

Syllabus

Folk Teleology

PhD Research Course
Department of Cognitive Science
Central European University
Fall 2023, 2 credits

Class:

Tuesdays 8:50am to 10:30am, in Room C503, Quellenstrasse 51, Vienna.

Instructor:

Gergely Csibra

Office hours: by appointment

Course description:

This course provides an introduction to the literature on folk teleology. Both theoretical and empirical works will be discussed, focusing on the cognitive aspects of teleological interpretation and explanation of various phenomena. The format of the course is a discussion seminar centred around seminal and more recent readings on the topic.

Learning Outcomes

At the end of the course, students should have an overview on when and how humans deploy teleological interpretations and explanations, and should be aware of the key theoretical issues related to the nature and cognitive mechanisms of these processes.

Evaluation:

Students are required to attend classes regularly and to participate actively in seminar discussions. Students are also required to give one or two short presentations of some chosen topic(s) and lead the following discussion. Finally, students are required to submit a term-paper (about 3000 words) in a topic agreed in advance by the instructor. The final grade will be composed of evaluations of these three elements in the following proportions:

Participation in class discussion (20%)

Presenting papers and leading discussion (30%)

End-of-term essay (50%), deadline for submission: December 18, 2023

Date	Topic	Literature
Sep 19	Teleological inversion	Csibra & Gergely, 2007; Baker et al., 2009
Sep 26	Goal bias	Lakusta & Landau, 2012; Lakusta & DiFabrizio, 2017
Oct 3	Goals in language	Allen et al., 2010; Rissman & Majid, 2019
Oct 10	Tools	Casler & Kelemen, 2005; Hernik & Csibra, 2009; Kelemen, 1999
Oct 17	Nature	ojalehto et al., 2013; Lombrozo & Rehder, 2012; Roberts et al., 2021
Oct 24	Explanatory bias	Järnefelt et al., 2015; Kelemen et al., 2013
Oct 31	Teleological vs. causal explanations	Lombrozo & Carey, 2006; Lombrozo, 2010;
Nov 7	Teleological intuitions	Kertész & Kodaj, 2023; de Smedt & de Cruz, 2020a
Nov 14	Teleological essentialism 1	Rose & Nichols, 2019, 2020; Rose et al., 2020
Nov 21	Teleological essentialism 2	Neufeld, 2021; Joo & Yousif, 2022
Nov 25	Anthropocentrism	Lewry et al., 2023; Preston & Shin, 2021; Banerjee & Bloom, 2014
Dec 5	Conspiracy theories	Wagner-Egger et al., 2018

Literature

- Allen, K., Ibara, S., Seymour, A., Cordova, N., & Botvinick, M. (2010). Abstract structural representations of goal-directed behavior. *Psychological Science*, 21, 1518-1524. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797610383434>
- Baker, C. L., Saxe, R., & Tenenbaum, J. B. (2009). Action understanding as inverse planning. *Cognition*, 113(3), 329-349. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2009.07.005>
- Banerjee, K. & Bloom, P. (2014). Why did this happen to me? Religious believers' and non-believers' teleological reasoning about life events. *Cognition*, 133, 277-303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2014.06.017>
- Casler, K., & Kelemen, D. (2005) Young children's rapid learning about artifacts. *Developmental Science*, 8, 472-480.
- Csibra, G., & Gergely, G. (1998). The teleological origins of mentalistic action explanations: A developmental hypothesis. *Developmental Science*, 1, 255-259. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-7687.00039>
- Csibra, G. & Gergely, G. (2007). 'Obsessed with goals': Functions and mechanisms of teleological interpretation of actions in humans. *Acta Psychologica*, 124, 60-78. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2006.09.007>
- De Smedt, J. & De Cruz, H. (2020a). Is intuitive teleological reasoning promiscuous? In W. Gibson, D. O'Brien, & M. Turda (Eds.) *Teleology ans Modernity* (pp. 185-203). Routledge.
- De Smedt, J. & De Cruz, H. (2020b). Chapter 2 in *The Challenge of Evolution in Religion*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hernik, M. & Csibra, G. (2009). Functional understanding facilitates learning about tools in human children. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, 19, 34-38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2009.05.003>
- Järnefelt, E., Canfield, C. F., & Kelemen, D. 2015). The divided mind of a disbeliever: Intuitive beliefs about nature as purposefully created among different groups of non-religious adults. *Cognition*, 140, 72-88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2015.02.005>
- Joo, S. & Yousif, S.R. (2022). Are we teleological essentialist? *Cognitive Science*, 46, e13202. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.13202>.
- Joo, S., Yousif, S. R., & Knobe, J. (in press). Teleology beyond explanation. *Mind & Language*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mila.12393>

- Kelemen, D. (1999). Function, goals and intention: children's teleological reasoning about objects. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 3(12), 461-468.
- Kelemen, D., Rottman, J., & Seston, R. (2013). Professional physical scientists display tenacious teleological tendencies: Purpose-based reasoning as a cognitive default. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 142(4), 1074–1083. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030399>
- Kertész, G. & Kodaj, D. (2023). In defense of teleological intuitions. *Philosophical Studies*, 180, 1421-1437. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-023-01937-3>
- Lakusta, L. & DiFabrizio, S. (2017). And, the Winner Is...A Visual Preference for Endpoints over Starting Points in Infants' Motion Event Representations. *Infancy*, 22(3), 323-343. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/inf.12153>
- Lakusta, L., & Landau, B. (2012). Language and memory for motion events: Origins of the asymmetry between source and goal paths. *Cognitive Science*, 36(3), 517–544.
- Lewry, C., Kelemen, D., & Lombrozo, T. (2023). The moral consequences of teleological beliefs about the human species. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0001446>
- ojalehto, b., Waxman, S. R., & Medin, D. L. (2013). Tele- ological reasoning about nature: Intentional design or relational perspectives? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 17(4), 166–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2013.02.006>
- Lombrozo, T. (2010). Causal-explanatory pluralism: How intentions, functions, and mechanisms influence causal ascriptions. *Cognitive Psychology*, 61(4), 303-332. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogpsych.2010.05.002>
- Lombrozo, T. & Carey, S. (2006). Functional explanation and the function of explanation. *Cognition*, 99, 167-204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2004.12.009>
- Lombrozo, T., & Rehder, B. (2012). Functions in biological kind classification. *Cognitive Psychology*, 65(4), 457-485. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogpsych.2012.06.002>
- Neufeld, E. (2021). Against teleological essentialism. *Cognitive Science*, 45, e12961. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12961>
- Perner, J., Prielwasser, B., & Roessler, J. (2018). The practical other: teleology and its development. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, 43(2), 99-114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03080188.2018.1453246>
- Prestin, J.L. & Shin, F. (2021). Anthropocentric biases in teleological thinking: How nature seems designed for humans. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 5, 943-955. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1037/xge0000981>
- Rissman, L., Majid, A. (2019). Thematic roles: Core knowledge or linguistic construct?. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 26, 1850–1869. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-019-01634-5>
- Roberts, A. J., Handley, S. J., & Polito, V. (2021). The design stance, intentional stance, and teleological beliefs about biological and nonbiological natural entities. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 120(6), 1720–1748. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000383>
- Rose, D. & Nichols, S. (2019). Teleological essentialism. *Cognitive Science*, 43, e12725. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12725>
- Rose, D. & Nichols, S (2020). Teleological esstentialism: Generalized. *Cognitive Science*, 44, e12818. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12818>
- Rose, D., Schaffer, J., & Tobia, K. (2020). Folk teleology drives persistence judgments. *Synthese*, 197, 5491-5509. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-018-01974-0>
- Scott, M. J. (2022). Reasons things happen for a reason: An integrative theory of teleology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 17(2), 452–464. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691621995753>
- Wagner-Egger, P., Delouvée, S., Gauvrit, N., & Dieguez, S. (2018). Creationism and conspiracism share a common teleological bias. *Current Biology*, 28(16), R867-R868. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2018.06.072>