

## Abstract

In the sense of a modern political geography, the focus is mainly put upon spatial conflicts and geopolitics in this branch of science. There are two branches of research, which follow a constructivist approach and complement each other. The activity-oriented research of conflict views the stakeholder as an acting person in the focus of their examination; his or her use of power and the position in the conflict as well as the biography appearance are subject to research. With the approach of the poststructuralist critical geopolitics, the speech act of the stakeholders and the reporters are investigated. Because of speech, daily conflicts arise, so that only speech allows to deconstruct spatial conflicts. The stakeholders have power through their words, which they use in argumentations in order to follow their own interests and intentions. The linking element between the two branches of research is the power of speech and the power of the stakeholders as well as the speech in general and especially argumentation. Stakeholders use it and with the help of language, students should deconstruct conflicts and be enabled to become responsible individuals, who can give an opinion and represent it argumentatively. But how well pupils are able to evaluate opinions in spatial conflicts, and which reception abilities and understanding of speech they have is not yet determined for Geography as a subject. Therefore, this dissertation aims at linking the two branches of subjects with the competence of argumentation. The existing model of competence of reception by Budke et al. (2011) should be challenged as well as the use of modern linguistic methods like the analysis of argumentation and discourse in Geography, are subject of investigation in this paper, in order to find out which criteria pupils use for argumentation in spatial conflicts. The method of loud thinking was used to collect data. This method postulates to solve a primary exercise, while all thoughts and ideas during this process are being uttered aloud. The thinking-aloud-protocols can then be transcribed and analysed. The primary exercise in this research is a survey with which the pupils should evaluate the stakeholder's comments on a spatial conflict in form of marks. The main results of this research are the modification of the existing competence model of BUDKE ET AL. (2010). Moreover, the criteria derived from the theories (spatial dimension, argumentational structure, perspectives, content) could be confirmed by the study and replaced by new criteria (solutions/ compromise, dual perspectivity, accountability). Thereby, first results of how pupils evaluate argumentations, how much importance they attach to language and which basic knowledge they use for reception could be determined. Furthermore, the results of the intervention indicate that speech-analytical methods can be well applied to the subject of Geography. Another aim of this dissertation is to show that spatial conflicts are rarely discussed in current schoolbooks in their entire scope and multidimensionality.