TEH21
Erasmus+
Teaching European History in the 21st Century

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

Teaching Multiperspective European History in International Classrooms

Lessons from Testing of the Multiperspective Textbook *The European Experience: A Multi-Perspective History of Modern Europe, 1500-2000* and Guide for its Use

Jaroslav Ira, Alice Modena & Miranda Renders
(with contributions by Judit Klement, Juan Luis Simal, Justine Faure and Jochen Hung)

2023

This document was created as an intellectual output within the project *Teaching European History in the Twenty-First Century* (TEH21), supported by the European Commission under the Erasmus+ Key Action 2 (Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices).

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

1.1. Aims of the document

This document serves as a guide for teaching multiperspective European history in the international classroom. It provides lessons, recommendations and best practices to support innovative ways of teaching various themes of modern European history (c. 1500–2000) in international classrooms with a multiperspective approach. This guide is based on collected data and the rich experiences drawn from the testing of the upcoming textbook *The European Experience: A Multi-Perspective History of Modern Europe, 1500-2000*, along with an accompanying set of video lectures available on the TEH21 YouTube channel, and an online database of primary sources accessible at the *Historiana* portal. These tools were developed with the specific aim of assisting European history lecturers with innovative and multiperspective teaching methods.[1] This guide is addressed primarily to lecturers of European history at universities, especially in international classrooms and for bachelor-level students, and it partly serves as a toolkit for using the textbook. We nevertheless believe that the document may also provide useful suggestions for secondary school history teachers, public historians, and educators beyond academia, while also bringing to the fore valuable insights for history education researchers, education policy-makers and other stakeholders broadly involved in the teaching of history.

1.2. Approach and theoretical background

This section covers the concept of multiperspectivity and how it was applied in the TEH21 project. It is important to stress that the textbook focused on major historical phenomena and processes – not on any particular historical event or narrative – which imposed certain limits on how the multiperspective approach could be applied. Unlike some other multiperspective texts, our intention was not to juxtapose different views on a particular event or phenomenon, whether by historical actors, current observers, or in different historical interpretations. Rather, our approach focused on complexity and decentring European history while including a multitude of views, perspectives, and experiences.

[1] The project Teaching European History in 21st Century (TEH21) was a three-year project that ran from 2019 to 2022. It was coordinated by Utrecht University. The project was funded by the European Commission under the Erasmus+ Key Action 2 (Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices) within the scheme Erasmus Strategic Partnership. For more information about the project, as well as for links to other outputs, see the project website https://teh21.sites.uu.nl/. The textbook is available in open access here: https://www.openbookpublishers.com/books/10.11647/obp.0323.

Though we were aware that a narrow sense of multiperspectivity – to display and confront competing narratives – could be more prominent in the textbook, we made a deliberate effort to avoid reification into a definite set of perspectives (which ones would be most relevant? How many should be included?) and thus another closure of the narrative, albeit on a higher level. Our strategy instead was to develop the text as an open document, which does not provide an ultimate history of Europe, but rather a tool to be developed and worked with creatively in classrooms. In this way, we see multiperspectivity as a dimension throughout the textbook and beyond:

- Pre-text multiperspectivity (composition of authorial teams): each chapter of the textbook was written by an international author team, sourced from the project partners. This ensured a diversity of experiences, national perspectives, academic traditions and backgrounds. The teams were relatively free to fill the chapter structure in a way that best reflected this diversity.
- In-text multiperspectivity (design and content of the textbook chapters): authors were instructed not to aim for a definitive account of their assigned topic, but to produce an open-ended text that reflected the diverse perspectives of their team. This also leaves room for students and other readers to relate and insert their own experiences. Case studies and examples were included only to provide a foil for readers to compare with their own backgrounds and experiences.
- Post-text multiperspectivity (work with the textbook in classrooms): the teaching materials produced by the TEH21 project are designed to be used in the international classroom. Appreciating and giving space to the diversity of the audience is an essential characteristic of this material.

What challenges does multiperspectivity bring to teaching? Wansink et al. have identified several factors that may inhibit multiperspective history education, including moral connections between teachers and topics, the 'hotness' of themes under discussion, the time pressures and knowledge demands affecting teachers, and, significantly, their reliance on textbooks not usually associated with multiperspectivity.[2] Clearly, one of the major objectives of the TEH21 project was to overcome this last obstacle, by delivering to history teachers and students a textbook with a high level of multiperspectivity. Still, as Kropman et al. have shown, the idea that a multiperspective textbook would automatically stimulate the multiperspective design of a history class remains far from proven.[3] As

[2] B. Wansink, S. Akkerman, I. Zuiker & T. Wubbels, "Where Does Teaching Multiperspectivity in History Education Begin and End? An Analysis of the Uses of Temporality," *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 46(4), 2018, 495-527.

[3] M. Kropman, C. Van Boxtel, & J. Van Drie, "Multiperspectivity in lesson designs of history teachers: The role of school book texts in the design of multiperspective history lessons," *Historical Encounters*, 8(1), 2021, 46-69.

such, simply reading the textbook will not necessarily lead to multiperspective comprehension of the text. The role of teachers in steering the work with the text remains indispensable.

There are many possible ways to turn the concept of multiperspectivity into concrete features of history textbooks and history teaching. Kropman et al., for instance, have operationalized the term into five indicators: (1) agents (addressing the perspectives of opposing agents); (2) geographical scale (incorporating more than one scale of events or developments – local, regional, international); (3) dimensions (addressing more than one dimension, e.g. causes of an event); (4) historiography (reference to alternative narratives or the work of specific historians); (5) student perspectives (students are explicitly asked to formulate their own perspective on a particular phenomenon).[4] Wansink et al. have introduced a temporal aspect, suggesting that multiperspectivity can be applied in three temporal layers: (1) in the past (confronting different perspectives among historical actors involved in a historical event, or contemporaneous to it); (2) in the present (confronting different views among contemporary readers of a historical topic); (3) between the present and the past (confronting different historical explanations).[5] Many features and criteria have been suggested by Stradling in his guide *Teaching 20th-century European history*, which served in many ways as an inspiration for this guide and the testing process in general.[6]

1.3. Testing and data collection

The data for this report were gathered during three Intensive Study Programs (ISP). Several chapters were also tested within regular classes at Charles University, University of Lille, ELTE Budapest and Autonomous University of Madrid (academic partner institutions involved in the project TEH21), which generated further data. Additional sources came from hands-on seminars at the final conference of the TEH21 project in Brussels, September 2022.

The ISPs were organized in the form of three-day workshops, of which one proceeded as an online event (Utrecht 2021) due to Covid-19 related regulations, and two others (Lille 2021, Prague 2022) as on-site meetings. In each ISP, drafts of selected chapters were read and discussed in international classrooms involving three to seven students from different universities, led by two lecturers. The

[4] Kropman et al., cit.
[5] Wansink et al., cit.
[6] R. Stradling, *Teaching 20th-century European history*, Strasbourg 2001. Stradling's guide was also instructive in terms of structuring the testing of the textbook, see especially chapter 18 (Evaluating History Textbooks), 257-263, though his template is oriented primarily to teachers' evaluation and to secondary school teaching materials.

students produced short written reports afterwards. This feedback served as one of the major sources for this report, together with notes taken by lecturers.

Table 1: The overview of chapters tested during ISPs	
ISP	**Tested chapters**
Utrecht	1.1.2. Ideas of Europe in Modern History 1.1.3. Ideas of Europe in Contemporary History 1.2.1. Borders in Early Modern History 1.2.2. Borders in Modern History 1.4.1. Europe's other(ed)s in Early Modern History 1.4.3. Europe's other(ed)s in Contemporary History
Lille	7.4.2. Heritage and Memory in Modern History 2.2.2. Interethnic Relations in Modern History 3.5.3. Protests and social movements in Modern History 6.2.3. Ideologies in Contemporary History 1.3.3. Migrations and diasporas in Modern History
Prague	3.3.1 Revolutions and civil wars in Early Modern History 3.3.3. Revolutions and civil wars in Contemporary History 5.1.1. Entrepreneurs, Companies and Markets in Early Modern History 3.1.2. State Building and Nationalism in Modern History 7.2.2. Mass Media and Popular Culture in Modern History 2.3.2. Household and family in Modern History

Students were encouraged to adopt a critical approach toward the drafts. For that reason, questions asked by lecturers in these sessions went beyond standard discussions of content and its apprehension, such as assessing how well the students understood the topic or leading debates around particular chapter themes. Instead, lecturers targeted several qualitative aspects of the chapters that focused on a) formal and practical qualities (such as legibility and usefulness) and b) multiperspectivity. These meta-discussions became particularly useful as they helped formulate more precise questions for the Prague survey (see below), while also serving as internal feedbacks to improve the chapters. Moreover, they were an effective way of involving the students as co-producers of the teaching materials, rather than making them passive receivers.

Individual testing was furthermore conducted within university classes, yielding another set of reports written by students or lecturers. At UAM Madrid, two chapters were tested in the course “The Birth of the Modern World”, part of the bachelor’s degree in International Studies at UAM Madrid, taught in the second semester of the first year.[7] The class is taught in English and all students therefore require

[7] The testing was undertaken by Juan Luis Simal (UAM), who was instructor of the class.

language proficiency. The number of students is between 45 and 50. Most students are of Spanish origin, but there is a significant number of students with different national backgrounds, including those born in Spain of foreign parents (including Arab, Romanian, Latin American and African) and those who were born and educated elsewhere, but moved to Spain for their studies (mostly from Spanish American countries and Brazil). A significant number of students enrolled in the course as students of Erasmus or other exchange programs (including Korean, British, Canadian, German, Czech and Italian). The two tested chapters were 3.1.2 "State Building and Nationalism in Modern History (1800-1900)", and 3.3.2 "Revolutions and Civil Wars in Modern History (1800-1900)". They were tested across two years, in March 2021 and March 2022, and thus with two different groups. In both cases the text was read by students in advance at home before being discussed in the classroom.

Table 2: The overview of chapters' testing in regular university classes

Partner	Tested chapters	Program	Students' groups	Form of testing	Output
UAM	3.1.2 State Building and Nationalism in Modern History (1800-1900) 3.3.2 Revolutions and Civil Wars in Modern History (1800-1900)	Bachelor's degree in International Relations	45-50, mostly domestic (Spanish) + many international	Reading in advance and discussion in class	Report by instructor
ELTE	7.4.2 Heritage and Memory in Modern History (1800-1900) 7.4.3 Heritage and Memory in Contemporary History (1900-2000)	Master's degree in Cultural Heritage Studies	10, international, European (6) and non-European (4)	Reading in advance, discussion and critical commentary in class, working with online sources	Report by instructors
UL	3.2.3 Empire and Colonialism in Contemporary History (1900-2000)	Bachelor's degree in History	36, mainly domestic (French), BA level	Reading in advance, closer assessment in three groups, joint discussion	Report by instructor
CUNI	4.3 Education and Knowledge Transfer (all subchapters)	Erasmus+ exchange programme	57, international (mostly European), BA and MA level, various study programmes	Reading in advance and then filling questionnaire	Questionnaires (37 processed)

In Lille, chapter 3.2.3 "Empire and Colonialism in Contemporary History (1900-2000)" was tested in a semi-annual course on international relations since the 1930s.[8] The class comprised 36 students in the first year of the bachelor's programme in History; all students were French except from two students from Italy. Students were required to read the chapter in advance. The class was then divided into three groups that focused on the colonial period, on decolonization, and on post-colonialism and neo-colonialism respectively, and each of the three groups made a collective assessment of their reading and the lessons they drew from it. Subsequently, one or two students from each group made an oral

[8] The testing was undertaken by Justine Faure (Université de Lille).

presentation of their conclusions in order to launch discussion and debate. Chapter 3.2.3 was deliberately chosen as it corresponded to the class program and one of its co-authors, Isabelle Surun, was known to some of the students. Furthermore, given the students' knowledge of French colonial history, the European perspective adopted in the textbook was interesting and useful in demonstrating to them how the analysis of this topic can be decentred from France to Europe.

In Budapest, the tested chapters were 7.4.2 "Heritage and Memory in Modern History (1800-1900)" and 7.4.3 "Heritage and Memory in Contemporary History (1900-2000)". The course "Social responsibility", part of the master's programmes in Cultural Heritage Studies and TEMA+ European Territories: Heritage and Development, provided the framework for the class.[9] The testing group consisted of international students in their first and second years of the master's programme. During the testing on November 2022, ten students were present in the class, of which four were non-European. The students had received the chapters before the class and the texts were discussed collectively in a two-hour session. The first aim of the class was to identify together the key messages of the texts, much like in a regular seminar. In the second part of the session, however, the students were invited comments on the structure of the chapters, their main arguments and included topics, alongside suggestions for additional aspects and possible teaching approaches to the topic. During the class online sources linked to the chapters (which are available at *Historiana* website) were also discussed: they were displayed with a projector and the students added more examples. There was no need to formally link the topics of discussion to current issues; such connections came up spontaneously during the discussion.

In Prague, testing was undertaken in the Erasmus course "Prague – The role of the City in Czech and European Culture".[10] This course is organized around guided visits to a range of cultural institutions and sites of memory in Prague, all related to broader themes in local and Czech history in European context. The group comprised 57 students, of which the majority came from various European universities within the Erasmus+ exchange programme, while the minority consisted of non-European students. The group included bachelor and master-level students of history and, to a lesser degree, other disciplines such as geography and cultural heritage. The chapter designated for the testing was 4.3 "Education and Knowledge Transfer" (with all three subchapters). We used the provisional online version that was made available on the *Historiana* website.[11] Students were asked to read the chapter

[9] The testing was undertaken by Imre Tarafás, Péter Erdősi, and Judit Klement (ELTE), who was also instructor of the class.

[10] (AHSV10491) "Prague – The role of the City in Czech and European Culture" (instructor: Tomáš Masař), Winter Semester 2022/2023. The testing took place from 9 to 15 November 2022. The authors of this report are grateful to Dr. Masař for the adaptation of his class schedule and for distributing and gathering surveys for the class. The design and processing of the results was undertaken by Jaroslav Ira.

[11] https://historiana.eu/historical-content/narratives/the-european-experience-education-and-knowledge-1

at home and then complete a simple questionnaire, including a few open questions (see Appendix 1). Before reading the chapter, students were taken on a guided excursion to the J.A. Comenius National Museum of Pedagogy in Prague,[12] where they gained a more tangible experience of the themes covered by the chapter as well as a concrete example, in Comenius, that was used in the chapter itself. The chapter theme was furthermore aligned with the experiences shared by the students of undergoing the educational process at a foreign university and within the framework of an international exchange programme. The testing yielded fifty-seven filled-in questionnaires, bring a large sample of ideas focused mainly around four key aspects of the chapter that the students were asked to reflect upon:

- Multiperspective and multinational views
- Meanings and imaginations of Europe
- Bias and underlying narratives
- Complexity and multiple scales

These questions, which specifically targeted multiperspectivity, were complemented by questions concerning the chapter's usability or practicality, as well as any impact the chapter had on students in terms of changing, challenging, or expanding their knowledge and understanding of the theme, or stimulating further interest in the topic.

[12] https://www.npmk.cz/

2. Insights from Using the Multiperspective Textbook

In this chapter, we summarize major lessons and insights that were gathered during the testing. The first part discusses general experiences from the ISP meetings and in-class testing. The second part focuses specifically on how multiperspectivity was assessed and understood by students during testing. The third part looks more closely at practical aspects raised by students concerning their work with the chapters. The final part summarizes the perceived impact that the students felt from reading the chapters.

2.1. General observations

Experience with ISP discussions and reporting. The Intensive Study Programs were organized with the intention of securing a friendly and informal atmosphere, facilitated partly by many ice-breaking and socializing activities. It was essential to setup a relationship between students and lecturers that was based on a shared sense of cooperation and co-creativeness. Thanks to these endeavours, and also due to encouragement during the meetings, students were able to adopt a quite sincere and critical approach toward chapter drafts, while at the same time providing constructive feedback and suggestions on how chapters could be improved or utilized during classrooms. Moreover, students had chance to make comparisons between several chapters. During ISPs, students were typically asked to read and give feedback on subchapters from three different themes. A few students participated in two ISPs, allowing them an even broader comparison. In the survey testing conducted in the Prague Erasmus class, students read only one thematic chapter, but this comprised all three subchapters, covering different time periods and written by different authorial teams.

Diversity of opinions. Although the assessments and commentaries of individual chapters tended to converge (partly conditioned by group debates during the ISPs), diverse and sometimes conflicting opinions on the chapters and their features were revealed by class discussions, even more so by the questionnaire. The diversity of the groups clearly played some role in the range of assessments; students varied in terms of initial knowledge and academic background (such as level and subject of studies), different academic traditions, and the degree of familiarity with relevant themes, concepts and approaches (such as multiperspectivity, post-colonial critique, deconstructivism, and so on). Sometimes the backgrounds of the students had an imprint on their views. For instance, some students from particular countries appeared more sensitive to marginalized parts of Europe, while others

coming from countries with stronger maritime and colonial experiences typically noted the absence of overseas, non-European, and colonial perspectives.

Differences in the approach, theme, and state of art in each chapter. The feedback on the chapters from ISPs should be qualified in view of certain factors, such as state of the chapters: during the first and second ISPs students read mostly first drafts, whereas during the third ISP they could read near-finished versions after an initial round of language proofs. Furthermore, reactions were varied between chapters that discussed rather well-known and typical themes, and those that discussed less-known topics – themes that have largely been omitted from standard history courses. In the former case, students sometimes expressed a desire for including less-known cases and examples. For instance, in chapter 6.2.3 "Ideologies in Contemporary History", students appreciated passages on neoliberalism or expressed desire to learn more about communism in Western Europe, to supplement the better-known story of communism in Eastern Europe. Some other themes, to the contrary, were generally deemed less known and therefore at times difficult to comprehend. This was the case for the chapter on "Heritage and Memory in Modern History", for which students often reported a kind of abstractness. In this case, it was obvious that a basic orientation in the topic and its major concepts was expected of this chapter.

Beyond the ISPs, chapters were also tested in various settings within regular course programs in Madrid, Lille, Budapest and Prague, shedding further light on the significance of the specific academic contexts in which the textbook is used, including the composition of students and their experience with the topic of the chapter. This provided useful insights on how the textbook and the online sources can be used during classes.

a) Madrid

In Madrid, the chapters were tested in the course "The Birth of the Modern World". This course offers a global history of the nineteenth century for students whose degree is not history, but who are interested in the topic. In the course of their study program students take several courses in history, from the medieval times to the twentieth century, in combination with other subjects in the humanities and social sciences, such as law, economy, political science, international relations, history of art, anthropology, geography and literature. The scope of the course is global, but in many ways the history of the European continent is central to the topics offered on the course. Regarding the themes of the two tested chapters (the modern process of nation-building and the revolutionary character of modern politics), the European experience comes prominently to the fore.

While the two tested chapters combine rather well in terms of their subject matter, each has a distinct character: one is more analytical, whereas the other offers a rich narrative abundant with historical

events, though framed by overarching historical interpretation. Chapter 3.1 “State-Building and Nationalism” is analytical in the sense that it discusses different interpretations of the process of state and nation-building, mentioning particular scholars in the field and engaging in historiographical debates. This chapter thus worked better as a standalone reading. Students were familiar with the main theoretical elements of the text, including the names of several authors mentioned, having been introduced to them in previous lectures. The text therefore worked well in sparking a more in-depth discussion of many relevant aspects that the students found most enlightening.

In the case of “Revolutions and civil wars”, to the contrary, much more information on historical events and protagonists was present in the text, which turned out to be unknown or poorly known to most of the students. From the perspective of multiperspectivity, this had implications. Many of these events and protagonists carried a strong national imprint: a revolutionary leader or a ‘founding father’, a revolution against a foreign power, a declaration of independence, a civil war. They were not well known to most of the (first-year) students, whose secondary education may have derived from a framework that was very much national, and who were less (or not at all) familiar with key moments in the history of several European nations and states. Thus, many of them commented that the text was confusing and hard to follow. Such limitations could however be turned into stimulus for class activities, for example by encouraging students to do some research (online or in an encyclopedia) into one or two of the national and/or regional contexts in which they have a knowledge gap, before sharing this information with the rest of the class. The international setting of the class could assist this process, taking advantage of a potential combination of different national histories to be discussed and interconnected by students, under the guidance of an instructor.

b) Lille

In Lille, the testing was undertaken in the ‘national’ setting of history education, i.e., in a class for French students at a French university department. Although the textbook was developed primarily for use in international classes, the highly positive experience in Lille has proven that the textbook can be used in national curricula as well. French students, especially in their first year of study, often have a poor command of English and are quite reluctant to read scientific works in other languages than French. The aim of this class was to test the ease, or lack thereof, of reading the chapter in English; most students appreciated the clarity of the text and understood it easily.

Furthermore, the Lille testing revealed that even in national settings the textbook can have a positive impact in terms of broadening student horizons and overcoming the limits of national curricula that tend to prioritize national history – as is often the case in France. While the history of other Western European powers is sometimes covered, students know unfortunately little about the history of

Central and Eastern Europe. The European perspective that was adopted in chapter 3.2 on empire and colonialism was therefore particularly interesting in this context, since the students were very sensitive to this theme. Students were particular attentive to passages in this chapter on Central Europe and the Russian/Soviet and Austro-Hungarian empires, allowing for very interesting discussions on the nature of colonialism and its different forms. At the same time, the testing also revealed some limitations. Since the students generally showed strong historical knowledge of the French empire (and to a lesser extent the British empire), they found that the chapter on the whole was sometimes too brisk and not sufficiently in-depth. Students also felt some themes could have been developed more, such as the history of the Second World War and the question of imperial forms of Nazi and Japanese rule.

c) Budapest

In Budapest, the testing of chapter 7.4 on memory and heritage was in the specific context of a combined international classroom setting involving a specialized and rather advanced group of students enrolled in the master's program in Cultural Heritage Studies. This context was reflected in a constructive approach to the chapters and to the accompanying database of online sources. For instance, while appreciating the examples in the texts, students collected even more during the discussion, citing examples like Dresden or the Mostar Bridge as heritage sites. They also suggested that further visual materials (graphs, tables, diagrams) could illustrate some of the described phenomena well: in the case of the 'heritage boom', the rise of the number of heritage sites, for instance. They also suggested some external activities as discussion points for the heritage chapters, such as a cemetery visit to organize teamwork on a heritage site. Last but not least, they also suggested linking heritage topics to other chapters of the textbook during teaching, such as heritage and society or heritage and religion. Greater experience and knowledge in the topic made the students more attentive to missing aspects and perspectives, such as gender, religion, rurality and folklore, or the consequences of colonialization. They also mentioned that the chapters do not include specific heritage fields, like industrial, rural, or intangible heritage. To strengthen the key message of the chapter, they suggested creating more links between the modern and contemporary periods – if not in the chapter itself, then at least during teaching. And for a more balanced perspective, the negative consequences of heritage issues, such as the heritage industry, should also be raised in the classroom among discussion questions. Students nevertheless agreed with that the chapters could not cover all possible topics, so they suggested to use multiple scales during the discussion. From the perspective of lecturers, this experience has also revealed that the actual practice of teaching is crucial for making the chapters of the textbook successful, as several aspects and examples which could not make their way to the chapters themselves can be introduced and explained.

During all ISPs, an important part of the feedback-gathering process was to query what aspects or content students missed in the chapters. Replies typically stated these kinds of aspects:

- Particular dimensions of the key concept or phenomenon in the chapter: e.g., in chapter 1.2 on borders, discussion of border crossings and the underlying power relations beyond border-making processes was considered lacking
- Particular subthemes of chapter topics: e.g., in chapter 1.2, the concept of natural borders compared to other kinds of borders; in chapter 1.1.2, those who were excluded by the concepts and ideas of Europe in the nineteenth century
- Particular territories in Europe or beyond Europe: e.g., in chapter 1.2.1 students noted the lack of coverage of borders in the overseas colonies; in chapter 1.2.2, students noted the absence of regions such as south-eastern Europe
- Further explanation of related themes: e.g., migration in chapter 1.2, nationalism in chapter 7.4.2 on "Heritage and Memory in Modern History"
- Alternative explanations and developments: e.g., students suggested that different starting points of the modern idea of Europe could be discussed alongside the French revolution

To be sure, students also tended to highlight what they saw as novel and refreshing perspectives, including unusual connections, themes and viewpoints – such as ordinary people coping with borders – that receive much less coverage in general textbooks. As one of the students explained: *"The description of cultural borders, how people dealt with the limits that borders put on their mobility or the origin of the passport was very interesting to read about. Papers in history often miss including the perspectives of 'simple people,' which is not the case for this article."* (ISP1, 1.2.1, BA, Germany).

These responses helped us to operationalize a multiperspective approach to complexity (see chapter 2.2.4), geographical coverage (chapters 2.2.1 and 2.2.2), and the control of bias (2.2.3). They also helped generate practical suggestions for the use of the textbook, such as developing critical perspectives based on what is missing from a particular chapter – or what could be added. (In some instances, a similar critique can already be found in the textbook's summary questions.) Another response suggested that students look for thematic connections between the chapters in order to trace specific themes across the textbook, allowing for a transversal reading (see more in chapter 3).

2.2. Evaluation of multiperspectivity in the textbook

As we stated in the introduction, there are many dimensions of multiperspectivity. References to multiperspectivity drawn from ISP discussions and reports can be grouped into four themes, and are discussed below in separate subchapters.

2.2.1. Multiperspectivity in geographical and multinational perspective

One of the key objectives of the project was to prepare a textbook that would introduce major themes and processes in European history from different geographical and national perspectives. This guided the composition of authorial teams as well as the design of the chapters, which, at least in the original plan, aimed to present a given topic through its manifestations in different parts of Europe. In practice, the authorial teams were at liberty to decide how exactly this ambition would be carried out in particular chapters: some teams opted to focus only on a small selection of regions (e.g., France and Russia in chapter 6.3.1, or the low countries, England, and the Czech lands in chapter 7.4.1); others concentrated more on a particular region (such as Central Europe in chapter 2.2.2); still others made efforts to encompass a wide range of countries, even if just with a small illustrative remark. On the other hand, many chapters diverted from this geographical structure, preferring themes, chronologies, or spatial scales as major organizing principles for their chapters. This diversity of authorial approaches was matched by varied interpretations of multiperspectivity among readers. Testing was therefore doubly revealing, highlighting the limits of particular chapters but also uncovering different views on what a truly multiperspective text should look like in terms of geographical diversity and inclusiveness.

Differing opinions surfaced during the ISPs on the significance of territorial coverage in developing multiperspectivity. The prevalent expectation among students was that, ideally, the chapters should include examples from as many different countries as possible, drawn from several (preferably all) macro-regions of Europe. From this perspective, some reports pointed to the absence of regions like south-eastern Europe, the Ottoman empire, or northern Europe (to some degree these lacunae reflected the distribution of expertise in the authorial collective); or, in a more positive tone, expressed a desire to learn more about certain regions, particularly northern Europe. Other reports commented on what they saw as an overrepresentation of Western Europe, which might have implied a certain bias toward this region as the epitome of the proper course of history. Criticism was also directed at the dominance of English-language items in the textbook's reading lists, which appeared to be a clear contradiction of the objective to transcend Anglo-American perspectives. It may be argued, however, that the prevalence of anglophone texts (as with the use of English in the textbook itself) is the price

paid for the use of English as *lingua franca* in the majority of international study programs. In fact, many of the literature suggestions were put forward by scholars from non-anglophone countries, and some of these texts were English translations from original languages.

In some cases, students criticized an overemphasis on certain countries and regions. For instance, in chapter 7.4.2 on memory and heritage, some students pointed out that too many examples were related to the Czech lands and France, and that they would prefer a wider range of references. But there was no strict agreement on this point. Some students were actually more at ease with foregrounding specific countries or regions at the expense of diversity, especially if the regions in question were traditionally absent from national curricula. As one participant from the Netherlands made clear: "*Especially the example of Bohemia (and Moravia) is enlightening for a student from Northern Europe since we do not usually encounter this type of case study. The Central European component might have been slightly overrepresented, yet I do not believe that this is a very grave issue*." (ISP2, 7.4.2, MA, Netherlands). Regarding the more formal aspects of the texts, some student evaluations were critical of individual author backgrounds surfacing too prominently in the chapters and case study selections. As one report explained: "*From my perspective, and one thing that made chapter a lot better, was when the reader could not distinguish which part had written who. In this case it is obvious the origin of the author.*" (ISP2, 7.4.2, BA, Spain). Apparently, some students preferred a plural and somewhat amalgamated narrative.

The issue of multiperspectivity in geographical and multinational perspective was also included in the Prague survey testing of chapter 4.3, "Education and Knowledge Transfer". Students were given the following subset of questions:[13]

- Does the chapter provide a multiperspective view of European history?
- How would you read the chapter from, e.g., French perspective?
- Now, imagine that you are, e.g., a Swedish, Italian, or Polish reader: how would you find the chapter in that case?

Responses displayed a variety of assessments on the chapter's provision of multiperspective views: some were resolutely affirmative, a few others were negative, with many answers leaning to one pole of the spectrum or the other. It seems that several notions of what multiperspectivity means were at play. At least nine interpretations can be discerned from the positive responses, suggesting that multiperspectivity:

[13] Please note that the questions (here and in subsequent chapters) were language-edited for this document and thus slightly differ in their wording from the version used for actual testing. For the original wording, see the questionnaire in the appendix.

a) Includes many countries and draws from them a diverse set of examples
b) Reflects the diversity of European history and the variability of its processes
c) Is objective, in the sense that it is unbiased towards any particular region
d) Includes a general perspective, focused on transnational and formative processes
e) Maintains a European perspective, with Europe as the central focus
f) Provides a comparative perspective
g) Incorporates additional perspectives from beyond Western Europe
h) Provides a broad view of European history, beyond national contexts
i) Enables readers from diverse national contexts to identify with the histories being told

Point (a), on the inclusion of many countries and their diverse examples in the narrative, was by far the most frequently cited as a marker of multiperspectivity. In this regard, three further points are worth mentioning: 1) some respondents saw the absence of some countries or macro-regions as a weakness that reduced the quality of multiperspectivity; 2) other respondents, to the contrary, were explicit that including all European countries or macro-regions was not a necessary precondition of true multiperspectivity in the chapters; 3) some respondents went further and speculated on the logic behind certain inclusions and exclusions, for instance if an excluded region was of lesser importance for a given historical phenomenon at a certain point in time. The second and third points corresponded with the meanings of multiperspectivity described under letters b) to i), emphasizing either a more variable, decentred, and unbiased view of European history or, alternatively, the narrative centrality of Europe and the transnational processes spread over the continent's history, which encouraged the development of shared traits. As illustrated by the example below, many students combined several meanings of the concept:

Quote Box 1: Multiperspectivity in geographical and multinational perspective in chapter 4.3 (positive replies)
"I think so, the article offers a multiperspective view of European history. Indeed, the examples used do not come from a single European country, but from several of them. Since then, it makes it possible to think about the subject in a more global way. As a French student, for example, I didn't feel like I was reading anything specifically centred on France. On the contrary, I had the impression that Europe was the centre of the subject and treated as a whole, which allowed a comparison between different parts of Europe. The only problem, but which is not the fault of the article, is that some countries may not feel included in this article of European dimension in particular because none of the examples given speak of something coming from their country. For example, a Latvian student may not have the feeling of being represented because the chapter never mentions a Latvian specificity." (BA, History-European Studies, France)

Negative replies, with some of the most eloquent ones displayed in the Quote Box 2, that explicitly pointed to the limits of multiperspectivity in the chapter provided several reasons. Some considered the exclusion of certain regions, or bias towards others, as a critical weakness that undermined the very concept of multiperspectivity: the chapter was not "sufficiently multiperspective", provided an "unfair image of the history of knowledge", or was potentially deceptive to readers from countries not represented in the chapter, who might well have expected to identify with the general narrative. One comment explicitly noted the absence of a comparative perspective and of explicit reflections by the authors on their own positionality. Interestingly, this commentator also included a web link to the Stradling's guidelines on the multiperspective teaching of European history.[14] This suggests that at least one student was either familiar with the concept or had looked into its meaning.

Quote Box 2: Multiperspectivity in geographical and multinational perspective in chapter 4.3 (negative replies)
"The text mentions two different perspectives; Western European and Eastern European. In the beginning of the chapter, the authors talk about European history through either one of these but while reading further, it gradually puts more focus on the Western European view. (…) The history from Northern and Southern Europe for example is barely being touched. When keeping that in mind, this text does not provide a sufficient multiperspective view of European history, apart for the interaction between the Western and Eastern European history." (MA, Geography, Belgium)
"From my point of view, the text lacks very much representation of Eastern and South-West insights on the matter of education. While putting focus on the Central Europe issues and progress, it does not include virtually any narratives from the areas mentioned previously. It draws a clear and detailed image of the evolution of education in the German, Dutch, French and Austro-Hungarian territories. However, the exclusion of the discoveries and work on the Eastern Block and the far-south-west countries of Europe brings above all an unfair image of the history of knowledge making and trespassing." (BA, Sociology, Spain)
"The chapter provides a general perspective on the European knowledge history, focusing on the highlights and the 'big names' mostly coming from Western Europe. Especially the first two parts focus mainly on Germany and its Western neighbours, as if Germany is equal to the whole of Europe. Until the third, and final, part the East is neglected in this perspective. As a Swedish, Italian or Polish I would go in this chapter thinking it would also be about my history, since these countries are also European, but in the end I would feel tricked by this." (BA, Media-Culture, Netherlands)
"I think the information about the education systems and changes in post-war Europe is vague and does not really lend itself to multiperspective views. There is a generalization of 'European universities' which does not aid the understanding of the clear differences in systems across Europe. It is good how it is divided into the different sections of Europe but maybe there could be more linking between them – a comparison section before the conclusion. Multiperspectivity needs to challenge the status-quo in the European countries and involves reflecting on your own standpoint so maybe a section at the start which establishes the viewpoint you are coming from (Western and European). This involves also pointing out that this viewpoint is a product of cultural context and is almost always going to be Eurocentric." (MA, Philosophy, UK)

[14] R. Stradling, *Teaching 20th-century European history*, Strasbourg 2001.

2.2.2. Meanings and concepts of Europe

The recurrent problem that haunts any writing project in European history is the question of what Europe actually is and how it should be conceptualized in spatial terms. This pertains not only to the question of where the limits of Europe should be drawn but also how the space within those limits should be structured. Needless to say, conceptualizations of space are never simply neutral – instead, they often reflect symbolic and value-laden geographies that are imbued with implicit hierarchies and judgements. Historically, these divisions and imaginings of Europe have been quite diverse and often contested; they reflect different interests and are in themselves a topic that calls for multiperspective approaches. The intention of the textbook, and of the project TEH21 more broadly, was to let these diverse and hidden geographies come to the surface, rather than impose any binding and uniform spatial concept of Europe. As a result, 'Europe' takes many shapes across the textbook. This diversity should also serve to stimulate student reflections on what Europe and European can mean, to cultivate practical skills for the spatial framing of historical research, and to develop sensitivity to the way in which implicit geographical imaginations are conditioned by (and provide conditions for) divisions, hierarchies, and centralizations past and present.

During the ISPs students sometimes pointed out inconsistencies in how Europe was divided in particular chapters. The usage, or not, of the concept of Central or East-Central Europe was discussed during ISP3, for example. Obviously, the variation of geographical divisions partly reflects the textbook's broader theme of variation in the symbolic geographies and perceptions of Europe. To some degree it also mirrors the diversity of the authorial groups, some of whom have a background in (East-)Central Europe – or are specialists in this region – and who were well-positioned to adopt this category. The varying geographical frames may also have reflected the periods discussed: for instance, the east vs. west scheme typically features in histories of the Cold War era.

During Prague class testing, students were required to read the chapter 4.3 "Education and Knowledge Transfer" and address a particular set of questions related to the concept of Europe, namely:

- How does the chapter delineate Europe?
- How is Europe divided into particular regions (e.g., Southern, Central, Western or Eastern Europe)?
- Do you find the concept of Europe in this chapter accurate?
- If not, how would you change it?

The questions stimulated a remarkable number of critical comments, with some of the most illuminative quoted at length in the box bellow. To be sure, many respondents assessed the chapter's

macro-regional division of Europe as an accurate and useful strategy. Yet many criticisms were also articulated around this point, as well as responses that suggested a different spatial framing (see also the Quote Box 3 below).

Some students used this question to expand on their criticism of geographical distribution across the chapters, what they saw as overemphasis on certain regions. In particular, they mentioned bias toward Western Europe or, in the early modern subchapter, an overemphasis on Central Europe, a category that was at times seen as quite unclear. Some answers pointed out that the chapter overstressed the division between east and west while ignoring south and north. Other replies considered the macro-regions as generally too vague, or even simplifying in the sense of grouping together countries that might have in fact had quite different experiences. On the other hand, there were some suggestions to avoid regional division (or any division) altogether, and suggestions to conceptualize Europe as one space in which transnational processes and exchanges unfolded. No answers addressed the issue of European borders, which may be a result of the question's formulation. Several respondents noticed the differences in spatial framings among the temporal subchapters and pondered the evolution of spatial divisions in relation to the historical dynamics that have structured European space (such as empires during early modernity, states in modern history, or the role of the Cold War divide in the postwar history).

Quote Box 3: Students' reflections on meanings and concepts of Europe in chapter 4.3
"Europe has been delimited in this article not according to borders but according to common points such as religion, political organization, geographical location. I think this is a good way to go because talking about European history, especially across the centuries, does not allow you to use borders or modern political concepts as a tool of comparison. Indeed the European states were not defined in the same way as today. For example, France is not the same if we take it in medieval times or in Napoleonic times. However, I think comparing or defining concepts based on geographical regions like Eastern Europe is not the best thing to do because European states can share common things without being in the same region. Moreover, these concepts of East, South, etc. are quite vague and difficult to define precisely. So I think the division on commonalities is more relevant, although more complex to deal with, than the geographic delineation." (BA, history and European studies, France)
"Europe drawn in the chapter is correct when thinking about geographics, although the political idea of Europe and the "European Experience" (as the title says) is likely corrupted. We see the portrait of a progressive, freedom of knowledge federation associated with the Central-northern part of the continent; while the Eastern Block is almost only mentioned for underlining the censorship and oppression which suffered during the socialist times. The South-West area is also ignored after some brief, summed-up notes on the first part of the text. If writing a fair, inclusive history of education in Europe is the goal, writers and editors should investigate more about the achievements on the matter in the Iberian Peninsula, South of Italy, and the Balkans during the early-modern and modern history." (BA, sociology, Spain)
"Europe is separated into sections and blocs according to how particular countries were politically, religiously, and economically aligned throughout history. For example, the Hapsburg empire forms a particular bloc, whilst England is separate, and the Protestant countries are another bloc. I do find the concept of Europe accurate as there are different formulations of Europe in each chapter depending on the area of history (modern, contemporary etc.). For example, it is separated into empires in the early modern period whereas into separate political blocs in the contemporary period which reflects the period of the World Wars and Cold Wars." (BA, history, UK/Netherlands)

"The author of the article divides Europe, in terms of universities and knowledge spread, into West and Central Europe. West Europe also contains Southern Europe, probably due to a similar development and partly similar cultures. France, Spain and Italy are still often mentioned as West Europe. Besides that, it seems like the author believes that East Europe is in this case not significant enough to mention it separately. Although I don't think it is accurate to distinguish the different parts of Europe like this, especially because West Europe already puts itself in the centre of everything, it could be justified in this case because for example Hungary didn't play that big of a part in the early university culture. On the other side, I don't know enough about East or North Europe to assume what they contributed knowledge wise. The author should at least inform the reader more about the different parts of Europe." (BA, religious studies, Netherlands)
"The chapter delineates Europe into geographical areas. I find that the division between Western and Eastern Europe restricts the particularities of each country and generates generalities by erasing singularities. In my opinion, the concept of Europe is not accurate. I would have liked to see Europe as a vast, dense, and connected space in terms of exchanges. Thus, there is a certain repercussion of the events, of the movements of thought and the models are exported." (BA, history, France)
"Linking to what was said above, I do not think it accurately represents Europe as it could be more specific. For example, saying Eastern Europe is not very specific. What's more, there is no mention of colonization during these periods and the impact colonial forces in Europe had on the education systems and production of knowledge in the colonies. This failure to mention the devastating legacy and impact of colonization does not aid multiperspectivity and does not accurately represent the concept of Europe. It would be great to have a section dedicated to the impact of Eurocentric education systems and the legacy they still have today in shaping and perpetuating colonialism. This could also include solutions for deconstructing this like the inclusions of historians that lie outside Europe and write from the standpoint of colonization." (MA, philosophy, UK)

2.2.3. Bias and underlying narratives

The ambition of this project was to provide a textbook that would go beyond the dominance of Anglo-American or west-centric narratives, while also reflecting on the recent trends in the humanities that have called for deconstructing and rethinking traditional narratives centred on men, written from the perspective of a certain (upper) social class, and do on. Therefore, testing paid particular attention to biases. Two complementary definitions of bias were applied: a) in the sense of endorsing a particular narrative of European history, including any sort of centrism, imposition of a particular and dominant interpretation, any particular perspective or underlying master narratives; b) bias defined negatively as incomplete or absent multiperspectivity and the exclusion of particular voices and perspectives.

During ISPs, students pointed out some examples. When discussing the draft of chapter 1.1.3, "Ideas of Europe in Contemporary History", some were critical of the chapter's focus on ideas of Europe that were relevant for affluent white men in the centres of power, and not for most other people, including less affluent citizens, minorities, and migrant communities. The view from outside of Europe was also missing. Notwithstanding that all texts, including the textbook chapters, carry limitations, the strength of student critique may partly be explained by the somewhat higher expectations raised by the very theme of chapter 1.1 – a theme that was central to the very concept of the textbook. Other comments

related to lingering schemes of 'proper' historical progress (mostly western) set against courses of development that were delayed, deficient, or deviant. For instance, during debates on the draft of chapter 1.2.2 on borders in the modern period, students noticed a dichotomy between 'modern' nation-states in the west and 'traditional' empires in the east; in their view, this implied a binary pattern of history between the progressive and the regressive. In a similar vein, when discussing chapter 3.1.2, "State-Building and Nationalism in Modern History", several students raised criticism of the assumption of the nation-state as the only and inevitable model of political organization. This, they felt, implied that the western path to political modernization was the typical and ultimately triumphant pattern, relegating other models to the margins – empires, for example, were still present in the nineteenth century and their (failed) attempts to introduce imperial state-related identities (such as Austrian identity in the Habsburg empire) represent a different kind of pattern. Other comments on this chapter doubted its imagery of one-directional transfers and flows of particular phenomena, such as ideology and the practice of nationalism, from centres (typically Western Europe) to peripheries:

Quote Box 4: Students' reflections on bias in chapters tested during ISPs
"What is striking about the discussions, held to discuss the requirements of a trans- or multinational approach to the presented texts, is that despite the readable efforts of the authors, it was repeatedly noted that the perspectives continue to be predominantly western. Examples were given of events from various countries that substantiate or underpin the historical described phenomena. In the case of nationalism and the nation-state, however, we have noted that the understanding of this conception, especially for the state model of the nation-state, is fundamentally a central or western European one and continues to be constitutive of the historiographical debate. It was noted that there are various other ideas and conceptions or models of the state besides the nation-state, the mention of which should not be missing." (ISP3, 3.1.2, MA, Germany)
"They were educated at western European universities which ensured the transfer of western European ideas.' To me, this sentence implies that nationalism or some aspects of it originated in the western Europe. This could be just misunderstanding from my part, but it still accentuates the superiority of the western part of Europe over the central or eastern areas and the translation of knowledge in west-east direction which does not have to be a universal rule. When discussing nationalism, I would lay more importance on the local specifics and motivations. The chapter almost gives me the feeling that nationalism was a monolithic concept which was gradually adopted across the whole of Europe and gained its specifics during the subsequent confrontation with local particularities and needs. Couldn't it be the other way around? Couldn't 'nationalism' be a generalizing term for emancipation-seeking and identity-building movements which mostly resulted in creating of a nation-state?" (ISP3, 3.1.2, BA, Czech Republic)

During Prague testing of chapter 4.3, students were explicitly asked about potential biases in the chapter. Once again, they were guided by indicative sub-questions, namely:

- Do you think the chapter puts forward a narrative that captures experiences in all parts of Europe?

- Do you find the chapter biased to a particular narrative of European history? Such as:
    - Western-based narratives
    - Bias towards great powers and large states
    - Dominance of male voices and experiences
- If so, how should (or could) the chapter be improved?

The surveys revealed plenty of variability in general assessments of chapter bias, which partly reflected differing interpretations of the term itself. Many of these interpretations largely followed the suggestions (bias concerns gender imbalances and west-centrism). Interestingly, some respondents came up with more general reflections on what bias can mean. This included attempts to distinguish between biases that emerge from problems in the text and, on the other hand, biases that might logically correspond to the varying focus of each chapter, reflecting the varying historical significance of certain countries or regions.

None of the replies suggested bias in the strong sense of an underlying agenda or advancing certain interests and ideological positions. Several students nonetheless criticized the focus on Western Europe, the core countries of the continent. They also mentioned lacunae: the absent role of non-European worlds; the omission of colonial, rural, and otherwise peripheral experiences of knowledge production; the overemphasis on major urban centres or more advanced countries; and the overlooking of informal and less-institutionalized education, vocational training (such as training of apprentices in guilds), and female-run spheres of education.

Quote Box 5: Students' perceptions of bias in chapter 4.3
"I think the chapter is male-dominated as it primarily mentions male figures. Although I understand that women were excluded from educational institutions so there is not much to say about their contribution, women also had a role to play in educating one another and contributing to public discourse through their own informal communities outside of the traditional academic sphere. Additionally, the chapter does not give much attention to people from colonial/post-colonial backgrounds whose ideas were borrowed and had their own influence on the development of ideology within modern and contemporary Europe. More attention could be given to their contribution." (BA, history, UK/Netherlands)
"The chapter does not give a fair insight into the history of education in the European continent, as it does not include almost any perspective Eastern or south-western perspective as widely as it does with the Central European one (specifically, the German and Austro-Hungarian one). Moreover, it is mainly a history of institutionalized accessible education, forgetting the informal, work-related environments of learning (there is just a brief mention of guilds in the beginning). Expanding the information about the areas which were not covered would be a big improvement." (BA, sociology, Spain)
"I think that the chapter presents an account that does not capture the experience in all parts of Europe, especially in rural and less developed areas where education was not yet present. Not everyone was lucky enough to have access to education. The chapter may therefore be biased in some respects as it cannot represent the whole of Europe, it is mostly dominated by the more developed states, and necessarily dominated by men, although education is beginning to allow some women, but this is still rare. It should therefore be made clear directly that the chapter may be biased because of these elements." (BA, literature, France)

2.2.4. Complexity and multiple scales

The basic plan of the textbook was to discuss general processes and phenomena on a European scale, while exhibiting how they manifested in various parts of the continent. But, of course, history takes place on many scales and is experienced on many more, from the local to the global. Besides, to work flexibly and creatively with spatial frameworks – and be able to trace through them a certain historical phenomenon – has become an important methodological challenge for historians. The European experience, like any other history, has been differentiated along the lines of class and many other categories, meaning that it appears differently from below, from the perspective of individuals, and so on. This complexity in terms of spatial scales and social structure is what generates the multidimensionality of historical phenomena, as well as their cross-sectional nature. For all these reasons, some of the authorial teams adopted strategies that focused more specifically, for instance, on local and regional dimensions, or on the experiences of individuals and 'ordinary people'. Or, they introduced dimensions through which a given theme could understood from atypical perspectives, such as the everyday reproduction of national identities in chapter 3.1.2 on "State-building and Nationalism in Modern History".

During the ISPs, students often praised chapters that went beyond 'big' history – beyond official, macro, top-down, or institutionalized experiences, reaching out to more bottom-up, ordinary, less typical, or everyday perspectives. When such perspectives were absent from the chapters, it would sometimes be flagged as a negative trait. For instance, when discussing chapter 7.2.2, "Mass Media and Popular Culture in Modern History", students were concerned that too much emphasis was put on newspapers and quantitative data, such as circulation numbers, at the expense other media, such as pamphlets, or alternative practices of newspaper consumption (such as lending and borrowing copies, or and reading aloud for groups). Also criticized was the chapter's foregrounding of the urban sphere while not paying enough attention to rural practices. In a similar vein, discussions of chapters 3.3.1 "Revolutions and Civil Wars in Early Modern History" and 7.4.2 "Heritage and Memory in Modern History" pointed to the lack of bottom-up methods, individual perspectives, or rural experiences:

Quote Box 6: Students' ideas about complexity during IPS testing
"The last and my personal favourite aspect in the discussion was what I personally came up with when I was reflecting on the text when I was reading it: the aspect that we cannot forget the "people" behind the "revolution" and "civil war". The text provides us just the top-looking-down perspective as we draw our explanation of the history of revolutions and civil wars. It deals with the experiences of violence and explains what happened before and after a war happened. But the text did not cover the perspective behind what was happening: the actors of experiencing it. I argue that it would additionally be interesting to have that perspective in the text. Another perspective on the matter could eventually turn the perspective into a different one: we could, or we should even let the people speak who were in the streets and fought for their rights as it was for example the case in the French Revolution to get a bottom-up-view." (ISP3, 3.3.3, MA, Germany)

"Rather than the extensive list of examples of urban heritage and its construction an example of rural heritage would be very interesting. This contrast can offer an insight into the multi-dimensionality and multiperspectivity of cultural heritage within a country whilst at the same time illustrating that these differences between rural and urban areas in European nations are part of a larger trend of urbanization in Europe. The examples that are discussed in this section on urban history are a very nice combination of examples from different European countries. It felt like a very balanced representation of European countries in this section." (ISP2, 7.4.2, MA, Netherlands)

When testing chapter 4.3 in Prague, the question of complexity and multiple scales was specified in the following subset of questions:

- Do you think the chapter pays due attention to Europe's national, regional, local, and individual dimensions of historical experience?
- If not, how could the chapter be altered to put more emphasis on, e.g., local or global scales?
- Or try to suggest a different structure for the chapter? Why would this work better?

Answers to these questions brought rather divergent opinions. Some students concluded that the chapter was relatively balanced on the whole. Others pointed out less attention to certain scales, but did not necessarily see this as detrimental to the textbook, partly in recognition that the physical limits of the book would not allow for coverage of all spatial levels in the same depth. Some students further argued that greater complexity presents a greater challenge in terms of orientation. Students also made clear their understanding of the textbook's aim to provide them with a transnational history of Europe that outlines only the major trends and processes. In this regard, other students suggested an even stricter focus on the continental level, or on the level of transnational exchanges and flows; more critically, they pointed out the lack of global perspectives and Europe's interactions with the non-European world.

Quote Box 7: Students' comments on complexity and multiple scales in chapter 4.3 (positive)

"The overall structure of the chapter is good. It has a clear chronological order that is easy to follow. Regarding the scale of the text it remains quite European/national or at best regional. Individual dimension of historical experience is rarely talked about. However, as I said, this text is rather a short and brief introduction and for that reason does not necessarily need a local and individual dimension. The text would benefit in quality if these elements are incorporated but would also immensely increase in quantity which would make it less attractive to read. In terms of the structure, I think it is best to stick with a chronological order as this creates less complexity and confusion." (MA, geography, Belgium)

"In my opinion, the article has struck a good balance between the macro and micro scale of the story. Because the article cannot focus on all local specificities at the risk of losing its fundamental objective, namely to write a European history. I would even say that I would prefer to have more global information than local, because I think that specific information can be found in the "national" or "local" history of European states. This is why I would insist even more on the global or European aspect." (BA, history and European studies, France)

Still, several comments were critical on the absence of certain scales and dimensions of historical experience, especially the individual, local, and regional levels, as well as that of the lower classes and rural sphere. Some students raised stronger criticisms, for example that the prevalence of top-down perspectives produces an elitist historical narrative.

Quote Box 8: Students' comments on complexity and multiple scales in chapter 4.3 (negative)
"I think the chapter does well in giving attention to the influence of European, national, and regional dimensions of historical experience. However, more attention could be given to the individual experiences, doing a 'bottom-up' history using evidence that gives insights into how the lower social classes experienced this period of history, rather than giving so much attention to the influence of political and national projects, which gives more of an elitist history (it suggests that those at the top were in charge of shaping the lives of those at the bottom, which is not necessarily true)." (BA, history, UK/Netherlands)
"I haven't noticed enough emphasis on the local dimension. Maybe a few words how the changes affected poorer classes could help in really seeing the whole perspective. As a Polish person, I would like to also suggest more emphasis on the Galicia in the Habsburg Empire, as well as generally Poland in this time, since it was split between three countries (1795-1918) and education in all of them looked different. In Galicia, for example, there were many tries to help improve the education, but the decisions generally were influenced by the Habsburg Empire. Also, those parts of Poland, that were then parts if different countries in most cases were forced to keep their education system flawed, because that way it was easier to influence them. It is generally partly mentioned in the conclusion of the second part of the chapter but I would personally like to see this as an example." (BA, history, Poland/UK)

2.3. Formal and practical aspects

The aim of the project was to develop a textbook addressed primarily at undergraduate and bachelor-level students. When considering the practicalities of this project, we had in mind a quite heterogenous group of student readers: typically, our model readerships were Erasmus classes consisting of students from different countries, often including students from disciplines other than history, at different levels of study, and with varying levels of English. We also kept in mind non-European students of European history and culture, who may have limited, if any, knowledge of European history. Next to this basic requirement – to design a textbook for highly diverse readerships and international classrooms – our intention was to produce a truly practical and student-friendly textbook that would be easy to read, easy to navigate through, and linked to other media. The ISPs were therefore precisely focused on testing the applicability and practical aspects of such a text.

The very exercise of reading and subsequently discussing chapters during the ISPs was a highly effective test of many formal textual aspects, including readability, comprehensibility, and ease of

orientation – especially given that students were asked to read the texts in rather short timeframes. Students were asked explicitly about these formal aspects, for instance on the internal structure of the chapter, or the number and type of examples used to support its claims. What had they missed, or what they would suggest otherwise?

Already during the first (online) ISP in Utrecht, students articulated a preference for including further questions that would help readers comprehend the essential points of each chapter and stimulate further reflection on the topic. Further suggestions sought more concrete illustrative examples in the text and the inclusion of quotations from primary sources, as well as visual sources. In subsequent ISPs, students also requested conclusions that would summarize the chapters and highlight major points.

Many reflections concerned structure of the chapters. Students generally appreciated chronological division into early modern (1500-1800), modern (1800-1900) and contemporary (1900-2000) periods, which in their view made the textbook easier to navigate. Some students nevertheless noticed and critically commented upon what they perceived as arbitrary or schematic divisions which, in many chapters, did not match the inner logic of historical development. Thus, the idea behind the practical and isomorphic design of the textbook chapters was undermined by a sense of historical development; it could have benefited from more conventional, well-established, and historically sensitive methods of periodization. However, it may be argued that the schematic division of the textbook allows space for reflection on periodization in itself – which of course could be developed in the class discussions – rather than singly and flatly imposing the perspective of a specific periodization.

In terms of the structuring of topics and themes, there was less agreement on the best principles to work with. Preferences for the thematic division prevailed, but only slightly, with some students preferring chronological or geographical divisions. The question of theory was also met with a diversity of views. Some students regarded theory as indispensable, one arguing that "*the presentation and application of theoretical approaches are unavoidable and should be a prerequisite, even if they are introductory readings*" (ISP3, 3.1.2, MA, Germany). Clearly, for points like this, the diversity of feedback mirrors differences in the organization of history curricula in respective national contexts. As had already become evident during preparatory meetings for the project, some undergraduate curricula require an introduction to theory, method, and historiography, or else to conduct research and work with primary sources, while in other countries these topics and requirements only appear prominently at postgraduate levels. In any case, most students appreciated the inclusion of conceptual elements and at some points wished for further clarifications of certain concepts, such as revolution, rebellion, and heritage.

During the testing of chapter 4.3 in Prague, students were once again asked about some of the formal and practical aspects of the texts. More specifically, they were asked to add any comments (critical, positive, and constructive) on such aspects as:

- *The understandability of the text*
- *Its usefulness as an introduction to the theme*
- *The usefulness of its visual sources*
- *The presence/absence of theory and concepts*
- *The usefulness of concrete examples in the text*
- *The usefulness of the final reading questions*
- *Links between the chapter and extra-class activities (e.g., the museum visit)*

The answers were partly influenced by variations in student preferences and experiences. Some students found the chapter more difficult to read, especially when the theme was new to them, or for those at an early stage of their studies. Differentiated opinions also related to structure (some students preferred country-by-country, for instance), the use of illustrations, or the density of factual information. Some readers were sensitive to differences in style and approach between the subchapters and found this to be a disturbance or incoherence.

In general, though, the chapter was considered to be straightforward in terms of reading and orientation, particularly by virtue of its multi-levelled structure. Still, some suggestions were made on this front: some replies were critical of the introductions, which they found confusing rather than helpful for navigation. Other replies suggested including visual aids, such as timelines and diagrams, or glossaries of terms. Most significantly, several students stated that they would appreciate inclusion of maps to facilitate orientation with the complexities of Europe's highly structured and fast-changing geography. More generally, there was a desire to more effectively connect topics and examples of discussion with a sense of topography.

Most responses praised concrete examples as a tool for illustrating large topics. A couple of replies nevertheless suggested streamlining factual information (e.g., too many names) for sake of clarity on more general issues. Students mostly appreciated inclusion of images and many of them highlighted their functionality (animating the text, concretizing the key points, and so on), though some of them also raised critical remarks, particularly with the selection of images: some they found to be more decorative than insightful, or in others cases students would have preferred other visuals like graphs.

Responses strongly agreed on the usefulness of the reading questions, which helped students summarize the main points and initiate their own reflections on the theme. As one student put it, "*The final reading questions are a point that I especially like, because it forces the person who is reading the text to formulate own questions about it*." (BA, history, Spain).

Only a few respondents commented on the textbook's connections with their museum visit or, more generally, on connections with other historical sites that could be found in the local context in which the class was taking place. In general, they saw connection as a potentially enriching and animative strategy.

2.4. Impacts

During ISPs, many students expressed positive experiences, pointing to new and broader perspectives on the history of Europe, and generally endorsed the project and its major objective—to provide a new and multiperspective textbook—as highly desirable. To be sure, the view of students who participated in ISPs was partly influenced by their high motivations to take part in the project's activities. For that reason, survey testing in Prague was used to arrive at a more precise understanding of the project's reception and impact.

Quote Box 9: Students' comments on personal impact during IPS testing
"So, all in all, the reading of the text opened for me a new perspective on the economic history of European companies. Now, I do understand why it could also be interesting to know, for example, how these companies worked back in time to be able to compare them with nowadays companies – so that is why I find the last discussion question "In which ways does the early modern period still shape the European economy today" is very accurate to ask. The answer is very broad, could not be found in the text, but the text provides thoughts to what we potentially could learn from that for today. Consequently, I would even go further and ask how the early modern European markets and companies differs to rest of the world's market today." (ISP3, 5.1.1, MA, Germany)

During the Prague testing of the chapter on *Education and Knowledge Transfer*, the question of the chapter's impact was examined through the posing of the following sub-questions:

- Has reading the chapter and the discussion changed your view about the topic?
- Has it challenged your previous understandings?

- Has it challenged the ways you thought about it in your home high school or university education?
- Has reading the chapter and discussion stimulated further interest in the topic?
- Has it motivated you to explore further?

As some of the answers made clear, two extra-textual factors influenced replies to this point: a) the level of initial knowledge on the topic, which ranged from “none at all” to “already learned about this topic”, and b) varying levels of interest in the topic (some students admitted low interest). In the case of little knowledge, students typically saw major impact in having been provided with new information, or being exposed to new themes. Students with high knowledge and/or low interest in the topic declared low impact, though some of them acknowledged drawbacks of the chapter. Some viewed the reading questions as encouragement to reflect more on the topic or the ways it can be approached.

The positive replies often stated that reading the chapter helped them look at history from a more general perspective, getting beyond Western-centric narratives of Europe. Responses suggested that readers gained a broader view of the topic, seeing European history from a different, namely European, angle. In a similar vein, some students admitted the chapter made them see their own (national) history in a broader (comparative) perspective and thus helped them to better understand its particular traits. Others noted that the chapter drew attention to transnational links (e.g. interconnectedness of educational system). Some students expressed support for the book because of its diversity of points of view, which they felt was lacking at home. As one French student stated: *“However, I can say that I really appreciated the fact that the chapter has multiple European perspectives and we do not really have this diversity of point of views in French history manuals.”* (BA, philosophy and social sciences, BA). Others professed new understandings of variability in Europe’s history: “*My understanding was challenged because I was not aware of the variability of Europe’s history on knowledge and education*.” (BA, psychology, Canada).

Some replies indicated that the chapter drew attention to the preconditions and historical background of contemporary education, revealing hitherto unconsidered or ignored factors such as the role of states in shaping curricula and transmitting knowledge: *“It did challenge the way I thought about university education as I realized how much the state is involved in determining my education, which can be problematic. I also realized the influence of ideas such as rationalism and Enlightenment-era reasoning on how I think about learning today.*” (BA, history, Netherlands/UK). One reply also pointed out meta-level of stimulation reflection over the teaching of history: "*It has made me think about how history about Europe is taught in Europe*." (MA, philosophy, UK).

Two answers voiced support for the textbook with regard to its possible political impact, namely, serving as a tool that overcomes nationalistic accounts of history and thus helps facilitate better understanding among the nations in Europe: as one student wrote: "*I highly support the textbook, as I criticize that history lessons in school are limited to German, British and American history and some parts of French history (…) And I think this textbook supports the understanding of other nations and broadens the horizon. I really support that, because that's the only way for a peaceful future*." (BA, political science, Germany).

3. Recommendations and Teacher Guides

This part summarizes recommendations and best practices drawn from the testing of the handbook. It further provides practical hints on how to work effectively with other teaching materials produced in the project TEH21. Finally, it suggests a range of innovative techniques and tools that can be applied to enhance use of the TEH21 teaching materials and offers a few examples of class templates specified for selected chapters of the TEH21 handbook.

3.1. Recommendations

This section suggests a few strategies that were drawn from the experience during ISPs and from the replies in reports and questionnaires, that were discussed in depth in chapter 2. It is important to reiterate that the TEH21 handbook was not intended as a comprehensive summation of knowledge. Rather, it was intended as an introductory and open-ended text that should serve to promote critical discussions and (self)reflective learning process, to help develop academic and pedagogical skills for aspiring historians and history teachers, and to serve as a tool for history teachers aiming to either design multiperspective classes or just seeking a practical, easy-to-use textbook for the international and highly diverse classrooms, such as Erasmus or study-abroad classes. As such, the handbook is considered merely a part of more complex teaching process, and as subject to multiple creative uses beyond a simple read-and-learn approach. Furthermore, as testing has convincingly shown, critical debates with students about chapters can pioneer a novel form of education through reading and discussion, relying on the principle of reciprocity and more equal relations between teachers and students, and helping to foster—and in turn facilitate—a sense of co-creation in the teaching process and teaching materials.

Adapting the use of the handbook to your course / classroom:

The handbook can be applied systematically as a comprehensive textbook (for instance for major and introductory courses such as Modern History of Europe or Contemporary European History), or more selectively for thematically oriented courses, such as Social History or Economic History, History of European Identity, etc. The book was structured to enable the possibility of using individual chapters and combining them in whatever way deemed desirable in particular contexts, rather than requiring

the students to read the content from start to finish. Depending on the course or classroom at hand, it is thus possible to:

a) read thematic chapters in chronological order. For example, by reading about Interethnic Relations in Early Modern History (2.2.1), in Modern History (2.2.2), and in Contemporary History (2.2.3). This approach would allow students to develop a deep understanding of a specific aspect of European History (in the case of the example, Interethnic Relations) across time and throughout the continent.

b) identify a macro-topic and carry out a deep dive on the different aspects of this topic in a given time period. For example, if the macro-topic identified is Society, and the selected time period is Modern History, a deep dive would look at Demographic Change, Interethnic Relations, Household and Family, and Inequalities in Modern History (2.1.2, 2.2.2, 2.3.2, 2.4.2). This approach is beneficial to major introductory courses, for example of the Modern History of Europe, but also to complementary courses such as Economic History (using Unit 5) or (inter)Cultural History courses (with Units 3 or 6, for example).

c) select one of the seven thematic units and read it in its entirety. This would support students and lecturers in developing specialized knowledge of the different aspects of the selected theme, and of their development from 1500 to 2000.

d) read any chapter as a stand-alone text. This is especially appropriate as an introduction to a new topic, or as support for student-led research.

e) create thematic clusters of chapters (e.g. Empire and Colonialism—Labor and Forced Labour—Social Movements) or trace a particular topic (e.g. Slavery and Abolitionism) across the chapters. Also in this case, the approach is suited to the introduction of a new topic, to support student-led research, or to dedicated complementary courses such as Economic History or Global History.

f) use a chapter in ad hoc contexts. For example, in the context of the ongoing climate strikes at universities, students in a historical class can be asked to read and discuss the chapter “Understanding and Controlling the Environment”. This would help students root current events in history, developing meaningful connections between past and present.

In addition, the handbook is designed to be used before, after, or during a specific lecture/course.

- When used before, for example by asking students to read a selection of chapters, the content of the handbook becomes a powerful tool to promote classroom discussion and exchange.

- When used during, for example by skimming a chapter in plenary or divided in groups, it can support the lecture with examples that, as highlighted by several students in the reports, would not normally be presented or analysed.
- When used after, for example as a resource for student-led research or as a follow-up reading, it can help students self-assess their understanding of a specific topic, identifying gaps that still need to be filled.

Questioning the chapters and their multiperspective approach:

The questions used as feedback tools during IPSs and classes turned out to be highly effective and stimulating ways of encouraging students to take a deep dive into the chapters at hand, followed by meaningful discussions. Discussions can be focused on the limits (and strengths) of each chapter's aspirations towards multiperspectivity. By focusing discussions on multiperspectivity, students will develop their own understanding of the concept, as well as an awareness of its complexity, layers, and other relevant aspects.

Lecturers and educators can spark discussions on multiperspectivity through the use of one of the following questions or activities:

- In your opinion, does this chapter provide a multiperspective view of European history? Please, explain how.

  By answering this question, students will reflect on their own definition of multiperspectivity, and look for examples that (do not) fit this example in the text. If time allows, as a follow-up activity the classroom in plenary could discuss the different definitions of multiperspectivity, with the ultimate aim of creating a communal definition. With the discussion, and the examples identified in the text, students' own approaches to multiperspectivity will be challenged and enriched.
- How would you read the chapter from, e.g., French perspective? Now, imagine that you are, e.g., a Swedish/Italian/Polish reader: How does the chapter resonate with you in this case?

  (When using this question, please make sure that you ask students to take perspectives different from their own. Ideally, you could use also the perspective of national minorities, such as Albanian people in Italy or German people in Romania).

  By putting themselves in the shoes of different readers, students will exercise their knowledge of the history of different people, and understand how perspectives and narratives are created. Also in this case, if time allows students could be led in a discussion of

their answers and approaches (for example, by asking them “how did you approach this question”, or even the simpler “why”).

- Finally, students could be asked to identify examples that are not presented in the text, to research them, and to present them to the group in a follow-up lecture / meeting. This activity is suitable not only for students at university level, but also for students at the last years of secondary school, who are often required to formulate research questions and research primary and secondary sources as part of their history exams. This strategy falls into the meta-textual reading, which is explored below.

Adopting the author’s perspective with a meta-textual reading

Meta-textual readings can be carried out:

- to encourage students to think about the construction of the chapters, how they are structured, whether more or less theory should be included, whether more or less details should be used, etc.

- to develop writing skills, help students recognize the limits of any textbook, think of alternative approaches etc.

There are several potential approaches to meta-textual readings. A first approach could be to ask students to analyse the taxonomy of the selected chapter(s). To do this, students can be divided in groups and asked to identify the most frequently used terms in the chapter(s) at hand, and to reason why they think these words are most used, what is the meaning the authors give to these words, and whether they would have added any other key words. After each group has presented their analysis, students as a plenary discuss their findings.

A second approach could be to identify, instead than the most used terms and their definition, the countries or regions that are referred most frequently in the chapter(s) at hand. In this case, students can then be led in a discussion on the following questions:

- Why (do you think) these countries/regions feature prominently in this chapter?
- What countries/regions do you think could have been added?

After having discussed the questions, students could be asked to research the countries they identified as missing, and to write short paragraphs to complement the text.

Reading from the perspective of spatial frameworks

As stated in chapter 2.2.2, the handbook examines the manifold geographies of Europe. The teachers should be aware of these variations, as well as the many reasons why such diverse geographies may appear, while making it a theme for further exploration, and a point of reflection. If used for class exercises, the diversity can help

- stimulate reflection about multiple meanings and visions of Europe, when seen from different (national) perspectives, as well as their change over time,

- understand the role of value-laden meta-geographies in structuring our perception of the continent and discuss the relevance, meanings and durability of major cleavages (East/South, North/West),

- foster practical skills, such as what spatial frameworks historians should use for framing research and narratives, how to work flexibly with space, and how to spatially frame transnational phenomena.

One of the exercises might be to ask students to read a particular chapter through the perspective of applied spatial frameworks, and answer questions, such as:

- How does the chapter structure Europe? (Does it use macro-regions? Empires and states? Or large divisions, such as East/West or North/South?)
- What are the explicit or implicit borders of the continent? (E.g., is Russia, Ottoman Empire, Northern/Mediterranean Africa, and overseas spaces conceived as part of European history?)
- Which spatial scales does the chapter address and which ones feature prominently? (From local to global)

Subsequently, students may discuss advantages and limits of the approach adopted in the chapter, such as whether it help conveys balanced or biased view of European history, or whether it helps understand the theme in its geographical complexity and variability, what might have been overt and covert reasons for such structuring, and what alternatives they would suggest.

Another possibility might be to have students read and compare several chapters and ask them to follow differences in adopted spatial divisions. Two variations can be followed: a) take one theme and trace spatial frameworks in different time periods. This would help students reflect over shifts in relevance of various divisions in the past and ponder on the (dis)advantages of various spatial structuring for respective periods; b) trace spatial frameworks in different thematic chapters within the same time period. This would make students think about relations between themes and spatial frameworks, such as how much particular themes prompt adopting a particular spatial division of Europe, or what spatial framework would work best for the given theme.

Other options might include, for instance, drawing mental maps of the chapter: Groups of students would underline or write down all places and geographical concepts and units mentioned in selected chapters and subsequently pin them down to a blind map of Europe. The comparison of maps would then serve for further debate of varying geographies and (un)balanced geographical scopes.

Transversal reading and interconnections across the handbook

One task might consist of asking students to look for a particular theme in other chapters beyond the one specifically devoted to the topic: for instance, besides chapter 3.1 (State Building and Nationalism), the topics of nation, nationalism and national identity features in many other chapters of the handbook (e.g. 2.2 Interethnic Relations; 7.3 Sports and Leisure; 7.4 Heritage and Memory). Some topics, such as cities and urbanization, are not the main subject to any specific chapter, but they appear across the handbook. Alternatively, students may be asked to trace a particular place (e.g. Paris, Prague), a person (e.g. Comenius, Napoleon), an event (e.g. the French Revolution, the Munich Agreement), or a concept (e.g. slavery, memory, citizenship, gender) across the handbook. Students can make use of index in the handbook or full-text searching function in the electronic reader for effective accomplishment of this task. During class debates, students can also be asked questions, such as, in which other chapters of the handbook a particular theme, such as 'environment' or 'borders', could be included as well, why and in what ways.

The added value of this exercise consists in training students' sensitivity to cross-sectional nature of history and to connections across different domains of history (social history, economic history etc.). Also, students are encouraged to think about relative importance of certain phenomena as formative in many domains of historical experience in particular periods (for instance, nationalism as formative factor that affected many domains from politics to popular culture). The reflection on appearance of a particular theme, place or event in different contexts, helps develop a sense of multidimensionality of historical phenomena.

Valuing diversity in the classroom

As mentioned above, the handbook was developed with Erasmus courses or English-language courses with international attendance in mind. For this reason, one of the strategies that could be used when approaching the text is to engage with the diversity of the classroom, taking advantage of it for the advancement of the group's knowledge and understanding.

For example, students with different (cultural/ethnic/national/religious) background could be asked to respond to the text with examples from their own experience, or to share how they read and interpret the text (following the questions listed above in the multiperspectivity strategies) with the group. In this case, however, it is important not to single out students with a different background, but to encompass their experience and sharing in the wider classroom context, for example asking more than one person to share.

3.2. Engaging with other results of the Teaching European History in the 21st Century project

In addition to the Handbook discussed above, the project Teaching European History in the 21st Century delivered several other results that can be used by lectures and educators. These are:

1. A series of 29 Video Lectures available free of charge on a dedicated YouTube playlist. Each lecture introduces a chapter of the Handbook, diving into a given topic (for example, Empire and Colonialism) in Early Modern, Modern, and Contemporary History.
2. A series of 7 Source Collections (one dedicated to each Handbook unit), gathering visual primary sources that can be used to enrich the learning experience or to develop dedicated lesson plans and educational activities.
3. A series of 29 Narratives, one dedicated to each Handbook chapter, which merge the text of the handbook with the content of the source collections, delivering digital versions of the Handbook chapters that are interactive and visually stimulating.

The Source Collections and the Narratives are available, free of charge, on the eLearning Platform Historiana[15].

Using the Historiana Source Collections in your practice

The components of a Source Collection: All Source Collections on Historiana feature three main components:

1. A thumbnail picture, which is a primary source that features in the collection and that is representative of the theme.

[15] A table of contents, gathering together all the results on Historiana, is available at this link: https://euroclio.eu/wp-content/uploads/The-European-Experience.-A-Multi-Perspective-History-of-Modern-Europe-1500-2000.pdf.

2. A description of the collection, highlighting what can be found in it, how it can be used for teaching, and where it is possible to find additional resources.
3. Visual primary sources, each presented with a title and contextual information.

Source Collections on Historiana feature in the Historical Content portion of the platform. The Source Collections developed within the Teaching European History in the 21st Century Project are all identified by the title "The European Experience". In addition, direct links to the Source Collections are available in the Table of Contents, by clicking on the picture next to the title of each unit.

The Source Collections can be used in several ways. First and foremost, they are a repository of copyright-cleared primary sources that can be used by educators to enrich their teaching experience. Each source's description indicates the location of the original image, which can then be downloaded and used as the educator pleases. All educators who wish to do so can also create their own Historiana account, and use the Source Collections in the eActivity Builder (see below for more information) to create their own eLearning Activities.

In addition, the following activities can also be carried out to use the Source Collections on The European Experience in educational contexts:

- Creation of a two-dimensional timeline. The creation of a two-dimensional timeline asks students to assess the impacts of events on a timeline of European History. By during this, students will develop an understanding of how narratives are created and influenced by personal perspectives: each historian chooses which elements to add to a timeline, what relevance they have, and how to connect them to each other. To carry out this activity:
    - Educators select a theme, and then a series of sources from the dedicated source collection (for example, the development of Europe's relations with the rest of the world, depicted in the Source Collection on Power and Citizenship). We recommend to select around 10 sources that represent how the selected theme evolved in European history.
    - Students are then given the sources (either as printouts or digitally in a dedicated eLearning Activity[16]), as well as three "bonuses". They are asked, individually, to put the events represented by the sources on a two-dimensional timeline: from left to right, they will put the events in chronological order, and they will put each event at a different height depending on how relevant they deem it to be. They can use only a

[16] At this link: http://hi.st/M3 you can find an example of an eLearning Activity where students create a multi-dimensional timeline on European Integration.

total of 10 events, so they can choose if they want to use the 10 events that were provided by the educator, or some of these plus one of their three bonuses, with which they can add new events to the timeline.

  - Each student presents their timeline, highlighting why they chose specific events, and how they evaluated their relevance.
  - Finally, a group discussion ensues on what this exercise tells us about how each of us makes sense of the past, and what the impact of our own experiences is on our approach to historical events.
  - If many students made use of their bonuses, the discussion can be further moved on to discussing why new events were added, and what perspectives do these events represent, thus touching also on the topic of multiperspectivity in history and in the Handbook (since the Source Collections make reference to the content of the Handbook).

- Source analysis. Several sources of the collection consist of paintings or etchings, where symbolic value is attributed to various elements of the image. Students can be asked to analyse the sources, identifying the symbols and reflecting on their meaning. For example, the Source Collection on Cultural Encounters features two paintings: the Batavians defeating the Romans at the Rhine, and the Batavians defeating the Romans at Vetera. By analysing these paintings (ideally, after having read the dedicated part in chapter 7.4) students can reflect on the use of historical analogies and symbolism, by answering questions: for example— "what do these paintings tell us about the Dutch revolt of the XVII century?" .
- For teacher trainees: creation of an eLearning activity. Finally, teacher trainees can be asked to formulate a question on a selected topic (for example, on Social Engineering and Welfare) and to use the Source Collection on Knowledge to select a series of sources that can be used within a secondary school classroom. Then, they could be directed to the eActivity Builder (see below) to create their own lesson plan. In this way, they could experiment with the creation of educational content using sources that are copyright cleared and ready-to-use.

Using the Narratives in your practice

Each chapter of the Handbook has been made available on Historiana in a dedicated Historiana Narrative, which presents the chapter and a series of visual sources that enrich the reading experience. Each Narrative consists of three parts:

- a landing page, where the chapter is connected with the Handbook Unit that it is a part of. For example, the landing page of Empire and Colonialism makes reference to the narratives on “State-building and Nationalism”, “Revolutions and Civil Wars”, "Peace and Conflicts" and “Protests and Social Movements”, which compose Unit 3 on Power and Citizenship.
- A summary page, where the content of each sub-chapters, dedicated respectively to Early Modern, Modern, and Contemporary History, is summarized.
- A read portion, where students can read the chapter and view the dedicated sources. Across the read portion suggested readings and discussion questions are also featured.

The Narratives can be used to help students engage with the content of the Handbook by providing an intuitive and visually appealing reading experience. Thanks to the interactive index visible on the left-hand side of the read page, students can jump to the part of text that they wish to read. This allows them, for example, to first read the discussion questions, and subsequently to identify the paragraph where the answer is more likely to feature and start their read from there. This approach will help students develop their analytical reading.

Additional activities that can be done when engaging with the narrative are:

- Questioning the narrative at hand and its multiperspective approach by using the questions and methodologies listed above in the recommendations;
- Adopting the author’s perspective with a meta-textual reading, following the approach delineated in the recommendations above;
- Developing their own Narrative, by selecting a topic and identifying the parts of the Handbook (as a whole) that would add to it. This can be done by creating a “my Historiana” account, clicking on the “create a new Narrative”, and then following the guided creation procedure. Text from various parts of the Handbook can be added to students’ own narratives, or they can be asked to develop their own text as well. By doing this, students will practice the work of the historiographer, and engage in a rewarding creative process.

The Historiana eActivity Builder

The Historiana eActivity Builder is an interactive creative tool that educators can use to create their own digital learning activities, that can then be shared with students to prompt them to interact with primary sources in the digital environment.

It consists of several building blocks, that can be dragged and dropped into the eLearning Activity to add/remove steps to a given activity. Each building block fosters specific historical thinking skills in students, including analysing visual and written sources, comparing and contrasting primary sources, sorting sources according to different criteria, and answering questions.

EuroClio has created a series of video-tutorials on how to use the eActivity Builder, which can be found in a dedicated YouTube playlist. For more information, including on the upcoming Historiana trainings, you can always reach out to EuroClio at secretariat@euroclio.eu!

3.3. Teacher guide: practical implementation of the materials – techniques, tools & templates

3.3.1 Introduction and theory

One could argue that the increased presence of technology in our society has created an information society wherein access to all sorts of information and information systems is a given. Technology is advancing rapidly and is gradually taking over or supporting human tasks. According to Levy & Mundane (2006), this does not mean that information exchanges become a more important part of (future) jobs in a general sense, but instead that a specific understanding of information is required. These specific skills are often referred to as 21st century skills. The European Commission (2002) even states that all European citizens should be given the opportunity to acquire "key skills", also referred to as "lifelong learning competences" (OECD, 2004). In that line of thought, it is implied that the educational systems should stimulate its learners to develop competences which are needed in the 21st century. Anderson (2008) argues that this list of required skills focuses mostly on conceptual and meta-cognitive skills. In that way, future workers of the knowledge society are better prepared for jobs that do not yet exist. These skills, listed below, are also referred to as "key skills" or "lifelong learning competencies" (European Commission, 2002):

1. Knowledge construction
2. Adaptability
3. Finding, organizing, and retrieving information
4. Information management
5. Critical thinking skills
6. Teamwork

In addition to these 21st century skills mentioned by Anderson (2008), Trilling & Fadel (2009) have created a list of 21st century sub-skills that focus on the specific content of future skill requirements. The summary of Trilling & Fadel's (2009) 21st century skills is provided in the table below.

Table 3: 21st Century Skills (Trilling & Fadel, 2009)

Critical learning skills & innovation	Critical thinking and problem solving	Expert thinking (remember, understand, apply, analyse, evaluate, and create)
	Communication and collaboration	Complex communicating
	Creativity and innovation	Applied imagination and invention
Digital literacy skills	Information literacy	1. Access information efficiently and effectively 2. Evaluate information critically and competently 3. Use information accurately and creatively
	Media literacy	1. Delivering & crafting a message in a particular medium 2. Knowledge about who the media impacts its audience
	Information and communication technology literacy	Applying ICT tools effectively to advance learning
Life and Career Skills	Flexibility and adaptability	
	Initiative and self-direction	
	Social and cross-cultural interaction	
	Productivity and accountability	Defining, planning, executing, and evaluating projects
	Leadership and responsibility	

The definitions of both Anderson (2008) and Trilling & Fadel (2009) are mere examples of attempts to concretize the framework of 21st century skills. Voogt & Roblin (2009) have compared the most prevailing frameworks and conclude that the similarities between the most common frameworks from Trier (2002), Dede (2010) and Anderson (2008) focus on the need for skills regarding communication, collaboration, ICT literacy and/or cultural awareness (Voogt & Roblin, 2009). Moreover, the authors indicate that creativity, problem solving, critical thinking contribute to developing relevant and high-quality products are evenly important in most frameworks.

Apart from the comparison of different studies, Voogt & Roblin (2008) provide the reader with several recommendations. When integrating these 21st century skills, Voogt (2008) emphasizes that the (new) pedagogical approaches should include a variety of learning activities. This enables all students to learn at their own pace, it encourages collaborative (team)work, addresses problem solving skills and ideally also increases student involvement in assessment. Bransford, Brown & Cocking (2000) add to the recommendations that leaner centred forms of instructions are more beneficial to students and, moreover, integrate 21st century skills: within this approach, students are expected to strongly determine their own learning processes and therefore are assumed to be more actively involved. This, however, changes the traditional student/teacher roles and responsibilities and requires different teaching strategies.

According to Gauge (2009, EU) the integration of 21st century skills is best supported by specific pedagogical techniques being activities focused on problem-based, cooperative, experiential learning and formative assessment. Moreover, most frameworks also emphasize the need for comprehensive use of technology to enhance student learning and 21st century skills (Voogt & Roblin, 2008).

Relevance

The information society not only requires its citizens to foster certain (lifelong) skills, it also requires the implicit use of them in formal and informal settings. Various authors, such as Voogt (2008) and Voogt & Roblin (2008) have empahised the need of pedagogical integration of those skills, but it would be a misconception to think those skills are only needed after one's education. This makes the teaching of these 21st century skills just as essential as the actual implementation of those skills. The number of papers written on the assessment of 21st century skills illustrate the difficulty of pinpointing the 'correct' use of said skills.

This project focuses on multiperspectivity and the teaching aspects of history. We see the implementation of 21st century skills as contributing to the development of new pedagogies, inspiring

teachers to make use of techniques and technologies that better prepare their students for their future careers and as an opportunity for students to practice and refine their skills where teachers modify and evaluate their skills on a continuous, formative basis.

As an integral part of our project is offering multiple perspectives (on teaching) European history (in the 21st century), we would be remiss to not include a comprehensive guide on how to integrate these 21st century skills and to help students learn how to navigate through different (cultural) backgrounds, histories, perspectives, and visions on history. A multiperspective view on history lends itself to integrating 21st century skills such as problem-based learning, teamwork, critical thinking skills, adaptability and finding, retrieving interpreting, and organizing new information.

It is also our intention to equip and inspire teachers with ways to incorporate new technologies and 21st century skills. For that purpose, we have included templates in this guide for teachers. Students are given a more active role in their own learning processes and thus are given more autonomy in their learning experiences. Through collaborative work they complete information gaps. This way of teaching encourages students not only to be more active, but also more critical, and it attempts to equalize the differences in (educational, cultural, national) backgrounds.

Method and usability

The lesson templates in this teacher guide integrate 21st century skills through free online collaborative software. Input was gathered from the teaching of stand-alone chapters in several university lecturers in different classrooms across the projects' partner countries (Spain, France, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Germany, and the Netherlands). From these experiences, conclusions were drawn and teaching recommendations were formulated, addressing how to best work with the materials and to navigate differences in student knowledge and backgrounds. Additionally, students who participated in the projects' International Study Programs (ISPs), also wrote critical reflection essays about the materials, and provided the project with recommendations of how to use these materials. These recommendations are incorporated in the lesson templates so that the strengths and weaknesses of the materials in combination with the actual (European classroom) setting are best addressed.

The tools and templates included in the next section provide teachers with concrete ideas on how to use the different materials in class and how to integrate 21st century skills. Each of the templates can be adapted to better fit the setting.

3.3.2 Techniques and Tools

Below a list of techniques and free teaching tools are provided. An introduction is provided for each tool to summarize its potential in relation to the 21st century skills. Also, some key pedagogical concepts that can be used in combination with the different materials are briefly explained.

Flipping the classroom (O2, O3)

A flipped classroom is a classroom wherein the classical homework tasks are reversed relative to traditional, full class instruction. In this arrangement, the instruction is done as homework, and the homework is done under supervision in class. This ensures a more effective use of teacher-student time. By assigning the instruction as homework, students can be more active in class (working together, discussing, and doing assignments together) and the teacher has more time to explain, differentiate, reteach and guide (individual) students. In general, flipping the classroom, takes place over four different stages.

1. Introducing a new topic (together, in class).
2. Assigning the instruction as homework (individual, at home).
3. Autonomous content exploration (individual, at home).
4. Group consolidation (together, in class).

Tools: Showme (whiteboard explainer + voice), Edpuzzle (adding questions to a video), Playposit (creating video's together), Screencast-o-matic (recording screen + voice).

Differentiation within differentiation

De Koning (1973) states that there are three levels of differentiation within education: macro, meso, and micro differentiation. It refers to the way teachers address differences between students in the same class. According to De Koning (1973), dividing the students into groups of similar levels, progress and/or time the students spend on tasks for certain exercises are common forms of this type of differentiation.

In context where student populations are more culturally and ethnically diverse, Tomlinson et al. (2003) describe micro differentiation as an approach to education where teachers proactively adapt the learning contents, tools, activities, and student products so that they meet the diverse learning

needs of individual (or small groups of) students with the goal of extending the learning opportunities in the classroom.

Differentiation is often discussed with regards to two different perspectives: convergent differentiation, and divergent differentiation (Bosker, 2005). Convergent differentiation is characterized by its focus similar learning goals (for all students) and by supporting the individual learner optimally. This means that time and guidance given learners differs. Divergent differentiation, on the contrary, is characterized by its focus on providing the optimal climate for each individual student to fully develop their talents. This also means that each student has different learning goals.

Tools: canva.com (creating group posters), screencast-o-matic (creating a group explainer).

Engaging in critical thinking

Teachers can help students improve their critical thinking skills, by working on the sub-skills of critical thinking (see below). In this way students are made aware of the process and learn it to be an essential part of learning and giving or receiving feedback. By explaining steps of the critical thinking process, students also learn how to communicate and deal with problems or differences in the classroom, groupwork or overall perspectives.

1. *Observe:* Observe a situation.
2. *Analyse*: Identify a problem or issue in this specific situation.
3. *Infer:* Think of why this problem/situation can exist and think of a possible solution.
4. *Communicate:* Communicate your findings.
5. *Problem solving:* Develop and test possible solutions.

Critical thinking is not only a 21st century skill: it also contributes to other 21st century skills such as self-reflection and problem-solving. It contributes to better decision-making and it helps students to develop well-informed opinions.

Blended learning

By using blended learning techniques, teachers combine on- and offline learning strategies to reach their specific learning goals. According to Oliver & Trigwell (2005) the essence of blended learning lies in the combination of traditional and online education. Regardless of the use of technology, it is further

characterized by the combination of different didactic strategies (different learning styles, tempi and processes).

EdPuzzle.com

EdPuzzle is a tool which allows for the embedding of questions in (existing) videos. It increases student engagement as students are impelled to reflect or think critically about the information, they are processing. There are several different question formats and each provides teachers with instant feedback on the learning processes of their students. The EdPuzzle format is thus a very comprehensive tool for teachers to use. By adding, (for example) diagnostic questions, misconceptions can be addressed early on. For more advanced users, there also is the option of (screen)recording your own lectures, or -of course- integrating the TEH21-video lectures. EdPuzzle can be used for flipping the classroom.

Bookwidgets.com

Bookwidgets is a paid subscription but does offer some interesting options to foster 21st century skills. Teachers can track student answers and have a question bank at their disposal. Video, audio, and different file types can be integrated. An example of a webquest, made by the TEH21-team, can be found here. Using a tool via Bookwidgets is a safe way for students to share or explore ideas as a flipping activity, which they can later reflect on and discuss in class.

Flipgrid

Flipgrid is a tool which allows its users to share video content on a big wall. It allows learners to watch videos from their peers, discuss, and learn together. The teacher creates a board which is only accessible for specific learners via a code. Students can, for example, be assigned to do a deep or shallow dive into certain parts of the material (events, background of a key figure, explaining key concepts). By combining all materials from all students, the information becomes clearer and presented at the level of the students' understanding.

Linoit

Linoit, like Padlet and Flipgrid, is an online wall which allows students to share different types of content. Characterized by a post-it note style, students can post, interact, and comment on videos, text messages and photos. Linoit can serve as a quick test of background knowledge where students

present what they associate with a particular topic online. Alternatively, questions can be posted for other students to answer. This way, assessing knowledge and peer-learning can be accomplished in a smooth, easy way.

Mentimeter.com

Menti.com is a free tool which allows a presenter to gather responses from their audience. It serves as a great conversation/discussion starter, thought exercise or as a method of concluding a topic by offering a variety of different questions to be filled in. Examples include multiple choice questions, word clouds, scale and ranking questions, Q&A, and open-ended questions. By pre-teaching some materials or by flipping the classroom, Mentimeter can also serve as a deep dive or discussion starter. Another option is integrating the reflection questions at the end of each subchapter in Mentimeter.

Padlet

Padlet is a collaborative tool which allows students to add their comments, information or multimedia to a wall, timeline, discussion board, world map or blog-overview. This tool lends itself to a comprehensive collection of data, perspectives or an overview. It can be used as an exploration of perspectives on a certain topic and or can be used to summarize the students' knowledge.

Peardeck

Peardeck can be integrated into Teams or PowerPoint and allows teachers to make presentations more interactive. Teachers can formatively check if students understand the topics and students are challenged to be more actively involved and critically assess their understanding of the content.

Powtoon

Powtoon used to be a tool which was created for making short informative animations. Although it still has that feature, it now also includes the option of creating presentations and doing screen recordings. Powtoon allows presentations and information to be shared and thus is very easily used in assignments in which students summarize, reflect, or present new information. By asking students to retrieve, organize, analyse and processing information digitally, some essential 21st century skills are addressed.

Web Hypothesis

Web Hypothesis is a more complex tool which allows users to annotate in digital texts. Teachers can see annotations made by students who, add context, comments, and questions to the reading. Group annotation and thus reflection and peer-learning are possible. A text from the handbook can be used as a possible starting point. Students add their own national perspectives, questions, or remarks which can then be discussed in class.

Whiteboard.fi

This tool allows teachers to assign digital whiteboards for students. Students can write, copy, paste and select ideas on their whiteboards while the teacher can monitor them all. This can be great for keeping track of discussions, mind maps, ideas and thinking processes and helping students work on topics in groups. When showing all whiteboards on the instruction screen, asking students to explain an idea or line of thought from a different group, helps mutual understanding and stimulates social or cross-cultural communication.

Wordwall

Wordwall offers a range of different activity templates that can be used in class. Students can mix and match key concepts, do a quiz, or sort items into the correct group. An advantage of this app is that students, as part of a flipping the classroom strategy, can also create activities for their peers.

3.3.3 Templates

Each of the templates can be adapted to a specific (sub)chapter and include basic information about the specific skill aimed at, the tools that are used, the complexity, pedagogical arrangements (time, pedagogical, didactic requirements). On the bottom, the remarks section allows for teachers to fill in information about their class complexity. This may help to foresee some issues that arise when student have different (educational) backgrounds. In other words: when the class is rather heterogeneous, students may have divergent knowledge about the same topic, taught in different ways and may therefore also have different ideas that come forth from those different backgrounds. Some tools offered in the previous section lend themselves a bit better to particular situations, so please do not hesitate to choose different tools for the same objectives and goals.

At the top of the template, (second row) a note on (teacher) preparation is given. For certain tools, an account or exercise needs to be created beforehand. Below, a rough sketch of the lesson(s) is provided. Most topics need a preparatory introduction phase after which the discussion and consolidation phases take place. This can be done in one session but depending on the time available and level of (background knowledge of) the students, can also be spread over different days. The examples per template will also appear in this section.

Template 1:

<table>
<tr><td>Subchapter:
‘State-Nation’ §3.1.1 (example)

Remark: Analytically written, suited for in-depth debate</td><td>21st century skill:
Finding, organizing, retrieving information, critical thinking, adaptability.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Step 1: Preparation/Introduction
Create a Padlet wall of Linoit and think about the type of wall you want to create (timeline, world map, overview of information in this chapter, discussion board). As the chapter in this example is analytical and lends itself to discussion, you might want to aim for a type of set up where students can interact (discussion board).

Step 2: Teaching/assigning
Students read the chapter at home and work in the Padlet or Linoit as a preparation for class. Assign, for example, a critical piece on the state-nation discussion.

Step 3: Teaching/discussing
Let students read their peers’ input. Organize an in-depth class discussion on the students’ input. Try to steer the discussion towards different cultural and knowledge background and navigate students towards understanding different histories.

Step 4: Pre-/post-teaching (differentiation)
Use the O2 video lectures for a more complete contextualization and discussion (pre-teaching) or insert questions via EdPuzzle to evaluate the students’ understanding and retention of topics and themes discussed in class.</td><td>Tools: Padlet/Linoit/EdPuzzle</td></tr>
<tr><td>Pedagogy/didactics: Flipping the classroom using O1 chapter, O2 video lecture for differentiation</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Remarks: -</td></tr>
</table>

Template 2:

<table>
<tr><td>Subchapter:
‘Revolutions and civil wars’ §3.1.2 (example)

Remark: Presented as a narrative, most likely some material unfamiliar to students.</td><td>21st century skills:
Finding, organizing, retrieving information, digital literacy, critical thinking, creativity.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Step 1: Preparation/Introduction
Introduce the chapter and the possible difficulties students might encounter. Divide the class into groups and monitor group work. Either let students start in class or at home so that some valuable class time can also be spent on analysing, discussing, framing, and addressing misconceptions.

Option 1: Use PowToon to make informative animations about protagonists.

Option 2: Use Padlet as a timeline where students add background information about protagonists, countries, and more.
Option 3: Use Flipgrid to make short information clips.

Option 4: Use O2 video lectures as a basis for groupwork.

Step 2: Teaching/ assigning
Assign a different part of the chapter to a group of students.

Option PowToon: Students create a short animation in PowToon based on the information that was unknown or difficult to understand in their part of the text. They focus on contextualization and multiperspectivity.

Option Padlet: Students add background material related to unknown or difficult information to help contextualize the chapter. They group this information on a timeline based either on the chronological order of events or the order of events in the chapter.

Option Flipgrid: Students create a video explainer of unknown or difficult information.

O2 video lectures: Students work in groups to create critical questions or to fill in information gaps on this chapter based on the video lecture.

Step 3: Teaching/discussing
Combine all student work and let students assess the work of their peers. Do they now have the full picture? Guide a discussion with critical questions or ask students to analyse their peers’ work.</td><td>Tools: Padlet, Flipgrid, O2 video lecture, PowToon.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Pedagogy/didactics: Flipping the classroom using O1 chapter, O2 video lecture, blended learning.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Remarks: This chapter possibly contains some unknown data about protagonists. Prepare students for this and provide them with guidance for reading this chapter.</td></tr>
</table>

Template 3:

<table>
<tr><td>Subchapter:
‘Ideas of Europe in Early Modern History’ §1.1.1 (example)

Remarks: Europe vs. others from several different angles (geographical, social & political)</td><td>21st century skills:
Finding, organizing, retrieving information, digital literacy, critical thinking.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Step 1: Preparation/Introduction
Present the reading and the discussion questions at the end of the chapter to the students.

Step 2: Teaching/assigning
Have students create annotations (questions/remarks/ multiperspective remarks) using the web hypothesis app. Create small groups and ask the students to resolve their peers’ questions.

Then use the online source collection (O3) and the suggested sources to have students engage the discussion questions and use other sources to back up their answers. Any information gaps in the chapter can also be closed/addressed via this method. An added benefit is that this technique will involve students’ backgrounds by opening the discussion about different histories and backgrounds

Use Peardeck to let students create interactive PowerPoints (in groups) about their answers to the discussion questions.

Step 3: Teaching/ Discussion
Show and discuss the Peardeck presentations and annotations. What have students learnt from different perspectives and others’ answers to the questions?</td><td>Tools: O3 source collection, Peardeck, WebHypothesis.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Pedagogy/didactics: Flipping the classroom, blended learning, peer learning.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Remarks: This chapter lends itself for a discussion on perspectives (multiperspectivity).</td></tr>
</table>

Template 4:

<table>
<tr><td>Subchapter:
‘Demographic Change in Early Modern History §2.1.1 (example)

Remark: Meta-critical chapter, focusing on methodological problems in analysing demographic change</td><td>21st century skills:
Critical thinking, digital literacy, teamwork, life & career skills.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Step 1: Preparation/Introduction
Provide the students with the reading. Set up a Padlet.

Step 2: Teaching/assigning
Students will work in groups to analyse this chapter. Divide the groups and give each of them a topic to work on (facts, statistics, etc.) for each a different region in or outside Europe. First, they can add new information in the Padlet (use, preferably, the map-format).

Then they can present the information on a poster (graphs, extra sources, images, and text).

Step 3: Teaching/discussing
The posters can be compared and analysed by all peers, providing them with a full overview of the same period in different regions in Europe.</td><td>Tools: Padlet (world map), Canva or an illustrator tool.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Pedagogy/didactics:
Flipping the classroom, blended learning.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Remarks: -</td></tr>
</table>

Template 5:

<table>
<tr><td>Subchapter:
‘Science and Technological Change in Early Modern History §4.1.1 (example)

Remark: -</td><td>21st century skills:
Critical thinking, digital literacy, teamwork, life & career skills, knowledge construction.</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Step 1: Preparation/Introduction
Provide the reading and divide students into groups. Each group will be assigned one of the discussion questions.

Step 2: Teaching/assigning
Based on the discussion questions, the suggested reading, video lecture from O2, and source collection from O3, students will create a podcast centred around their assigned question.

Step 3: Teaching/discussing
Collect the podcasts on a central tool (Padlet, Flipgrid, etc.) and let students assess their peers before class. Use the time in class to effectively feedback, discuss, and deepen the topics.</td><td>Tools: PlayPosit or any other recording tool.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Pedagogy/didactics:
Flipping the classroom, blended learning.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Remarks: -</td></tr>
</table>

Bibliography

Anderson, R. (2008). Implications of the information and knowledge society for education. In J. Voogt, & G. Knezek, (Eds.), *International handbook of information technology in primary and secondary education*. NewYork: Springer.

Bransford, J.D., Brown, A.L., & Cocking, R.R. (Eds.). (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school (expanded)*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press

De Koning, P. (1973). *Interne differentiatie*. Purmerend: APS.

Dede, C. (2010). Comparing Frameworks for 21st Century Skills. In J. Bellanca & R. Brandt, Eds, *21st Century Skills*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

European Commission (2002). Europe2005: *An information society formall*. Brussel: Europese Commissie.

Kropman, M., Van Boxtel, C. & J. Van Drie (2021). Multiperspectivity in lesson designs of history teachers: The role of school book texts in the design of multiperspective history lessons. *Historical Encounters*, 8(1), 46-69.

OECD. (2004). *Completing the Foundation for Lifelong learning: An OECD Survey of Upper Secondary Schools Centre for Educational Research and Innovation*, Studienverlag Ges.m.b.H., Innsbruck/OECD Publishing, Paris. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264103733-en

Oliver, M. & Trigwell, K. (2005). Can 'Blended Learning' Be Redeemed? In: *E-Learning*, Vol. 2, Nr. 1.

Stradling, R. (2001). *Teaching 20th-century European history*. Strasbourg.

Trier, U. (2002). Twelve countries contributing to DeSeCo: A summary report. In D. Rychen, L. Salganik, & M. McLaughlin (Eds.), Definition and selection of key competences. Contributions to the second DeSeCo symposium (pp. 27-59). Geneva, Switzerland, 11-13 February.

Trilling, B. & Fadel, C. (2009). *21st Century Skills: Learning for Life in Our Times*. San Fransisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Tomlinson, C.A., Brighton, C., Hertberg, H., Callahan, C.M., Moon, T.R., Brimijoin, K., Conover, L.A. & Reynolds, T. (2003). Differentiating instruction in response to student readiness, interest, and learning profile in academically diverse classrooms: A review of literature. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 27(2/3), 119-145.

Voogt, J. & Roblin, N.P. (2010). 21st Century Skills. Discussion Paper. http://opite.pbworks.com/w/file/fetch/61995295/White%20Paper%2021stCS_Final_ENG_def2.pdf

Voogt, J. (2008). IT and curriculum processes: Dilemmas and challenges. In J. Voogt, & G. Knezek (Eds.), *International handbook of information technology in primary and secondary education* (pp.117-132). New York: Springer.

Wansink, B., Akkerman, S., Zuiker, I. & Wubbels, T. (2018). Where Does Teaching Multiperspectivity in History Education Begin and End? An Analysis of the Uses of Temporality. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 46(4), 2018, 495-527.

Appendix 1: Questionnaire for the testing of textbook chapters

(Chapter 4.3, CUNI, Erasmus class "Prague – The role of the City in Czech and European Culture)

(Please use this form and write your answers to this document; formulate your answers in sentences and add explanations – please avoid simple yes/no answers)

A) Please provide a few information about yourself:

- Your home country and country of your university (if different): **……**

- Your level of studies (Bachelor – Master's – PhD.): **……**

- Your main subject of education (History, Languages, Psychology etc.): **……**

B) Please add your comments to the chapter in terms of multiperspectivity and European scope. Follow suggested questions and tasks, and try to answer at least with one short paragraph

1. Multiperspective/multi-national views

Does the chapter provide a multiperspective view of European history? (How would you read the chapter from, e.g., French perspective? Now, imagine that you are, e.g., a Swedish/Italian/Polish reader. How would you find the chapter in that case?

Answer:

2. Meanings and imaginations of Europe

How does the chapter delineate Europe? How does it divide it in particular regions (e.g. Southern Europe, Central Europe, Western and Eastern Europe)? Do you find the concept of Europe in the chapter accurate? If not, how would you change it?

Answer:

3. Bias and underlying narratives

Do you think the chapter puts forward a narrative that captures experience in all parts of Europe? Do you find the chapter biased to particular narrative of European history? (E.g. Western-based/biased to big states/male-dominated)? If so, how should (or could) the chapter be improved?

Answer:

4. Complexity and multiple scales

Do you think the chapter pays due attention to European – national – regional – local – individual dimension of historical experience? If not, how would the chapter be altered if more emphasis is put on e.g. local or global scale? (Or: try to suggest a different structure of the chapter; why do you think it would work better?)

Answer:

C) Comments on usefulness and practicality of the materials and suggestions for their best/most effective use:

- Please add any comments (critical/positive/constructive) that concerns aspects such as:

    - understandability of the text

    - usefulness as an introduction to the theme

    - usefulness of examples of the visual sources

    - presence/absence of theory and concepts

    - usefulness of concrete examples in the text

    - usefulness of the final reading questions

    - linking of the chapter with extra-class activities (visit to the museum)

Answer:

- Please and any comment on impact, such as:

    - Have reading of the chapter and the discussion changed your view about the topic? Has it challenged your understanding? Has it challenged the ways you thought about it in your home high school or university education?

    - Has reading of the chapter and discussion raised your further interest in the topic? Has it motivated you to explore further?

Answer:

- Please add any other suggestions, ideas, or reflections that come to your mind: **……**