CONCLUSION
Rethinking Our Use of "Plagiarism"

Carol Peterson Haviland and Joan A. Mullin

We began this research hoping that defining disciplinary ownership would lead us to richer understandings of plagiarism, collaboration, and intellectual property and thus to more effective ways of teaching students about these issues. And indeed it has. It also has demonstrated the complexity, flexibility, and plasticity of information sharing, challenging our definitions of "intellectual property" and "plagiarism" even further than expected. Although from the beginning, we have been chiefly interested in what our colleagues say, what they do, and how they communicate ownership practices to their students rather than with the legal wrangling over IP, our interviews mirrored the disputes being played out on the Internet between what people traditionally have done with information and what they now can be seen doing with it. Millions of users—corporations, institutions, and individuals—are attempting through the courts to expand traditional notions of ownership, to protect or extend their profits, or to contain creativity as they seek to establish what constitutes intellectual property, how much one can borrow, alter, and still own, and when citation and acknowledgment are necessary.

Our research, likewise, found that rather than explore these questions in their classes with students, academics often defaulted to their traditional nineteenth-century Germanic roots—those nested in notions of expertise, disciplinarity, and single authorship.[1] This results, at least overtly, in responding

1. For a recent discussion of how this influence led to "an emphasis on rigorous research, typically empirical, and publication in scholarly journals," see Michael Carter's (2007) "Ways of Knowing Doing and Writing in the

to plagiarism by quantifying it—by counting words, lines, and phrases—and by punishing those who have not been "original" enough, ignoring the knowledge-building that takes place in activity systems (disciplines) and ignoring what, in fact, scholars actually do.

This gap between what courts and corporations may lead us to think and what people actually do through file sharing, appropriation, remixing, and mashing via the Internet, offers an analogy to the gap between what university sites dedicated to plagiarism lay out for classrooms and the practices in which faculty engage in their own disciplinary work. Just as legal rulings do not cover all circumstances, so, too, the simple definitions of plagiarism found on most university Web sites cannot cover all possible scenes, and they offer little teaching about citation as knowledge-building. This is confirmed by the participants we interviewed who, while uniformly defining plagiarism in the negative—as direct copying without citation—described acknowledgment as integral to the literate practices by which they *build on and extend* their work within disciplines and interdisciplines (another case of the tendency to remix and mash). As Russell and Yañez (2003) succinctly put it, writing

> tends to disappear into the activity it mediates. It is messy to analyze, because contexts are networks, not containers. People act in multiple, interacting systems of activity where writing that seems the 'same' as what one has read or written before is in practice very different—and not only in the formal features, the 'how' of writing. Lying behind the *how* are the *who*, *where*, *when*, *what* and—most importantly—the *why* of writing, the motives of people engaged in some system of activity. (359)

As we investigated the who, where, when, and what of ownership and citation in these disciplines, we began to see why faculty engage in their particular practices: these practices allow them to participate in knowledge-building communities, to

Disciplines." Such "siloing" of knowledge also underpins our practices of tenure and promotion—a process that depends on proving ownership.

know and to be known in the professional arenas that matter to them; they are part of an ethos that gives faculty credibility, standing, and tangible professional and personal rewards. Because our interviewees already knew how to participate in their intertwined systems of communication and citation, they had both a sense of what counted as intellectual property and an understanding of how collaboration and recognition were valued as academic inquiry practices. However, they were far less sure about how they had acquired this knowledge or how to articulate it to students, novices who are expected to negotiate the complex discourse activities of a discipline and at the same time intuit what is known, not known, recognized, and cited. Instead, they, too, relied on generic definitions of plagiarism and their resulting policies. However, these do not accurately represent faculty's unspoken, disciplinary expectations about student citation practices; they also end up making the reasons that underpin disciplinary processes of citation invisible, recreating for students the same barriers to learning practices as were set for faculty when they were students. As Prior and Shipka have found,

> what is historically striking are the institutional practices that so foreground single activity systems and so codify and formalize practices that it appear[s], at least from a certain perspective, that the work activity [i]s ever a single, solid, and rule-governed phenomenon. (2003, 207)

Michael Carter warns us that relying on generic definitions of research

> obscure[s] the complex disciplinary goal structures behind the research paper. . . . As a rule, the goal is not simply to write a research paper for the sake of learning to manage research, but to use the process of doing and writing research to shape a disciplinary way of knowing. (2007, 407)

Part of that research process—and a way of learning a discipline—is to know what is owned and how that knowledge is

created, disseminated, challenged, and expanded in a visual, textual, and auditory world of multiple, continually-shifting literate practices, of inter-disciplines, remixes, and mashups.[2] Our interviewees provide the support for Valentine's claim that

> it is not enough for students to know the rules or textual practices of citation, partly because they do not cover all enactments and partly because they shift as disciplines and the varied technologies that support them shift. Rather, students need to come to understand citation and plagiarism as literacy practices—as complicated ways of making meaning. (2006, 105)

In light of these shifting particularities, commonalities, and contradictions, we conclude here not by offering a set of templates that faculty members can use to instruct students how to "document" their research, but by offering a process of field and classroom inquiry in which faculty can engage students, exploring with them the "who, where, when, what and—most importantly—the why" of disciplinary knowledge and knowledge building. In so doing, we suggest, students will not merely "learn rules," but rather they will see the concepts that undergird the ways in which disciplines—and different instructors within those disciplines—shape their research questions and define their research practices as they build on, reconsider, or reject others' worlds through their particular lenses. Understanding these activities, we contend, more fully prepares students to participate in disciplines whose understandings of collaboration, plagiarism, and intellectual property continually evolve. We believe we can start by interrogating the definitions we presently use to name these concepts, terms that have shaped and limited our own understandings and thus the understandings we transmit to students.

---

2. To clarify the difference: "*Remix* is the reworking or adaptation of an existing work. The remix may be subtle, or it may completely redefine how the work comes across. It may add elements from other works, but generally efforts are focused on creating an alternate version of the original. A *mashup*, on the other hand, involves the combination of two or more works that may be very different from one another" (Lamb 2007).

OWNERSHIP/ORIGINALITY/PLAGIARISM

"Ownership" initially seemed exactly the right term to get us beyond simplistic understandings of plagiarism and cheating, but it quickly became problematic. Across disciplines, our informants alternately embrace, contest, and resist flattened definitions of ownership. In their own work, they speak unabashedly of including the work of other writers under their own names: in some cases, their signatures add the required authority or prestige to the texts, and in others they simply represent an expected and hierarchical collaboration in which participants are differently represented. Likewise, our fieldworkers first trouble the term "ownership" when they mention it as more significantly tied to their study sites than to their textual research productions, and then resist the concept altogether because of its colonialist connotations. Such challenges move us away from thinking of intellectual property solely in terms of ownership, turning us instead to originality, which is another cornerstone of traditional readings of intellectual property.

Yet, art informants complicate our view of originality and push us to rethink its role in constructing plagiarism. Art practitioners' engagement in appropriation, homage, and pastiche raises questions for all disciplines about how our assignments also invite appropriation, homage, and pastiche, about how faculty members and students might be differently accountable for originality given their different knowledge bases within an activity system. Originality thus becomes a matter of point of view, as Malcolm Gladwell explains in his detailed examination of a playwright accused of plagiarism:

> by the time ideas pass into their third and fourth lives, we lose track of where they came from, and we lose control of where they are going. The final dishonesty of the plagiarism fundamentalists is to encourage us to pretend that these chains of influence and evolution do not exist, and that a writer's words have a virgin birth and an eternal life (2004, 7).

Writers as diverse as Gladwell, Bakhtin, and Bazerman maintain that even though authors may use others' words, they use them with their own intents in their own spaces. Students' intents are based on students' performances—their practicing—a process of learning that implies imitation and repetition; this is much different from the intents of academics as they develop and situate themselves in ongoing conversations that they already claim as their own.[3] The word "original" takes on new meaning for faculty as their

> writing occasions call for a very intricate dance between the new and the familiar: in all disciplines, 'new' work must be derivative enough to make sense, to mark writers as credible insiders, to evoke interest and relevance, and yet be original enough to be considered a contribution. (Bazerman 2005)

Even when work is at its most resistant, that which it resists must be recognizable in order for readers to grasp its full function. In this regard, all texts—written by novices or by experts—in some fashion appropriate, pay homage, and pastiche, but the extent to and the means by which they accomplish this is driven by the disciplinary activity, not by a romantic notion of originality. In our classrooms, however, we often send mystifying messages when we merely refer to "originality" as part of our assignment criteria—assignments, whose intent is often not to be original anyway, but to put together known information in a way that is new to the student writers.

When we ask students, for example, to write summaries, we are not looking as much for original words as for skill in selecting and arranging another's ideas for yet another reader's use. Here, then, we need to communicate clearly what we know about how summary writing functions in our fields, about why we work from primary sources, about how arrangement and word choice can shape even "objective" writing, such as summaries, and thus lead to subtly different texts. We also need to

3. For a discussion of other ways faculty differently privilege their actions from those of students, see Haviland and Mullin, 1999.

discuss the *occasions for* summaries and the expectations readers have for summaries, and we can begin with asking students why they read summaries and what they expect to learn from them. Otherwise students can see summary assignments as busywork, and we should be disappointed but not surprised when they produce them as such, often resorting to copying or downloading someone else's summary because the work we are asking them to do has already been done (why repeat it?). We need to assign summary writing for real purposes and to link those purposes to larger assignments that require summary as an activity that contributes to an ongoing conversation, demonstrating how summaries function in, say, a particular disciplinary controversy or grant proposal. By situating the activity (summary) within the "why," we can mitigate the negative response that creates either insufficient citation or "originality despair" in complex assignments.

Experienced scholars can easily overestimate students' understandings of disciplinary content and of what might be original, and yet originality despair among students is a serious consequence of the flattening of rules defining plagiarism. As Jonathan Hall points out, it is a

> question about the boundaries of identity: where, exactly, do ideas which are 'mine' leave off, and ideas which are 'other people's' begin? It is, of course, a question without a clear answer, and any honest account of any creative process, academic or otherwise, will have to acknowledge these kinds of doubts about the tenability of the concept of ideas as anyone's personal possession. (Hall 2005)

As a consequence, when faced with challenging texts to read and summarize, and with unfamiliar information to organize in new ways, it is no surprise that, intentionally or not, students copy ideas, words, or phrases, without citations. Comparing learning a disciplinary culture to learning a foreign language illuminates this logic. Learners often revert to copying others' words and phrases as they struggle to gain fluidity in the language: "They're appropriating 'reliable syntax' in a field where

they're scared to make a mistake . . . and unable to paraphrase or even sure if it's possible to paraphrase!" (Kearns 2007)

For example, our informants spoke of both the rules and the vagaries of visual production. Most clearly protected are the photographers whose professional associations have articulated specific guidelines and who are further guarded by corporate Web crawlers looking for appropriation. Students are taught about these and the laws that seem quite clear: stealing an image is wrong, just as stealing a photographer's negative is wrong. Likewise, it is wrong for a photographer to steal code for a computerized image or for a computer scientist to steal a new interface or piece of software. At the same time, however, those very companies whose business is the selling and buying of images, those who so strenuously protect themselves and their clients, appropriate portions of images or investigate and adapt codes (sometimes allegedly illegally).[4] As more of the public exchange stories about their codes, their pictures, their texts being appropriated,[5] it is little wonder that these taking and manipulating practices multiply, despite what might be said in a classroom.

Common disciplinary practices that encourage mimicry through a variety of exercises, formatting, and rubrics further complicate this dilemma. This is easiest to see where art students are told to go to a museum and copy a painting, turning in the copy for feedback about technique; or where fashion design students are told to look through magazines for forms that appeal to them and to sketch them—to start from the original form but then expand or repeat it. Architecture students are given similar projects, as are graphic artists and illustrators.

4. See Monica Hesse's (2008) description of several instances of this: For example, Fox News posting a picture of a cute dog during an NFL game that was lifted from Flickr—originally taken and posted by Gaughran-Perez after dressing her pug in a Santa Claus hat. The company ignored the "all rights reserved" post.

5. As Paul Tolme notes, "When I traveled to South Dakota in 2005 to write a story about black-footed ferrets, I never imagined my words about the little weasels would one day appear in a trashy romance novel." (Tolme 2008)

Here our cross-disciplinary research creates a puzzle: how are these uses of someone else's shape, form, or idea—without attribution—really different from taking words, lines, or ideas and incorporating them into newly pastiched research papers? How can the visual inform textual production and our thinking about plagiarism in ways that are both more nuanced and precise? (See also Orr, Blythman, and Mullin 2005.)

Our culture—and our students—need to better understand faculty members' own successes and missteps with these ventures, and academics can contribute to this understanding by talking explicitly about their personal and disciplinary, intellectual, ethical, and legal understandings of "originality" and "ownership." They can build into courses discussions about originating, remixing, and mashups, about owning via originating, and about owning by commissioning or purchasing or building on a foundation. They can talk concretely about how Beethoven's Fifth Symphony might be differently owned by Beethoven, by his patrons, by a particular symphonic interpreter, or by a recording company. They can incorporate into classrooms discussions of how artists and Disney, computer scientists and Dell, or those of us who edited this book and Utah State University Press are originators and owners of intellectual property. Faculty can explore with students what they own through their production—and what we each gain from claiming ownership—and thus *why* we claim it.

How texts of all kind are used and claimed is closely connected, as court cases reveal, to what is gained, for, despite what we like to think, "the rhetoric of creative originality doesn't fully explain our preoccupation with footnoting and credit" (O'Rourke 2007). Unless we are more forthright with ourselves about plagiarism and why we disapprove of it, our students may simply make the pragmatic association of grades, labor, plagiarism, and punishment, and, therefore, feel more intrigued with "getting away with it" than with understanding it. What could be a fertile learning space then decays and a "scent of mistrust" develops when students are seen and see themselves as

"being monitored because they are not toeing the line, achieving enough, working hard enough" (Bazerman 2002, 443). By focusing on catching the plagiarists, we miss focusing on why students may be plagiarizing; by assuming that they plagiarize because it is convenient or because they are lazy, we ignore the tradition of the academy that encourages performance over substance, that reifies originality while ignoring the complexity of knowledge-building. Thus we might want to begin by admitting to ourselves—and our students—that

> for "publish or perish" faculty, . . . ideas are, quite literally, all that they have; it is their claim to ownership and origination of ideas that is the basis of their continued employment. Perhaps this is why we tend to oversimplify the complex issues surrounding plagiarism: because it threatens the very way that we put food on our tables. (Hall, 2005)

However, our participants' conversations about ownership, originality, collaboration, and plagiarism, and the ways they build on others' ideas and work, suggest to us that our actual practices not only challenge what we think we know about the term "plagiarism," but also call into question that for which we as faculty want to be recognized. This thrusts us into very uncomfortable territory. But to change the conversation about plagiarism, to link it to our actual disciplinary practices, we need to place ourselves in precisely the discomfiting positions in which we place our students.

COLLABORATION

Although some academic departments, particularly in the humanities, continue to prize, and even demand, individual scholarship, our informants assert that their own work is often unavoidably collaborative and, again, that they simply "know" how to negotiate credit and ownership within resulting collaborations. In contrast, collaboration in their classrooms seems more complicated: while some informants report that they conduct almost entirely collaborative classrooms and others

construct some collaborative activities, much of this classroom work does not closely parallel disciplinary collaboration.

While the disciplinary activity systems that thrive on collaborative projects may earn individual attention (e.g., Gehry in architecture, Versace in design) or collective recognition (the list of authors for a science article), insiders in fields understand that the work is collaborative, regardless of how that collaboration is publicly marked. The scene is different, however, in classrooms. Even though students receive grades as a result of their group work, the activity on which their evaluations are based is seldom negotiated or even visible. Faculty members often assign/apportion grades based on their estimations of students' contributions or on self or peer evaluations of performance. On the one hand, individual grades are the stakes by which students accrue recognition for original work; on the other hand, as students in some of our classes attest, classroom collaborations become games, not real scholarship. Students generally dislike group work because, in their real world—school—individual excellence is what counts. The contradiction is apparent to them, but what is not made apparent in classrooms is any parallel between recognition for their assignments and recognition for work they might do—collaborative and individual—outside of school. Students often view the issues of ownership and plagiarism as a school activity rather than as a disciplinary activity, shrugging off the issues as simply rules to guess at or an individual faculty member's idiosyncrasy (which indeed, they may be). When they are in art and design, they see how collaboration works toward a material end; when they are in business or higher education administration, they witness how documents are patched together from multiple sources. Unlike some of their humanities counterparts, faculty in other fields may be more realistic about disciplinary practices based on collaboration and sharing, making it even more difficult to apply that one-size-fits-all definition to students' work. Thinking in terms of a generic definition of plagiarism works against students who, while engaging in appropriate disciplinary practices in art or

business, will be penalized for applying those practices to history or literature.

These disciplinary differences can be generative spaces where students learn about ownership and recognition. For example, we found that even though our informants expect students to work collaboratively as they generate their projects (as they write computer code, for example), very rarely do any of them spend significant time walking groups through practices that parallel those they conduct with their colleagues as they plan, discuss ownership, and determine credit for collaborative projects. In their own academic work, before even starting to write a grant project with another scholar, several informants routinely negotiate investigator and primary author roles up front, although they also report that sometimes it becomes necessary to renegotiate these arrangements as the projects develop and particularly when author roles shift. We can facilitate student decisions about and engagement in collaboration as knowledge-building, helping them see it as much more than dividing up a project, going off to their corners to write, and coming back with a large roll of tape to assemble the collected results. Also, rather than insisting that students' practices remain different from faculty practices, we can create methodologies that elicit and credit collaborative student work according to disciplinary practices.

A methods and research class in the major might begin by discussing why scholars or investigators collaborate.[6] Why do they discuss ideas with colleagues, and how do they then use feedback to expand or focus a project? How do they situate

6. Too many institutions and departments have no carefully scripted series of prerequisites for students in the major, making instruction haphazard at best. This often leads faculty to assume that students have learned about disciplinary knowledge and citation practices elsewhere, freeing them from teaching about such issues. While not all classes will need to address them, the curriculum should guarantee that students will learn about acknowledgment in a timely fashion, be able to practice their understandings, and have occasions to work on increasingly complex activities that call for thoughtful application of disciplinary constructions.

conflicting perspectives? How do they incorporate or reject conference feedback? We might even ask students to determine how these practices might translate to the classroom collaborations we orchestrate. Perhaps, instead of writing "the research paper," sociology students might track the evolution of a question or issue, noting how it has been shaped and changed, what disciplinary questions stimulated the further research, and what new questions have emerged. This then could lead students to discuss the same kinds of issues that faculty members consider when they assign authorship of publications. Likewise, faculty could incorporate this same sort of inquiry as students write and publish code, as they do laboratory research and report their data, as they prepare field notes for publication, or as in management courses they negotiate representations of themselves as writers/sponsors/signers of public documents or artists of public works. Such negotiations could also open questions about different publication sites. For example, students could look more closely at both using and publishing in electronic forums where, unlike in traditional print spaces, an audience might be able to immediately and publicly react to text, alter it, or build on it.

This would also demand that we rethink our reward system. If, as Rebecca Moore Howard (1999) asserts, we all "stand in the shadow of giants" and student "patchwriting" should be recognized as novices' valid attempts to walk with them as they enter a discourse, then we also need to reconsider differently using and rewarding collaboration with other voices and with peers in our classrooms. Classrooms, in the novice-professional sense of the word, are discourse communities in which members engage in building entry into a knowledge-field, but while it flies in the face of our grading system, might recognition for community discourse building more readily apply to the class as a whole? Might we begin to imagine our classes as learning collaboratives to begin with? Might, then, class members be rewarded for leadership positions, yet others be rewarded for their contributions to those individuals? How might the class be held responsible

for the mutual creation, documentation, recognition, ownership, and accountability for knowledge-building?

There is little doubt that assigning students a single class grade would never appease our competition-saturated culture, at least now; but how might our collaborative classrooms more effectively teach the processes of meaning-making and rewards other than an alphabetical ranking that doesn't appropriately correspond to the actual merits of collaboration that builds a community? We are suggesting that work groups can be clearly discussed, constituted, and given tasks that reflect a discipline's inquiry and processes, and that the term "collaboration" take on more than just a classroom role, it becomes seen as a learning *process*, an activity. As a result, we need to reconsider how our misuse of the word "plagiarism" is blinding us to fruitful classroom and discourse collaborations and how it calls into question our assessment practices (see also Bazerman 2002) as well as our model of competitive marking and ranking.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS/PRELIMINARY ANSWERS

Thaiss and Zawacki's (2006) and Russell and Yanez's (2003) work demonstrates how faculty might use research questions and practices as activities—and teach them as such. At the heart of their data and of our participants' reflections is the realization that

> Without a theory of activity that attends to the intersection of durable projects, individual goal-oriented acts, and the affordances of mediational means and that also acknowledges the fundamental heterogeneity (and hence lamination) of activity, studies of writing have typically continued to rely on ideologies that see writing as a general skill of transcription and as everyday mappings of the social world, which seem to suggest that a named social space is a bounded, definite object. (Prior and Shipka 2003, 208)

We might also begin questioning our current constructions and practices that shape student learning by recalling our own initiations into our fields and by recording how our students do it.

We might identify overlapping complexities, answer questions, and ask how knowing is constructed, how credibility is established, and why particular resources are chosen. Understanding these activities might not only help faculty shift their plagiarism paradigm, but also could create practices that help students delineate what belongs to them and what needs to be cited as belonging to others.

We use this book project as an example: although each researcher began with the same questions, we often ended up in different places, adjusting our questions according to emerging data, drawing on each others' findings as we compared them, receiving feedback from tentative propositions and resetting our boundaries. We noticed how those in fields we were investigating defined our questions according to their own disciplinary perspectives, and this changed how we thought about our subject and how we might continue to investigate it. For example, Boland and Haviland immediately became intrigued with fieldworkers' identification of study spaces (sites, populations) as something they owned, although they subsequently substituted the term "stewardship" or resisted the term "ownership" altogether. This discovery led them to look more carefully at the connections between disciplinary epistemologies and research and ownership practices. When faced with the plastic definition of appropriation in art, architecture, and design, Mullin found herself questioning what had seemed to her "givens" in defining plagiarism in the humanities, and these questions caused her to rethink how she teaches research in her field to students who are increasingly working in multimodal environments. The common use of borrowed texts in academic administration invites all of us to wonder how the divide between institutional members who make rules about plagiarism and those who must follow them mirrors the gap between faculty's actual disciplinary practices and their hidden expectations for their students in the classroom.

This leads us to believe that questioning definitions of plagiarism and ownership is especially crucial, and not just because

students come to our classes prepped with traditional ideas about ownership and research and with very general ideas about citation practices. The terms as currently constituted and used falsely constrain our practices within a narrow "social space" (the classroom), treating the collaborative facets of our activities as general skills that have little to do with functions across boundaries.[7] In the same way, faculty foster a reduced notion of citation and its relation to ownership by teaching generic genres or templates of ownership, further ignoring the systems of activity that frame our intellectual work and making it more difficult for students to understand and enter our actual complex systems with a sense of inquiry and curiosity. At best, we teach practices students cannot transfer to other writing scenes, and at worst, we set them up for negative transfer, as happened to Tim in Anne Beaufort's (2007) study. In his progression from a first-year writing course to a history major to an engineering major, Tim assumed the habits of historians were directly applicable to those of engineer.

Coupled with Beaufort's descriptions of Tim's experience as a professional engineer and Steve Westbrook's reminder that academics conceive of intellectual property in more generous terms than do those outside of the academy, we must ask if it is possible for "students [to] acquire genre knowledge without participating in the larger activity system" (Thaiss and Zawacki 2006, 169). Just as Thaiss and Zawacki then ask, "to what extent can we teach activity system by teaching its genres, like the lab report in biology, for example," we ask, to what extent can we teach activity systems by teaching plagiarism as a contained object? For example, if we were to use Youra's (2008) term "authorized collaboration" in discussing plagiarism with students writing lab reports, we might allow them to see how, at each juncture, when scientists make sense out of things by putting questions and discoveries into works, they are "writing the text" of that study—and that they are assuming both the credit

7. For a thorough discussion of how we need to look at the "doing" within disciplines, see Michael Carter's "Ways of Knowing, Doing, and Writing in the Discipline" (2007) or Lethem (2007).

and the responsibility for its integrity. In the large-scale collaboration that is the norm in science, when students understand *the* "*who*, *where*, *when*, *what,* and—most importantly—the *why*" they are writing lab reports *within* a discipline; they can more easily understand when they should and should not copy, cite, and appropriate. Likewise, as Boland and Haviland note in chapter 2, when positioned as readers and writers rather than as punishment avoiders, students can describe ownership and citation practices in readerly-writerly terms. When they observe that as readers they want writers to cite so that they can track authorial credibility and sequencing, they are offering the same reasons faculty writers offer. When they say that they want to be cited as writers because they want credit for their work and because they want to be included in continuing conversations about the issues they are working on, they are responding much like the academics that our chapter authors interviewed.

Inquiry originally was at the center of education; we are suggesting here that we consciously return to that purpose by studying and sharing our research processes rather than merely disseminating our knowledge. We can reduce the anxiety over disciplinary coverage by recognizing how thinking, reading, and writing collaboratively engages students (as it engages us) in a more lasting kind of learning, foregrounding the *activity* of research rather than the transmitting of results (Brent, 274). This might well have transformative repercussions within our institutions. Should our worth as academics hang not merely on our own originality, it might then be possible to have our teaching considered equally important—our ability to share our research processes, assimilation, analysis, and knowledge-building. However, our interviews here realistically lead us to conclude that, as a start, faculty members can more accurately develop a vocabulary for their research activities, define their systems, rethink "plagiarism," reconsider notions of "originality," and reform classroom practices to more consistently reflect inquiry processes. Of course, we would like to claim these statements as our original work, but can we?

As is our custom as academics, what follows this conclusion is a works cited list that documents how much we owe to our colleagues whose conversations we have engaged and expanded. But our work owes acknowledgment to those outside that list: Linda Bergmann, for example, has been an essential contributor to this project from its inception, taking a central role in multiple conference presentations, talking through the introduction with us, deliberating in conference hotel bars over how to interpret our data, as well as originating her own chapter. Other colleagues in each of our institutions listened intently, generously setting aside their own projects, enlarging our views with their perspectives as we worked out the evolving meanings of "originality," "collaboration," and "plagiarism." Howard, Bazerman, Hall, and many others contributed unwittingly by giving their own conference presentations and publishing their own texts, upon which we have built, and the result is a multiply revised "conclusion" in which we have tried but surely failed in places to document sources and in which our two voices are indistinguishable. Thus, we conclude with a retreat from "originality," which we believe no longer serves usefully, and return to what seems a more viable although flawed and complicated term "ownership." But we return with new thinking.

Ownership in a capitalist society cannot stand uncomplicated, for if we leave it as such, we leave it to lawyers and to plagiarism-detecting services to chart our relationships with texts and ideas.[8] We could then eliminate overusing the word "plagiarism," substituting discussions of our community practices: collaboration, appropriation, and knowledge building. In order to do this, however, we believe that we need to take a closer look at the dramatically different significance we assign to the various marks we make. Why, for example, can a student or a faculty

8. We have abundant examples in higher education—the most recent in the area of assessment—of the costs of neglecting our responsibilities to define our own terms. While the movement to regularize testing of college students by the federal government has been stopped, it will again emerge if we don't assert our own knowledge in the public sphere. The same is true of "plagiarism."

member appropriate a design element in a paisley print popular in the sixties, expand it with and within other elements, and not be charged with plagiarizing? Whereas that same student—or faculty—who selects a set of words aptly describing "interacting systems of activity" and then situates those words in and within her written text must quote and cite or be held to a charge of plagiarism?

Given what our research here has shown us about our communities' practices, we are led to question whether the Romantic construction of originality, which is so much a part of plagiarism discussions valorized long ago by textual scholars, is useful in any form. We suggest here that discussions open up in classrooms and in our wider communities, reaching people engaging in current practices that mitigate these traditional definitions. We suggest that these discussions of what one owns be situated in our present information-rich, technology-supported contexts. We believe that pointed and purposeful discussions among professional groups that share practices should consider

- How might beginning students write short papers about which they don't know anything? What kinds of assignments might allow them to demonstrate what they already know, and then how they are discovering and understanding existing knowledge with which they are not familiar? What assignments might encourage them to map ways of pushing current thinking further yet provide the authorial sequencing that allows readers to understand their maps?
- How can students speak in/to discourse communities while they are yet novices? Claiming a voice in a discourse community takes the ability to read, extract information, and synthesize it, and then to speak or write about that material in ways that will be understood and accepted within that community. How might we teach

students to "read" discourse communities, to more fully understand attribution rhetorics, and to resist as well as acquire existing forms? How might interim strategies such as patchwriting figure in this process?

- What is the role of ownership and knowledge building in a discipline's teaching, research, and learning? What is the place of each in a community of initiates, and what language most accurately describes actors and activities within their contexts?

Equally or perhaps more importantly, we challenge the terms we presently use to name these concepts, terms that shape and limit our own understandings and thus the understandings we transmit to students. Price (in Hall 2007) refers to the pockets of ambiguity that our terms "ownership," "originality," "collaboration," and "plagiarism" evoke, but we are coming to see these terms as already being fashioned by a public who prefers the fluidity and participation of a Wikipedia, or the tagging of information as a folksonomy. As Brian Lamb notes,

> Educators might justifiably argue that their materials are more authoritative, reliable, and instructionally sound than those found on the wider Web [e.g., Wikipedia], but those materials are effectively rendered invisible and inaccessible if they are locked inside course management systems. (Lamb 2007)

Those locked course management systems are indicative of an unexamined sense of faculty and institutional ownership, which, while useful to the continuance of traditional measurements, has fostered current one-size-fits-all, rule-bound discussions of plagiarism (and of education). Not only are these now not applicable to every discipline, but also they will become increasingly inapplicable to any discipline as information systems change: one only needs to go online to Creative Commons, CopyWrong, or Flickr to witness the growing rebellion against current ownership practices—ones to which our students are exposed daily (unfortunately, not in most of their classrooms).

The real question for us, then, is whether universities will continue to draw lines everyone crosses anyway, to uphold traditional notions about knowledge and meaning-making, despite rapidly changing technologies, or whether they will participate in the flexible processes already taking place both within and outside its walls. As Margo Blythman recently noted on an online plagiarism discussion list:

> I'm enough of an old style leftie still to have a belief in a degree of technological determinism. In my view there is absolutely no point in saying things like 'don't cut and paste', 'don't use wikipedia' etc. . . . it reminds me of when I was a kid in the late 50s and we were not allowed to use biros which were seen as not only wrecking your hand writing but also morally dubious. The technology exists—we have to work out how to use it. I find myself asking more and more about students' work that is perceived as plagiarised whether they plagiarised the argument or constructed their own argument then cut and pasted to fit it. We have to find ways of making the second legitimate. (e-mail 8 July 2006)

Blythman compares attitudes toward plagiarism to those toward writing technologies, and we build on that, looking at the relationship between automobile drivers, speed limits, and police officers. If drivers see only an external relationship between speed limits and themselves, they will observe speed limits only when they believe police officers are in a position to cite them if they do not: their motivations are anchored in avoiding punishment. However, if drivers feel an internal motivation for observing speed limits—such as motorist safety or fuel conservation—they will observe limits regardless of the presence of an officer. Likewise, we believe that we have presented overwhelming evidence that plagiarism rules can never cover all occasions because conventions are context specific and fluid, and, even more important, that if students—indeed writers generally—find only external motivations for trying to observe these rules, plagiarism will continue to be a cat-and-mouse game—with no winners. However, if faculty turn to

internal motivations, looking first at why and how they care about intellectual property and forms of ownership in their own work, and then to using these answers as they design and help students produce writing in their field, they can make an important shift to internal motivation—to help students situate themselves as readers and writers who matter in conversations that create knowledge.

Such discussions of plagiarism should help us think more reflectively about why we teach, why we are passionate about inquiry, and what we own as scholars/students. We need to work at how to align our disciplinary practices with those in our classrooms,[9] thoughtfully undermining our own institutional assessment practices, defining clearly what we need to measure and how, and, therefore, what role appropriation plays in our content, what constitutes learning in our fields. By rejecting or more carefully articulating what our informants revealed to us as contested terminology—"plagiarism," "ownership," "intellectual property"—we might actually free ourselves from the limits of those terms. This could, in turn, create space for us to shape, realistically, how we define ethical disciplinary action in our classrooms and in our professions, engaging, with the authors of chapter 1, "what it means to be an author today, what it means to have—and to share—agency." We might, in turn, narrow the gap between what our institutional traditions still uphold and we as practitioners do in our fields as well as in the increasingly larger world of the Internet as we build, appropriate, remix, mash, and create new knowledge.

9. Current movements to incorporate problem-based learning, undergraduate research, and study abroad move in useful directions, but they can more easily reach their potential if informed by discussions suggested here.

APPENDIX A

Common Research Questions—Intellectual Property and Plagiarism[1]

Faculty "Ownership" of Creative and Intellectual Work

1. What kinds of writing do you typically do as part of your scholarly and/or professional work? (May include production for classes or the public or writing computer code, for example, as well as written text.)
2. Do you produce this work individually or collaboratively?
3. What factors help you decide when to collaborate?
4. If you collaborate, how do you share credit for or ownership of your work?
5. What kinds of writing or other intellectual work are owned in your field? (For example, images, ideas, code, artifacts.)
6. What constitutes shared knowledge in your field?
7. How is ownership rewarded?
8. How do you decide what/how/when to give credit to others for their contributions to your work?
9. What purposes does citing or giving credit serve in your work and in the work of your field?
10. How do you give credit or attribute ownership in your field? (Think about features such as formal citation, shared authorship, acknowledgments, and the order of artists' names.)
11. How did you learn to attribute ownership or give credit for others' contributions?

---

1. Basic questions were adapted slightly for disciplinary context by each interview team.

Student "Ownership"

1. How are faculty creativity, scholarly production, ownership, and attribution similar to or different from student production, ownership, and attribution?
2. Do you expect your students to collaborate on your assignments? How do they acknowledge this collaboration?
3. What does the concept of shared knowledge mean to your students?
4. What errors in giving credit or attributing do you see in your students' work? What constitutes plagiarism in your classes?
5. To what extent do you expect students in your upper-division courses to know and apply the conventions for attribution in your courses?
6. What consequences occur when they fail to attribute appropriately?
7. What roles do you play in teaching your students about ownership and giving credit for others' contributions to their work?

The Future

1. With what questions about ownership/attribution does your field currently wrestle?
2. What new questions do you anticipate? What implications do these questions/directions have for your teaching?

APPENDIX B

"Common" Knowledge

Using recommended Web sites to find out what is common when a student isn't yet a member of an academic field can prove challenging. On the St. John's Web site, Miguel Roig states:

> one must give credit to those whose ideas and facts we are using. One general exception to this principle occurs when the ideas we are discussing represent 'common knowledge'. If the material we are discussing is assumed to be known by the readership, then one need not cite its origin. Suppose you are an American student writing a paper on the history of the United States for a college course and in your paper, you mention the fact that George Washington was the first president of the United States and that the Declaration of Independence was signed in the year 1776. Must you provide a citation for that pair of facts? Most likely not, as these are facts commonly known by average American college and high school students. The general expectation is that 'everybody knows that'. However, suppose that in the same paper the student must identify the 23rd president and his running mate and the main platform under which they were running for office, plus the year they both assumed power. Should that be considered common knowledge? The answer is probably no. It is doubtful that the average American, would know those facts. (http://facpub.stjohns.edu/~roigm/plagiarism/Plagiarism%20and%20common.html)

Another site notes that:

> Facts can be viewed as common knowledge if they are generally known and widely established. The term 'common knowledge' implies that the audience and the author have agreed on certain facts, so accepted common knowledge might vary depending on your audience. For example, dates referring to well-known events can be viewed as common knowledge. So, when referring to

> December 7, 1941 as the date the Japanese forces attacked Pearl Harbor, you would not need to cite a source for your information—if Americans comprise your target audience. (http://cai.ucdavis.edu/plagiarism.html)

Given these examples, how are students who may know the twenty-third president of the United States, who are Civil War buffs, or who are just precocious determine whether they must cite: does it hang on whether they know the information or whether they believe their audience knows? Are they writing for a general audience, the teacher, or their classmates? For initiates into a discipline, it can seem as if nearly everything should be cited, especially because almost all sources that discuss common knowledge point out, "When in doubt, cite" (and are we safe in not citing this quotation?) This becomes even more interesting when faculty members acknowledge their students' varied backgrounds. For example: "If you are writing a paper about western Canada and you refer to Edmonton and Calgary as the two major cities in Alberta, you would not have to cite a source. This is generally known" (http://www.athabascau.ca/studserv/inthonesty.htm#comkno).

While this Canadian Web site considers Canadian geography to be common knowledge, a student in a US classroom would have to cite this information. Yet, a Finnish student receives this advice:

> stating that 'Abraham Lincoln was the 16th President of the United States' would not require a citation; even if most Americans could not tell you where Lincoln was in the numerical order (not to mention non-Americans, many of whom would not even know a person named Lincoln had been a President). Again, this is knowledge that is easily found, is not changeable, and thus can be assumed to be 'common.' (http://www.uta.fi/FAST/PK6/REF/commknow.html)

This appears to offer a good guideline for common knowledge—it "is easily found, is not changeable." Yet, on the Internet, much information is repeated and is thus easily found

and authoritatively cited. How are students to know what is always common in another country but new to them? The key might be in audience: in what country or culture is the writer; what knowledge would most people have? But how can students always know this?

Determining whether or not to cite for a specific audience is especially problematic when definitions of common knowledge seem to depend not on some overarching agreed-upon set of terms but rather on the status of being the student:

> Of course, in every professional field, experts consider some ideas 'common knowledge,' but remember that you're not a professional (yet). In fact, you're just learning about those concepts in the course you're taking, so the material you are reading may not yet be 'common knowledge' to you. In order to decide if the material you want to use in your paper constitutes 'common knowledge,' you may find it helpful to ask yourself the following questions:
>
> • Did I know this information before I took this course?
> • Did this information/idea come from my own brain?
>
> If you answer 'no' to either or both of these questions, then the information is not 'common knowledge' to you. In these cases, you need to cite your source(s) and indicate where you first learned this bit of what may be 'common knowledge' in the field.
>
> (www.unc.edu/depts/wcweb/handouts/plagiarism.html)

Such "guidance" actually contradicts the idea that there is "common knowledge"—something "everyone or the average person knows." Instead, any knowledge must be quoted if the instructor thinks that the student couldn't have known information prior to a course. This contributes to a deficit version of plagiarizing, one that sees knowledge as property students can't own until they have gone through appropriate, approved processes (i.e., "my class"), and it puts students in the position of guessing what faculty members will think they don't know. It also assumes that all students come to class as blank slates—the same blank slates. In trying to clarify this, students might find:

> *Common knowledge*: facts that can be found in numerous places and are likely to be known by a lot of people.
>
> Example: John F. Kennedy was elected President of the United States in 1960.
>
> This is generally known information. You do not need to document this fact.
>
> However, you must document facts that are not generally known and ideas that interpret facts.
>
> Example: According the American Family Leave Coalition's new book, *Family Issues and Congress*, President Bush's relationship with Congress has hindered family leave legislation (6).
>
> The idea that "Bush's relationship with Congress has hindered family leave legislation" is not a fact but an *interpretation*; consequently, you need to cite your source. (www.indiana.edu/~wts/pamphlets/plagiarism.shtml#terms)

It is not unlikely that students would read that "Bush's relationship with Congress has hindered family leave legislation" in more than one source. However, if students are new to the discipline, how do they know that this statement is an interpretation when such conclusions might well be seen as fact—as common knowledge? This is especially possible if students read that, "Common knowledge is information that is widely available. If you saw the same fact repeated in most of your sources, and if your reader is likely to already know this fact, it is probably common knowledge" (http://www.infoplease.com/spot/plagiarism.html).

The University of Wisconsin, Madison's approach places the discussion on a useful track when it highlights a special section under common knowledge:

> Field-specific common knowledge is 'common' only within a particular field or specialty. It may include facts, theories, or methods that are familiar to readers within that discipline. For instance, you may not need to cite a reference to Piaget's developmental stages in a paper for an education class or give a source for your description of a commonly used method in a biology report, but you must be

> sure that this information is so widely known within that field that it will be shared by your readers. (http://www.wisc.edu/writing/Handbook/QPA_plagiarism.html)

This also, though subtly, reminds students of their status in the academy, but it gives no hints as to how they should determine whether something is widely known in a field. Again, they may read an idea in several sources and conclude that it is common knowledge, only to be told that they have plagiarized an opinion. The University of Oregon's document attempts to remedy this problem:

> Hairston and Ruszkiewicz (1993) define common knowledge as "facts, dates, events, information, and concepts that belong generally to an educated public. No individual owns the facts about history, physics, social behavior, geography, current events, popular culture, and so on." (614)
>
> Therefore, common knowledge does not need to be cited—the difficulty is knowing when something is, in fact, widely known. An added twist is that each discipline has its own common knowledge, for example, psychologists will be familiar with the work of Jean Piaget so you do not need to establish who he was. If you are not sure whether or not something is common knowledge, ask your instructor. (www.unc.edu/depts/wcweb/handouts/plagiarism.html)

If faculty wish to help students become independent, responsible researchers/writers, they certainly will encourage such questions. However, realistically, how many students are going to ask their instructors about common knowledge every time they aren't sure? And how many lines of students or e-mailed questions can instructors accommodate?