



RISTAL

*Research in Subject-matter
Teaching and Learning*

Rothgangel, M. & Frederking, V. (2020). Editorial

RISTAL 3 / 2020

Research in Subject-matter Teaching and Learning

Citation:

Rothgangel, M. & Frederking, V. (2020). Editorial. *RISTAL*, 3, 1.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23770/suffix>

ISSN 1863-0502



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. (CC BY 4.0)

Editorial

Martin Rothgangel & Volker Frederking

As RISTAL continues into its third year, readers can again find an interesting range of articles of subject-matter research. In some articles, one specific focus and goal of RISTAL is evident right from the title: to stimulate the research dialogue between the subject didactics. This is done in the conviction that the reference sciences of the subject didactics are not only the respective subject sciences and the educational sciences, but also other subject didactics. This observation is also clearly evident in the evolution of a general subject didactics (Bayrhuber et al. 2017; Rothgangel et al. 2020): numerous subject didactics point to other subject didactics as their dialogue partners with regard to their research (see Rothgangel & Vollmer in this issue).

Accordingly, the present issue contains dialogues between the didactics of natural sciences (Handkte & Bögeholz), between German didactics and mathematics didactics (Winkler, Fischer, Krause & Specht), and between German didactics and geography didactics (Budke, Gebele, Königs, Schwerdtfeger & Zepter).

The importance of the dialogue between the didactics can also be seen in the three contributions, which are written from the perspective of one of the subject didactics: In the contribution by Reinfried & Künzle from geography didactics, the approach of Knowledge-in-Pieces (KiP) from science education is transferred to the respective subject. In the contribution by Ring & Brahm from economics education, the significance for all those subject didactics in which logical pictures play a role is made clear by their object of investigation. Finally, the chemistry didactic study by Hermanns and Thomanek has a comparable potential insofar as their Delphi study can form the basis for establishing a link to other subject didactics.

Beyond this dialogue between the subject didactics, the dialogue between the subject didactics and the educational sciences remains important, as is impressively demonstrated by the article by Stinken-Rösner, Rott, Hundertmark, Baumann, Menche, Hoffmann, Nehring & Abels on Science Education and Inclusive Pedagogy.

With this in mind, we would like to thank all authors for their excellent articles and all reviewers for their valuable work. A special thank you also goes out to Bernard Schneuwly, who headed the review process in which the main editor shoulders responsibility for the article (Rothgangel & Vollmer).

A heartfelt thankyou goes out to the staff of the Institute of Religious Education of the University of Vienna who have made this publication possible through their hard work and dedication: Karin Sima and Marietta Behnoush for their technical and editorial work, Maximillian Saudino for proofreading the contributions and last but not least Dr. Sabine Hermisson for all her support in her function as journal manager.

Finally, we would like to thank the University of Vienna and the Association for *Fachdidaktik* (Gesellschaft für Fachdidaktik; GFD) for their financial support without which this journal would not be possible.