

## Syllabus of Curricular Unit

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>Curricular Unit</b>         | <b>Research Design I</b>  |
| <b>Academic year /semester</b> | 2017/2018, 1st semester   |
| <b>ECTS</b>                    | 12  |
| <b>Coordination</b>            | Bruno Reis (ISCTE-IUL)<br>Maria Alexandre Lousada (FL-ULisboa)  |
| <b>Learning outcomes</b>       | The main objective of Research Design I and II is to follow and support the PhD students in designing their PhD research project.<br><br>In Research Design I the aim is that the students:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Define the central issues of their research and their intellectual relevance</li> <li>- Demonstrate the feasibility and innovative features of their research.</li> <li>- Establish the conceptual framework, problems, questions and working hypotheses.</li> <li>- Identify the main literature in their field of research and the sources upon which the research is based.</li> <li>- Write a State of the Art of the respective topic of investigation.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Syllabus</b>                | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Criteria for defining the research topic</li> <li>2. Designing a research project. Objectives, novelty and feasibility</li> <li>3. The definition of the problem and the conceptual framework. How to define research questions and hypotheses.</li> <li>4. Literature review. Who to quote, what to quote and how to quote. Epistemic communities of historiographic debate.</li> <li>5. Potential of interdisciplinarity.</li> <li>6. Criteria for the identification and delimitation of the documentary sources.</li> </ol>   |
| <b>Bibliography (core)</b>     | <p>ARÓSTEGUI, Julio - <i>La Investigación Historica. Teoria y Método</i>, Barcelona, 2.ª ed., 2003.</p> <p>BURKE, P. - <i>What is Cultural History?</i>, Cambridge, 2004.</p> <p>CARRINGTON, Peter, <i>Models and methods in social network analysis</i>, Cambridge-NY, 2005</p> <p>HAUPT, Heinz-Gerhard - «Comparative history – a contested method», <i>HistoriskTidskrift</i>, 127:4, 2007, pp. 697-714.</p> <p>KOCKA, J., “Comparison and Beyond”, <i>History and Theory</i>, vol. 42, no. 1, 2003, pp. 39–44</p> <p>KOSSELLECK, Reinhart – <i>Esbozo teóricos. Siegue teniendo utilidad la historia?</i>, Madrid, 2013 (original alemão, Berlim, 2010)</p> <p>LAMBERT, P.; SCHOFIELD, P. (eds.) - <i>Making History. An introduction to the history and practices of a discipline</i>, Londres-NY, 2004.</p> <p>LEPETIT, Bernard (dir.)- <i>Les formes de l’expérience. Une autre histoire sociale</i>, Paris, Albin Michel, 1995.</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>LEVI, G. - «Sobre microhistoria» in <i>Formas de hacer Historia</i>, ed. Peter Burke, Madrid, 1993, pp. 119-3.</p> <p>REVEL, Jacques (dir.) - <i>Jeux d'Échelles. La micro-analyse à l'expérience</i>, "Hautes Études", Paris, Gallimard-Le Seuil, 1996.</p> <p>RICHIE, D. - <i>Doing Oral History</i>, Oxford, 3.ª ed, 2014.</p> <p>STOREY, W.K - <i>Writing History. A Guide for Students</i>, Oxford e Nova York, 3.ª ed., 2008.</p> <p>THOMPSON, W. - <i>Postmodernism and History</i>, Nova York, 2004.</p> <p>VINCENT, J. - <i>An Intelligent Person's Guide to History</i>, Londres, 1995.</p> <p>WELSKOPP, Thomas- Comparative History, in: <i>European History Online (EGO)</i>, published by the Institute of European History (IEG), Mainz 2010-12-03. URL: <a href="http://www.ieg-ego.eu/welskoppt-2010-en">http://www.ieg-ego.eu/welskoppt-2010-en</a></p> <p>WILLIAMS, R - <i>The Historian's Toolbox. A Student's Guide to the Theory and Craft of History</i>, Londres-NY, 2.ª ed., 2007.</p>  |
| <b>Bibliography (complementary)</b>              | Each doctoral student is given theoretical or historiographical readings related to the specific needs of his / her Ph.D. project in response to specific requests.  |
| <b>Evaluation Criteria</b>                       | <p>Organised in a seminar format, the lectures will be essentially practical, aimed at exploring and discussing, among doctoral students and professors regarding: the topic/ themes, the documentary corpus, the methodologies and problems, in order to know, follow-up and support doctoral students in their individual research itinerary.</p> <p>The evaluation is continuous, requires a minimum of 75% attendance (9 sessions), and is based on three main components that add up in the final grade:</p> <p>A) Active participation in debates and discussions, including an oral presentation of the first version of the literature review and the documentary corpus (30% of the final grade)</p> <p>B) Initial report justifying the selection of the research topic with a review of the literature on the research topic (up to 5000 words);</p> <p>C) Initial report demonstrating the feasibility of the research proposal by characterising the documentary corpus (up to 5000 words);</p> <p>D) Submitting a State of the Art; (weight of the written work - B, C and D - will be 70% of the final grade) be previously validated by the seminar coordinates and the presence confirmed by the presentation of proof of attendance. The final evaluation consists of two texts, each with 1200 words, on themes or works of two of the conferences attended and the critical analysis of what they added to the reflection on the PhD' subject. They should be delivered during the semester, on dates to be fixed, and presented orally, in sessions organized for this purpose.</p> |
| <b>Contact hours</b>                             | <p>Seminars = 24 H + Tutorials = 6 H</p> <p>Total = 30 H</p>   |
| <b>Other participants in teaching activities</b> |  |