



PRIFYSGOL CYMRU
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
UNIVERSITY OF WALES
Trinity Saint David

EXAMINATIONS 2015/2016

ARHOLIADAU 2015/2016

Semester 2: RESIT JULY 2016

FACULTY OF: EDUCATION AND COMMUNITIES

NAME OF COURSE/PROGRAMME:	BA/BSc Psychology Portfolio
YEAR OR LEVEL:	Year 2 Level 5
NAME OF MODULE/UNIT/EXAM PAPER:	Brain, Behaviour and Cognition: Cognitive Paper RESIT
MODULE NO:	M5X00908
DATE OF EXAMINATION:	July 2016
EXAMINATION TIMES:	
START TIME:	
FINISH TIME:	
TIME ALLOWED:	1 hour

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES:

Candidates are required to answer ONE question.

Calculators are not required.

Q1. Critically discuss the Working Memory Model of Baddeley and Hitch (1974).

Indicative answer: It would be expected that the student give a brief description of the working memory model (i.e., different components) but the that the focus should swiftly move on to the critical elements of providing detailed evidence from empirical research that have tested the appropriateness of the model and any alternative models that have been proposed. A weak answer would be limited to describing the working memory model with little research. A strong answer would include empirical evidence and discussion of studies. A very strong answer would identify strengths and weaknesses associated with the model based on relevant studies and would clearly explain what the findings mean for theories on the structure and mechanisms of memory.

Q2. Critically analyse Cognitive theories of reasoning.

Indicative answer: This question would require students to show an understanding of the different theoretical approaches to reasoning and the models proposed to explain how people reason. A critical analysis of these theories based on findings from relevant empirical research would be required. Weak answers would simply outline the different theories of reasoning. A strong answer would add to this by using relevant research studies to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the various theories. A very strong answer would further this by providing a synthesis of argument and consider any wider implications by providing evidence from various tasks that have been designed to assess reasoning in humans.

Q3. Compare and contrast the spotlight and zoom lens theories of attention.

Indicative answer: Students should keep the description of spotlight and zoom lens to a minimum and instead focus on comparing and contrasting the two theories of attention by drawing on empirical evidence to evaluate their appropriateness. A weak answer would simply describe the theories without any synthesis of argument. A strong answer would provide relevant empirical studies to assess the appropriateness of the theories. A very strong answer would further on this by providing evaluation and synthesis of argument.

Q4. Critically discuss models of object recognition.

Indicative answer: This question could begin with a brief and general overview of how perceptions of objects are transferred to visual representations in the brain. However, the key object recognition models would need to be the main focus of the answer (e.g., Marr's computational theory, Biederman's Recognition-by-components) with a solid evaluation of the models provided through reference to empirical research. Answers would need to keep the description of the models quite concise in order to draw upon the empirical evidence to support or contradict the appropriateness of the models to explain how we recognise objects. There could be reference made to the brain structures involved and could draw on evidence from cognitive neuropsychology (e.g., visual agnosia). The more stronger answer would also be able to highlight the importance of the role shape and colour plays within the models and make links with how object recognition can be influenced by top-down vs. bottom-up processing. This could incorporate the role of memory and language.