

INTRODUCTION

Connecting Plagiarism, Intellectual Property, and Disciplinary Habits

Carol Peterson Haviland and Joan A. Mullin

The concept of ownership has become increasingly important in the teaching of writing, particularly as university faculty members encourage students to study and write collaboratively and to use the increasingly rich and available range of electronic resources. On many campuses, undergraduates and their instructors expect that first-year writing courses will teach students to discover, select, and cite resources appropriately. Thus, believing that students will have learned this “somewhere else,” faculty often assume that plagiarism of any kind can and should be eliminated chiefly by using detection services such as Turnitin.com and that failure to acknowledge sources should be punished as an intentional violation of university policy. However, despite these assumptions and the efforts of composition programs, writing centers, writing across the curriculum initiatives, workshops on intellectual property and academic integrity, Web sites on avoiding plagiarism¹, software detection programs, and even threats of failure or expulsion of plagiarists, faculty still encounter unreferenced sources in student writing. A number of recent publications document the legal and pedagogical implications of these concerns (Howard and Robillard 2008, Roberts 2008). Nevertheless, undergraduates continue to download papers from any of the widely advertised “term paper providers,” cut and paste freely from online sources, and turn in

1. See for example the Purdue OWL, <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/589/01/> or the University of Leicester, <http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/ssds/slc/resources/writing/plagiarism/plagiarism-tutorial/>.

patch-written research essays; graduate students struggle to distinguish between their own discourse and that of their sources; and faculty members continue to wonder why students “can’t just follow an APA manual.”

Downloading from term-paper mills and other kinds of recycling are clearly acts of intellectual dishonesty and are considered unethical across the disciplines; such attempts to avoid work are not the focus of this book.² Neither does this collection look at the relationship between the Web and students’ sense that all information is free for the taking, for this already is common to conversations and incorporated on plagiarism Web sites, usually under “academic integrity.” Nor are the authors concerned here with teaching APA and MLA as solutions for reducing plagiarism. We also chose not to repeat previous research on the commodification of culture because others have and continue to make that case and demonstrate its effects on creativity (e.g., Choate 2005, Lessig 2004, McLeod 2005, Vaidhyathan 2001). Instead, this collection examines faculty’s perceptions of what they own as academics; it asks what they have learned to consider as their intellectual property (IP) and then explores how their discipline-based definitions inform their understanding and subsequent teaching of collaboration, citation, and plagiarism.

Faculty are aware that IP is a concept anchored in copyright laws that carry legal ramifications and that in a capitalist culture ownership is continually parlayed into some form of currency (e.g., cash, recognition, tenure, and promotion); for academics, this has meant defining text as “property.” It is not unusual, therefore, for academic language defining plagiarism to parallel the legal: “stealing” someone’s words or ideas, “expulsion” from a community, or “sentencing” before student judicial boards. Thus the chapters here question the common practice of treating text as property that can be “stolen” and explore the actual disciplinary practices that define what is owned and what is not, what can be taken and what cannot, and what can

2. Insight on plagiarism as a sign of cultural laziness is provided in Megan O’Rourke’s (2007) discussion.

be appropriated and what cannot. However, just as Thaiss and Zawacki's (2006) discussions with faculty uncovered unarticulated assumptions about how students should write in the disciplines, and, therefore, how faculty might change their practices to match their expectations, the authors of individual chapters here have compiled research on unexamined concepts of ownership. Their data allow us, as editors, to look at how these concepts may play a role in students' plagiarism, why generic definitions of plagiarism and consequent punishments haven't eliminated it, and what faculty members might do about it.

These inquiries began with questions about how to teach citation practices more thoughtfully and more successfully, articulated during an afternoon of discussion at the 2002 Conference on College Composition and Communication Intellectual Property Caucus. Members of the caucus recognized that although they had learned a great deal about ownership and plagiarism and had developed teaching practices in response, plagiarism persisted. Perhaps then, they concluded, they needed to reconsider their premises; perhaps they weren't asking the right questions.

As a result of that conversation, we (the editors and chapter authors) began the research for this book project, and we first turned to the definition of plagiarism on which we had relied: passing off someone else's words or ideas as one's own (see, for example, Rebecca Howard 1995 and Margaret Price 2002). However, as writing center and writing-across-the-curriculum faculty, we quickly recognized that this worked for us because we, like most of our colleagues, had internalized disciplinary "rules" for collaboration, attribution, derivation, and citation. Therefore, as veteran academics, we had little difficulty determining which words or ideas to claim as our own and which to mark as belonging to someone else; in fact, we used others' words and ideas strategically according to disciplinary traditions that we could easily trace in our own discipline's texts.³ It seemed that if students were only more careful readers and researchers and if they took

3. For a linguistic and discourse analysis, see Ken Hyland's (1999) work on the establishment of authority in eight professional disciplinary texts.

the time to consult handbooks or Web sites on plagiarism, they, too, could avoid plagiarism by distinguishing what is common knowledge, what is unique to other scholars, and what is theirs.

Recognizing this faculty complaint about an age-old student dilemma, Price (2002) offers a solution: involve students in creating plagiarism documents, make explicit their questions and concerns, and teach them that “conventions governing text ownership and attribution are constructed and dynamic” (110). We agree with Price that engaging students in discussing and constructing such documents is a positive move. However, we also have observed that the outcome of such discussions is often yet another set of rules that capture typical school conversations about plagiarism, that do not uncover tacit disciplinary conventions, and that ignore the dynamic nature of knowledge construction—and therefore the activity system that produces conventions in a field, an area, or a classroom.

In addition, because we all were involved in writing-in-the-disciplines projects, we wondered what kind of instruction students were getting about the activity systems that determine “someone else’s words or ideas” in chemistry, art, or anthropology, and how faculty in these very different areas know what is theirs to engage with and build upon. And even though we all worked across disciplines, we began to wonder whether *we* really knew what constituted plagiarism in other disciplines. We found ourselves talking variously of legal terms as they relate to taking ideas and words, of ethical practices, and of disciplinary conventions, often interweaving the terms “intellectual property,” “ownership,” and “plagiarism.” We wondered whether the legal constructs of intellectual property, as defined by lawyers, corporations, and courts, captured the ways academics really work or wish to work, and we began to question the rule-based discourse of plagiarism that mimics legal-speak and the definitions it generates. We thought that a conceptual investigation of what faculty judge as “theirs” might offer a more generative space for understanding the ways those of us in particular disciplines think and talk about what we own, borrow, or use.

To explore our new set of questions, we chose to study the way faculty members and experienced scholars internalize disciplinary “rules” for acknowledgment, derivation, and citation. We needed to discover where their disciplinary expectations led them—other than just to recognizing different citation conventions. We needed to see how the continually changing agreements being hammered out in the courts are shaping faculty’s definitions of textual “ownership” in their professional work—and how faculty definitions and practices that depend on ownership and acknowledgment of disciplinary texts (and, as we discovered, artifacts) shape what they expect in student work. We needed to learn how faculty’s own collaborative, writing, and citation practices inform their explanations and expectations of collaboration and writing in student work.⁴

This volume, which reports the findings of our six-year project of interviewing faculty across the disciplines to determine their beliefs and practices about scholarly ownership, intellectual property, and plagiarism, is one outcome of these queries. Chapter authors selected a discipline or field to investigate, all using the same protocols with slight adaptations to context (see Appendix A), interviewing faculty on a total of nine campuses. The questions were designed to (1) uncover definitions of and the relationship between research practices, intellectual property, ownership, and plagiarism held by disciplinary experts in their fields; (2) investigate faculty expectations for students’ use of sources; and (3) determine when, how, and what expectations were communicated to students. As we engaged in our

4. Expanding the work of Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995) and Bazerman (2002), Ken Hyland (1999) analyzes the texts faculty produce, finding that “textual conventions point to distinctions in the ways knowledge is typically negotiated and confirmed. . . . Clear disciplinary differences are identified in both the extent to which writers refer in the work of others and in how they depict the reported information” (341). He uses linguistic analysis and “insider informants” in “Stance and engagement a model of interaction in academic discourse.” We find Hyland insightful but were interested in how faculty *understand* their practices and how they *articulate* this to themselves, colleagues, and students rather than how we identify and interpret these conventions.

research, we periodically collaborated on conference presentations, reporting our findings-in-progress. Our interactions with audiences at a series of MLA, CCCC, WAC, and writing center conferences enriched our understanding of our data, and our conversations with other faculty on our campuses enlivened our discussion. We are grateful for their encouragement and insights.

Following this introduction, we offer five chapters written by researchers who posed a common set of questions to faculty colleagues. In chapter 1, Diogenes, Lunsford, and Otuteye deal with the complexities of writing and owning computer code, a process that could seem quite straightforward and mathematical, but that involves complex issues of ownership. In chapter 2, Buranen and Stephenson take up the biological sciences, a field known to be based explicitly on knowledge-building and replication, yet one that is increasingly complicated by its collaborative practices and shifting citation conventions. Chapter 3 opens up academic ownership to objects beyond text as Boland and Haviland explore the ways fieldworkers' identifications with their study sites and populations shape the ways they understand intellectual property and ownership. Such professional identifications change not only what can be owned and what is cited but also how such ownership shifts over time. Further removed from what is often defined as common textual understandings of ownership and acknowledgment, the practices described by Mullin in chapter 4 challenge through the visual arts our notions of ownership. She describes the elusive lines that artists, designers, and architects negotiate both inside and outside the academy as they commonly engage in the age-old practice of appropriating visuals, processes, and materials. In chapter 5, Bergmann highlights the differences in the practices outlined by the very university administrators who "write" the rules for student plagiarists, but who, as is common in business, "borrow," cut, paste, and adopt policy and procedures from others without acknowledgment—including "plagiarizing" plagiarism rules. We conclude by

summarizing the implications of these professional practices, linking them to underlying causes of plagiarism in academe, outlining the implications for our students and our teaching, and suggesting areas for further investigation.

WRESTLING WITH OUR TERMS: INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, PLAGIARISM, AND COMMON KNOWLEDGE

Our first research step was to find out how “ownership” is defined and credited in faculty’s professional work, and we began by asking our colleagues to describe what elements of scholarship they own, how they come to own them, how they mark that ownership, and why and how ownership matters within their field. We then asked what bearing these concepts and practices have on whether and how they define disciplinary ownership for students, and we asked whether this ownership is overtly connected to citation practices. We hoped to determine how these practices are negotiated and recorded within each area, whether and how faculty members’ own disciplinary practices are related to those they expect of students, whether definitions of ownership and use of citation cross professional practices in disciplines, and whether these are or should be taught—and by whom.

While we had looked at the research on academic ownership, the responses we gathered showed that disciplinary professional practices seemed to operate both in conjunction with and in conflict with common legal understandings of IP. Just as the general population continue to download, appropriate, and remix despite corporate legal battles, so too the academics we interviewed often spoke of long-held or newly emerging practices that exist apart from and in spite of courtroom decisions.

“Intellectual property,” “copyright,” “patent law,” “works for hire,” and “fair use” are carefully defined under the law—albeit with vigorous and continuing debate (See, for example, McSherry 2001, Dolin 2007). The US government defines “intellectual property” (<http://www.uspto.gov/main/glossary/index.html#TM>) at the same time as it describes how to claim

it through trademarks, patents, and copyrights. Trademarks “protect words, names, symbols, sounds, or colors that distinguish goods and services from those manufactured or sold by others and to indicate the source of the goods.” A patent is a property right granted by the government to an inventor “to exclude others from making, using, offering for sale, or selling the invention throughout the United States or importing the invention into the United States” for a limited time in exchange for public disclosure of the invention when the patent is granted. A copyright “protects works of authorship, such as writings, music, and works of art that have been tangibly expressed.” Further explication states that, “Copyright is a form of protection provided to the authors of ‘original works of authorship’ including literary, dramatic, musical, artistic, and certain other intellectual works, both published and unpublished” (<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/olia/copyright/basics.htm>).

While this might seem to settle questions about ownership, use, and citation, current and pending legal cases indicate it does not. Most problematic is the term “original,” for the government’s definition ignores the concept of “knowledge-building.”⁵ As is seen in the chapters herein and elsewhere (e.g., Lessig 2004, Creative Commons, Lethem 2007, Suehle 2007), the result is a growing frustration with the corporate and litigious culture that has spawned an industry aimed at profit, one less concerned with practices of knowledge-building and creativity and more with unrealistic definitions that increase bottom lines. We want to bring the focus of these discussions back to the educational practices used by those responsible for teaching the vast majority of students who are not law students. Therefore, while not disregarding the importance and power of legal definitions, the authors of these chapters investigate what faculty *claim* as owned—what *they* see as their intellectual property. Having teased this out, we then looked at how actual IP

5. For further discussion of the problems of legal definitions, see Suehle (2007), Liptak (2006), Vorsino (2007), Gladwell (2004), or Lethem (2007).

constructions by faculty affect how they respond to student texts and whether and how they teach students about plagiarism.

What we all found was that faculty members' definitions and enactments of scholarly work and their ways of acknowledging contribution and collaboration within their professional activities are not clearly evident in the ways they talk about their systems of disciplinary activity to their students. Indeed, our interviews uncovered a disconnect between faculty members' professional, tacit expectations and the ways institutions generically define it for students. This leads us to suspect that relying on traditional, institutional definitions of plagiarism may be a factor in faculty's frustration with the ways students interpret citation practices. By defining the actual practices that lead to faculty's beliefs about ownership, we suggest a different way to think about teaching disciplinary contexts to students and seek to further disciplinary discussions of how creativity and intellectual property are threatened when scholarly traditions are legally called into question. We believe that articulating the importance of each discipline's freedom to borrow, build, and remix ideas that focus on knowledge creation and ownership is much more useful for students than are generic rules and regulations.

These definitions of knowledge creation and ownership of research, ideas, and objects, however, are complicated by the parallel disciplinary role of teaching. Faculty often move between spaces: as an archaeologist-instructor, an artist-teacher, or a biologist-mentor. Classroom activities and course materials are other sites where tacit attitudes toward definitions of knowledge and ownership become evident. This turns problematic when the traditional practices and common assumptions under which faculty expect to operate and which underlie the models they present to students may no longer be legally viable. For example, under fair use provisions, faculty commonly incorporate images, portions of text, and chapters from collections into class materials, sometimes specifying sources—but not always. Faculty may fail to cite because they are stretching fair

use provisions, because images are (or are thought to be) in the public domain, or because they want to protect original authors, as is often the case when they distribute, as examples, work produced by students. But if faculty themselves are wrongly assuming common ownership of their teaching materials, they also are modeling the validity of such uses to students. It follows then, that when students see uncited texts as part of their course materials or when their materials are used in classes without their own permission, they find the line between fair use, ownership, educational purposes, and legal constraints very fuzzy.⁶

This was brought home recently when one of our students submitted a video project as part of an assignment to portray a grammar issue from a handbook in a way that would speak to students. This student's work would have served as an excellent example for future classes, but before asking the student for a copy, it seemed important to check with the university's legal counsel about a brief shot of a Red Bull can in one frame out of the montage of the student's own images. The university's legal opinion was that because of the shot of the can, the student's work could not be reproduced, nor could a copy of the video even be shown to the publisher of the handbook. If, however, the picture of the Red Bull can were to be removed, the instructor could then, with the student's permission, use the video as an example for subsequent classes (for educational reasons). The instructor could not, however, reproduce or post it electronically (it could be accessed for non-educational use), or even show it to the publisher of the grammar text or anyone outside of her classroom.

This and other current legal decisions regarding ownership suggest that instructors may need to reconsider the ways they use student work as examples, particularly as such work increasingly

6. In light of recent lawsuits directed at Turnitin.com, faculty's use of student texts as examples can be questioned. In *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (<http://chronicle.com/free/v48/i36/36a03701.htm>), Dan Burk, a professor at the University of Minnesota Law School notes about Turnitin that, "To run a database, you've got to make a copy, and if the student hasn't authorized that, then that's potentially an infringing copy."

includes electronic elements. But this is not necessarily how faculty *want* to work, nor does such a decision consider the means and goals of education as faculty understand it.⁷ The fact that those interviewed for this collection expressed concerns and even confusion about what it is they own as researchers and what they own or can use as instructors may be one reason faculty tend not to discuss disciplinary knowledge-building and citation practices in their classrooms. Yet after our interviews, faculty themselves agreed that “All of these [plagiarism, fair use, and copyright] are interconnected and need to be taught as situated, localized networks” (Johnson-Eilola 1998).

Our discussions with faculty brought into vivid relief that while punishment for abusing IP is stressed to students, tangible benefits for ownership within the academy are often not stressed beyond the achieving of a grade; why citation matters to faculty and to a discipline is tacitly held and, therefore, potentially invisible to students. If there seems to be no reason *for* citing what appears (to students) to be commonly held or for public use, then it also appears that no one and nothing is harmed by such an act⁸ whose tangible rewards (for students) seem only to be a grade, more time, and less work.⁹

In addition to the gap between the way IP functions generatively within a discipline and the way it is discussed (or not) within a class, we found the term “plagiarism” equally problematic, and

-
7. For a discussion of the application of “intellectual property” to faculty classroom work, see McSherry (2001).
 8. Dolin (2007) promotes finding a balance between the copyright concept that promotes “do no harm” to the author and the fact that the greater public is harmed by increased copyrighting of ideas.
 9. For a discussion of this Lockean reasoning and the inadequacies of this and other theories that underpin current legal rulings and public attitudes toward intellectual property and its use, see Fisher (2001). His discussion also demonstrates “the constitutional provision upon which the copyright and patent statutes rest indicates that the purpose of those laws is to provide incentives for creative intellectual efforts that will benefit the society at large” (8–9). The unlikely benefits of most student papers to “society at large” raise questions about how much of the assigned research might be considered exercises in copying, summary, and synthesis instead of “original”—a term perhaps misused in classrooms.

our work here has made us consider how common academic definitions of it are limiting if not hopelessly confusing or even entirely flawed. On academic Web sites, plagiarism is often defined as “the deliberate or reckless representation of another’s words, thoughts, or ideas as one’s own without attribution” (<http://www.unc.edu/depts/wcweb/handouts/plagiarism.html>). Often-used terms include “representation of another’s,” “stealing ideas” (<http://www.lib.jmu.edu/gold/documents/glossary.doc>), “appropriating ideas” (<http://LINK>”<http://www.google.com/url?sa=X&start=2&oi=define&q=http://ucblibraries.colorado.edu/about/glossary.htm&usg=AFQjCNHwRY6uyhhZtrRR7xy-DmPPRJl4EA>”ucblibraries.colorado.edu/about/glossary.htm), “using, and passing off as your own, the ideas” (<http://www.lib.monash.edu.au/vl/glossind.htm>), and “presenting . . . without proper acknowledgement” (<http://www.sunysb.edu/library/tutorial/glossary/index.html>). As in copyright law, all imply a prior ownership based on an originality claimed as one’s own; they also imply that avoiding plagiarism is easy to figure out. While this is true in the wholesale import of an entire passage, page, or written paper, something on which interviewees across the disciplines agreed, “plagiarism” becomes complicated once faculty begin to define in detail what they own and what they can “appropriate,” “transform,” and “use.”

Even Web sites that shift from warning students not to “steal” or “cheat,” to exhorting them to maintain “academic integrity,” remain stuck in generic, rule-based language. Much like handbook explanations of grammar and syntax, these generalized definitions are useful chiefly to students who already understand plagiarism as a concept rather than as a set of rules. An alternative approach, one similar to the way Martha Kolln (2007) promotes a rhetorical and contextual explanation of grammar, moves away from mechanical and general definitions of intellectual property and plagiarism, particularly definitions offered by “handbooks” (e.g., on government, academic, and legal Web sites). Our interviews with faculty have led us to believe that by probing beyond traditional rules (Don’t cheat)

in order to define concepts (What does ownership mean?), we can help students situate themselves within often unspoken but very real knowledge-driven practices. Further, we suspect that this approach will enable students to transfer strategies to new contexts as they arise rather than try to slot learned rules about citation into situations that they don't fit.¹⁰

As we interviewed scholars, it became evident that new and challenging situations already arise for students and that neither group is prepared to meet them. When describing their "ownership" of elements besides the expected academic texts, faculty complicate issues of "owning," "possessing," and "originating" as they speak of "using," "appropriating," "deriving," and "transforming" texts, objects, materials, and ideas. Added to this are concepts of mashup and Lessig's (2005) characterization of academic practices as remixing texts, all pointing to further complications to ownership claims—even the legal ones. While we leave the resolution of those legal arguments to scholars who have already begun this work,¹¹ the idea of remix nicely complicates simplistic definitions of plagiarism that attempt to divide the term into an academic right and wrong.

"Common knowledge," too, is a problematic term. Although it is often described as information that "everyone knows so it doesn't need to be cited,"¹² a careful look at the resources on

-
10. We are not claiming that rules are not useful, but we are arguing for unpacking the reasons behind rules so that they can be seen as flexible and transferable. For example, years ago, when academics began citing online sources, they found that practices had to be adjusted to fit the medium: URLs had to be provided, along with the access date; dates of origin and revision had to be considered as well as the difference between Web site authors and text authors. Our practices changed how we cited, even as citation requirements remained. Work in disciplinary genres by Theresa Lillis and the New London Group (2001) effectively address this issue of the "situatedness" of texts and could be extended to citation and ownership practices.
 11. Lessig (2004) among others, questions the assumptions behind the laws that attempt to define ownership, arguing that when remix and mashup technologies change, freedoms also change.
 12. This is so common a phrase that, though in quotes, we don't think (!) it has to be cited.

which students rely for definitions of common knowledge reveal vague, contradictory, or ambiguous information about what makes knowledge “common.” Today, for example, many writing centers have followed the Purdue University OWL’s initial definition by creating Web site sections like their “Deciding if something is ‘Common Knowledge’”:

Material is probably common knowledge if . . .

You find the same information undocumented in at least five other sources

You think it is information that your readers will already know

You think a person could easily find the information with general reference sources. (http://owl.english.purdue.edu/handouts/research/r_plagiar.html#common)¹³

One can turn to hundreds of statements on academic integrity or plagiarism on university and college Web sites around the world, on high school Web sites, on Web sites of private educational businesses, or in dictionaries and find versions of this definition. However, the versions, examples, and explanations of basic “common knowledge” offered—that is, those items that are so well known they do not need citation—often assume students don’t know anything about the subjects to begin with, and depend on students’ clear understanding of the audience to whom they are writing at any one time. Worse, though, they offer contradictory information and do little to clarify the concept for students. (See appendix B for further examples of this phenomenon.)

As students read and write their papers in libraries, residence halls, or on laptops in subways, they make judgment calls about common knowledge. They make those calls based on their own knowledge, on their assumptions about what their instructors think about that knowledge, and on their student status. This poses problems when they are told that:

13. This was originally on the Purdue Web site and so remains as a standard definition on other Web sites; however, our work here has influenced a change in how plagiarism is currently discussed at Purdue, especially since the director of the writing center there, Linda Bergmann, was instrumental in shaping of this book project.

What is considered common knowledge will vary from one field to another. Medical doctors who write research papers do not have to cite their sources for anatomical terminology or common pathological procedures, as such basic knowledge would be considered as common to any doctor reading the paper—whereas it would usually not be common knowledge for a non-doctor. (<http://www.uta.fi/FAST/PK6/REF/commknow.html>)

When, then, should biology students, senior pre-meds, or junior medical students cite, and when can they assume acceptance into the discipline and stop citing? Clearly, a line differentiates the two, but this line seems both different and clearer for faculty members than for students:

At university there are some occasions where referencing is not used but this is not considered plagiarism. For example, lecturers often do not reference the ideas that they present in lectures; some text books do not give in-text references, just a list of references at the end of chapters. (<http://www.unisanet.unisa.edu.au/learningconnection/student/learningAdvisors/plagiarism.asp>)

If students hear instructors lecturing what may not be facts, but are interpretations and opinions, which are not cited, how are they to know that stating them in their own texts requires a citation?¹⁴ If institutions have varying descriptions of common knowledge, and if those definitions further complicate notions of who is expert, in what field, on what day, and in what place, how can students begin to tease out for themselves what constitutes plagiarism in a discipline-specific course and determine who owns that upon which they wish to build?

OUR NOT-SO-COMMON FINDINGS

According to most of the faculty interviewed for this book, connecting their own beliefs about disciplinary ownership with their students' beliefs about plagiarism was an eye-opening

14. We have already explored the idea of faculty and professionals being differently entitled (Haviland and Mullin 1999).

approach. As interviewers, we found that although we had located our work in different disciplines and on different kinds of campuses, we all uncovered a similar need to open up academic discussions about intellectual property that expressly connect it to disciplinary practice and knowledge construction in classrooms. The disparity discovered among disciplinary definitions of ownership, not just within single institutions or within single disciplines within those institutions, has further educational import when faculty also consider intellectual property issues across the disciplines: faculty think differently about what is owned in their field. As a result, citation is not merely a matter of avoiding the inappropriate use of someone else's work; rather it becomes a matter of how to engage with and use someone else's work and when, as well as why, to cite it. Not only is there little linkage of these disciplinary questions to classroom practices and thus little acknowledgement of faculty's tacit expectations, we noted no recognition of how institutionalized descriptions of academic integrity and plagiarism insufficiently support disciplinary learning goals.

For example, unlike humanities faculty, who think chiefly of texts as "ownable," field workers in sociology and archaeology point to ownership of school populations, tribal cultures, or dig sites, noting that their ownership is provisional and that publication releases ownership and at the same time establishes the associated scholarly work as their own (Boland and Haviland, chapter 3). Computer scientists speak to the complexities of owning and sharing code (Lunsford et al., chapter 1). Biologists speak of owning laboratory data and patents (Stephenson and Buranen, chapter 2), although there is seldom a sole owner of data or author of text in the various fields of science. Photographers speak of owning images, and designers and architects distinguish between passing someone's work off as one's own and appropriating someone's work: the former is plagiarism, the latter consistent with a long tradition of how art emerges (Mullin, chapter 4). University administrators look at much of what they write—both what is written for them and

what they write for others—as belonging to the institution, not to themselves as individuals or as holders of a position. They do, however, often distinguish among intended audiences for distribution as something akin to “ownership” of particular documents. That is, while they “own” confidential documents, they can share those documents with selected audiences, who then also “own” the information they convey (Bergmann, chapter 5). As Bergmann points out in her chapter here, these same administrators are often enough accused of plagiarizing information, though such accusations are prevalent in all fields: artists debate rights to appropriated images (see Kellehar and Farr 2006), scientists argue over who owns research (McCook 2007), suits have been brought over archaeological sites (Wilford 1991), and historians are often enough accused of taking what is otherwise owned (Weiner 2007).

If determining what is original, owned, or acknowledged creates conflict within the professional arenas in which faculty practice their disciplines, it seems reasonable to expect that these controversies will appear in classrooms as well. It also is reasonable to expect that they should influence faculty teaching practices because knowing what is “owned” is part of the continuously evolving context of multiple voices, objects, and activities that comprise and extend any field: they are central to the sources of data, texts, visuals, and objects out of which knowledge is constructed and claims are made. They are, therefore, central to how students read, use, respond to, and cite disciplinary “texts,” and then claim ownership of their own ideas, sites, and objects.

The notion of single-authored, original work also remains an idealized norm in western authorship, and thus establishing student ownership has become an important element in grading (see Woodmansee). This fiction is maintained in some humanities fields where single-authored texts or projects are the norm; even though feedback and editorial comments from colleagues clearly affect the creation of a text, these are not always acknowledged. Yet our classroom practices and grading

systems continue to support the single-author notion, for while students might work together or consult writing center tutors, often their work is expected to be single-authored, ignoring the actual social interactions and literate practices that comprise all texts.

In areas outside the humanities, work typically is produced by teams of researcher-writers for whom collaboration is so fundamental as to be unquestioned; these faculty expect the multiple authors' contributions to differ substantially in kind or degree. However, while these same faculty members encourage collaboration in laboratory or other teams, they often require that students submit "their own" work for purposes of grading. This not only leaves students confused about how to collaborate responsibly but also leaves instructors uncertain about how to evaluate the resulting texts—individual texts that don't reflect collaboration in their areas. As Steven Youra (2008) observes, the question "Who Wrote This Text?" is difficult for scientists because their work begins with the research design and continues during experimentation, data collection, and final reporting; each of these elements involves acts of creating knowledge with words by building on others' work. While some of the scientists interviewed for chapter 2 make it a point to explain to students where their own work begins and the group's work ends and how to claim it, this is not yet a common practice in the field, and certainly not across disciplines that engage in collaboration and differently define what is owned.

These and other field-specific practices reported in these chapters point to the need for discussions of plagiarism based on disciplinary concepts of ownership and for an acknowledgment to students (and faculty) that tacit differences among areas exist. They call upon faculty to investigate and then articulate those differences and to challenge the one-size-fits-all definitions of plagiarism and their origins. Scholars such as Andrea Lunsford (1996) already have pointed out that academics' understandings of ownership grow out of patent law, which was designed to cover rights to more tangible inventions, not to

scholarly ideas or the expression of those ideas. Lethem's (2007) and Woodmansee's observations take to task the Romantic notions of authorship upon which our ideas of copyright are built (16). They promote opening up our definitions and applications of access and ownership to recognize, as suggested by the Bellagio agreement, that "systems built around the author paradigm tend to obscure or undervalue the importance of the 'public domain' the intellectual and cultural commons from which future works will be constructed" (qtd. in Dolin 2007, 70). Zemer (2007) argues further that the public needs to be recognized in all acts of creation and allowed better access and use when there is no harm involved (65).

Our work with this project suggests that if these issues are taken up within each discipline, if the controversies over ownership in which faculty are (or should be) engaged are brought into the classroom, we might find ourselves less occupied with policing student texts and materials and more involved in discussing the *processes and concepts* critical to entering disciplinary discourses. Thus, we invite readers to continue this study of plagiarism by further investigating academic definitions of intellectual property and ownership—and the resulting practices—so that colleagues working within educational systems come to actively understand, resist, perpetuate, and revise them for themselves and for those currently making decisions about what we own, should own, or borrow. We suggest including discussions of citation practices in genre studies, in activity system theory, and in the work that challenges notions of linear progressions from novice to expert writer. In light of our research and that of others in these areas, we strongly urge a reconsideration of our terminology, our generalizations, and our teaching practices, for they are and will continue to be inadequate without this kind of careful and continual reexamination.