GESM 140g: Seminar in the Life Sciences
Science of Mind: Language
(Last modified: August 26, 2024, subject to change)

Instructor: Hajime Hoji
Time: T/Th 2-3:20
Location: GFS 109
Office: GFS 301T
Office Hours: T/Th 12:30-1:30 and (Zoom) appointment
Contact Info: [hoji@usc.edu, (310) 382-0110, Timeline for replying to emails is within 48 hours).]

1 Course description

This course explores how the parts of the mind that deal with language (the language faculty) can be studied by hypothesis-formation, deduction of definite predictions, and obtaining and replicating experimental results precisely in line with such definite predictions. The overarching hypothesis that will be adopted is that the core properties of the language faculty is shared by all members of the human species, and this core part specifically includes a formal system (a Computational System of the language faculty).

The discussion about scientific methods will be based on an individual student getting exposed to the process of hypothesis formation, logical reasoning based on the hypotheses discussed, the designing and conducting of experiments, analyses of experimental results, and most crucially participation in experiments themselves, i.e., checking their own linguistic judgments.

The predictions being tested are deduced in part by hypotheses about an individual's language faculty, as a speaker of their native language, and they are about their linguistic judgments with regard to what are possible and impossible interpretations for sentences of a particular sentence pattern in that language.

As Feynman puts it, "If [the prediction] disagrees with experiment, it is wrong. In that simple statement is the key to science." The hypotheses are considered valid, provisionally, if we obtain and replicate definite experimental results *precisely* in line with the definite predictions. They are considered invalid if the prediction deduced from them disagrees with experiment.

The transcript version https://jamesclear.com/great-speeches/seeking-new-laws-by-richard-feynman of Feynman's remarks on p. 150 of the Feynman reading "Seeking New Laws" is given below, slightly different from what is given in the reading.

> In general, we look for a new law by the following process. First, we guess it.
>
> Then, we compute– well, don't laugh, that's really true. Then we compute the consequences of the guess, to see what, if this is right, if this law that we guessed is right, we see what it would imply. And then we compare those computation results to nature. Or we say, compare to experiment or experience. Compare it directly with observation, to see if it works.
>
> If it disagrees with experiment, it's wrong. And that simple statement is the key to science. It doesn't make any difference how beautiful your guess is, it doesn't make any difference how smart you are, who made the guess, or what his name is. If it disagrees with experiment, it's wrong. That's all there is to it.
>
> It's true, however, that one has to check a little bit, to make sure that it's wrong. Because someone who did the experiment may have reported incorrectly. Or there may have been some feature in

> the experiment that wasn't noticed, like some kind of dirt and so on. You have to obviously check.
>
> Furthermore, the man who computed the consequences may have been the same one that made the guesses, may have made some mistake in the analysis. Those are obvious remarks. So when I say, if it disagrees with experiment, it's wrong, I mean after the experiment has been checked, the calculations have been checked, and the thing has been rubbed back and forth a few times to make sure that the consequences are logical consequences from the guess, and that, in fact, it disagrees with our very carefully checked experiment.

An individual speaker's linguistic judgments in question are affected not only by "formal properties" of the Computational System of the language faculty (CS) but also by "non-formal factors" outside the CS, or even factors outside the language faculty proper.

This necessitates the controlling for effects of non-formal factors (noise control) so as to obtain accurate experimental results. Obtaining and replicating definite experimental results will be sought in the form of definite speaker judgments, more precisely, in the form of definite *correlations* of patterns of linguistic judgments precisely in line with our definite predictions, first within an individual student and then across students in class, and beyond if that is possible.

If we fail to obtain a correlational pattern of linguistic judgments as predicted within a speaker or across speakers, something must be wrong, and if that happens, we will try to determine what might be wrong. Maybe, a speaker does not clearly understand what interpretation is being considered in the experiment in question. (This is like "some kind of dirt" in the experimental device.) If we determine that the speaker clearly understands what interpretation is being considered, the failure will be taken as indicating that at least one of our hypotheses that have led to the prediction is wrong. If we can identify which one is at fault, that is progress; we will then try to modify the one at fault and make a new prediction and test it. If the new prediction is supported experimentally, that is more progress. Obtaining "clear" judgments from an individual speaker is a key for being able to do this, and a major portion of our class discussion and activities is about how to do this, along with discussion about what is responsible for judgmental variation within a speaker and among speakers, in relation to the hypotheses to be introduced.

By actively and closely participating in such activities, students will learn how we can try to accumulate knowledge about the language faculty by the basic scientific method, sometimes (or possibly often) experiencing and observing failed attempts to do so, at various stages of investigation.

The main experiments we discuss in class are about individual speakers of English although the methodology to be discussed is meant to apply to speakers of any language. Existing work detailing research replicating such predicted correlational patterns of judgments beyond speakers of English will be discussed mainly in relation to Japanese, but, to a lesser degree, in relation to Mandarin Chinese and Korean. Students will learn certain properties of Japanese necessary for understanding Japanese-specific hypotheses, and also about how Japanese-specific hypotheses were formulated and tested for noise control, along with results of experiments in Japanese.

One of the key concepts is rigorous testability, and the course will address how our hypotheses lead to rigorously testable predictions about individual speakers. As noted, the focus of the course is on individual speakers, rather than groups of speakers; it focuses on definite and categorical predictions about an individual speaker's linguistic judgments, rather than the average of a group of speakers. This will be illustrated in part based on results of "large-scale" experiments, making reference to the distinction between "factual knowledge" (based on statistical inference) and "comprehension" (based on deducing, obtaining

and replicating, a definite prediction) in the terms of Einstein's "Foreword", included in the readings.[1]

Overall, students will learn about basic aspects of scientific reasoning and experimentation, based on close investigation of linguistic intuitions of their own and of others. The biggest takeaway from the course is that we can accumulate knowledge about parts of the mind (the language faculty) by the scientific method, focusing on an individual speaker and replicating their linguistic judgments within speakers of the same linguistic community and beyond. The course does not require any prior experience of linguistics but it requires an inquisitive and critical mind.

1.1 Learning Objectives

Students' understanding of various concepts mentioned below will be checked by assignments and tests.

Weeks	Learning Objectives: At the end of the period, we want students to be able to:
1-3	State the object and the method of inquiry in Language Faculty Science (=LFS). State the significance of a success of LFS. State the general source of difficulty in achieving the goal of LFS. Clearly understand that it is important for them to state what they have understood and what they have not. State what understandings/conceptions of language and language-related issues have been discussed in class, including what students have expressed.
4-7a	State the general hypothesis about the necessary conditions for MR(S, X, Y):yes. State hypotheses about the necessary conditions for each of the five sources of MR(S, X, Y):yes. FR(FD and DD) NFS1 NFS2 coI coD State what is meant by: MR(S, X, Y) and three specific instances of it: What is meant by BVA(S, X, Y). What is meant by DR(S, X, beta). What is meant by Coref(alpha, Y). State what factors affect the J of MR(S, X, Y):J State the hypothesis about the necessary conditions for BVA(S, X, Y):yes. State the hypothesis about the necessary conditions for DR(S, X, beta):yes. State the hypothesis about the necessary conditions for Coref(S, alpha, Y):yes. State the hypothesis about how SVO and OSV in English must and can be related to hypothesized abstract structural representations. State how we get the sixteen (2x2x2x2=16) sentence patterns (=schemata), just with Subject, Object, and Verb, regarding where X and Y appear in the sentence, based on the choices of: whether X is embedded whether Y is embedded whether X is in the "Subject side" or in the "Object side" whether X precedes Y (We only consider schemata in which X being in the "Subject side" necessarily means Y being in the "Object side".)
4-7b	Check and state their introspective judgments about the possibility of BVA(X, Y) in a given sentence pattern, depending upon choices of X, Y, and other variables.

[1] Einstein, A., 1953/1967. "Foreword to the English translation of Galileo's Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems, University of California Press.

	Check and state their introspective judgments about the possibility of DR(X, beta) in a given sentence pattern, depending upon choices of X, beta, and other variables. Check and state their introspective judgments about the possibility of Coref(alpha, Y) in a given sentence pattern, depending upon choices of alpha, Y, and other variables.
4-7c	Answer logic questions, having to do with the truth tables for ∧, ∨, ¬, →. State what is meant by: Entailment Contrapositive De Morgan's Law State how the truth table for "→" is related to empirical research that seeks rigorous testability in the form of disconfirmability. State how deduction and abduction are used in LFS, in relation to its hypotheses, predictions and interpretation of experimental results.
8-9	Assess and state what firm understanding they have of some of concepts and state what concepts are still (somewhat) difficult. Assess and state what improvement they have made during Weeks 8-9 about their understanding of the concepts in question.
10-11	State what we will have decided to do for the remainder of the semester, based on the results in Weeks 8-9. State what we have done during Weeks 10-11 and what progress they have made. State how replication is pursued in LFS. Understand and state the significance of results of demonstration attempts in LFS.
12-15	TBA, based on what will have happened in Weeks 1-11. (Depending upon results in Weeks 1-11, we may decide to have the students conduct "experiments" on their friends and family members and report the results.)

1.2 Readings and Optional Readings

Readings will be assigned based on how things go. See 1.4.3 "Reading-related assignments" for the current (and tentative) line-up of the readings, apart from "easier-to-read" files, to be provided later.

1.3 Description and Assessment of Assignments

Each experiment-related assignment is based on in-class activities. Students will start doing the task in question in class and they will complete the task after class and submit it. Those assignments are intended to measure your understanding of relevant notions related to experiments in LFS, in reference to your own judgments.

Students are required to participate in on-line experiments. The on-line experiments are actually a pedagogical demonstration, where students will have the first experience of checking their own linguistic intuitions about the availability of meaning relations that will be discussed in depth in the rest of the semester. The actual empirical materials in the on-line experiments will be a small subset of what will be discussed in class. Participation of the on-line experiments will place students in a good position to appreciate discussion later in the semester about results of the same on-line experiments conducted in the past, with over 1,000 participants, and also results of analogous on-line experiments in Japanese, with close to 200 participants. If you fully participate in the on-line experiments, you get full points for that task.

The other types of assignments are to measure your understanding of the logic of LFS, including the basic logic in LFS.

1.4 Grading Breakdown

The course grades will be based on the assignments and tests as indicated below:

1.4.1 Five experiment-related assignments (each 7 points: 35 points in total)

For each of the experiment-related assignments, you will be given a list of choices for the items relevant, e.g., choices of: X, Y, beta, and alpha, and different sentence-types. (You are free to use your own choices of X Y, beta, and alpha (and even a different sentence-type) so as to obtain clearer judgments. The assignments are for:

–Finding choices of X and Y of DR(X, beta) (and other factors, such as the sentence-types) that lead to a c-command pattern for you and those that do not.
–Finding choices of X and Y of Coref(alpha, Y) (and other factors, such as the sentence-types) that lead to a c-command pattern for you and those that do not.
–Finding choices of X and Y of BVA(X, Y) (and other factors, such as the sentence-types) that lead to a c-command pattern for you and those that do not.

–Testing whether the correlational prediction about the J:no on BVA(X, Y), based on the choices of X, Y, and other factors, such as the sentence-type, based on the DR test and the Coref test, survives rigorous attempts at disconfirmation in your self-experiment.

–Placing yourself (and other speakers if applicable) (based on the reported judgments at a given time) in the appropriate part of the Venn Diagram showing results of an experiment, based on particular choices of X, Y, beta, alpha, and the sentence-type, confirming your understanding of the significance of your judgments with regards to the hypotheses and the prediction under discussion. In this assignment, you will also be asked questions assessing your understanding of how the contrapositive plays an important role in analyzing experimental results in LFS.

Each of the above tasks is for yourself (and for others in class). In the event that the assignment refers to judgments by other students in class, information about other students' judgments will be provided in the assignment.

We will use Google Doc for the submission of these Assignments.
(7x5=35 points)

1.4.2 On-line experiment participation (5 points)

(5 points)

1.4.3 Reading-related assignments (Currently listed as "Assignments" in Brightspace (each 5 points: 25 points in total)

Currently, they will cover the following, but more accessible files, covering the relevant materials, will be provided in due course, reflecting class discussion, student reactions, etc., and each assignment is based on each of those (more accessible) files. The readings mentioned below should be considered as "background readings" for each assignment in question; it will be announced what can be read as "background readings" for each assignment. These assignments will be done on-line; the questions will be given in a file to be distributed on-line and you will submit your answers on-line, at the Answer Page for each assignment.

Lasnik 1990
Ch. 9: 9.1 and 9.2 and Ch. 4: 4.1
Ch. 4: 4.2 and 4.3
Ch. 4: 4.4 (perhaps excluding the Ueyama models)
Ch. 4: 4.5
Ch. 4: 4.6.1
Ch. 5: 5.1

Ch. 5: 5.2-5.4
Ch. 6: 6.1, 6.2
Ch. 6: 6.3 (up to 6.3.1.3)
Ch. 6: 6.3.1.5
(5x5=25 points)

1.4.4 Logic Assignments (each 5 points: 10 points in total)

These are to make sure that you have a good understanding of the logic discussion (including Truth tables, De Morgan's Law and the contrapositive, the latter two of which are crucial for understanding how our correlational predictions are deduced from hypotheses in LFS. The format of these Assignments will be determined later.
(5x2=10 points)

1.4.5 Tests (each 5 points: 25 points in total)

Five Tests are currently being planned, to measure, and make sure about, your understanding of the important materials covered in the Experiment-related Assignments, and other Assignments. The Tests will be done in class.

Total
(30+5+25+10+25=100)

1.4.6 Extra points

You can earn extra points (up to 8 points for the course grade), based on your contribution to the understanding of the class. This can be by means of helping others in class, by means to raising questions that will benefit the class, etc.

1.5 Course Grading Scale

Course grades will be determined based on the following scale.

A 94 or higher
A- 90 or higher and lower than 94
B+ 87 or higher and lower than 90
B 84 or higher and lower than 87
B- 80 or higher and lower than 84
C+ 77 or higher and lower than 80
C 74 or higher and lower than 77
C- 70 or higher and lower than 74
D+ 67 or higher and lower than 70
D 64 or higher and lower than 67
D- 60 or higher and lower than 64
F 59 and below
C- or higher counts as Pass for Pass/Non Pass.

1.6 Assignment Submission Policy

The due dates for, and where/how to submit, each assignment will be announced later.

1.7 Grading Timeline

Students can expect grading and feedback from the instructor within a week from the submission of the assignment, often much faster than that.

2 Weekly Schedule

Tentative Schedule

Weeks	In-class activities	Lecture topics
1-2	Going over the syllabus. We will likely spend at least two sessions to go over the syllabus. Participating in on-line experiments. Talking about common conceptions of language and the conception of the language faculty in LFS. General and initial discussion. Discussing ambiguity: e.g., *unlockable*, referential vs. bound uses of pronouns, the plural and singular-denoting uses of *their*, *our*, etc. Pronoun vs. Names Effects of word orders on our judgments An initial look at initial "experimental" results Reliability of speaker judgments. Participating in Sub-Experiments. Different choices of X, Y, alpha, and beta, and other factors (like the sentence-type) that affect speaker judgments on the possibility of BVA(S, X, Y), DR(S, X, beta), and Coref(S, alpha, Y).	General introduction to LFS Vision and language Ambiguity, phrase structures, sound-meaning pairing, the concept of "meaning" Object of inquiry and the method of inquiry Basic Scientific Method The basic logic of LFS, up to the postulation of Merge, and how we can seek disconfirmability of Merge hypothesis by the basic scientific method Disconfirmability Merge, c-command, and M(eaning) R(elation)s C-command detection Hypothesis about MR(S, X, Y), with MR including BVA(S, X, Y), DR(S, X, beta) and Coref(S, alpha, Y).
3-4	Experiment-related assignment(s).	
5-7	On-line experiment participation. Self-experiments Experiment-related assignment(s). ..Logic	Different MRs (BVA, DR, and Coref) as observational tools for investigating properties of the Computational System (CS) of the language faculty, more specifically, for detecting c-command effects. MR(S, X, Y):J The hypothesis about the necessary conditions for MR(S, X, Y):yes. The hypothesis about the necessary conditions for each of the five sources of MR(S, X, Y):yes. FR(FD and DD) NFS1 NFS2 coI coD Factors affecting the J of MR(S, X, Y):J The hypothesis about the necessary conditions for BVA(S, X, Y). The hypothesis about the necessary conditions for DR(S, X, beta). The hypothesis about the necessary conditions for Coref(S, alpha, Y). The basic logic of LFS. The Correlational methodology.
8-9	—Discussing and assessing student understanding at this point	

	—Deciding how we want to proceed from here. —Trying to implement the ideas.	
10-11	—Venn Diagrams	Replication. Demonstration attempts.
12-15	TBA	

3 Readings and what purpose they are meant to serve

Very tentative schedule.
As stated above, more easily accessible files will be provided in due course, covering the relevant materials, reflecting class discussion, student reactions, etc., and the readings mentioned below are meant to be "background readings".

Weeks	Background Readings	Remarks
1-2	Feynman 1965/1994 Ch. 9: Sections 9.1 and 9.2 Lasnik 1990	The Ch. 9 readings are for an initial exposure to the object and the method of inquiry in LFS, the Feynman reading is about the basic scientific method adopted in LFS. They are the basis for the basic logic of LFS. The Lasnik reading is an important background reading.
3-4	Ch. 4: 4.2, and 4.3 Ch. 4.4.4 Ch. 4.4.5 Ch. 4.4.6.1	The Ch. 4 readings are for understanding basics of what is behind the class activities.
5-9	Ch. 5:5.1 Ch. 5: 5-2-5.4	The Ch. 5 readings illustrate how a LFStist working on Japanese (their native language) checked their introspective judgments in a way analogous to what students will have checked their introspective judgments.
10-11	Plesniak 2022a	The Plesniak 2022a reading is for a review of the correlational methodology.
12	TBA	
13	Ch. 6: 6.1-6.2 Ch. 6: 6.3 (up to 6.3.1.3) Ch. 6: 6.3.1.5	The Ch. 6 readings illustrate how replication is pursed in demonstration attempts in Japanese.
14-15	Various readings mentioned below under "Readings", not mentioned above, including: Einstein 1953/1967, Feynman 1985, Meehl 1967, Chomsky 2017.	Those readings are meant to help students to understand the LFS research in wider (historical) contexts.

4 Readings

Chomsky, Noam. 1959. "A Review of B. F. Skinner's *Verbal Behavior*", in *Language*, 35, No. 1, 26-58.

Chomsky, Noam. 2017. "The Galilean Challenge," *Inference: International Review of Science*, Vol. 3. Issue 1.

Einstein, Albert. 1936. Physics and Reality. The Journal of the Franklin Institute; Reprinted in: *Ideas and*

Opinions. 1955. Crown Publishers, New York. (The assigned reading is pp. 293-295.)
Einstein, Albert. 1953/1967. "Foreword to the English translation of *Galileo's Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems*, University of California Press. (The assigned reading is pp. xvii-xix)
Feynman, Richard. 1965/1994. *The character of physical law*. New York: The Modern Library. (The Feynman lectures based on which this book was prepared can be viewed on-line. If you Google "Feynman Messenger Lectures," you will find the seven lectures. The assigned reading is pp. 150-153, which is part of his seventh lecture ("Seeking New Laws") available at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MIN_-Flswy0 (last accessed on 1/24/2023). The content of pp. 150-151 starts around 14:40 of that video.)
Feynman, Richard. 1985. "Cargo Cult Science", in *"Surely You're joking, Mr. Feynman": Adventures of a curious character*, W. W. Norton and Company, New York.
Hoji, H. 2017. "Galileo's Other Challenge." *Inference: International Review of Science*, Vol. 3. Issue 2.
Hoji, H, D. Plesniak, and Y. Takubo. (eds.) 2023 *The Theory and Practice of Language Faculty Science*, De Gruyter Mouton.
Hoji, H. "The key tenets of language faculty science", in Hoji et al. 2023. (This shall be referred to as "Ch. 4".)
Hoji, H. "Detection of c-command effects", in Hoji et al. 2023. (This shall be referred to as "Ch. 5".)
Hoji, H. "Replication: predicted correlations of judgments in Japanese", in Hoji et al. 2023. (This shall be referred to as "Ch. 6".)
Hoji, H. and D. Plesniak. "Language Faculty Science and Physics", in Hoji et al. 2023. (This shall be referred to as "Ch. 9".).
Lasnik, Howard. 1990. "Syntax", in D. N. Osherson and H. Lasnik eds., *Language: An Invitation to Cognitive Science Volume 1*, A Bradford Book, The MIT Press, Cambridge, pp. 5-21.
Meehl, E. Paul. 1967. "Theory testing in psychology and physics: a methodological paradox", *Philosophy of Science* 34: 103-115. (Reprinted in Morrison and Henkel 1970/2007. The page reference is to Morrison and Henkel 1970/2007.)
Penrose, Roger. 2004. *The Road to Reality: A Complete Guide to the Laws of the Universe*, Jonathan Cape. (The required reading is Chapter 1: Section 1.4, but you will find it useful to read the rest of the chapter.)
Plesniak, Daniel. 2022a. "Building the Linguistic Telescope". February 2022. Talk given at the Second Annual Workshop on Language Faculty Science. Online.
Plesniak, Daniel. 2023a. "Predicted Correlations of Judgments in English", in Hoji et al. 2023. (This shall be referred to as "Ch. 7".)
Popper, Karl. 1963. "Science: Problems, aims, responsibilities", Federation Proceedings (Baltimore), *Federations of American Societies of Experimental Biology* 22.4: 961-972.
Schütze, Carson and Jon Sprouse. 2013. "Judgment Data", in Robert J. Podesva and Devyani Sharma, eds., *Research Methods in Linguistics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 27-50.

5 Additional References

Chomsky, Noam. 1975. *Reflections on Language*. Pantheon, New York.
Chomsky, Noam. 2004. *The Generative Enterprise Revisited*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
Chomsky, Noam. 2012. *The Science of Language: Interview with James McGilvray*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Duhem, Pierre. 1906/1954. *The aim and structure of physical theory*, Princeton University Press, Princeton. (The original publication in French in 1906, its original English translation in 1954, and its renewed edition in 1982.)
Einstein, Albert., 1936. Physics and Reality. The Journal of the Franklin Institute; Reprinted in: *Ideas and Opinions*. 1955. Crown Publishers, New York.
Feynman, Richard. 1963. *Six Easy Pieces*, Basic Books, New York.
Feynman, Richard. 1965/1994. *The character of physical law*, The Modern Library, New York.

Feynman, Richard. 1999. *The Pleasure of Finding Things Out*, Basic Books, New York. (The suggested readings are pp. 22-23 and pp. 108-109. What is in pp. 22-23 can be viewed at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tWr39Q9vBgo&t=7s (last accessed on 1/24/2023).)
Hoji, Hajime. 2015. *Language Faculty Science*. Cambridge University Press.
Hoji, Hajime, Satoshi Kinsui, Yukinori Takubo and Ayumi Ueyama. 2003. "The demonstratives in modern Japanese", In Yen-Hui Audrey Li and Andrew Simpson (eds.), *Functional structure(s), form and interpretation*, 97–128. New York: Routledge.
Plesniak, Daniel. 2022b. *Towards a Correlational Law of Language: Three Factors Constraining Judgment Variation*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California PhD dissertation.
Plesniak, Daniel. 2023b. "Implementing Experiments on the Language Faculty", in Hoji et al. 2023. (This shall be referred to as "Ch. 8".)
Plesniak, Daniel. 2023c. "C-command and Beyond: The Emerging Universe of Formal and Non-Formal Relations", *The Korean Journal of Linguistics* (언어), 48(2), 315-366.
Poincaré, Henri. 1952. *Science and hypothesis*. New York: Dover Publications. (The English translation of *La science et l'hypothèse* (1902).)
Schütze, Carson. 1996. *The empirical base of linguistics: Grammaticality judgments and linguistic methodology*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

6 Academic Integrity

The University of Southern California is foremost a learning community committed to fostering successful scholars and researchers dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge and the transmission of ideas. Academic misconduct is in contrast to the university's mission to educate students through a broad array of first-rank academic, professional, and extracurricular programs and includes any act of dishonesty in the submission of academic work (either in draft or final form).

This course will follow the expectations for academic integrity as stated in the USC Student Handbook. All students are expected to submit assignments that are original work and prepared specifically for the course/section in this academic term. You may not submit work written by others or "recycle" work prepared for other courses without obtaining written permission from the instructor(s). Students suspected of engaging in academic misconduct will be reported to the Office of Academic Integrity.

Other violations of academic misconduct include, but are not limited to, cheating, plagiarism, fabrication (e.g., falsifying data), knowingly assisting others in acts of academic dishonesty, and any act that gains or is intended to gain an unfair academic advantage.

The impact of academic dishonesty is far-reaching and is considered a serious offense against the university and could result in outcomes such as failure on the assignment, failure in the course, suspension, or even expulsion from the university.

For more information about academic integrity see the student handbook or the Office of Academic Integrity's website, and university policies on Research and Scholarship Misconduct.

7 Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems

7.1 Academic Integrity:

The University of Southern California is a learning community committed to developing successful scholars

and researchers dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge and the dissemination of ideas. Academic misconduct, which includes any act of dishonesty in the production or submission of academic work, comprises the integrity of the person who commits the act and can impugn the perceived integrity of the entire university community. It stands in opposition to the university's mission to research, educate, and contribute productively to our community and the world.

All students are expected to submit assignments that represent their own original work, and that have been prepared specifically for the course or section for which they have been submitted. You may not submit work written by others or "recycle" work prepared for other courses without obtaining written permission from the instructor(s).

Other violations of academic integrity include, but are not limited to, cheating, plagiarism, fabrication (e.g., falsifying data), collusion, knowingly assisting others in acts of academic dishonesty, and any act that gains or is intended to gain an unfair academic advantage.

The impact of academic dishonesty is far-reaching and is considered a serious offense against the university. All incidences of academic misconduct will be reported to the Office of Academic Integrity and could result in outcomes such as failure on the assignment, failure in the course, suspension, or even expulsion from the university.

For more information about academic integrity see the student handbook or the Office of Academic Integrity's website, and university policies on Research and Scholarship Misconduct.

Please ask your instructor if you are unsure what constitutes unauthorized assistance on an exam or assignment, or what information requires citation and/or attribution.

7.2 Students and Disability Accommodations:
USC welcomes students with disabilities into all of the University's educational programs. The Office of Student Accessibility Services (OSAS) is responsible for the determination of appropriate accommodations for students who encounter disability-related barriers. Once a student has completed the OSAS process (registration, initial appointment, and submitted documentation) and accommodations are determined to be reasonable and appropriate, a Letter of Accommodation (LOA) will be available to generate for each course. The LOA must be given to each course instructor by the student and followed up with a discussion. This should be done as early in the semester as possible as accommodations are not retroactive. More information can be found at osas.usc.edu. You may contact OSAS at (213) 740-0776 or via email at osasfrontdesk@usc.edu.

7.3 Support Systems:
The Student Resources page is found at: https://sites.google.com/view/uscphongroup/usc-support