

1-1-2003

Plagiarism and its (Disciplinary) Discontents: Towards an Interdisciplinary Theory and Pedagogy

Lisa Maruca

Wayne State University, lisa.maruca@wayne.edu

Recommended Citation

Maruca, L. (2006). "Plagiarism and its (Disciplinary) Discontents: Towards and Interdisciplinary Theory and Pedagogy." *Issues in Integrative studies*, 21, 74-97.

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/englishfrp/8>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English at DigitalCommons@WayneState. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Faculty Research Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@WayneState.

ISSUES IN INTEGRATIVE STUDIES
No. 21, pp. 74-97 (2003)

PLAGIARISM AND ITS (DISCIPLINARY) DISCONTENTS

Towards an Interdisciplinary Theory and Pedagogy

by
Lisa Maruca

Wayne State University
Department of Interdisciplinary Studies

Abstract: Despite the abundance of literature on the topic, there is very little that can be called “common” about our common sense understanding of plagiarism. Taking a closer look at the history, rhetorical uses, and cultural practices of plagiarism, this essay reveals that this concept is multiple and heterogeneous, riddled with contradictions and blind spots. As a result, the article argues the overlapping, inter-related, yet distinct discourses of plagiarism that circulate within the academy can be usefully described as a “complex system.” In positing plagiarism as a complex system, this article has several goals. First, it shows how singular approaches to plagiarism are ultimately insufficient and examines the ways in which an interdisciplinary consideration of the issues can shed light on the problem. Next, it uses the issue of plagiarism to examine the rubric of “complexity” itself, suggesting ways that recent uses of the term within interdisciplinary research might be modified and extended. Finally, it uses this enhanced, integrative understanding of plagiarism to make pragmatic proposals for both pedagogy and policy.

Introduction

Plagiarism is a vexed and vexing issue, at least if we are to judge solely by the amount of rhetoric it generates in the popular media, among educators, and in scholarly articles across a variety of fields. Plagiarism is considered a

widespread and growing problem, facilitated by information technologies such as the Internet, which allow for fast and efficient research and source retrieval—and an easy way to “cut and paste” without attribution. The problem is believed to add to faculty workload, disrupt the learning process, and undermine the nature and value of education itself. Solutions range from the pedagogical—advocating “process” methods and teacher overview of draft preparation—to the technological—subscribing to software such as Turnitin.com, which uses custom algorithms to compare student papers to the web and other text databases.

Despite the time, energy, and resources dedicated to prevention, surveillance, and adjudication, however, little work has been done that attempts to dissect the *meanings* conveyed by and constructed through “plagiarism.” Instead, much of the instructional literature on plagiarism assumes that notions of academic honesty, and the citation conventions meant to reflect that ethical grounding, are based on universal academic traditions. It implies that while procedures for recognizing attribution may differ stylistically across disciplines, they derive from a shared, transdisciplinary, even natural, understanding of authorship, ownership, and the construction of knowledge in the academy. This essay argues, on the other hand, that there is very little that can be called “common” about our common sense understanding of these issues. A closer look at the history, rhetorical uses, and cultural practices of plagiarism reveals that this concept is multiple and heterogeneous, riddled with contradictions and blindspots. Indeed, I will argue that the overlapping, inter-related, yet distinct discourses of plagiarism that circulate within the academy can be usefully described as a “complex system.” Seen in this way, plagiarism becomes, as Newell (2001) has asserted of all complex social systems, a topic that requires an interdisciplinary approach.

In positing plagiarism as a complex system, this article has three goals. First, I will show how singular approaches to plagiarism are ultimately insufficient and examine the ways in which an interdisciplinary consideration of the issues can shed light on the problem. Second, I will use the issue of plagiarism to examine the rubric of “complexity” itself, suggesting ways in which Newell’s useful yet problematic proposal be modified and extended. Third, I will use this enhanced, integrative understanding of plagiarism to make pragmatic proposals for both pedagogy and policy.

The Problem of/with Plagiarism

Before detailing the multiple discourses of plagiarism, however, it might be useful to explore the academy’s recent obsession with this phenomenon.

Certainly, there is a perception within universities that incidents of student plagiarism are increasing. Anecdotal evidence—hallway chatter—is one unreliable source fueling notions of this rise. As more attention is paid to the issue, educators become more distrustful, questioning papers they used to let pass. Then, thanks to their increased ability to verify cases, using the web or other databases, they find what they seek. This, of course, only increases their suspicions, as well as those of their colleagues to whom they voice their complaints, and the cycle continues. In short, there is what criminologist Stanley Cohen (1980) calls “a moral panic” around plagiarism.

It might seem that more objective evidence could better inform the subjective analyses, yet statistics about the pervasiveness of plagiarism actually tend to complicate rather than clarify the problem. These reports are undermined by that fact that there is a question of what exactly is being discussed—a definitional problem casts doubt on accuracy. As I will show, educators themselves are divided on what exactly constitutes plagiarism, so we cannot expect students to bring a singular definition to their responses. Recent studies, for example, suggest that anywhere from 45% to 80% of high school students admit to cheating, while some 15% to 54% say that they have plagiarized from a website (Center for Academic Integrity, n.d.; Kellogg 2002; Heyboer 2003; Rimer 2003; Sanders 2003). While a detailed analysis of these surveys is outside the purview of this article, the wide variation itself in the number of cheating and plagiarizing students “discovered” by various surveys suggests that the wording of the question—or the different interpretations students brought to the terminology used—may have shaped responses. There is also evidence that some students do not consider plagiarism to be cheating, or that they do not consider what they are doing to be plagiarism. In a 2003 survey conducted by Donald L. McCabe, one of the founders of the Center for Academic Integrity, approximately half the students declared that they did not think it was cheating to copy up to an entire paragraph from the Web (Rimer 2003, par. 2).

As I will discuss in more detail below, many scholars familiar with student writing problems have asserted that a variety of practices labeled as “plagiarism” are not acts of purposeful dishonesty, but the result of several factors: students’ ignorance of the conventions of academic writing; their earnest, if ultimately failed, attempts to mimic academic discourse; and cultural differences between students and their professors, whether ethnic, cultural, geographical, or generational (Bowden 1996; Buranen and Roy 1999; Howard 1999b; Angélil-Carter 2000; Ede and Lunsford 2001; Boynton 2001). Thus, studies of student cheating, while plentiful, are not completely adequate as

an approach to this issue.¹ Even if we narrow our focus only to fraudulent activities, the news may not be as bad as first suspected, for despite widespread faculty worries that electronic sources constitute an almost unavoidable temptation for students, there is evidence to the contrary. As McCabe (2001) acknowledges, his “research suggests that the primary issue is an increase in the amount of plagiarism by students who are already plagiarizing using written sources, and that the increase in the number of new plagiarizers is rather modest.”

Contributing to the difficulty in ascertaining accurate data on plagiarism are the multiple interpretations of what is meant by the word, even among educators themselves. In the simplest terms, plagiarism is the use, in any public work of writing, art, programming, data collection, and so on, of another’s language or ideas without acknowledgement of the original source. Blatant fraud—such as downloading or purchasing an entire term paper or article and presenting this as one’s own work—is generally reviled as an extreme form of dishonesty. It is also usually considered plagiarism to include in one’s paper any literal word-for-word copying *of any length* when the original source is not acknowledged.

Plagiaristic practices can also, but don’t always, include the failure to provide attribution when presenting another’s conceptions or ideas, whether paraphrasing or summarizing. This is complicated by the fact that what is considered “common knowledge”—which usually does not need to be cited—varies from discipline to discipline, among student levels within a discipline, and among individual students at each level. Sometimes, using quotation marks but not citations, or listing sources only at the end of a paper, without providing appropriate attribution within the text, may be considered plagiarism, though this might also be more accurately called improper citation.² This last example reminds us that the issue of intentionality—difficult to prove or deny—complicates definitional approaches all the more. Indeed, as one of the essential elements in establishing criminality, intent (*mens rea*), becomes difficult to establish when discursive practices neutralize the moral inhibition to deviate (Sykes & Matza 1957; Pfuhl & Henry 1993). In some schools or programs, an over-reliance on tutoring or peer assistance is called plagiarism, while others consider this appropriate, even pedagogically constructive collaboration.

The academy is not alone in its confusion about how to define plagiarism. Accusations of plagiarism against prominent figures such as civil rights leader Martin Luther King, Jr., historian Doris Kearns Goodwin, fiction writer Yann Martel, and New York *Times* reporter Jayson Blair reveal how complex,

how contested, *and* how micro-culturally biased representations of unattributed copied writing may be. All these writers—working in diverse settings with disparate norms, values, and expectations governing the texts they produced—had detractors and proponents. Moreover, in each case, a variety of issues were brought forward that were not, superficially at least, related to plagiarism itself. The King controversy, for example, has been used as ammunition by conservative forces in arguments about academic political correctness and the so-called “cultural wars.” Attempts to understand King’s unattributed source use, as part of the African-American oral homiletic tradition, were seen as a cover-up, or one more case of special privileges being offered to protected minorities (See Pappas 1998). Goodwin’s year-long media brouhaha elicited comments about the academic research techniques, the role of the popular historian, sexist double-standards among historians, and the nature of media scandals themselves.³ Martel’s case engendered debate over literary prizes, the post-colonial appropriation of discourse, the inspirational sources of fiction, and (again) the nature of media scandals themselves. Finally, Blair’s “outing” shook the foundations of an august news source, raised questions about newsroom management technique, and called into question affirmative action hiring practices.

The very fact that each incident seems inseparable from topics not directly related to the unsanctioned repetition of written texts shows the difficulty of defining plagiarism in and of itself. It is a topic that can only be understood through its context, embedded as it is in a variety of other cultural discourses. Nonetheless, these cases garnered cultural attention because of the media’s deployment of a term weighted with cultural anxiety—“plagiarism” was the headline-making device, whether or not the claims were accurate, precisely because of its juridical associations and the moral-ethical capital it conveys.⁴ In turn, despite the complexity of these examples, the wide publicity surrounding each one only adds to the public perception of plagiarism as a rampant social ill.

Certainly, there are dishonest writers, including students. The term’s roots lie in the Latin *plagiare*, “to kidnap,” and colloquially, “stealing” has become a synonym for “plagiarizing.” Indeed, when accomplished in its fraudulent form, plagiarism is an attempt to steal others’ academic capital for one’s own benefit, which over the long term could theoretically translate into increased material wealth, via higher grades, better job prospects, and so on. Nonetheless, despite this possibility, plagiarism is typically not a crime of *property* as much as *propriety*. In other words, plagiarism is a violation of that which is considered proper, in good taste, and conforming to a sense of

decency in accordance with local custom.

But how local is custom? Even within the academy, positioning vis-à-vis the issues surrounding plagiarism differs according to the theoretical or methodological framework invoked. In reviewing the plentiful literature on this topic, which includes everything from books and published articles to instructional handouts and “how-to-avoid” websites, I have been able to divide it into four categories that describe practitioners’ divergent understandings of and subsequent approaches to the issue: (1) traditional, (2) historical, (3) technological, and (4) pedagogical. Across these divisions, there is wide variation not only in perceptions of the causes and effects of plagiarism, but also in assumptions about the technologies, cultural norms, and sites of writing that generate and regulate textual circulation.

Interestingly, the typology I have developed does not line up directly with a disciplinary schema, but rather reflects theoretical standpoints (whether acknowledged as such or not) that are inter- and cross-disciplinary. In fact, they might be seen as what Richard M. Carp (2001) has called “knowledge formations,” a term that emphasizes their existence as “both processes and entities” (p. 75). Carp describes these knowledge formations as “ecological, developing in relation with other entities and composed in part of material and structures taken from them” (p. 75). This accounts for the overlap that is seen both theoretically and in practice: while each of these “formations” of plagiarism is internally coherent, and while some methods seem antithetical to others, they are not distinct, but build from and against each other. This complexity I discuss in more detail below. First, though, it is necessary to illustrate the multiplicity of ideas circulating about plagiarism and to show how each by itself presents a limited and flawed view.

Traditional Plagiarism

One of the many approaches toward plagiarism might be called “traditionalist.” This formation utilizes a “common sense” or mainstream understanding of plagiarism that is believed to be based in deeply rooted and shared cultural traditions. It is apparent in so-called “classic” popular works such as Thomas Mallon’s *Stolen Words* (1989; 2001) as well as in works by such respected literary historians as Christopher Ricks (2003); indeed, some surveys suggest that most university faculty support this view (Roy 1999). Discussions of plagiarism within this formation—which includes most university policies—call on perceptions of universal moral standards in casting all sorts of plagiarism as cheating or deception, in contrast to “honest source

use” (Boston University 1995, par. 1).⁵ Many of these policies thus fail to distinguish between types of plagiarism or the differing conventions governing writing tasks. They also do not factor in intentionality—whether or not a student writer purposely sets out to deceive his or her teachers—or deficiencies in understanding the norms of source use. Indeed, policies governing plagiarism are often found under codes of academic integrity, honesty, dishonesty, misconduct, or other morally-laden terms, all of which serve to make this clearly and essentially an issue of individual ethics. Because this formation decries plagiarism as fundamentally and unequivocally transgressive, equivalent to theft or at best deceit, it often uses extreme language in describing it. Pappas, for example, calls plagiarism a “form of cheating and . . . an act of mendacity,” and labels the plagiarist a “two-bit thug” (1998, p. 30); Timothy Noah’s (2002) article on the Goodwin scandal is titled, pointedly, “Doris Kearns Goodwin, Liar.”⁶

Some participants within this formation also worry that this sort of cheating is becoming an acceptable part of the student culture of high schools and colleges. Indeed, conservative cultural critics such as Theodore Pappas place the blame for this attitude on permissive parenting, fuzzy social values, and the moral relativism engendered by the “liberal academy” (1998, p. 25). Even the *National Review* has found it necessary to weigh in on the plagiarism issue recently, to once more sound the drum beat that universities are filled with “French-bathed barbarians in pursuit of destroying Western Civilization” (Goldberg 2000, par. 2). Pappas is representative of a larger group, then, when he links what is in his view a dangerous redefinition of plagiarism to nihilistic postmodernism and deconstructionism, and,

their nefarious offspring—multiculturalism, cultural relativism, political correctness and their many manifestations, from sensitivity seminars and diversity training to the war of defamation on the cultural inheritance of old Europe, on the Anglo-American traditions of our country, and on white Western males and their achievements in general. (1998, p. 24)

Such recent interlopers are seen to be disrupting a long humanistic history of fighting plagiarism. Ricks (2003) asserts in a lecture to the British Academy that while there may be “grey areas” (p. 22) in which adjudication is difficult, the definition—and the moral ramifications of that definition—is stark and simple. He dates this *obvious* view of plagiarism to at least the first century A.D. and Martial’s epigrams. Any critics who offer counter-examples

are merely excusing with “exculpatory bonhomie” (2003, p. 36) the crimes of past writers, a move Ricks sees as fundamentally immoral in itself. He ignores the ways in which the meanings of all the terms he uses—writing, authorship, copying—have shifted in the ensuing two millennia along with the media and communication contexts supporting these terms (see Hammond 2003).

Historical Plagiarism

Although Ricks’ version of the history of plagiarism serves a traditionalist agenda in the present, there are “new historical” formations as well that foster a more progressive politics. Those investigating the cultural history of plagiarism, often as part of broader studies on authorship, the literary market, and the development of intellectual property law, view the concept—and its ethical ramifications—as developing in specific and disparate cultural contexts. They assert that plagiarism is not a universally despised example of “theft” or “dishonesty,” but a set of practices that carries diverse moral inflections and receives various ethical treatments. Unacknowledged copying, in other words, may be normative in one era and decried in another.⁷ For example, Renaissance writers privileged imitation, seeing it as a way of exhibiting one’s learning and expressing one’s debt to earlier writers. Knowledge was believed to be shared, and an inspirational gift from God (Woodmansee 1994, pp.36-37).⁸ With the rise of the print marketplace in the eighteenth century, however, the financial stakes were raised. The first copyright law was passed in 1709 at the urging of booksellers; the notion of individual artistic originality developed over the next half-century (Woodmansee 1994; Rose 1993). With a vested interest in seeing their writing as property, a new class of professional writers began representing plagiarism as a pressing moral and artistic concern (Hammond 2003).

This narrative is, of course, a simplification of what is actually a more complex and varied history, for even as the concept of singular authorial genius slowly became culturally dominant, alternative understandings of the sanctity of originary text and ways of judging the acceptability of collaborative and derivative practices flourished (see Rosenthal 1996; Johns 1998; Maruca 2003a). Literary historians are thus careful, when discussing plagiarism, *not* to present it as a concept that is “naturally” or “normally” understood as a timeless social ill, but one that bears the imprint of the cultural expectations of specific times and places. Further, their explication of the proliferation of definitions and practices in the past deconstructs the notion

that there can be one monolithic understanding of the issue in the present, as is sometimes assumed. Nonetheless, such historical understandings are rarely explicitly linked to today's practices; it is unclear what early modern practices of authorship and attribution, for example, can say about student writing in the U.S. academy of the 21st century. Bertrand Goldgar (2003) has noted that such approaches may cast plagiarism as "an illusion, a term rendered meaningless because there is no possibility of originality" (p. 215). Although certainly an overstatement, this comment reveals the exasperation at the unwillingness of many historians to theorize the possible relevance of their studies to today's writing environments.

Technological Plagiarism

Within another formation, concerns about student plagiarism focus specifically on the media and technologies that support it. This formation can itself be divided into two distinct points of view. The first shares much in common with the traditional formation, defining plagiarism in simple moral terms, based on a presumption of universally shared values. However, within the techno-rubric, recent changes in communication tools are seen as fundamentally corrupting these values: as the World Wide Web increasingly becomes students' primary research tool, new technology-based forms of plagiarism are believed to proliferate and are seen as a cause for alarm. For example, one advice book, Ann Lathrop and Kathleen Foss' *Student Cheating and Plagiarism in the Internet Era: A Wake-Up Call* (2000), the cover of which is designed in a fiery motif of red, yellow, and orange, uses the language of warfare in chapter titles such as "A Call to Action," "Things are Bad and Getting Worse," "Information as a First Line of Defense," "High Tech Defenses," and "Be Vigilant about Cheating and Plagiarism." Such approaches emphasize the inherent danger to academic integrity and urge educators to mobilize. This general feeling of threat is extended in the rhetoric of *biological* warfare: according to the senior editor of *The American School Board Journal*, plagiarism (which is never differentiated from cheating) is seen as an "epidemic" and "a plague" on the American school system (Bushweller 2000, p. xi).

Indeed, because students can easily download or cut and paste not only from a variety of legitimate sites, but also from digital "paper mills"—online businesses that sell completed student papers and that in some cases claim their papers to be "original" and even, "unplagiarized"—the most egregious forms of plagiarism are seen as becoming easier than ever. Whether

this translates into proliferation is difficult to ascertain, as I mentioned above; certainly the inflated language used to describe the phenomenon creates an environment of hyper-vigilance, which, as with “moral panics” in general, results in more incidents being discovered, reported, and labeled, but not necessarily more occurring. Indeed, the technological ease of accomplishing plagiarism goes both ways such that, what faculty would once ignore because of the difficulty of tracking down the original printed sources, assuming one even knew them, can now be accomplished with a simple click on a suspect phrase into an Internet search engine. Clearly, this technological transformation alone will produce more recorded incidents, further complicating the question of whether real rates of plagiarism have increased. (In fact, considering that paper files have long been maintained by fraternities and sororities, digital paper mills such as “schoolsucks.com” may only be a democratization of fraud, or even its “outing” from a previously hidden but routine practice.)

Nonetheless, some believe that the only way to combat the increased opportunities for “cyber-plagiarism” provided by these practices is to turn to technology itself. Search engines such as Google can in seconds track down a web source used by students when a teacher enters a problematic phrase, or an even entire sentence. Furthermore, services now exist—Turnitin.com is one of the most widely used—that provide online plagiarism-detection software. Many universities or individual departments do subscribe, since even when teachers do not actually use these services, there is evidence that warning students about this possibility works as a deterrent (Braumoeller & Gaines 2001). This is in spite of the fact that ethical and legal questions have been raised about the violation of students’ privacy—every paper submitted becomes part of the institution’s database—and about the pedagogical value of responding to all student work with suspicion.

Within this same formation, however, another approach to understanding Internet-specific plagiarism suggests that these sorts of counter-moves are at best futile, at worst, reactionary responses. This camp sees the ease with which students can copy from the Internet not as a temptation, but a new way of thinking about the creation and circulation of texts. Supporters draw on historical studies to highlight the different practices of writing supported by current communication technologies in contrast to those based in the market- and property-driven forms of publication. Because even early hypertext was, as opposed to staid print books, interactive and non-linear, allowing readers to decide which of the many links they would pursue, it was thought to be able to strip this primary author of his vestments of solitary genius and origi-

nality, concepts fueling notions of plagiarism.⁹ More recent claims also contend that new media forms generate a new ethos, the “Napsterization of knowledge” (Boynton 2001) or a GenX “cultural commons” (Livingston-Weber 1999) as it has been termed, and that popular notions of the morality of plagiarism are thus outdated. Much on the web is, after all, collective and/or anonymous, and most web authoring is not compensated financially. Web pages often contain chunks of other pages and graphics freely circulate—all without attribution. The web’s ephemeral nature is thought to be fundamentally incompatible with the fixity of print text that is required for “real” plagiarism.

Interestingly, traditional technologists rely on the same historical contrast of print and digital forms to decry this trend and urge a continuation of print-based ways of understanding and regulating the copying of texts. Mallon (2001), for example, laments the easy and more casual approach to writing and research spawned by the web and argues for “retention of the printed, bound book” (p. 248). In this common plea, we see the ease in which the familiar—print—becomes the neutral ground against which new media are constructed and compared. Print/digital becomes a fixed binary reinscribing moral nature vs. pernicious technology. This traditional approach, however, merely reverses the terms used by postmodern technologists: both groups create a media-essential notion of plagiarism, ignoring the social and discursive construction of communication machines and the mores that order their use—mores that often develop from earlier forms and do not change as easily as the tools themselves.

Pedagogical Plagiarism

Many of those concerned about student plagiarism—whether they draw on traditionalist or technology-based approaches to understand it—assert that a large part of the ethical responsibility for this problem lies with educators themselves. The former focus on ways instructors can structure classrooms to actively prevent plagiarism, which they see as a lurking threat. Some insist that the core value of academic integrity, while unassailable in itself, should not be taken for granted as understood by the uninitiated, but instead should be routinely explained to and discussed with students. Others suggest that teachers develop assignments that are difficult to plagiarize because of their specificity, their reliance on course materials, or their relevance to student lives and individual opinions (Edmundson 2003).

On the other hand, many composition instructors assert that although aca-

demetic dishonesty should be condemned, research methodology, source use, and citation practices need to be more rigorously *taught* to students as conventions, not innate textual principles. Indeed, some believe that “patchwriting,” as Rebecca Howard (1995; 1999b) terms the linking together of several paraphrases from unacknowledged sources, is an important stage in the evolution of student knowledge and rhetorical skill. They may also view plagiarism as a problem in the development of “voice,” a reflection of a student’s lack of confidence in his or her own opinions and authority, or a misunderstanding of the very purposes of academic writing (Hull and Rose 1989; Bowden 1996; Kloss 1996). Because they see plagiarism as a complex learning issue, these educators question the morality of “prosecuting” students for their ignorance or lack of ability, and resent the negative effects that the “policing” of plagiarism has on teacher-student relations (Howard 1999b, p. 23-26). The few policy statements written by those within this formation thus classify plagiarism into two-tiers, distinguishing purposeful fraud from accidental source misuse.¹⁰ The slippery nature of “intent to deceive,” however, is seldom interrogated.

Unfortunately, in constructing this student-centered approach to plagiarism, most compositionists have relied rather simplistically on histories of authorship and intellectual property emerging in the last two decades. They see plagiarism as fundamentally connected to copyright and so emerging directly—and artificially—from the consolidation of the literary market. With a vested interest in seeing their writing as property, it is believed, a new class of professional writers began representing plagiarism as a pressing moral and artistic concern (Hammond 2003). They identify pivotal moments such as the passing of the 1709 Act of Anne and the publication of Edward Young’s “Conjectures on Original Genius” as the “birth” of modern attitudes toward plagiarism (Howard 1999a, p. 92). Indeed, these two disparate events are often conflated, ignoring the complex cultural negotiations that took place before, between, and after them.¹¹ Because this school of thought sees plagiarism as ultimately an artificial and old-fashioned construct, its historical subtleties are often seen as irrelevant to today’s writing pedagogy.

An Interdisciplinary Approach: Plagiarism as a Complex System

I have developed this outline of the academic cultural construction of plagiarism in order to show that it is a *contested* site, one of debate and dissent, not a homogenous value. Each formation within this typology carries with it

a distinct way of looking at the issue that allows for a limited range of options in addressing it. However, it should be stressed that in daily life individual educators may find themselves in the contradictory position of espousing one view theoretically, while enacting another pedagogically or institutionally. This is because none of these ways of seeing plagiarism exists in a vacuum, but works to oppose and/or influence each other (sometimes simultaneously) in complex and sometimes unpredictable ways. To understand how this works requires stepping back to view the entirety—not as the mythical “objective observer” critiquing from outside or above—but as a participant in a “complex system” of discourse. It is here that I borrow from and modify Newell’s positing of the interdisciplinarian as one who studies complex systems (2001). While Newell sees interdisciplinarity as the ideal mode for studying an acknowledged complex system, I posit the interdisciplinarian as one who sees all forms of knowledge production as inevitably and intrinsically complex and interconnected. In this understanding, the disciplines emerge as artificial constructions that present epistemological limits on complexity.

Complex systems theory has benefits for understanding forms of knowledge production.¹² For example, seeing plagiarism as a complex discursive system allows us to see it emerging not from a progression of linear influence—the way traditional historical accounts view the evolution of ideas—but as a dynamic, fluid, and constantly transforming organic entity. Within this system, minor offshoots of a school of thought or seemingly insignificant footnotes can loom large in the next iteration of its theory or practice. Further, using theories of complexity not only accounts for disproportionate effects of seemingly minor practices, but also introduces and insists on the importance of randomness in the development of the knowledge of plagiarism—whether that is the random nature of individual readings and responses (based on an individual thinker’s social conditioning, history of reading, and personal quirks) or of local material conditions (such as what journals one’s library carries or what sorts of students one teaches). Indeed, these material conditions are an important element that in themselves increase the complexity of the system—and reveal the limits of traditional disciplinary knowledge. Put another way, we should see ideas about plagiarism developing not merely from competing *abstractions*, for ideas are never just that. Instead, if we agree, as I indicated above, that the various understandings of the term “plagiarism” can be seen as examples of Carp’s “knowledge formations” (2001), then we must acknowledge the ways in which our understanding of these formations—and the many ways we participate within them through

specific practices—emerges from, and also works to position us within, “a network that includes institutional structures, economic forces, social interactions, political considerations, historical influences, personal motivations and so forth” (p. 75).

In order to more clearly understand the complex system of knowledge production as including the material and political, it may be useful to turn to another theorist whose work seems outside the rubric of complexity. Nonetheless, Pierre Bourdieu’s (1993) concept of the work of cultural production as a field of *struggle* helps us see how “complexity,” when applied to a social system such as intellectual activity, can never be viewed as the interaction, interdependence, and ordering of *neutral* information, ideas, and praxis. Instead, for Bourdieu, participants in a field are understood as using their utterances—whether these are works of art or their thoughts on plagiarism—to jockey for position in a network of power. Bourdieu (1993) believes that “what can be constituted as a *system* for the sake of analysis is not the product of a coherence-seeking intention or objective consensus . . . but the product and prize of a permanent conflict” (p.34). The production of discourse is thus seen as a way to—often unconsciously—garner more symbolic or cultural capital. This political rise and fall of ideas are represented through a shorthand—“labels of schools, truncated quotations, functioning as slogans of celebration or polemics” (Bourdieu 1993, p.32)—recognized only (and not always) by insiders as signifying a whole universe of related ideas. However, the history of the discursive struggle for dominance usually ends up erased, expressed as a form of disguised truth in “academic routine and perhaps above all by school manuals . . . which perhaps do more than anything else to constitute the ‘common sense’ of an intellectual generation” (p. 32). The result is a “derealization” of these schools of thought as they become part of an intellectual history “stripped of everything which attached them to the most concrete debates of their time” (p. 32).

Thus a Bourdieuan analysis of plagiarism might work to recover (as I have) the debates and competition underlying our current approaches, while complex systems theory helps us understand that the result of this symbolic struggle is hardly predictable. For those who take the issue of plagiarism as a serious intellectual/theoretical issue, bringing its entangled history to light presents new and invigorating challenges. Indeed, it offers opportunities for new constructions of, and approaches to, plagiarism to emerge as we juxtapose the old versions and examine the interstices between them. Students, however, are often positioned more passively in relation to these struggles, situated as consumers of the “normal science” of reference books that ob-

score debate. At the same time, the proliferation of positions towards plagiarism that I have outlined means that students pick up multiple, yet contradictory, rationales as they take different disciplinary courses or courses that cross theoretical borders; students taking interdisciplinary courses may be even more confused.

A Complex Model for Pedagogy and Policy

Ultimately, my deconstruction of plagiarism is not meant to avoid the certainty at its center: unfortunately, many students do set out purposefully to deceive their instructors about the origins of their prose. What I am suggesting, however, is that the rubric of plagiarism, as currently deployed, has become so all encompassing and self-contradictory as to become virtually useless as a category of ethics *or* rhetoric. Likewise, my insistence on the complexity of plagiarism is not meant to engender a sense of futility or helplessness among faculty in the face of the many practices currently defined as plagiaristic. Instead, I am trying to encourage a more nuanced—and ultimately more effective—response to a wide range of non-standard source use issues *and* cheating.

The goal of this last section is to begin to articulate a response to plagiarism that does not ignore its material history or complexity, that engages students in the process of their own learning about and participation in this larger discourse, yet that seeks to appease numerous groups with divergent definitions and goals. Thus one cannot adopt the approach taken by composition scholars wholesale as *the* solution, for to do so excludes traditionalists. Likewise, a merely historical approach that dismisses plagiarism as an outdated relic of false consciousness fails to recognize its active currency in today's academic environments. Indeed, recognizing the complexity of plagiarism as academic struggle puts the interdisciplinarian wishing to formulate new policy in the almost impossible position of negotiating—in all its connotations of “moving through,” surmounting, or forming compromises, and creating saleable transactions—among multiple stakeholders with seemingly irreconcilable differences.

It may seem useful, then, to turn the topic on its head, to examine our assumptions about plagiarism from a new angle—in other words, to shift the interdisciplinary kaleidoscope just enough so the same pieces form a new picture. Toward this end, I suggest an analysis of the problem of plagiarism from a more positive angle, one that questions *why* the citation of sources in academic writing is so important. I recently put this question to some of my

Wayne State colleagues as part of a larger, collaborative study on different disciplinary attitudes toward intellectual property issues.¹³ While my survey was informal and provisional, it does provide a useful starting point in teasing out the complexities of the philosophical underpinning of citation practices. The close reading methodology I used in analyzing the responses derives from post-structuralist discourse analysis and relies on the idea that individual responses only gain currency—indeed, even meaning—from their relationship to larger culturally-shared discursive constructions. In analyzing the responses, I looked for repetitive or similar uses of terms, tropes and metaphorical patterns to decipher the larger cultural discourses on which these answers depend. From this I gleaned that, as in the literature on approaches to plagiarism, citation usage reflects a multiplicity of viewpoints. However, in reviewing the responses, I could begin to categorize the types of reasoning I saw underlying their explanations.

Not surprisingly, many focus on the *moral issues*, believing that citing is the honest or ethical thing to do, and that to deny credit is tantamount to stealing another's idea. As with many closely held beliefs, many respondents had difficulty articulating why citation was important, and some were flummoxed as to why something so self-evident required explanation. Others, though, focused on the idea that it is fundamentally fair to give recognition to others whose ideas are important to their own work. Some called upon Judeo-Christian understandings of “doing unto others”—that is, they cite because they want to be cited.

Others discussed the *social ethics* involved, explaining that citations work to build a community of scholars. This group drew on notions that all intellectual work is ultimately collaborative, and all involved in the production of a work should be recognized as contributors to this process. Although relying on a more postmodern understanding of the discursive production of knowledge, such a rationale, like the first, relies on notions of fairness to earlier producers.

Still others described the *intellectual purpose* of citations, which can be used to show the history of an idea, how it was developed over time, and the context in which it was developed. This is especially important in interdisciplinary work, which by its very nature draws on disciplines that may not share a common background literature and may have differing epistemological bases for evidence use and citation. Quotation and citation also assist writers in refuting outmoded theories or distinguishing their own from previous work. At the same time, the visibility of citations also helps to ensure the accuracy of one's work, for listed sources can be tracked, traced, and corroborated.

There are also important *rhetorical purposes* served by proper source attribution. First, citations help bolster a writer's authority. Through citation, writers exhibit knowledge of the field and show the supporting evidence for their ideas, giving their work as a whole more credibility and legitimacy in the eyes of their readers. The use of quotations can also make essays more stylistically interesting by adding the words of others, especially when those words seem especially apt or articulate.

Finally, related to rhetorical purposes is what may be called the *generic rationale*, which considers citations one of many social and genre-specific conventions that writers must emulate in order to demonstrate proficiency in their particular realm of writing. This is not reducible to, but is certainly related to, disciplinary citation conventions, as anyone struggling to adapt an MLA epistemology to the demands of APA style can attest (or vice versa). It is also a transdisciplinary issue: for example, while published academic essays and the student papers modeled on these demand extensive attribution, mass media magazine articles may rely on paraphrasing or summarizing with few or no references listed. Educational television shows may orally refer to authors or visually focus on the cover of a book. Speech writing and some workplace writing, especially anonymous or bureaucratic forms, use no citations at all, and even the direct transcription of source material may be acceptable.¹⁴

Clearly, there are, like plagiarism itself, deeper underpinnings of the deceptively simple practice of citation. I propose that a more thorough and honest teaching of the rationale of source use addresses the complex and contradictory nature of the beast we call "plagiarism." Students attempting to integrate disciplinary forms of knowledge themselves may have the most to gain from a pedagogy that attempts to reconcile—yet reveal the struggle behind—these multiple viewpoints. Further, given that simplistic prohibitions against plagiarism have not proved effective at either stopping the problem or quelling fears about the issue, we may be best served by investigating a new approach that celebrates, rather than eschews, complexity. Thus, I advocate bracketing any one singular understanding of plagiarism to talk more in depth about what we do—and why we do it—when we research and write within, across, and beyond the disciplines. Such an approach gets to the heart of our mission as educators by allowing us to communicate the very purpose of academic reading and writing: to develop and share our own ideas through the process of mediating those of others. In a time in which education is increasingly defined as a standardized test score, can we blame students who have not yet internalized this process?

Indeed, focusing on citation use has multiple advantages for students. It

teaches a concrete writing skill, but at the same time, it allows students to begin to think epistemologically about their own creation of knowledge in relation to the works of others. It reveals the ultimately collaborative nature of all discourse production without the careless erasure of others' voices. Because practices of source attribution themselves have a multiple rationales, it also helps students understand that knowledge is not neat and tidy, but often ambiguous, contested, and culturally specific, produced within a complex system of struggle.¹⁵ Finally, I do not believe that this more positive approach to source use avoids the tough ethical issues engendered by plagiarism. Rather, it calls on an ethics that avoids hasty judgments and moral certitudes. By talking about the many ways and the diverse meanings of citation, we can integrate ethics into conversations about the construction of knowledge, the methods of learning, the responsibilities of authorship, and the power of writing.

The issue of adjudication is possibly even more difficult to negotiate. It is not my goal here to present a one-size-fits-all solution, for again, to do so would be to deny the very complexity and specificity that I have tried to show is central to this issue. Instead, I urge that policies be crafted collaboratively by groups representing diverse, even conflicting views—including students. Policies should emerge from specific institutional environments so that local material conditions and educational goals can be taken into consideration. Nonetheless, I hope that framers will recognize the complexity I have outlined and form multi-leveled policies that allow for student confusion, misunderstandings, and diverse learning curves. I would wish as well that my “denaturalization” of plagiarism may result in judgments about source misuse being made in the arena of knowledge production rather than the realm of moral certitudes. This would *not* mean that unacknowledged copying—whether one paragraph or ten pages—would be excused or considered acceptable, but it would shift our understanding about what exactly is wrong with such copying. For example, we may fail a student for being unable to write a coherent essay or reproduce quadratic equations or discuss the causes of the French Revolution, but we would not judge them as ethically remiss.

Once we emphasize the conventions and rationales for citation in pedagogy, then, it follows that our policies assess students' integration of and facility in using these mechanisms. Depending on the academic culture in which the policy is forged, students who fail to meet these standards may be judged as finally deficient (and graded accordingly), or they may be given opportunities for rehabilitation through further learning. This may mean a developmental course in source use, one-on-one counseling, or simply the

opportunity to rework faulty passages. To be effective, however, policies that focus on student engagement and responsibility in this process need documentation and communication among faculty across the area of adjudicative responsibility, so that a student's expected level of competence can be traced and assessed in a manner fair to both student and teacher. In individual settings, this may be university-, college- or department-wide. Such communication, especially when it crosses disciplinary and/or theoretical borders, is difficult to establish and maintain, but ultimately necessary to ensure that plagiarism is addressed in a complex way that acknowledges its multiple, conflicted domains. (An example of a policy that addresses many of these issues can be seen at www.is.wayne.edu.)

In conclusion, I believe that interdisciplinarians are well placed to begin the conversations needed to engender truly new ways of framing and responding to this important yet troublesome issue. This is not just because of the complexity and cross-disciplinary nature of the plagiarism problem, but because of issues fundamentally related to its opposite, the acknowledgement of sources. Interdisciplinarians' knowledge and usage of multiple disciplinary conventions make them uniquely situated among scholars more generally to understand the difficulties raised by so-called "common" knowledge and the ways in which citation strategies are rooted in specific disciplinary mechanisms. Further, interdisciplinary pedagogy has often been student-centered, non-hierarchical, and collaborative—methods that challenge traditional assumptions about how students gain and internalize skills, but which also have the potential to undermine conventional, individualistic views of how knowledge is "owned." Indeed, many interdisciplinary practitioners integrate not just disciplinary knowledges, but other ways of knowing (e.g., Carp 2001)—which might, we can imagine, include alternate ways of exhibiting and recognizing the knowledge of others. Thus, I hope this essay can be just the beginning of a longer discussion. For as interdisciplinarity becomes more necessary and common, as disciplines splinter and reconstitute to meet the needs of new issues and problems, rooted in new historical understandings and mediated by new technologies, we will need new models of the production, accreditation, and attribution of ideas. Questioning our certainties about plagiarism may be the place to start.

Biographical Note: Lisa Maruca is Assistant Professor in the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies, Wayne State University where she teaches composition and cultural studies courses. She has published work on authorship and intellectual property, the eighteenth-century book trade, and digital literacies.

Notes

¹ For a useful overview of the studies on student cheating, as well as an in-depth analysis of some specific modalities of test-cheating, see Shon (2004).

² Even in a smaller subset of knowledge production, such as the field of scientific publishing alone, what exactly constitutes plagiarism is ambiguous. As Marcel C. LaFollette (1992) reports,

Each field of research, each institution, and each journal adopts slightly different criteria for attribution and citation, but new questions continually arise. What about such things as appropriating all or most of another writer's bibliography, or copying data tables? When are certain illustrations considered to be original contributions and when simply part of common knowledge? Should one credit descriptions of common experimental procedures or common phenomena? What about identical chronological descriptions of events? Don't we all tend to use more or less the same terms to summarize the plot of Hamlet or to define radioactive decay? (p. 51)

He goes on to describe problems in deciding that something is a "truism" that does not have to be cited, excusing coincidental similarities and similarities resulting from concurrent thinking, and finally concluding only that "the decision will inevitably depend on the individual circumstances of the author and the publication" (1992, p. 51).

³ For a blow-by-blow overview of this case, see HNN Staff (2002).

⁴ In fact, I have asserted elsewhere that although Blair clearly violated journalistic standards for gathering evidence and presenting factual information, very little of what he did could be described as plagiarism. See Maruca (2003b).

⁵ For a collection of university policies, see Center for Intellectual Property (2003).

⁶ For a pedagogical example, see Babbie (1998).

⁷ For a collection of scholarly essays that together illustrate the diverse practices and attitudes towards literary borrowing in the years 1550-1800, see Kewes (2003).

⁸ For a different approach to this period, see Thomas (2000).

⁹ See, for example, Jay David Bolter (1991), who explains, "As long as the printed book remains the primary medium of literature, traditional

views of the author as authority . . . will remain convincing for most readers. The electronic medium, however, threatens to bring down the whole edifice at once. . . . [I]t denies the fixity of the text, and it questions the authority of the author” (p. 153)

¹⁰ A model for this approach is the Council of Writing Program Administrators’ *Defining and Avoiding Plagiarism: The WPA Statement on Best Practices* (2003), a plagiarism policy statement highlighting the concept’s complexity as well as teachers’ and students’ shared responsibilities for maintaining academic integrity and excellence.

¹¹ Ironically, most compositionists borrow heavily from the work of Martha Woodmansee (1994), simplifying what she represents as a much more complex process of consolidation.

¹² My understanding of complexity derives not only from Newell (2001) and his respondents (articles by Bailis, Klein, Mackey, Carp and Meek in *Issues in Integrative Studies*, 19) but also from N. Katherine Hayles (1990), an early interdisciplinary attempt to trace the emergence of a new epistemological paradigm that resulted in scientific theories of chaos and complexity, literary postmodernism, and post-structuralist theory.

¹³ Linda Bergmann, Marvin Diogenes, Ruth Overman Fischer, Carol Peterson Haviland, Andrea Lunsford, Lisa Maruca, and Claude Reichard have presented preliminary survey results as part a multi-stage project (2003). I wish to thank my Wayne State University colleagues for generously giving their time for these interviews. Their thoughtful and impassioned responses inspired me to look more thoroughly at this important issue.

¹⁴ Indeed, Martin (1994) decries the fact that this sort of condoned yet exploitative plagiarism is ignored. See also Dettmar (1999) on literary allusion.

¹⁵ Germane to this is Bourdieu’s (1993) discussion of “citatology,” the strategic rationale behind source use (pp. 137-139).

References

- Angélil-Carter, S. (2000). *Stolen Language? Plagiarism in Writing*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Babbie, E. (1998). Plagiarism. *Social Sciences Research and Instructional Council Teaching Resources Depository*. Retrieved April 22, 2004 from <http://www.csubak.edu/ssric/Modules/Other/plagiarism.htm>
- Bergmann, L., Diogenes, M., Fischer, R.O., Haviland, C.P., Lunsford, A., Maruca, L. & Reichard, C. (2003, March 22). “Ownership/Intellectual Property: Our Definitions Are Not the Only Ones.” College Composition and Communication Conference.
- Bolter, J.D. (1991). *Writing Space: The Computer, Hypertext, and the History of Writing*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Boston University. (1995). "A Definition of Plagiarism." *Boston University College of Arts and Sciences Academic Conduct Code*. Retrieved October 1, 2003 from <http://www.cs.bu.edu/ugradprogram/conduct.html>
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bowden, D. (1996). "Stolen Voices: Plagiarism and Authentic Voice." *Composition Studies/Freshman English News*, 24 (Spring-Fall), 5-18.
- Boynton, R.S. (2001, May 27). "Is Honor Up for Grabs? Education Isn't About Surveillance." *The Washington Post*, p. B1.
- Braumoeller, B.F. & Gaines, B. (2001). "Actions Do Speak Louder than Words: Deterring Plagiarism with the Use of Plagiarism-Detection Software." *PS: Political Science and Politics*. Retrieved October 1, 2003, from <http://www.apsanet.org/PS/dec01/braumoeller.cfm>
- Buranen, L. & Roy, A.M. (Eds.). (1999). *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bushweller, K. (2000). Cheating: "A Plague on American Schools" (Preface). In A Lathrop & K. Foss (Eds.), *Student Cheating and Plagiarism in the Internet Era: A Wake-up Call* (pp xi-xii). Englewood, CO Greenwood Publishing.
- Carp, R. (2001). "Integrative Praxes: Learning from Multiple Knowledge Formations." *Issues in Integrative Studies*, 19, 71-121.
- Center for Academic Integrity. (n.d.). CAI Research. Retrieved October 1, 2003, from http://www.academicintegrity.org/cai_research.asp
- Center for Intellectual Property, University of Maryland University College. (2003). *Collected Plagiarism Policies*. Retrieved October 1, 2003 from http://www.umuc.edu/distance/odell/cip/links_policy.html#collection
- Cohen, S. (1980). *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators. (2003). *Defining and Avoiding Plagiarism: The WPA Statement on Best Practices*. Retrieved October 1, 2003 from <http://www.wpacouncil.org/positions/WPAplagiarism.pdf>
- Dettmar, K.J.H. (1999). "The Illusion of Modern Allusion and the Politics of Postmodern Plagiarism." In L. Buranen & A.M. Roy (Eds.), *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World* (pp. 99-110). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Ede, L., & Lunsford, A. (2001). "Collaboration and Concepts of Authorship." *PMLA*, 116, 354-69.
- Edmundson, M. (2003). "How Teachers Can Stop Cheaters." *The New York Times*. Retrieved September 10, 2003 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/09/09/opinion/09EDMU.html>
- Goldberg, J. (2000). "Plagiarism Is Rape?" *National Review Online*. Retrieved October 1, 2003 from <http://www.nationalreview.com/goldberg/goldberg031500.html>

- Goldgar, B. A. (2003). Afterword. In P. Kewes (Ed.), *Plagiarism in Early Modern England* (pp. 215-220). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hammond, B.S. (2003). "Plagiarism: Hammond versus Ricks." In P. Kewes (Ed.), *Plagiarism in Early Modern England* (pp. 41-55). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hayles N.K. (1990). *Chaos Bound: Orderly Disorder in Contemporary Literature and Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press
- Heyboer, K. (2003, August 28). "Is Plagiarism Cheating?" *Ann Arbor News*, (from the Newhouse News Service), A4.
- HNN Staff. (2002). "How the Goodwin Story Developed." *History News Network*. Retrieved October 1, 2003 from <http://hnn.us/articles/590.html#latest>
- Howard, R.M. (1995). "Plagiarisms, Authorships, and the Academic Death Penalty." *College English*, 57, 788-806.
- . (1999a). "The New Abolitionism Comes to Plagiarism." In L. Buranen & A.M. Roy (Eds.), *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World* (pp. 87-96). Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- . (1999b). *Standing in the Shadows of Giants: Plagiarists, Authors, Collaborators*. Stamford, CT: Ablex Publishing.
- Hull, G. & Rose, M. (1989). Rethinking Remediation: Toward a Social-cognitive Understanding of a Problematic Reading and Writing. *Written Communication*, 6, 139-154.
- Johns, A. (1998). *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kellogg, A.P. (2002, February 1). "Students Plagiarize Less than Many Think, a New Study Finds." *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved November 30, 2003 from <http://chronicle.com/free/2002/02/2002020101t.htm>
- Kewes, P. (Ed.). (2003). *Plagiarism in Early Modern England*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kloss, R.J. (1996, Winter). "Writing Things Down versus Writing Things Up: Are Research Papers Valid?" *College Teaching*, 44, 3-7.
- LaFollette, M.C. (1992). *Stealing into Print: Fraud, Plagiarism, and Misconduct in Scientific Publishing*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lathrop, A. & Foss, K. (2000). *Student Cheating and Plagiarism in the Internet Era: A Wake-up Call*. Englewood, CO: Greenwood Publishing.
- Livingston-Webber, J. (1999). "GenX Occupies the Cultural Commons: Ethical Practices and Perceptions of Fair Use." In L. Buranen & A.M. Roy (Eds.), *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World* (pp. 263-272). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Mallon, T. (1989, 2001). *Stolen Words*. New York: Harcourt, Inc.
- Martin, B. (1994, Fall). "Plagiarism: A Misplaced Emphasis." *Journal of Information Ethics*, 3, 36-47.

- Maruca, L. (2003a). "Bodies of Type: The Work of Textual Production in English Printers' Manuals." *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 36, 321-344.
- . (2003b, November 8). "Plagiarism(s) and Histories." Paper presented at the Society for Critical Exchange Seminar on New Histories of Writing (in conjunction with the Midwest Modern Language Association), Chicago, IL.
- McCabe, D.L. (2001, July 6). [Interview moderated by J. Young]. "Colloquy Live: Plagiarism and Plagiarism Detection Go High Tech." *Chronicle for Higher Education*. Retrieved April 20, 2004 from <http://chronicle.com/colloquylive/2001/07/cheat/>
- Newell, W.H. (2001). "A Theory of Interdisciplinary Studies." *Issues in Integrative Studies*, 19, 1-25.
- Noah, T. (2002, January 22). "Doris Kearns Goodwin, Liar." *Slate*. Retrieved October 1, 2003 from <http://slate.msn.com/?id=2061056>
- Pappas, T. (1998). *Plagiarism and the Culture War: The Writings of Martin Luther King, Jr., and Other Prominent Americans*. Tampa, FL: Hallberg Publishing.
- Pfuhl, E.H., & Henry, S. (1993). *The Deviance Process*. (3rd ed.). Hawthorn, NY: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Ricks, C. (2003). "Plagiarism." In P. Kewes (Ed.), *Plagiarism in Early Modern England* (pp. 21-40). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rimer, S. (2003, September 3). "Campus Fad That's Being Copied: Internet Plagiarism." *New York Times*. Retrieved September 3, 2003, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/09/03/education/03CHEA.html>
- Rose, M. (1993). *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copyright*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rosenthal, L. (1996). *Playwrights and Plagiarists in Early Modern England: Gender, Authorship, Literary Property*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Roy, A.M. (1999). "Whose Words These Are I Think I Know: Plagiarism, the Postmodern, and Faculty Attitudes." In L. Buranen and A. M. Roy (Eds.), *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World* (pp. 55-62). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Sanders, B. R. (Moderator). (2003, April 1). *Critical Challenges in Distance Education: Cheating and Plagiarism Using the Internet*. Teleconference Participant Packet. Dallas: Dallas TeleLearning and Dallas TeleConferences.
- Shon, P.C.H. (2004). "Creativity, Strain, and Techniques of Innovation: How College Students Cheat on In-Class Examinations." Unpublished paper.
- Sykes, G. & Matza, D. (1957). "Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency." *American Sociological Review*, 22, 664-670.
- Thomas, M. W. (2000). "Eschewing Credit: Heywood, Shakespeare, and Plagiarism Before Copyright." *New Literary History*, 31, 277-293.
- Woodmansee, M. (1994). *The Author, Art and the Market: Rereading the History of Aesthetics*. New York: Columbia University Press.