

## COURSE OUTLINE

### 1. GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>LECTURER</b>	DESPINA STAMATOPOULOU		
<b>SEMESTER</b> (fall/spring)	fall		
<b>SCHOOL</b>	PHILOSOPHY		
<b>DEPARTMENT</b>	PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIAL STUDIES		
<b>LEVEL</b>	undergraduate		
<b>COURSE CODE</b>	KΨB355	<b>SEMESTER OF STUDIES</b> (1-8)	
<b>COURSE TITLE</b>	SYMBOLI FUCTION OF PICTURES		
<b>INDEPENDENT TEACHING ACTIVITIES</b>		<b>WEEKLY LECTURE HOURS</b>	<b>ECTS CREDITS</b>
		3	5
<b>COURSE CLASSIFICATION</b>	Undergraduate		
<b>COURSE TYPE</b>	SEMINAR		
<b>TEACHING COMPETENCE COURSE</b>			
<b>PREREQUISITES</b>	Advanced level (introductory lessons) Good knowledge of English		
<b>TEACHING AND EXAMINATION LANGUAGE</b>	Greek		
<b>AVAILABLE FOR ERASMUS STUDENTS</b>	yes		
<b>COURSE URL</b>			

## 2. LEARNING OUTCOMES

The goals of the lesson will be accomplished through participation in class discussion, work on a couple of assignments, and, most substantively, in a substantive, original paper that students will work on all semester.

In order to: 1) gain an understanding of selective but central concepts in defining self, identity and culture; 2) develop expertise in a specific domain of interest related to self and identity; 3) explore new theoretical and/or research ideas; 4) improve your scholarly writing skills; 5) gain experience reviewing papers; and 6) gain experience revising manuscripts and “submitting” them.

### COURSE OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of the course is to help students to think through and discuss the questions and assumptions set in the course, so to come away with an informed opinion about each of them. The discussions will be based on readings, but the goal is to synthesize, to gain a meta-understanding of the positions and the problems they raise, and to practice, as a group, deconstructing and constructing the arguments that underpin these positions and problems.

## 3. COURSE CONTENT

The aim of this seminar is to present ideas on how children begin to form the first symbolic processes in dealing with images up to the age of late adolescence. As a general background, we suggest that the development of iconographic production and understanding arises primarily in the context of the need to communicate and maintain closeness with others ("basic connectivity need") and the interactive organization of (a) its tangible perceptual and (b) productive process. "I leave a trace / paint".

We suggest here that inhibiting symbolic development with these social / relational terms helps us to understand some of the mechanisms or causes that lead to symbolic development. To a large extent, this last question remains open, with most research to date being limited to describing how symbolic development evolves rather than why. The seminar is organized as follows: 1. Virtual symbols, like other symbols, are by definition communicative and intentional.

2. Symbols are intentionally created to communicate, so be understood by others.

3. Their function is purposeful - to capture / understand and ultimately influence the mind (MOVING PROCEDURES) of others and to express themselves

4. Then we outline some relevant models that are proposed and elaborate the consequences that involve and list relevant concerns regarding the basic symbolic dimensions contained in the images at a connotative level, mostly ignored in multi-modal approaches.

## 4. TEACHING AND ASSESSMENT METHODS

<b>TEACHING METHOD</b>	Seminar discussion-based course	
<b>USE OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES</b>	Yes	
<b>COURSE STRUCTURE</b>	<b>ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>SEMESTER WORKLOAD</b>
	Presentation of the core ideas on pictorial representations, symbolic functions and	40%

	development, expressivity, and the double object symbol relationship.	
	For each substantive session of the course, several students will be asked to come prepared with a “seed” question that they will turn in to prompt discussion..	20%
	Review assignment, early in the semester, will involve looking at an already published paper of students choice, but related to issues of self and identity. Students should choose a paper that seems interesting to them and relevant to the topic they will use in their final essay.	40%
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>ASSESSMENT METHOD</b>	Participation in the review assignment 30%  Final essay 70%  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In case of essays: The paper should fit one of three forms. 1) An argument with full literature review, (2) An argument with brief literature review and well developed proposal for a study, or (3) An analysis of archival data with supporting argument and literature review.</li> </ul>	

**5. RECOMMENDED READING**

<p>6. Adi-Japha, E., Berberich-Artzi, J., &amp; Libnawi, A. (2010). Cognitive flexibility in drawings of bilingual children. <i>Child Development</i>, 81, 1356–1366.</p> <p>7. Adi-Japha, E., Levin, I., &amp; Solomon, S. (1998). Emergence of representation drawing: The relation between kinematic and referential aspects. <i>CognitiveDevelopment</i>, 13, 1–13.</p> <p>8. Alp, E. (1992). A task analysis of the Imitation Sorting Task. In Paper Presented at the</p>
--

5th European Conference on Developmental Psychology.

9. Alp, E. (1994). Measuring the Size of Working Memory in Very Young Children: The Imitation Sorting Task. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 17, 125–141.
10. Callaghan, T. C., & Corbit, J. (2014). The Development of Symbolic Representation. In L. Liben, & U. Muller (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology and Developmental Science* (pp. 451–535). New York: Wiley.
11. Callaghan, T. C., & Rankin, M. P. (2002). Emergence of graphic symbol functioning and the question of domain specificity: A longitudinal training study. *Child Development*, 73, 359–376.
12. Callaghan, T. C., & Rochat, P. (2008). Children's Understanding of Artist-Picture Relations: Implications for Their Theories of Pic  
Bard, K. (2008). Understanding reflections of self and other objects. In C. Lange-Kuttner, & A. Vinter (Eds.), *Drawing and the non-verbal mind* (pp. 23–41). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
13. Bidet-Ildei, C., Meary, D., & Orliaguet, J.-P. (2006). Visual perception of elliptic movements in 7- to 11-year old children: influence of motor rules. *Visual Perception*, 19(2), 2–10.
14. Bloom, P., & Markson, L. (1998). I
15. Intention and analogy in children's naming of drawings. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, 4, 389–412.  
Stamatopoulou, D. (2011). "Symbol formation and the embodied self: A microgenetic case-study examination of the transition to symbolic communication in scribbling activities from 14 to 31 months of age" *Original Research Article Pages New Ideas in Psychology*, 162-188.
16. Meltzoff, A. N., & Gallagher, S. (1996). The earliest sense of self and others: Merleau-Ponty and recent developmental studies. *Philosophical Psychology*, 9(2), 211–233
17. Mounoud, P. (1999). What is homeopathic when you overdose? In *Peer commentaries on James Russell's "cognitive development as an executive process in part: a homeopathic dose of Piaget"*. *Developmental Science*, 2(3), 271–288.
18. Niedenthal, P. M., Barsalou, L. W., Winkielman, P., Krauth-Gruber, S., & Ric, F. (2005). Embodiment in attitudes, social perception, and emotion. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9, 184–211.
19. Picard, D., & Vinter, A. (2005). Development of graphic formulas for the depiction of familiar objects. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 29(5), 418–432. Preissler, M. A., & Bloom, P. (2008). Two-year-olds use artistic intention to understand drawings. *Cognition*, 106, 512–518