

## 4

### APPROPRIATION, HOMAGE, AND PASTICHE

#### *Using Artistic Tradition to Reconsider and Redefine Plagiarism*

Joan A. Mullin

Artists who work in visual media have always built on a tradition of appropriation: painters can speak of impressionists because of common techniques or materials; interior designers can produce French country because they use particular furniture, objects, and patterned fabrics in the room; designers return from a fashion week in Milan ready to mass produce the latest trend; and architects after Frank Lloyd Wright have used cantilevered roofs. Taking such license with visual techniques is understood as artistic tradition and considered by designers and artists as legal appropriation. Besides, “if a design or object too closely resembles another’s work, an artist can claim it as ‘pastiche,’ ‘in the style of,’ or ‘as an homage to’ a particular artist or mentor” (U.K. cinematographer<sup>1</sup>). While appropriative practices may seem descriptive of the wider, Internet culture as well, they purposefully comprise the environment and experience of art students, who are told on the one hand not to steal ideas and designs, and on the other hand, to take images and build on them.

Students immersed in this culture of appropriation, homage, and pastiche might also assume that once a piece of written text

---

1. For a variety of reasons, some faculty preferred not to be identified by name, so for consistency, interviewees are referred to by their countries and fields to establish a context for the comments.

is removed from its original source and placed in another context—put to another use in a student’s paper—it is not “copied,” but instead, is part of a tradition of appropriation and transformation: the student’s work is merely “derivative.” Derivation, appropriation, or expansion of a known idea without citing might leave students open to charges of plagiarism in subject areas where words instead of images are used to communicate; however, while derivation and its variations are not the goals of budding artists, they are recognized by faculty in art and design as steps on the way toward becoming an artist. This attitude on the part of faculty differs significantly from that of writing-based faculty who teach students not to appropriate from others (see Orr, Blythman, and Mullin 2005). Art offers multiple examples of this line that is negotiated between plagiarism and creative expression, examples that can be useful for those who work with writing in any discipline. This chapter looks at how faculty-artists’ understandings and use of visual media not only conflict with articulations about plagiarism in writing classrooms, but also point to new strategies for teaching and talking about plagiarism in text-based classrooms.

In order to examine a potential conflict and useful differences between practices in visual- and word-based disciplines, I interviewed more than thirty faculty in two U.S. universities and two colleges in the United Kingdom. Faculty crossed the generations and were involved in professional art or museums in varying degrees; all taught students, and they represented a variety of disciplines: architecture, art history, fashion design, film documentary, cinematography, landscape design, painting, interior design, photography, graphic art, digital media, ceramics, and drawing. While conclusions from this study should be tested in other art and design schools, they are premised on two points of consensus that did emerge. First, plagiarism in written or visual texts means passing off someone else’s words/images as one’s own, without citation; second, art is, by definition, referential. Art faculty teach students to build on and appropriate technique and material, to get ideas from other objects and artists,

and to expand part of an object or image in order to help find their creative voices.

In these practices we can find parallels to writing: students read texts for ideas, look at models of effective writing, and expand concepts stated by others in order to promote their own perspectives. Yet the more comparisons I constructed between visual arts and textual productions, the more I began to reconsider how academics, who all speak out of their various traditions, employ what must seem like similar but conflicting language when they talk to students about written plagiarism: use resources, but be original. As I listened to art faculty speak first of appropriation, then of creativity, and next of teaching students to start with others' designs, I found my own definition of "written plagiarism" challenged by the language and traditions of the visual.

#### **ARTIST/FACULTY OWNERSHIP**

In addition to writing professional articles or books, art faculty interviewed spoke of owning the coursework they create as well as, though not always, the professional work they might create and display. For those in art and design, that includes class syllabi, descriptions of assignments, and exhibition directions, as well as artistic scenes instructors might set for drawing or painting classes. These enumerations may seem obvious, but such items have already been "stolen" from faculty interviewed. One of the art historians says she does not and will not have a Web site where she posts syllabi or class assignments because she already has had her research projects and rubrics presented by someone else in her field at a conference—without citing her as the originator.

While art historians may be assumed to write more than do working artists and teachers, all of the professionals interviewed speak of writing as a part of their work. They write critiques, give feedback for colleagues' work, write poetry as part of their visual art, create signage for exhibitions, write textbooks, and create CDs or DVDs that promote and describe their work. They

apply for awards, grants, or exhibitions, and they describe historical processes, eras, or movements. They engage in “interpretive work, synthesizing complex information for people who are not experts—sort of tech-writing about objects—translating, introducing works of art” in their own, individually produced and published texts (U.S. ceramicist).

Artists like to claim ownership of these physical productions, as well as any maps, graphics, photos, charts, or interior or fashion design ideas. However, many of those interviewed posed similar questions about their visual work: If someone takes a picture of a painting, landscape design, or object, who, then, owns the photo? Who owns ideas that incorporate another artist’s process? Who owns the setting created for art students in a classroom? One U.S. painter had spent a great deal of time using found objects, fabric, and natural plants to create a large and complex still life for her students to draw. Unbeknownst to her, a student who was also taking a photography class liked the setting so much that she photographed parts of it. The student’s photography instructor praised the setting and resulting photos and urged the student to enter them in a contest. In a chance conversation with the photography instructor, the painter found that the student had entered her photo of the class setting—without attribution. The painting instructor feels that her work, work that might have later been part of her own artistic production, had been taken: “I create studies of light and intervals of space by finding a language through mark-making.” For this faculty/artist, the student had stolen her light and shadow creation and had plagiarized her “words,” but others would not agree, claiming that the photograph translated the setting through another medium.

To avoid similar situations, many museums and historical and architectural sites forbid photography, but several of the art historians interviewed admitted going to considerable trouble to photograph cathedrals or other sites that are posted as off-limits to cameras. They hide equipment in their clothes, and they use partners to distract guards while they take shots

“for educational purposes.” These same photos, while they now belong to the photographer, can be used in other projects by anyone who may access them through online class Web pages. Who, then, can charge whom with plagiarizing, copying, or stealing? As a U.S. digital media artist pointed out, “The reality is that once you put it out there, anyone can take it and change it for their own purposes.” And that is precisely the problem with ownership in art. With a long artistic tradition of using what is in the public domain—paints, color, design ideas, formats, glazes, or film shots—it can be difficult to define “ownership,” even if an individual does equate her visual work to written (“mark-making”) text. As one of the film artists from the United Kingdom put it, “All you have to say to avoid a charge of plagiarism is that it is an homage to someone—that takes care of the ownership problem.”

Illustrators and graphic designers describe a negotiated ownership when they act as individual consultants: “Clients assume they own the design you do for them . . . [but] it really becomes a personal point of view—what is owned.” Clients might buy

one-time use . . . [they] buy use for a few years and then ownership reverts back to the person. If they want it forever, you ask for a ridiculous amount of money. But if you work for a company, especially for Disney with their characters, the ownership is theirs; working for any company, the ownership is theirs. (U.K. illustrator)

Illustrators and graphic artists were the most jaded about “ownership” (some purposefully indicated the quotation marks around the word), and several interviewed had left companies because of their sense of being used. They spoke often of the lack of creativity afforded them because they were told to make public, pastiche, borrowed, and derivative art that would sell. While they don’t physically own these works (companies do), their production of them implies a use of or ownership of their talent.

Objects and technique form another blurry line to negotiate in a world where what is owned by someone can be bought,

used, and then changed and owned by someone else. For example, fonts, paints, and materials are owned by their “makers,” but, once purchased, artists can manipulate them to make anything—new color washes, brushes, glazes for ceramics (see current copyright law, U.S. Copyright Office). A U.S. digital media artist asserts he owns the images he produces,

but the technical knowledge and process knowledge is shared; the physical process, scripting and programming is part of a conversation—just like the conversation called ‘art’ that has been going on for a millennia.

While copyright law would support this contention, and recent suits have begun to chip away at these premises (Fox, 2006; Kaindl, 2007; Kelleher and Farr, 2006), this “conversation called ‘art’ that has been going on for a millennia” forms the context within which art students learn that taking an idea or medium and using or developing it does not merit acknowledgment since ownership is not an issue.

This thin line between ownership and appropriate, professional use is one that students in art and design schools must learn to negotiate, especially when architects and interior and fashion designers in both countries acknowledge that teaching students “to borrow” develops their professional creative skill. Interior and fashion design faculty were “basically taught: here are the skills—go get images from magazines, exhibitions and film and do cross-visualization” (U.K. interior designers), and that is part of their pedagogy.<sup>2</sup> Students are told to take an image and use their own imagination to tease out, capitalize on, manipulate, or expand certain lines, qualities, figures, or colors in order to create their own product: they’re “cross-visualizing.” Students’ ability to push someone else’s vision gains them praise and recognition. In art classrooms, as in the profession,

---

2. When I heard “cross-visualization” explained, it seemed a wonderful word for a student to use when caught plagiarizing a research paper, for students *are* directed to start with someone else’s idea. Conversely, it’s a visual way to explain to students how to use other sources in any text.

“recognition in one’s field and by the public” was named most often as a reward, and while it is evidenced in publication, exhibition, citation, and critical praise, it is also recognized through derivation or copying by others: “Let’s face it; if you aren’t being copied, you’re not very good” (U.S. architect).

As with interior designers, students of architecture are expected to build within and on a tradition, choosing from the already established (and continually growing) architectural body of language: “Richard Meier works in the vocabulary of Le Corbusier, but his work is recognized as his own” (U.S. architect). Meier has taken Le Corbusier and pushed form in a new direction with other materials: “if you are inventive and define something new, there is a lot of status and respect given . . . status and renown” (U.S. architect). So, as part of their initiation into art, whatever the media, students learn that “ownership” in art has flexible boundaries, determined as much by the producer of a product as by the “user.” Student-artists, like their faculty counterparts, are both users and producers: One U.S. ceramist recalls her own professor, who closely guarded all of his own glazes, refusing to let her use them or to even try to make something else out of them. Whereas his sense of ownership made him guard his secrets, she believes that art itself demands she share her processes: “If students find a way to use or improve on a glaze I create—then they deserve to do so.” Students are taught, anyway, that art builds and merges into other art; it is shared.

#### **COLLABORATION—MIXING IT UP**

After hearing about the presumed, negotiated, and broken contracts experienced by the artist-collaborators interviewed, copyright laws that clearly articulate ownership and citation practices seem on the one hand necessary, and, on the other, a threat to creativity and the tradition that underpins artistic production. “In museum work, everything is shared; it has to be” (U.S. curator-art historian). Curators produce written works that accompany images and objects that are technically owned by

the museum and displayed in its physical space. The arrangement of objects and the surrounding setting created by the curators are not anyone's and yet everyone's because an exhibition is a collaborative project, done in teams. While the signage accompanying a traveling exhibition may be the property of the curator or consultant who helped mount the project, it also may be altered, with permission, to accommodate a museum's audience. Even, however, when a curator "writes individually, I put it before the team for input and review. I may also voluntarily consult an expert I respect, whose opinion I want" (curator-art historian). At a museum, there's no choice about whether to collaborate or not:

You don't really have to give credit to everyone in a museum because everyone knows it's collaborative; there is recognition, though, on the exhibition, acknowledgments—which may be part of a wall or of the displayed art—or in footnotes. Grant agencies or donors will be credited, as may consultants, and, when the academic organization demands it, the university itself may be mentioned. (U.S. art historian-painter)

This tacit understanding is acknowledged by most faculty interviewed: while they want credit for having a part in a work where they were major contributors or designers, they all recognize that setting up an exhibition, designing a building, creating a text, (visual or written, 2-D or 3-D) filmmaking, or designing logos involves those who remain unacknowledged.

Many of the artist-faculty interviewed emphasized that the project parameters determine the kind of collaboration, and that collaboration may be subject to corporate practice or professional traditions that have become common practice over time. Some art productions (ceramics, computer art, painting, drawing) may be solo ventures, yet these same artists collaborate at conferences or on exhibitions. Some photographers work alone, while other sessions take a crew. In the film industry, collaboration is spelled out in a contract. Graphic design artists may work alone or agree, like illustrators, to work with



clients, getting feedback on concepts and executions. One U.K. designer collaborates with rock groups when designing their album covers because “the design has to parallel how they think about their music; our discussion indicates the image.” In this and similar cases, design is a partnership comprised of artist, client, imagined audience, and material on which the image will appear.

Yet it is this collaborative and derivative nature of art that produces unresolved ethical and copyright problems. Contracts can take away all artistic rights; ideas can be manipulated just enough so that legal claims can’t be made; a young artist may think he owns material, only to find others making profits from it and claiming ownership. What in the past may have been produced collaboratively may now be subject to negotiation because one in a group seeks ownership through copyright.

#### CITATION AND ETHICS

Because art is both derivative and collaborative in the best possible sense of those words and because artists produce alone or collaboratively at any one time, the rules for citation and recognition are not always as clear as they purport to be for those involved in the production of words. Even when an image or object is clearly located in a museum’s art display or in an individual’s house, claiming, citing, and recognizing ownership may be problematic. In a well-known story related by several artist-faculty interviewed in the United Kingdom, a collector was asked by a popular magazine for an interview. Accompanying the interview was, of course, a picture of the collector in front of the works he owns; the agent for the artist of that picture sued the magazine—and won—for publicizing the artist’s work without his permission. Could pictures of shelved books in an article about a collector of early twentieth-century literary works or of the flyleaf of a signed, first edition be similarly contested?

Even though some faculty-artists are bound by copyright or professional contracts, nearly all spoke of rules of thumb guiding their practices. For a U.S. architect, giving credit and

not being accused of plagiarism or copying was a simple matter. He would ask himself, “If you get a design award, who will walk up at the ceremony with you?” A U.K. photographer, who takes images and uses translators or guides to help him photograph an area, determines project by project who will get credit. Photographers interviewed generally agreed that “collaboration credit is given in the form of acknowledging an association that has made a work possible” (U.K. photographer). It is acknowledged that “while an individual may own his images, the whole work is everyone’s even though everyone can’t benefit equally from the whole work” (U.K. documentary filmmaker). Realistically, if a photographer acknowledged everyone who made some projects possible, the citations would sometimes take up more space than the images in a publication—the work would be unmanageable as a book (U.K. photographer).

The endless list of names after a commercial film, those recognizing everyone from a caterer to the star’s dogsitter, seem to acknowledge the collaborators that make films possible. However, in U.S. promotional materials or reviews, films are referred to as the work of the few: the primary actors, screenwriter, director, and, perhaps, producer. In Europe, those participating in filmmaking have carefully articulated laws that give much more credit to contributors. Cinematographers may “even be recognized in places like Poland and Germany on the box-office receipts [tickets] because it is part of copyright laws” (U.K. cinematographer).

On the other hand, according to U.K. faculty interviewed, contracts tend to work against graphic artists:

Magazines and newspapers might put your name on [your work], but it depends on their practice and the context. Graphic artists leave their egos at the door—like a bricklayer. (U.K. illustrator)

Graphic artists, as well as interior and fashion designers who work for companies, learn that “style, techniques can be pastiched”: raiding other designs is a given. Many of the artist-faculty interviewed who had worked outside of academe said their

supervisors told them to “take small ideas from anywhere and run with them” and to “throw together others’ images” in order to create a finished product for a client. It was well known that

since people might not know who the original designer is, it doesn’t matter. You can avoid accusations by saying “influenced by” or “in the style of” . . . or give credit in terms of “after so-and-so” but people seldom do even that much. (U.K. graphic designer)

These practices are evident in many of the stories and experiences of those interviewed. One faculty-illustrator’s professional organization recently received complaints

that an award-winning illustrator was copying another’s style. The board couldn’t resolve the issue or agree among themselves because, while there were clear similarities, there were differences. Most on the board believed the work had been copied. (U.K. illustrator)

Even so, it was difficult for even these professionals to find the line between appropriation and originality, or perhaps, to dare claim individual work as plagiarized when copying is often standard corporate practice. In this case, nothing was publicly said or done.

Unlike interior designers, illustrators, and graphic designers, photographers rely on organizations that provide clear terms under which their photos can be used and cited. Companies that represent artists as well as individual photographers may embed a digital watermark in online images so that anyone downloading or printing them will get distorted images with lines and breaks through them. Companies that own large numbers of images have Web crawlers that troll through the Internet looking for unauthorized use of their images. If such an instance is found, the perpetrator will be sent a cease-or-be-prosecuted note. “Appropriation” is not tolerated. A recent case pointed to by more than one person interviewed in the United Kingdom involved the Hush Puppies corporation. Its advertising group ordered a portfolio of images from a large company that owns and sells them for public use. Hush Puppies returned

the photos, saying they'd found nothing that interested them, yet their next ad campaign duplicated the setting and objects from one of the portfolio's pictures. The image provider successfully sued Hush Puppies, which had to pay penalties and withdraw the ad. So goes the corporate world that settles such issues in courts, quite different from the illustrators' organization, which chose not to press what seemed to be a similar a case of appropriation.

While contractual or traditional citation and acknowledgment practices can ensure recognition of ownership, other artist-academics who were interviewed believe that there is another ethical dimension attached to the use and citation of their artistic productions. One photographer is willing to have her work published or used by others as long as she knows their purpose. Because she often photographs women and children who are victims of war and abuse, she does not want her images used frivolously by aid organizations with unproven track records or by politicians. She likewise always gets permission to photograph her subjects because "it is a question of moral ethics as to how you portray someone by photographing them," and she believes that anyone using her images should be equally as thoughtful about their intentions.

The ethics of citation for these artist-faculty consist of being recognized not just for a product, but also for the worldview represented through their creative talent. An illustrator who now works primarily alone

worried as a [corporate] designer: how honest can you be? You are not hired to be honest. . . .They want you to be—particularly in illustration where your style is partitioned—they want you to be what they want. . . . if they want you to copy a style, you do it. (U.K. illustrator)

Another noted that illustration is often a "farm of pens" with companies determining styles; "in the market, illustration is built on plagiarism. It's wallpaper." Realistic about the corporate objective tied to production of mass images for the public,

these artist-faculty still expressed anger at the lack of ethics and recognition that is part and parcel of the world in which many of their students will start.

Unfortunately, students get introduced to unethical practices fairly early in their schooling. It is common knowledge in the United Kingdom that corporate representatives and individual artists attend student exhibitions, grazing on the ideas presented. In an oft-told story, a national team of professionals formed a panel of judges for a student exhibition and

within three months of the exhibition, an ad appeared using the student's idea. While many speculated on a connection between the ad agency and one of the judges, nothing could be done. (Graphic artist)

Student shows are important venues for all art schools as they provide experience and, sometimes, opportunities for budding artists, but as one illustrator said, "I wish we could ensure that company spies could be banned from them." The reality, though, is that

Once you put it 'out there', anyone can take it and change it for their own. If you feel precious about something, take credit; get it out there. If someone says, 'Didn't so-and-so do that first?' shrug your shoulders and say, 'I don't know.' (U.S. ceramicist)

This response is not surprising since less than one percent of those interviewed had any formal training in issues of citation. When asked how they learned about attribution, replies were similar:

Can't remember.

By the skin of my teeth.

In ninth-grade English.

The hard way—when someone stole my work.

I didn't learn—I'm still learning.

Most became educated as they apprenticed in studios, watched a mentor, read about others' misfortunes, or had their own work used without reference. A U.K. graphic artist who received no

formal training in copyright, ethics, or plagiarism says he relies on friends who are copyright lawyers to help him negotiate issues of ownership, publication, and credit. He wonders, not facetiously, “Is my own image mine? Does a cartoon characterizing it, steal it?” These artist/faculty articulated clearly the ever-shifting negotiations of their professional lives and traced their own confusions about ownership, collaboration, and ethics to a lack of training and to the increasing complexity of court cases that infringe on creativity and artistic tradition. They realized that the ability of their own students to navigate through these same professional questions was not going to get any easier.

**ART STUDENTS: NEGOTIATING PLAGIARISM,  
APPROPRIATION, AND COLLABORATION**

One of the illustrators interviewed had just come across “another instance” of a somewhat obscure person’s work being copied by a known artist:

I haven’t done anything . . . I’m surprised the magazine didn’t notice . . . I couldn’t work out whether it mattered, but it actually does. . . . if it happened here [at university] it would matter. I would definitely do something.

But the “something” in art schools is often different from the disciplinary hearings and grade penalties given students who plagiarize with words. For art professionals, it may amount to quiet ostracizing, but while everyone interviewed states that plagiarism in its most obvious form is discouraged at art schools, “Copying is a really, really, really useful way of learning” (U.K. graphic artist).

When they [students] get lost, they might copy. . . . As they become skilled, they might stall. It’s important for them to learn that they don’t operate in a vacuum, that there is a tradition to build on; they may say, ‘I don’t want to look at a book [about an artist] because it’ll corrupt me,’ but that’s naïve. They’ve been influenced all their lives. (U.K. painter-printmaker)

On the one hand, the acknowledgment of tradition and the use of models in art are not unlike practices in other disciplines.

You teach students to borrow imagery: If I have a subject, I might study others who use similar subjects . . . the university is like a cultural swimming pool; they [students] need to learn how to imagine by swimming in it. (U.K. painter)

However, art students are encouraged to also “copy ideas—it’s the field. . . . Fritz Lang describes himself as a visual magpie” (U.K. filmmaker). For filmmakers and others in art, “It’s OK to copy in the beginning. To emulate is not to copy; it’s part of the learning process” (U.K. illustrator).

While faculty claim that no student wants to be seen as “merely” or “only” derivative, U.K. interior designers acknowledge that, on a recent field trip to Dubai, students saw designers making excessive amounts of money in a culture where there was “clearly no concept of plagiarism . . . pretty much everything they saw was ripped off.”<sup>3</sup> Nonetheless, while their pedagogy and some commercial interests encourage copying, artist-faculty were quite confident that, like them, their students eventually figure out how one can negotiate the line between derivation and appropriation. “Students do not want to be conventional or derivative. [They] have a strong sense of wanting to be known as creative; it makes them self-censor copying” (U.K. interior designer). This attitude serves students in the professional world because, for artists, “the crux of the issue is not plagiarism so much as the quality of thinking: derivation vs. taking something and moving it forward” (U.K. photojournalist).

---

3. There is a difference between students who come in wanting to be unique and those who may, for a number of career decisions, choose to be copyists. There is more to be said here about the differences between practices within the academy and those outside of it; these differences, if not explained, can often contribute to perceived irrelevancy of what is taught as opposed to what is actually practiced in the world. Bergmann’s chapter in this collection demonstrates one such disjuncture—in this case, between faculty-student practices and academic administrators.

To move students forward, art faculty rely on sketchbooks or storyboards, providing lots of feedback wherein they seek to challenge students. For a U.K. painter-printmaker, “response to students’ sketchbooks is vital for showing them how to use an idea, how to use a medium to make it theirs.” A U.S. architect who finds a student’s sketches “exceptionally derivative” will point out that they are imitations of (for example) Mies van der Rohe, but then “send that student to study the architect even more in order to see how that copied design might be changed, how the student might incorporate facets of van der Rohe in different ways.” Likewise, when an interior designer in the United Kingdom finds that student work is “glaringly, obviously copied,” she looks for its first iteration in the student’s sketchbook and uses feedback and “humor in classes—and they laugh, and it makes [being told it’s a copy] not so scary.” U.K. interior designers acknowledged that the highly derivative nature of their field may lead students to create designs that are very similar to others. However, because they see the processes through which the designs emerged, along with the inspiration, iteration, drafts, and revisions, they believe they can accurately measure students’ creative talent. They point out how difficult it would be for a student to start with someone else’s product, reproduce backwards the steps leading to it, and then spend the entire semester trying to pass that off as original work. They also would

like to think students have the moral and intellectual guidance to make them want to make something better or different. Students know they need to innovate as does the world, as it and they continue to change. (U.K. interior designer)

It is not unusual, faculty acknowledge, for students to copy a particular person or style as part of their creative growth, manipulating and extending others’ work. This is how art students learn to build on a tradition, find “their own voice” (U.S. painter) and “avoid plagiarism like the Black Death!” (U.S. curator-art historian). Digital media students are taught in one U.S. class that



while appropriation is a big part of twenty-first-century art making . . . the art of appropriation has to be relevant to the work. If I do a piece on classical artwork and include Michelangelo's *David* to make a point—fine. But if I take a picture of a cow off the Internet because I can't make one—that's inappropriate. (U.K. interior designer)

Those interviewed indicate that the consequences of not learning the difference show up in students' grades now, and will later show up in loss of commissions and work; they teach that, while there will always be a Dubai, worldwide recognition depends on creative innovation.

While art, design, and architecture students are learning to negotiate the use of others' work, they are also being taught the collaborative side of their future professions. All those interviewed have students collaborate at various points throughout their classes. Mostly, students

hate collaborating. They believe art hinges on individual expression and that their creative genius is being compromised. Usually they collaborate in the form of process rather than in conceptual development, but when they do the latter, their work is much stronger. . . . They're not required to acknowledge their collaboration; I think if I required it, [collaboration] would end (U.S. digital artist).

Part of their resistance to collaboration is that they "have a strong sense of ownership. . . . They're terrified of having their creativity 'stolen' . . . even if their own work is clearly derivative" (U.S. painter). It was common to hear that students prefer to work alone "because of what they perceive as unequal work quality in others. They don't know how to play yet" (U.S. ceramicist). U.K. interior design instructors add that students resist collaboration "because they know that one student can pull everyone down or that one student will cover for a mate." Art faculty see these resistances as naïve student positions and provide collaborative opportunities so that students learn the boundaries and crossings one takes on when making art.

In order to measure their individual thinking and processes, one U.S. art historian has students keep journals when they work collaboratively; however, this kind of accounting for individual work within a collaboration may be more usual in a discipline like art history—which deals with words—than in the material, visual arts. A U.S. architect noted that students “are not *allowed* to delineate who did what part; they are told to use ‘we,’ not ‘I.’” That’s because “while students might believe it’s Gehry who did it [designed a building], they find out it’s a team.” Like graphic designers-in-training who are taught to leave egos at the door and work together, architects learn to “self-identify what they have done on a project,” (U.K. graphic artist) and that has to be enough for most of them.

This complex dance between being recognized for collaboration or being satisfied with one’s own silent part in production is becoming more difficult. As more images are turned into profit, and as more artists find themselves either losing a way of life or working as a corporate tool, more are learning to legally protect what might have once been shared. Even so, faculty clearly indicated that their teaching encourages the artistic tradition of collaboration. At the same time, they recognize that images which make up the tradition—its ideas, its processes, and materials—are becoming so copyrighted that “the ability to create requires a call to your lawyer” (Lessig 2004, 192). How to teach students about this future is one of the many concerns of all artist-faculty.

#### FUTURE CHALLENGES FOR FACULTY AND STUDENTS

The Internet and all the possibilities for appropriating and copying came up as the most challenging issue of the future. There are thousands of images on the Web, “virtual galleries . . . and it’s nearly impossible to control what happens to them” (U.S. art historian). Some of the uses seem harmless: in a landscape architect’s course, students downloaded images of people walking so that they could place them in their design, but technically, they had illegally copied those images. Teaching what is

fair use or allowable in education changes the way faculty think about their pedagogy:

I'd like to do a lot more on the Web, but there are implications for educational use, for use of student produced products, for using images in their work. I don't let students use the Internet initially when they do their research—it has to be after they look at original objects and books/papers. It actually has been a good thing to wrestle with these questions, because it helps in understanding the dilemma students are in. I don't have all the answers; I can sympathize with my students' wrestling with the same issues. (U.S. art historian)

Some architects are not allowing their buildings to be photographed because of ownership issues; they don't want Web images of them sold for profits in which they don't share, or they don't want their work imaged for any profit. Unfortunately, this approach also gets in the way of legitimate photography used for educational reasons or for inspiration. Finally, one can try to protect images and objects, but the reality is that “students steal images all day—so sue them! What will you get? But the worst thing is that [when] students appropriate so much, what skills do they develop? The overall artistic level is declining” (U.S. digital artist).

The reliance on the Internet as a substitution for creativity rather than a tool was expressed by several of those interviewed:

Students are so good at the computer and current with technical aspects, but their aesthetics lag behind their technical abilities. They get seduced by speed and can't filter information. I have to get them to slow down and really look. I have to get them to see that they can't take an image as theirs and just use it as it is. They need to learn to discriminate. (U.S. painter)

Besides adjusting pedagogy to both accommodate and critique technology, faculty find themselves addressing ethical issues raised by discussions of intellectual property, ownership, and

art. For example, an architect interviewed had one of his buildings photographed without permission. The photos were printed in a magazine, and while he agreed that the photos were quite good, the magazine in which they appeared was third-rate. He believes the photos' appearance in the publication demeaned the quality of his architecture. Even worse, the photographer offered to sell the photos back to him for quite a large sum of money.

Deciding what determines ethical practice among artists and those who make money off of art is not the only area students need to consider: they need to develop a philosophy of public use that justifies fair use of their work as well as public access. In the summer of 2006, a light sculpture was installed in front of the oft-photographed Eiffel Tower. Because the installation belonged to the artist, he demanded that no one photograph the tower at night when his sculpture was lit, but the tower itself is in the public domain. Students will need to consider whether the placement of their art should be used to block the right to reproduce other items that are within public domain.

Ethical questions are of particular concern to photographers and documentary artists. Faculty members interviewed in the United Kingdom were very careful about tracing the uses of images, clips, or whole pieces of their work. They were concerned that others may unthinkingly use selected material that misrepresent the artist's intentions, fail to dignify their subjects, or produce—out of pieces—end products that carry overtones of racism. For example, one documentary artist questions the use of her or others' war photos, believing it is not ethical to embody the weight of war on one image of a child. She is careful to delineate for her students a controversy between who in her field are called the "hunters"—those who go out and observe and record—and the "gatherers," those who reconstruct reality and then photograph it. She believes the former is about respecting people who are the subject of her work while the latter offers the ability to manipulate a reality (e.g., freelance photographer Adnan Hajj, whose doctored pictures of the 2006

Lebanon War led to Reuters expunging over 900 of his photographs from their files).

Such manipulation occurs often in advertising, a threat to photographers and any image-maker. A U.K. graphic artist spoke of a Russian photographer who shot an image of an American firing a missile as proof that the United States was illegally involved in a Chechnyan conflict. The photographer had offers to buy the picture, but he found that one of them came from the company that made the missile; they wanted to use it in the promotional materials they sent to other prospective buyers. A U.K. illustrator related another story of an artist who was so taken with a photographer's print that he painted it. Originally, the painter was going to buy the print, but he ended up making such huge amounts of money off the painting—legally, it was determined—that he never purchased the print he used. With the continually evolving laws about copyright and ownership and continually evolving technology, how—several faculty wondered—can they begin to help their students make creative, ethical decisions.

As they articulated their concerns about ethics, plagiarism and ownership, faculty often acknowledged that the interview in which we engaged for this chapter was the first time they thought about the relationship among these issues. More than eighty-five percent said that as a result, they realized they needed to spend more time being explicit about what they see as implied in daily instruction. Their sketchbook responses, directing students to further research and the public critique in class, were important but given the future, most concluded, they would have to incorporate direct instruction about plagiarism, ownership, and copyright. Others already found ways to teach these issues together, but in some form or another, nearly all of those interviewed expressed the concern of a U.S. art historian:

Will there even *be* such a thing as intellectual property in the future? Prior to the Renaissance, people in art didn't take ownership: building a cathedral and all the art associated with it was God's work and

collaborative; people relied on notebooks of ideas and copied what was endorsed. . . . For those building a cathedral, what was most valued was God and that's why they engaged in their work. There really isn't anything new under the sun; it is all referential with iterations and derivations.

In sum, faculty seemed to agree for the need to increase instruction and open class discussions of fair use and copyright; some pointed to including in their classes an examination of innovative public responses to over-regulation of tradition (e.g., Creative Commons, <http://creativecommons.org>), but all were concerned about the effect of technology on their students' aesthetic education, skill, technique, or ethical understanding of appropriation, as well as its effect on their own work as educators and artists.

#### **ART TO WORDS AND BACK AGAIN**

An art historian in the United States noted that, when using words, "students don't know how to separate what they have borrowed from what they want to say. They can't figure out how to say something they think when someone else has said it so well; they don't know how to borrow language." Another faculty member from the United States who teaches art history and design courses, where students produce products with words and images, finds that they

are completely unclear [about plagiarism]. I highlight what they've lifted in an article. They seem to understand that lifting a concept wholeheartedly is plagiarism, but not lifting a part. . . . They're clear about citing visuals, but not writing. (U.S. art historian)

These interviews have caused me to carefully examine how our traditional ideas about language use, ownership, and plagiarism in text-based classes have not been accommodating a culture where everything seems to have already been said, nor recognizing its own tradition of appropriation and evolution: what else is living language if not appropriation? How can we

acknowledge metaphor, allusion, satire, and other genres (or even the concept of genre), and yet tell students they must be original? How can we teach the plasticity of language on the one hand and deny students, as learners, the ability to play with appropriation and word building on the other? A careful look at how visual media is taught might help us define and teach voice effectively. How tradition informs and takes a role in art education can show us how to align our expectations of originality with the reality of information overload and the Internet.

For those in art, the challenge and pleasure of their work clearly come from engaging the tradition out of which they seek to grow, and that attitude is not as successfully transferred to students when they write papers. Unlike perceptions about authorship, the practice of being an artist is so closely tied to individuation within an acknowledged tradition of appropriation that art students do tend to self-regulate. Further, unlike what students seem to believe about the importance of writing, art students are taught that they will reap consequences of copying that will reflect on their personal, artistic goal of self-expression. This will mean lost recognition and money in some fields of art, but in other fields, they learn that rewards will accrue from turning their talent to someone else's ends (graphic art, illustration, some interior design and architecture). While artist-faculty are trying to find an ethical balance between these two, they also are realistic about how their students will be asked to use their abilities: some will be able to make a living through individual voices while others will be echoes. Similarly, in a culture where writing and the visual are increasingly enmeshed, some students will excel as writers or Web designers. While Web designers will easily draw on traditions of design language and models, how will our writing pedagogies help the others find voice in a tradition of language? If written texts are so available in finished form, ready to be copied and manipulated, why can't our students appropriate them just as a corporate graphic artist might incorporate images? How do we help them negotiate these and enter a field if

we respond to plagiarism by using a large brush to paint over students' efforts to find voice?

Art students' ability to make choices often is tied to their talent as well as their business savvy, but their willingness to use and explore their talent is tied to the high stakes associated with their artistic production. The stakes are not the same for art students' (or most students') papers. An interior designer in the United Kingdom, commenting on the lack of plagiarized material in art school, wisely points out that

students value their designs over their papers; they are more inclined, therefore, to value the creativity in their design work than in their papers. They have a desire that everyone is going to see their designs—but who will ever read their papers?

Perhaps that question drives the most egregious copying of whole papers, but for most of our students, uncited quotations, borrowed ideas, and patchwriting are their appropriations, their attempts to find what they sound like so they can take their places in a tradition of expression through words as their peers do through visuals.