. (1996, 48) state: “The justification may be made on moral, practical, aesthetic, or political grounds, or some combination thereof, but all institutionalized knowledge proceeds on the presumption that the lessons of the case at hand have significant bearing on the next case, and that the list of potential cases is, for all practical purposes, endless.” Once knowledge is institutionalised it is very difficult to challenge notions of an alleged universality.

3.2. Examples for Disciplinisation: Process and Problematic

Art History

Positions of disciplines change over time and can co-exist at a time, forming a heterogeneous complex. This can be shown by considering the juxtaposition of two versions of Art History, which can be distinguished at least as types: Art History as “*Geistesgeschichte*” and as “*Kulturwissenschaft*”.⁷⁷ Art History understood as *Geistesgeschichte* conceives of works of art as a direct emanation of a group’s, community’s or nation’s collective (existential) orientation, i.e. as a “sensual objectification” of a mentality. In comparison the *kulturwissenschaftliche* approach of Art History tries to reconstruct the historical context and situations in which and on behalf of which works of art are produced. Art History as *Kulturwissenschaft* includes approaches and topics of the Social Sciences and therefore a point of view where the disciplinary boundaries between Human and Social Sciences can be crossed (an aspect we will return to in section 6).

An often quoted central author of the *kulturwissenschaftliche* position of Art History is Aby Warburg (1866-1929). Characteristic of his view was his broad field of interest, including antiquity, Renaissance art but also non-European subjects not considered as art from an euro-centric point of view, e.g. the Indian rituals of the Hopi. He also emphasised the relevance of so-called “trivial objects” like stamps for art history for example. (Traditionally these subjects

⁷⁷ Cf. Ulrich Pfisterer (ed.): Metzler Lexikon Kunstwissenschaft. Ideen. Methoden, Begriffe. Stuttgart; Weimar 2003, 201. For the history of Art History see also Heinrich Dilly: Kunstgeschichte als Institution: Studien zur Geschichte einer Disziplin. Frankfurt a.M. 1979.

had only been discussed by disciplines such as Ethnology, Anthropology, Oriental Studies.)⁷⁸ Warburg, who built the “*Warburg-Bibliothek für Kulturwissenschaft*” in Hamburg, included in his research what (not only) Art History traditionally had excluded.⁷⁹ Art History as *Kulturwissenschaften* opens up to a wider definition of its subject matter. This development was stopped in Germany by Nazism, the Warburg Library was brought to London and Erwin Panofsky, an art historian who followed the tradition of *Kulturwissenschaften* emigrated to the United States.

In the 1970s some younger art historians returned to cultural approaches in art history. Following the works of Warburg, Edgar Wind and Erwin Panofsky they opposed an understanding of art history as a discipline of “pure” history of artists or formal styles. Similar to Art History as a social history of art, which had been established shortly before, they were influenced by “Cultural Studies” and the “New Historicism”.

Besides the omission of non-European cultures,⁸⁰ modern media and other forms of “non-artistic” visual media, women artists/questions of women in/and art and the reflection of gender aspects have been excluded from traditional Art History. The traditional focus of Art History on the myth of the male, white artist was criticized by Women`s and Feminist Art History during the late 1970s. Feminist criticism highlighted the heteronormative understandings/structures of Art History, for example its gendered division: on the one hand mostly female students, on the other hand male professors; “male” written art history and “female” art education work in the museums (see also Hoffmann-Curtius: 1991; Paul 2001).

Debates on the canon form a crucial point in the process of building disciplines. In these debates common sets of beliefs of science communities are negotiated, founding a common sense of identity and allowing differentiation of other disciplines. Laitko (1999) calls attention to the fact that during the processes of building canons and disciplines knowledge of a discipline`s systemics became increasingly important than the knowledge of a discipline`s history. This led to a loss of reflexivity, a problem which for Hark is an essential point in her criticism of disciplinarity (Hark: 2004, 345f.).⁸¹

Sociology

The structuring of disciplines as primary units of the internal differentiation of science, is relatively new in the historical process. The new discipline range of the “sciences of action and the social sciences” (*Handlungs- und Sozialwissenschaften*) developed around 1900. While pre-modern hierarchical forms of knowledge (*Wissensformen*) tended to separate knowledge systems, the modern sciences an interrelation between the disciplines and their hereto unknown dynamics developed. Rudolf Stichweh defined this process as “the formation of the internal environment” (“*die Formation der inneren Umwelt*“) of the sciences (see: Stichweh: 1994, Wobbe: 1995). According to Stichweh, this phase of formation of a

⁷⁸ Cf. Metzler: 2003, 195.

⁷⁹ Cf. on the growing critique of the Euro-centric positions of all Western-European disciplines, in this report referring mainly to the Social Sciences see Wallerstein et al.: 1996, 91.

⁸⁰ These borders have become also increasingly permeable because of “globalisation” (Pfisterer: Metzler Lexikon: 2003, 195).

⁸¹ Female Art Historians organised the „*Kunsthistorikerinnentagung*“ (conferences of female art historians) as a counterinstitution to the „*Deutsche Kunsthistorikertag*“organised by the *Deutscher Kunsthistorikerverband*. (see Section 5). The first *Kunsthistorikerinnentagung* took place in 1981. Meanwhile the *Kunsthistorikerverband* began to include gender research (see also Section 5).

discipline is particularly interesting, because this is when the criteria for fixing the boundaries and the differentiation of disciplines takes place (Wobbe: 1995, 14).

Wolf Lepenies described sociology as a “third culture” (*dritte Kultur*) between the Humanities on the one side and the Natural Sciences on the other side.⁸² For Lepenies, sociology and literature have competed since the middle of the 19th century, to supply the key orientation for the civilization of modern society and of secularized industrial society. Accordingly, Lepenies’ sociology was and is a discipline, which varies, imitating the scientific attitude of the natural sciences and following the hermeneutic disciplines (Lepenies: 1985). Viola Klein sees this as the most important and characteristic element of sociology. Through the development of its own set of problems, Sociology could differ from the other philosophical and historical disciplines (Wobbe: 1995, 13). “Questions about the possibility of social order were transported from a philosophical context to a context of analytical problems and were directed to questions of social life, towards its rules, samples and stability” (Wobbe: 1995, 13). It introduced itself in the science system as a “third culture” (Lepenies: 1985) by finding its impulses in philosophy, history and economy (Wobbe: 1995, 125). At the same time, sociology justified itself primarily because of a new perspective and especially by the conceptualisation of a “methodology and method” for the empirical- theoretical research of social action, structures and processes. Even, if sociology emerged as a system of thought, as an independent “academic discipline” of study and research, sociology did not take root in universities until end of the 19th century. The institutionalizing process⁸³ of the discipline Sociology can be divided into different sequences. Wobbe differentiates between six phases (1995, 129):

1. phase of identification, (*Identifikationsphase*),
2. Communication phase (*Kommunikationsphase*)
3. Initiation and demarcation phase (*Initiations- und Abgrenzungsphase*),
4. Recruiting phase (*Rekrutierungsphase*),
5. Diffusion phase (*Diffusionsphase*),
6. Legitimation phase (*Sanktionierungsphase*).

To date the development and history of sociology are considered a male domain (on this point, see especially Wobbe 1995, Honegger/ Wobbe1998).

The establishment of the German Sociological Association *DGS* marks a first date of the process of institutionalisation (Thieme: 1990, 13). The *DGS* was created by 39 scientists on 3rd January 1909. (Kaesler: 1984, 32/Glatzer: 1995, 216). Among the founding members were Ferdinand Tönnies, Georg Simmel und Max Weber. They were interested in sociology, but their original disciplines were economics, statistics, jurisprudence, theology, philosophy (Wobbe: 1995, 125). They were active in research and teaching in the subject of sociology before sociology could be established as discipline in the universities. Accordingly, Kaesler, Ferdinand Tönnies and Leopold von Wiese are the crucial representatives of a "single-science sociology" (Kaesler: 1984, 51). However, the main participants in the fight for the “single-scientific” status of sociology were George Simmel and Max Weber. They tried to justify the legitimacy of the new subject (Wobbe: 1995, 125). Although the first conference, the so called “*Soziologentag*” (sociologists’ day) took place in 1910, (Glatzer: 1995, 215) sociology in this phase could not be established as a discipline anywhere. One reason for this was the resistance of the traditional subjects, e.g humanities and economics, which were

⁸² See to this point also section 6.

⁸³ Institutionalisation designates the process of regularly recurring structured operational sequences, which solidify themselves. This may include intellectual, organizational and social- cultural aspects (Geiger: 1981 acc. to Thieme: 1990, 13).

afraid of sociology as competition. In the Weimar Republic the establishment process moved very slowly. Sociology split into political economy and historical philosophy. This found its expression in certain academic degrees, e.g. the introduction of the academic degree “*Diplom-Volkswirt*“ during the Weimarer Republic. Sociology remained part of the philosophical faculty. Even when sociology received clear institutional outlines, the classical authors of sociology Georg Simmel, Max Weber and Ferdinand Tönnis did not receive chairs as sociologists (Wobbe: 1995, 16, 126).

In 1919 or shortly thereafter, the first chairs in sociology were established at the new universities of Köln and Frankfurt/Main. At the university of Frankfurt/ Main, the first professorship for “Sociology and Theoretical National Economics” was established 1919. The first professor was Franz Oppenheimer, followed 1930 by Karl Mannheim. Franz Oppenheimer was appointed to the chair of political economy and sociology at the university of Köln.⁸⁴ At the beginning of 1930 there were already scientific journals, e.g., the “*Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie*“, the “*Archiv für angewandte Soziologie*“, and the “*Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung*“ which was created in Frankfurt/ Main. Thus, already crucial steps were undertaken for the “professionalisation” of the subject. However, the political change in Germany after 1933 led to the demise of these, which could not in all cases, build a bridge over the generations to the 1950s and 1960s.

When the Nazis came into power in 1933, the establishment of sociology was stopped and doomed. Most sociologists representing the tradition of Georg Simmel or Max Weber were either Jews, Marxists or Social Democrats. Those who were civil servants were dismissed from their tenured professorships in April 1933. Between 1933 and 1945, and even long after this period, sociology as academic discipline and intellectual profession was driven out of Germany completely and forced into exile. Many sociologists, especially those from the Universities of Frankfurt, Heidelberg and Berlin, were rescued through fellowships helping them to make a fresh start in London or the United States. The Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research in New York became a rallying point for exiled social scientists from Germany (Buck-Morris 1977).

The fresh start of the re-establishment of sociology at German universities after the Second World War, took place in several stages. The process of the re-establishment had two characteristic features. The relationship between the discipline as it re-emerged in Germany and its English language refuge of twelve years or more remained characteristic. The discipline as an intellectual enterprise had continued there. All younger sociologists who became known in the 1950s and 1960s studied or spent extensive periods of time at American universities. According to Wobbe, Weimar traditions like historical sociology or the sociology of knowledge and Women’s Studies did not play a significant role in the first decades of the re-establishment of sociology as a subject (Wobbe 1995: 23).⁸⁵

⁸⁴ Karl Mannheim was suspended from his position by one of the first National Socialist enactments in 1933. Invited to Britain by Harold Laski, he spent the next ten years as a lecturer at the London School of Economics. In the middle of the war he was appointed to the new professorship in the sociology of education at the University of London.

⁸⁵ See Wiggershaus, Rolf (1986): *Die Frankfurter Schule. Geschichte, theoretische Entwicklung, politische Bedeutung*, München. Kruse, Volker (1990): *Soziologie und „Gegenwartskrise“*. Die Zeitdiagnose Franz Oppenheimers und Alfred Webers, Wiesbaden and Kruse, Volker (1990): *Von der historischen Nationalökonomie zur historischen Soziologie. Ein Paradigmenwechsel in den deutschen Sozialwissenschaften um 1900*, in: *ZfS* 19/3. p. 149-165. Meja, Volker / Stehr, Nico (1982): *Der Streit um die Wissenssoziologie*, Frankfurt/ Main. Honegger, Claudia (1994): *Die bittersüße Freiheit der Halbdistanz. Die ersten Soziologinnen im deutschen Sprachraum*. In: Wobbe, Theresa/Lindemann, Gesa (1994) (eds.): *Denkachsen. Zur theoretischen und institutionellen Rede von Geschlecht*. Frankfurt/Main.

The German Sociological Association met as early as 1946 in Frankfurt/Main. Until the 1960s sociological chairs were relatively rare. Between 1949-1954 only nine professorships for sociology were established.⁸⁶ Sociology gained social relevance in the 1960s. In the process of education expansion, the establishment of chairs in Sociology and Sociology Departments occurred.

4. Change in Disciplinisation: Case Studies

4.1. Gender Studies

The Development of Gender Studies in Germany

As Gabriele Jähnert states in her introduction to a congress on Gender Studies, which took place in 2003 in Berlin⁸⁷, the process of institutionalisation of interdisciplinary approaches to gender subjects is quite a new and controversial issue in Germany. Until the mid-1990s the dominant consensus was to strive for a decentralised introduction of gender issues in the different disciplines for theoretical as well as practical reasons. Arguments against the establishment of interdisciplinary curricula focusing on gender were the fear of ghettoization and/or the fear of the depoliticizing effects on gender studies.⁸⁸ Additionally there were infrastructural difficulties to install separate gender courses, such as a lack the required continuous course offerings.⁸⁹ However, the first steps towards institutionalisation were taken by different initiatives, due to the increasing number of professorships for gender studies and founding of research centres of Women's and Gender Studies. The first interdisciplinary courses in Gender Studies had been introduced in 1997 at the universities of Oldenburg and Berlin (Humboldt). In Oldenburg the *Aufbau-* and *Promotionsstudiengang* "Kulturwissenschaftliche Geschlechterstudien" (postgraduate program of cultural gender studies) was established in the summer term of 1997 and the Women's and Gender Studies as a minor course of a *Magister* (Masters) degree in the winter term of 1997/98. Further initiatives have been started since the end of the 1990s. Now there exist a couple of Gender Studies courses in Germany (Magisterdegree in Berlin, Oldenburg, Göttingen, Freiburg, Hamburg and BA/MA in Hamburg and Bochum), so called "*Interdisziplinäre Studienschwerpunkte*" (major fields of studies in Hannover, Hamburg, Berlin, Regensburg, Bielefeld, Frankfurt/Main, Trier, Marburg, Bremen, Kassel), *Graduiertenkollegs*, *Aufbaustudiengänge* (postgraduate programs) etc. (overview p.11-14 congress 2003)⁹⁰. Against the background of the institutionalisation both congresses of the German-speaking centres of Gender Studies in 2003 and 2004 raised vital issues: inter-/transdisciplinarity, the question of the canon and reforms concerning the BA/MA. These are central and controversial themes. Due to the fact that Gender Studies has been interdisciplinary in its origins it defines itself as such. But it may also be "transdisciplinary"⁹¹. Transdisciplinarity is defined as a way of looking at the blind spots between the disciplines, understanding the

⁸⁶ Among them René König in Köln 1949, Marx Horkheimer 1950 in Frankfurt am Main, Otto Stammer 1951 in Berlin, Helmut Plessner 1952 in Göttingen, Theodor W. Adorno 1953 in Frankfurt/ Main, Helmut Schelsky 1953 in Hamburg.

⁸⁷ Zentrum für transdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (eds.): 2004, 10.

⁸⁸ Es „standen viele Frauen- und Geschlechterforscherinnen der Etablierung von interdisziplinären Studiengängen und Schwerpunkten skeptisch gegenüber. Ähnlich wie bei der Einrichtung von Frauenforschungsprofessuren wurde eine Ghettoisierung und/oder eine Entpolitisierung der Gender Studies befürchtet.“ (Jähnert in: Zentrum f. transdiziplinäre Geschlechterstudien ... (eds.): 2004, ibid.)

⁸⁹ „Es fehlte häufig das erforderliche kontinuierliche Lehr- und Betreuungsangebot“ (ibid.).

⁹⁰ Zentrum f. transdiziplinäre Geschlechterstudien (eds.): 2004.

⁹¹ The ZIF (*Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Frauenforschung*) was renamed in 2003 as the *Zentrum für transdisziplinäre Frauenforschung* (Centre for Transdisciplinary Women's Studies).

borders of disciplines and reflecting at the same time on the methods and categories which constitute the subjects of research (see also section 3 and section 7).⁹² Within the context of inter-/transdisciplinary Gender Studies the notion of the canon is viewed sceptically since it has been experienced in the genesis of Women's and Gender Studies as an instrument of exclusion and part of disciplinary hegemonic (patriarchal) discourses.⁹³ Due to its growing institutionalisation the debates about what is fundamental to Gender Studies still continue.⁹⁴

4.2. Gender Studies at the Carl-von-Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg

Since 1997 there has been a minor course in Women's and Gender Studies. Eleven disciplines from the Social, the Human and (less represented) the Natural and Technical Sciences take an active part in the teaching of Gender Studies.⁹⁵ The current degree structures are changing insofar as the *Magister/Diplom/Teacher*-degrees are converted into BA/MA degrees. This process will be concluded at the university of Oldenburg by the winter term 2005/2006. (Smilla Ebeling/Karin Flaake/Heike Fleßner: 2003, 157). For the future two MAs are planned, one MA called Gender Studies (oriented towards research), the other "Gender and Politics".⁹⁶ No BA is envisaged, but probably a so-called *Ergänzungsfach* (supplementary subject of 30 credit points). The organisational coordination of the courses is managed by a "Studiengangskommission" founded in 1997. (its members come from different disciplines).⁹⁷ The *Kulturwissenschaftliche Geschlechterstudien* (Cultural Gender Studies), now part of the faculty III, *Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaften* (Language- and Cultural Studies) was from the very beginning in the Summer term of 1997 conceived as a postgraduate course leading to a PhD. Two of its initiators⁹⁸, Karen Ellwanger and Silke Wenk, argued that they wanted to create a frame⁹⁹ where young academics are sustained in an interdisciplinary context and at the same time to respond to the Social Science orientation of Gender Studies in Germany by

⁹² Compare Silke Wenk: 2001, 110 and Wenk: 1997, 199. Wenk (2001) quotes an official paper of the WKN (Scientific Commission) from 1999 (2001,107-108). The brochure gave some recommendations for innovation in the promotion of postgraduates and recommends also "transdisciplinarity", replacing "interdisciplinarity". But a slight change of meaning connected with the term is introduced. The authors of the brochure connect transdisciplinarity with crossing boundaries between academic research and "the society" rather than with crossing boundaries between academic disciplines. The WKN authors do not define exactly what "society" or "social use" means. Wenk expounds the problems of this formulation: "In den nun formulierten Programmen droht dagegen Transdisziplinarität unter der Hand zur Bestätigung und zur Rekonstruktion einer dominanten Kultur zu werden, die sich um die Universität herum schließt. [In the new programmes transdisciplinarity is on verge of becoming an affirmation and a reconstruction of a dominant culture surrounding universities.]" (116). Similar problematic changes of content can be stated for „gesellschaftliche Reflexivität“ (social reflexivity).

⁹³ Susanne Baer (2004) writes in her introduction to the canon discussion in the Gender Studies: "Kanones stehen allerdings auch schon immer unter Verdacht. Aus der Gender-Perspektive erscheinen sie allerdings genuin gefährlich. [Canons are always suspicious. From a gender perspective they indeed seem to be a genuine danger]". (70) Christa Binswanger and Brigitte Schnegg (2004) state: „Feministische Wissenschaft hat sich als Wissenschaftskritik und mithin auch als Kanonkritik konstituiert. [Feminist science is constituted as a critique of science and this also means as a critique of canons.]“ (77)

⁹⁴ Zentrum f. transdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien (ed.): 2004, 69-1.

⁹⁵ See Zentrum f. transdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien: 2004, 34-5.

⁹⁶ Zentrum für transdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien (eds.): 2004, 34.

⁹⁷ 4.11.1997 constitutive meeting.

⁹⁸ The research course was founded by members of Textile Studies (*Textilwissenschaften*), History of Art and Music Studies (as a cooperation of the universities of Oldenburg and Bremen). The principal organisational structure for the establishment of the course has been the "Kolleg" (organisational structure according to §115 of the *NHG*) *Kulturwissenschaftliche Geschlechterstudien*, already founded in 1996. (Kolleg "Kulturwissenschaftliche Geschlechterstudien: 2000, 9).

⁹⁹ The establishment of an accompanying colloquium is meant to diminish the existing personal dependence of the postgraduates from their supervisor and to promote an inter- and transdisciplinary dialogue amongst the students. (Kolleg "Kulturwissenschaftliche Geschlechterstudien: 2000, 13)

augmenting its Cultural Studies angle.¹⁰⁰ Three years after these courses had been introduced the Centre for Interdisciplinary Women's and Gender Research, the *ZFG (Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung)*, was founded in 2000.¹⁰¹ Its goal is to reinforce and support women's and gender research from an interdisciplinary perspective.¹⁰² The reasons for the institutionalisation given by our interview partners¹⁰³ were the intensification of the already existing resources of Gender Studies at the level of research and an increase of "visibility". The *ZFG* occupies itself with the organisation and planning of research. It initiates and encourages research projects in the field of Gender Studies and organises conferences and lectures¹⁰⁴. Additionally since 2002 the *ZFG* together with the *ZFS (Zentrum für feministische Studien Bremen)* has initiated a series of publications called *Studien interdisziplinärer Geschlechterforschung* (interdisciplinary gender research). In the "target agreements" (*Zielvereinbarungen*) between the university and the *Niedersächsisches Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Kultur* (Ministry of Science and Culture in Lower Saxony) from 2002 among others Women- and Gender Studies has been established as a main research focus.¹⁰⁵

An analysis of the process of institutionalisation

The following analysis is based on interviews we conducted with different "experts" who were involved in the process of institutionalisation. We interviewed two professors, one (in the following A) of them a founding member of the Minor *Frauen- und Geschlechterstudien* and professor of Social Pedagogics (thus coming from the Social Sciences), the other (in the following B) a founding member of the Minor course and the Cultural Gender Studies as well as professor of *Empirische Kulturwissenschaften* in the department of Textile Studies (thus coming from the *Kulturwissenschaften*). Our other two interview partners were the former president of the university of Oldenburg (C) and a former student (D) of the Minor Women and Gender Studies.

Positive factors favouring institutionalisation

To all of them the process of institutionalisation seemed relatively easy. One main reason for this which the experts we interviewed gave, is the university context of a "reform university". Both the institutionalisation of the Minor and then the Research degree program were supported by the former president (C)¹⁰⁶, who said, that Gender Studies should have been installed already earlier on "in and by the student movement", but that its acceptance in society had been necessary too for implementing such an institutionalisation. Our expert

¹⁰⁰ Ellwanger and Wenk (In: Kolleg Kulturwissenschaftliche Geschlechterstudien: 2000, 5) write: "Zum einen war es das Interesse, unserer disziplinübergreifenden und -durchquerenden Kooperation eine Form zu geben, in der auch Nachwuchswissenschaftlerinnen ihren Ort weiterführender Qualifizierung im kontinuierlichen Austausch finden können; zum anderen erschien es uns nötig, das Defizit zu beheben, dass die universitäre Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung in der Bundesrepublik vor allem sozialwissenschaftlich orientiert und zugleich die Geschlechterforschung in der kulturwissenschaftlichen Lehre und Forschung unterrepräsentiert ist." See also „Informationen zum Aufbaustudiengang Kulturwissenschaftliche Geschlechterstudien, University of Oldenburg,, internal paper 1997.

¹⁰¹ For the founding members see www.uni-oldenburg.de/zfg/gruendungsmitglieder.htm.

¹⁰² www.uni-oldenburg.de/zfg/aufgaben_und_ziele.htm

¹⁰³ Prof. of Pedagogics and Social Pedagogics, today the chairwoman of the *ZFG*. Interview 2nd December 2004.

¹⁰⁴ www.uni-oldenburg.de/zfg/aktuell/facht.htm and www.uni-oldenburg.de/zfg/aktuell/vortraege.htm

¹⁰⁵ Compare „Zielvereinbarung gemäß § 1 Abs. 3 des Niedersächsischen Hochschulgesetzes i.d.F. vom 24.6.2002 zwischen dem Niedersächsischen Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Kultur und der Universität Oldenburg, 11.

Stand: 24.3.004.

¹⁰⁶ Sociologist. Interview 29th November 2004 R.K.

(B)¹⁰⁷ who did her PhD at the old and traditional university of Tübingen was surprised by the smoothness of the whole process of institutionalisation in Oldenburg.

Even if the “reform spirit” of the university was a supporting factor, it is possible to imagine a case, where in very conservative surroundings Gender Studies get installed as (C) states

A reason to consent to the institutionalisation of Gender Studies in the context of a conservative university could be the implicit goal of opponents of Gender Studies, “to get rid of the problems” in the disciplines themselves as (C) states.¹⁰⁸ The term “ghettoization” has been used to draw attention to this problem (see above).

Another factor was very important for the institutionalisation: the already existing personnel working on gender issues in the different disciplines. (A), a founding member of the Minor Women’s and Gender Studies and of the *ZFG* gave two further reasons for the ease of the process: first, the institutionalisation was also a matter of prestige, connected to the explicitly articulated need for universities to support women’s equalisation. Secondly, the institutionalisation of the courses didn’t cost a lot, since there were no new professorships required for their founding (“*Kostenneutralität*”).

Problems

According to (C), looking back, opponents to the institutionalisation did not criticise the institutionalisation explicitly. The only counter-argument provided was that “Gender Studies” was not a “real scientific discipline”¹⁰⁹, but in fact this has been the case for all disciplines in their development as (C) argues. (A) noticed most opposition towards the establishment of Gender Studies in the Natural Science. (B) remembers that opposition was more likely to be found on a “lower university level”, i.e. in the disciplines themselves.¹¹⁰ The arguments against the institutionalisation of a PhD program were that teaching, traditionally focused on teacher training (*Lehramtsstudium*) would suffer, if energies shifted towards such a postgraduate program. Generally in the founding period of the *Kulturwissenschaftliche Geschlechterstudien* institutionalised postgraduate programs were not considered at the university of Oldenburg as an important aspect of teaching. This has changed recently, connected to the allocation of funds (“*indikatorengesteuerte Mittelvergabe*”) on the basis of specific criteria, a changed situation, which could threaten also the existence of the Research Degree Programs such as Cultural Gender Studies, as (B) thought.

Teaching structures and concepts concerning interdisciplinarity

Before looking at future plans concerning the Bologna process we will have to analyse the present organisation and contents of the minor course *Magister* in Gender Studies and the Cultural Gender Studies (postgraduate *Kulturwissenschaftliche Geschlechterstudien*).

The minor course in Women’s and Gender Studies (*Frauen- und Geschlechterstudien, Nebenfach*)

The Minor course *Magister* Gender Studies is divided as is/was the case for all *Magister* courses into a *Grund-* and *Hauptstudium*. In the first part (4 semesters), teaching focuses on the “basics” of Gender Studies which include theory, methodology and epistemology of Gender Studies, history of the women’s movement and gender relations and gendered division

¹⁰⁷Interview 30th December 2004 R.K.

¹⁰⁸ „um sich die Schwierigkeiten vom Hals zu schaffen“, Interview R.K.

¹⁰⁹ Interview R.K.

¹¹⁰ „Je konkreter ich in meinen eigenen Fachbereich kam, desto mehr Widerstände gab es.“ [The more concrete I got in my own department, the greater the opposition became.] Interview R.K.

of labour.¹¹¹ In the second part the students choose at least two focuses on gender. They can choose from seven different focuses:

- *Kulturanalysen/symbolisch-kulturelle Repräsentation der Geschlechterverhältnisse/Kultur von Frauen*, (cultural analysis/ symbolic and cultural representations of gender relations/ Women`s Culture)
- *Sozialisation/Sozialpsychologie der Geschlechterverhältnisse* (socialisation/ social psychology of gender relations)
- *Bildung, Erziehung, soziale Arbeit* (education, social work)
- *Recht, Organisation, Management für Frauen* (law, organisation, management for women)
- *Geschichtswissenschaftliche Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung* (historical women and gender studies)
- *Natur und Technik aus der Frauen- und Geschlechterperspektive*, (nature and technology from a women`s and gender perspective)
- *Politik und Staat aus der Frauen- und Geschlechterperspektive* (Politics and the state from a women`s and gender perspective)¹¹²

These options operate along disciplinary lines (cultural studies, sociology, pedagogics, jurisprudence, natural- and technical sciences, political sciences) that reappear in the plans for the MA.¹¹³

Forms of teaching

Forms of teaching¹¹⁴ which try to respond to interdisciplinarity as a central theme are co-teaching and introductions to Gender Studies in the first part of the study course (Grundstudium). Co-teaching is an easy way to confront different disciplinary perspectives. Introductory courses, which were demanded by the coordination committee (the *Studiengangskommission*) were established for the Minor from 2001. The problem is that there is no additional funding. This has to some extent been resolved, as these courses are now taught by a “*Juniorprofessorin*” (junior professor). In some way “introductory courses” instal a canon, shaped by the lecturer and her personal resources, as expert (A) said.¹¹⁵ (B) stated, that interdisciplinarity depends largely on the Introductory Courses.¹¹⁶

There have been discussions about having “*Ringvorlesungen*” (Lecture series with professors from various disciplines) as another form of interdisciplinary teaching. These have been organised at other universities that teach Gender Studies such as Hannover and Göttingen. (A) viewed this form of organisation critically, as the organisational expense is high in comparison to the possible benefits. There is the danger, that it will just be an accumulation of different disciplinary perspectives. Otherwise it has to be organised in a very conceptual way, but that again demands extra resources.

As a former student (D)¹¹⁷ stated, a student can choose disciplinary courses corresponding to the two disciplines (one Minor, one Major), which she/he has chosen. In this case, the only specific course, which would connect the different disciplinary Gender courses to each other

¹¹¹ „-Theorien der Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung, -Wissenschaftstheorien, Methodologien und Methoden der Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung, -Geschichte der Frauenbewegungen, -Geschlechterverhältnisse und geschlechtliche Arbeitsteilungen“ www.uni-oldenburg.de/zfg/studiengaenge/5302.html

¹¹² www.uni-oldenburg.de/zfg/studiengaenge/5302.html.

¹¹³ www.uni-oldenburg.de/zfg/studiengaenge/5302.html.

¹¹⁴ A, Interview R.K.

¹¹⁵ A, Interview, R.K.

¹¹⁶ B, Interview, R.K.

¹¹⁷ Studied German, Social Sciences and Gender Studies from 1997-2004. Interview 29th November 2004, R.K.

would be the forms of teaching described above. Interdisciplinarity therefore depends also on the initiative of the students. They can introduce different disciplinary backgrounds into their gender courses and it depends on their choice how broad their interdisciplinary field of study is. Students can be regarded as important promoters of interdisciplinarity, as they move between the different disciplines (at least in the former course concept of the Magister and to some extent in one of the new BA ones).

Postgraduate Cultural Gender Studies (*Promotionsstudiengang Kulturwissenschaftliche Geschlechterstudien*)

The course Cultural Gender Studies (six semesters) was intended to lead to a PhD or to a certificate. In its conceptualization transdisciplinarity as opposed to “interdisciplinarity” was stressed. It has three key “modules” (*Bausteine*):

A: “*Methodisch-wissenschaftstheoretische Grundlagen aus der Perspektive der Transdisziplinarität*“ (the cultural theories, science history, methods and categories of Women- and Gender Studies),

B: “*Historisch-empirische Kulturanalyse an ausgewählten Inhaltsfeldern*“ (historical and empirical cultural analysis of specific topics),

C: “*Visualisierung und Präsentationsformen*” (Visualisation and presentation) related to the special profile of Oldenburg connecting theory and aesthetic practice.¹¹⁸

Commenting on three years of experience with this pilot scheme the initiators considered a high degree of methodical-theoretical self-reflection as essential for creating a “cooperative group of postgraduates” (Kolleg “Kulturwissenschaftliche Geschlechterstudien“: 2000, 14). The report of the Cultural Gender Studies course states that a similar project should have a developmental phase (“*Anlaufphase*”) built in.

Interdisciplinarity occurs where discussions (and also conflicts) are encouraged. As (B)¹¹⁹ stated with regard to the Cultural Gender Studies program, examples of such situations are the regular colloquia, where PhD students present their work or the cooperation of two supervisors, who come from different disciplines.¹²⁰ In comparison to the much bigger network of the Minor course, the postgraduate program has much fewer resources, but “enforces” probably more debate and therefore more “transdisciplinarity” in its process.

4.3. Gender Studies at the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University Frankfurt/Main

In contrast to our case study at the university of Oldenburg, the University of Frankfurt/Main does not have an degree in Gender Studies, but a “Women’s and Gender Studies” course (*Studienprogramm*) for graduate students. The course is coordinated by the Cornelia Goethe Center for Women’s and Gender Studies.

The Cornelia Goethe Center for Women’s and Gender Studies: the process of institutionalisation

The institutionalisation of Women’s Studies started at the end of the 1980s. In 1987 the Department of Social Sciences, dedicated a professorship to “*Sociology and Social Politics with focus on Women’s Movements*”. The first professor, Ute Gerhard, together with members of other faculties, initiated the establishment of an interdisciplinary research center at the

¹¹⁸ Wenk: 1997, 201, Ellwanger/Wenk: 2000, 13.

¹¹⁹ Interview, R.K.

¹²⁰ The responsible teaching staff of the program comes from Art History, Political Science, European Ethnology, Cultural and American Studies. The responsible professors endeavour to broaden the program through (international) guest-professorships and teaching assignments.

beginning of the 1990s. “The Center’s theoretical framework is based on the epistemological and theoretical critique of gender and its relevance as a historical, social, and cultural construction”. (CGC 2002, 1). To the extent that this thematizes ambivalence, paradox, as well as ruptures and non-synchronicities of social reality, such feminist analyses place themselves in the tradition of the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory.

The Hessian Ministry supported the constitution of the Center from the beginning. The ministry signalled to Ute Gerhard to initiate a center, but the president of the university referred the decision to the departments which would support the project financially. Although it was very difficult to convince the departments to support its initiation the institutionalisation of the Center finally succeeded. In 1997 the interdisciplinary “*Zentrum für Frauenstudien und die Erforschung der Geschlechterverhältnisse*” was officially established at Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität/ Frankfurt am Main. Besides financial difficulties, the Center had logistical problems, (e.g lack of rooms for collaborators, administration, teaching). At the beginning it was more of a fictitious area than a real institute. Today, it is located in the so-called Social Science Tower of the University of Frankfurt campus. The Center was renamed “*Cornelia Goethe Center*” in 2000 in honour of the sister of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (see: Gerhard 2000).¹²¹ The idea to change the name was especially initiated by the “*Förderkreis des Cornelia Goethe Centrums*”, an association of sponsors and friends. Affiliated disciplines in the Center are the Social Sciences (Sociology and Political Sciences) Educational Sciences, Linguistics, American Studies, Legal and Film Studies. These departments, especially the Department of Social Sciences and Educational Sciences, support the Center through the dedication of two assistant professors. The *Hessische Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Kunst* (Ministry of Higher Education, Research and Arts) supported the Center from the beginning until 2005 with a so called “*Anschubsfinanzierung*”, i.e seed money for the creation of projects. The university of Frankfurt supports the Center with a minimal grant for administration. Above all, at present the Center is financed by research grants from third parties, (e.g, DFG, EU, ministries, etc.)

The Center prospered through the commitment of its members. The members teach and work at the Cornelia Goethe Center additionally to teaching in their own departments. An important task of the Center was and still is to initiate research projects. Currently 11 research projects have been and are being coordinated by the Center.¹²²

Forms and approaches to teaching Women’s and Gender Studies at the Cornelia Goethe Center

The Center’s twofold orientation is: “On the one hand, it is a research facility that deals with interdisciplinarity and intercultural, empirical and theoretical approaches to gender relations in the past and present. On the other hand the Center is committed to developing and improving cooperative courses in the field of women’s and gender studies with a view to designing such courses for the participating departments and disciplines. At the same time, the Center aims at integrating the multiple and internationally relevant perspectives of women’s and gender studies into more traditional fields of study” (CGC 2002). The programme of the

¹²¹ The present chair of the Cornelia Goethe Center is Susanne Opfermann. She is Professor of American Studies. There are additional professors with a focus on Gender Studies from different disciplines on the Board of Directors: Ursula Apitzsch (Sociology/ Political Science), Barbara Friebertshäuser, (Education), Marlis Hellinger (Linguistics), Britta Rang (History of Education), Uta Ruppert (Political Science), Ute Sacksowsky (Legal Science), Heide Schlüpmann (Film Studies), Susanne Schmidt (English Studies), Ulla Wischermann (Sociology of Media). Members of the Cornelia Goethe Center are also research fellows, visiting professors, lectures, instructors, PhD students and graduate students with a focus on Gender Studies.

¹²² See: http://web.uni-frankfurt.de/cgc/cgc-current_projects.shtml

Center is based on four pillars: teaching (*Lehre*), research (*Forschung*), interdisciplinarity (*Interdisziplinarität*) and international orientation (*Internationalität*) (see: CGC Frauenstudien/ Genderstudies, 2004: 2). Inspired by these aims, the Center designs new forms and approaches to teaching Women's and Gender Studies. The Center established an interdisciplinary course on "Women's and Gender Studies" for students from the participating departments: Law (1), Social Sciences (3), Educational Sciences (4) Modern Languages (10). The course aims at teaching the fundamental concepts of Women's and Gender Studies and at introducing their theory, methods and history. In this way the affiliation to the participating disciplines is maintained. (see: Gerhard 2000) The curriculum emphasizes an international and interdisciplinary perspective. The course is two years long (four semesters) in its main phase (*Hauptstudiumsphase*). The participating graduate students of the program "Women's and Gender Studies" have to study one of the participating disciplines as a main or minor subject (*Haupt- oder Nebenfach*). Disciplinary courses by the Departments that participate in the Cornelia Goethe Center are thus combined with additional interdisciplinary classes. The interdisciplinary courses are offered by two or more professors and teachers from different academic disciplines.¹²³ The interdisciplinary and disciplinary courses centre on the following four thematic issues:

1. *Feministische Theorie* (Feminist theories),
2. *Methoden und feministische Wissenschaftskritik* (Methods and feminist critique of knowledge)
3. *Geschlechterverhältnisse in internationaler Perspektive* (Gender relations in international perspective) ,
4. *Geschichte des Feminismus* (History of feminism).

Additionally, students can take part in workshops and an international interdisciplinary colloquium, which is organized by the Center. In the colloquium scholars present and discuss their research projects and the political relevance of feminist theory. In the winter semester 2004/ 2005 the thematic focus of the colloquium was "Experiences of injustice" („*Unrechtserfahrungen*“). The participation in the program is limited to those students who are enrolled as students in one of the affiliated departments. They must have finished the first phase of their studies, (*Grundstudiumsphase*).¹²⁴ After successful participation in two interdisciplinary courses and two disciplinary courses, the graduate students receive a certificate ("Zusatzqualifikation") in Women's and Gender Studies.

For postgraduate students the Cornelia Goethe Center established the interdisciplinary Graduate Course "Public Spheres and Gender Relations. Dimensions of Experience" („*Öffentlichkeiten und Geschlechterverhältnisse. Dimensionen von Erfahrung*“). The Graduate College was established in cooperation with the interdisciplinary working group Women and Gender Studies at the university of Kassel in October 1999. The members of the Graduate Course are developing five research fields from an interdisciplinary perspective:

1. The Constitution of public spheres (*Die Herstellung von Öffentlichkeiten*),
2. Critique and change of institutions (*Institutionen: Kritik und Veränderbarkeit*),
3. Functionality and fictionality of public and private spheres (*Funktionalität und Fiktionalität von Öffentlichkeit und Privatheit*)
4. Experience of the self and cultures of protest (*Erfahrungen des Selbst- Kulturen des Widerspruchs*)
5. Knowledge as critique and the critique of science (*Wissen als Kritik und Kritik der Wissenschaft*).

¹²³ In the winter semester 2004/ 2005 the interdisciplinary seminars are: "Politeness, Gender and Education" and "Women's Human Rights in the Context of Asylum Seeking".

¹²⁴ The interdisciplinary courses are additional to the regular courses. Students can use the credits for the disciplinary courses for both, the program and the minor or major subjects.

In their research projects they work in different disciplines in this research area. The Graduate Course is financed by the German Research Foundation (*Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*) and offers 19 fellowships to PHD students and post - doc students from the Social Sciences and Humanities.¹²⁵

In contrast to other institutionalized models of Gender Studies in Germany, i. e. Magister degrees, BA and MA degrees, the goal of the Cornelia Goethe Center is to establish Gender Studies within the disciplines and to make interdisciplinarity possible.¹²⁶ Gender Studies is understood as course of interdisciplinary studies or as subjects but not as own discipline. According to Ute Gerhard Gender Studies needs to establish self- reflexivity within the disciplines and in this way become an accepted ordinary part of other disciplines (Gerhard 2000). In this process now another development, the Bologna process, comes in between. The Bologna process represents on one hand a chance, but on the other hand a special difficulty. At present the Cornelia Goethe Center is still working on the development of a gender studies module, for the use in the different disciplines.

4.4. Studies in Political Theory: a planned new MA at the J.W. Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main

In this section we describe the process of institutionalisation of a planned new course of study, an international MA in Political Theory, to be set up in the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Frankfurt am Main. The faculty is currently in a phase of intensive planning relating to broader changes in degree structures. The *Magister* and *Diplom* degrees in Political Science and Sociology are being converted into BA and MA degrees. The Institute for Comparative, Politics and International Relations is planning to introduce three MA s, in (a) Political Science, (b) Political Theory, and (c) International Studies in Peace and Conflict Research.

The planned MA in Political Theory appeared to be interesting because political theory has gone through a remarkable change in recent decades. In the 1950s, political theory was not in the position of a field of teaching and research in which specialisation took place. It seemed more of an institutionalised memory of a past tradition of great thinkers. Today, however, it can be seen as a flourishing discipline addressing the basic questions of political life.

The initiation and institutionalisation process

The institutionalisation process started in 2004, when the MA course was initiated by a professor of political science specializing in political theory, in connection with appointment negotiations, "*Berufungsverhandlungen*" for professors. The Institute for Comparative Politics and International Relations supported the idea of setting up an international MA in Political Theory from the beginning.

The main basis for the planned MA in Political Theory remains in the Faculty of Social Sciences, but it also extends to the disciplines of philosophy, law, theology, and history at the University of Frankfurt. The course is being set up in cooperation with other institutes of political science in Germany and the United States. Political theory is understood here not

¹²⁵ For more information about the theoretical framework of the Graduate College and the PhD projects see: <http://www.uni-kassel.de/iag-fg/grako/>

¹²⁶ See Gerhard 2000: 50, „dass, die Gender Studies in den Disziplinen verankert bleiben und zugleich Interdisziplinarität ermöglicht und eingeübt werden soll. Kennzeichnend und qualifizierend ist insbesondere die internationale Orientierung“

as a discipline or subject, but as a complex academic field "which should certainly be an interdisciplinary and in the best sense a transdisciplinary undertaking" (Institute for Comparative Politics and International Relations, Proposal 2004: 3). In this context, political theory not only plays the role of a basic foundation of political science, but also relies on the outcomes of other fields of social science, addressing the overall question of the constitution of legitimate political orders. At the end of the course, students who have completed it should have developed a specialism which opens up a range of possibilities. Students might move on to further study in the theoretical or another field of political or social science, or work in professional fields in which this knowledge is in demand (see Institute for Comparative Politics and International Relations, Proposal 2004).

The goal of the course is to avoid too narrow an interpretation of political theory and to include the following dimensions:

- (a) a historical reconstruction, i.e. both a reconstruction of the history of ideas and a genealogical-critical reconstruction of the concepts (some of them perhaps in need of revision) we use to describe such problems;
- (b) a corresponding conceptual analysis of these problems, together with a normative evaluation of them and of possible solutions;
- (c) a critical, empirical stocktaking of the existing problems, i.e. of the cultural, social, economic, legal, and political-institutional contexts in which these challenges arise; and finally
- (d) consideration of institutional theories, of the ways in which legitimate political relations are established under the conditions of complex societies (also at the transnational level). (Institute for Comparative Politics and International Relations, Proposal 2004: 2)

The following topics are proposed for individual modules:

- - History of Ideas (Antiquity, Middle Ages, Early Modern Age, Enlightenment, especially: liberalism, Marxism, conservatism etc.)
- - Normative theories of legitimate orders (i.e. concepts of justice, democracy, freedom, citizenship)
- - Theories of society and political economy
- - Critical Theory (and its development)
- - Theories of peace and of international conflicts, human rights
- - Critical theories of democracy (discourse theory, Marxist approaches, feminist theories)
- - Institutional theories (including constitutional theories and state theories)
- - Politics and law, politics and religion.

The guidelines for the development of the modules are to integrate different disciplinary perspectives into the overall question of the legitimacy of political relations and order. It is planned to divide the course of study into the following six modules:

1. General Foundations (*Allgemeine Grundlagen*)
2. Theories of democracy (*Theorien der Demokratie*)
3. Society, law, economy, religion (*Gesellschaft, Recht, Wirtschaft, Religion*)
4. Global society and international politics (*Globale Gesellschaft und internationale Politik*)
5. A semester of study abroad (*Auslandssemester*)
6. Final phase: Colloquium and MA thesis (*Abschluß; Kolloquium and MA Arbeit*)

In the provisional version it is not completely clear how interdisciplinarity or transdisciplinarity will be achieved in teaching concepts. It seems that different

interdisciplinary perspectives should be taught not only within the course of study, but ideally also within individual seminars. In this respect this course of study, as well as the course in Gender Studies at the J. W. Goethe University, can be characterized as a type of “problem-centered interdisciplinarity”.

4.5. Kulturwissenschaften at the Europa-Universität Viadrina Frankfurt/Oder

Our last example in connection with change in disciplinisation is the institutionalisation of Kulturwissenschaften at the Europa Universität Viadrina Frankfurt/ Oder. As we have stated earlier (see section 2) the *European University Viadrina* is interesting for us because of its concept of interdisciplinarity in the Human and Social Sciences.

The university says on its website¹²⁷ that it explicitly strives for an integration of Human and Social Sciences in the Faculty of Cultural Studies (*Kulturwissenschaftliche Fakultät*). To support interdisciplinary work from the very beginning of the degrees a special research and education structure was developed, which could be seen as an experiment putting into practice what until then had only been formulated theoretically.¹²⁸ Although the university has a very interdisciplinary program, they do not include Gender Studies. The courses consist of a BA and an MA in Cultural Studies. On the BA the students have to choose two disciplines out of the following: Cultural History, Literature, Linguistics and Comparative Social Sciences.¹²⁹ Education in two disciplines is seen by the university as essential for interdisciplinary work. Beside the chosen focus in two disciplines relevant to *Kulturwissenschaften*, Cultural Studies “methods” are taught. The MA is conceived as an interdisciplinary course in that it contains different interdisciplinary focuses, which at first sight do not seem to be defined along disciplines. These focuses are meant to facilitate a smooth transition to the PhD phase, as they are at the same time research focuses of the university, e.g. the postgraduate college (*Graduiertenkolleg*). There are six interdisciplinary focuses¹³⁰:

- Knowledge-Communication-Society
- Social Movements–Institutions-Cultural Orientations
- City-Region-Culture
- Rhetoric-Aesthetics-Hermeneutic
- Historicity (*Historizität*) and Mediality (*Medialität*)
- Language-Culture-Identity.

Apart from these, one of the disciplines taken at BA level is continued on the MA course. Gender Studies are not (yet) institutionalised.

5. The establishment and legitimation of professional identities in academe

The establishment and legitimation of professional identities in Humanities and Social Sciences in Germany is achieved through the formal steps of access to academe but also through informal and “not visible” processes. In the following we shall focus on the formal and for Germany specific steps for access.

¹²⁷ Cf. www.euv-frankfurt-o.de/allgem/allgem.html and www.kuwi.euv-frankfurt-o.de/kuwiFFo/Intro.htm

¹²⁸ www.kuwi.euv-frankfurt-o.de/kuwiFFo/Intro.htm. Their ideas resemble a lot the publication we will come back to in section 6: Frühwald et. al. eds. (1991): *Geisteswissenschaften heute: eine Denkschrift*. Frankfurt/Main.

¹²⁹ www.kuwi.euv-frankfurt-o.de/bachelor/Studienablauf.htm: „*Kulturgeschichte, Literaturwissenschaften, Sprachwissenschaften, Vergleichende Sozialwissenschaften*“.

¹³⁰ www.kuwi.euv-frankfurt-o.de/schwerpunkte/intro.htm.

5.1. Access to university

The prerequisite of access to studies at German universities and equivalent institutions of higher education is the possession of a university entrance qualification (general or subject-specific), generally acquired after 13 years of school on the basis of an examination qualifying for admission to higher education (*Allgemeine Hochschulreife*).¹³¹ The *Abitur* enables students to study any subject at university so that the qualification for studying at the universities is totally independent of the school programs and subjects at school. Admission restrictions (*Numerus Clausus*) exist for those degree programs at universities and *Fachhochschulen* for which there is a large surplus of applicants.

5.2. Degrees program structure in Humanities and Social Sciences

The duration of studies in Humanities and Social Sciences is regulated by law (see HRG, § 11). The regulations on degree examinations indicate a standard period of study for each degree. The standard period of study at universities is generally eight or nine semesters (for MA or diploma). The actual duration of study is currently longer than the defined standard period. In general, the degree programs in Germany are divided into two parts (see HRG § 11, 12): a first period of two years (*Grundstudium*) which ends with an intermediate exam, and a period of at least two more years (*Hauptstudium*) leading to the final exam. In the course of their degree program students have to obtain the often graded certificates (*Scheine*) required in the respective regulations (*Studienordnung*). These certificates are achieved through successful completion of the individual modules. Undergraduate degrees in Germany are distinguished into

1. state examination (*Staatsexamen*),
2. diploma (*Diplom*),
3. the magister degree (*MA*)

and, since 1999, the BA and the MA.

Besides these academic degrees, universities award the doctorate/ PhD (*Dr. phil*) and have the right to confer the habilitation (*habil.*), the professorial teaching qualification. For all degrees the requirements are fixed by the Higher Education Act (*HRG, Hochschulrahmengesetz*) and the Higher Education Acts of the *Länder* (*Hochschulgesetze des Bundes und der Länder*).¹³²

For the diploma degrees, the requirements (*Diplomstudienordnung*) are fixed by the respective departments. The requirements for the magister degrees in Humanities and Social Sciences are usually fixed by exam requirements (*Prüfungsordnung*), for the doctoral/ Ph.D degree in Social Sciences and Humanities by PhD requirements (*Promotionsordnung*).

The difference between the Humanities and the Social Sciences is that the degree programs in Humanities are always completed with a Magister Artium degree or state examination while in Social Sciences the degree programs result in a magister or diploma degree.¹³³ In this degree program the emphasis is put on one main discipline, mostly with focus on empirical (research) methods. The PhD degree results in both disciplines in the *Doktor der Philosophie* (*Dr.Phil.*).

5.3. Doctoral Studies and Habilitation

The prerequisite of an application for doctoral/ PhD studies at Humanities and/or Social Sciences at German universities is fixed in the PhD requirements of the universities; hence,

¹³¹ The prerequisite for access to *Fachhochschulen* is an entrance qualification (*Fachhochschulreife*) i.e., 12 years' school education and a period of practical training or the general higher education entrance qualification (*Abitur*).

¹³² For the state examination (in Medical Sciences, Veterinary Sciences, Teacher Education, and Law) the requirements are fixed by state law and the exam is supervised by a governmental commission. See section 1.2.

¹³³ For the changes caused by the Bologna Process see section 8.

the admission procedures for PhD candidates are in accordance with the doctoral regulation of the universities. Normally, a degree from a German university is required (state examination, magister degree, diploma degree, Masters degree). To start a PhD project one has to have a supervisor, usually a full professor, sometimes a *Privatdozent*. The supervisor is decisive for the career of the new generation of academics (Beaufäys 2003, 198). Traditionally, the doctoral thesis results in a long intensive tie to the academic mentor, which is decisive for the integration of the mentor's candidate into the academic community. Both enter into a “working alliance” (*Arbeitsbündnis*). The intensity of the relationship between the mentor and the candidate is shown, above all, in the use of the terms *Doktorvater* (PhD father) and *Doktormutter* (PhD mother) to denote the supervisor. Apart from the first supervisor, PhD students need a second supervisor. The PhD regulations (*Promotionsordnung*) usually (e.g. in Frankfurt/Main and Oldenburg) allow the choice of two supervisors from different disciplines.

There are different types of doctoral programs in Germany. Usually doctoral students participate in a doctoral colloquium (*Kolloquium*), organised by the professors. In colloquia, current and completed doctoral theses prepared by graduate student and staff are presented and discussed. In addition, more highly structured doctoral programs have begun to emerge, such as the transdisciplinary doctoral program at the University of Oldenburg.

In Germany doctoral studies are usually financed by fellowships, contracts for research assistance and fixed-term research projects (Enders 1996: 38). There are a great variety of fellowships, e.g. fellowships granted by the *Länder* (*Graduiertenförderung nach Landesrecht*); fellowships from various foundations (*Studienstiftungen*) are supported by the political parties; DFG PhD studentships; fellowships from other foundations and fellowships in graduate colleges. Given that PhD students usually take longer than the 2-3-year period for which they can get financial support, initiatives have been started to improve completion time through new graduate programmes such as Graduate Schools.¹³⁴ However, according to a report published by the *HRK Hochschulrektorenkonferenz*, young graduates prefer employment for a limited period to fellowships, e.g., because employment as opposed to grants confers benefits such as social security (see: www.hrk.de).

To continue their academic career, traditionally young scholars need an additional stage of qualification after the first Ph.D, the “second PhD”, i.e., the so-called *Habilitation*. Usually, the young scholars can write their habilitation while in employment as assistants of professors (*Wissenschaftliche Assistenten*). They can have such positions for up to six years. During this time, the assistant has to complete the habilitation. After having achieved this academic grade, scholars can apply for full professorships. Until the end of the 1990s the habilitation was the final exam in the career of academic staff in Germany. Through the habilitation professors provide proof of their academic qualification in research and teaching in an additional procedure. They write a habilitation thesis (*opus magnum*) or several scientific publications of outstanding quality (*cumulative Habilitation*). The habilitation commission of the faculties makes the decision regarding the acceptance of a habilitation thesis. This committee grants the academic title „*Privatdozent*“ and the teaching licence (*venia legendi*) (see *Habilitationsordnung*, J.W. Goethe University, Paragraph 42 Abs. 3 HuG). Habilitated academics who do not have a full professorship at a university have the status of *Privatdozenten*. They may work as freelancers for or be employed by the university; this varies in the different *Länder*.

¹³⁴ See section 2.2.

The present situation of habilitated scientists in Germany, especially in Social Sciences and Humanities, is characterized by a professional risk for both male and female scholars. The problem is that there are too many habilitated scientists who have gained their academic qualification in a long career at a university but do not find a permanent job (Spiewak 1999).

5.4. The recruitment process for Professors

The universities appoint the professors but the ministries have the right and the power to intervene. For full professorship applications, the habilitation degree was required up to the end of the 20th century. This was changed by the establishment of the so-called junior professorship (*Juniorprofessur*) in the last few years. The establishment of the position of junior professor is controversial. In introducing this position which follows the American model of an "assistant professor", the Federal Ministry of Education and Research wanted to:

- (i) give young academics with a PhD the chance to independent teaching and research;
- (ii) reduce the age of the first appointment of academics;
- (iii) spare or even abolish the habilitation procedure; and
- (iv) make it easier to plan academic careers (Landfester/Rössel 2004, 44).¹³⁵

Unlike the habilitated assistants, junior professors should have the same rights to teach and research as the full professors. Junior professor are the objects of an interim assessment after three years. Only in the case of a positive evaluation is the job extended for another three years. Junior chairs are criticised because the burden of teaching on one's own authority is considered much too high and the resources too poor to allow for the kind of research that would pay off in a later appointment procedure.¹³⁶ However, the junior chair does not require a habilitation.

The procedures for the appointment of professors (*Berufungsverfahren*) are the same in all German universities; for Social Sciences and Humanities they start with the proposal of three external candidates to the faculty by a committee of the faculty. Habilitated academics usually cannot obtain a full professorship at their own university. This is specified in the Higher Education Act (HRG) and is called internal promotion prohibition (*Hausberufungsverbot*).¹³⁷ The normal appointment procedure is as follows: The appointment committee (*Berufungskommission*) sends a ranked list to the university senate who are free to modify the list before it is submitted to the ministry. Thus, there is always the risk involved of an encroachment from outside the faculties, i.e the university president or the ministry (Reuhl 1992: 92). The ministries cannot easily justify ignoring the lists but they are free to appoint

¹³⁵ Until today the traditional chair model influences staff structures at German universities. The chair model is characterised by a relatively sharp contrast between the traditional professorial core of the profession holding tenured positions as chair holders and the largely untenured class of junior staff (Wissenschaftliche Assistenten, Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiter, Lehrbeauftragte) (see Enders 1996). The career system in German universities is characterized by different independent fixed-term contracts in combination with the rule to hire only full professors external to the institution. This has discriminatory effects on women. Especially, for female academics it is very difficult to plan an academic career with a partner and children. So, women are considerable underrepresented in leadership positions at German universities. If they get a professorship, the average age for an initial appointment at universities is over 40 in the Natural Sciences and over 50 in the Social Sciences. One argument for the establishment of the junior professorships -which is still controversial - is to support the participation of women in leading positions (Hadulla-Kuhlmann/Hartung 2002: 3).

¹³⁶ Full professors at universities (defined as C4, C3 in relatively few cases also C2) are usually tenured civil servants (*Beamten*) (only in exceptional cases are full professors also employees with a permanent contract). Traditionally, neither their universities nor the ministry supervised or evaluated the individual academic work of full professors. They are perfectly free in the choice of topic, in the manner of presentation and in the content of their seminars. Since 2004 new academic positions (W1-W4; see section 1.1) have been established. These positions are not automatically tenured positions but become tenured positions after a second evaluation. The payment of the professors is fixed according to evaluation criteria.

¹³⁷ This is changing with the establishment of junior professorships.

one of the three candidates. It happens quite often that the ministry disregards suggestions emanating from the faculties.

Members of the appointment committee may also be representatives of other faculties. According to the provisions of the Federate State laws (see for an example HHG, § 53 Abs. 1), at least nine individuals must participate in the procedure. In the selection of the experts for the appointment committee, however, special attention must be paid to the "subject-specific competence". A "sufficient number" of expert opinions are collected from experts who do not have a personal relationship with the candidates and who have an established academic reputation in the academic community.¹³⁸ These experts are asked to provide comparative evaluations of all the candidates.

5.5. The function of professional associations in the Social Sciences and Humanities

If we compare the relevance of membership in the academic associations for different disciplines of the Social Sciences and Humanities, for example Sociology and Art history, the importance of this membership for one's professional career seems to vary. The German Sociological Association (*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie, DGS*) was founded in 1909. At that time, there was neither a chair of sociology nor any other aspect of that discipline, established. The *DGS* is the main organization of recognized sociological scholars in Germany; it has more than 1400 members. According to its homepage (<http://www.dgs.de>), about four fifth of all German sociologists with a doctoral degree are members of this association. Upon application, the membership is usually granted to all those who are interested. Especially for young researchers and PhD students it is quite important to be a member in one of the sections in order to have the chance to present themselves as newcomers and to establish informal networks for their academic career. The *DGS* consists of 33 sections and workshops (*Sektionen und Arbeitsgruppen*). It is of special importance that some sections are composed in an interdisciplinary way, for example, the section on biographical research and the section on women's and gender studies. The latter was founded in 1979 and aims at the inclusion of women's studies in the Social Sciences and especially in the *DGS*¹³⁹. Academic associations like the *DGS* are important in Germany as contexts in which academic "newcomers" or "not yet established" and "established" academics can present themselves and establish informal networks¹⁴⁰. Membership in academic associations does not seem to be important in the same way in the Humanities. But nevertheless it is useful for an academic career to present papers at conferences organised by the disciplinary academic associations, for example the so-called Historians' Day, organized every two years by the Association of Historians (*Verband der Historiker und Historikerinnen Deutschlands VHD*, founded in 1948) or the Art Historians' Day (*Kunsthistorikertag*), organized by the association of Art Historians (*Verband deutscher Kunsthistoriker VDK* founded in 1948).

¹³⁸ This is different from Anglo-Saxon universities where references by individuals about individuals, in the spirit of advocacy, are obtained (Steinert 2004: 40). In Hesse, such a procedure is even stipulated in a *Berufungserlass* ("appointment decree") published by the relevant Ministry. In the other Länder, the procedure is only required by the internal provisions of the universities (Steinert 2004: 39). In Social Science, here: sociology, a debate has started recently, triggered by an article published by Heinz Steinert, a sociologist, on the subject: "On the professionalism of expert opinions. An incitement to deny comparative expert opinions." (*Zur Professionalität des Gutachtens. Eine Aufforderung, vergleichende Gutachten zu verweigern.*) In this article, he demands of the ethics commission of the German Association for Sociology to recommend to its members to deny the preparation of comparative expert opinions "for reasons of professional logic", and to refuse any requests for comparative expert opinions (Steinert 2004: 43).

¹³⁹ The section for women's and gender studies is responsible for the renaming of the "Soziologentag" into "Kongress für Soziologie"

¹⁴⁰ Rainer Blasius: Beirat und Geschichte. In: *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 20.9.2004.

Furthermore there exists a second association for art historians, the “*Ulmer Verein für Kunst- und Kulturwissenschaften*” which was founded 1968 by younger art historians who criticized the narrow elitist concept of art history and aimed at more interdisciplinary – *kulturwissenschaftliches* – understanding of art history.

To promote young academics from the discipline, the *VHD* established a separate forum “Young historians present themselves” (“*Junge Historiker stellen sich vor*”) in 2004.¹⁴¹ In this forum for PhD students (*Doktorandenforum*) can present their work on posters¹⁴² similar to the “*Postersektion*” of the *VDK*. In 2002 the *Historikertag* was criticized for its underrepresentation of women since fewer female historians gave a paper than before. One of the assumptions of the author was that women conduct research in more innovative areas and are therefore perhaps more attracted to the “secret second *Historikertag*” of the German Studies Association in the United States.¹⁴³

In this section we have concentrated on formal access to academe. Professional identities are established and legitimated in academe in a very heterogeneous manner. The conditions are not the same in the different subjects, and there are also different prerequisites that can be put down to “subject-specific cultures”, so-called “*Fachkulturen*”.¹⁴⁴ Hence, the various disciplines are not only regarded as units differing from each other in respect of content and knowledge but also as different *soziale Welten* (social worlds) (Liebau/Huber 1985). Liebau and Huber plead for interpreting these “social worlds” as cultures, “i.e., as distinguishable interrelations of patterns of awareness, thought, judging, and action which are systematically connected with each other” (Liebau / Huber 1985: 315). The development of a professional identity is created by professional research ethics which must be acquired during one’s studies by learning exemplary discipline-specific methods, theories and knowledge (see section 3). Such professional skills are recognized beyond any individual discipline. Furthermore such skills are connected with a specific trained disciplinary habitus which however remains mostly unreflected upon - and unanalysed.

6. The Construction of Knowledge in the Social Sciences and Humanities

“*Geisteswissenschaften*”, the specific German term for Humanities, can be defined as “the sciences of language and history, culture and human ways of thinking and behaving” (Søren Kjørup 2001). And a dictionary definition from the 1980s reads: “*Geisteswissenschaften*” are “academic disciplines that focus on how life is regulated in the state, society, law, custom, education, science and technology, and on interpretations of the world in language, myth, religion, art, philosophy and science.”¹⁴⁵ There is hardly any discipline that does not fall under this definition, as long as it is not designated as part of the “natural sciences” (which is generally seen as an opposite concept: e.g. “*Wahrigs Deutsches Wörterbuch*”, 1986).¹⁴⁶ The separate entry “*Sozialwissenschaften, Gesellschaftswissenschaften* (social sciences)”, however,

¹⁴¹ www.vhd.gwdg.de, 3.11.2004

¹⁴² www.historikertag2004kiel.de/dokforum.html, 3.11.2004

¹⁴³ Christian Esch: Der neue turn 14.9.2002

¹⁴⁴ As an example, see the study of History and Biochemistry by Sandra Beaufays (2003) “Wie werden Wissenschaftler gemacht? Beobachtungen zur wechselseitigen Konstitution von Geschlecht und Wissenschaft.”
¹⁴⁵ dtv-Lexikon in twenty volumes, 1st edition 1982, fourth edition 1997, Vol. 6.

¹⁴⁶ In the Grimm dictionary of 1897 the “*Geisteswissenschaften*” were defined as follows: “newly regarded as opposite to the natural sciences, and hence philosophy, history, philology, cf. “*geistesphilosophie*” (moral philosophy).

allows for further differentiation: “scientific disciplines, which are directed at investigating the conditions and organisation of human cohabitation, and which in their applied form serve to develop alternative models and criteria for rational political decision-making for social and community change.” (dtv-lexikon, Vol. 17). “Regulation” and “interpretation” are thus opposed to “application” and political counselling.

The German concept of “*Geisteswissenschaften*” in contrast with the French concept of “*les sciences humaines*” or the English “humanities” underlines the fact that the German *Geisteswissenschaften* developed out of the philosophy of idealism.¹⁴⁷ This legacy has been called into question in various fields over recent decades. The discussion involves the social legitimation of scientific disciplines and their specific “use” as well as the criteria by which to define the latter. The much-touted recent re-orientation of the *Geisteswissenschaften* into *Kulturwissenschaften*, or “cultural sciences” should be seen in the context of the relevant (scientific)-political process of negotiation.

6.1. Geisteswissenschaften today?

In 1991, a memorandum entitled “*Geisteswissenschaften heute*” attempted to formulate a possible answer to the question of the social legitimation of the Humanities in Germany. The memorandum resulted from a research project at the University of Konstanz, initiated by the German Science Council (*Wissenschaftsrat*) and the West German Rectors’ Conference (*Westdeutsche Rektorenkonferenz*) (Denkschrift: 1991, 7). The memorandum, still frequently quoted today, set out to define the *Geisteswissenschaften*, and the *Sozialwissenschaften* (social sciences) as an innovative and up to date field of scientific research. Jürgen Mittelstraß, Professor of Philosophy and the Philosophy of Science at the University of Konstanz (a university founded at the end of the 1960s), who is today an often quoted evaluation adviser, proposed two views in his article “The *Geisteswissenschaften* in the knowledge system”¹⁴⁸ (Denkschrift 1991). Both seek to answer the question concerning the social function of the *Geisteswissenschaften*: compensation versus orientation (*Orientierung*). Mittelstraß objects to the “compensation theory” of the philosopher Odo Marquard¹⁴⁹ from the 1980s. Marquard saw the task of the *Geisteswissenschaften* as compensating for the “damages of modernisation” of contemporary society. Mittelstraß criticises this implied dualistic interpretation of the natural sciences versus the *Geisteswissenschaften*, established by Marquard. The *Geisteswissenschaften* were thereby portrayed as a scientific discipline that were backward-looking from the very beginning, their “compensating” role perceived as a persisting, protecting and remembering awareness. Thus conservatism in the *Geisteswissenschaften* was not only approved, but even demanded. Contemporary problems would thus not be addressed by the *Geisteswissenschaften*, or dealt with in silence: compensation would simply be looked for. The *Geisteswissenschaften* would become “*acceptance sciences*” (Mittelstraß, the author’s italics, Denkschrift: 1991, 33). Mittelstraß, however, felt that it was essential for the *Geisteswissenschaften* also to participate in contemporary social debates and decisions with an “argued and constructive power of thought” (Denkschrift: 1991, 34).

However, the *Geisteswissenschaften* should not be understood as “orientation disciplines” either. Just as the “compensation theory” expects too little of *Geisteswissenschaften*, the second position risks expecting too much: “orientation” cannot be the sole task of the *Geisteswissenschaften*. The division between the natural sciences and the

¹⁴⁷ On this, see, for example, Kjörup: 2001, 1.

¹⁴⁸ All following translations in section 6 by Judith Ingg.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Odo Marquard: *Apologie des Zufälligen*. Stuttgart 1986, 101.

Geisteswissenschaften, according to which the former are “instrumental knowledge” (*Verfügungswissen*) and the latter are “meaning knowledge” (*Orientierungswissen*) is obsolete. Contesting such a division, Mittelstraß called on all the sciences to act as factors of both *production* and *orientation* (38). Nevertheless he conceded that the *Geisteswissenschaften* have an important role to play in the discussion of “orientation problems”. Continuing his argument against a dualistic picture of the sciences and against existing representations of the sense and objective of the *Geisteswissenschaften* as compensation or orientation, Mittelstraß conceived of the *Geisteswissenschaften* as the site where modern societies acquire a knowledge of themselves in scientific form” (39).¹⁵⁰ This also includes the idea of “orientation”. Such a view presupposes a further cultural concept, which implies an extension of the subject area of the *Geisteswissenschaften*: “Culture means two things: it is the embodiment of all human labour and forms of life, and it is a subsystem of this general culture, somehow divided from the fields of technology, economics, and politics”. (ibid, 40)¹⁵¹ The *Geisteswissenschaften* cannot be restricted to “understanding” (“*verstehen*”)- and here Mittelstraß returns to a traditional distinction (Wilhelm Dilthey¹⁵²). The task of the *Geisteswissenschaften* is also to “explain” (“*erklären*”) (41). The same is true in reverse for the natural sciences. Thus Mittelstraß also attacks the distinction of the *Geisteswissenschaften* and the natural sciences as a “myth” of “two cultures”.¹⁵³

A related view appeared in the “Memorandum” explicated by the literary scholar Hans Robert Jauß (1991). From the point of view of methodological history he named three characteristics of the *Geisteswissenschaften*. These are “border-crossing”, “integration” and “dialogue” (45). This could promote the permeability of disciplines and their potential for development. Thus, a new definition of the *Geisteswissenschaften* can be achieved by reactivating their existing traditional features. The development of the *Geisteswissenschaften* has been defined since the Enlightenment by differentiation and reintegration, in which various “key disciplines” (48 ff.) have played an integrating role. That is why the history of *Geisteswissenschaft* cannot be described using Kuhn’s¹⁵⁴ historical scientific model of “discontinuous paradigm change” (50)¹⁵⁵. The methodological history of the *GW* is governed above all by “*historical-philological paradigms*” (52) which have remained an important “instrument of comprehension” in the *Geisteswissenschaften* to this day (52). Only later did systematic approaches emerge within the framework of “descriptive paradigms” (formalist, structuralist, or part of linguistic criticism). (Jauß, Denkschrift: 1991, 52) In general, the discussion of the methods and development of the *Geisteswissenschaften* can be characterised by a “relationship of tension between historical and systematic approaches” (53). The concept of

¹⁵⁰ The powerful effect of the memorandum, even today, was indicated in Georg Bollenbeck’s newspaper article in 2002, in which he quoted this definition of the *Geisteswissenschaften*. He compared it to the reduction of academic disciplines to economic utility, as current in university political debates.

¹⁵¹ Mittelstraß is here referring to H. Schnädelbach: *Kritik der Kompensationstheorie* (A critique of compensation theory). In: *Kursbuch 91: Wozu Geisteswissenschaften? (What use the Geisteswissenschaften ?)* Berlin (1988) 35-45.

¹⁵² Wilhelm Dilthey: „Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften“ (*Introduction to Geisteswissenschaften* (1883); „Rede über die Entstehung der Hermeneutik“ (Discussion of the emergence of hermeneutics) (1900); „Aufbau der geschichtlichen Welt in den Geisteswissenschaften“ (Construction of the historical world in the *Geisteswissenschaften*, published posthumously in 1910).

¹⁵³ The discussion of the “two cultures” refers to Charles Percy Snow. Cf. Charles Percy Snow: *The Two Cultures and a Second Look. An Expanded Version of the Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*. Cambridge 1964. The British physicist, novelist and state official in 1959 linked natural science as a “future-oriented” science with the concepts and methods of “science, measuring and weighing” (Mittelstraß: 1991, 24) and literary studies as “oriented towards the past, with the concepts of literature, education and memory” (ibid).

¹⁵⁴ Th. S. Kuhn: *The structure of the scientific revolution*. 1962.

¹⁵⁵ See in this connection Kjörup: 2001, 95-96. Kjörup’s thesis is interesting in that Kuhn’s descriptive model of the natural sciences is related to art history (2001, 91).

*Kulturwissenschaften*¹⁵⁶ (cultural studies) is used in the memorandum programmatically as a “modernising cipher” (Böhme et al. 2002, 19). Elisabeth List (2004) speaks of a “model”, understood as an attempt to respond to the “frequently stated crisis of the *Geisteswissenschaften*“ (13). The concept of *Kulturwissenschaften* has been coming back into scientific political discourse since the 1980s. The memorandum questions the “myth of the two cultures”, which establishes boundaries between the natural sciences, the social sciences and the *Geisteswissenschaften* as allegedly totally divided cultures. (Denkschrift: 1991, 25 ff.) Böhme et al argue for an understanding of natural sciences and humanities as “expressions” of one culture. The suggestions for modernisation in the memorandum therefore includes the demand to extend the subject field of the *Geisteswissenschaften* as well as their function in society. In the author’s view, this necessarily implies “interdisciplinarity” (on this issue see also section 7.)

6.2. Reasons for questioning the *Geisteswissenschaften* again

According to Wolfgang Frühwald (Denkschrift: 1991, 85), the recurrent crisis of legitimation of the Humanities can be seen in connection with “phases of strengthened authority of rational objectives . . . in which, according to the practical orientation of the sciences, their usefulness for political, social and economic needs is tested and their applicability discussed”. These phases can be observed during the founding period of Berlin University, the “period of logical realism” at the turn of the 19th into the 20th century, and finally during the debates at the end of the 1980s and beginning of the 1990s (Frühwald, Denkschrift: 1991, 85f.). The call for a practically orientated science was therefore not so much the result of successive developments in the discussion of science as assumed for example by Arno Bammé (2004, 24-30), but rather a traditional motif. Moreover, attempts at reformulating the *Geisteswissenschaften* should be seen in connection with different scientific theoretical positions, or ‘internal’ shifts in scientific discourse, which are also tied up with “external” factors.

Changing scientific cultures

Frühwald holds a recurring domination of rational purposeful thinking responsible for the legitimation crisis of the *Geisteswissenschaften* (Denkschrift: 1991, 85-6). The transition from “academic” (that is, university) science to “postacademic” science is described by Arno Bammé (2004), as the progression of the sciences from relative autonomy to an application-orientated science established in the 1970s.¹⁵⁷ Bammé explains the application-oriented development of science since the 1970s in terms of the increasing “scientization” of society (2004, 17). Thus “society” is increasingly interested in “exerting control over science”(ibid). According to Bammé, the university institution has become dated and science is increasingly located in areas outside the university. It is clear that this form of applied research, which no longer subscribes to the ideal image of autonomous research established in the 19th century, is most feasible in economically exploitable disciplines. (According to Bammé around 70% of “research and development” in Germany is financed by trade and industry and is also carried out in the business sector (2004, 14).)

Bammé (2004) speaks of a process of “taking away the magic from science” which started in the 1980s and which led to a “science war” in the 1990s. The paradigm conflict reached its high point in the media with the “Sokal affair”. Bammé sees this process against the

¹⁵⁶ Cf *Geisteswissenschaften* heute. Eine Denkschrift (The *Geisteswissenschaften* today. A memorandum.) Mittelstraß, 39 ff; Jauß, 71; Koselleck, 141.

¹⁵⁷ He bases his thesis on the following scientific-historical interpretations: Gernot Böhme; Wolfgang van den Daele and Wolfgang Krohn: Die Finalisierung der Wissenschaft. (The finalising of science) In: Zeitschrift f. Soziologie. JG. 2, April 1973, Heft 2, 128-44 and Peter Weingart: Wissensproduktion und soziale Struktur. (The production of knowledge and social structure) Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp 1976.

background of the transfer of science out of the universities and the opening up of research for “external purposes” (see, for example, 16/17). On the whole Bammé remains vague in his assessment of the concrete consequences of scientific developments for the content of science: “They [the decisions concerning research projects] are in line with the expectations of social groups, current fashion trends or valiant promises made by scientists seeking to increase their financial resources” (20).

The Germanist and cultural scientist Georg Bollenbeck has written about the influence of economic pressure on tertiary education policies in a 2002 newspaper article on “the reorganisation of the meaning of the university in terms of a market and economic rhetoric”. The extent of the pressure of legitimation on the *Geisteswissenschaften* in particular is illustrated in Bammé’s reference to the idea of the establishment of a “third culture”, formulated by John Brockmann¹⁵⁸ and John Horgan¹⁵⁹. This “third culture” replaces the “first and second cultures”, in that it no longer insists on the autonomous status of science, but is to be understood as applied science. The authors thus condemn the “first culture” to insignificance, since the so-called “third culture” “is grounded in a scientifically shaped world of empirical method, which at the same time comprises natural scientists, social scientists, technologists and anthropologists, behaviourists and science journalists, to name only a few” (Brockmann: 1996, 15ff, quot. in Bammé: 2004, 171) This interpretation appears to continue the hostile stance taken by positivist natural scientists against the *Geisteswissenschaften* in the name of applicability and therefore does not really escape the opposition between the “first” and the “second” culture. Consequently according to Bammé the “attack” of Brockmann and Horgan’s concept aims at “the exclusion of intellectual writers, philosophers and obscurantists, and in particular postmodern thinkers of European origin” (2004, 11; it remains uncertain to what extent Bammé shares a similar concept of the enemy).

The idea of “applicability” as a criterion for university research is full of conflict in terms of its socio-political significance – it could signify an emancipatory ideal or the reduction of the university to short-term usability or total dissolution. The *Geisteswissenschaften* were discussed in a similar way in the 1960s and 1970s in terms of social change rather than economic usefulness. Georg Bollenbeck (2002) points to this in his article in the weekly newspaper “Freitag”.¹⁶⁰ In this article he demarcates the “planned objectives” of the 70s and the initiatives in the memorandum at the start of the 90s from the contemporary “neoliberal trend” in the structure of universities. Within this trend there are also signs of problematic shifts in the meaning of concepts such as “social reflection” (and “transdisciplinarity”).

¹⁵⁸ John Brockmann: Die dritte Kultur. Das Weltbild der modernen Naturwissenschaft. (Third Culture. Scientists on the Edge) Basel; Boston: btb 1996 (1995). Brockmann’s concept is not to be equated with Lepenies’ concept of the “third culture”. While Lepenies speaks of a third culture that refers to the social sciences and therefore encompasses elements of the “first” and the “second” culture, the authors take as their starting point the replacement of a “first” and “second” culture with a “third culture”. In this sense the concept excludes all social sciences and *Geisteswissenschaften* which are not conducted “empirically”.

¹⁵⁹ John Horgan: An den Grenzen des Wissens. Siegeszug und Dilemma der Naturwissenschaften. Frankfurt/Main. (The End of Science. Facing the Limits of Science in the Twilight of the Scientific Age) 2002 (1996). Bammé refers to Horgan’s study both in the *Geisteswissenschaften* and the natural sciences (2004, 172). It seems that he has basically abandoned his study of the literary sciences in order to devote himself to the empirical sciences as a scientific journalist, not without regret noting their end as “pure sciences”. (Cf. quotation in Bammé: 2004, 173). A quotation on his homepage clarifies his view: “My claim is that science is a bounded enterprise, limited by social, economic, physical and cognitive factors. Science is being threatened, literally, in some cases, by technophobes, by creationists and other religious fundamentalists, by post-modern philosophers and, most important of all, by stingy politicians.” (www.edge.org/3rd_culture/bios/horgan.html, 9.9.2004)

¹⁶⁰ Georg Bollenbeck: Entschlossener Griff nach dem ökonomischen Hebel. Hochschulreform. Zur traditionsvergessenen Programmlosigkeit der neuen Hochschulesemantik. (In: Freitag 10, 1.3.2002, www.freitag.de/2002/10/02100401.php, 19.8. 2004.

Concepts that were first formulated from a critical scientific perspective in the context of new social movements (anti-nuclear movements, environmental movements and women's movements), are becoming increasingly technocratic: for example, "social reflexion" has been rearticulated with a focus on "extra-scientific mechanisms for generating consensus and for quality control", in which economic usability is subsumed (see Wenk: 2001 for further details).

Changes in media culture

The 1991 memorandum criticised the "decades-long distance of the *Geisteswissenschaften* and the *Kulturwissenschaften*" from the consequences of the new media technology "for our culture", a distance which is only now being cautiously broached today.¹⁶¹ The reason for this remoteness was convincingly sought in the specifically German tradition of the *Geisteswissenschaften*, whose "elitist stigmatizing of popular forms of communication and spectacles of mass culture" continues (Steinwachs, Denkschrift: 1991, 153). Moreover, the critique of the "culture industry" by the Frankfurt School, regarded both as "astute" and "fundamentalist", explains the reservations with regard to the mass media (Steinwachs, Denkschrift: 1991, 153). Other serious traditions – such as the works of Walter Benjamin – are thus suppressed or at least pushed into the background (Steinwachs, Denkschrift: 1991, 151-153)¹⁶².

Clearly, the study of mass communication as a proper subject started in sociology in the USA during the 1930s in order to analyse the propaganda of the First World War and the impact of the mass media on democracy in general. It was Paul Lazarsfeld, who emigrated after the Nazi occupation of Austria, who developed an empirical sociological concept of mass communication research. He saw the risk that empirical positivistic data analysis might neglect the political implications of the mass media. Habermas in this work opened up the sociological analysis of the mass media to a philosophical analysis of the transformation of the public sphere in the course of the development of capitalism (Apitzsch 1980).

Confrontation with media culture took place first and foremost in the German-language area; there can be scarcely any other field of the social sciences that has experienced the kind of recent developments we have seen in "research into the impact and use of the media" (Steinwachs, Denkschrift: 1991, 144; reference to DFG 1987). Such research is clearly to be seen in connection with the promotion of the "evaluation of technical effects" (Steinwachs, Denkschrift: 1991, 142). "The extent of the 'backlog in the field of media research in the *Geisteswissenschaften* and *Kulturwissenschaften*' is visible in the available research capacity, which is not adequately promoted, 'because its results are neither directly related to application nor economically usable'" (Steinwachs, Denkschrift: 1991, 144).¹⁶³ The "increasing visualisation and dematerialisation of media communication" that is observed today (Steinwachs, 152) requires reflection and analysis of the "forms of mediation and presentation" by the *Geisteswissenschaften* – in both teaching *and* research.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶¹ Advertisements for professorships of "media science" support this (mostly redesignated empty positions in philological faculties) as well as a series of research associations and the establishment of media centres (Steinwachs, Denkschrift: 1991, 142f.)

¹⁶² See also Böhme et al.: 2000, 180 ff.; the authors also refer to Ernst Cassirer, for whom "medium" was a central idea and give the impression of paying attention to another tradition of German *Kulturwissenschaften*, which – no doubt also determined by National Socialism – was forgotten for a long time.

¹⁶³ A generally equitable relationship between media research in the empirical social sciences and in the *Kulturwissenschaften* is described by the author as existing, for example, in the USA, Great Britain, France or Sweden (Denkschrift: 1991, 144).

¹⁶⁴ Reference is made here to the scientific historical studies of the practice of visualisation in the natural sciences and the effects of developments in the media (see the report by Nikolow 2002) as well as to the studies

The analysis of the reciprocal purpose of media development and research in the *Geisteswissenschaften* and the *Kulturwissenschaften* – from printing through to digital media – is however difficult to deal with in a single subject called “media studies”. The methodological backlog of media studies requires “institutional and interdisciplinary cooperation” – the “establishment of research associations, for example, of semioticians, cognitive scientists, perception psychologists, ethnologists or cultural anthropologists” (Steinwachs, 157).¹⁶⁵ “A media science, which investigates the culture of communication in terms of its structures and functions, impact and history, would be a model for regenerating a science by crossing the increasing boundaries between disciplines as well as for reorienting the *Geisteswissenschaften* towards the cultural sciences (*Kulturwissenschaften*)”. (Steinwachs, 159).

6.3. “*Kulturwissenschaft(en)*” as a perspective?

The authors of the “Denkschrift” see the reorientation of the *Geisteswissenschaften* towards the *Kulturwissenschaften* as a possible way out of the dilemma, which in Germany is rooted in the idealistic tradition of the subject field. Within *Kulturwissenschaften* they include areas such as technology, the natural sciences and society, which are separated from the “spirit” (*Geist*). Mittelstraß thus calls idealism an “inopportune ‘philosophical’ system which forced the *Geisteswissenschaften* not only out of a rationality in common with the natural sciences, but with the ‘social sciences’, understood as descriptive and nomotological”. (Denkschrift: 1991, 27) (This thesis on the drawing of borders between the social sciences and the *Geisteswissenschaften* remains to be proved.)

Despite the demarcation of the idealistic tradition the memorandum seems to require a connection of some kind with certain aspects of this tradition. Thus despite the gradual progress towards the independence of the social sciences in the 19th century the *Geisteswissenschaften* are still “socially underpinned” by the “implicit premises of the ‘spirit’ (*Geist*)” (Koselleck, Denkschrift: 1991, 124). The double movement in the memorandum, which refers to the idealistic successor of the *Geisteswissenschaften* while also differentiating itself from this, is clarified in the following quotation on the “provocative” implications of the concept of “*Kulturwissenschaften*”: “It implies general interconnections, putting the names and the self-designation of the *Geisteswissenschaften* into perspective, without however giving up its old claim that both nature and society should be its themes. The concept of culture, moreover, has the benefit of being sufficiently flexible to identify and take up interdisciplinary challenges”. (Koselleck: 1991, 141)¹⁶⁶

The opportunity for the *Kulturwissenschaften* therefore lies in their reintegration with the social sciences and the *Geisteswissenschaften*. Thus “*Kulturwissenschaften*”, the “modernisation cipher”¹⁶⁷ is connected to a traditional discourse, which was fashionable as early as the end of the 19th century. Indeed, during the second half of the 19th century the

on the interdependence of methods of art history, photography and slide projection (Dilly 1976; Wenk 1999 et al.)

¹⁶⁵ On the possibilities and limitations of “art theory” with regard to these tasks, see also Denkschrift: 1991, 158f.

¹⁶⁶ The concept of “culture” is an alternative to the idealistic spiritual concept: *Culture*, made into a German word by Leibniz, which has, since the late 18th century, been a concept that is appropriate for indicating the connection between all linguistic sciences and *Geisteswissenschaften* on the one hand, and the social sciences on the other; for assuming their theoretical common interests”. (Koselleck, Denkschrift: 1991, 138) Nevertheless after the First World War it was used polemically as a definition of Western civilisation and was suspected of “encouraging amateurism”. (ibid, 141).

¹⁶⁷ See above 6.1 Böhme et. al.

concept of “life” (Nietzsche) and of “culture” attempted to deal with the separation of science and society as well as the narrowing of disciplines. (Koselleck: 1991, 136) Other, more recent publications have emphasised the fact that in the German scientific tradition, especially from the early part of the 20th century, methods and questions were developed that opened the way for the integration of different disciplines: Manfred Fauser refers to debates around a new conception of “cultural philosophy and science” around 1900. Georg Simmel was a prominent participant in this debate – as a philosopher, author, and founding member of the German Sociology Society – as well as Max Weber¹⁶⁸ and Ernst Cassirer (Fauser: 2004, 12ff., 16-26; see also Böhme: 2000, 9f.; List 2004; among others).¹⁶⁹

The literary scholar Fauser saw in “*Kulturwissenschaften*” the opportunity to develop a “reflective and theoretical competence” in contrast with a mere “obsolete accumulation of easily recited knowledge” (2004, 11). In so doing he explicitly assigned an important value to ‘cultural science’ theories of literature in debates concerning methodology (Fauser: 2004, inter alia 7 f.). Fauser demarcates his concept of ‘*Kulturwissenschaften*’ in the plural from a “discipline named *Kulturwissenschaft*” (in the singular, as used by Böhme and others: see Böhme 2000).¹⁷⁰ In contrast *Kulturwissenschaften* in the plural designates a “research practice with a transdisciplinary purpose among otherwise unchanged disciplines”. This also encompasses the relationship of disciplines to “their own scholarliness”, “so that subjects are never simply given, but are formed by the disciplines and are dependent on their access” (Fauser: 2004, 9)¹⁷¹.

7. Interdisciplinarity

Interdisciplinarity is a key term used in various discussions concerning innovation in the organisation of academic working and knowledge and it is a programmatic request in recent governmental positions. Sabine Hark calls it a “Passepartout” (2004, 357) which can be used to pursue different and sometimes also antagonistic aims. “Strange alliances of discourses” of university reformers oriented towards the market and management, and of critical science and Women’s and Gender Studies¹⁷² can be observed (see section 6).

¹⁶⁸ Böhme refers to the fact that Weber allocated the social sciences specifically to the “*Kulturwissenschaften*” (2000: 9f.)

¹⁶⁹ It should be mentioned here to the link made by Richard Lee (1997) between the establishment of Cultural Studies and the development in the German debate around the end of the century and its move against the opposition between “value” and “knowledge”.

¹⁷⁰ The fact that in current debates on the *Geisteswissenschaften* as *Kulturwissenschaften* the development and productivity of “Cultural Studies” in English-speaking countries plays an important role, is mainly implicitly, but also sometimes explicitly thematised. “*Kulturwissenschaft*”, as outlined by Böhme and others, the “risks” of a “virtually never ending internal differentiation and particularisation” of “culture” are viewed in an “interest-led grasp of ethnic and/or ‘minority’ groups”, through which the concept of culture threatens to “lose its analytical and synthetic functions of ideological criticism”: “In the place of the analysis of processes of traditional canon formation an unreflective new canon could emerge from a conglomerate of combined particularisms.”(Böhme: 2000, 13) Such misgivings seem to be an inevitable result of the wish to re-establish a discipline. At the same time the wish for a profile in contrast to the Anglo-Saxon debates is not to be overlooked, a wish that in another German-language text on the “cultural history of *Kulturwissenschaft*” (Kittler: 2001) is linked even more explicitly to a turn against ‘imports’, meaning minority and gender research (for a critique see Hof: 2003).

¹⁷¹ Elsewhere he mentions “Gender Studies” as an “outstanding example” of the praxis of *Kulturwissenschaften* (Fauser: 2004, 11).

¹⁷² Sabine Hark: 2004, 356: „merkwürdige[n] Diskursallianzen zwischen markt- und managementorientierten HochschulreformerInnen auf der einen und kritischer Wissenschaft sowie Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung auf der anderen“.

In the current debates interdisciplinarity evokes “dynamism, flexibility and modernisation”¹⁷³, and “discipline” as the opposed term is regarded as “static, rigid and immune against reforms” (Hark 2004, 357).¹⁷⁴ This dichotomy is dubious. The question to ask is what are the „reforms“ for, or in other words what are the problems which should be solved by “interdisciplinarity” – or by “transdisciplinarity”, another term which is often used? Furthermore the question is how interdisciplinarity can be put into practice and how it has been realised until now.

7.1. “Inter-“ or “Transdisciplinarity” – shifts of meanings

Interdisciplinarity has been demanded since the reforms of the university in the 1960s. The critical interrogation of the disciplinary production of knowledge was driven forward both through the student movement and academics connected to later social movements like ecological and women’s movements. Questions of social utility of scientific knowledge were at the same time questions about the boundaries of each discipline, its methods and categories – or of the discourses of discipline which (according to Michel Foucault) produce the subjects of research.

The innovative potential of Women’s and Gender Studies in a process of rethinking and restructuring traditional modes of knowledge production is evident (cf. Dröege-Modelmog, Flaake 1997: 4f. et al.). A very important factor here is what Edit Kirsch-Auwärter (1996) called a “feminist interventionist culture”, with its origins outside of institutional and university-political contexts in the “grassroots movements” where a commitment to social responsibility was always considered imperative. The “innovative potential of women’s and gender studies” could be described as “an important force in the restructuring of academia. The displacement and spectacular breakdown of well-established legitimisation strategies, which resulted from the erosion of traditional academic life, favoured innovative thinking” (Wenk 2002, 47). Thinking about the social responsibilities of academic knowledge production led to self-reflection. As a result interdisciplinarity itself was criticised in so far as it could be understood as just an addition of various disciplines. Some proposed a concept of “contra-disciplinarity”.¹⁷⁵

The differentiation of the term interdisciplinarity reflects the debate about the way in which interdisciplinarity should be organised and what its main goals should be (see also Section 6) “Multidisciplinarity”¹⁷⁶ has recently been more often used as a term to signify a mere accumulation of different disciplinary perspectives. Opposing an additive interdisciplinarity practice, the term “transdisciplinarity”¹⁷⁷ was introduced, demanding a stronger reflexivity and analytical discussion of disciplinary perspectives and topics. Hark (2004) proposes a further differentiation and introduces the term “discipline-orientated transdisciplinarity”

¹⁷³ „Dynamik, Flexibilität, Modernisierung“, Sabine Hark: 2004, 357.

¹⁷⁴ “Stasis, Rigidität, Reformfeindlichkeit”, *ibid.*

¹⁷⁵ *Konter/Kontradisziplinarität* cf. Gudrun-Axeli Knapp/Edith Saurer: Editorial. In: Issue: interdisciplinarity L’HOMME. Zeitschrift für Femistische Geschichtswissenschaft. (6) nr. 2 1995 and also the editorial of Ines Lindner/Sigrid Schade/Silke Wenk/Gabriele Werner (eds.) (1989): *Blick-Wechsel. Konstruktionen von Männlichkeit und Weiblichkeit in Kunst und Kunstgeschichte*. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag, 13.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. Jochen Jaeger and Martin Scheringer: *Landschaftszerschneidung. Transdisziplinarität: Problemorientierung ohne Methodenzwang*. www.fragmentation.de/Deutsch/Publikationen/D_16.12.2004. and www.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/britcult/DOInterdiszipli. and Mittelstraß: 1998, 32.

¹⁷⁷ Eg. the Cultural Gender Studies Program in Oldenburg defined themselves as „transdisciplinarity“, that means that the aim is not only to combine knowledges from different disciplines but also to examine the the different forms of production of knowledge within each discipline. The objective is to establish new connections between the disciplines (cf. Wenk 2002). See further Mittelstraß: 1998, 29 ff.; Hark: 1998; Mittelstraß: 2001. Interesting in this context is that the former *ZIF, Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien* of the Berlin Humboldt University was renamed as *Zentrum für transdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien* a “transdisciplinarity” Centre of Gender Studies in 2003.

(“*disziplinorientierte Transdisziplinarität*”, 372). “Transdisciplinarity” in this sense is primarily intended as a transgression of borders between scientific areas (and not necessarily with non-scientific areas, as another reading of “transdisciplinarity” (Hark: 2004, 370-2). She distinguishes this concept from a “discipline-oriented interdisciplinarity” (“*disziplinorientierte Interdisziplinarität*”)¹⁷⁸, which leaves the disciplines and their perspectives untouched. The discussion about the term “transdisciplinarity” not only implied a communicative process and reflection about criteria and views in the respective disciplines which Hark (2004) stresses as the main point, but also the notion of covering areas excluded by different disciplines (see Wenk 2002; 2001). Hark pleads for “transdisciplinarity” in the sense of “post-disciplinarity”, distinguished from a second understanding of this term connected to “post-academic science” or “mode 2”-conceptions.¹⁷⁹ A slightly different third definition of “transdisciplinarity” is given by Jaeger and Scheringer (1998) who define “transdisciplinarity” as problem-oriented research, which is free in its choice of methods and which can be both “practice-oriented” and “theory-oriented”.¹⁸⁰

In the last ten years the meanings of “transdisciplinarity” have shifted. “The way the term of ‘transdisciplinarity’ is often used in official statements in connection with the demand that academia concern itself with social concerns and that it should feel itself responsible to society [...] The question arises however, ‘who defines which social issues should to be addressed?’ All too often [...] the question of social responsibility is confused with immediate usability.” (Wenk 2002, 48) What threatens to be forgotten is the responsibility to reflect the conditions under which (disciplinary) knowledge is produced (Wenk 2002, 48).

7.2. Realising Inter/Transdisciplinarity

Considering our German samples we can identify different forms of institutionalised interdisciplinary practice as

- interdisciplinary research and teaching focuses (thus problem-oriented and not discipline-oriented) e.g. Hannover, Frankfurt, Frankfurt/Oder,
- newly established “interdisciplinary disciplines” like the institutionalisation of Women’s and Gender Studies in different German universities
- postgraduate research programs as the research training groups (*Graduiertenkollegs*), which get financed by the DFG and also other kinds of doctoral programs which are financially less well equipped.

Often these interdisciplinary “projects” seem to evolve out of personal initiatives and to benefit from already existing (informel) networks. Two main questions should be posed in this context: Under which conditions can “interdisciplinarity” as “transdisciplinarity” be realised in the structures mentioned above? And: to what extend are initiatives of single “promoters” of interdisciplinarity sustained and rewarded?

As we can summarize from our interviews, interdisciplinary dialogue, which promotes a change of disciplinary boundaries takes place in situations where debates occur. These kinds of encounter between different disciplinary perspectives take place for example in co-taught

¹⁷⁸ Hark concludes: „’Trans’ steht hier nicht oder nicht vorrangig für die Überschreitung der Grenze zwischen wissenschaftlichen oder nicht vorrangig für die Überschreitung der Grenze zwischen wissenschaftlichen und nicht-wissenschaftlichen Wissen, sondern für den reflexiv organisierten Grenzverkehr, für die Quergänge zwischen den Disziplinen und Fächern.“ (Hark: 2004, 372)

¹⁷⁹ This means resolving problems in close cooperation with various stakeholders in a not academically defined field. Cf. The Potential of Transdisciplinarity (2001). In: J. Thompson Klein et. al (2001) and Gibbons et al: 1994, 168, g J. Thompson Klein et.al : 2001. See also Arno Bammé (2004) cited by us in section 6.

¹⁸⁰ “problemorientierte und in der Methodenwahl freie Forschung” die „praxisorientiert, aber auch theorieorientiert sein“ kann In: Jochen Jäger/Martin Scheringer: 1998, www.fragmentation.de/Deutsch/Publikationen/D... 16.12.2004.

classes, in lectures which teach different disciplinary methods and perspectives (as for example in introductory Women's and Gender Studies modules), and in co-supervision by professors (from different disciplines) for dissertations (either at graduate or postgraduate level) or interdisciplinary PhD colloquia where dissertations from different disciplines are discussed. Some of these activities, which encourage transdisciplinary working, require additional capacity and therefore also resources. But what seems to be the tendency is, that this additional time and energy needed to create an interdisciplinary space is being provided by individuals without further resources. The pre-condition for the institutionalisation of interdisciplinary courses like Gender Studies was in most cases that these courses do not need any extra money (they have to be "*kostenneutral*"). Thus, interdisciplinary cooperation – in teaching and research – depends on personal involvement, which is made more difficult when teaching tasks increase while staff capacities remain the same.

7.3. Finances

There is a discrepancy between the official rhetoric on education and research in political contexts and concrete university politics. What can be concluded from the interviews is that a lot of interdisciplinarity initiatives are extra, and not rewarded financially. Additionally interdisciplinarity is mostly not an indicator for extra financial funding within universities. A specific problem we noted in the case of interdisciplinary centres is the problem of evaluation. Research evaluation focuses on how much third-party funding the scientists have raised. In the case of the interdisciplinary centres researchers get into dilemma, because they need either to declare their research project in the context of the discipline or the centre. Considering the fact, that the evaluation of one's post in the discipline is important and that scientists may be more committed to their discipline, it can be presumed that they tend to opt for the discipline. At the very least they experience a serious conflict of interests. Furthermore the financial frame seems to define the priorities of the research program of a centre whose member understand themselves as an inter- or transdisciplinary working group. Research programs which seem to be immediately usable for policy advice have more chance to get money and are mostly focussed on the traditional methods of the Social Sciences. At times of limited resources interdisciplinarity seems to be sustained by political authorities above all in its "application". If research is reduced to a political and economic supply of services, this could enhance the borders between the Social and Human Sciences. Even if the institutionalisation of the Gender Studies has been evolving, it has been institutionalised only to some extent. As Helga Nowotny points out, "transdisciplinary sites" ("*transdisziplinäre Orte*") are precarious and susceptible to financial, organisational and political changes.¹⁸¹

8. The Impact of the Bologna Process on Disciplinisation

The responsibility for implementing Bologna is with the universities and the disciplines in the federal states. It is adapted to the respective university culture and tradition and converted accordingly. So the Social Sciences Department of the University of Frankfurt for example has not yet introduced BAs or MAs but is still in the process of preparing these, while at the same time other Universities, for example the University of Oldenburg introduced MAs from the end of the 1990s and BAs since the winter term of 2004.

¹⁸¹ See the report about the project „Organisation und Entwicklung transdisziplinärer Forschungsprozesse“ (financed by the Foundation Gebert Rūf, finished in 2003, September), http://www.grstiftung.ch/_projektarchivDB/archiv_detail_f.dna?ProjNr1=GRS-089/99, 15.8.2004.

We shall start by looking at the definitions of the new degrees given by the *KMK* (Standing Conference of the Ministers of Culture) in 1999¹⁸² and by the *Akkreditierungsrat* (Accreditation Council) in 2001¹⁸³. Beside the *HRG* they are relevant as framework regulations (*Rahmenvorschriften bundesrechtlicher Art*) for the organization of Bachelor and Master degrees, even if they have only an advisory function and are not binding laws.¹⁸⁴ The traditional system of graduation is regulated by § 18 and the new one by § 19 in the *HRG* (Framework Act). The new graduation system was established on a trial basis by amendment of the *HRG* in 1998. In contrast to the former system a Bachelor degree is achieved more quickly. After the so-called *Regelstudienzeit* (the standard period of study) of three, respectively four years for the Bachelor, the Master is a one- or two-year long course which can be studied only after completion of a Bachelor degree.

8.1. “Applications-oriented” versus “theory-oriented” courses in the Bologna process

The *KMK* distinguishes in its resolution of March 1999 both for the BA and the MA between more “theoretical”, and more “applied” courses.¹⁸⁵ The Bachelor oriented towards theory is called Bachelor of Arts (BA) or Bachelor of Science. The name of the discipline does not appear. For the Bachelor focused on “application” the term Bachelor plus the name of the discipline are used.¹⁸⁶ The introduction of this separation between “applied” and “theoretical” courses is justified by the political goal to “strengthen international competitiveness”¹⁸⁷. This explicit division is a new concept, although there has been some kind of division through the binary higher education system of *Fachhochschulen* (Universities of Applied Science or Polytechnics) and *Universitäten* (Universities), which traditionally relate themselves either more to an “applied” or a “theoretical” approach in teaching.¹⁸⁸ One might expect that this division would diminish, if universities introduce more applied courses or vice versa and students having studied a Bachelor at a *Fachhochschule* (University of Applied Science) continue their studies with a Master at a university.¹⁸⁹ On the other hand the higher education reform could also lay extra stress on the division of the two forms of higher education institutes.¹⁹⁰

Beside this division in application/theory, another division into arts/science is articulated through the introduction of the BA/MA and BSc/MSc, dividing the disciplines into these two fields.¹⁹¹ This is especially interesting as it establishes a division that traditionally has been unified by the German term (and concept) of “*Wissenschaft*”. In her essay „*Kultur der wissenschaftlichen Objektivität*“ Daston (1998) reflects on the differing meanings of the German term *Wissenschaft* in comparison to the English term “science“. While the English

¹⁸² www.kultusministerkonferenz.de/hschule/bsstrukt.htm

¹⁸³ www.akkreditierungsrat.de/referenzrahmen.htm

¹⁸⁴ Wex, Peter: 2002, 12.

¹⁸⁵ www.kultusministerkonferenz.de/hschule/bsstruktur.htm 3.2.

¹⁸⁶ Compare also www.akkreditierungsrat.de/referenzrahmen.htm, 1 and www.accreditation-council.de

¹⁸⁷ “Nach dem Beschluss der Kultusministerkonferenz zur Stärkung der internationalen Wettbewerbsfähigkeit des Studienstandorts Deutschland vom 24.10.1997 muss die Bezeichnung der Abschlüsse der Differenzierung des Ausbildungsangebots in stärker theorieorientierte und stärker anwendungsorientierte Studiengänge Rechnung tragen” www.kultusministerkonferenz.de/hschule/bsstruktur.htm, 13.12.2004.

¹⁸⁸ See section 2. Cf.: *Süddeutsche Zeitung*: Die Misere mit dem Master 23./24.10.2004

¹⁸⁹ This the universities might refuse as Hans-Herbert Holzhammer suggests in an article in the newspaper *Süddeutsche Zeitung* 23rd, 24th October 2004.

¹⁹⁰ In the past the *Fachhochschulen* offered only the *Diplom* as a degree, while the universities offered *Diplom* and *Magister*. With the new system both institutions can offer all Bachelor and Masters Degrees.

¹⁹¹ Compare the table under 3., www.kultusministerkonferenz.de/hschule/bsstruktur.htm.

term “science” (similar to Italian: *Scienza* and French: *Science*) is used mainly in the sense of Natural Science, the German term *Wissenschaft* refers to the systematic construction of every kind of knowledge.¹⁹²

8.2. Organisational structures

The new system of courses is supposed to be structured in a much more detailed and fixed way than before. While the federal system had a great many different degree regulations these may now be harmonized through the introduction of the so-called *Modulsystem* which works through credit points and which has to be approved by accreditation. The *Akkreditierungsrat* (Accreditation Council) has suggested that there should be enough freedom for experiments during the early stages of the Bologna process implementation. “Peers” as experts should have much influence on the accreditation of the courses.¹⁹³

The *Akkreditierungsrat* defines the Bachelor as follows: “According to § 19 Abs. 2 HRG, a Bachelor degree course is a first course of university study which leads to a first professional degree. Such courses must be structured in such a way as to qualify students in the application of the academic and/or scientific methods of the subject in question and must, through the delivery of a specialist systematology, provide students with the specific subject-based foundation for a future profession. In its capacity as a first professional degree, the Bachelor is generally awarded across all kinds of higher education institution.”¹⁹⁴ The *KMK* determined at the conference in 1999 for the Bachelor that it should be conceived as a degree focused on one main subject with possible accompaniments of further „scientific and interdisciplinary qualifications“.¹⁹⁵ In his handbook (2002, 16) Peter Wex too argues that the new degree system should result in “a clear profile in content by concentration of one scientific core subject”¹⁹⁶. But according to him the combination of two subjects should also be made possible. This seems to be a change in the concept of the German degree course system, as it reduces the courses to one main subject (or at most two as is the case for the model of the Bachelor degrees in the Humanities, introduced at the university of Oldenburg in the winter term of 2004) while before in the case of the *Magister* you could choose two or three subjects (two Major or one Major and two Minors) in a wide range of combinations. This change could lead to a more restricted disciplinary perspective. On the other hand supplementary new “spaces” (such as the so-called *Ergänzungsbereich* (complementary field) in Oldenburg) and the *Professionalisierungsbereich* (field of professionalisation) could encourage interdisciplinary work, depending on the willingness to cooperate between and to innovate in the disciplines. The newly created Masters degrees might also produce new interdisciplinary fields of knowledge. Regarding the contents and differences between Bachelor and Masters, the Accreditation Council writes that “Masters degrees distinguish themselves from Bachelor

¹⁹² See Daston (1998) 11f: „Wissenschaft“: “sämtliche Arten des systematischen Wissens über alle möglichen Gegenstände“.

¹⁹³ “In the test phase for the new degree courses, which aims to promote innovation in the range of courses offered, it would seem advisable to have only a few criteria serving as a rough orientation. Such an approach would enable us to dispense with far-ranging regulation and would at the same time ensure that a process of ‘peer review’ takes on a special significance within the accreditation process.” www.accreditation-council.de/frame-of-reference.htm

¹⁹⁴ www.accreditation-council.de/frame-of-reference.htm, (1), 14.12.2004.

¹⁹⁵ “die neue Studienstruktur bedeutet für die kürzeren Bachelor-/Bakkalaureusstudiengänge die Konzentration auf ein wissenschaftliches Kernfach, wobei eine Ergänzung durch die Vermittlung weiterer wissenschaftlicher oder fachübergreifender Qualifikationen möglich ist.“ www.kultusministerkonferenz.de/hschule/bsstrukt.htm, 13.12.2004, 1.

¹⁹⁶ The desired „klare inhaltliche Grundprofilierung des Studienangebotes [is meant to be reached] durch die Konzentration auf ein wissenschaftliches Kernfach“ (Wex: 2002, 16).

degrees in the depth and complexity of the specialist knowledge taught in the course, in the ability to independently extend that knowledge and, without guidance or instruction, to apply it to new situations as well as to exercise personal responsibility in career fields involving cooperation on an equal footing with decision-making levels from other disciplines and specialisations.¹⁹⁷ Wex (2002) names as another characteristic of the Masters “specialisation” and states that two different types of Masters are possible: the so-called “*Genuiner Master*” and the “*Hybrid-Master*”. The “Genuine Master” is supposed to continue a single disciplinary perspective, already pursued at Bachelor level, while the “Hybrid Master” will add another disciplinary perspective to the disciplinary perspective of the Bachelor.¹⁹⁸ Wex states in regard to the differences between Bachelor and Masters that the second is meant to provide the possibility for “interdisciplinary combination with other disciplines”.¹⁹⁹

Excursus: a Case Study about problems during the BA-Introduction

As we have stated in section 4 all course structures, which have existed, are and will be changing insofar as the *Magister/Diplom/Teacher*-degrees are converted to BA/MA-degrees. This process should be concluded at the university of Oldenburg by the winter term of 2005/2006 (Smilla Ebeling/Karin Flaake/Heike Fleßner: 2003, 157). The specific model developed for the BA in Oldenburg by a university working group²⁰⁰ offers roughly two different forms of BA (even if the course structure reform group “SSR” speaks of three variations in their framework²⁰¹), one or actually two BAs²⁰² consisting of a Major Subject (90 credit points) and a Minor Subject (30 credit points), or of two Major Subjects²⁰³ (60 credit points each). Either is complemented by a so-called “*Professionalisierungsbereich*” (field of professionalisation), which includes among other things (like practical training) “basics of scientific working” (*Grundlagen wissenschaftlichen Arbeiten*)²⁰⁴, where the “reflection on the history and perspectives of disciplines” should be taught. Students can choose a lecture series out of three different so-called “*studium fundamentale*” (3a) or out of two transdisciplinary modules on “Language and Culture” (“*Transdisziplinäre Module: Sprache und Kultur*” 3b). This could represent a starting point for interdisciplinary reflections.²⁰⁵

¹⁹⁷ See (2) www.akkreditierungsrat.de/referenzrahmen.htm, www.accreditation-council.de 13.12.2004.

¹⁹⁸ “Mit Hybrid-Masterstudiengängen sind solche Studiengänge gemeint, die auf einer bestehenden fachlichen Grundlage eine weitere fachliche Perspektive hinzufügen.”, www.akkreditierungsrat.de/referenzrahmen.htm, „The expression “hybrid Master's degree courses” is used to denote degree courses which provide an additional specialist perspective to an existing disciplinary base.“ (2.2.) www.accreditation-council.de 13.12.2004.

¹⁹⁹ “Im Gegensatz zum Bachelor-Studium sind daher die Masterstudiengänge auch darauf angelegt, die Möglichkeit interdisziplinärer Kombination mit anderen Fächern wahrzunehmen”, Wex: 2002, 47.

²⁰⁰ See www.uni-oldenburg.de/studium/neustruktur/download/BA_MA_Modell_von_OL_Stand_08.05.2003.pdf, 2.2004 and

www.uni-oldenburg.de/studium/neustruktur/download/Oldenburger_Rahmen_Eckpunkte_II_AG_SSR14.1.20041.pdf, updated by the workinggroup “SSR” at the Oldenburg University, (study structure reform) in January and March 2004, 13.12.2004.

²⁰¹ Cf. I-III: www.uni-oldenburg.de/studium/neustruktur/download/Oldenburger_Rahmen_Eckpunkte_II_Ag_SSR14.1.20041.pdf

²⁰² One called „Zweifachkombination mit unterschiedlichem KP-Umfang“ (Variante II), the other „Kernfachstudium mit Ergänzungsbereich“ (Variante III), *ibid.*

²⁰³ „Zweifachkombination bei gleichem KP-Umfang im Erst- und Zweifach“ (Variante I), *ibid.*

²⁰⁴ See www.uni-oldenburg.de/dezernat3/pruefung/BachelorPOs/Profbereich.pdf, 13.12.2004.

²⁰⁵ Among other things they write that the „studium fundamentale“ could encourage the students to transfer interdisciplinary contents to their respective disciplines (“Anregungen zum Transfer fächerübergreifender Inhalte auf die eigenen Studiengänge”)

The two professors we interviewed in Oldenburg were involved in the discussions about the course reforms concerning Bachelor and Masters degrees and both had positive expectations, possibly inappropriate given that both noted a “re-disciplinisation”. Our interview partner (B) saw possibilities for transdisciplinary perspectives above all in the newly created space of the “field of professionalisation” (*Professionalisierungsbereich*) mentioned above.²⁰⁶ As a first step towards interdisciplinarity (B) referred to the newly established “transdisciplinary modules” (*transdisziplinäre Module*) developed by a cooperative network in Faculty III (*Kulturwissenschaftliche Fakultät*). A problem for these kinds of initiatives is the additional workload, which has to be covered by the existing personnel.²⁰⁷ The interviewed experts thought that interdisciplinarity was largely lacking in the new degree structures and noted instead the already mentioned „re-disciplination“. (A)²⁰⁸ explained this by pointing out that the general expectation of the new system is, that former course contents will be transferred in their current form into the Bachelor degrees. The reform is felt as a pressure and is dealt with reluctantly. Additionally, as both (A) and (B) pointed out, attempts are being made to define even parts of the *Professionalisierungsbereich* in a disciplinary way. Another problem, which makes reforms and steps towards interdisciplinarity difficult, is the way in which the reforms are predetermined by state regulations. To become a teacher one needs a Bachelor and a Masters degree. The modules continue to be based on the old state-defined exam-regulations, which (A) described as a restricting “corset”. Generally (A) and (B) both described difficulties in initiating interdisciplinary cooperation. (A) saw the ongoing introduction of Bachelor and Masters degrees as a phase of experimentation which should be evaluated soon and if needed changed to encourage greater flexibility.

After its short history of institutionalisation Gender Studies has had to re-orient itself and even fight again for its academic position in the new situation of the Bachelor and Masters system.²⁰⁹ With regard to Oldenburg two issues could threaten the Gender Studies. Recent planning at Oldenburg does not envisage a single honours undergraduate degree in Gender Studies, but only possibly Gender Studies as a “complementary subject” (*Ergänzungsfach*) with 30 credit points.²¹⁰ Secondly, gender contents will be put into other modules, which can be introduced in the respective disciplines. This is compounded by the fact that in the Humanities the model of the binary Bachelor of two Major Subjects (60/60 credit points) is preferred, differing from the other model preferred by the Social Sciences and the Natural Sciences of a core subject (90 credit points) combined with a complementary subject (30 credit points). This means that Humanities students will not be able to take Gender Studies since it will only be available as a complementary subject which does not fit into Humanities’ preferred credit point framework. This will result in both a lack of students and a dominance of the Social Sciences perspective in Gender Studies.²¹¹ (A) stated that being able to offer Gender as a Major (60 credit points) at Bachelor level would be much more desirable concerning its “*Außenwirkung*” (external impact), but issues of capacity will make this impossible. Additionally in Lower Saxony the ministry has prescribed that if a Masters degree does not follow on from the Bachelor the students will have to pay for the course. If therefore students in the Humanities do not study Gender as a subject at Bachelor level they may have to pay for a Masters degree in the subject. This will decrease the demand for a Masters in Gender,²¹² and impact on the renewal of the profession.²¹³

²⁰⁶ Dies wäre die „Einstiegspforte für Transdisziplinarität“. Interview 30th December 2004 R.K..

²⁰⁷ (B): „Kapazitätenfrage“ (Interview 30th November 2004 R.K.).

²⁰⁸ Interview 2nd December 2004 R.K.

²⁰⁹ Ebeling/Flaake/Fleßner (2003) write: “Sie [Gender-Inhalte] dürfen im Zuge des curricularen Strukturumbaus nicht verloren gehen bzw. sie müssen sogar neu erstritten werden.“ (157)

²¹⁰ Cf. Smilla Ebeling/Karin Flaake/Heike Fleßner: 2003, 158.

²¹¹ (A) fears a „Versozialwissenschaftlichung“ of the Gender Studies in Oldenburg.

²¹² (A) Interview 2nd December 2004 R.K.

In sum the impact of the Bologna process is ambiguous. On the one hand a spontaneous re-disciplination has occurred (especially where disciplines have to secure their own finances), on the other hand there are spaces for experiments –driven by the demand to build special profiles. But these are often market-oriented. The conditions for Gender Studies are not very encouraging. But the process of change is still going on.

CONCLUSIONS

A change in the German university system is the growing economization, which forces research even in the Social and Human Sciences (traditionally less involved in third-party-funded research) to orient them towards applied research. This could have an impact on the borders between the Human and Social Sciences. The question of application and utility in higher education policy is a very controversial issue in Germany.

Discussions about the “crisis” of the Human and Social Sciences are responding to the growing financial pressure i.e. cost-cutting measures. The Human and Social Sciences are here especially affected, as the Natural Sciences are predominantly both third-party-funded and receive a higher amount of state funding.

In the context of the debate concerning the legitimisation of the Humanities interdisciplinarity is again (as in earlier debates from the 1960s onwards) an issue. The problem of disciplinarity is on the one hand growing specialisation and fragmentation, and on the other a loss of reflexivity. The introduction of problem-oriented interdisciplinary research and teaching focuses in faculties, interdisciplinary *Graduiertenkollegs*, doctoral programs and special research areas (*Sonderforschungsbereiche*) are ways of proposing solutions to this. Higher education policy proclaims interdisciplinarity; its different forms of institutionalisation are only occasionally supported by the state with additional money. Still, one might want to ask how far interdisciplinarity is really practised. In our opinion it is necessary to introduce communicative frames where disciplinary perspectives are communicated and reflected upon. Only if this is guaranteed (in teaching and research) can narrow and static disciplinary perspectives be overcome. Apart from the concept of problem-oriented interdisciplinarity we therefore stress the need for (methodological) reflections. Not only is money needed for the realisation of interdisciplinarity, but also the initiative and motivation of individuals to take the risk of working in an interdisciplinary way. These personal commitments need support from university politics. We note that this can be seen especially in the case of universities, which have been or are in a process of restructuring.

Interdisciplinarity has been pursued in gender focused research from the very beginning. The first gender studies courses were established in Berlin (Humboldt) and Oldenburg. We assume that the support of the introduction of Gender Studies is in part related to the universities’ desire of creating a specific profile. These institutionalisations were based on already existing

²¹³ In Oldenburg there is planned a Master Gender Studies is planned in cooperation with the university of Bremen and the *Fachhochschule Oldenburg/Ostfriesland/Wilhelmshaven*. These plans will be discussed next year in February 2005 and therefore are not decided on until now. A tendency seems to be, that the different fields which are planned as “*Wahlpflichtmodule*” are oriented towards different disciplinary fields, which seem to mark a division between Human and Social Sciences.(cf. Ebeling/Flaake/Fleßner 2003, 159). One big focus is made in the draft of Ebeling/Flaake/Fleßner (2003) on the “professional practice part” (“*Genderpraxismodul*”) of the Masters, which could lead to an exclusion of the Humanities. Still, these points will have to be discussed on in the future.

gender teaching. Many researchers pursuing divergent “paths” are/were often attracted and appointed by universities, which do not have such a strong disciplinary tradition (e.g. Hannover as a former technical college and Oldenburg as a former a teacher training college).

Institutionalisation however does not guarantee that the created forms of interdisciplinarity survive. They remain “precarious spaces” which are threatened by changes in economy and higher education politics. Even if interdisciplinarity is proclaimed by political authorities it is threatened by economisation policies which increase the concurrence between disciplines. In the context of and as a reaction to the Bologna process developments towards re-disciplinisation are occurring, as disciplines are frightened to lose “space”. One form of “interdisciplinarity” in the old degree system was the personal freedom to choose from a wide range of subjects. The BA is much more prescriptive. With the BA there is some limited possibility to choose transdisciplinary courses. As we can see in our case study there are possibilities to introduce new teaching forms, which address interdisciplinarity. At MA level it seems more probable that interdisciplinary forms and contents will be established. It is too early to say, how the concurrence between disciplines and interdisciplinary courses will work out.

The introduction of accreditation determines teaching content in a new way. The introduction of peer review may lead to disciplinary hegemonies. It is important that evaluation, introduced increasingly in the German university system, has as one criterion interdisciplinarity. Thus the evaluation process itself has to be observed.

List of abbreviations

BerlHG: Gesetz über die Hochschulen im Land Berlin (Berliner Hochschulgesetz-BerlHG) in der Fassung vom 13. Februar 2003 [Higher education institutions law of Berlin, version 13/2/2003]

BbgHG: Gesetz über die Hochschulen des Landes Brandenburg (Brandenburgisches Hochschulgesetz – BbgHG) in der Fassung der Bekanntmachung vom 6. Juli 2004 [Higher education institutions law of Brandenburg, version based on the proclamation of 6/7/2004]

Hessisches HG: Hessisches Hochschulgesetz in der Fassung vom 31. Juli 2000 Entwurf des neuen Hessischen Hochschulgesetzes in der vom Kabinett beschlossenen Fassung vom 25. Juni 2004 [Hessian higher education institutions law, version 31/7/2000 of the draft of the new Hessian higher education institutions law in the version agreed by the Cabinet on 25/6/2004]

HG Nordrhein-Westfalen: Gesetz über die Hochschulen des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen (Hochschulgesetz-HG) vom 14. März 2000 [Higher education institutions law of North-Rhine Westphalia]

HRG: 4. Text des Hochschulrahmengesetzes in der Fassung der Bekanntmachung vom 19. Januar 1999 (BGBl.I S.18), zuletzt geändert durch Artikel 1 des Gesetzes vom 8. August 2002 (BGBl.I S.3138) [Text of the higher education institutions framework law, version based on the proclamation of 19/1/1999, most recently amended by article 1 of the law of 8/8/2002]

NHG: Niedersächsisches Hochschulgesetz in der Fassung vom 24. Juni 2002 [Higher education institutions law of Lower saxony, version 24/6/2002]

UG Baden-Württemberg: Gesetz über die Universitäten im Lande Baden-Württemberg (Universitätsgesetz – UG) in der Fassung vom 1. Februar 2000. [Law governing the universities in Baden- Württemberg, version 1/2/2000]

Glossary

Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF): Federal Ministry of Education and Research. This is the federal ministry which, within the framework of the areas of responsibility laid down by the federal basic law, deals with questions relating to the improvement of education, science, and research. .

Hochschulrahmengesetz (HRG): Framework Act of Higher Education. The HRG came into force in 1976, and was intended to provide a legislative framework at the federal level for standardization of the higher education laws in the individual Länder.

Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (HRK): The German Rectors' Conference is the voluntary association of state and state-recognised universities and other higher education institutions in Germany. The HRK is the body which unites institutions of higher education in Germany. It currently has 262 member institutions. Its functions include representing the interests of higher education institutions in political decision-making and informing the public about German higher education institutions.

Kultusministerkonferenz (KMK): The Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder in the Federal Republic of Germany brings together the ministers and senators of the Länder responsible for education, higher education and research, and cultural affairs. The Standing Conference was founded in 1948, i.e. before the Federal Republic of Germany was constituted. It is based on an agreement between the *Länder*.

Wissenschaftsrat (Science Council): The Wissenschaftsrat is the oldest advisory body for science policy in Europe. It was founded in 1957 by the Federal Government and the *Länder* governments. Its function is to draw up recommendations for the development of higher education institutions, science, and the research sector as regards content and structure, as well as on the construction of new universities.

Akkreditierungsrat (Accreditation Council): The Akkreditierungsrat was set up by a decision of the Kultusministerkonferenz (KMK) on 3 December 1998, with reference to the HRK decision of 6 July 1998. The Akkreditierungsrat is an independent body with 17 members (representatives of the Länder, the universities, students, and professional organizations). Its task is to accredit agencies which in turn accredit the new Bachelor and Master degree programmes.

Bibliography

Apitzsch, Ursula (1980): Massenkommunikation. In: Ritter, Joachim/ Grunch, Karlfried (eds.): Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie, Bd.5, Basel, Stuttgart. Schwabe. 831-835.

Baer, Susanne (2004): Einführung. In: Zentrum für transdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin: Geschlechterstudien im deutschsprachigen Raum (eds.): Studiengänge, Erfahrungen, Herausforderungen. Dokumentation der gleichnamigen Tagung vom 4.-5. Juli 2003. Berlin 2004, 69-72.

Bammé, Arno (2004): Science Wars. Von der akademischen zur postakademischen Wissenschaft. Frankfurt/ New York. Campus Verlag.

Beaufäys, Sandra (2003): Wie werden Wissenschaftler gemacht? Beobachtungen zur wechselseitigen Konstitution von Geschlecht und Wissenschaft. Bielefeld: transcript Verlag.

Beschlüsse des Akkreditierungsrates – Mindeststandards und Kriterien – Bonn, 30.11.1999.
[http:// www. akkreditierungsrat.de/kriterien.htm](http://www.akkreditierungsrat.de/kriterien.htm).

Beschlüsse des Akkreditierungsrates. Referenzrahmen für Bachelor-/Bakkalaureus- und Master-/Magister-Studiengänge Bonn 20. 6. 2001.
[http:// www. akkreditierungsrat.de/ referanzrahmen.htm](http://www.akkreditierungsrat.de/referanzrahmen.htm).

Binswanger, Christa/Brigitte Schnegg (2004): Kanon – no Kanon: Historische und literaturwissenschaftliche Überlegungen zur Traditionsbildung in den Gender Studies. In: Zentrum für transdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin: Geschlechterstudien im deutschsprachigen Raum (eds.): Studiengänge, Erfahrungen, Herausforderungen. Dokumentation der gleichnamigen Tagung vom 4.-5. Juli 2003. Berlin 2004, 77-79.

Blasius, Rainer (2004): Beirat und Geschichte, in: Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung. 20.9.2004.

Böhme, Gernot / Daele, Wolfgang van den/ Krohn, Wolfgang (2002): Die Finalisierung der Wissenschaft. In: Zeitschrift f. Soziologie, JG 2, April 1973. Heft 2, 128-144.

Bollenbeck, Georg (2002): Entschlossener Griff nach dem ökonomischen Hebel. Hochschulreform. Zur traditionsvergessenen Programmlosigkeit der neuen Hochschulsemantik. In: Freitag 10, 1.3.2002.

Brockmann, John (1995): Die dritte Kultur. Das Weltbild der modernen Naturwissenschaft. Basel/ Boston.

Buck- Morss, Susan (1977): The origin of Negative Dialectics. Theodor W. Adorno, Walter Benjamin, and the Frankfurt Institute. Sassex. The Harvester Press Limited.

Clark, Burton R. (1983): The Higher Education System: Academic Organizations in Cross-National Perspective. Berkeley/Los Angeles: UP California.

Cornelia Goethe Centrum (2004): Frauenstudien Gender Studies, Programm für das Wintersemester 2004 2005.

Daston, Lorraine (1998): Die Kultur der wissenschaftlichen Objektivität. In: Oexle, Otto Gerhard (ed.): Göttingen Naturwissenschaft, Geisteswissenschaft, Kulturwissenschaft: Einheit – Gegensatz – Komplementarität?. Göttingen.

Daxner, Michael (1999): Die blockierte Universität. Warum die Wissensgesellschaft eine andere Hochschule braucht. Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag.

De Vivanco, Wedico (2003): Der Bologna Prozess oder die Durchlässigkeit der europäischen Hochschulsysteme. Freie Universität Berlin.

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (2002): Jahresbericht 2002. Aufgaben und Ergebnisse. Weinheim.

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (2002): Perspektiven der Forschung und ihrer Förderung. Aufgaben und Finanzierung, 2002-2006. Weinheim.

Douglas, Mary (1991): Wie Institutionen denken. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp.

Dröge-Modelmog, Ilse/ Karin Flaake (1997): Frauen – und Geschlechterstudien an BRD-Hochschulen. Produktive Potentiale und Problembereiche. In: Zeitschrift für Frauenforschung 15, 4, pp. 7-9.

Ebeling, Smilla/Karin Flaake/Heike Fleßner (2003): Modularisierung und Übergänge in die BA/MA-Studiengangsstruktur – aktuelle Anforderung an Frauen- und Geschlechterstudien. In: Zentrum für transdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin: Geschlechterstudien im deutschsprachigen Raum (eds.): Studiengänge, Erfahrungen, Herausforderungen. Dokumentation der gleichnamigen Tagung vom 4.-5. Juli 2003. Berlin 2004, 157-161.

Ellwanger, Karen/ Silke Wenk: Vorwort. In: Kolleg „Kulturwissenschaftliche Geschlechterstudien“ Carl v. Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg Fachbereich 2 (ed.): Bericht des Aufbaustudiengangs „Kulturwissenschaftliche Geschlechterstudien“ November 2000.

Enders, Jürgen (1996): Die wissenschaftlichen Mitarbeiter. Ausbildung, Beschäftigung und Karriere der Nachwuchswissenschaftler und Mittelbauangehörigen an den Universitäten. Frankfurt am Main; New York: Campus Verlag.

Faulstich- Wieland, Hannelore (2003): Entwicklung und Stand von Genderstudien in Deutschland. in: Faulstich- Wieland, Hannelore (2003): Einführung in Genderstudien. Band 12. S. 45- 84. Opladen. Leske + Budrich.

Fausser, Markus (2004): Kulturwissenschaft. Darmstadt.

Flexner, Abraham (1994): German Universities, in: Flexner (1994): Universities. Oxford: University Press.

Frühwald, Wolfgang / Jauß, Hans- Robert / Koselleck, Reinhard / Mittelstraß, Jürgen/ Steinwachs, Burkhard (eds.) (1991): Geisteswissenschaften heute: eine Denkschrift. Frankfurt/ Main.

Gerhard, Ute (ed.) (2002): Dokumentation der Namensgebung am 7. Dezember 2000. Mitteilungen des Cornelia Goethe Centrum für Frauenstudien und die Erforschung der Geschlechterverhältnisse an der J.W. Goethe Universität Frankfurt/ Main.

Gibbons, Michael et. al. (1995): The New production of Knowledge. The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Society. London: Sage.

Glatzer, Wolfgang (1989): „Die deutschen Soziologen und ihre Gesellschaft“- am Beispiel der Soziologentage in Frankfurt/ Main. In: Steinert, Heinz (ed.): „Die mindestens zwei Sozialwissenschaften in Frankfurt und ihre Geschichte, StS- Sonderband 3, Frankfurt am Main.

Glatzer, Wolfgang (ed.) (1999): Ansichten der Gesellschaft. Frankfurter Beiträge aus Soziologie und Politikwissenschaft. Opladen. Leske +Budrich.

Habermas, Jürgen (1962): Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit, Frankfurt/ Main. Suhrkamp.

Habilitationsordnung des Fachbereichs Gesellschaftswissenschaften der Johann Wolfgang Goethe- Universität Frankfurt/ Main (1991/ 2004).

Hadulla Kuhlmann, Christina / Hartung, Barbara (2002): Women and Science: Review on the situation in Germany. German national report, Helsinki Group on women and science.

Hark, Sabine (1998): Disziplinäre Quergänge. (Un)Möglichkeiten transdisziplinärer Geschlechterforschung. In: Potsdamer Studien zur Frauen- und Geschlechterforschung, 2,2, 9-25.

Hark, Sabine (2004): Dissidente Partizipation. Soziologie einer umstrittenen Wissensformation. Habilitationsschrift im Fach Soziologie. Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaftliche Fakultät. Universität Potsdam.

Hauenschild, Helga (2003): Abenteuer Interdisziplinarität: eine Herausforderung für Studierende und Lehrende. In: Zentrum für transdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin: Geschlechterstudien im deutschsprachigen Raum (eds.): Studiengänge, Erfahrungen, Herausforderungen. Dokumentation der gleichnamigen Tagung vom 4.-5. Juli 2003. Berlin 2004, 105-107.

Hochschulrahmengesetz (HRG): download at: www.hochschulverband.de.

Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (ed.) (2003): Wegweiser 2003. Qualitätssicherung an Hochschulen. Sachstandsbericht und Ergebnisse einer Umfrage des Projekts *Qualitätssicherung*. Beiträge zur Hochschulpolitik 7/2003.

Hoffmann-Curtius, Kathrin (1991): Frauen in der deutschen Kunstgeschichte, in: Frauen–Kunst–Wissenschaft, Rundbrief, Heft 11, 1991, 6–13.

Honegger, Claudia/ Wobbe, Theresa (eds.): Frauen in der Soziologie. München. C.H.Beck Verlag.

Horgan, John (1996): An den Grenzen des Wissens. Siegeszug und Dilemma der Naturwissenschaften. Frankfurt/ Main.

Hoyningen-Huene, D. (2002): Grußwort. In: Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (eds.): Strukturwandel im Hochschulbereich – Neue Organisationsformen an den Hochschulen. Dokumentation zur Jahrestagung des Bad Wiesser Kreises vom 24.-27. 5. 2001. Beiträge zur Hochschulepolitik 2/2002, 1-9.

Institute for Comparative Politics and International Relations (2004): Proposal for an international M.A course in Political Theory at the Department of Social Sciences at the Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität, Frankfurt/ Main.

Jähnert, Gabriele: Der Status quo der Gender Studies im deutschsprachigen Raum. In: Zentrum für transdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin: Geschlechterstudien im deutschsprachigen Raum (eds.): Studiengänge, Erfahrungen, Herausforderungen. Dokumentation der gleichnamigen Tagung vom 4.-5. Juli 2003. Berlin 2004, 10-18.

Kaesler, Dirk (1984): Die frühe deutsche Soziologie 1909 bis 1934 und ihre Entstehungs-Milieus: eine wissenschaftssoziologische Untersuchung. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Kehm, Barbara M.(2004): Hochschulen in Deutschland. In: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. Beilage zur Wochenzeitung Das Parlament. 14.6.2004, 6-17. (www.bpb.de/files/TN1DGU.pdf).

Kirsch-Auwärter, Edit (1996): Anerkennung durch Dissidenz. Anmerkungen zur Kultur der Marginalität. In: Ilse Modelmog/ Edit Kirsch-Auwärter (eds.): Kultur in Bewegung. Beharrliche Ermächtigungen. Freiburg: Kore, 25-48.

Kittler, Friedrich (2001): Eine Kulturgeschichte der Kulturwissenschaft. München.

Kjørup, Søren (2001): Humanities. Geisteswissenschaften Science Humaines. Eine Einführung. Stuttgart, Weimar Metzler.

Klein, J. Thompson / W. Grossenbacher-Mansuy, R. Häberli, A. Bill, R.W. Scholz, M. Welti (2001): *Transdisciplinarity: Joint Problem Solving among Science, Technology, and Society. An Effective Way for Managing Complexity*. Basel/Boston/Berlin: Birkhäuser, 67-80.

Knapp, Gudrun-Axeli (1998): *Beziehungssinn und Unterscheidungsvermögen*. In: *Potsdamer Studien zur Frauen und Geschlechterforschung* 2, 45-56.

Kolleg „Kulturwissenschaftliche Geschlechterstudien“ Carl v. Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg Fachbereich 2: Bericht des Aufbaustudiengangs „Kulturwissenschaftliche Geschlechterstudien“ November 2000.

KMK (Pressemitteilung): *Ergebnisse der 307. Plenarsitzung der Kultusministerkonferenz*. 15.10.2004-11-11.

Kreckel, Reinhard (2003): *Handlungsoptionen deutscher Universitäten. Im Kräftefeld von staatlicher Steuerung, Marktorientierung und akademischer Autonomie*. HoF – Institut für Hochschulforschung Wittenberg. 6.7.2003 (www.sociologie.uni-halle.de/kreckel/docs/handlungsoptionen.pdf).

Landfester, Katharina/ Rössel, Jörg (2004): *Die Juniorprofessur zwei Jahre nach ihrer Einführung*. In: *Soziologie*, 33. Jg., Heft4, 2004, S.44-56.

Landfried, Klaus: *Strukturwandel im Hochschulbereich – Neue Organisationsformen an den Hochschulen*. In: Hochschulrektorenkonferenz (eds.): *Strukturwandel im Hochschulbereich – Neue Organisationsformen an den Hochschulen. Dokumentation zur Jahrestagung des Bad Wieser Kreises vom 24.-27. 5. 2001*. Beiträge zur Hochschulpolitik 2/2002, 11-22.

Laitko, Hubert (1999): *Disziplingeschichte und Disziplinverständnis*. In: Volker Peckhaus/Christian Thiel (eds.): *Disziplinen im Kontext*. München: Fink Verlag, 21-60.

Lepenies, Wolf (1985): *Die drei Kulturen. Soziologie zwischen Literatur und Wissenschaft*. München. Hanser Verlag.

Liebau, Eckhard / Ludwig, Huber (1985): *Die Kulturen der Fächer*, in: *Neue Sammlung*, Jg. 25, Heft 3, S. 314-339.

List, Elisabeth / Fiala, Ervin (eds.)(2004): *Grundlagen der Kulturwissenschaften. Interdisziplinäre Kulturstudien*. Tübingen.

Loeber, Heinz-Dieter: *Wissen sie, was sie tun? Mutmaßungen über aktuelle Strategien in der Hochschulpolitik*. Oldenburger Universitätsreden. Friedrich W. Busch/ Hans-Joachim Wätjen (eds.). Nr. 149 Oldenburg 2003.

Marquard, Odo (1986): *Apologie des Zufälligen*. Stuttgart.

Mittelstraß, Jürgen (1998): *Die Häuser des Wissens. Wissenschaftstheoretische Studien*. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp.

Mittelstraß, Jürgen (2001): Wissen und Grenzen. Philosophische Studien. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp.

Müller, Rainer (1990): Geschichte der Universität. Von der mittelalterlichen Universitas zur deutschen Hochschule. München. Callwey.

Müller-Böling, Detlef Müller: Eröffnungsrede. Symposium „Gesellschaft – Staat – Hochschule: Vertrauen als Grundlage erfolgreicher Hochschulentwicklung“ (7./8.2.2002, Berlin – Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften) (www.che.de/downloads/Eröffnungsrede_52.pdf).

Ordnung zur Erlangung des Akademischen Grades eines Doktors der Philosophie (Dr.phil) oder einer Doktorin der Philosophie (Dr. phil) an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe – Universität in Frankfurt am Main, vom 26.6.2001.

Palatschek, Sylvia (2001): Verbreitete sich ein „Humbold´ches Modell“ an den deutschen Universitäten im 19. Jh., in: Schwinges, Rainer- Christoph (ed.): Humboldt International. Der Export des deutschen Universitätsmodells im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Basel. Schwabe &Co. 75-104.

Paul, Barbara (2001): Kunsthistorische Gender Studies: geschichtliche Entwicklungen und aktuelle Perspektiven, in: kritische berichte 4, 5-12.

Pfisterer, Ulrich (1996)(ed.): Metzler Lexikon Kunstwissenschaft. Ideen, Methoden, Begriffe. Stuttgart; Weimar.

Reuhl, Günther (1992): Wissenschaftskonkurrenz: Hochschulorganisation in den USA, Europa und der Sowjetunion. Frankfurt am Main. Campus Verlag.

Schade, Sigrid/Silke Wenk: Inszenierungen des Sehens. Kunst, Geschichte, Geschlecht, in Hadomud Bußmann, Renate Hof (Eds.): Genus: Zur Geschlechterdifferenz in den Kulturwissenschaften. Stuttgart, 1995.

Senatsgrundlage der Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität Frankfurt am Main für die Berufungsverfahren vom 14.7.04.

Shils, Edward (1982): Tradition, Ecology and Institution in the History of Sociology. In: Ibid.: The Constitution of Society. Chicago, 275-383.

Sievers, Herbert (1998): Der Modellversuch “Globalhaushalt” in Niedersachsen: Chancen und Risiken. 1997, Univ. Diss. 1998.

Spiewak, Martin (1999): Dr. habil. Hoffnungslos. Die Alma mater ist eine Rabenmutter. Sie zwingt den Forschernachwuchs in eine jämmerliche Existenz. In: Die Zeit 47/ 1998.

Steinert, Heinz (2004): Zur Professionalität des Gutachtens. Eine Aufforderung, vergleichende Gutachten zu verweigern. In: Soziologie, 33 Jg., Heft 4, 2004, S.36-43.

Sterzel, Dieter/Joachim Perels (2003): Freiheit der Wissenschaft und Hochschulmodernisierung. Das Niedersächsische Hochschulgesetz und das Selbstverwaltungsrecht der Universitäten. Baden-Baden 2003.

Stichweh, Rudolf (1991): Der frühmoderne Staat und die europäische Universität. Zur Interaktion von Politik und Erziehungssystem im Prozeß ihrer Ausdifferenzierung (16-18. Jahrhundert). Frankfurt/ Main. Suhrkamp Verlag.

Stichweh, Rudolf (1994): Wissenschaft, Universität, Professionen. Soziologische Analysen. Frankfurt/ Main: Suhrkamp.

Strukturplan 1999- 2005 des Fachbereichs Gesellschaftswissenschaften, der J.W.Goethe Universität Frankfurt / Main.

Strukturvorgaben für die Einführung von Bachelor-/Bakkalaureus und Master-/Magisterstudiengängen. Beschluss der Kulturministerkonferenz vom 5.3.1999. www.kultusministerkonferenz.de/hschule/bsstrukt.htm, 13.12.2004.

Strukturvorgaben für die Einführung von Bachelor-/Bakkalaureus- und Master-/Magisterstudiengängen. Beschluss der Ministerkonferenz vom 5.3.1999, www.kultusministerkonferenz.de/hschule/bsstrukt.htm Einsicht: 25.10.2004.

Teichler, Ulrich: The Federal Republic of Germany. In: Neave, Guy/ Van Vught, Frans A. (ed.) (1991): Prometheus Bound. The Changing Relationship Between Government and Higher Education in Western Europe. Oxford; New York; Beijing et al: Pergamon Press 1991, 29-49.

Thieme, Frank (1990): Soziologie im Wandel. Ein Beitrag zum Entstehungsprozess der Soziologie in Deutschland. Frankfurt/ Main. Peter Lang Verlag.

Thompson Klein, Julie (1993): Blurring, Cracking and Crossing: Permeation and the Fracturing of Discipline. In: Knowledges. Historical and Critical Studies in Dsisciplinarity. Ed. By Ellen Messer-Davidow, David R. Shumway and David J. Sylvan, Charlottesville/London: Virginia UP, 185-214.

Verbund Norddeutscher Universitäten Geschäftsstelle (ed.): Zielvereinbarungen als „Follow up“ der Evaluation von Studium und Lehre. Verbund-Materialien Bd. 6. Hamburg 2000.

Wallerstein, Immanuel et al. (1996): Open the Social Sciences. Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructing of the Social Sciences. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

Weingart, Peter (1976): Wissensproduktion und soziale Struktur. Frankfurt/ Main: Suhrkamp.

Wenk, Silke (1997): „Kulturwissenschaftliche Geschlechterstudien“ als Aufbaustudiengang – ein transdisziplinäres Projekt. In: Sigrid Metz-Göckel u. Felititas Steck (eds.): Frauenuniversitäten. Initiativen und Reformprojekte im internationalen Vergleich. Opladen: Leske+Budrich 1997.

Wenk, Silke (2001): Transdisziplinarität als hochschulpolitisches Programm: Neue Perspektiven für Frauen- und Geschlechterstudien in Forschung und Lehre? In: Claudia Batisweiler, Elisabeth Lembeck und Mechthild Jansen (eds.): Geschlechterpolitik an Hochschulen: Perspektivenwechsel. Zwischen Frauenförderung und Gender Mainstreaming. Opladen: Leske+Budrich, 107 –120.

Wenk, Silke (2002): Womens' and Gender Studies in German Higher Education. In: Heike Fleßner/Lydia Potts (eds.): Societies in Transition – Challenges to Womens' and Gender Studies. Opladen: Leske+Budrich 2002, 43-49.

Wex, Peter (2002): Bachelor and Master. Prüfungsrecht und Prüfungsverfahren. Neues Handbuch Hochschullehre. Sonderdruck im September 2002.

Wissenschaftliche Kommission Niedersachsen und das Niedersächsische Ministerium für Wissenschaft und Kultur (eds.) 2004: Forschungsevaluation an niedersächsischen Hochschulen und Forschungseinrichtungen. Politikwissenschaft und Soziologie. Ergebnisse und Empfehlungen. März 2004. Hannover.

Wissenschaftliche Kommission Niedersachsen (ed.): Tätigkeitsbericht 1997-2003. Hannover 2003.

Wissenschaftsrat (1994): Stellungnahme des Wissenschaftsrates zur Weiterführung des Graduiertenkollegprogramms. Schwerin.

Wobbe, Theresa (1995): Wahlverwandtschaften. Die Soziologie und die Frauen auf dem Weg zur Wissenschaft. Frankfurt/ Main. Campus Verlag.

Zentrale Evaluations- und Akkreditierungsagentur Hannover (ZevA) (2003): Qualitätssicherung in Lehre und Studium. Erst- und Folgeevaluationen sowie Akkreditierungen. Handbuch zur Qualitätssicherung in Lehre und Studium. Schriftenreihe „Lehre an Hochschulen“ 33/03. Hannover.

Zentrum für transdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien an der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin: Geschlechterstudien im deutschsprachigen Raum (eds.): Studiengänge, Erfahrungen, Herausforderungen. Dokumentation der gleichnamigen Tagung vom 4.-5. Juli 2003. Berlin 2004.

Zentrum für transdisziplinäre Geschlechterstudien (ed.) (2004): Überblick über alle Studiengänge, Schwerpunkte etc. in D-land/Schweiz/ Österreich S. 11-14.