**SYLLABUS**

1. **Program details**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * 1. Higher education institution | West University of Timișoara |
| 1.2 Faculty / Department | Faculty of Sociology and Psychology |
| 1.3 Department | Psychology |
| 1.4 Field of study | Psychology |
| 1.5 Cycle of studies | Bachelor degree |
| 1.6 Study program / Qualification | Psychology – Cognitive Sciences |

1. **Discipline details**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2.1 Discipline name | | | **Introduction to Cognitive Science** | | | | | |
| 2.2 Tenured teacher - course activities | | | Lect. univ. dr. Adrian Briciu | | | | | |
| 2.3 Tenured teacher – seminar/laboratory activities | | | Lect. univ. dr. Adrian Briciu | | | | | |
| 2.4 Study year | 1 | 2.5 Semester | | 1 | 2.6 Type of assessment | E | 2.7 Discipline regime | DO |

1. **Estimated total time (hours per semester) of teaching activities**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3.1 Number of hours per semester | 3 | Of which: 3.2 course | | 2 | 3.3 seminar/laboratory | 1 |
| 3.4 Total hours from the curriculum | 42 | Of which: 3.5 course | | 28 | 3.6 seminar/laboratory | 14 |
| Time fund distribution: | | | | | | hours |
| Study based on the textbook, course material, bibliography, and notes | | | | | | 20 |
| Additional documentation in the library, on specialist electronic platforms / in the field | | | | | | 18 |
| Preparing seminars/labs, homework, papers, portfolios, and essays | | | | | | 10 |
| Tutoring | | | | | | 8 |
| Examinations | | | | | | 2 |
| Other activities | | | | | |  |
| 3.7 Total hours of individual study | **58** | |
| 3.8 Total hours per semester | **100** | |
| 3.9 Number of credits (ECTS) | **4** | |

1. **Prerequisites (where necessary)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4.1 for curriculum | * None |
| 4.2 for competencies | * None |

1. **Conditions (where necessary)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 5.1 for conducting the course | * Google classroom   Gclassroom code: nwof6er |
| 5.2 for conducting the seminar/laboratory | * Google classroom   Glassroom code: nwof6er |

1. **Discipline objectives - expected learning outcomes to which the discipline's study and promotion contributes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Knowledge | * To understand the mind from a scientific perspective * To understand the basic theoretical concepts and methods in cognitive science |
| Skills | * To identify the main problems that cognitive science seeks to address * To describe and explain the main theoretical debates within cognitive science * To describe the empirical approaches cognitive scientists, use to discover the inner workings of the mind. * To describe how psychology, philosophy contribute and broaden our understanding of cognitive science |
| Responsibility and autonomy | * To carry out professional duties responsibly, under conditions of restricted autonomy and qualified supervision |

1. **Contents**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **7.1 Course** | **Teaching methods** | **Observations** |
| 1. Introduction: scope, models, idealizations, assumptions and milestones | Interactive presentation, discussion and debate | Introductory discussion |
| 1. Nuts and bolts of cognitive science: mental representations, computation, levels of explanations | Interactive presentation, discussion and debate | To read Bermudez (2020, chapters1& 2) |
| 1. Two large research strategies in cognitive sciences | Interactive presentation, discussion and debate | To read Prinz (2014 cap 2,) |
| 1. Case study: two models of language learning | Interactive presentation, discussion and debate | To read Bermudez (cap 4.1 – 4.2 & cap 10.1 – 10.3) |
| 1. Universal cognitive traits or just WEIRD ones: what is a human universal? | Interactive presentation, discussion and debate | To read Brown (2004) |
| 1. Case study. Linguistic universals: are there any? | Interactive presentation, discussion and debate | To read Moro (2008, cap 2) |
| 1. The debate over mental modules and modularity | Interactive presentation, discussion and debate | To read Bermudez (2020 chap 8) and Pinker (1995 chap 5) |
| 1. Case study: “language module(s)”. | Interactive presentation, discussion and debate | To read Moro (2008, chap3) |
| 1. The debate over inateness | Interactive presentation, discussion and debate | To read Samuels (2004) |
| 1. Case study: innateness of the language faculty? | Interactive presentation, discussion and debate | To read Adger (2019, cap3) |
| 1. Adaptive arguments in cognitive sciences | Interactive presentation, discussion and debate | Lloyd (1999) |
| 1. Non-adaptive explanations | Interactive presentation, discussion and debate | To read Gould & Lewontin (1979) |
| 1. Case study. Language: adaptive or not? | Interactive presentation, discussion and debate | To read Pinker & Bloom (1990) |
| 1. Summary | Discussion & debate | Discussion |
| References:  Bermudez, Jose Luis (2020) *Cognitive Science: An introduction to the science of mind*, (3rd edition), Cambridge University Press  Prinz, J. (2012) *Beyond Human Nature: How Culture and Experience Shape the Human Mind*. W.W. Norton.  Pinker, Steven (2002) *The Blank Slate: The Modern Denial of Human Nature*, Penguin,  Chomskyv Noam, *What Kind of Creatures Are We?* Columbia University Press, New York, 2016  Pinker, Steven (1995). *How the Mind Works*. Norton.  Brown, Donald. E. (2004), “Human Universals, Human Nature & Human Culture “in *Daedalus* , fall 2004  Prinz, J. (2006). Is the mind really modular? In R. Stainton (Ed.), *Contemporary debates in cognitive science*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.  Adger, David (2019), *Language Unlimited: The Science behind our most creative power*, Oxford University Press.  Moro, Andrea (2008) *The Boundaries of Babel: The Brain and the Enigma of Impossible Languages*. MIT Press. 2008  Samuels, Richard (2004). Innateness in cognitive science. Trends in Cognitive Sciences 8 (3):136-141.  Knobe, Joshua & Samuels, Richard (2013). Thinking like a scientist: Innateness as a case study. Cognition 126 (1):72-86.  Gould, Stephen Jay & Lewontin, Richard C. (1979) „The Spandrels of Marco Polo and the Panglossian Paradigm: A critique of the Adaptionist Programme” *Proceedings of the Royal Society London, B 205*, 581-598  Lloyd, Elisabeth, (1999) „Evolutionary Psychology: The Burdens of Proof”, *Biology and Philosophy* 14: 211–233, 1999.  Pinker, Steven & Bloom, Paul (1990). Natural language and natural selection. Behavioral and Brain Sciences 13 (4):707-27.  D. Hauser, Noam Chomsky, W. Tecumesh Fitch, (2002) „The Faculty of Language: What is it, Who Has it, and How did it Evolve?” in *Science*, vol 298 | | |
| **7.2 Seminar** | **Teaching methods** | **Observations** |
| 1. Introduction: overview of basic concepts and tools | Presentation, debate and quizzes | Bermudez (2020, chapters1& 2) |
| 1. Nature vs nurture in cognitive science | Presentation, debate and quizzes | Pinker (2002, cap 1-2) |
| 1. Cognitive Universals | Presentation, debate and quizzes | Cashdan (2003) & Baker (2001 cap 3) |
| 1. Mental Modules | Presentation, debate and quizzes | Smith & Tsimpli (1995, chap 1) |
| 1. Innateness | Presentation, debate and quizzes | Gleitman and Newport (1995) |
| 1. Adaptive and non-adaptive explanations | Presentation, debate and quizzes | Lloyd & Gould (2017) |
| 1. Summary: Bringing the issues together | Presentation, debate and quizzes | Hauser et al (2014) |
| References:  Gleitman L., Liberman M. (eds) (1996) *Invitation to cognitive science. Vol. 1: Language*. Cambridge: MIT Press; 1996.  Elisabeth Cashdan, (2013) „What is a Human Universal? Human Behavioral Ecology and Human Nature” in Downes, S. & Machery, E. *(*eds.*) Arguing about Human Nature,* Routledge  Levinson, S.C. (2012), The Original Sin of Cognitive Science. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 4: 396-403.  Pinker, Steven (2002) *The Blank Slate: The Modern Denial of Human Nature*, Penguin,  Baker, Mark (2001) *The Atoms of Language: The Mind’s Hidden Rules of Grammar*, Basic Books  Smith, Neil & Tsimpli, Ianthi-Maria (1995), *The Mind of a Savant: Language learning and modularity*, Blackwell  Newport, E. & Gleitman, L. (2002). The invention of language by children: Environmental and biological influences. In Daniel Levitin (ed.), Foundations of Cognitive Psychology: Core Readings. MIT Press. pp. 685—704  Feldman, H., Goldin-Meadow, S., & Gleitman, L. (1978). Beyond Herodotus: The creation of language by linguistically deprived deaf children. In A. Lock (ed.). Action, Symbol, and Gesture: The Emergence of Language (pp. 351–414). New York: Academic Press.  Lloyd, A. Elisabeth. & Gould, Stephen (2017). Exaptation Revisited. *Biological Theory* 12 (1):50-65.  Hauser MD, Yang C, Berwick RC, Tattersall I, Ryan MJ, Watumull J, Chomsky N and Lewontin RC (2014) “The mystery of language evolution’. *Front. Psychol*. **5**:401.  Fodor, Jerry A. (1983). *The Modularity of Mind*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.  Fodor, Jerry A. (2000). *The Mind Doesn’T Work That Way: The Scope and Limits of Computational Psychology*. MIT Press. | | |

1. **Correlation of discipline contents with the expectations of the representatives of the epistemic community, professional associations and representative employers in the field related to the program**

|  |
| --- |
| This course develops professional skills relevant both to practicing cognitive science and to other occupations that involve cognitive science. Also, the content of the course correlates closely with introductory courses in cognitive science offered elsewhere as well as with the topics presented in major handbooks and monographies in the discipline. |

1. **Assessment**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity type** | **9.1 Assessment criteria** | **9.2 Assessment methods** | **9.3 Weight of final mark** |
| 9.4 Course | Written exam | Students will receive a battery of exercises whereby they will be asked any of the following: explain in their own words a certain experiment, hypothesis, or problem, give their own example of a certain type of phenomenon, think of an informal experiment, etc. | 50% |
| 9.5 Seminar / laboratory | Written assignments & class participation | (1) Bi-weekly reading assignments and written assignments. Students have one week to complete each assignment. For each seminar, students will receive a battery of questions and/or exercises related to the weekly readings and are expected to return the answers within 7 days. The answers should be one page or less.  (b) Class participation*.* Everyone is expected to come to class prepared to discuss the assigned articles and to contribute to the group learning process. | 50 % |
| 9.6 Minimum performance standard | | | |
| Students are allowed to miss at most 2 (two) of their written assignments.  The final grade obtained must be at least 5 (five) to pass this course | | | |

Date of completion Tenure teacher

07.10.2022 Lect. univ. dr. Adrian Briciu

Date of approval in department Department Director

Prof. univ. dr. Delia Vîrgă