

# Pluralizing Plagiarism

**IDENTITIES, CONTEXTS, PEDAGOGIES**

*Edited by*  
Rebecca Moore Howard  
*and*  
Amy E. Robillard

Boynton/Cook Publishers  
HEINEMANN  
Portsmouth, NH

**Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.**

361 Hanover Street  
Portsmouth, NH 03801-3912  
www.boyntoncook.com

*Offices and agents throughout the world*

© 2008 by Boynton/Cook Publishers

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage and retrieval systems, without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer, who may quote brief passages in a review.

The editors and publisher wish to thank those who have generously given permission to reprint borrowed material:

Portions of Chapter 9, "We Never Wanted to Be Cops," by Chris Anson originally appeared as "Student Plagiarism: Are Teachers Part of the Problem or Part of the Solution?" by Chris Anson. From *Essays on Teaching Excellence* (2003-2004). Reprinted with permission of The Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education.

For our friend Candace Spigelman,  
whose work in authorship and  
whose belief in students and teaching  
will continue to inspire us.

Cataloging-in-Publication data is on file at the Library of Congress.

ISBN-13: 978-0-86709-595-1

ISBN-10: 0-86709-595-4

Editor: Charles I. Schuster

Production management: Karina Felizardo, SPi

Production coordinator: Vicki Kasabian

Cover design: Night and Day Design

Typesetter: SPi

Manufacturing: Louise Richardson

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper

12 11 10 09 08 VP 1 2 3 4 5

# Contents

## Introduction: Plagiarisms

*Amy E. Robillard, Illinois State University*

*Rebecca Moore Howard, Syracuse University 1*

- 1 Man Bites Dog: The Public, the Press, and Plagiarism  
*Michele Eodice, University of Oklahoma 8*

- 2 Situating Plagiarism as a Form of Authorship: The Politics  
of Writing in a First-Year Writing Course  
*Amy E. Robillard, Illinois State University 27*

- 3 Time Is Not on Our Side: Plagiarism and Workload in the  
Community College  
*Kami Day, Johnson County Community College 43*

- 4 Where There's Smoke, Is There Fire? Understanding  
Coauthorship in the Writing Center  
*Tracy Hamler Carrick, Colby College 62*

- 5 One Size Does Not Fit All: Plagiarism Across the Curriculum  
*Sandra Jamieson, Drew University 77*

- 6 Plagiarizing (from) Graduate Students  
*Rebecca Moore Howard, Syracuse University 92*

- 7 "Thou Shalt Not Plagiarize"? Appeals to Textual Authority and  
Community at Religiously Affiliated and Secular Colleges  
*T. Kenny Fountain, University of Minnesota*  
*Lauren Fitzgerald, Yeshiva University 101*

- 8 Intertextuality in the Transcultural Contact Zone  
*Celia Thompson, University of Melbourne*  
*Alastair Pennycook, University of Technology, Sydney 124*

- 9 We Never Wanted to Be Cops: Plagiarism, Institutional  
Paranoia, and Shared Responsibility  
*Chris M. Anson, North Carolina State University 140*

**10 Beyond Plagiarism**

*Kathleen Blake Yancey, Florida State University 158*

Afterword: Plagiarism, Difference, and Power

*Bruce Horner, University of Louisville 171*

Contributors 179

# Pluralizing Plagiarism

**One Size Does Not Fit All***Plagiarism Across the Curriculum*

Sandra Jamieson

*Drew University*

I first heard it when we revised our academic integrity policy a few years after I started teaching at my small liberal arts college, but I didn't comprehend its significance. I heard it again later in response to various cases brought to the Academic Integrity Committee by colleagues across the disciplines. What is interesting to me is that none of my colleagues said it directly until I sat down to talk one-on-one with them. When I did that, this is what they said: *Most of these rules about how to use and cite sources don't actually apply in my discipline.* My colleagues had worked with me through long faculty meetings in which we discussed and group-edited the new academic integrity policy, and they had brought cases of plagiarism and misuse of sources to the committee for hearing and sanction; but they did not follow those guidelines themselves, did not have any personal sense of ownership of them beyond general education, and could not afford to teach them to students who wanted to pursue graduate studies in their field. They could teach the principle that significant sources must be acknowledged, but they could not require that students in their disciplines remain within the rules of our policy in upper-level discipline-specific courses. We all agreed about paper mills and cheat sites, of course; about the paper, report, computer code, or work of art not authored by the student who submits it for a grade; and about cheating on tests. But it was impossible to generalize or universalize pretty much anything else—from what to cite to how one should indicate the work of others or even why one cites at all.

Interestingly, when I expressed my concern and desire to develop a new policy incorporating discipline-specific guidelines and conventions, to a person they defended the existing policy, arguing that in a liberal arts college we should have some universal standards and that it made sense for the English

department to set them. They added that the rules were fine for first-year seminars and introductory and general education courses and that the existence of common rules taught in first-year composition meant that they did not have to try to teach the rules in introductory classes and that nonmajors did not have to learn the rules of each discipline as they fulfilled general education breadth requirements.

I remained mystified about this response until the publication of Chris Thaiss and Terry Myers Zawacki's fascinating study in *Engaged Writers and Dynamic Disciplines* (2006). Thaiss and Zawacki interviewed faculty and students about the kinds of writing assigned and its adherence to convention. In contrast to faculty in other studies (most notably Walvoord and McCarthy 1990), the faculty they interviewed did not believe the purpose of undergraduate education is to "train little psychologists, mathematicians, [or] biologists" (117) and argued instead that "good writing is good writing and hence good thinking, no matter what the discipline" (58). Yet Thaiss and Zawacki report that their responses to questions and their description of practice revealed significant differences in the way "common" terms they named as being at the heart of "good writing" (such as evidence, purpose, style, audience, and organization) are articulated in each discipline and explained to students. Even as the faculty claimed they were simply teaching "good writing" (89), all were found to assign and expect writing that matched the way they write (88), without noting the disciplinary embeddedness of their own writing. This matches what Lee Ann Carroll learned from the students in her study—namely what she calls the "gap between faculty fantasies about writing" and the struggles of their students (8). It also matches her major finding that faculty are not likely to understand the extent to which writing differs from discipline to discipline and, at times, class to class and professor to professor. Walvoord and McCarthy (1990) also discuss a mismatch between student and teacher expectations.

David Russell (1997) explains this gap or mismatch as the inevitable result of disciplinary apprenticeship through which fledgling members of a discipline "very gradually learn its written conventions as an active and integral part of their socialization in a community" (16), which makes learning to write in that discipline seem a "transparent" process. Hare and Fitzsimmons (1991) also observe that "literacy norms within most fields . . . remain . . . invisible" (144). According to Russell, this is because "the community's genres and conventions appear to be unproblematic renderings of the fruits of research" (17) rather than determining that research or interpellating its members into discipline-specific ideologies.

Aside from the intellectual implications of this lack of self-reflexivity, such as simplistic calls to break down the walls between disciplines, Russell's analysis has some serious pedagogical repercussions. If, as Thaiss and Zawacki (2006) put it, the faculty they interviewed "see academic writing as generic rather than discipline-specific" (123), they will pass that belief to students who then assume that what they learn in one class—including source-use rules—

applies to all classes. This also will lead students to perceive variation from that assumed norm as "differences in teachers' personalities rather than . . . nuanced articulations of the discipline" (132). Such a mystification of the fundamental differences between academic discourse communities can only lead to problems for students who try to write for us.

Thaiss and Zawacki's (2006) findings and Russell's (1997) analysis all seem to explain exactly what I saw on my campus and perhaps also the "cluelessness" that Gerald Graff (2003) describes. If faculty are not intending to invite undergraduates into disciplinary discourse, but undergraduates are being interpellated by the values of that discourse and feeling the need to speak its language anyway, there is clearly "cluelessness" on both sides. As faculty, we think we are teaching general skills—hence our enthusiasm for one-size-fits-all policies and plagiarism checking programs. Yet students do feel the need, and desire, to "speak our language," understanding better than us that our passion for what we do and the answers our disciplines seek to uncover are to be found in the way we speak about our research. While Thaiss and Zawacki's focus group informants revealed that "more experienced writers understand that knowing a discipline occurs gradually and involves much more than imitation of forms, templates, and styles" (129), most of the students in their study expressed the kind of anxiety and frustration that, according to the Council of Writing Program Administrators (2003), can lead to overdependence on source material in the first place. (The first thing listed under the heading "What Are the Causes of Plagiarism and the Failure to Use and Document Sources Appropriately?" is "Students may fear failure or fear taking risks in their own work.") Alienation leads to being risk averse, which in turn, ironically, leads to misuse of sources.

All of this explains why my colleagues rejected my suggestion that we develop a source-use policy reflecting disciplinary difference, arguing instead that we should spend more time teaching the ethical component of source use in the first year to reduce the incidence of plagiarism in upper-level classes. Persuaded by their emphasis on ethics, my dean drafted a "contract" that each student signs stating that they have received a copy of the academic integrity booklet and that their first-year seminar instructor has explained it to them. While we have an "administrative resolution" process for first- and second-year students who "unintentionally misuse sources," misuse at the upper level is considered a violation of academic integrity. It is true that the penalty may be mild for such "violations" when the student appears to have acted in ignorance, but charges are still required by our faculty regulations when misuse of any kind is found. Where the *WPA Statement* (Council of Writing Program Administrators 2003) uses the terms *deliberate* to indicate plagiarism and *good faith* to indicate accidental misuse of sources, Drew University (2001) uses *intentional* and *unintentional*. In each case, it is *intent* that is at the heart of this matter. And I think the issue of how and when we use source material in academic writing is a matter that should be discussed in terms of intent;

however, not in the current sense of intent to steal, defraud, mislead, or any other ethical or capitalist terms one might insert. Rather, we need to focus on what the author is intending to do by referencing sources and what established members of the discipline intend in the same situation, even if not all of them can articulate it as Thaiss and Zawacki (2006) imply. In other words, we need to focus on *use* of sources rather than *misuse* of sources. It is my contention that as long as our pedagogy, policies, textbooks, software programs, and scholarship continue to focus on the misuse of sources and ignore the larger *intention* of source use itself, we will continue to fail to address the problem of plagiarism in any discipline. Indeed, without consideration of intent, we will also continue to operate with inaccurate definitions of “correct” source use and continue to mystify the real work of the disciplines.

Discipline-specific conventions and in particular source use are the markers of membership in academic disciplines. One must learn them to be a member of a discipline, and in turn they interpellate new members into the values and expectations of that discipline through their very invisibility as ideology and classification as simply “good writing.” It is the way we use the words and ideas of others that determines our relationship to them, to their ideas, and to the generation of knowledge. As is evidenced with the case of the passive voice, the speaker plays a different role in each discipline, and the discourse community signals its relationship to that speaker through the way it does or does not invoke his or her name. In some disciplines, especially the sciences, general information matters, and it is much less important to know who discovered it; in others, especially the social sciences, data matter, and the gatherer is identified to allow readers to evaluate the validity of that data (note, though, that the use of initials only in APA prevents us from knowing the gender of those cited); in still others, and especially the humanities, words and creative product are the object of study, and so it matters very much that the creator be named and given appropriate credit. These different relationships have a profound impact on both our work in a specific discipline and our relationship to that work and its dissemination.

The speakers of a discipline are, of course, its actors. They are us if we are already members of the community, and they are who we want to be if we are in the process of joining. As we master the discourse conventions of a discipline, then, we also learn how to take our place in it: how to act appropriately and how to refer to other members. We learn what is valued, and that shapes the way we do research. But we don’t learn it from a book or from lectures, and the slow apprenticeship that Russell (1997) describes occurs on multiple levels. We are, in Althusser’s (1971) sense of the word, interpellated into the subject-positions necessary to participate in a discipline-specific discourse community through its language and way of speaking itself. The publications of a discipline call readers into specific relationship with texts and each other; they create a community in what might be the most effective ideological apparatus imaginable. We recognize ourselves as members when we can talk the

talk in the expected manner without thinking about it; when the language and our ability to communicate in it seem transparent. Indeed, the work is so successful that we are not even aware it is happening—a process that Althusser (1971, 182) describes as ideology working “all by itself.” My colleagues were happy to have a general source-use policy even though it contradicted their own practices because they had not been asked to articulate the constructive force of source-use conventions, and I was able to go along with that because I had not done so either. Clearly, as Shirley Rose (1996, 34) has said, a rhetoric of citation practices is very long overdue.

Almost two decades before Rose’s call for such a rhetoric, Charles Bazerman (1980, 661) observed that “if students are not taught the skills of creating new statements through evaluating, assimilating, and responding to the prior statements of the written conversation, we offer them the meager choice of being parrots of authority or raconteurs stocked with anecdotes for every occasion,” and I would add, “misusers of source material.” He ends that statement with “Only a fortunate few will learn to enter the community of the literate on their own.” It is, of course, this sentiment that led my colleagues to urge that first-year composition continue to teach the research process, research writing, and generic source use without realizing that it also speaks to discipline-specific conversations. But if we extend Bazerman’s point, and Gerald Graff’s (2003, 3) arguably similar call that we save students from “cluelessness” by teaching them that “summarizing and making arguments is the name of the game in academia,” we see that by focusing on finding and penalizing those who are unable to enter general or discipline-specific discourse communities we continue to fail to create opportunity for more than “a fortunate few” to really enter disciplinary conversation and make meaning within it.

I believe that the use of universal source-use policies and generic instruction in first-year composition or the equivalent actually reduces the ability of students to join the discourse communities of the disciplines and undermines the very goals of composition (to increase communication and help students invent the university). The fact is that academic integrity policies and source-use pedagogies that originate in English departments all too often “present scholarly citation in terms limited to a view of ideas as intellectual property and of scholarly productivity as a factor in a capitalistic economy,” as Shirley Rose (1996, 35) so eloquently puts it. She shows how textbooks reinforce that capitalist model of source use with their language of “ownership,” “borrowing,” “debt,” and “intellectual property.” They also reinforce an emphasis on form rather than the discursive practices inherent in and inscribed by that form. Source-use instruction has become rote learning of formulae and rules (of thumb and of law). Textbooks and handbooks reproduce lists of rules for every kind of source imaginable in MLA or Chicago style. Some also include APA, CBE, and other style sheets as if one needs only to adjust the format as one moves among disciplines. Many include discussion of how to evaluate sources and determine “appropriate” from “inappropriate” material, but that

rarely goes beyond how to evaluate Websites and differentiate online publications from print publications that are available online. The emphasis is on “how to” in specific cases rather than the more difficult know-how of broad interaction with sources. To be fair, of course, textbooks cannot teach students how to act within discourse communities any more than foreign language texts can teach the exact angle to bow, the exact pressure to shake hands (which varies by community anyway), or the manner one greets with kisses. The problem is that unlike language guides and textbooks, writing textbooks suggest that the language of academic discourse does not need to be learned from within a specific context and that cultural practice does not go beyond lists and rules. Instead we penalize for misplaced commas and absent introductory phrases as if that is what counts and there is nothing more to learn.

So we say we are teaching students how to be flexible communicators, but in fact we have set up a disciplinary structure of the other kind in which students are hyperconscious of the rules and thereby less likely to be able to participate in specific discourse communities. They enter the disciplines like tourists clutching their dictionaries and phrase books, and a compulsive fear of “getting it wrong” makes them miss the whole point of “it.” This is the very opposite of the goals of the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) movement with its emphasis on writing to learn and the discursive freedom that invites students to use writing as a way of making meaning. A major point of WAC was to create ways for students to escape the paralysis brought on by right/wrong binaries and fear of error. Freed from obsessive focus on his or her own correctness, a student can actually listen to others and speak back to them. The parallel with foreign languages may seem a stretch here, but I am going to stick with it because it helps to make apparent what the simplification of our understanding of source-use obscures. I think it is harder to enter the discourse community of an unfamiliar academic discipline than to enter that of an unfamiliar nation for precisely this reason. Those readers who are the product of Anglo-American foreign language education will recognize the fear of mispronunciation and punishment. While today the drudgery of drills has largely been replaced by a language immersion approach, the grades are still based on correct pronunciation, spelling, and grammar. And too many students are left functionally monolingual, focusing on form rather than communication and pronunciation rather than engagement.

In 2000 I was in South Africa visiting schools and learning about the Government of National Unity’s Curriculum 2005, the ambitious education policy “based on the principles of co-operation, critical thinking and social responsibility . . . [to] empower individuals to participate in all aspects of society” (Manganyi 1997). Part of the curriculum focuses on language, including multilingualism and knowledge of and respect for “cultural and language traditions” to “promote the development of a national identity” by promoting multilingualism to enable “learners to develop and value . . . other languages and cultures in our multi-cultural country and in international contexts”

(Curriculum 1997). Where possible, students were to study in their “home language” (one of the eleven official languages, which could include English and Afrikaans) or South African Sign Language and learn a “first additional language” and ideally a “second additional language.” In the small, very rundown Thaba Jabula Secondary School in Soweto, I visited a ninth-grade classroom where the students were learning Afrikaans, their “second official language” after English, which they spoke fluently. I listened, impressed, and at the break I asked a student how hard it was to learn this language that she told me was actually her fourth language. I admitted that I was finding it impossible to say the name of our Afrikaaner bus driver or, indeed, Gauteng Province where we were. The German version of that *G* sound had eluded me in my middle-school German classes, and this version did so too. She looked at me with concern. “No,” she said, “you’re worrying about the wrong thing. You don’t have to pretend to be Afrikaans. You just have to be able to communicate with them. It doesn’t matter how the words sound. If we understand each other, we can work together.” Her teacher confirmed this for me. “Yes, perhaps, one day we will all speak each other’s languages with each other’s accents, but our goal is not to make everyone the same. Each person remains who he is with his own language and accent, but everyone else also understands that language so we can communicate, and then we can also learn about each other.”

This is a powerful model as we think about source use and WAC. If disciplinary conventions, including source use, are the languages of each discipline, when source-use instruction focuses on correct pronunciation (avoiding the ill-placed comma, knowing when to italicize a journal title, when to place it in quotation marks, and when to do nothing to it), it leaves us missing the point. Whether instruction is designed to create the opportunity for multilingualism and thereby “invitation into the mental positions of those who think differently from us,” as Graff (2003, 13) put it, or whether it is simply advanced conversation within a discipline, if my fear of failure leads me to depend on a phrase book for my Afrikaans sentences or not speak for fear of mangling the *G*, I may never even communicate at all. I will certainly be too busy to meet the glance of my interlocutor, let alone make conversation. The student who depends too heavily on sources for phrases and sentences suffers the same inability.

Reliance on one general English department-generated policy is clearly limiting, yet it is not practical—or desirable—for all students to have to “pretend to be” members of an academic discipline to write college-level papers. A middle ground seems to be to create a sufficient awareness of basic differences and vocabulary for students to be able to communicate in the various “languages” of the disciplines and so have access to the culture and knowledge embedded within them. This, of course, also requires that, as faculty, we give up the notion that there is such a thing as generally agreed-upon “good writing” across the curriculum—give up English department prose as the colonial language—and explore ways to make the languages of our disciplines apparent to us and then to our students without expecting technical perfection or reducing

difference to the generic. And this is where WAC can take on a new and more intellectually challenging role in which writing-to-learn ceases to be a general principle that does not necessarily improve writing or thinking (Russell 2001, 259) and becomes a space for demystifying context-specific writing. Russell's reviews suggest that methods for such a pedagogy would include direct instruction in the components of discourse-specific writing, thinking, and source use along with models, guidelines, "classroom talk," and a focus on discipline-specific writing processes (283–91). Our new goal, Russell concludes, should be to move beyond what we want students to *know* in any given discipline to what we want them to "*do* with the material of the course" (290) and how we want them to do that; or, as Graff (2003) might put it, to give all students the "ability to join an intellectual community that makes sense to them" (274).

If the goal of WAC that we increase communication across the curriculum (also known as CAC) and writing to learn within all parts of it is to be fully realized, we need to retrace and reconsider our history to see how what we focus on now came to dominate, and to listen to the voices that have been ignored and learn from them. Our task in this history is to understand how one discipline—English—came to have an exclusive hold over the notion of "good writing" in all other disciplines. It was WAC that led to the inaccurate definitions and generic institutional plagiarism and source-use policies discussed so far, but it is also within WAC scholarship that we can find more useful ways to think about source use across the disciplines. By retracing our steps, so to speak, we can understand where we lost our way in the shift from writing across the curriculum (WAC) to Writing in the Disciplines (WID) and also refocus our attention on plagiarism across the curriculum in new and productive ways.

The fact that WAC has survived for the last thirty years in still recognizable form is testament to what it has to offer and what it has already delivered. The goal of helping students write to learn and the related goal of reforming pedagogy to include process as well as product have largely succeeded. Writing assignments are sequenced, and students are assigned journals, freewriting, drafts, and revisions across the curriculum. Thanks to WAC, students develop general writing skills that they use to help them articulate what they learn and that, in theory, help them enter different discourse communities. But these skills and strategies were an ideological Trojan horse carrying embedded within them a set of practices that conflict with the disciplinary communities into which they were delivered, the most important being the relationship to sources and the MLA citation method that underpins universal source-use policies and plagiarism detection software.

As we became more immersed in WAC, we began to understand discipline specificity and have often been humbled by the sheer audacity of our project. Susan McLeod (2000) observes:

when I began my first faculty seminar, I really had no appreciation of the complexity of disciplinary discourse—I assumed that as an English teacher,

I knew what good writing was and simply needed to enlighten my colleagues across the disciplines. . . . A passionate, hour-long discussion of the use of the passive voice was one of the most memorable sessions in my own understanding of the social sciences.

I had a similar experience with a laboratory report I tried to write as I collaborated with a colleague in the chemistry department. My colleague could not understand why I was unable to produce the kind of prose she expected of first-year students and I could not believe how difficult it was to write in passive voice that did not sound ugly and disjointed. I learned that there is a world of difference between the passive voice we decry in first-year writing courses and the elegant and informative prose of the hard sciences, but my colleague had to literally rewrite my report before I could get it. For many of us, these experiences led to the move to writing in the disciplines. The question this brief history seeks to understand is why this move did not lead to a rethinking of source use.

Everything we thought we understood about our colleagues turned out to be opaque, and the most opaque of all was source use. I could ask my colleagues what role writing served in their discipline and how it helped to create and disseminate meaning. I could learn that, for some of my colleagues, writing essentially told a story about data (economics) or observation (anthropology), while for others it challenged assumptions (chemistry) or interpretations (history), and for still others it offered interpretation (art history) or connected ideas (sociology). I could also learn that not everyone in those disciplines articulated the role of writing in the same manner, just as my colleagues in English disagree about the role (and importance of) literary analysis. The disciplines in parentheses above could be mixed and matched depending on one's subfield, theoretical or methodological framework, or specific research. At times there seemed to be greater similarity among disciplines than within them. But I never thought to ask about citations and their relationship to source material and the ideas of others. And no one thought to tell me.

While those of us involved in WAC programs (Thaiss and Zawacki's 2006 findings notwithstanding) can talk at great length about the content and purpose of writing, the routine conventions of source use and citation seem like an afterthought. They are often taught at the editing stage of the writing process, and several software programs will even change papers from one format to another as if the issue were really just where to put the punctuation as composition handbooks and software suggest. This afterthought model leads faculty across the country to support a source-use policy that is applicable only to literary studies, because it further obscures the overall discipline-specific differences. Perhaps this model also explains the fact that while there are a few excellent articles on the subject, a very small proportion of the thousands of articles and studies on WAC, WID, CAC, and all their derivatives focus on source use or the discursive nature of research writing within the disciplines.

As with the passive voice, perhaps, we think we know what we will find. Or perhaps we do not know how to ask the question and/or our colleagues don't know how to answer it.

Anne Herrington (2000) reminds us that for many, a mission of WAC was "aiming to foster the success of all students, particularly those who for reasons of class, race, or other factors are less likely to succeed." Although we may indeed have largely forgotten this mission, as she suggests, it is never more urgent than in source use where one-size-fits-all policies exclude and discipline some, while somehow permitting others with more advanced and flexible writing skills (what Thaiss and Zawacki call third-stage writers) to enter the discourse of specific disciplines. With the increasing dependence on electronic plagiarism detection, sustained research on source-use practices is long overdue. When we focus not on *how* sources are cited within specific disciplinary discourse communities but on *why* they are cited, we will be in a better position to develop policies and pedagogies that invite students into the discourse of the disciplines rather than disciplining those who do not make it.

Interestingly, if we go back to Bazerman's (1980) article on the relationship between reading and writing, we see the beginning of a thread that could have led to very different source-use policies, and this is where the historical exploration is so important. After summarizing the work of James Britton and his coauthors (1975) in *The Development of Writing Abilities (11–18)* and his comment "source-book material may be used in various ways involving different levels of activity by the writer," Bazerman (1980, 657) observes those "various ways" and "different levels of activity" can be understood as part of an "on-going, written conversation." The fact that he takes great pains to acknowledge the differences between spoken and written conversation indicates what a novel idea this was a quarter of a century ago. By 1996 Shirley Rose could describe the same thing as a "courtship ritual" with no need of justification, but before we move to the recent past we need to really engage with this idea of conversation as Bazerman (1980) approached it. He observes that "conversation requires absorption of what prior speakers have said, consideration of how earlier comments relate to the responder's thoughts, and a response framed to the situation and the reader's purposes" (657). By that definition, my invocation of Russell (1997, 2001), Thaiss and Zawacki (2006), Graff (2003), McLeod (2000), Britton (1975), Bazerman 1980, and Rose (1996) seems to clearly mark this article as a conversation, and we are so used to this idea that it seems somewhat banal even to make the observation.

What makes the observation important is what marks this as a conversation *in the discipline of composition*. That discipline-specific context is marked by much more than my absorbing, considering, and responding to the sources listed above; it is revealed in the way I introduce and cite those sources and the way you will find them presented in the references list (along with the fact that in an early draft of this chapter I called it a "works cited list"). The fact that I wrote this essay using MLA and was then asked to "translate" it to Chicago

for this volume also indicates something about the discipline of composition—our emergent but still partial identity *as* a discipline separate from English. But the fact that I assume my readers will understand the irony of this request indicates the same "insider knowledge" as I reveal in my assumption that readers will know what WAC, CAC, WID, and WPA stand for. Bazerman 1980 alerted us to this distinction back in 1980 when he wrote:

The model of conversation even transforms the technical skills of reference and citation. The variety of uses to be made of quotation, the options for referring to others' ideas and information (e.g., quotation, paraphrase, summary, name only), and the techniques of introducing and discussing source materials are the tools which allow the accurate but pointed connection of one's argument to earlier statements. The mechanics of documentation, more than being an exercise in intellectual etiquette, become the means of indicating the full range of comments to which the new essay is responding. (661)

Although still steeped in the language of afterthought ("*technical* skills of reference and citation" and "*mechanics* of documentation"), Bazerman 1980 was clearly challenging us to look more deeply. Had we done so, our conception of Writing in the Disciplines would have been much more tightly focused on the specific relationship to source material in each discourse community, and our understanding of unintentional plagiarism would be focused on source use rather than *mis*-use.

We had another chance to pick up this thread a decade ago when Shirley Rose (1996) drew on another work of Bazerman (1988) to lead into a Burkean analysis of the conversation within discipline-specific source-use decisions as courtship ritual. She places her analysis in the context of Bazerman's work, observing that Bazerman's "exploration of writers' motives is necessarily limited" and asserting that "a complete rhetoric of citations must be able to address writer's motives and purposes, for these cannot be taken for granted without risk of reducing them to simplistic terms" (38). Through the Burkean lens, Rose sees scholarly citation as "a microcosm of the academic discipline understood as both scene and outcome or cooperative action, the act of citing—collaboration between the author and other authors and between author and reader—serves as a representative anecdote of all written discourse as collaboration" (40). Further, "the scholarly writer's rhetoric builds her identification with both her readers and the other writers she cites in her text as she negotiates for a place in a relatively small and well-defined community" (41).

I'd like to engage in a little analysis of the structure of the last few paragraphs of this paper to help us think more about disciplinary difference. I have quoted heavily from two articles that I consider very significant to this conversation about the history of plagiarism across the curriculum. I have done so with the purpose of demonstrating their relationship and setting a ground for further analysis. If I were to run these paragraphs through some magical software program that would track the percentage of original prose

contained therein I'd be done for. I have broken the oft-repeated general rule of thumb that quotation does not make up more than 10 percent of a written paper (at least for the last few paragraphs). And in not citing examples of sources who "oft repeat" advice, I have broken a rule of citation often invoked in composition classes at least. To my credit, I have block-indented a quotation that is over four lines, and I have indicated a source quoted by another source, introduced "borrowed" material so no one is in any doubt as to who is "speaking" at any given time, and not ended a paragraph with a quotation. However, if these paragraphs were part of a psychology paper I would still have breached etiquette because according to APA I should not have quoted at all. I should have summarized or paraphrased. I should also not have included first names, which might focus attention on gender and the impact of the person observing rather than on the observations themselves. For some teachers of mathematics I did not need to cite any sources; I could have simply summarized the general history of the discipline and moved on to my point (ideally several pages ago). But for *this* conversation in *this* discipline I feel that I need to quote for exactly the reasons Rose (1996) argues we use sources at all.

First, she says, we include familiar "words, ideas, and conclusions" of others to remind our readers of our shared knowledge. To quote early WAC scholars is both to give them what my students call "their props" and in so doing, also, to show that I know who is who in the field—or not. Readers who are inclined to respect those "founders" will be more likely to pay attention to my point and to think that I have done my homework. If I did it right, my readers will identify with me and feel that *we* are having a conversation that is important. Indeed, by explaining this I am simply reminding you of what you already know. But I am also, as Rose (1996) further points out, providing you with "a narrative of the process by which [I] arrived at [the] ideas" I discuss in this article. If I am successful, the rhetorical move is as follows: "this is what we already have believed, this is how I propose to challenge or further develop our belief, and you, dear reader, will believe this new way too" (Rose 1996, 41). On the other hand, the fact that I have failed to cite many other scholars in the history of the field could lead some to dismiss me as an upstart rather than a member of the discipline; a follower of footnotes, or what Bazerman (1981) calls "a parrot of authority" (661) rather than a member of this scholarly community to which I presume to speak. "Thus," as Rose puts it, "the citation choices meant to foster identification have the potential for creating division" (41) or outright rejection. If I had cited many sources, you might have assumed I did not know enough to make wise decisions about whom *not* to cite. Conversely, you might have assumed that I am widely read in the field. If I were to cite a source with which you are unfamiliar, Rose's Burkean analysis suggests that I offer you a gift: You can strengthen your relationship to the discourse community and "achieve closer identification with the author" by locating and reading that work (41).

Now let us turn our attention back from one discourse community (ours) to the world of our students. If they include only recent sources, as Rose (1996) observes, we may find them refreshingly up-to-date or depressingly unprepared for the purpose because of their unfamiliarity with historical context. And vice versa. If a student were to explain that Charles Bazerman has written many important books and articles in the field of composition or that David Russell writes about WAC, we would know that she has just learned that fact and does not understand the field sufficiently to know that it is discipline-specific common knowledge. And so on. These rules do not easily lend themselves to handbooks or handouts. They are learned by interacting with a discourse community; by reading as Bazerman (1980) observes and Thaiss and Zawacki (2006) emphasize, but also by trial and error and the comments of others on our work—whether they are the teacher-to-student comments valued by the students in Thaiss and Zawacki's study and in so many others, or the editorial comments and feedback from our colleagues that makes all writing, indeed, a collaboration. Russell's (2001) detailed analysis of naturalistic studies in WAC/WID highlights what many other surveys have reported and what Thaiss and Zawacki found in their study of students; however, those same studies do not all present faculty attitudes to student disciplinary membership in the same way (Russell 2001, 259–98), and this is what indicates that we need more study, especially with regard to the role of source material.

Rose (1996) observes that all too often the sources used by "inexperienced academic writers," and I would add more pressingly novices of a disciplinary discourse, are not "integrated into their texts" to the degree that the students are not integrated into the academic community (43). They may use too many quotations, not enough, or not the right ones; but they also may not introduce those quotations, indicate where paraphrases begin, or provide full citations. They may assume that what they know is common knowledge, or they may assume that what they just learned is not common knowledge. As I did earlier, they may adopt informal prose or inaccurate terminology. But there is a distinction to be made in this list. All mark the writer as an outsider, but only some will result in charges of misuse of sources.

We can focus as much as we like on ethics. Asserting as the WPA statement does that "Ethical writers make every effort to acknowledge sources fully and appropriately in accordance with the contexts and genres of their writing" (Council of Writing Program Administrators 2003), even if we do not classify those who fail as "unethical." To reduce discipline-specific or generic source-use conventions to good and evil, ethical and immoral, is to miss an important pedagogical moment, as many have observed before me. I believe that what we must do instead is remember that South African student learning Afrikaans, and early WAC calls for us to develop strategies to make disciplinary discourse apparent and the connection between discourse conventions and content clear. And then we need to teach those languages. Students may learn general "good writing" in the safe(r) official home language of first-year

composition or other first-year and introductory courses, even the first two stages of the research paper as described by Brian Sutton (1997) ("generalized academic writing concerned with stating claims, offering evidence, respecting others' opinions, and learning how to write with authority"[48]); Graff's (2003) summary and argument; and Bazerman's (1981) evaluating, assimilating, and responding to prior arguments. In contrast, in majors, minors, and specializations they must also learn a "first additional language" and a "second additional language" sufficiently that they can enter the culture and knowledge base of a discipline rather than simply learning its facts and remaining "clueless" about the larger issues, concerns, or motives of members of those disciplines. In other words, they need to be taught to really write-to-learn and communicate across the curriculum and in the disciplines. While we should not stop teaching "good writing," we must determine exactly what that is and how a useful form of it may be taught in first-year writing and WAC classes. But those courses must also begin the process of explaining how and why writing is context specific and the importance of understanding any culture or discipline through its language. It is not the accent that matters, what matters is that we are able to communicate sufficiently for us to learn about ideas. We need to teach students to use sources in dialogue rather than to fear the penalty of misuse in isolation.

### References

- Althusser, Louis. 1971. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes Towards an Investigation)." In *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Trans. Ben Brewster. New York: Monthly Review.
- Bazerman, Charles. 1980. "A Relationship Between Reading and Writing: The Conversation Model." *College English* 41 (6): 656-61.
- Bazerman, Charles. 1988. *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Britton, James N., et al. 1975. *The Development of Writing Abilities, 11-18*. London: Macmillan.
- Carroll, Lee Ann. 2003. *Rehearsing New Roles: How College Students Develop as Writers*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Council of Writing Program Administrators. 2003. "Defining and Avoiding Plagiarism: WPA Statement on Best Policies." <http://wpacouncil.org/node/9>.
- Curriculum 2005: Lifelong Learning for the 21st Century. A User's Guide*. 1997. [www.polity.org.za/html/govdocs/misc/curr2005.html#foreward](http://www.polity.org.za/html/govdocs/misc/curr2005.html#foreward).
- Drew University. 2001. "College of Liberal Arts Standards of Academic Integrity." [www.depts.drew.edu/composition/Academic\\_Honesty.htm](http://www.depts.drew.edu/composition/Academic_Honesty.htm).
- Graff, Gerald. 2003. *Clueless in Academe: How Schooling Obscures the Life of the Mind*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hare, Victoria Chou, and Denise A. Fitzsimmons. 1991. "The Influence of Interpretive Communities on the Use of Content and Procedural Knowledge." *Written Communication* 8 (3): 348-78.
- Herrington, Anne. 2000. "Principles That Should Guide WAC/CAC Program Development in the Coming Decade." *Academic Writing: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Communication Across the Curriculum*. [http://wac.colostate.edu/aw/forums/winter2000/index\\_expand.htm](http://wac.colostate.edu/aw/forums/winter2000/index_expand.htm).
- Manganyi, Chabani. 1997. Foreward. *Curriculum 2005: Lifelong Learning for the 21st Century. A User's Guide*. [www.polity.org.za/html/govdocs/misc/curr2005.html#foreward](http://www.polity.org.za/html/govdocs/misc/curr2005.html#foreward).
- McLeod, Susan. 2000. "Principles That Should Guide WAC/CAC Program Development in the Coming Decade." *Academic Writing: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Communication Across the Curriculum*. [http://wac.colostate.edu/aw/forums/winter2000/index\\_expand.htm](http://wac.colostate.edu/aw/forums/winter2000/index_expand.htm).
- Rose, Shirley K. 1996. "What's Love Got to Do With It? Scholarly Citation Practices as Courtship Ritual." *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines* 1 (3): 34-48.
- Russell, David. 1997. "Rethinking Genre in School and Society: An Activity Theory Analysis." *Written Communication* 14 (4): 504-54.
- Russell, David. 2001. "Where Do Naturalistic Studies of WAC/WID Point?" In *WAC for the New Millennium: Strategies for Continuing Writing-Across-the-Curriculum*, edited by Susan H. McLeod, Eric Miraglia, Margot Soven, and Christopher Thais. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 259-98.
- Sutton, Brian. 1997. "Writing in the Disciplines, First-Year Composition, and the Research Paper." *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines* 2 (1): 46-57.
- Thaiss, Chris, and Terry Myers Zawacki. 2006. *Engaged Writers and Dynamic Disciplines: Research on the Academic Writing Life*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann/Boynton Cook.
- Walvoord, Barbara E., and Lucille P. McCarthy. 1990. *Thinking and Writing in College: A Naturalistic Study of Students in Four Disciplines*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.