Dissertations

Graduate College

6-2013

Teaching Students About Plagiarism: What it Looks Like and How It Is Measured

Diana Stout
Western Michigan University, drdianastout@gmail.com

Recommended Citation

TEACHING STUDENTS ABOUT PLAGIARISM:
WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE AND HOW
IT IS MEASURED

by

Diana Stout

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
English
Western Michigan University
June 2013

Doctoral Committee:

Jonathan Bush, Ph.D., Chair
Ellen Brinkley, Ph.D.
Karen Vocke, Ph.D.
Cheryl Almeda, Ph.D

TEACHING STUDENTS ABOUT PLAGIARISM:
WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE AND HOW
IT IS MEASURED

Diana Stout, Ph.D.

Western Michigan University, 2013

This case study examines how full-time faculty, adjunct instructors, and graduate teaching assistants teach students how to avoid plagiarism. Additionally, this case study includes a cross-section of teachers who encounter plagiarism in writing assignments across the curriculum. While many studies in the past have focused on students, this study places the spotlight on teachers. For this study, participants have been asked how they can be sure whether their instruction is correct or not, what it means to paraphrase and rewrite correctly, and how do they assess their students to determine if correct learning has taken place. Additionally, these instructors were asked how they would feel if they were to learn that their knowledge of using sources was not totally correct. On that foundation, the goal of this study is to learn how instructors teach students to avoid plagiarism, what methodology and activities are used, how they ensure students learned what was taught, what happens when they encounter plagiarism, and what is their attitude toward their students' plagiarism when it occurs. This study attempts to reveal instructional knowledge regarding plagiarism, how that knowledge is taught to students, and how to determine whether that knowledge was properly learned. Overall, this study makes an attempt to understand why plagiarism continues to be an academic problem.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Just as it takes a village to raise a child, it takes a school, department, a family, and lots of friends to help a graduate student obtain a doctoral degree, particularly when it comes to writing the dissertation. Due to the assistance of many, I have been successful in achieving one of the biggest goals of my life. I was in my twenties when I first considered this degree, and now, many lifetime twists and turns later, I have successfully achieved that goal.

To my Davenport University family – There were exhaustive times I wondered if I could do it, but there were always several of you at any one time who would say, "We have no doubt that you can." Thank you for your loyal support and unflagging enthusiasm. I appreciate all the celebrations along the way, and I am still in awe of your heartfelt support when my sister died in the middle of the writing of this dissertation. I could not have kept my major deadlines had it not been for you.

To my Western Michigan University family – I have gotten to know so many of you and am thankful for your friendship and support through all my degrees. As a department, you have been a wonderful role model. As individuals, I enjoyed and still enjoy all moments spent with you, because I continue to learn and be entertained. I always feel I am coming home when walking toward Sprau Tower. Thank you for your support and your friendship,

To my two daughters, Carrie and Kelly – Thank you for your understanding as I moved from having prepared you for the world into preparing myself for a new career. I know I have not always been as available as you would have preferred, but now that is about to change. I promise you, though: this *is* my last degree.

Acknowledgments—Continued

To my grandchildren – Hopefully, I will be a role model for you, in that you can see that age, gender, or even economic status does not matter when you have a dream. Anyone can dream, but the single difference between those who succeed and those who fail is that those who failed gave up and quit. Whatever the dream, it can be yours.

To my brother, Bill, and sister, Monica – Toward the end of this academic journey, a critical time for me, we lost our sister, Eileen. The experience was not easy, but as a result, we became closer. As we continued to deal with family issues, you enabled me to keep going, to finish what I had started. Your help and support means more than you know.

To my friends – There are so many and you know who you are. Thank you for your support and your cheerleading. You have been there for more than just this one successful achievement; you have been there from the beginning when I first said I wanted to write, or you joined me somewhere along the path. All of you had some part—whether big or small—in my journey.

To my dissertation committee members: Ellen Brinkley, Karen Vocke, and Cheryl Almeda – Thank you for your support and the pearls of wisdom you gave me along the way.

And a special thank you to my chair: Jonathan Bush – You are a special kind of leader—definitely a cheerleader!—who shared my enthusiasm, and who always pointed me in the right direction. You have been a wonderful role model for me.

Thank you all.

Diana Stout

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents - continued

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER I

AN UNINTENTIONAL JOURNEY TURNS INTENTIONAL
"Well, after this I should think nothing of falling down stairs."
Alice, from *Alice in Wonderland*

My journey into the rabbit-hole world of plagiarism occurred slowly and unintentionally. As I later entered academia, that journey down the rabbit hole sped up and landed me in that small room where I would choose to enter that little-used door that led to a complex world of copyright and sourcing that included quoting, paraphrasing, rewriting, and using proper citations. As a result, I would journey into a world where not many wanted to be (Bailey, 2012, July 26), a world I purposefully chose and passionately embraced, determined to understand why plagiarism was and continues to be problematic to both students and instructors. This chapter is a narrative of key events that became my journey that piqued my curiosity and eventually shaped my determination to pursue its quandaries into the depths of a dissertation project.

To begin this narrative, I have to go back in time briefly, to that time before my academic career began and wasn't even a consideration. After high-school graduation, I attended a business school where I became a certified Executive Secretary and was two classes shy of becoming a Junior Accountant. I worked in offices, performed bookwork, and tried my hand at poetry to no avail. Then, I married and became a substitute school bus driver while living on a dairy farm, raising calves for market, taking care of a family, eventually doing all the bookkeeping for the business, and writing on a manual typewriter as personal

computers and access to the Internet were future events. My early work began with non-fiction as a newspaper columnist, with Erma Bombeck-like essays that were later reprinted in magazines. Soon, I was writing original how-to informational articles and short stories for magazines.

All the while, I was reading romances and Janet Daily became my favorite author. I admired her style of writing, her ability to hook me as a reader and keep me reading, where I was unable to put the book down until I finished. From her first book publication, I watched her career blossom into a full-blown career, as she became a best-selling romance writer. Dailey inspired me, so I began writing romances. Quickly, I joined Romance Writers of America (RWA), along with a local chapter where I met with other writers on a monthly basis. I first met Dailey, at the height of her career, at a RWA national conference. The audience was huge and the questions were many. Her memory capacity was astonishing as she revealed that when writing a book, ten pages every day, she never kept notes. She would read the last paragraph from the day before and write her ten pages for the day. She would never read anything else that she had written except for the one paragraph each day. Each page would come out of the typewriter and be placed in a pile of pages, all face-down, until the book was finished. She admitted that she never mixed up names, dates, ages, eye-color as most of us were prone to do. Her memory was that good.

After her conference session was over, I got a chance to talk to her one-on-one for about five minutes. A year later, we met again at another conference, but in a bathroom of all places. She looked and me, and said, "Diana Stout, right? How are you?" The fact that she remembered me as the result of a five-minute discussion, and

more importantly my name, a full year later, showcased her memory abilities.

My first encounter with plagiarism was at an event that garnered headlines and shockwaves across the writing and New York publishing community of romance and best-selling books. This woman whose writing I highly admired—a woman who had published over 80 books by that time—was accused of having plagiarized one of Nora Roberts books (Wexler, 1997, p. 20; "Roberts Will Sue," 1997, p. 15). *Why would a best-selling author copy someone else's work? Why would she need to?* I could not imagine how such a talented writer could have committed such an act that could impact her life's work and future career. The only conclusion I could come to was that her remarkable memory had tripped her up somehow.

At the time, I thought plagiarism was simply a matter of copying word for word without credit. While I saw similarities of sentence structure between the two authors' work when I compared their two books, I did not understand, at the time, how this similarity was considered plagiarism. When Dailey confessed to having plagiarized due to a psychological disorder and agreed to pay an undisclosed amount in restitution to a literacy organization, Literacy Volunteers of American (Wilson, 1997, p. D-2), my interest in plagiarism, and in the case, quickly disappeared.

My disinterest was chiefly a result of there being no library books on the subject of plagiarism, and the Internet still a future event in our community. As a result, I had no real way to research the topic. In retrospect, I realize that while there was publication discussion about Dailey having plagiarized, there was never any real discussion about the manner of plagiarism itself and what made Dailey's writing as plagiarized. This incident made a huge impression upon me, and yet, I did not fully

understand why it did. As a result, the incident was tucked away, not to be forgotten, but it would be a couple decades before it would resurface and become all-important, simply because of the high esteem I held for Dailey.

I continued with my writing, my publications to newspapers, magazines, and my own romance novels. I divorced, remarried, moved across the country, became the office manager and bookkeeper for a small manufacturing company, and became a screenwriter, optioning a script. As a result of my publications, I was asked to speak at various organizations about writing in Tallahassee, Southwest Georgia and Northern Florida, where I was living at the time. Then I was asked to teach creative writing classes through an adult enrichment program at Bainbridge Community College in Bainbridge Georgia, a neighboring community. Soon after, I was approached by a writer's colony to teach creative writing classes online, long before online teaching became popular.

My courses included screenwriting, novels and short stories, creative non-fiction articles, memoirs, and how-to articles, all based on what students already knew or stories they originally created. It would be twelve years before I would be teaching college composition, and during that time I never gave plagiarism a thought. After all, my own work and the work of my students—mostly non-traditional students—was the invention of our own ideas and creations that involved our own history. Plagiarism was never discussed, those questions never asked. No one wondered if they were quoting or paraphrasing incorrectly. How to use sources was never brought up. In fact, as I look back in all workshops and courses I took, on all the writing magazines I subscribed to, the various discussions I heard at writing

conferences, how to use sources and how to avoid plagiarism was never a topic. I have to wonder *why not?* Was it because no one cared, or because back then we did not have the tools to check like we do now?

Nine years into this teaching, I returned to Michigan, and began working in retail for the first time in my life. Not liking it and having no desire to return working in an office or to bookkeeping despite my experience and expertise, I returned to college. In fact, I loved teaching so much, my decision to leave the world of business and retail eventually and create a new career was due to my passion in writing. If I had to work, I wanted that work to be interesting and fun. Working full-time and still teaching on the side, I attended Kellogg Community College (KCC), where I obtained my associate degree. In the traditional composition class that I took, plagiarism was never discussed beyond the reference made to the syllabus on the first day and the standard paragraph of academic integrity. In fact, in every class, the only reference to plagiarism, but under the guise of *academic integrity,* would be pointed out—a small paragraph of standard phrasing in the syllabus. Invariably, it referred us to academic institutional policies that could be found in the student catalog. The expectation? As a student, I was expected to know what academic integrity meant, and I did, I thought.

The fact that I was writing papers in every class and doing well by them grade-wise told me that obviously I had no academic integrity problem. No one was telling me otherwise, and yet, I did not know. No one bothered to determine if I did know. Unfortunately, this mode of thinking is common to all students; they don't know what they don't know. How are students supposed to know what they do not

know, especially when they believe, as I did, that what they are doing is totally correct? I would come back to this question repeatedly as my awareness of this problem grew.

A year and a half later, with my associate degree in hand, I transferred to Western Michigan University and began work on my English creative writing bachelor degree. It was in my senior year that a professor, new to the University herself, took me aside and said, "Are you aware that you're plagiarizing?" I was shocked. I was careful to cite and quote carefully, but apparently I was still doing something wrong. How could that be? I was doing exactly as I had been taught in high school. Thankfully, this professor—the only one in all the classes I took throughout all my degrees—took the time needed to demonstrate the specifics in using sources correctly. As a result, I learned there was much more to paraphrasing and rewriting than simply substituting words, which also affected how I was citing my sources. In effect, I was plagiarizing and not even realizing it, and yet I had been doing only what I'd been taught. I had been taught to substitute words in sentences, a process that Rebecca Moore Howard (1995, 2001, & 2002) calls "patchwriting." This one professor's intervention had me questioning why and trying to understand how my previous knowledge and learning had been flawed.

I found myself asking, what was a teacher's role in the teaching of using sources properly? Why were students being taught to use patchwriting in the first place? Why not teach students how to use a source correctly from the beginning? Ultimately, who was responsible for teaching this topic? Only English teachers? All teachers? If teaching patchwriting creates a flawed confidence in students, why is

that practice of patchwriting continued to be taught? As time evolved, I found myself asking these questions repeatedly and in my readings, finding next to nothing that addressed the problem of the students' flawed learning. I began to see a gap. Literature talked about patchwriting, and then talked about the responsibility of students needing to know and taking responsibility. The biggest question I kept butting up against was *if students do not know what they don't know, who is responsible for pointing out that flaw*? The only obvious answer was that it should be the teachers. It was that question and what seemed to be an obvious answer to me that became the focus of my study—the teachers.

What was most startling and disheartening was that I made it all the way to my senior year of my B.A. degree without anyone—neither teacher nor editor, with the exception of one teacher—pointing out this error, and I wondered why. Did my instructors not know themselves? Did they not care? How was it that I had not been taught this valuable lesson in any of my classes? Who was responsible for teaching students how to avoid plagiarism? Who was checking instructors to ensure they were teaching the skill correctly? Even more important, why were there so few examples of what paraphrasing and rewriting was supposed to look like. Nearly every handbook and textbook that discussed plagiarism, at the time, would *tell* me, the reader, how to paraphrase and rewrite by using my own words, however, examples that *showed* me the differences between these two extremely different skills were non-existent.

The next year I began my MFA studies as a Teaching Assistant (TA) at Western Michigan University where I would teach three college composition classes

a year. Additionally, I was an adjunct instructor at other colleges; all total, I taught four composition classes every semester. Now, I began to see the issue of plagiarism not just from a student perspective but from a teaching one, as well. I noticed students using source material exactly the same way I had . . . or worse, using no citations whatsoever. While students said they knew what plagiarism was—to copy and paste without giving credit—in actuality, they did not understand. As a result, I developed a class activity (see Appendix A) that I presented the second or third class, the day when students brought in their first draft and where they had used a source in the body of their work.

I wanted to know what they knew about plagiarism, but I needed to do so in the shelter of safety and confidentiality. Yet, I also wanted to create a learning environment where students could discover that they were not alone in dealing with this problem and not be afraid to share their errors with each other. Ultimately, I wanted to create a climate where the subject was not only opening discussed and demonstrated, but also where, ultimately, the students would be teaching each other on how to avoid plagiarism.

At the start of each class, where we would use the Appendix A activity worksheet, students were supposed to have read the chapter on how to use resources. Being typical students, I knew that most of them came to class not having read the chapter and most confessed as such when asked. Without any discussion about plagiarism, I had students move into small groups so they could talk to each other, and where they were allowed to use their textbook and handbook. They were charged with plagiarizing the provided paragraph on the sheet, paraphrasing it, and rewriting

it. The activity was not graded, much to their relief. Instead, they received full participation points. I let them know that the exercise was more about them *showing* me what they knew. As a result, they were confident they could do the activity correctly. After all, they had each other, their books, and even online resources, for those that had iPhones or computers with them. How difficult could it be?

Generally, it was not long before one of the groups asked me, *What does it mean to rewrite? Our books don't tell us. We don't understand what it means to rewrite in our own words. Aren't we doing that already when we paraphrase?* I never answered the question while they attempted to work the problem; I wanted them to fill out the worksheet amongst themselves, to share what they already knew. I told them to do the best they could. I would have to remind them that if they got it wrong, they would not be punished because they were receiving full credit, that we were going to be learning from our mistakes.

Having performed this activity in more than 70 composition and writing classes, which includes writing classes with transfer students of juniors, seniors, and non-traditional students returning to the classroom after ten, twenty, or thirty years, the total number of students that I have had who proved they could paraphrase, rewrite, and cite correctly at the time they began the class is shockingly low. Only five students, so far, have been able to prove their knowledge was correct before coming into any one of my classes. While students told me they knew what it meant to plagiarize—taking someone's work and using it as their own, as in *copy and paste*, without giving proper credit—the exercise revealed and *showed* students they did not know what it meant to plagiarize. Interestingly, I found that a good number of

students were paraphrasing in the rewrite portion but failed to cite, which then made it a plagiarism problem.

Students were surprised to learn that ideas could be stolen (U.S. Copyright, 2011, p. 3), that it was the *creation of an idea* into a concrete, tangible construction, written or imaged creation that is copyrighted, thus, requiring attribution. Also, students were surprised to learn that their own class papers were copyrighted the minute they put words to paper and that in order to be able to reuse that work, they had to cite themselves; otherwise it would be self-plagiarism.

Students continued to be surprised in learning that while paraphrasing and rewriting both required that they use their own words but that only the paraphrase required a citation. They struggled to grasp the concept that they had to find the core idea that was being expressed in that author's creation of an idea in order to rewrite the idea in their own words without using the author's creation of text in discussing that idea (refer to Appendix B as answered examples to Appendix A; or Appendix C for a detailed explanation on these differences and examples, which students receive as a handout in my class). Much discussion would take place regarding the difference between discussing another author's idea and critically developing their own idea that resulted from reading that author's idea.

Overall, their earlier assumption had been that a citation was required if quotes were used. As a result of the exercise, my students asked questions, such as: *Who makes these rules? Why do other countries considering borrowing another's words okay but we* (Americans) *don't? If rewriting and paraphrasing is so difficult to do, why isn't it okay to quote more? Why don't other teachers care about*

plagiarism? Why were we taught patchwriting in high school when it isn't correct usage? Research shows that my students' questions are shared by other students across the country (Ashworth, Bannister, & Thorne, 1997). Understanding for them did not come easy, and despite my focus on the subject, I would still find myself dealing with the plagiarism with various students in every class, and on multiple papers. I had told students how to cite. We looked at examples, and yet they still plagiarized or cited incorrectly. I wondered why.

In order to determine what students thought of their own skills, I devised a survey (see Appendix D) that asked students to rate their skills. Questions 15, 16, and 17 pertain to using resources:

15. Able to demonstrate how to use quotes and citations correctly.

16. Able to demonstrate how to paraphrase correctly.

17. Able to demonstrate how to rewrite research material correctly.

The students filled out the survey on the first day, and then they filled out the survey again on the last day. The goal was to provide a way for students to visualize whether they believed they had improved their skills, and in particular for these three questions, regarding their ability to avoid plagiarism.

Surprisingly, despite the amount of time we spent in class talking about avoiding plagiarism, demonstrating how to cite correctly, the students' confidence level from the first date to the last day of class in their ability to avoid plagiarism was telling (see Figure 1). These statistics represent 282 of my students in their freshman composition classes, where students rate themselves on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being the least skilled and 5 being the highest.

Figure 1 Composition Students Rate Their Skills
Source: Data collected from 57 students, with permission, in freshman composition classes taught by Diana Stout from Fall 2009, Winter & Fall 2010, Fall 2011 at Davenport Unversity.

The high number of 3s that students rate themselves on the first day could indicate a medium confidence level and could indicate a sign that students are not sure of what they know. While the students' confidence had grown tremendousely in their ability to use quotes and citations properly and to paraphrase correctly, their confidence level was not strong when it came to being able to rewrite correctly.

After my first two years as a TA, and at the beginning of my third and final years as a TA, I was asked to conduct a seminar for new incoming TAs, most who were newly graduated BA students, and who would be teaching WMU's English 1050 for the first time that fall semester. My workshop was on plagiarism. I gave these new teachers the same in-class plagiarism worksheet (see Appendix A) activity that I gave my students the day they brought their first drafts using research to class. Unlike me, I figured that these new TAs would know how paraphrase and rewrite correctly. Surprisingly, I discovered more than 75 percent of these new teachers were unaware that they did not how to paraphrase and rewrite properly. They, like me, thought patchwriting was correct paraphrasing and used true paraphrasing for rewriting. I wondered why so many of these students who were becoming teachers were misinformed, especially considering that many were thirty years younger than I was. In the discussion that followed, most said if they were not confident about a subject, they were not going to teach it. Was that the reason that so few of my own instructors, whom I discovered after I received my bachelor's degree had been TAs, did not discuss plagiarism when I was in their classes? Was it possible that the teaching of how to use sources had not evolved all this time and that students were still being taught as I had been? I was concerned for the students of these new TAs,

and other TAs like them across the country. Had it not been for one professor who intervened on my behalf, I would have been just like them. Due to the tight seminar schedule, I did not have enough time to bridge the gap of their current knowledge of providing them a variety of teaching tools that would enable them to produce first-year composition writers who would not plagiarize. All I had done was prick the awareness of these new teachers. Would it be enough?

For me, that workshop only led to more questions: How many teachers out there have a flawed understanding of plagiarism? How many teachers are teaching how to avoid plagiarism incorrectly? How many teachers avoid dealing with plagiarism, altogether, even though they may see it in their students' papers? At that time, I did not know, and I was not sure how to find out. Instead, my concentration turned to finishing my MFA and getting a job.

As a result of my findings due to that instructor workshop, I became more and more aware of what was going on in my classrooms. While I was confident that I was doing a good job, sadly, it would be several more years before I would realize my own teaching shortcomings on this topic. Only when I saw students continuing to have plagiarism problems or just here and there, did I start quizzing them about citations and using sources correctly to assess their learning. The quizzes had no value for the students as a real test, because I gave them full points regardless of their answers, which they would discover after the fact. My intent was for information-gathering purposes only. What I discovered is that despite our discussions, their eye-opening learning through the exercise (see Appendix A) I provided for them, which afterward they verbally told me they now understood better how to avoid plagiarism,

in reality they still struggled and were still unsure about the process.

Some, who plagiarized in their papers, confided that they still did not understand. Those who did not plagiarize revealed that they still did not have confidence that they could totally avoid plagiarism. The students admitted that they needed more practice, low-stake opportunities in practicing how to avoid plagiarism.

Another time during this period, as I was completing my MFA degree, I had another instructor sharing information about one of my students who had been in his[1] class the previous semester. "I failed him because he plagiarized his final paper," he told me. I took this instructor at his word that the student had plagiarized. However, as the class progress and I moved into my plagiarism exercise that revealed a student's true knowledge about plagiarism, this repeat student revealed to me during break when it was just the two of us alone, that he failed his last class because he was told that he had plagiarized. "I didn't even know what I had done!" This student's statement and his experience made me realize that students do want to learn, to understand, and that they need more help than we instructors realize. More discussion with this student revealed that the former instructor had never discussed plagiarism with the class beyond the first day's reading of the college's skimpy one-paragraph academic integrity statement that resided in every syllabus, as dictated by the academic institution. This instructor told them not to plagiarize and that it was their responsibility to know what academic integrity meant. That previous incident for that student and my own interaction with him ramped up my curiosity. How

---

[1] So that no student or instructor is recognizable, names have been changed along with other identity markers such as age, possibly sex, etc. for both instructor(s) and student(s).

many other instructors handed out failing grades on papers due to plagiarism, with students not understanding? How many students, like this one, were hesitant to approach their instructors because they didn't want to look stupid? Where did the real problem reside? Was it with the students or the instructors? As I investigated and further researched the topic, I learned that most research is student focused, as I will discuss in Chapter II, with little focus on instructors, and I wondered why.

As I listened to other instructors—both those who taught writing and those who did not—talk about writing assignments in their classes, I found plagiarism a hot button with them, as well. Some instructors wanted nothing to do with the topic. Those instructors who did not teach English classes believed it was the responsibility of the English department to *fix* the problem. Some instructors said they witnessed plagiarism all the time, but they would not report it. Other instructors wanted to help but did not know where to begin; they felt overwhelmed and under-educated on how to teach it.

What was more troubling was when I discovered first-hand one particular student's attitude about plagiarism. I was conferencing with a student regarding her plagiarism, a second occurrence. When I asked her what was confusing her since she had not learned from the mistakes she had made on the first paper, she replied, *Oh, I know how not to plagiarize, but other teachers here don't care about it like you do, so why should I? It won't matter after this class.*

Once I became employed full-time, I saw more plagiarism occur and many instructors troubled by its frequency with no real consequences in place. I talked about my experiences every chance I got. At one point, one individual said, "Don't

bother pursing this. No one cares. You're the only one who does." I could not

believe that philosophy was true, not with so many people complaining about it.

As I began my Ph.D. program in English Education, I knew that I wanted to

research this problem that appears to be growing considering the headlines and the

academic discussion. However, I noticed that the predominate focus was on students,

with little research and literature focusing on teachers. Was it possible that the real

reason this problem was not improving and seemingly had not changed over the

decades (see Chapter II) was that the root of the problem—the teachers—had

received little focus? Was it possible that in order to ensure that our students receive

proper instructions on how to plagiarism that we must first ensure our instructors are

teaching that skill correctly? I wondered, and in that wondering my doctorate

research was fully born. I already knew that most students—99 percent in my

classroom experience—do not know that they do not know. Could the same be true

of teachers?

The purpose of my study as a case study is to learn what teachers know

regarding how to avoid plagiarism, how they learned it, and who taught it to them. I

want my research to determine whether teachers know how to paraphrase correctly,

whether they know how to rewrite correctly. If they do not know how to avoid

plagiarism correctly, is it possible that their flawed education occurred in high school

as mine did? Is it possible that they, like their students, don't know that they don't

know?

While many studies and texts squarely place the problem of plagiarism on

students and the Internet's ease of access, I suspect that the issue is not as one-sided

as it appears. My study attempts to draw back the veil on teachers and questions whether we, as teachers and institutions, are doing the most that we can. If we want to educate our students as we say we do, then we need to ensure that a proper education is being delivered by the teachers and is equally received by the students. The purpose of my study, then, is to examine what teachers know.

While I have discovered that 99 percent of my students do not know how to avoid plagiarism, despite them saying otherwise initially, my study intends to discover if that percentage holds true for teachers, as well. Ultimately, this study could uncover a major rabbit hole that has been covered and camouflaged with the brush and twigs of learning never checked. Should this study reveal that teachers are fully aware of proper avoidance of plagiarism and are responsibly teaching their students, then where does the problem reside? Is it possible that the problem is multi-dimensional, involving students, teachers, and academic institutions? Is it possible that responsibility and accountability is not as well understood as it should be, with expected standards that are never checked, institutional policies and reporting methods that are difficult to follow by instructors, hence they ignore the problem altogether? Hopefully, this study will reveal that in our educational institutions that we, as educators and policy makers, need to ensure that not only do we all understand what it means to plagiarize, but that we can all have a hand in teaching our students how to avoid plagiarism.

The next chapter is the literature review. I intend to reveal how there is a gap of literature that does not *show* teachers how to properly avoid plagiarism. While there is much discussion, there are few explicit examples. Additionally, there is a

lack of student-directed literature that shows students how to properly avoid

plagiarism. While there is much discussion about plagiarism in today's literature,

much of literature is student focused—why they plagiarize and how they plagiarize—

with some literature directed toward institutions and teachers and how they can make

changes in the assignments, classrooms, and academic policies to curb plagiarism.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

"Not until we are lost do we begin to understand ourselves."

Henry David Thoreau

The literature within the study of plagiarism and pedagogy of plagiarism is vast. It is presented formally in academic journals and informally in newsletter articles, online blogs, and even letters to the editor. In my research, I found that there are about two dozen books devoted solely to the topic of plagiarism, with most of those books appearing to be either pedagogy—how to avoid plagiarism—or theory on why students plagiarize. Sorting through this literature I created various categories, so that I could demonstrate the breadth of discussion from the past and headlines which are ongoing daily, to the specific discussions, such as teacher focused or student focused. These categories include the early history; the twentieth century and modern history, and the headlines that are part of our current history. Other categories involve the various studies; the focus on instructors in how to teach students how to avoid plagiarism, which includes plagiarism detection tools; the institutional focus, including academic integrity statements and policies; and, the focus of literature toward students. Finally, the last category will highlight daily current discussions that alert us to the ongoing issues of plagiarism in academia in this country and other countries, as well.

With the advent of plagiarism-detection software, instructors have been provided with better policing abilities. Thus, I believe the practice of plagiarism has been easily placed into the spotlight of sharp scrutiny. Most of that scrutiny appears

to be student focused. In fact, Eisner and Vicinus (2008) claim that "[s]tudents have been the initial target of [plagiarism] software tools" (p. 163). What responsibility does the instructor have in this plagiarism phenomenon, then? How do we ensure that the teaching of using sources correctly occurs? Furthermore, how is the effectiveness of that teaching measured and by whom? Based upon my review of the literature, which I will present in this chapter, there appears to be a lack of teacher-focused research. That lack has me asking the question, is the plagiarism problem more than what it appears to be, or is it just a problem with the students? Is it possible that plagiarism is much like an iceberg, where we see the problem occurring with students in the portion of ice visible above the water line, but in reality, there is much more at stake that is not readily seen and is the bulk of the iceberg hidden below the water line, and which involves teachers and institutions?

Water line   Students

                                              Teachers

                                              Institutions

Figure 2 The Iceberg of Plagiarism

In my past and present discussions with instructors, they quickly fault the Internet for the plagiarism phenomenon; it is too easy for students to copy and paste. However, plagiarism is not a new convention. Before we can examine modern-day beliefs, events, studies, literature, and fully understand today's plagiarism problem, we need to go back in time. If there is a disconnection between students and

instructors on how plagiarism is taught and learned, is it even possible by understanding the history of plagiarism to discover that disconnection, let alone when it began?

Early History

As a concept, plagiarism has an early history and knowing its history helps position the importance of this study. From the beginning, plagiarism has been a messy concept, and over the centuries, and in particular over these past few decades since the invention of our easy ability to obtain information over the Internet, the concept of plagiarism has become messier. Early history shows that plagiarism, as we know it today, was a common practice among writers and speakers who borrowed heavily from each other. While we find the act of plagiarism egregious today, it was not uncommon for writers to copy text of another in the past. Plagiarism, fundamentally as we define it as *copying without attribution*, occurred long before copyright laws. Because of plagiarism, copyright laws were created.

> "Copyright is a commercial privilege that developed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in England and Germany. . . . In the Middle Ages the 'right to copy'—the literal meaning of 'copyright'—rested with the *owners* of manuscripts, which were copied by hand" (Blum, 2009, p. 33).

Going back in time, even earlier than the eighteenth century, for example, Virgil borrowed heavily from Homer's best-known saga poems, the *Illiad* the *Odyssey* (Lindey, 1952, p. 66). Plato and Cicero borrowed as well (p. 66). The "work of Nennius in the ninth century, emerged solidly in Geoffrey of Monmouth's twelfth-century *Historia Regum Britanniae,"* and then was further borrowed in succession by

the "poet Wace, the Worcestershire priest Layamon, and the Provençal romancer

Chrétien de Troyes, and culminated in Malory's *Morte d'Arthur* in the fifteenth

century" (p. 68). Voltaire and others have accused Milton of plagiarism (p. 77).

"Canonical forgeries were especially common in the Carolingian period" (Constable,

1983, p. 9). Moving foward in time, many printed "works [that] were frequently

pirated . . . [and] Galileo's images of the lunar surface, first published in Venice in

1610, were reprinted without permission in Frankfurt and London editions" (cited in

Lyons, 2010, p. 38).

Before the 1450 invention of Gutenberg's printing press, "the Church

maintained control over the spread of information" (Sutherland-Smith, 2008, p. 37)

that was given to the illiterate masses. Therefore, few published manuscripts existed

that were outside of the Church's control. It would take 200 years after the invention

of the printing press before book ownership exploded across Europe and its lower

class (Lyons, 2010, p. 35) and when plagiarism, as we define it today, became

common.

Frequently, Shakespeare is criticized as having plagiarized and those

criticisms are correct; he borrowed ideas liberally, as did many of his peers. They did

so with no threat of breaking any law, because early in the Elizabethan period, artists

of all kinds—particularly playwrights—took license in testing their ideas, using plots,

characters, and sometimes lifting large chunks of dialogue (Lindley, 1952, p. 74;

Lyons, 2010). With the printing press, many publishers made changes without

consulting with the authors, because at that time, authors had no rights. Not until the

"Stationers' Guild, which had always sought to regulate the production of books, . . .

suddenly lost its primary instrument of authority and monopoly" (Sutherland-Smith, 2008, p. 41) did the idea of author intellectual property take hold. As a result of the "combined pressure of authors and the Stationer's Guild pressed [on] the legislature for legal proprietary rights of authors over their creations . . . [l]egal protection for individuals occurred in England's Statue of Anne of 1710" (p. 41), giving authors protection over their intellection property, and "the notion of plagiarism" (p. 41). It would take another 100 years, however, "until the Copyright Act of 1814 that the author [would be] legally protected as the creator and therefore the owner of literary works as property" (p.42).

Our own country has a history of plagiarism as we define it today, which included one of our founding fathers, Benjamin Franklin who "was a serial plagiary. . . . But when Franklin stole whole works, no one cared. Far from being a scandal, it was almost the norm" (Lynch, 2006, para. 3). Again, copyright was not an issue until Great Britain passed the first copyright law, which then we adapted, as the "framers of the U.S. Constitution paid attention" (para. 10). It would be over 100 years and many Congressional debates and discussions, with more than 200 bills entered with "twenty-five of which became law" (para. 13). While American joined other countries in "copyright treaties" (para 13), it would be 1988 before American finally joined the "Berne Convention—the modern international copyright system" (para 13).

There are a number of other texts that discuss the history of plagiarism, such as the *Originality, Imitation, and Plagiarism: Teaching Writing in the Digital Age*, by editors Caroline Eisner and Martha Vicinus (2008). Richard Terry's book, *The Plagiarism Allegation in English Literature from Butler to Sterne* (2010) and his

article, "'Plagiarism': A Literary Concept in England to 1775 "(2007), provide an extensive history regarding plagiarism. Two other texts are *Borrowed Feathers: Plagiarism and the Limits of Imitation in Early Modern Europe* by editor Hall Bjornstad (2008) and *Plagiarism in Early Modern England*, edited by Paulina Kewes (2003), both of which provide additional historical information.

Thus, throughout early history, the practice of plagiarism as we define it today, was never considered an offensive act. Many great writers engaged in plagiarism and did so without repercussion. Not until our modern era has plagiarism generated attention, and lawsuits, with plagiarists seen as engaging in activity viewed as moral misconduct.

Twentieth Century and Modern History: The Headlines

Because plagiarism is currently conceived as an immoral act, and because we have better methods of uncovering and revealing the act, plagiarism receives much more attention today than it did in during first half of the twentieth century. For example, the plagiarism of romance writer Janet Daily as discussed in Chapter I toppled this best-selling author and derailed her career. Her name and the situation were publicized in many newspapers, publishing magazines, and was discussed endlessly on many writer's online lists, which back then were the equivalent of today's Facebook. As the owner of one such list, Scribelink, I hosted and interacted with over 400 writers; and as a member of several of other writers' lists, it was difficult to listen to the battering she took and watch as one of my favorite authors stumbled and tumbled. While her plagiarism had been unintentional, according to her statement (Wexler, 1997, p. 20; "Roberts Will Sue," 1997, p. 15), she was

nonetheless judged as amoral. It was several years before she began writing again and she no longer makes public appearances as she once did.

Today, newspaper headlines denote plagiarism in politics, business, entertainment, law, health, science, and academic institutions—instructors, teachers, and high-ranking administration—almost every week, and these plagiarism incidences are too often being drawn back to the plagiarist's education. As "academic dishonesty has been the subject of front-page stories in major stories, and ABC aired a two-hour television special about the problem," (Callahan, 2004, p. 305), it quickly becomes obvious just how serious this problem has become not only in our country but in other countries, as well. For example, Germany has lost two government cabinet members due to plagiarism: Chancellor Angela Merkel (Breridthardt, 2013) and Defense Minister Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg (Schuetze, 2011, April; Schuetze, 2011, September; "German," 2011; "Germany," 2011; Dempsey 2011, February; Dempsey, 2011, March). Additionally, a German 17-year-old author made headlines in that country with her plagiarism (Kulish, 2010). Germany is not alone; there have been recent headlines involving prominent citizens or universities in other countries, as well.

In Romania, government officials were ousted when a book and academic documents the officials had generated had been found plagiarized (Bailey, 2012, July 2). In France, a TV journalist was accused of "lifting almost 100 pages of material for a new Ernest Hemingway biography" he was writing, which he had taken from a writer in American (Carvajal, 2011). In the Philippines, university officials—deans, faculty members, and others—demanded the resignation of a Supreme Court judge

who "lifted from the works of legal scholars" ("A Fundamental Breach," 2010). In Canada, a medical dean plagiarized parts of his speech to graduating students, forcing his resignation (Express, 2011; "University," 2011; "U of Alberta," 2011). In Australia, a plagiarism case that involved "large enrollments of foreign students" over the course of two years ended up "exonerat[ing] the students involved but exposed the staff to discipline" (Slattery, 2008). And, in China, plagiarism is forcing that country to re-examine its academic policies. "Pressure on scholars by administration of state-run universities to earn journal citations—a measure of innovation—has produced a deluge of plagiarized or fabricated research" (Jacobs, 2010). These are just a few of many international headlines that have appeared in recent years.

By no means is our country immune to plagiarism. Evidence shows that in writing his dissertation, Martin Luther King plagiarized "substantial amounts of his writing" (Blum, 2009, p. 16). Additionally, he borrowed heavily from Jack Boozer's dissertation, written three years prior to his own dissertation, and "questions remain, such as how Professor L. Hardol DeWold, the first reader of both Boozer's and King's dissertations, could have overlooked—intentionally or unintentionally—the similarities between the two theses" (Pappas, 1998, p. 81; Bradley, 2011), and that "we may question how responsible King's professors were in reading those papers" (p. 154). Unfortunately, Martin Luther King is just one of many well-known figures who has been caught in the headlines (Bailey, 2009; Cook, 2010; Dionne, 1987; Evans, 2009; "Headlines," n.d.; Miller, 1993; Nelson 2002; "People," 2005). For example, after it was discovered that a *Cook's Source* author had plagiarized, and the online magazine began receiving a deluge of negative comments from its readers, the

magazine shut down (Crowley, 2010; Stewart, 2010).

Other headlined plagiarists include authors Gerald Posner, a previous plagiarist, whose various works were found troublesome (Elfrink, 2010). Doris Kearns Goodwin plagiarized in her book, *The Fitzgeralds and the Kennedys* (Blum, 2009, p. 16). Author and Harvard student, Kaavya Viswanathan's book, *How Opal Mehta Got Kissed, Got Wild and Got a Life*, was published but then pulled from the shelves when the plagiarism was discovered (Rich, 2006; Van Gelder, 2006). The business school at UCLA had 52 MBA applicants who plagiarized (Byrne, 2012), as did a graduate student at the University of Virginia (Hoover, 2002). A North Carolina Central University law student gave a plagiarized graduation speech (Stancill, 2011), and applicants at Penn State plagiarized (Goral, 2011).

Plagiarism also struck even higher up the academic ladder when a university president stepped down before a plagiarism probe had barely begun ("A President Retires," 2009; Mangan, 2009). Two educators at Rutgers University were found to have plagiarized in six different books between 1980 and 2009 (Bartlett, 2010). Michigan State University had a professor who plagiarized a report concerning the school's consolidation savings (Gazette Staff, 2010; Dodson, 2011). Two scientific papers written by Harvard researchers contained plagiarism (Johnson, 2011). A New York University professor blogged about his experience where a good number of his students had plagiarized and where he had dutifully reported the plagiarism only to find that he was punished rather than the students. As a result, he said that if his students ever plagiarized again, he would be ignoring it. The University would not comment on the situation (Parry, 2011; Bashin, 2011). At Edward Waters College,

the college president was forced to resign after the self-study report provided to "its accreditation group" was found to have been plagiarized from Alabama's A&M University ("Edward Waters," 2005), and a cheating scandal at the University of Central Florida involved hundreds of students ("Cheating," 2010).

On the political and news scene, reporter Sari Horwitz was suspended for plagiarizing from another newspaper for her investigative story (Vega, 2011). A politician running for governor had to repay a foundation that had provided $300,000 in a fellowship when it was found that his report was plagiarized ("Colorado," 2010). ESPN news anchor, Will Selva, was "sidelined after apparently plagiarizing several sentences" from another newspaper (Stelter, 2010). South Park creators had to apologize to other writers for having stolen lines from their material (Itzkoff, 2010), and our own United States President, Barrack Obama, was accused of plagiarism in his first inaugural speech, by taking phrases taken from another politician's speech, but Obama claimed the other man was his good friend (Allen, 2008). These are just a few of the many headlines that are appearing in our newspapers, newscasts, and radios.

So, how do these headlines relate to our students and the plagiarism problem that occur in our classrooms? These headlines attest to the devastation of a career and loss of honor when plagiarism occurs: how people are fired, how they are forced to step down, how a whole country's doctoral exam is being scrutinized. On the flip side, however, students also see how some people can plagiarize and nothing happens except for a sensationalized headline. In the case of Martin Luther King, while his egregious act was thoroughly discussed and heavily debated, in the end, it was

determined because of the good works he performed throughout his life, that the incidences would be ignored, other than an addendum that was attached to his dissertation stating awareness of the plagiarism (Bradley, 2011). Obama suffered nothing more than a few questions from the press, to which he responded the material used was from a good friend and the two of them borrow each other's words all the time. These headlines become important to the discussion of plagiarism because the students are noticing there is an inconsistency of outcome. The headlines show us just how messy the concept of plagiarism, as we know it today, has become.

Studies – Why and How Students Plagiarize

Not only is the history of plagiarism interesting, but so is how it appears in our student papers, as well. While there have been a number of small studies, there are only a few large studies. In the review of this literature, I found stories again and again that blame the Internet for today's plagiarism problem, and yet the studies show, in my opinion, that in reality, the Internet is not the cause of today's rampant plagiarism.

One of the first profound studies on cheating, which included plagiarism was provided in Dr. William Joseph Bowers' dissertation, *Student Dishonesty and Its Control in College*, conducted in 1963 and published in 1966. His study is referenced in every important paper and a good number of the texts listed in this project. The study involved 99 colleges and universities across the country, with responses from over 600 deans, 500 student body presidents, and 5,422 students during the spring of 1963 (Bowers, 1966, p. 1). Half of the students who responded said they had cheated at some point during college. Yet, "only a small fraction of the students who cheat or

plagiarize come to the attention of authorities" according to the deans and student body presidents who responded to the survey (p. 65). Right away, Bowers provided evidence that there was a disconnection between the practice of plagiarism and cheating and the lack of consequences for those acts.

While Bowers' study was not the first, it was the second largest study performed. David Callahan (2004), in his book, *The Cheating Culture: Why More Americans Are Doing Wrong to Get Ahead,* states that there have been "[h]undreds of studies have been conducted over the past eight years that look at why, when, and how college students cheat on their academic work" (p. 215), with a 1938 survey mentioned where "a majority of students who indicated they thought it was 'right to cheat' justified cheating on the grounds that 'it gives one a chance to keep up with those who do cheat'" (as cited, p. 215-16). As the founder of the Center of Academic Integrity and professor at Rutgers University, Callahan goes on to cite a 1941 survey where fraternity members cheated more than non-fraternity students because of the need to "maintain a high grade point average" (p 216). Further, Callahan briefly describes a "high-profile 1951 scandal" (p. 216) that involved ninety cadets "dismissed from the United States Military Academy" (p.216).

Bob S. Brown (2001), a professor of marketing, along with Dennis Emmett, a professor of management, provide an article that documents 31 different surveys conducted between 1966 and 1999. Bowers' survey was the only one done in the 1960s with 5,422 participants; three were performed in 1970, 1971, and 1978 with each having 45, 138, and 591 participants respectively; ten surveys or observations were performed in the 1980s ranging from 100 to 1,374 participants; and then 17

surveys and observations were performed in the 1990s, with most under 1000

participants with the exception of Hollinger's in 1996 with 1,672 participants, and

McCabe and Trevino's 1995 survey of 6,096 participants, clearly making it the

largest survey to date (p. 532). At the time, Donald McCabe was a professor of

organizational management at Rutgers University and his colleague, Linda K.

Trevino, was a professor of organizational behavior at Pennsylvania State (McCabe &

Trevino, 1996). Callahan (2004) proclaims that

> [a]fter a decade of research, including six major studies, McCabe is without
>
> question the leading national authority on cheating among high school and
>
> college students. McCabe's surveys at dozens of college campuses have
>
> revealed overall levels of cheating similar to what Bowers found in the 1960s"
>
> (p. 217).

McCabe's biggest study occurred thirty years after Bowers and reveals interesting

comparison data. While many studies, books, papers, and plagiarism detection

programs squarely place the blame on the students, virtually the same number of

students plagiarized according to McCabe and Trevino's (1996) study of over 6000

students as did students at the time of William Bowers' (1966) 1963 study of 5422

students in 1963, which was during the pre-computer, pre-Internet era. While

cheating on tests and examinations, such as "copying from another student" had risen

significantly from 26 percent to 52 percent, the written work cheating percentages

remained close (see Figure 3).

33

		Using sources without citations	Intentional Plagiarism	References listed but not used
1963	5422 students, 99 campuses of all sizes	49%	30%	28%
1993	6000 students, 31 campuses of small to medium size	54%	26%	29%

Figure 3 Bower vs. McCabe/Trevino Study Comparison
Source: McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1996, January/February). What we know about cheating in college. *Change*, *28*(1), 31.

If the numbers have not changed much between those thirty years for those students who plagiarized despite Internet access in the second study, then what has? Is the answer as simple as the Internet providing teachers and school officials the ability to check students' writings? Does that mean that checking for plagiarism was not effectively performed before?

In my research, I found that a good number of teachers and educational administrators who agree that plagiarism is pandemic across our nation's high school, college, and university campuses. The various studies back up this concern. Of course, there were other studies that did not make Brown and Emmett's list. For example, in one study that used a "126 item questionnaire solicited through campus mail . . . a 33 item questionnaire solicited the same way, and . . .a questionnaire that offered course credit" (Miller, Shoptaugh, & Parkerson, 2008, p. 326), the goal was to determine if students would be honest in their reports about themselves or if they would be honest in reporting other students that they knew fairly well. Interestingly

enough, course-credit reporting garnered a much higher reporting of cheating, just over 80%, while the questionnaires garnered just over 68% and 56%. Additionally, there was less reporting of the individuals themselves versus the reporting of others (p.326). Paul Grimes (2004), a professor of economics, performed a survey of international students and American students and their perceptions of cheating. Both groups perceived cheating as a more severe characteristic when performed in a business setting than in an academic setting (p. 273).

A study performed by Thomas S. Dee (2010), associated with the Department of Economics at Swarthmore College and Brian A. Jacob, with the University of Michigan, examined over 1,200 papers from undergraduate students. Half of the students were allowed to submit their papers to an online plagiarism detection program. The researchers' purpose was to determine if having that detection ability would make a difference. It did not. Despite half of the students who were allowed to submit their papers to an online plagiarism detection program, which provided some education of how to avoid plagiarism to the students, Doe and Jacob's conclusions determined that "the decision to plagiarize reflects both a poor understanding of academic integrity and the perception that the probabilities of detection and severe punishment are low" (abstract). Further, Doe and Jacob claim that the "individual incentives of both students and their instructors are not well aligned to support . . . institutional norms . . . [but that] educationally themed interventions can meaningfully address this problem" (28).

Doris R. Dant (1986) performed a study of high school students, believing that "students who plagiarize are not necessarily dishonest, lazy, or unoriginal" but

that the students are unknowingly plagiarizing because "many teachers do not attack it" (81). To check her theory, she queried incoming freshman through their composition classes, about 20% of the total composition classes (81). Dant concluded that while how to avoid plagiarism was initially introduced to students in high school, enough was not being taught to them to ensure the avoidance of plagiarism in college. In fact, Dant also states that for these students English teachers had a different expectation of plagiarism than did teachers from other disciplines (p. 83).

Wendy Sutherland-Smith, an Australian professor, is a prolific writer on the subject of plagiarism and has conducted several studies. Her book, for example, *Plagiarism, the Internet and Student Learning: Improving Academic Integrity* (2008), discusses various other studies performed by various other professionals and in other countries that would demonstrate further that American students are not the only students who struggle with plagiarism. In fact, Sutherland-Smith states that "[m]ost [students] maintain they were not aware they were breaching academic protocols. One of [her] many worries is that despite receiving penalties, many students do not seem to be able to 'fix' the problems of plagiarism in their writing" (2008, p. 2). Despite some students not understanding the full implication, Sutherland-Smith also reports that other students "readily admit that they have plagiarized whole assignments over many years, but have never been caught before. . . . [and] have avoided detection and punishment" (2008, p. 2).

Peter Ashworth, Madeleine Freewood, and Ranald Macdonald (2003), in association with the British, Sheffield Hallam University, conducted interviews with

twelve students and presented three of those interview conclusions in their article, "The Student Lifeworld and the Meanings of Plagiarism." Dan Berrett (2011) reports on Rebecca Moore Howard and Sandra Jamieson's research that "stunned" them, with their discoveries becoming part of the Citation Project that has gained national importance in the discussion of plagiarism. The result of their study of 164 student research papers—another study that did not make Brown's list—resulted in their discovery that students don't understand what it means to reference sources using "their own words" (para. 7). M. Lynette Smyth and James R. Davis (2003) conducted a study that analyzed students at two-year colleges, in particular at the Gordon College in Georgia. Basically, their research showed the same statistics as studies at universities, that "between 40-50% of all categories of students have cheated" (p. 30).

One study designed to determine students' understanding about plagiarism divided studies into two group: one group receiving no instruction about plagiarism, and the second group "multiple types of instruction" (Soto, Anand, & McGee, 2004, p. 42). What the researchers discovered is that "[i]n general, students who plagiarized . . . lacked good note-taking skills" when reading from sources. They failed to note if they were taking word-for-word notes, failed to use proper punctuation marks that would identify copying, and failed to mark "proper attribution" (p. 47).

Another study that focused on online plagiarism was designed to discover if there were "any difference in terms of student perceptions of online plagiarism and print plagiarism" (Wang, 2008, p. 743). Wang states that the "most troubling finding of this study was that students considered plagiarism as a common practice," a fact that "supports the findings by McCabe and Trevino" (p. 750).

One study focused on student handouts and within that study, the handouts were checked to determine if there were any conversations about plagiarism and how to avoid it. Only 18 percent of the handouts "either defined plagiarism, discussed it as a form of academic fraud, or explained ways of avoiding it (Head & Eisenberg, 2010, p. 20-21).

Only a few studies discussed schools that had honor codes, but it is the 1999 study done by Donald McCabe, Linda Trevino, and Kenneth Butterfield that specifically addresses schools that use honor codes and those that do not, and the students' thoughts regarding honor codes. The study was conducted during the 1995-1996 academic year and involved 31 U.S. colleges and universities (212). One theme that came out of the study "suggest[s] that honor code environments help shape the ethics, values, character, attitudes, and behaviors that students carry forward from their collegiate experiences" (p. 216). In fact, the study was able to make a connection that "individual instructors and administrators play a more important academic integrity role on non-code campuses, where rules may vary widely from course to course and program to program" than on those campuses where code existed and was "controlled by an honor committee and thus generally more uniform across courses and professors" (p. 223).

One study took an ethical stance, exploring the "ethical reasoning students invoke when defending their transgressions: deontology [student's right], utilitarianism [cost vs. benefit], rational self-interest, Machiavellianism [ethical egoism], cultural relativism [right vs. wrong], or situational ethics" (Granitz & Loewry, 2006, p. 293). These researchers wanted to understand how students were

going to "justify the act of plagiarism" (294). Deontology was cited as the winning

excuse at 41.8 percent, with situational ethics coming in at 19.9 percent, following

closely by Machiavellianism at 18.4 percent. The other three categories were each

well under 10 percent (p. 299). While this study had no solid or big conclusion, the

study instead focused on each category with recommendations on how to reduce or

eliminate their use. Other studies include those performed by Kerkvliet & Sigmund,

1999; Carter & Punyanunt-Carter, 2006; Rettinger & Kramer, 2009; and Power,

2009.   While a good number of these studies discuss cheating, plagiarism is generally

specified as one element of cheating. Clearly, the number of studies done and the

research garnered reveals that there is a significant plagiarism problem.

While these various studies show that there are a number of students who

plagiarize because they truly do not understand how to avoid plagiarism, other studies

reveal that sometimes students do understand what it means to avoid plagiarism.

Some students link their own lack of concern or caution regarding plagiarism to their

perception of their instructors who either do not care or do not understand (Bowers

1966; Power, 2009; McCabe & Trevino, 1996; McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield,

1999). These studies also show that another reason students plagiarize is because

they do not understand *why* plagiarism is a bad form of writing or why borrowing is

okay in one country but not in another.

In a study done by Lisa Emerson at Massey University, a research university

in New Zealand, the students participated in a trial use of Turnitin.com. "A majority

of students (69 percent) rated their understanding of plagiarism as either good or very

good. Their answers to the more specific questions, however, showed that their

confidence was misplaced" (Eisner & Vicinus, 2008, p. 184). Students

"overestimated their skills and showed that, while they understood the broad terms,

they had insufficient knowledge of the distinctions between paraphrasing and

quoting, and of how to acknowledge sources" (p. 185). Additionally, Rebecca Moore

Howard claims that students continue to struggle with using research materials and

citing properly because students have a lack of understanding, have cultural

differences in the use of sources, have confusion when it comes to citing materials,

and have a lack of understanding about what common language means (pp. 2-3). So,

if students do not understand, whose responsibility is it to ensure that students not

only learn how to avoid plagiarism, but ensure that if plagiarism occurs that there are

consequences? Does that responsibility fall wholly upon the students, the teachers,

the institutions, or is the responsibility shared? If these studies are indicating that

students do not understand, does then the responsibility fall more heavily upon the

instructors and the institutions?

Ethical Perspective

As instructors, our approach to ethically not using words that belong to

someone else without proper attribution means only one thing—plagiarism has

occurred. For our students, however, this ethically behavior may be either missing or

weak because they have not practiced this skill of proper citations, so they may not

have the same ethical approach as many of their instructors. As instructors, we often

forget that this chasm of experience exists between instructors and students. As a

result, do instructors assume students already have a strong platform of plagiarism

knowledge and how to avoid it? According to the research stated in the previous

"Studies" section, apparently so.

Other than a purposeful cut-and-paste scenario, which is blatant plagiarism, I never thought about a students' work habits, which could lead to a student plagiarizing from an unethical perspective. Susan Blum, an Associate Professor of Anthropology at the University of Notre Dame, influenced my thinking and consideration of how plagiarism occurs among students in the most profound way, and it is to her that I credit my solid turn toward investigating plagiarism as my academic topic choice.

On March 18, 2010, Blum came to Western Michigan University, and I attended her presentation, "My Word! Plagiarism and College Culture," which is also the title of her book ("Plagiarism," 2010). In her presentation, Blum explored plagiarism on college campuses from an ethical lens. Blum discussed her three years of research on why students cheat, whether they are immoral, whether they believe plagiarism is the same as cheating, and their understanding of plagiarism based on an ethnographic study performed at her university. Blum contends that the "Internet is part of the story, but not in the way people usually think" (2009, p. 3) when students plagiarize. In her PowerPoint presentation, Blum began by stating that there are four styles of anthropology: the physical—the bones, remains, etc.; the archeology— human society and how they bury their dead; the linguistic—the behavior of a society through the language; and the cultural or social—patterns of known behavior. For Blum, plagiarism intersects holistically, in context, in connection, in ground behavior/investigations, and she begins her investigations with a position of cultural relativism, and individually within a sociocultural context (2010). Blum continued

her presentation by defining the word *plagiarism*, which comes from *palgiarius*, to kidnap. She explained that the kidnapping is either "unintentional or inadvertent" or "deliberate or intentional" (2010). Blum explained that in her research she found the penalties for plagiarism ranged from nothing, a slap on the wrist, an assignment redo, a low or failing grade for the assignment or for the class, a hearing, a letter of ethic violation on file, a suspension, to the ultimate punishment—an expulsion from school (2010). Up until this point, Blum's presentation revealed nothing new, showing the inconsistencies that exist from class to class, institution to institution. It was the following that had me sitting up and taking notice, because it was information I had not considered before, particularly as it related to my students' study habits.

In answering the question, Why do students plagiarize? Blum informed us that there were two sides to plagiarism: the textual side and the contextual side. She claimed the "textual side as writing." Students are ignorant; have intertextural and individual authorship; are provided inconsistencies among individual faculty, disciplines, departments, editors, and countries; and have changing ideas of originality, authorship, and/or collaboration. Blum stated the "contextual side" as that of temptation; lack of interest; assignments having little value, time constraints, bottom-line mentality—I need an A; and, pleasing the teacher, because our education system is teacher centered (2010). She continued by saying that "plagiarism are symptoms of an education problem because the students' focus is on grades, [so] they have a lack of academic involvement, and they have pressure outside academia" (2010). Today's students

"are in a hurry—because of technology, because their parents encouraged

them to pile on more and more activities so they could get into a good school,

because our society in general is concerned with the fruits of our labors. . . .

Contemporary students are swimming in a sea of texts . . . . [and] are writing

all the time, reading all the time" (Blum, 2009, p. 4).

Essentially, the end product has become more important than the process of the

creation of that product.

While Blum's presentation and book moved me to consider what our students

face when they come to college, the following had me considering the behavior of my

own students. Blum reported that "a student who is diligent, really trying to learn,

and who plagiarizes commits *unintentional* plagiarism. It is the student who is

continually absent, and who puts little time to the task of the assignment who is

committing plagiarism *deliberately*" (2010). This proclamation became a huge

revelation for me and had me re-examining and re-evaluating my own students and

their behavior. In her book, Blum diagrams this relationship of student plagiarism as

one of three ways (see Figure 4).

Student doesn't know

Intentional Plagiarism   Unintentional Plagiarism

Figure 4 Blum's Chart of Student Plagiarism
Source: Blum, S. (2009) *My Word!: Plagiarism and College Culture*, p.171.

"Some [students] really don't know how to avoid [plagiarism], because the rules are terribly subtle and take many years to master. . . . The bottom line is that we cannot treat all student plagiarism solely as a matter of individual morality" (Blum, 2009, p. 6). "Plagiarism is a confusing issue. . . . because plagiarism is not a crime in the legal system but rather a break of social norms among writers and scholars" (p. 21). Blum's assessment of the complex issue of plagiarism is currently being seen as the infraction of societal norms that are becoming the admonishment or abolishment of life-time careers as witnessed in today's headlines.

Eric M. Anderman and Tamera B. Murdock (2007), the authors of *Psychology of Academic Cheating* concur with Blum's assessment, stating that the **"**data also suggest that students who are less confident that they can master a given task are also more likely to cheat" (p. 19).

> "Academic cheating does not occur without a reason. Students generally
> don't cheat 'for the fun of it'; rather, cheating often is motivated by specific
> individual difference variables, by contextual factors, or by interactions
> between individual differences and social contexts" (p. 87).

These authors conclude that when students are able to master the skill of avoiding plagiarism, they are less likely to plagiarize. In fact, once they have mastered the skill, students see plagiarizing as a detriment to their education goal (93).

This same attitude was found in Bowers' study according to Callahan (2004) as students saw college as a place to master skills and as "a training ground for moral and intellectual development" (p. 216). Callahan further supported Blum's findings of plagiarism not having consequences. "Most academic cheating does, in fact, go

unpunished. . . . [with] few consequences for those suspected of cheating" (p. 229).

For example,

> "in a 1999 survey of 1,000 faculty at twenty-two colleges, a third of [the]
> professors said they were aware of cheating in their classes but didn't stop it.
> Likewise, in an earlier survey of student-affairs administrators in colleges
> across the United States, 60 percent reported that faculty at their schools
> tended to handle incidents of cheating independently and not subject student
> violations to formal disciplinary actions. Many professors would rather let
> cheaters slide than take on the bureaucratic hassles of pursuing disciplinary
> actions" (p. 229).

When it comes to the ethical issues of learning right from wrong and being shown
how to master the skills of avoiding plagiarism these experts are telling us that it is
the responsibility of institution and the students' teachers to lead the way. In fact,
"[s]tudents want their instructors to take action against cheaters. They view faculty
members' refusal to confront it as unethical" (Whitley & Keith-Spiegel, 2002, p. 9).

Creating the Ethical Academy, a text edited by Tricia Bertram Gallant in
2011, is a journal-like text that argues for academia not only for better understanding
of the ethical problems academia faces, but to "raise awareness about *academic ethics
as a systemic issues that is broader than (but inclusive of) individual ethical failures
. . .* [and] to address [the academy's] continuing academic ethics crisis" (pp. 7, 9).
Another scholar believes that "faculty who allow dishonesty are morally responsible
for their students' actions" (Parameswaran, 2007, p. 263).

So, if as Blum states that we cannot treat plagiarism from the platform of

morality, then does it get treated as a rule that has consequences? In the non-academic world, plagiarism can mean the loss of an income due to the loss of a job; it can mean students who do not get accepted into college; it can mean institutions such as academia, newspapers, and television stations, along with individuals who are given a black-eye by society, which in the long run can mean a decrease of sales. Plagiarism in the real world results in law suits, court appearances, and fines. So, why should we not teach our students the reality of the real world by teaching them that plagiarism has severe consequences? If we, as instructors, do not teach our students how to master the skill of avoiding plagiarism, do we not do them a disservice as we ready them for that real world?

Teacher- and Teaching-Based Literature

Here, we arrive back at the role of the teacher and how the instructor is trained or perceived to be trained before they enter the classroom. There is a plethora of books and articles both in journals, online academic magazines, and newsletters that address the plagiarism issue and how teachers can create better assignments that will help eliminate plagiarism. Overall, the literature identifies that we, as instructors, need to do more, particularly in our writing assignments. What the literature does not identify clearly, however, as I have discovered in my research and review of the literature, is how our pedagogy is evaluated to ensure that we are providing our students with the necessary skills so that they can master the skills of avoiding plagiarism.

Ann Lathrop, a Professor Emerita from California State University, and Kathleen Foss, a high school Media Specialist with the Los Alamitos United School

District in California, are two prolific authors in this subject of plagiarism. Both authors worked in school libraries. Their book, *Student Cheating and Plagiarism in the Internet Era: A Wake-Up Call* (2000)*,* is a how-to text for parents, teachers, and administrators. A useful book, it includes pages that the reader is encouraged to copy and use. Foss writes of her first-hand experience with a student who plagiarized, which drew Foss and Lathrop into researching the topic for a paper. That paper eventually grew into the text listed above. What this particular book does that others do not is pull the librarian into the mix, even though the text centers on students and instructors. Thus, plagiarism is seen through a different lens, the lens of the librarian. Like many pedagogy texts, there is a specific chapter that provides tools to avoiding plagiarism, which tells instructors to better construct their assignments so that it becomes difficult for students to plagiarize (p. 184). Also, the authors ask instructors to not make assumptions about their students. "Things that are common knowledge to adults . . . might not be known to middle school students. **Teachers tend to assume that students know more than they do** [my emphasis]. When assigning research reports, however, teachers should assume that their students know virtually nothing about the topic**"** (p. 185).

Another book authored by Lathrop and Foss (2005), *Guiding Students from Cheating and Plagiarism to Honesty and Integrity: Strategies for Changes*, once again provides pages that are encouraged to be copied with the words "copy me" at the top, giving instructors automatic permission to use and share the information with their students, administrators, and parents. An anthology of articles from various authors, this text says nothing about unintentional plagiarism, which includes time

management and the lazy student, although there is an article in the text entitled, "'The Dog Ate It'—Conquering Homework Hassles" (62). A claim made by one of their authors is that "[i]t's the adults, not the kids, who have the greatest responsibility to create an ethical culture that nurtures the virtues of honor, honesty, and fairness" (p. 10). Lathrop and Foss' texts are not about placing blame, but rather providing teachers and administrators with tools in which they can make a difference with their students, in their schools. The common theme that runs through both books is about the writing process and getting students fully engaged in that process, with scaffolded due dates, "designed to make the *process* as important as the final paper, or *product"* (Lathrop & Foss, 2005, p. 38). One important survey that Lathrop and Ross did is provided with the results as another "copy me" page, which is encouraged to be used for class discussion. For example, one question is "How many of YOUR teachers have discussed cheating on tests and assignments in one or more of your classes this year?" Another question is "Do you know what your Student Handbook says about cheating and plagiarism?" These sheets include survey responses to engage discussion, and blank survey forms are also included as an appendix so that instructors can survey their own students. From their library point of view, Lathrop and Foss believe that the problem of plagiarism is across all disciplines and state that "[i]f we were to change student culture, we had to change teacher culture. The problem was not a language arts problem—it ran across disciplines" (p. 123). They believe that teachers, parents, and administrators need to "[t]each the skills students need to have confidence in their own research abilities" (p. 143) and "[p]rovide guided practice" (p. 144) as students learn to avoid plagiarism and use sources

correctly. One innovative suggestion Lathrop and Foss make is that instead of

grading the final paper, "grade the research *process"* (p. 165).

Another prominent plagiarism expert is Barry Gilmore. A past president of

the Tennessee Council of Teachers of English, Gilmore teaches English at Lausanne

Collegiate School in Memphis. Chapters in his book, *Plagiarism* (2008) include how

students plagiarize, why they do it, and how their plagiarism should be treated.

Additionally, Gilmore advocates that we need to give students better tools to prevent

plagiarism, and that we have an obligation to write better assignments, providing

clear assessments that insure students construct original work.

Gilmore (2008) believes that few students plagiarize intentionally (p. 4) and

that we shouldn't consider plagiarism a "disease" (p. 5) where we punish the students,

but instead help our students understand why and how they are plagiarize; and, to do

this well, involves everyone—teachers, parents, and administrators (p. 8). Gilmore

believes that Turnitin.com appears to be working, helping students find their

plagiarism (p. 19), although Donald McCabe suggests that Turnitin be used as a

learning tool (p. 20). Just as Lathrop and Foss recommend scaffolding parts of a

writing assignment, so does Gilmore (p. 24).

For Gilmore (2008), his bottom line question is do students really get what it

means not to plagiarize? (p. 48). By asking that question, he is placing the

responsibility of a student's learning on the teacher, despite teachers he talked with

stating their belief that "plagiarism is simply the product of laziness" (48). This

supposition is backed up by the questions Gilmore then asks of the instructor: Is the

assignment clear? Steps understood? Are expectations adequate? Does the weight

of the assignment create tension that can lead to plagiarism? Are students able to ask questions? (p. 50). Gilmore does state that there can exist an ethical gap as "teachers assume that students share their values or should" (51), and believes that discussions need to take place to discover where the gaps of understanding really reside. Once the gap is identified, then the real teaching begins, and where "students take ownership of assignments rather than be owned by them, plagiarism is less likely to occur. School culture—and classroom culture—can promote plagiarism or work to prevent it" (p. 74).

Another important text is Bernard E. Whitley, Jr. and Patricia Keith-Splegel's, *Academic Dishonesty: An Educator's Guide,* published in 2001. A rather small book, in its total text length of 150 pages, the book provides practical advice for both instructors and administrators in how to help students avoid plagiarism. Whitley and Splegel believe that pressure on students needs to be lessened for high grades, using a variety of ways to prove that learning has occurred (p. 65), and allowing students the opportunity to retake a test or rewrite a paper in order to "enhance learning" (p.67). While the bulk of the text addresses instructors and engaging students in the learning, the last part of the text is addressed to administrators and institutions, proclaiming that academic integrity is an institutional problem but "well worth the effort" when changes are made to help the instructors better teach and engage the students in the learning process (p. 155).

Laura Hennessey DeSena, an adjunct assistant professor, wrote *Preventing Plagiarism*: *Tips and Techniques*, in 2007 for instructors who want to help their students avoid plagiarism. While not a lengthy book, the pages are specific and point

toward teacher strategies for making assignments, tools to use in identifying

plagiarism, how sources are supposed to be used by students in their writing—in

particular, quoting, paraphrasing, using hybrid quotes, using primary sources over

secondary sources—how to look at readings critically, how to form their own

opinions and then write about them using sources to back up their own ideas.

Importantly, the text stresses the reasons why students are writing academic papers in

college, an issue that is often not explained. "All too often teachers emphasize the

content" (p. 2) rather than offering students the importance of their being able to enter

in to the conversation that is taking place in publications. "Students are so used to

receiving information . . . [that] we need to teach them how to interpret and respond"

(p. 3).

　　　　While *Cheating in School* could be well placed under the literature category of

ethics, this text equally addresses pedagogy. In particular, the chapter, "The Call for

Action and Wisdom: Conversations That Make a Difference" provides scripts that

could be used when confronting a student about plagiarism or cheating. Not only are

these scripts for teacher-to-student and teacher-to-teacher, but also for teacher-to-

parent, administrator-to-parent, and school president-to board member (Davis, Drinan

& Gallant, 2009, pp. 167-188).

　　　　Caroline Eisner and Martha Vicinus (2008), both having served as directors of

the Sweetland Writing Center at the University of Michigan edited the book,

Originality, Imitation, and Plagiarism: Teaching Writing in the Digital Age. "When

students plagiarize, are they 'stealing'? Or are they merely demonstrating their lack

of engagement with 'the academic community'?" (p. 195) so begins one of the

chapters. One third of the book is devoted directly toward plagiarism and deals with

the history of plagiarism, Turnitin.com, writing plagiarism-proof assignments,

international policies regarding plagiarism, and what constitutes common knowledge.

One chapter proposes that students plagiarize because

> they have not mastered the norms of scholarly writing and therefore do not see
>
> themselves as full participants in that community of writers. . . . [that] most
>
> teachers assume that students do understand academic norms, but they simply
>
> choose not to recognize or act on them (p. 195).

Another chapter entitled, "Plagiarism-Proof Assignments" states that when

> students write from *inside* the problem, issue, or literary or historical work at
>
> hand, they operate as engaged participants rather than as alien outsiders whose
>
> understanding comes through what others—sometimes centuries of others—
>
> have had to say on the subject (p. 210).

A number of articles that come from various publications talk about how we

should be teaching our students. For example, Rob Jenkins (2011), an associate

professor of English at Goergia Perimeter College states that plagiarism "is making us

crazy" (para. 1) and that it is his "primary responsibility to help students learn to write

better" (para. 5). We "need to discuss plagiarism with [our] students (para. 7) . . .

[and talk] candidly about plagiarism on the first day of class" (para. 8). Another

instructor talks about how she provides an activity in her class where the students

create an original drawing and then each student is informed that if they prefer

someone else's drawing, they can take it, and cross off the original drawer's name

and insert their own and turn it in for their own grade. When the students object to

their work being stolen, she then talks to them about using the words of others without attribution (Miller, 2012). Donald McCabe (2001) claims that "[s]tudents are looking to their teachers and schools to take the lead" (para. 26). Two Australian professors state that teaching how to avoid plagiarism during their first year of college is not enough, but that "repetition and reinforcement, particularly within a discipline context, is required for skills to be effectively embedded in students' long-term memory" (McGowan & Lightbody, 2011, p.285).

A section on pedagogy would not be complete without the mention of Rebecca Moore Howard, whose work coined the term *patchwriting*, which occurs when someone copies text but substitutes a few words here and there, but maintains most of the words and sentence structure. Howard claims "patchwriting is often a move toward membership in a discourse community, a means of learning unfamiliar language and ideas. Far from indicating a lack of respect for a source text, [students'] patchwriting is a gesture of reverence" (qtd. Blum, 2009, p. 26), and a "*necessary stage in student learning*" (p. 26). If Howard is right about patchwriting as a necessary step to learning how to avoid plagiarism, then where do the steps of learning how to paraphrase and rewrite properly enter a student's education? Does the gap of learning how to avoid plagiarism occur here—between high school and college—for students? *Pluralizing Plagiarism: Identities, Contexts, Pedagogies*, edited by both Howard and Amy E. Robillard (2008), tackles these questions and more as plagiarism is contextualized and identified as problematic across the curriculum, in writing centers, with graduate students, from cultural lenses, and shared by teachers with institutions. Kathleen Blake Yancey, who writes the chapter,

"Beyond Plagiarism," states that "plagiarism is a symptom, not a cause" (p. 159). If plagiarism is a symptom, then what is the real problem or cause and who is responsible for its cure?

So, if patchwriting is an acceptable first-approach to using sources, where is the pedagogy that shows instructors how to move from patchwriting to proper paraphrasing? From my own experiences in the classroom, it is patchwriting that students bring into the college classroom, without understanding how patchwriting leads to plagiarism. Additionally, far too often, I have had transfer students in advanced composition classes who have never used sources or have written a research paper in the composition class they took at another college. If Yancey is correct in her statement that plagiarism is not the cause, then what is? Who is?

When Confronting Plagiarism

The following articles are important literature because these instructors were expressing their frustration when finding their students plagiarizing. In my research, I have found that these instructors prefer to tell their stories in publications that provide less theory and more revelation. I find these publications practical and personal, because the instructors are sharing their experiences or sometimes warning us. There is no theory discussed, but rather a simple narrative of what happened. Their stories of plagiarism encountered are heart-felt and honest. While I have had the good fortune of having strong support from my institution regarding the handling of plagiarism once I report it, the same cannot be said for all instructors and all institutions. In some instances, instructors are telling how the plagiarism occurred and how they handled the problem. Sadly, in other instances, the instructor confides

how they tried to do the right thing by holding the student accountable for their

plagiarism, but then the institution blamed the instructor rather than the student. As a

result, the instructor has come to the conclusion that they will ignore all plagiarism in

the future, because the event either was so frustrating that they felt they were

alienating the students or because they nearly lost their job because their institution

sided with the student(s).

For example, Katherine Gekker (2012) provides a narrative as a new

instructor and her encounter with plagiarism in that first semester. For Gekker, the

experience was a good one as the student realized that she was "expecting too much

of [herself]" (qtd., para.20). Another instructor reports that a teacher friend felt that

"plagiarism was turning him into a cop" (Staples, 2010, para. 1). One instructor

"argues that faculty should act as educators, rather than as detectives" (Scanlon, 2003,

p. 161).

Yet another instructor, states that plagiarism is "a disease that plagues college

instructors everywhere" (Drum, 1986, p. 241) and that "[w]hen students fail to

comply honestly with an assignment, the pedagogical process breaks down" (p. 242).

As a result, Drum believes that administration should not be handling the plagiarism

in first-year composition classes, but that the instructor should be turning the

plagiarism into a learning experience for the student rather than having the plagiarism

reported (p. 243). Two instructors in the Netherlands agree with this methodology,

stating that they "believe that prevention is better than punished and that we should

approach rookies and senior students differently" (den Ouden & van Wijk, 2011, p.

197).

The stories of these plagiarism encounters and the teachers' frustration are numerous. During the last five years as I became interested in the topic and then began collecting literature, I noticed that generally there would be an article each month in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* or in *Inside Higher Education*. As I began reading the comments left by readers in the online versions, I began to see that many instructors are frustrated at the high level of plagiarism. So, if there is so much frustration from these instructors, why does that frustration continue? If these instructors are making changes in their classes, why are there still so many students who are plagiarizing?

Institutional-Directed Literature

While there is no one text that is directed specifically and only toward institutions, many texts address the need for institutions to become involved in the plagiarism issue and to take a leadership role. In my teaching experience, I found I was pretty much on my own when it came to plagiarism and how it would be taught. In fact, I cannot recall that plagiarism was addressed in the pedagogy classes I took or in our class texts. As a beginning teacher, no one ever checked to see if I was teaching students how to avoid plagiarism. In classes I took, pedagogy theory, how to teach the process of writing was taught. Likewise, I found the academic integrity statements in syllabi as generic or non-existent in the classes I took. Is it, then, any wonder that our students are confused about what plagiarism means?

Too often, there are instructors who will no longer address plagiarism when it occurs in their classrooms because their institution(s) do not support the instructors (Parry, 2011; Bashin, 2011). In another example, David Callahan tells how "I met a

college professor who had gone after a plagiarizing student—in an ethics class, no less—even though his institution made it clear that if he got sued by the student, he was on his own. Faculty are afraid to do the right thing, he said" (Callahan, 2004, p. 297). From another perspective, before the advent of Internet plagiarism detection programs, checking papers for plagiarism was too much work. Before the use of Turnitin.com and other policing tools, "teachers would turn the other cheek to plagiarism and cheating" (Howard & Robillard, 2008, p. 37).

On the other hand, the "placement of an institutional policy on plagiarism does not guarantee that it is understood and accepted by students and faculty" (Wang, 2008, p. 751). While teachers want a written policy and direction from their institutions, they also want to know how the administration is going to respond, with consequences in place that provide support for themselves, as the teachers, (Gilmore, 2008, p. 57), but more importantly, provide students the opportunity to learn, which is the chief concern of teachers (p. 61). Gilmore goes on to say that each institution needs a written definition of plagiarism, that educators cannot assume that students know and understand what it means to plagiarize (p. 2).

Lathrop and Foss (2005) believe that "[c]reating a school culture of honesty and integrity requires the commitment of parents, School Board members, administrators, teachers, staff, parents, and students" (p. 37). Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (2002) explain that "[t]o be effective, an academic integrity policy must clearly specify the responsibilities of students, faculty members, and administrators" (p. 131), and that "[t]he policy must also specify procedures for formal resolution of allegations of dishonesty" (p. 132) and that "[t]he policy should clearly state the

penalties that instructors are allowed to impose without going through the formal

process and the conditions under which they can be imposed" (p. 133).

Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (2002) author one of the few texts that discusses

the training of an institution's educators, saying that

[t]training . . . is an important part of any academic integrity program . . . [and

that] training for all newly hired graduate teaching assistants and faculty

members, and refresher training can be offered periodically for all instructors.

Such training is especially important for graduate students who teach their

own courses (p. 141).

The authors go on to say that "[d]epartment chairs, especially, can play an important

role in encouraging faculty to maintain academic integrity in the classroom and to

support those who detect and confront it" (p. 142).

Learning-oriented institutions evaluate their success in terms of student

learning and intellectual development; product-oriented institutions are more

concerned with quantity: the number of students 'processed,' the amount of

grant money obtained by faculty, the amount of revenue generated by the

athletic program, and so forth (p. 150).

Plagiarism within the academic walls are also being ignored. In one example,

"[i]n 2003 the American Historical Association made a decision to stop ruling about

plagiarism in its journals" (Blum, 2009, p. 19). What message does this send to

others in academia? Instead, "[d]eveloping and implementing an Academic Integrity

Policy is an important step in [an institution's] attempt to control cheating and

plagiarism" (Lathrop & Foss, 2000, p. 92).

Research on cheating at the college and university level indicates [that] a

policy can, in fact, make a significant difference. . . . [and] a major factor

determining whether a student will cheat or not is the academic culture of the

specific institution that he or she attends (p. 93),

and how the institution follows-up, implementing the policy.

Finally, the basis of Howard and Robillard's (2008) argument is that

plagiarism cannot be "universalized" (p. 2), that solutions are not a one-size fits all,

that no Internet detection program can solve or fix the problem of plagiarism (p. 16-

17). These two plagiarism experts ask, so why do we "choose punishment over

pedagogy"? (p. 17). Plagiarism affects everyone, not just the student; it affects other

students, instructors, administration, and the institution (Davis, Drinan, & Gallant,

2009, p. 14). Ignoring plagiarism is not the answer either, for "[w]hen teachers turn a

blind eye to plagiarism, it undermines that right [of students expecting fair treatment

in the classroom] and denigrates grades, degrees, and even institutions" (Lathrop &

Foss, 2000, p. 59).

So, if Howard and Robillard are correct in that teaching students how to avoid

plagiarism cannot be universalized, then what are students to do? Is it really fair to

ask them to shoulder the burden of responsibility for knowing how to avoid

plagiarism when they believe they have been taught properly? If there is a copyright

law that our country abides to and is uphead in our court system, is it really

impossible for academia to come together to create a universal policy that any

teaching facility could use and follow that mimics copyright law? Is it not possible

for institutions to assume more responsibility for ensuring their teachers know proper

use of sources, which in turn ensures that they are teaching their students correctly?

Current Important Literature

One important source of current information about plagiarism, who is plagiarizing, and the court battles over copyright infringement belongs to Jonathan Bailey, the founder and author of *Plagiarism Today*, an online, daily newsletter about copyright and plagiarism issues. Bailey reports who's in the news, how the problem evolved, how it's being resolved, court outcomes, what those outcomes mean to the public, and so forth. By subscribing to this daily newsletter, I have become more informed, more educated, and more interested in this topic of plagiarism. For example, terminology I was unaware of, let alone understanding its importance in the public sector include the following:

- DMCA – The Digital Millennium Copyright Act, which on October 28, 1998, was signed by President Clinton and is a U.S. agreement with two treaties created earlier by the WIPO.

- WIPO – World Intellectual Property Organization

- SOPA – Stop Online Piracy Act

- PRO-IP Act – Prioritizing Resources and Organization for Intellectual Property Act

- COICA – Combating Online Infringement and Counterfeits Act, which in 2010 was proposed by Senator Patrick Leahy and Senator Orrin Hatch. It was then reconstructed and rewritten, becoming the PROTECT IP Act.

- PIPA – Protect IP Act - IP being Intellectual Property

Student plagiarism is as important as commercial plagiarism because it becomes central to the issues surrounding a university system being re-evaluated in another country, to our students who are watching news anchors, high-positioned academics, and Pulitzer-prized writers either losing their jobs or the respect of their peers—or both—as plagiarism comes to the forefront of these various situations and events. Troubling most of all, though, is that through this constant feed of news events and various accounts of plagiarism, there appears to be a common theme: many of these plagiarisms are not coming from the current works of these professionals, but from the work they did years previous, sometimes decades before, in their college dissertations and thesis papers that admirers are going back to examine how these people began their careers. Two such examples are Martin Luther King (Pappas, 1998) and Elizabeth Paige Laurie, the granddaughter of Bud Walton of Wal-Mart fame ("People," 2005).

Other examples of important topics that Bailey's daily newsletter has reported include the issues that covers five different ways plagiarists act when caught (2011, July 28), if there can be life after plagiarism and whether the plagiarism can be forgiven or forgotten (2012, January 10), the three reasons main reasons when an instructor needs to suspect a student of plagiarism (2011, June 28), what role copyright has in the battle of plagiarism (2011, July 5; 2011, July 7), how to understand and what we can do when plagiarism is not illegal (2012, April 17), and clarifying the three copyright myths in simple language (n.d.).

So, if this plagiarism problem is a serious academic and public sector issue, why is there not more connection between these two sectors, because I have yet to see

Bailey's name appear in journal articles. By the same token, I do not recall Bailey

talking about important academic experts unless it is in relationship to a discussion

about a plagiarism conference where presentations were made by these experts.

While it is easy to understand that these two sectors have important separate roles,

these two sectors intersect with our students. As instructors, then, how can we

become better informed about real world events that do concern or will concern our

students?

Student-Based Literature

One example of literature available to students is the *Quick Coach Guide to

Avoiding Plagiarism*, a thin supplemental guide of 58 pages, written by Rosemary

Menager and Lyn Paulos (2009). An extremely thin text that is offered as a

supplemental text by Cengage Learning, it is one of the few texts that speaks directly

to students, and shows students how to use sources correctly. This thin guidebook is

typical of other small supplement guidebooks offered by textbook publishers.

However, how many of these little texts are required for students or are purchased by

students? If I were to make a determination based on the number my institution

purchases or requires, I would have to say, next to none.

The only other real literature that is student-based outside of texts that

instructors have their students purchase for specific writing classes, such as a

composition textbook for example, is the punctuation and grammar handbook often

required of students in many composition classes. These are the texts that show

students how to use grammar and punctuation properly; however, even these texts are

flawed when it comes to plagiarism interpretations. While these texts will discuss

plagiarism, the pages are far too often brief, as in one or two pages, and offer no visual examples of correct paraphrasing and rewriting. Instead, these texts *tell* students to use their own words when paraphrasing and rewriting. The problem for students is understanding the concept of *using their own words.* Without visual comparisons of proper and improper paraphrasing, rewriting, and use of quotes and citations, students are unable to *see* where their work is creating plagiarism rather than avoiding it as they are inclined to believe.

Here, in the student-based literature section, according to my research, is a major gap in the literature. While there has always been a plethora of handbooks offered by a multitude of textbook publishers, there are virtually few books written expressly for students that demonstrate the proper use of citations, particularly in the use of paraphrase and rewriting. When I began teaching accredited composition classes, in some handbooks, plagiarism was not even discussed. Today, most all handbooks do discuss plagiarism and how to avoid it, but few demonstrate, providing those visual examples that students need. Without seeing a visual display of what constitutes using *their own words*, students will continue to plagiarize believing they are using their own words, when in reality, they are not.

So, why is this gap important to my study that is an examination of instructors and how they teach plagiarism? **If teachers have no examples made readily available to them, how can they be assured that what they are teaching is correct?** Since teachers are not currently tested as to what they know, how can they be sure what they know was taught to them correctly? Not only would these books be a help to students, but I have to believe they would also be instructive to their

teachers.

The next three chapters continue to explore this gap in the literature. In Chapter III, I will describe my methodology as I investigated this problem. This chapter will also demonstrate the proper use of sources in those areas that are most problematic for students and these are in the areas of paraphrasing and rewriting. Chapter IV will present research I have gathered from instructors. In Chapter IV, I will describe my participants, their backgrounds, how and when they learned about avoiding plagiarism, how they teach it, and their views about their students when plagiarism occurs, how they would feel should they discover that their current teaching of how to avoid plagiarism is incorrect, and more. Chapter V concludes this study by summarizing where we currently stand with this plagiarism issue and where we need to go from here, as teachers and as an academic community. "If we want *them* [students] to understand what we ask of them, *we* [teachers and administration] need to understand it first" (Blum, 2009, p. 172).

It is this gap between what we learned as students and what we now teach as instructors, which this study focuses upon: the instructor's point of view. Conducting a study from this perspective, I hope to discover if there is indeed a disconnection between what instructors teach in how to avoid plagiarism and what is learned by the students, and if so, how wide is the disconnection.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY: THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE STUDY

"A single event can awaken within us a stranger totally unknown to us."
                            Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, *Flight to Arras* (translated)

Often, we do not recognize the significance a small event can have on us. When I look back on my journey, I realize now that the event of having my own plagiarism pointed out to me made me examine and discover what I thought I had known was really not known by me. Then, soon after, as an adjunct instructor and graduate TA, I began investigating with my students how they learned to use sources. I discovered that I was not alone in that learning. So why did our learning stop at patchwriting? What teaching should have occurred after that? More importantly, who should have been teaching us how to use sources properly?

From the beginning, my desire for my research was to examine teachers up close, so choosing the case-study methodology was the obvious choice. To that end, this chapter will provide my goal for this study, the methodology steps I took to obtain my research, the sub questions that were presented to the research participants, and then finally, I will provide terminology I have developed for the purpose of this study.

Goal and Purpose

My primary goal for this study is to focus the lens of the plagiarism problem that plagues our college classrooms on the teachers rather than the students. The question that led me to this focus was *if students do not know what they do not know,*

could that same principle be applied to teachers, as well? Is it possible that teachers do not know either?

Guiding Question

The guiding question for this study is to discover what do instructors understand, what do they know about avoiding plagiarism? What teaching did they receive in how to use sources? My purpose is not to point a finger and place blame but rather to try to understand why plagiarism is so rampant in our classrooms. If there is a disconnection in students being able to understand how to use sources correctly, where does that disconnection lie? Is it hidden from view because the spotlight has been focused on the outcome—the students—rather than on a probable cause located elsewhere in academia?

Sub Questions

The questions that came out of the guiding question or my primary goal are:

- How do teachers determine the effectiveness of their teaching? How do teachers know that they have taught students effectively in avoiding plagiarism?

- How are students assessed to determine if the teaching was learned?

- What happens when teachers encounter plagiarism? How does the teacher feel about their teaching when they come across plagiarism among their students' writings? How do they react?

- Do instructors have support from their schools when plagiarism is encountered? Are there specific policies their institution demands they

follow when plagiarism occurs or is the instructor left on their own to deal
with the situation?

- Do instructors consider being pro-active in addressing plagiarism important
to their classroom teaching?

- How do teachers structure their writing assignments to enable students to
create original writings, thus helping them avoid plagiarism?

My goal in seeking answers to these questions as sub questions is to discover exactly
what goes on in the classroom and what instructors do or not do to help students
avoid plagiarism, and more importantly what happens once plagiarism does occur.

If students admit that they plagiarize from a lack of understanding or because
they do not see the importance of creating plagiarism-free writings, then clearly
asking questions that examine how instructors teach plagiarism is important to
understanding how teachers can satisfy this lacking student skill. As a result, the
purpose of these questions is to place the spotlight on teachers. Because there is a
gap in the literature that demonstrates what the correct avoidance of plagiarism looks
like, with specific examples, for both instructors and students, and because there is a
lack of discussion that focuses on examining *how* instructors teach students to avoid
plagiarism directly and specifically, these questions will attempt to examine teachers
as a case-study situation.

Because instructors are not required to demonstrate what they know when it
comes to avoiding plagiarism, these questions are intended to discover if there could
be a problem at the classroom level that is not owned solely by the students. Because
teachers are not tested in their knowledge of how to avoid plagiarism, the assumption

is that they do know how to teach students correctly because they are a degreed instructor. Therefore, the purpose of these questions will examine what do instructors understand about avoiding plagiarism, what is their definition of plagiarism, how to teach it, what does that teaching look like, and how to they react to it when they see it.

The Case Study Methodology

I chose to utilize the case-study approach, as I wanted a "bounded system" or a system that is contained to a certain arena (Cresswell, 2007, p. 73), which was college instructors. I also chose the case-study approach because I wanted instructors to have an opportunity to explain their answers, to provide them an opportunity to speak from their experiences, their values, their truths about plagiarism. While this study is a case-study approach, there will be a touch of the phenomenological approach as participants in this initial survey are being asked to discuss plagiarism as to "how they perceive it, describe it, feel about it, judge it, remember it, make sense of it, and talk about it with others" (qtd. and cited in Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 19). I wanted instructors to talk about their learning and their own teaching. Also, I wanted to create a study where instructors, unknown to me, could choose to volunteer and participate rather than my recruiting them directly, as in a e-mail; I wanted participants to come into the study on their own because they were interested in the topic. Basically, I wanted to attract instructors with whom I had no familiarity regarding their teaching.

Subject Recruitment

My original goal was to recruit first-year composition teachers, whether they had taught composition in the past or were currently teaching it. Ideally, the instructors would have been full-time faculty. Instructors were made aware of the study by my making a *Call for Papers* announcement and by my going into various teaching forums, such as those on LinkedIn and NCTE's website and posting an announcement, inviting instructors to participate in the study. Shortly after the survey was posted online through Survey Monkey, I realized that rather than attracting full-time faculty only, I was also attracting adjunct instructors, and graduate teaching assistants who wanted to participate. I had two such instructors contacting me through e-mail, expressing their interest in the survey, letting me know that if I were to include adjuncts or graduate assistants in a future project that I was to contact them. As a result of this additional interest, these additional rankings of adjunct instructors and graduate teaching assistants were included. In conclusion, the categories of instructors are: full-time tenured, full-time non-tenured, part-time, adjunct, and graduate teaching assistant.

While initially I had considered case study from the lens of only full-time faculty and only those currently teaching composition, with few of those instructors responding—only two at the time with others as adjuncts and graduate instructors—I had to rethink the lens concentration. With the lens now widening to include adjunct instructors and graduate teaching assistants, I was curious as to whether there would be wide discrepancies. Would the disconnection between what is taught and what students learn show up with just graduate teaching assistants or adjunct instructors;

or was it possible that these instructors would be more thorough in their teaching and it would be with tenured full-time instructors where the disconnection would occur? Would all their experiences be the same or would they be somewhat similar? Would all of the instructors feel the same frustration or would some of these categorized instructors be more frustrated than others?

As a case-study methodology, the focus was on personal qualitative responses rather than a large quantitative survey. As to the size of the sampling, Marshall and Rossman (2006) state that "a small sample would be useful as thick cultural description" (p.103). Additionally, the goal was to enable participants to be involved in the study but without requiring time sacrificed to their responses. As a result, Phase I was designed to take no more than an hour of the participants' time. Phase II was designed to take no more a couple hours of the participants' time due to their crowded schedules. The more time I required from them in answering the questions, the less likely they would be to participate. While participants were able to remain anonymous in Phase I, an online survey, in order to participant in Phase II, a survey instigated and conducted through e-mail, participants would need to provide their name and e-mail address. The details regarding the survey instrumentation, and in particular for Phase I and Phase II, are described below and in more detail.

While at the beginning of the study the intent was to attract full-time faculty who were composition instructors, once instructors began participating, there were few of these desired instructors and more who were adjunct, part-time, or graduate teaching assistants, so it was decided that the case study would include these individuals, with appropriate protocol permission obtained.

In the end, I chose this particular method of study because it will "illuminate in detail larger [educational] forces while focusing on individuals" (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p.7). With this focus, Marshall and Rossman claim that the case study can reveal a "larger phenomenon" (p. 7). While a lot of studies focus on students, asking why they plagiarize, few studies look at the teachers to see if there is a connection between how they teach the subject of plagiarism and why students plagiarize. Therefore, this study performs a lens shift by focusing on the teachers and their teaching.

Survey Instrumentation

As I considered how I would attract participants, I first had to reflect on how I wanted to survey them. The goal was to inconvenience them as little as possible due to their busy schedules yet the desire was to acquire qualitative research as "a means for exploring and understanding the meaning of individual or groups ascribed to a social or human problem" (Creswell, 2009, p. 4). In particular, the desire was to obtain heart-felt and honest responses regarding the issues these participants face in their classroom when faced with plagiarism, but without placing blame anywhere. As a result, the short-essay response survey became the preferred data collection method.

The survey was composed of two parts: Phase I as an online survey with about eight short-answer essay questions, with minimum background data collected, and with a short exercise activity involving two multiple-choice questions; and, Phase II as e-mail survey that asked participants to respond to a dozen short essays. Later in this chapter, a more detailed explanation is provided for both Phase I and II, along with a more detailed purpose of each phase. The questions were designed to obtain

information from teachers as to whether they have had training regarding the teaching

of how to avoid plagiarism, how they teach it, and how they evaluate that teaching.

Additional questions asked whether there is any support from the teachers' superiors

regarding a plagiarism policy or if that policy is left up to the individual instructors

(see Appendix E).

By using open-ended questions requiring short-answer responses, I was

inviting participants to share their experiences, in their own words, providing

narratives. This multi-dimensional approach of both teaching levels, English and

non-English instructors, will allow "multiple sources of information" (Creswell,

2007, p. 75) so that the information gathered will provide deeper meaning (p. 246).

The goal was to get a good representation of what plagiarism teaching looks like from

different types of institutions to determine if there are initial differences or

commonalities. Therefore, "purposeful sampling" (p. 75) was employed in

conjunction with this multiple-dimensional approach of an anonymous online survey

first in Phase I, and then later in Phase II with a survey conducted through e-mail. In

particular, this case study is an instrumental case study "with the focus on a specific

issue rather than on the case itself" (p. 245). The focus of this case study is on the

issue of how plagiarism is taught and how its successful teaching is measured, not on

the particular students who have plagiarized. Consequently, the particular questions

that were asked are turning the lens' focus on the instructors. The questions

pertaining to each phase that were provided to the participants are listed below.

Phase I – online survey questions & short activity.
Ideally, I wanted to attract no more than 100 instructors to participate in Phase

I of my study, which would be an online survey, and where instructor identities were anonymous. Also, the online format was chosen to allow participants to utilize their own computers, whether at work or at home. To attract participants, the study was announced as a *Call for Participation* through the University of Pennsylvania website, http://call-for-papers.sas.upenn.edu/. Additionally, the study was announced online at various teaching forums, including the LinkedIn NCTE forum and teaching English forums on the official NCTE website. This online survey was conducted through a third-party survey website, Survey Monkey. This website was chosen for its ease of use for the participants, and particularly for the website's ability to gather data and place it conveniently into a spreadsheet for the data collector.

At the start of the survey, participants provided minimal background informational data (detailed below), which allowed me to determine how they were qualified. In particular, all participants were asked if they have taught freshman composition or not and if they were currently teaching it or had taught it in the past. Participants were then asked to answer eight short-essay questions. Following that portion of the survey, participants were then asked to read a short paragraph. Based on the paragraph, they were asked two questions that provided them five multiple-choice options each. The first of these two multiple-choice questions asked the participants to choose the correct paragraph. The second multiple-choice question asked participants to choose the correct rewrite.

Informational data requested.
At the start of the online survey, informational data was collected that allowed me to categorize the participant. The data that was collected is as follows:

- Whether the participant has taught composition or not

- Whether the participant has taught at least 4 semester of composition or not

- Whether the participant teaches at a 2-year college or at a 4-year university

- Whether the participant teaches at a private or public institution

- Whether the participant is a full-time faculty member, an adjunct instructor, or graduate teaching assistant

My goal in asking for this information was to determine if a participant's location, ranking, or length of composition experience would make a difference as to how the instructor teaches students how to avoid plagiarism.

Online survey short response essays questions.
Then, participants were asked to provide short answer responses to the following questions:

- Please describe how, when, and where you were taught to avoid plagiarism. What was the extent of that experience?

- How do you pro-actively address plagiarism in the classroom? For example, do you have a plan to address how to avoid plagiarism from the beginning or do you not have a plan at all and wait to see plagiarism occurring before you address it?

- Do you worry that plagiarism in your students' writings might be seen as a reflection of your teaching? If so, how?

- How do you show your interest in helping the student who is plagiarizing or struggling to understand the concept? Are you willing to put in the time? If so, how? Or do you feel frustrating that you don't have the time to spare to help them? If so, what are those frustrations in particular?

- How do you react when you see plagiarism occur? Do you take it personally? Are you disappointed or frustrated?

- What procedures do you take to deal with plagiarism once it occurs? Do the procedures stay inside the classroom, or are there institutional procedures that you are obligated to follow despite your own feelings or beliefs? Are the procedures known to students prior to their work being conducted or after the plagiarism has occurred?

- How do you structure your assignments to enable students to create original writings, thus help them avoid plagiarism? Do you consider the possibilities of plagiarism occurring as you develop your writing assignments, or is plagiarism not on your radar at all? Are there topics you choose because they force students to be more original than other assignments?

- What assessment methodology do you employ to ensure that your teaching of how to avoid plagiarism is fully learned?

Paraphrase & rewrite exercise – with multiple choice options.
After participants finished with these short response essay questions, they were provided with the following source as it would be found on a *References* page of a paper written using APA style:

McCormick, B. (2000). Ben Franklin's 12 Rules of Management. Irvine,

CA: Entrepreneur Press.

Then participants read the following paragraph:

Franklin despised using the bald eagle as our national symbol primarily

because of its inherent lack of hard work. He compared the bald eagle to men

who make their living as thieves and robbers and condemned the society that

is populated solely by such 'workers.' Franklin's own choice for our national

symbol was the turkey, which he preferred because it was native to North

America (as cited in McCormick, 2000, p. 75).

Following this quoted material, participants were asked to choose an appropriate

paraphrase from the following five choices, and then to choose an appropriate rewrite

from the second set of five choices.

Paraphrase choices.

1. Franklin disliked using the bald eagle as our national symbol because of its

   lack of hard work.

2. Franklin compared the bald eagle with men who make a living as criminals

   and condemned society solely populated by such "workers."

3. Franklin compared the bald eagle with men who make a living as criminals

   and condemned society solely populated by such "workers" (McCormick,

   2000, p. 75).

4. Franklin wanted the turkey rather than the bald eagle as our nation's emblem

   because the turkey is indigenous to North American. He believed the turkey

   was a bird with integrity (McCormick, 2000, p. 75).

5. Franklin didn't like using the bald eagle as our national emblem because he thought it represented laziness. He said the bald eagle was like men who make their living as thieves and robbers (McCormick, 2000, p. 75).[2]

Rewritten choices.

1. If Franklin had gotten his way, our national symbol would be the turkey instead of the bald eagle because the turkey is native to America.

2. Franklin opposed using the bald eagle as our country symbol primarily because of its laziness.

3. The Statue of Liberty should be our national symbol instead of birds. The Statue of Liberty is what our ancestors saw when they came to this country, and now that we are a melting pot of people, the Statue of Liberty represents all of us as a community.

4. Choosing a symbol is not easy, especially if the chosen symbol has any negative traits. When choosing a symbol, how it's viewed needs to be considered.

5. Because the bald eagle steals food from other animals, thus making it a lazy bird, it should not have been considered as a national symbol for America.[3]

At the end of this online survey, participants were invited to participate in Phase II. Participants were informed that in order to participate in Phase II, they would need to provide their name and e-mail address as the Phase II questions would be e-mailed to them. They would return their responses via e-mail. Participants were assured that

---

[2] The correct paraphrase choice is #4. Why this choice is correct will be discussed in Chapter IV.
[3] The correct rewrite choice is #4. Why this choice is correct will be discussed in Chapter IV.

their identity would remain confidential and not be part of the study. Participants were informed that Phase II of the study, which consisted of a dozen questions based on the Phase I responses, but which required more details, deepening the initial responses. Again, the questions were designed to ask these instructors how they teach students to avoid plagiarism, why and how they believe their assignment instruction(s) is effective, and what happens when they encounter plagiarism in their classroom.

Phase II – E-mail survey

After participating in Phase I portion of this study, I invited five of the survey responders, who had said yes that they were interested to participate in Phase II and who supplied their name and e-mail address, to participate in Phase II. I contacted the participants with an official e-mail invitation, which included the consent form. Once I received the electronic signature of the participant, I e-mail them the dozen questions that make up the Phase II portion of this study. From start-to-finish, the time participants would have to invest in to complete the e-mail survey responses would be about an hour, but no longer than a couple hours. Once again, these questions required participants to respond with short essay-style responses.

The goal of these questions was to identify whether these instructors were having common experiences in teaching students how to avoid plagiarism and how they dealt with plagiarism when it was encountered in their classrooms, or whether each instructor's experience was different from the others. Their answers could provide clues as to a possible student/teacher disconnection of what is perceived to have been taught versus what is actually being learned.

Phase II questions

1. Responses from the Phase I survey that asked participants "to describe how, when and where you were taught to avoid plagiarism" and "What was the extent of that experience" were that they were overall 1) taught in high school, 2) self-taught, 3) expected to know as a college student, 4) or by college instructors early on in college.

    As a result of this learning methodology, how assured are you that you were taught correctly? For consideration when writing your response, did you ever question what you were being taught by your instructors? Did these instructors guide you to textbooks and sources that verified that teaching? If taught in college, did it make a difference if you were being taught by full-time faculty, adjunct instructors, or graduate assistants?

2. While a subject teacher is *tested* by virtue of their master thesis and/or exams of their knowledge in their field of study, there is no test given to teachers to check their knowledge regarding how to avoid plagiarism. Some would claim by virtue of these subject teachers having successfully written papers without plagiarism detection claims that successful knowledge, and yet, there have been a number of individuals in various fields who have lost their jobs or are facing claims of plagiarism that has been found in their college papers, most generally in a dissertation.

    a. Why do you believe that the plagiarism was never detected at the time of the papers' production? Why is plagiarism becoming a problem decades after their graduation?

b. Should teachers be *tested* to discover if they can correctly teach students how to avoid plagiarism?

3. Should only composition teachers be responsible for teaching students how to avoid plagiarism; or, should all teachers regardless of their subject, be charged with teaching students how to avoid plagiarism if that teacher assigns a paper that uses research material? Please explain why.

4. Are we doing enough as higher-learning institutions to support our students in the learning of how to avoid plagiarism? If not, what more can we do, should we do?

5. Are we placing too much responsibility on the student in making it their responsibility in knowing how to avoid plagiarism, without determining if they have received the correct teaching or not? Should we be testing students in some manner?

6. Disappointment and frustration appears to be a common reaction of Phase I participants when discovering a student has plagiarized; and yet participants also believe that they have provided quality teaching about avoiding plagiarism to their students, whether it was in the form of feedback on drafts of the papers, in-class activities, one-on-one conferences, and so forth.

   That disappointment and frustration appears aimed at the students in that they are lazy, not willing to do the work that would allow more attention to details, or that they have blatantly chosen to plagiarize. Additionally, participants expressed that they generally take care of the plagiarism issues inside the classroom. Is that because to report the problem to your institution could have severe repercussions for the student? Do you keep the problem in the classroom, because you don't

want to be THE teacher that resulted in those consequences for that student? Or is it your intention to provide a solid teaching moment for your student? If so, how are you assured that the student won't go forward into other classes and plagiarize there despite all the work you did with that student?

7. What is the overall atmosphere in your institution of higher-education where you teach regarding plagiarism? Do the instructors talk about it? Is it a topic of discussion at any of the faculty meetings, kickoffs, in-house seminars or conferences? Do instructors report students or do they avoid doing so? Why or why not? Do you feel the policies at your institution are adequate and have a role in instructor attitudes and whether they report it or not?

8. If you currently take the plagiarism of your students personally, why do you think you do so? If you do not take it personally, was there ever a time that you did? If so, how did your make the conversion to not take it personally?

9. Overall, would you like to be free of having to detect plagiarism? Do you feel as if the focus on the subject matter receives less attention because there are plagiarism issues?

10. If you could create an ideal model of how a student who comes to your college or university—whether as a new student coming directly from high school, a transfer student who brings a degree or two with them, or as a re-entry student from years prior—what procedure(s) would you like to see in place to ensure that all students receive the same education/treatment to ensure knowledge of how to avoid plagiarism?

11. If you could create an ideal model of how your college or university's instructors

were checked to determine if they were teaching students how to avoid plagiarism correctly, what would that model look like?

12. How would you feel if you were to discover that your learning and what you believed to be true on how to avoid plagiarism was incorrect? What if you discovered what you have been teaching or are teaching was incorrect? Would you be upset? Would you take it in stride as a learning/teaching moment but keep it to yourself, or would you share that learning/teaching moment with others— with your peers, with your students? Would that discovery change your attitude about how we currently teach our students, how responsibility is placed on them to know how to avoid plagiarism, who should ultimately be responsible for teaching this skill, and when it is taught?

Terminology – Analysis Frame

Generally, plagiarism is considered intentional or unintentional, with a key factor of intentional plagiarism as not spending enough time with the assignment because the student *intentionally chose* not to devote that time to the issue (Blum, 2009). By the same token, teachers could be labeled as *intentionally* supporting plagiarism—even though the teacher in theory does not support it—by ignoring it when encountered. On the other hand, a teacher who is against plagiarism but teaches it incorrectly could be *unintentionally* enabling the student to plagiarize. Tragically, in this scenario, while both teacher and student believe they are doing the correct thing, in truth, if the teaching is incorrect and the student later turns in an incorrectly written assignment in another class where the instructor does know what plagiarism correctly looks like, the student could then be accused of plagiarism.

For the purpose of this study, the following terminology and definitions will be used when discussing the level of a teacher's level of knowledge and commitment to teaching students on how to avoid plagiarism. The purpose of creating these levels was to illuminate the differences, first between *caring open* instructors who were correct/informed (Tier 1) and caring open instructors but incorrect/uninformed or ill-informed (Tier 2), and then between those caring open but incorrect instructors located on Tier 2 and those were who were *uncaring and resistant* and either correct or incorrect located on Tier 3 (see Figure 5).

Tier 1

- The "informed caring instructor" – This instructor stays up-to-date of style changes, understands the gap of student understanding, and is willing to do what it takes to not only teach students how to avoid plagiarism, and will follow through with plagiarism reporting when necessary and as required by their institution. This instructor has correct knowledge about what plagiarism looks like, particularly in regards to paraphrasing and rewriting.

Tier 2

- The "uninformed/ill-informed caring/open instructor" – This instructor cares and believes they are teaching correct methods to students in how to avoid plagiarism, but they are teaching what they learned, rather than what is correct. *They don't know that they don't know.* If or when they are told that they are teaching incorrect information, they are immediately *open to learning* what is correct.

- The "uninformed/ill-informed caring/resistant instructor" – This instructor is very much like the "uninformed/ill-informed caring instructor," with the exception that they *think* they know, when actually, they do not know. If or when they are told they are teaching incorrect information, they will be in denial and will continue teaching as they always have because they care about their students. They care enough to teach their students but are resistant to learning the truth about themselves or in reporting their students.

Tier 3

- The "informed uncaring instructor" – This instructor is fully aware of how to avoid plagiarism but does not believe it is their responsibility, nor cares to make it their responsibility including reporting plagiarism when seen.

- The "ill-informed uncaring instructor" – This instructor thinks they know and does not realize they do not know how to avoid plagiarism. At the same time, they do not care about teaching students how to avoid plagiarism or what the students currently know or do not know. They would like to ignore the topic altogether, including reporting it should they see it. More often than not, they do not report plagiarism when they encounter it.

Tier 1	Informed caring instructor	
Tier 2	uninformed caring/open instructor	Ill-informed caring /resistant instructor
Tier 3	informed uncaring instructor	Ill-informed uncaring instructor

Figure 5 Terminology of Tier Levels

The creation of this terminology will be used in Chapter IV as the research is analyzed. Knowing in which tier an instructor resides can help identify possible problems that students will encounter as a result of a particular instructor's instruction. For example, while students who have a Tier 1 instructor can be assured of getting accurate information and an instructor who will care what learning takes place, the same cannot be said about Tier 2 and Tier 3 instructors. While Tier 2 instructors will care and make an attempt to teach students how to avoid plagiarism, what happens when that information is incorrect? How correct is their information?

That focus of these questions leads us back to the guiding question and is what this study proposes to find out: Are teachers providing correct information when teaching students how to avoid plagiarism or not? While it can be predicted that Tier 3 instructors will not provide any instruction to their students about avoiding plagiarism and will not report it if it does occur, how many of these instructors are in

the classroom versus the Tier 2 level of instructors? Again, this study proposes to

make that discovery. Even though the sampling of instructors is small, if the majority

of instructors are at a Tier 3 level, that fact reveals one kind of problem, of not caring,

versus if the majority of instructors are at the Tier 2 level, which means while we

having caring instructors who want to provide correct instruction, the problem then is

how do we insure teachers have the correct information? Consequently, the purpose

of this study will reveal what Tier type of instructors are in the classroom where

writing assignments occur.

By the same token, students can be labeled into those same categories as

informed, ill-informed and uninformed, and caring or uncaring. What happens when

an informed caring instructor butts up against an ill-informed caring student versus

the uncaring student? Is the instructor's reaction different? Do the students get

treated differently?

The discovery of both classroom instruction (or not) and how instructors

respond to the students (or not) will be valuable to both instructors and their

institutions. Teachers will be able to determine which tier they operate from and

discover the flaws in their teaching methodology regarding plagiarism. Institutions

will be able to see how they can better support their instructors in training and even in

re-examining their reporting process.

All of this brings us to Chapter IV, where I will present my data analysis.

Here I will present data from the participants of Phase I and then from Phase II.

While a dozen instructors began the study, only five finished, and all five were

interested in and completed Phase II of this study. While the sampling is small, at the

same time, the data is interesting, but I was not surprised. The data analysis will show how these five instructors are teaching their students how to avoid plagiarism, whether the teachers are correct in that teaching based on their responses to the short activity, how they feel when they encounter plagiarism in their students' writings, and how they feel about their institutions' support as they deal with that plagiarism. More importantly, this data analysis will reveal how these instructors were taught how to teach their students how to avoid plagiarism While it is not the intent of this study to point a finger at these instructors, the guiding question is to discover what do instructors understand and know about avoiding plagiarism? Could their own learning have been misguided to the point that their current teaching aggravates the situation rather helping it? If so, is it possible that their example of teaching is the dominant teaching methodology, which contributes to a disconnection in students being able to understand how to use sources correctly? Chapter IV, with its data analysis, will hopefully reveal whether there is a disconnect or not.

CHAPTER IV

WHAT THE STUDY REVEALS

"There is no education like adversity."

Benjamin Disraeli

Disraeli teaches us that we learn in conflict, that learning does not occur when all is going well. When we are frustrated, we learn and it is when we are in that adversity when education occurs. Today, plagiarism has become an adversity for the working world and a frustration for both teachers and students; yet, the frustration for teachers and students is different and for different reasons. Teachers cannot understand why their students are plagiarizing; in fact, some of this frustration is expressed later in this chapter through the research that was gathered from instructors. For the students, their frustration shows up in the classrooms. For example, when I show them what plagiarism looks like, they realize that what they thought they knew is only one small part of using sources correctly. While they know not to cut and paste without attribution, they have yet to be taught how to paraphrase and rewrite correctly. As a result, they end up asking, *why are we learning this for the first time? What's going on?*

My students' questions led me to my own questions, which ultimately became the guiding question for this study: *What do instructors understand about teaching students how to avoid plagiarism and how can they be sure they were taught correctly?* In turn, the sub questions of this study ask how are the instructors assured that their teaching has been well-received by their students? How are the students assessed? What happens when teachers encounter plagiarism and how do they feel

about it? Further, what support do their institutions provide when plagiarism is

encountered? Above all, what do these instructors believe can be done to eliminate

plagiarism in their classrooms? This chapter attempts to answer these questions as

the research comes directly from the instructors as these same questions are asked of

them.

Instructors who responded to a call to participate in this study were asked to

respond to eight short-essay response questions in a survey labeled Phase I and where

they could remain anonymous by not moving forward into Phase II of the survey.

However, if participants were interested in continuing further in this study , into

Phase II, they were required to provide their name and e-mail address so that the next

set of questions could be sent to them directly. Phase II was meant to be a

concentrated study of fewer participants, chosen from those who participated in Phase

I. The questions of Phase II were designed to dive deeper into the responses provided

by Phase I.

Initially, Phase I was designed with the hope and intent to attract up to 100

interested participants. However, the online survey attracted only 11 instructors, even

after the perimeters were changed to include adjunct instructors and graduate teaching

assistants along with the original full-time faculty category. Although the

participation was not what I had hoped for, ultimately those instructors who

responded created a broader analysis, one that spread across the curriculum and

provided a cross-section of various types of instructors. Of those 11 instructors who

first began the online process, 8 consented to the anonymous online survey and

proceeded into Phase I, answering the short-essay response questions and

participating in the short activity that asked them to identify the correct paraphrase and then the correct rewrite for a paragraph that was provided to them. In this chapter, each of these participants has been provided a pseudonym by me. In choosing those names, I simply started at the beginning of the alphabet and named them according to their gender, if their gender was known to me. I was able to identify gender when the participates provided me their name as they consented to participate in Phase II. Five individuals gave me their names, which thus identified their gender. For those three who did not choose to move into Phase II, their gender remains unknown. For these three individuals, they have received a gender-neutral pseudonym.

This chapter contains four sections. The first section describes the eight participants, some basic demographics to show how they are different and how they are the same. The second section sets up the terminology that will be used to discuss the next two sections, those of the two survey phases. The third section covers Phase I of the study, the online survey and the short activity. And then finally, the fourth section covers Phase II of the study, the e-mail survey.

The five instructors who consented to participate in Phase II, which meant sharing their identities with me, represent a diverse cross-section of instructors who were teaching students how to use sources and, in particular, write effectively to avoid plagiarism. In the beginning, as this study was proposed, the thought was that this study should be comprised of only full-time instructors who teach first-year composition. Unfortunately, only a few full-time instructors who teach first-year composition initially responded to the call. Interestingly, the call to participate was

attracting adjunct instructors and graduate teaching assistants, with several instructors teaching outside of the typical English department and who had never taught first-year composition. As a result, the study was revised to enable these interested individuals to be able to respond to the questions and participate fully. As plagiarism is a problem across the curriculum, having responses across the curriculum should create a valuable resource beyond English studies.

The Participants

This section introduces the participants and provides minimum demographic background information. In particular, this section of the chapter describes the instructors' teaching status, whether they teach or have taught first-year composition, whether they teach at a private or public institution, and whether that institution is a two-year college or four-year university. For the purpose of discussion regarding the instructors' institutions, a *small* two-year college or four-year university will be those with a student population of less than 15,000. Those colleges and universities with 15,000 or more student population will be deemed as *large*. There will be only the two different designations as to institutional size to enable the participants to maintain their anonymity. To designate those institutions with 5,000 or fewer students as *small,* and those institutions with 5,000 to 15,000 students as mid-size, as these student populations are normally categorized ("Student," n.d.), could jeopardize that anonymity; therefore, the decision was made to combine the two—the small and the mid-size—into the *small* category.

The Major Participants

With five instructors completing both Phase I and Phase II of this study, they are considered the major participants. Because they have participated fully in both surveys, their personalities became more pronounced as they talked more deeply about their concerns and about what they desired for their students. Below are basic descriptions of these eight participants, including a brief analysis about their concerns.

Ann – The Reluctant Proactive Adjunct

Ann is reluctantly proactive, thus a contradiction in motion. While Ann is enthusiastic and newly proactive in helping her students avoid plagiarism, she firmly believes that it is not her responsibility to teach students how to use sources properly. While she acknowledges that her students need help in learning how to avoid plagiarism, it is not her "job" even though she provides writing assignments in a liberal art's class not traditionally known for writing. Due to her students plagiarizing their writing assignments, Ann realized that the students were receiving little practice in using sources. In addition, she admits that her teaching institution has vague policies regarding plagiarism. As a result, she is actively providing worksheets, practice, and various exercises to help her students master the skill of using sources correctly. Frustrated in seeing her students plagiarizing has forced her to become proactive, though she still proclaims it is teaching outside of her teaching obligations and not a part of her course learning outcomes. Ann did not want her students to continue to have plagiarism issues.

Ann is concerned, frustrated when plagiarism occurs, frustrated that students

struggle, and frustrated that she has to help students in this teaching of using sources properly. Ann believes all students should be tested to determine their knowledge about using sources. She also believes that all teachers, even teachers who are not in the English department or teaching composition as it would do no harm, should be tested to determine their knowledge about plagiarism to ensure that their students are receiving correct information. Interestingly, Ann was only one of two instructors, of all the instructors who participated in the short activity to determine their knowledge about proper paraphrasing and rewriting, to choose the correct paraphrase, but she did not choose the correct rewrite.

Ann teaches at a large, public, two-year college in a large city. Ann does not and has never taught first-year composition, nor is she credentialed to teach in the English department. Instead, Ann teaches within the liberal arts field, teaching students skills in the performance and arts appreciation arena. Ann does not remember exactly when she first learned how to avoid plagiarism but believes that learning occurred in "writing-intensive courses in high school" (personal communication, January 22, 2013). In high school, she additionally learned how to use sources via the note-card method, where she paraphrased on the card, noting the source information for later citing. That methodology for using sources was reinforced for other writing assignments in other classes. Additionally, Ann states that plagiarism was thoroughly discussed in one of her first college courses, which was a introductory course in her liberal arts field. Ann concludes that she is also self-taught in how to avoid plagiarism. This last statement raises the question: If Ann had received adequate education from her instructors on how to avoid plagiarism, why

was there the need for self-teaching?

Betty – The Tough, Self-Contained Graduate Teaching Assistant

Betty is the sole Graduate Teaching Assistant (TA) who participated in Phase I and then in Phase II. Betty is a TA for a large city, public, four-year university. Betty currently teaches first-year composition and has taught over four semesters of first-year composition. Like Ann, Betty does not remember when she was taught specifically on how to avoid plagiarism, but she does remember learning how to use endnotes in a middle-school class. Additionally, Betty recalls that she did not learn how to use citations in an English or writing course but rather from other courses in humanities. In reflection, Betty does contribute her learning to the private college she attended and the full-time professors who were employed. Betty acknowledges that having a credentialed professor left her feeling assured of her learning versus learning from TAs, such as herself, using TAs was not the teaching policy at the institution from which she graduated. Because she was taught by qualified credentialed professionals, Betty is confident that she was trained in how to use sources properly. Despite that confidence, interestingly, Betty did not pick the correct paraphrase or rewrite choices in the short online activity. Is it possible that these teachers taught Betty what they had learned, which may have been flawed teaching or learning?

As to her own teaching, Betty takes a tough stance. Should a student blatantly plagiarize a paper early on or midway through the semester, Betty does allows a student who has plagiarized to redo the assignment for half credit (50%) rather than a zero grade; but when it comes to the final paper, a research paper, there are no redo opportunities. If a student plagiarizes in that paper, the grade remains at a zero. It

appears, however, that the use of sources and the teaching of how to use sources does not occur until the final paper, a research paper, the only research paper in the class. Therefore, that means that if students are plagiarizing in earlier papers, they are doing so with papers that have no resources, which further means they are not creating their own original material as would be required for a narrative, descriptive, or problem/solution type paper as is commonly taught in first-year composition classes. When the students do plagiarize, Betty feels angry, frustrated, and disrespected; she wants the time she spends in teaching students how to avoid plagiarism to be well-received.

Despite Betty's current tough stance in believing that students who plagiarize are lazy and uncaring, Betty does have a soft desire to see her students succeed. Even though the University where she works has a specific policy about reporting students when they plagiarize, Betty will not do it. Thus, she becomes resistant to the process of reporting. The main reason she will not report students is that she watched a friend of hers report a student for plagiarizing and then suffer through a "negative experience" (personal communication, December 27, 2012) as the responsibility of proving plagiarism falls on the instructor. Now it appears that Betty is both scared for herself but still wants to help her students but does not want to go through a reporting system. Even though Betty does not say so, it appears that Betty may be afraid of suffering the way her friend did, so she has decided it safer not to report a student. In addition, she may not want to suffer through the humiliation of the student being able to return to the class should the she fail to prove that plagiarism occurred, which is the institution's policy. Betty's soft side is also revealed as Betty is considering

repositioning when the research paper occurs within the semester so that the teaching

and learning of source usage will occur earlier in the semester rather than at the end.

Obviously, while Betty does take a tough approach, she does want to see her students

succeed.

Conway – The Conscientious, Online Business Adjunct Instructor

Conway emphatically believes that any instructor who creates a writing

assignment for a class is also responsible for teaching and helping students learn how

to avoid plagiarism, thus he believes all instructors need to become conscientious

instructors. Conway not only warns his students about the consequences of

plagiarism and follows the University's policies when plagiarism occurs in his

students' assignments, but then he "explain[s] briefly what it is again and how to

avoid it, then severely punish[es] point-wise those who do it" (personal

communication, December 24, 2012). Like many of the other participants in this

study, Conway does not see student plagiarism as a reflection of his teaching. He

blames the students for their plagiarism. He does provide as much instruction as the

class needs to understand the concept, but he expects the students to communicate

with him if they continue not to understand. Conway readily admits that a student's

plagiarism does tend to influence how Conway feels about that student, but despite

having a negative opinion, Conway does his best to keep the plagiarism incident

contained within the classroom. He prefers to help students learn from their mistakes

rather than report them, which will "escalate the offense to the institution" (2012).

As strong as Conway believes that all instructors are responsible for teaching

their students on how to avoid plagiarism and how to use sources, one would believe

that Conway teaches English; but he does not. In fact, he has never taught English

composition. He is an adjunct instructor, teaching business classes for both graduate

and undergraduate students for a large, public university, where his classes occur

online. Conway states that his learning about the correct method of using sources

occurred first in high school, then college. Despite that learning, Conway reveals that

there were gaps in that education, which required that he be diligent in learning the

concepts, including paying attention to any style change that would occur. Conway

believes that teachers should be tested regarding their ability to understand plagiarism

to ensure that they at least have the knowledge to teach it correctly, and that the

testing be "included on their exams" (personal communication, February 25, 2013).

Conway cites himself as an example of an instructor who diligently teaches students

how to avoid plagiarism, assesses the students' ability to use sources correctly, and

creates assignments that provides assignments that uses sources so that students are

provided lots of practice, and as an instructor with no English pedagogy background.

Obviously, Conway believes if he can provide this teaching service to his students,

then so can all other teachers, regardless of their teaching curriculum.

Conway reports that his teaching institution is highly involveed in providing

its instructors professional development, plagiarism detection software for instructors

to use with their students, and where "upper management encourages faculty to grade

against plagiarism" (personal communication, February 25, 2013). Is it possible that

because Conway's teaching institution is so highly engaged with helping their

instructors that Conway's conscientious teaching evolved?

Fran – The Frustrated, Hindered but Intentional Full-Time Professor

Fran intentionally does everything in her power to help students learn how to avoid plagiarism; however, she feels hindered by her institution, believing that the institution is not doing enough to provide consequences to students who purposely plagiarize. In fact, she is appalled that records are not kept on students who plagiarize.

Fran is one of three full-time faculty members who participated in the Phase I, online survey. She teaches first-year composition and has taught over four semesters of these composition classes. Fran has a Ph.D. and teaches at a small public four-year university in a relatively small community. Fran remembers having learned how to avoid plagiarism in high school, where she would write a healthy number of research projects and other writing assignments, but she does not recall any conversations centering around plagiarism. Fran does recall that in her senior year of high school, a large research project that used sources was required. Additionally, Fran never questioned the education she received from her teachers as to the correctness of their teachings; she assumed that what was being taught was correct. Fran also remembers receiving a handout with lots of examples from her college freshman composition class, and she remembers that as she advanced through her college courses, eventually becoming a graduate, then doctoral student that the expectation was that no one had to say anything about plagiarism as she was "supposed to know" (personal communication, February 19, 2013).

Fran's frustrations pertain to her students and their laziness in applying what they learn. She claims that most of the plagiarism that occurs in her classes is

intentional and that she has a "no-tolerance" policy regarding plagiarism, with

students earning a zero grade for assignments that have been plagiarized. What she

finds more frustrating, however, is how the University where she teaches hinders her

and all the other teachers in dealing with harsh consequences. Fran states that this

lenient plagiarism policy at her University further frustrates her. Because there is

such a focus on retention, the University does not want to lose students simply

because they plagiarized. Retention is an important topic for institutions and a topic

that cannot be dismissed by instructors, hence, Fran's frustration. This topic of

retention is addressed in more depth in Chapter V.

As a way of dealing with her frustration and at dealing with the lack of

support from her institution, Fran intentionally sets out to ensure that her students will

learn what it means to plagiarize. As a result, Fran spells out the consequences for

plagiarism the first day of class through her syllabus. Additionally, she places

plagiarism information into every assignment documentation and schedules meetings

with students individually should plagiarism occur.

While Fran does believe that all instructors should be assessed to determine if

their knowledge about how to avoid plagiarism is correct or not, she is equally

passionate about all instructors being "tested on a wide variety of other skills that are

not typically addressed in teacher ed[ucation] (or graduate education prepping future

teachers)" (personal communication, February 19, 2013). In her experiences at

having taught at a number of various institutions, Fran knows a good number of

teachers who "avoid assigning writing assignments" so that dealing with plagiarism

can be completely avoided. Not only is there a lack of support from institutions

where she has taught, but Fran finds that there is a lack of support from instructors for their students, which is why she purposefully and intentionally tries to make a difference for her students.

Hannah – The Direct-Approach Coach Full-Time Professor

Hannah is a strong advocate of the one-on-one approach when she finds a student has plagiarized. Because she teaches graduate students, she does not feel it necessary to provide classroom instruction to her students about plagiarism and how to avoid it. Her expectation is that they should already have that knowledge. When plagiarism occurs, however, she finds the reason is more often than not associated to laziness or a lack of time management by the student.

As a coach, Hannah does take the plagiarism personally, feeling that the student who plagiarized is showing a lack of respect for her, as the instructor. For those students whom she believes plagiarized unintentionally, she prefers that they experience a teaching/learning moment, providing the student an opportunity for redemption, to learn from their mistake, rather than reporting them. However, Hannah is prepared to report them if needed. Hannah is a "proponent of writing across the curriculum" (personal communication, March 2, 2013), but does not see how teachers, especially secondary-level teachers can find time to obtain training specifically on plagiarism and add that course to their already crammed agenda of required classes.

Hannah is the second full-time faculty member with a Ph.D., and who participated in both Phase I and Phase II of this study. She teaches at a small public university located in a large metropolis. Hannah is not currently teaching first-year

composition, however, she has taught more than four first-year composition courses.

Hannah remembers first learning about how to avoid plagiarism in high school with

research-based assignments and a teacher who insisted that the students use sources

correctly. Students who did not follow the directions of correct citations were known

to fail the course. Hannah declares that those who intentionally set out to deceive

should pay the consequences but those who do so unintentionally should have an

opportunity to learn from their mistakes. Hannah admits that she makes mistakes and

when she does, she readily admits them to her students so that she and they can learn

from her mistake together.

The Other Participants

There were three other instructors. Two who are adjunct instructors and one

is a full-time faculty member. All three participated only in Phase I. As a result, each

of their responses in total lack the depth of the major participants, however, their

responses to the Phase I questions were no less interesting than those who

participated in both Phase I and Phase II. As a group, two of these instructors teach

composition and these same two have both taught more than four semesters of first-

year composition. The two adjunct instructors are the only two participants of all the

teachers who participated in this study who teach at private institutions. All the other

participants teach at public institutions. The below paragraphs further emphasize

their differences. Because these teachers chose not to participate in Phase II of the

study, where they would have needed to provide their name and e-mail address, their

identities are and remain anonymous to me; therefore, their gender is unknown. As a

result, these three instructors were provided with an androgynous pseudonym.

Dakota – The Passive Proactive Online Adjunct

Dakota is an adjunct instructor who teaches online for a large, private four-year university, which is located in a metropolis landscape, though it appears that Dakota lives several states from this teaching facility. Dakota learned how to avoid plagiarism from writing the large number of papers that were assigned while attending a private college. Like many of today's students who are expected to know and understand what it means to avoid plagiarism, Dakota was expected to know the college expectations regarding plagiarism via the institution's handbook and guidelines. Dakota goes on to state that there were no handouts provided by the instructor or college nor were there any "warnings against the dangers of plagiarism" (personal communication, December 30, 2012) provided to students. As taught, Dakota appears to be teaching by that same methodology. Dakota makes it clear the University has adequately proclaimed the perils of plagiarism in the syllabus template provided to all instructors, which must be used, and in other places students populate. Dakota provides a teaching unit in the online classroom, where the difference between intentional and unintentional plagiarism is explained, and where Dakota provides "statements that students have to read and determine if they are plagiarized or correctly written" (2012). As a result, students are instructed to complete the workshop on their own; thus, Dakota is providing passive instruction as the students are expected to do the learning in their own time. Only when there is a problem with a student's writing, does Dakota address the plagiarism. Dakota does so by offering a private one-on-one tutoring session, in an online chat room that is private with just

the two of them. "Unfortunately, many of [the students] do not have the time" (2012)

to meet privately, Dakota reports. Dakota does not choose to meet with students this

way because Dakota wants to; Dakota meets with students because it is University

policy, and should Dakota determine that the plagiarism is intentional, Dakota is

obligated to report the plagiarism to the University per their policies. Due to all of

the online language that warns students about the perils of plagiarism, Dakota does

not take any plagiarism personally. Dakota believes it is the student's responsibility

to educate themselves on the subject.

Elliott – The Concerned-for-Self, but Correct Adjunct Instructor

Elliott is an adjunct instructor who has never taught first-year composition.

Elliott teaches at a small private university, in a large metropolis. Personally learning

how to avoid plagiarism was taught to Elliott by "English instructors and professional

developmental sessions" (personal communication, December 28, 2012). While the

eight questions in this Phase I online survey asked for short-essay responses, Elliott's

responses were short, without revealing little real information. In fact, with two

responses, Elliott's responses were simply one-word answers. Additionally, Elliott

appears to not have understood a couple questions as the questions asked about

background or feelings, but instead the responses were in relationship to those of the

students. What makes Elliott's responses worth noting, however, is that of all the

eight participants who responded in Phase I, Elliott was the only instructor who said,

yes, that there was concern about the students' plagiarism and if their plagiarism

could be viewed as a reflection of Elliott as a teacher. The basis of this response was

that Elliott "wouldn't want [the students] to move on and say it was ok in so-and-so's

class" (2012), obviously implicating Elliott as the "so-and-so." Even though Elliott

has never taught first-year composition, Elliott does feel responsible to teach students

how to avoid plagiarism. Additionally interesting is that Elliott was the only

instructor to correctly identify the proper rewrite in the short activity (see Appendix

B). How is that Elliott who does not teach composition and never has, has the skill or

ability to be the only instructor to choose the correct rewrite? Is it possible that the

difference is in the teaching Elliott received as a student versus the other participants'

teachings they received as students?

Gray – The Waiting, Full-Time Professor of Comp

Gray is the third and last participant who chose only to participate in Phase I

and not continue with the study in Phase II. Gray is a full-time faculty member and

teaches a small public two-year college, located in a relatively small community

situated within a rural landscape. Gray currently teaches first-year composition and

has taught more than four semesters of first-year composition. Gray does not

remember any specific discussions or learning about how to avoid plagiarism as a

student but does recall general "broad statements" from middle school and all the way

through college. Gray states that instructors "stressed the importance of creating

original work" (personal communication, December 17, 2012) but that little time was

spent on any instruction regarding the subject. Gray believes the instruction was well

received. Obviously, the instruction Gray obtained appears well received, because

Gray is one of only two participants to correctly identify the correct paraphrase in the

short activity exercise (see Appendix B). To Gray, plagiarism identification is

"common sense and students who submit work that isn't their own feign ignorance"

(2012). Is it possible that to Gray plagiarism is common sense because Gray knows and understands how to avoid plagiarism, but that the students have yet to understand proper source usage and citations or do not honestly know what Gray expects the students should know?

Other than the bit of instruction as required on the first day when going over the syllabus, as dictated by the University, Gray does not teach students about plagiarism. Instead, Gray waits for the plagiarism to occur. Then, and only then, does Gray begin to deal with the topic. Even though Gray teaches composition, it is only in the research paper, the only paper in the class that uses sources. After reading Gray's explanation that other papers assigned in the class are rhetorical analysis papers, I would have to ask, what is the purpose in not using sources in more of these papers? Would not the students benefit with more practice if more rhetorical analysis papers required sources, even if just one or two?

If Gray's composition classes are taught as I was first instructed to do as a graduate teaching assistant and how Betty appears to conduct the order and assigning of her papers, then the research paper is probably the last paper of the class. Like Gray, this was where I first observed plagiarism occurring. As I eventually realized that I needed to provide students with more practice using sources, and where I began assigning more papers that required the use of source materials, I wonder if Gray has ever considered doing the same? Even though Gray is a fulltime faculty member at a public college, is it possible that Gray's writing assignments are prescribed, as some institutions require? Or is it possible that Gray's choices of writing assignments have not ventured far from the pedagogy lessons learned as a teacher-student?

Here is a recap of the major and minor participants and their demographics.

Participants	Phase I Only	Dakota, Elliott, Gray
	Phase I & II	Ann, Betty, Conway, Fran, Hannah
Rank	Full-time	Gray, Fran, Hannah
	Adjunct	Dakota, Elliott, Ann, Conway
	Graduate TA	Betty
Teaching Curriculum	English Composition	Dakota, Gray, Betty, Fran
	Non-English – no composition	Elliott, Ann, Conway, Hannah
Institution	Public	Gray, Ann, Betty, Conway, Fran, Hannah
	Private	Dakota, Elliott
Size	Small	Elliott, Gray, Ann, Fran, Hannah
	Large	Dakota, Betty, Conway

Figure 6 Recap of Participants and Their Demographics

Terminology and Tier Paradigm

The purpose of this section is two-fold. First, to establish the definition of the terminology that is used when discussing plagiarism, which often can have different meanings for different instructors. Second, to utilize and demonstrate the tier paradigm that was first presented, described, and defined in Chapter III, Figure 5 and apply it as an analysis of the research obtained in this study.

As a prelude to the analysis of this research, I want to demonstrate the usefulness of such definitions when discussing plagiarism with students. When students come into my class, my previous experience has shown that their definitions pertaining to copyright and plagiarism are more often incorrect than they are correct, so my first task is to discover *what they know*. Only upon learning and understanding their current knowledge can I help them understand what is correct, what is not correct, and then move them into effective correct learning, thus helping them identify that which they did not know.

Likewise, the participants of this study were not given definitions of plagiarism before they began their participation in the study. Instead, a goal of this study was to learn what instructors currently know and understand. In that understanding, it may be possible to discover the disconnection between what student learns and what instructors teach, which is the guiding question of this study.

Terminology

The following terms are presented with their definitions only as it pertains in its relationship to plagiarism or as in how to avoid plagiarism.

Copyright

Ideas, along with short phrases, titles, slogans, procedures, and common property such as calendar charts, are not copyrighted. It is the *creation of an idea* which has copyright the moment of its creation; for example, as in literary works, sound records, motion pictures, calendars presented with pictures, the description of how to use ingredients listed in a recipe, and so forth (U.S. Copyright Office, 2011).

Unfortunately, misinformation can be found in handbooks, websites, handouts, and other literature that discusses copyright, which state that ideas are copyrighted. Again, it is the *creation of an idea* that is copyright protected, not the idea itself.

Intentional

There are two types of intentional plagiarism. The first type occurs when the writer blatantly performs that plagiarism, generally by copying and pasting source information without citation or quotes. The second type occurs when the writer

plagiarizes due to laziness or a lack of time management. In both of these cases, the writer knows how to avoid plagiarism but does not care enough to ensure that plagiarism is avoided. These second types of writers intentionally plagiarize when they do not proof-read their work specifically for plagiarism issues, or when they do not manage their time, which prevents proper proof-reading to occur.

Paraphrasing

Paraphrasing occurs when the original author's *creation of the idea* is preserved by using only those words that cannot be changed, such as topical nouns or proper nouns, by changing sentence and paragraph structure, and by using a citation. The writer's paraphrase, however, should look nothing like the original source. (See Appendix C for paraphrasing examples.)

Quoting

Quoting occurs when words are copied word-for-word and has a citation. Two or more words copied from a source where those words are critical to the creation of an author's idea, where those words are used "verbatim, or even one word . . . is used in a way that is unique to the source" (Yale, 2011), require quotes and a citation.

Rewriting

The essential idea in any writing can be used without the need of a source citation; however, the writer must be careful not to make any reference whatsoever so the original source's creation of that idea. That means the writer cannot use the original source's topic nouns or proper nouns; the writer needs to *rewrite* the idea in a

way so that there is no resemblance between the two. While the rewrite will be

discussing the source's core idea, the creation or expression of that idea does not exist

in the rewrite. (See Appendices B & C for examples.)

Rewriting should never use quotes. Done correctly, rewriting does not require

a source citation. Too often students will create a rewrite that is actually a correct

paraphrase, providing they use a citation. My experience shows that students do not

know how to rewrite properly. While they say they are using their own words, they

are actually using many words from the original source, just in a different order.

Unintentional

Unintentional plagiarism occurs when the writer is unaware how to properly

use source material. Generally, these are writers who do not know what they need to

learn so that they can rewrite and paraphrase properly. They are writers who have

either not been taught how to avoid plagiarism or they were taught incorrectly, thus

they believe they know how to avoid plagiarism when in truth they do not.

Tier Paradigm

In creating the Tier Paradigm and its three levels, my objective is hopefully to

start a dialogue that can separate these different levels of intent that are involved

when teaching about how to avoid plagiarism. Later in this chapter, my intent to

match these teaching tiers to the different levels of student plagiarism that occurs

whether intentional or unintentional.

My own journey, as told in Chapter I, shows that I had been plagiarizing

unintentionally in my academic writing because I did not know what I needed to

learn. In the Chapter II literature review, while there is discussion about

unintentional and intentional plagiarism among students, there is a gap in the

discussion about intentional or unintentional teaching and how it affects students.

Earlier in this chapter, the participants were introduced, along with the beginnings of

their beliefs, and their teaching intent provided. Those beliefs, how they teach, how

their institutions are involved, along with their teaching intent will be discussed in

conjunction with this tier paradigm. Knowledge of tier placement can help identify

those instructors who may need some professional development to enable them to

become instructors that are more effective. If instructors are able to determine their

own placement on the tier, they can identify why they may be disconnecting with

their students in the teaching of how to avoid plagiarism. Knowing from which tier

an instructor teaches can be a strong step in identifying problems their students will

encounter as a result of that instructor's teaching.

Tier 1 - The correct (informed) caring instructor

Informed caring instructors know that for students to succeed academically in

their writings, students need to fully understand how plagiarism works. These

instructors are willing to stay abreast of new changes made in the style(s) taught in

their classes and will do what it takes to help students understand how to avoid

plagiarism. At the same time, these instructors will report students when necessary

because the students are not abiding by institutional policies or class standards

whether purposefully intentional or intentional unintentionally. These instructors

correctly know how to paraphrase, rewrite, and use sources; thus, they are capable of

teaching that information to their students so that they receive correct information.

> **Correct (Informed) Caring Instructor**
> - Stays up-to-date with style changes
> - Believes teaching plagiarism is not their job but will do it and make a difference
> - Works to help students and provide teaching moments when needed
> - Will report students who fail to use sources properly after receiving teaching moment(s)

Figure 7 Correct (Informed) Caring Instructor Characteristics

Tier 2 - The incorrect (uninformed/ill-informed) caring, open instructor

Uninformed/ill-informed caring open instructors have good intentions in teaching students how to avoid plagiarism but they do not realize that they themselves do not know what they need to know. While they may be teaching what was taught to them, their knowledge is lacking. What is unfortunate in this scenario is that their students will believe they were taught well and will not understand how they could be plagiarizing should their writing be reported as having been plagiarized at some later time in their education or career, when at that point the expectations are that they should already have correct knowledge. **Instructors in this category suffer simply because they do not know that they do not know.** However, when they learn that they were misinformed and had not been taught correctly, they are open to making corrections. They will talk openly to their students and their peers about mistakes in their earlier learning, what they have now learned, and what changes they had to make in order to teach the information to their students correctly. These instructors are open to extra professional development if needed. These instructors are willing to do the research to discover what they need to know. These instructors can easily move up into Tier 1 and become correct, informed, caring open instructors as their knowledge becomes correct.

> **Incorrect (Uninformed/Ill-informed) Caring, Open Instructor**
> - Believes teaching plagiarism is not their job but will do it and make a difference
> - Is open to learning that what they thought they knew was incorrect
> - Is open to learning, open to fixing their mistakes, open to talking about their learning mistakes to others, including students and peers
> - Works to help students and provide teaching moments when needed
> - Will report students who fail to use sources properly but only after many teaching moments

Figure 8 Incorrect (Uninformed/Ill-informed) Caring, Open Instructor Characteristics

Tier 2 - The incorrect (uninformed/ill-informed) caring, resistant instructor

The only difference between this instructor on Tier 2 and the other Tier 2 instructor is that they continue to *think* they know how to avoid plagiarism correctly, when in reality, they do not. This instructor knows what is best for the student despite institutional policies to the contrary. They are resistant to correcting their teaching, are resistant to professional development. Basically, they are in denial about what they know. What can be dangerous for these particular instructors is that if they are unwilling to test their knowledge and continue to be resistant to the idea that they are wrong, their unwillingness can be dangerous for their students. The students will believe that these instructors are teaching them correctly and, unfortunately, the students will plagiarize without realization. Even more unfortunate is that this instructor will remain stuck on this tier. Should these instructors learn that their knowledge is incorrect, they are not likely to admit it to anyone, let alone their own students.

Incorrect (Uninformed/Ill-informed) Caring, Resistant Instructor
• Believes teaching plagiarism is not their job but will do it because it is the right thing to do but will provide just enough teaching so that the student should be informed provided the student pays attention.
• Does not want to learn that what they think they know is incorrect.
• Tends to remain silent about their own mistakes in what they were teaching, but will make adjusts as needed. Likes to have others believe they knew how to help students correctly all along.
• Will NOT report students for plagiarism. Prefers to handle entirely in the classroom.

Figure 9 Incorrect (Uninformed/Ill-informed) Caring, Resistant Instructor Characteristics

Tier 3 – The correct (informed) uncaring instructor

Informed uncaring instructors know how to avoid plagiarism and are totally capable of teaching students how to avoid, but for some reason they do not want to or care to teach students this valuable skill that they themselves have mastered. The reason may be concern for themselves in some regard with the institution or as simple as believing it is not their responsibility to teach their students. When it comes to reporting plagiarism, they will either ignore it when they see it, or they will report it without ever talking to the student about it, thus the student will be stunned to find the first discussion will be in the form of a notice from the institution.

Correct (Informed) Uncaring Instructor
• Has the ability to teach students how to avoid plagiarism correctly.
• Believes teaching about plagiarism is not their job and will not do it.
• Will either report plagiarism without conferencing with student first, or will not report at all; does not want to waste time on procedures.
• Will learn about style updates for own personal use, but does not share information with students.

Figure 10 Correct (Informed) Uncaring Instructor Characteristics

Tier 3 – The incorrect (uninformed/ill-informed) uncaring instructor

Uninformed and ill-informed uncaring instructors believe that they know how to teach students how to avoid plagiarism but do not and, in truth, do not care to know

what students currently understand. These instructors do not want to teach the

subject, do not want to report it should it occur, and would rather ignore the topic

altogether. In fact, should these instructors encounter plagiarism, these instructors

will ignore that they saw it. They simply do not want to deal with it.

Incorrect (Uninformed/Ill-informed) Uncaring Instructor
- Believes can teach students how to avoid plagiarism but will do so incorrectly and does not realize it.
- Believes teaching about plagiarism is not their job and will not do it.
- Will report plagiarism because it is required; does so without conferencing with students first; believes students need to be punished, that all plagiarism is intentional; or, will not report at all; does not want to waste time on procedures.
- Believes more is being made out of plagiarism than needs to be.

Figure 11 Incorrect (Uninformed/Ill-informed) Uncaring Instructor Characteristics

---

Phase I – Online Survey and Short Activity

Phase I of the online survey was designed so that instructor participants could

reveal their basic stance on plagiarism, share information on what happens when they

encounter plagiarism in their classroom, and how they feel about their institution's

support or lack of support. To achieve this goal in Phase I, eight questions were first

asked; and then, participants were asked to read a short paragraph, which was

followed by two questions, each having five multi-choice answers, with the first

question asking participants to pick the correct paraphrase, and the second question

asking participants to pick the correct rewrite (see Appendix E).

Online Survey Questions

Rather than addressing each Phase I question separately, the questions have

been embodied into five categories. These five categories and overall guiding

question(s) are:

- Past Experience – When and how were you taught how to avoid plagiarism?

- Classroom Experience – How is plagiarism taught and addressed in your classroom? How do you help students who struggle with the concept? What procedures are engaged when plagiarism occurs? How are your students' learning assessed?

- Institution Experience – How is your institution involved? What support does your institution provide to you and the students?

- Personal Experience – How does student plagiarism affect you personally? Are you frustrated or disappointed? Do you take the experience personally or how it may reflect on you as a teacher?

- Assessment Experience – What kind of assessment do you provide so that you are assured that your students have learned what you have taught, which is how to use sources properly in their writing?

Past Experience

Understanding the past is critical to understanding current practices and helpful in analyzing what the future could hold based on that examination. While obtaining a participant's history may not reveal if what they had learned was correctly taught or caught, understanding a participant's background of what was provided to them could be helpful, if not insightful.

Ann cannot state with preciseness when she learned how to avoid plagiarism. She believes the learning took place when she was in high school. However, she does remember having to "integrate and cite quotes from novels we reading in a high

school English class" and then, again, in college in "honors courses" and in both "history courses" and the "graduate introduction" course in her particular field. "Other than that, I can't pinpoint an exact time when I learned how to avoid plagiarism" (personal communication, January 22, 2013), she reports. Despite these few particular moments that Ann recalls, she cannot precisely "pinpoint an exact time when I learned how to avoid plagiarism. To some degree, I think I was self-taught in this regard" (2013). Obviously, Ann received some training in how to use sources, but in adding that she was self-taught to some degree, she reveals a lack of confidence in either having received totally correct teaching, that some gaps occurred in that learning, or that her learning needed reinforcement in order for her to be confident in her use of sources. What cannot be identified here is whether the teaching Ann received was incorrect, which could have led to these gaps and where Ann had to perform self-teaching, or was the teaching correct but not wholly learned by Ann at the time to where that self-teaching became needed?

Betty, the graduate teaching assistant, cannot recall any details in having been taught how to avoid plagiarism, other than "learning how to cite in-text during a psychology class" (personal communication, December 27, 2012). As a TA, Betty is in the early years of her teaching career, with relatively little professional development other than pedagogy classes she has taken or is currently undertaking. It is unknown if plagiarism has come up in her pedagogy classes or not. Again, there is no way to determine if the teaching Betty received on how to avoid plagiarism was correct or not.

Conway misinterpreted the question being asked and instead spoke of the

history of his own teaching rather than providing a reflection upon his past and whether or not he was taught how to avoid plagiarism.

Fran received her learning earlier than did the other participants. For Fran, her learning occurred in grade school and middle school. She states that she went to a private religious school where there were frequent writing assignments involving research, though she does not remember particular discussions centering on how to avoid plagiarism. Once again, there is no way to determine what Fran was taught specifically and whether that teaching was correct or not.

Hannah remembers writing her first research paper when she was in the tenth grade. This was the time that the discussion about plagiarism came into her realm of awareness and where she took the lesson critically as the "teacher was a stickler when it came to following correct citation . . . fail[ing] any student who did not correctly cite a source" (personal communication, November 26, 2012). As with the other participants, there is no way to determine whether the teachings Hannah received were correct or not, however, there is one clue provided. The fact that the teacher emphasized correct citations indicates that the teacher was teaching about how to use quotes or how to paraphrase, but there is no way to determine which one was taught or if both were taught.

As to the other three participants who only participated in this Phase I portion of the study, Dakota reports that how to avoid plagiarism was taught in conjunction with paper assignments dealing with research but only when research was being graded. When Dakota entered college, as a freshman, there was no help or information via "handouts" offered, or even warnings. "I was expected to read the

college handbook and follow the guidelines" (personal communication, December 30, 2012). While Dakota does not say if the handbook was actually read or not, I have to imagine that Dakota did not read the handbook, which would follow traditional student behavior, based on my experience when I ask my students if they have looked at their handbook.

Elliott, as the instructor who responded with few words to the eight questions, merely said that learning came from "English instructors and in professional development sessions" (personal communication, December 28, 2012). From the information provided, Elliott could have received teaching from high school English instructors, or only from college instructors, or possibly from both. The professional development sessions are an indication that Elliott has received some training since becoming an instructor.

Gray relays that there was no "extensive instruction" about how to avoid plagiarism, but only "broad statements" (personal communication, December 17, 2012). Gray believes that the message just "sunk in" because the teachers "stressed the importance of creating original work" (2012). Like the five major participants, there is no way to determine for these three instructors if the teachings they received were correct or not.

When the participants were asked to describe how, when, and where they learned how to avoid plagiarism, clearly each participant remembers a time, either in high school or in early college, when the issue was brought up. Each could easily describe an approximation of when, and each could easily remember where a possible first discussion or first awareness occurred. Unfortunately, not one participant could

describe *how* the learning occurred in detail other than to say that the learning was attached to research writing. No participant talks about plagiarism as in the contexts of learning how to use sources correctly in quotes, paraphrasing, or rewriting. A couple participants mention a strict teacher or swift and harsh consequences if instructions by the students were not followed and plagiarism occurred, but what type of plagiarism was being discussed? Could knowing be important to understanding a disconnection between what students learn and instructors teach?

Classroom Experience

The next category of questions that the participants were asked pertain to their classroom experience as teachers. In particular, they were asked how they teach students how to avoid plagiarism, how they help students who struggle with this concept, what happens when plagiarism is encountered in their classroom, and how do they, as teachers, assess the students' learning.

Ann, as a reluctant proactive adjunct, would rather not have to address plagiarism in her class at all. Unfortunately, for her, though, plagiarism is occurring in her classroom, and she realizes that it happens because the students do not understand how to use sources properly. While she could ignore the problem and fail the students' work according to her syllabus, she cares too much about her students' success. Consequently, she is proactively addressing the problem in her classroom. Ann happened to e-mail me, asking for permission to use a handout that I had developed (see Appendix A) and that a previous student of mine, and who was now in Ann's class, had given her. As a result, Ann became interested in this study even though she is not an English instructor and has never taught composition. Her insight

into the problem of plagiarism was just as important as those participants who do teach English composition because her frustration and concern mirrors that of other instructors. Prior to Ann contacting me, the extent of her classroom instruction was to direct her students to the Purdue OWL website via a link in her syllabus, along with the typical university paragraph about academic integrity. Now, Ann claims that in future semesters, she will be conducting an in-class activity to educate her students, showing them how to avoid plagiarism. Ann likes that her students will come to see her during office hours and that they will e-mail her when they have questions, so once again, Ann is actively engaged with her students' success. One observation Ann makes is that students are required to have "completed some sort of composition/English course prior to taking [her] course" (personal communication, January 22, 2013), and she admits that she understands that "it takes repetition" (2013) to understand the skill that they may have just learned. Ann has identified a key component in students needing practice in mastering the skill of using sources. This component of practice will be further addressed in Chapter V.

Betty, as the only TA, provides a specific teaching unit on plagiarism in her classroom. Up until she participated in this survey, Betty has placed that teaching unit at the end of her class when she assigns the final paper, which is the only paper that uses research; but now, Betty is re-evaluating that teaching unit's placement during the semester. Betty believes that due to earlier plagiarism issues that have occurred on other papers, that probably the unit should be moved earlier into the semester, where students will have various opportunities to practice their citation skills before dealing with their own research for that paper. Additionally, Betty is

considering moving the research paper earlier in the semester, as well, though, I have to wonder why. Is she considering allowing her students the opportunity to fix their plagiarism should it occur? Or is she considering having more than one paper in her semester-long class utilizing sources? When "blatant plagiarism" (personal communication, December 27, 2012) occurs on a student's paper, Betty is more forgiving than the other participants of this study have indicated. While blatant plagiarism can result in instant institutional reporting or a failing grade, Betty prefers to allow her students the opportunity to redo the assignment, but the student can earn only at best 50% of the grade. She believes 50% is far better for a student than receiving 0%; plus, she wants to provide as many teaching opportunities as possible.

Conway, as an online business adjunct instructor, is direct and to the point with his students when it comes to plagiarism. He warns them, he explains the concept, and then expects his students to comply. If they do not, Conway will "severely punish" (personal communication, December 24, 2012) by docking points. While Conway expects his students to follow his directions, Conway admits there are times when a student requires extra help, and Conway is willing to provide it to the student, giving the student as much of his time required until the student understands. However, what Conway does not say is if he conferences with the students one-on-one. It appears from Conway's responses that when students are found struggling with the concept of using sources properly, Conway will create a "class learning project without necessarily focusing attention on any one single student" (2012). Because Conway's teaching institution creates most of the student assignments, Conway feels restricted in being able to deter plagiarism by creating his own

assignments. In fact, if the institution is creating the assignments, the question has to

be asked if whether plagiarism has not escalated because of the duplicity of these

assignments as "an effort to keep the classes uniform across the U.S." (2012). With

Conway teaching for a large online university that controls these assignments, how

often are these assignments changed by the university? Conway does not say.

Fran is a full-time instructor who teaches English composition and who

addresses plagiarism with every assignment. Fran finds that most of the time when

plagiarism occurs in her class it is because the plagiarism was intentional, blatantly

and purposefully so. Fran factors in major one-on-one conferences with her students.

She realizes that even though they more often than not blatantly plagiarize that she

can still make a difference by talking about their lack of time management or needed

issues that resulted in the plagiarism in the first place. To help her students avoid

plagiarism, Fran creates assignments that will promote original thinking. For

example, when she assigns "the large research project, I have my students write about

local issues, so then a lot of the research . . . are interviews and smaller scale searches

rather than large web searches" (personal communication, November 29, 2012). Fran

is also cognizant of the fact that many times students are coming into her classroom,

even if directly from high school, without having any education on how to use a style,

such as MLA, APA, or Chicago. Fran feels obligated to spend time teaching her

students how to use the proper style as required. While Fran is willing to talk to

students one-one-one when there is an incidence of plagiarism, and while she believes

that most of the plagiarism that she sees is purposefully done, there was no real

discussion in this Phase I portion of the study as to how much time she spends in the

classroom teaching students about avoiding plagiarism.

Hannah, another full-time faculty member, has taught composition in the past, but currently teaches graduate students so she does not spend time in the classroom teaching students how to avoid plagiarism. However, when plagiarism does occur, she will coach the student through the concept, allowing the student an opportunity to make the assignment correct, though with a grade deduction for having committed the plagiarism in the first place. Hannah's goal is for her students to learn from their mistakes, believing if they have an opportunity to do what is right that the students will not repeat those same mistakes in the future. Hannah admits that it takes more time for her to provide this service to her students but that it is a price that she is willing to pay in order to create "a better writer, a better learner, and a deep thinker" (personal communication, November 26, 2012). Additionally, Hannah believes that if a student plagiarized a paper in her class, that the chances are that this is not the first time the student has plagiarized, though, Hannah would like it to be the last time that the student does plagiarize. Obviously, Hannah, as a coach, believes that learning is a continual process.

As to the other three participants, who only responded to the Phase I, online survey portion of this study, Dakota, who teaches online, provides students with an "online workshop," a unit about plagiarism, which students are expected to complete, along with examples that students have to identify whether the examples are plagiarism-free or not (personal communication, December 30, 2012).

Elliott's responses were vague when it came to answering questions about what occurs in the classroom, or in that the questions were not answered at all. For

example, regarding question two of the online survey, I asked: *How do you pro-actively address plagiarism in the classroom? For example, do you have a plan to address how to avoid plagiarism with your students from the beginning, before it occurs, or do you not have a plane at all and wait to see plagiarism occurring before you address it?* Elliott's response was "Yes" (personal communication December 28, 2012). Frankly, I am not sure what the *yes* addresses, so it becomes difficult to determine what kind of teaching Elliott provides to students in relationship to avoiding plagiarism. As an adjunct instructor who does not teach English, Elliott considers it a responsibility to teach students about the concept of plagiarism; however, Elliott provides no details as to how that teaching occurs. Based on the question *How do you react when you see plagiarism occur?*, Elliott views plagiarism occurring as a "teaching moment" (2012) with the first incidence, with further incidences being reported. Based on Elliott's responses, it appears that there may be the usual academic integrity statement made available in the syllabus with the students expected to understand the concept of plagiarism on their own. Should the students plagiarize, it appears possible that Elliott provides students with a teaching moment with a re-do of the assignment, but it is unclear based on Elliott's responses how involved Elliott is in providing extra teaching to those students.

Gray, as a full-time faculty member, appears to provide the most teaching opportunities of these three instructors who only participated in Phase I. Gray states that "original assignments" (personal communication, December 17, 2012) are created with the intent that plagiarism becomes difficult to perform. Gray also assigns "original readings for the students to analyze and switches them frequently so

they cannot be copied from classmates who took the class previously" (2012).

Obviously, Gray is conscientious of the potential for plagiarism with repeated

assignments. Also, Gray states that extensive notes are written on the students' drafts

of the research paper, which is the only assignment that uses sources. Gray believes

that the expectations are made clear to the students based on those comments, which

are "extensive" (2012), so that the students are expected to fix those errors before

turning in the final paper.

Institution Experience

Only one set of questions addressed the participants' teaching institutions in

this initial, Phase I portion of this study. Basically, the instructors were asked if their

institution was involved when their students plagiarized and how. The participants

were asked if they believed there was support from their institutions and whether or

not, as the instructor, they turned the plagiarism problem over to the institution or if

they preferred to keep the problem in the classroom.

Ann is not impressed with her institution's policy regarding plagiarism,

calling it "vague" (personal communication, January 22, 2013). Rather than reporting

her students for plagiarism, she deals with the problem in the classroom. If she

believes the students plagiarized unknowingly, she provides them an opportunity to

redo the assignment, to correct the plagiarism, rather than "simply failing them"

(2013).

Betty prefers to keep all plagiarism inside the classroom. While she admits

there are "institutional procedures" (personal communication, December 27, 2012) in

place, she would rather avoid them if possible due to an unfortunate experience a

friend of hers encountered when her friend followed those procedures. Apparently,

Betty's friend suffered the embarrassment of not being able to fully provide evidence

of plagiarism, thus the student was allowed to return to the class, which caused

Betty's friend further embarrassment. As a result, Betty is conscientious when

creating writing assignments and admits that she is mindful of plagiarism possibilities

as she creates these assignments.

Conway prefers to keep all plagiarism issues inside the classroom; however,

he states if the student plagiarizes again, "even after repeated warnings and failing

grades" (personal communication, December 24, 2012) that he will report the student.

This response raises the question of how many warnings and failings have to occur

before a student is reported as Conway spoke of warnings and failings in the plural

form. Based on an earlier response where Conway stated that he will "severely

punish" (2012) plagiarism with points being deducted from the work, it would appear

that a student has several opportunities to plagiarize before an official report to the

teaching institution is made.

Fran is the instructor, teaching composition full-time, who feels there are too

many rules at her teaching institution, which then prevents her to deal with plagiarism

as she believes it should be addressed, which is to have students "automatically fail

the course if they intentionally plagiarize" (personal communication, November 29,

2012). Fran simply does not want to deal with students who are willing to cheat on

purpose. Instead, however, she is forced to deal with intentional plagiarism in her

class until the student plagiarizes a second time—intentionally—before she can give

the student a failing grade for the class. What Fran dislikes even more is that there is

no reporting of any kind to indicate that the student has failed the class because of plagiarism, which means that the student could go on into other classes and perform intentional plagiarism multiple times.

Hannah prefers to handle plagiarism issues in the classroom before turning them over to her teaching institution, following its procedures and policies. While Hannah makes sure that she places the policy in her syllabus, she wants to provide students who plagiarize a one-on-one conference with her as a first step in the process of dealing with the issue. Only if a student is not willing to work with her does Hannah report the plagiarism as required. Obviously, while Hannah is willing to help a student learn how to avoid plagiarism, she is not willing to allow a student to plagiarize without consequences.

As to the other three participants, who only responded to the Phase I portion of this study, Dakota claims that the students are made aware of the teaching institution's policies and that Dakota is "obligated to follow the procedures" (personal communication, December 30, 2012). Elliott, on the other hand, tends to follow Hannah's methodology of handling the situation; the first instance stays in the classroom as Elliott works with the student. Subsequent instances of plagiarism get reported. Likewise, Gray handles a first occurrence of plagiarism with the student. However, should the student plagiarize a second time, Gray reports the incident to the "VP of Academic Affairs" (personal communication, December 17, 2012), which means the student could fail the assignment and even the class, depending on the plagiarized circumstance.

From the initial responses regarding the participants' feelings about their

institutional policies and procedures, it appears that these instructors would rather

help their students resolve the plagiarism instances than report them. However, they

are willing to report students for repeated offences, with the exception of Betty, a TA,

who saw a friend suffer through a bad experience having done the right thing by

reporting a student. So, the question has to be asked: Is Betty's lack of experience

making her more cautious about reporting, or is it possible that Betty's friend

believed that the student who was reported had plagiarized when in actuality the

student had not, thus putting into question, does Betty's friend fully understand the

concept of plagiarism?

Personal Experience

On rare occasions, I have read or heard of instructors who took their students'

plagiarism as a personal assault against them as instructors. I wondered, how

frequent is that feeling among instructors. So, I posed questions to my participants in

this study as sub questions, asking them: How does student plagiarism affect you

personally? Are you frustrated or disappointed? Do you take the experience

personally or how it may reflect on you as a teacher?

Ann believes that while teaching students how to avoid plagiarism is really is

not her job, she is "happy" to do it because she "would rather proactively address the

problem . . . than deal with it after the plagiarism has occurred" (personal

communication, January 22, 2013). Ann is hoping that plagiarism will be less of a

problem because she has become proactive. While Ann's initial frustration forced her

to become more proactive in teaching her students how to avoid plagiarism, Ann

states that if students continue to plagiarize despite the added effort she is

contributing in the classroom, she "will take it more personally" (2013).

Betty feels "disappointed and angry" (personal communication, December 27, 2012) when her students plagiarize. She believes that they are disrespecting her and the class by disregarding her instruction. She feels as if that time she spends teaching them about using sources correctly is a misuse of her time, of the other students' time. Additionally, she feels that her time is being wasted "to have even read the paper" (2012), let alone grade it when there is plagiarism. Finally, Betty feels anguish, concern, and "anxiety" (2012) when returning the papers, which indicates that Betty is concerned about how students view her teaching, even though she states that she does not take plagiarism personally, that she views plagiarism as students being lazy.

Conway says that he does not take plagiarism personally, as a reflection as an instructor, but he does "tend [to] have a negative opinion of that student" (2012). This response raises other questions: Why is that student now seen in a negative light? If the student does not understand the concept, how is that the student can be blamed? Or, is there missing information provided in this response, such as the student was lazy, thereby the plagiarism was intentional? While Conway does not take the plagiarize personally, he is frustrated when plagiarism occurs.

Fran states that initially when she finds that a student has plagiarized that she wonders if she might be at fault, that she has not taught the unit effectively to her students. However, after having a conversation with the student who had plagiarized, Fran finds that more times than not that the plagiarism was purposeful, performed intentionally, and that usually, "they ran out of time because they procrastinated" (personal communication, November 29, 2012). Fran's relief is palpable even though

she does not express that feeling of relief specifically. It is obvious by the amount of time she spends teaching her students how to avoid plagiarism that she may fear that she still is not doing enough and that she is relieved to learn that the students procrastinated rather than finding that it was she who failed them.

Hannah, like Fran, is genuinely concerned for her students when they plagiarize. Like Fran, Hannah finds that students plagiarize because they ran out of time, did not plan well, or were just plain lazy, thus resorted to blatant copying and pasting. Hannah states that she does not take the plagiarism personally nor sees that it "directly reflects on my teaching" (personal communication, November 26, 2012). Because she spends so much time coaching her students on how to avoid plagiarism, including one-on-one conferences, Hannah believes the students are simply performing as they have in the past and where the students have been able to get by without consequences to past plagiarism. Or is it possible that this is the first time the students are discovering what they do not know?

As to the other three participants, who only responded to the Phase I portion of this study, Dakota does not see the student plagiarism as a reflection of the teaching students receive in the class. Dakota believes that while some students are non-traditional, returning to school a good number of years since high school graduation, that the responsibility to learn how to avoid plagiarism is on them, particularly as Dakota explains the "differences between intentional plagiarism and unintentional plagiarism" (personal communication, December 30, 2012) to the students.

Elliott, however, sees differently; Elliott believes if students plagiarize in

class, then the reflection of teaching, or possible lack of teaching, comes back to the instructor. Elliott prefers not to be connected to a plagiarist, with that plagiarist going into other classes and saying it was okay not to cite sources in Elliott's class.

Gray states that those students who blatantly copy and paste should face the consequences of their actions and not be allowed to "feign ignorance . . . in an effort to get themselves out of trouble" (personal communication, December 17, 2012). Because Gray reads the students' drafts and makes comments on those drafts, Gray's belief is that when plagiarism occurs, the students "know what they're doing" (2012) by choosing to ignore the comments on previous drafts, thus they should suffer the consequences.

Overall, nearly every one of these instructors, with the exception of Dakota, expressed frustration at some point in one of their responses to the survey question, and yet, only one of them, Elliott, expressed concern that the frustration would be seen as a direct result of the teaching provided to the students.

Major Participants	
Ann	"Really disappointed and frustrated" (personal communication, January 22, 2013).
Betty	"Disappointed and angry . . . [with students showing] disrespect for me, my class, and for the author whose work they are stealing" (personal communication, December 27, 2012).
Conway	"Disappointed and frustrated" (personal communication, December 24, 2012).
Fran	"Usually, I am a bit disappointed and frustrated" (personal communication, November 29, 2012).
Hannah	"Yes, I am absolutely disappointed and frustrated. . . . I try not to take it personally . . . but (usually) it does still hurt my feelings" (personal communication, November 26, 2012).
Other Participants	
Dakota	(did not address if frustrated or not)
Elliott	"After repeated times, disappointment and frustration figure in" (personal communication, December 28, 2012).
Gray	"I am definitely frustrated when I see flagrant plagiarism, but I don't take it personally" (personal communication, December 17, 2012).

Figure 12 Recap of Participants' Frustration Level

So the question needs to be asked: When we are frustrated with something, is not that frustration a personal response to a situation that is not going as we would like? Are not frustration and feeling disrespected considered personal reflections? In effect, while most of the these instructors state that they do not consider that their students' plagiarism is formally reflected upon them personally, is it possible that they are taking their students' plagiarism personally, even if just a little bit because they are frustrated? A future project that could explore this frustration could prove interesting, and will be discussed further in Chapter V.

Assessment Experience

Only one question was posed to these Phase I online survey participants regarding how are they assured that their teaching has been well received by their students, and that question was, *What assessment methodology do you employ to ensure that your teaching of how to avoid plagiarism is fully learned?* Basically, not one of these eight instructors who participated in the Phase I, online survey have any formal assessment in place, so that they, as instructors, can be assured that proper learning of the material on how to avoid plagiarism was received well before the research assignment is graded. There are no tests, no quizzes, no formal assessment, or some kind of writing that could *test* the students' ability to avoid plagiarism; most assessments by these instructors is attained through the final draft of a research paper, though a few of these instructors do have an in-class activity or activities.

Ann states that she has no "specific assessment method, since teaching plagiarism is not technically part of my course" (personal communication, January

22, 2013). As for how Ann assesses her students to determine if they fully understand how to avoid plagiarism, Ann admits she has no formal assessment in place, though she does want to start implementing a few classroom activities in the future, which will allow her to determine if the students are learning what she is teaching.

Betty states that unless the final papers can be counted where they are graded for proper citation usage, then she has no assessment in place.

Conway, like Betty, as no assessment in place other than the "trial and error through writing research papers" (personal communication December 24, 2012).

Fran says that she has no official assessment in place. She depends on student learning to be reflected in the writing of their papers and the use of correct use of sources.

Hannah assesses her students through "workshop sessions" and has discovered that students "inadvertently plagiarize when they are paraphrasing material" (personal communication, November 26, 2012). Hannah also states that it is through these in-class activities that she is able to assess whether her students are understanding the concept or not.

As to the other three participants, who only responded to the Phase I portion of this study, Dakota has no assessment in place other than the students' abilities to read Dakota's comments on the drafts and fix their mistakes before turning in the final papers. Elliott responded with just one word: "Rubric" (personal communication, December 28, 2012). Obviously, Elliott's rubric has plagiarism properties built within it and should the student not use sources properly, the rubric

will deduct points or point out the error of the plagiarism. Gray, like Dakota, has no assessment nor "a specific lesson/unit on avoiding plagiarism" (personal communication, December 17, 2012).

While these instructors through their classroom experiences express the time and work they put into helping their students succeed in understanding how to avoid plagiarism, is it possible that the lack of some kind of formal assessment, some type of test, *before* they reach that all-important research paper could prove the students' understanding of this difficult concept of plagiarism to their instructors? Is it possible that the disconnection between student and instructor could be resolved simply if an assessment was provided so that both student and instructor knew exactly if the teaching was learned effectively or not?

Short Activity

As stated earlier, the short activity required participants to read a paragraph, then choose the appropriate paraphrase from five provided choices, and then choose the appropriate rewrite from five provided choices. What follows is Figure 12 that displays The Paragraph, The Paraphrase Choices, The Rewritten Choices, and then a graphic that details how the participants responded, indicating the number they chose, with highlighted cells to indicate that the number chosen was correct.

The Paragraph

> Franklin despised using the bald eagle as our national symbol primarily because of its inherent lack of hard work. He compared the bald eagle to men who make their living as thieves and robbers and condemned the society that is populated solely by such 'workers.' Franklin's own choice for our national symbol was the turkey, which he preferred because it was native to North America (as cited in McCormick, 2000, p. 75).

The Paraphrase Choices

1. Franklin disliked using the bald eagle as our national symbol because of its lack of hard work.
2. Franklin compared the bald eagle with men who make a living as criminals and condemned society solely populated by such "workers."
3. Franklin compared the bald eagle with men who make a living as criminals and condemned society solely populated by such "workers" (McCormick, 2000, p. 75).
4. Franklin wanted the turkey rather than the bald eagle as our nation's emblem because the turkey is indigenous to North American. He believed the turkey was a bird with integrity (McCormick, 2000, p. 75).
5. Franklin didn't like using the bald eagle as our national emblem because he thought it represented laziness. He said the bald eagle was like men who make their living as thieves and robbers (McCormick, 2000, p. 75).

The Rewrite Choices

1. If Franklin had gotten his way, our national symbol would be the turkey instead of the bald eagle because the turkey is native to America.
2. Franklin opposed using the bald eagle as our country symbol primarily because of its laziness.
3. The Statue of Liberty should be our national symbol instead of birds. The Statue of Liberty is what our ancestors saw when they came to this country, and now that we are a melting pot of people, the Statue of Liberty represents all of us as a community.
4. Choosing a symbol is not easy, especially if the chosen symbol has any negative traits. When choosing a symbol, how it's viewed needs to be considered.
5. Because the bald eagle steals food from other animals, thus making it a lazy bird, it should not have been considered as a national symbol for America.

Instructor Name	Clause Identifier	Paraphrase Choice	Rewritten Choice
Major Participants			
Ann	Non-English Adjunct	**4**	1
Betty	English Comp TA	5	5
Conway	Online Non-English Adjunct	5	5
Fran	English Full-Time Prof	5	2
Hannah	English Full-Time Prof	5	2
Other Participants			
Dakota	Online English Adjunct	3	5
Elliott	Non-English Adjunct	5	**4**
Gray	English Full-Time Prof	**4**	1

Figure 13 Short Activity Results
Source information comes from the Phase I portion of the online survey.

What is most interesting about the results of this short activity is that not one

instructor, including English instructors, managed to choose both the correct

paraphrase and the correct rewrite. What is surprising, however, is that out of the three total correct responses, two of those correct responses come from instructors whose expertise is in fields other than English. It would not be fair to make a judgment on the rank status of these instructors because the adjunct may be an adjunct by choice or has not been able to find a full-time position, as yet. Just because an instructor is an adjunct, that status does not make them less credible. Is it possible that age, assuming that with age comes more experience, could have made a difference? Although my research did not support age data in this study, that question can only be asked here but not answered; however, it might be worthy of data collection for a future study. This particular query will be further discussed in Chapter V, along with other questions that have arisen as a result of this study, questions that could have value as other future projects when tied or built upon this study.

The popular answer by these instructors was #5 for The Paraphrase Choice. The problem with that answer is that too many of McCormick's words, other than the nouns that could not be changed, were used. In order to discuss McCormick's creation of his idea based on Franklin's work, a writer would have to use the words *Franklin, turkey, bald eagle,* and possibly *North America.* However, every other word that McCormick used needed to be changed in order to have a correctly written paraphrase. In the #5 example, the words that specifically needed changing were *thieves and robbers. Thieves and robbers* come directly from the paragraph and without quote marks denotes plagiarism; and since there should not be quote marks in a proper paraphrase, the correct choice is #4. Since a paraphrase requires a citation

#1 and #2 are automatically wrong, and if quote marks should not appear in a paraphrase, that requirement eliminates #3, as well.

The choices made for The Rewrite Choice were equally divided between #1, #2 and #5, with only Gray picking the correct rewrite. In order for a proper rewrite to occur with McCormick's paragraph is to talk about the core idea but *not have it attached* to Franklin's expression of idea; thus, there can be no discussion about Franklin or birds in any fashion. Number 1 is appropriate as a paraphrase, providing a citation was included, but it is not appropriate as a rewrite. The problem with #1 as a rewrite answer is that is still about Franklin's expression of the idea as stated by McCormick. Consequently, there is only one correct rewrite answer, which is #4. Any one of the other options would be good for a paraphrase provided there was a proper citation at the end. In essence, each one of these instructors could have been accused of plagiarism for at least one of their choices had they been used in a paper.

With this many instructors not picking the right paraphrase and rewrite choices, it appears possible that these instructors are ill-informed or uninformed. While each one of these instructors was able to provide a time period where they remember having learned how to avoid plagiarism, and through their responses to this online survey, it is quite apparent that each one of them cares about their teaching and the success of their students in learning how to avoid plagiarism, this activity reveals that there may be a gap of understanding on the part of instructors as to what they may have learned back when they were in high school or in their early college composition classes.

Based on the Phase I responses to questions and on the results of this short

activity, Phase II of this study delved deeper into the specific areas that the instructors first discussed, particularly in those areas of teacher assurance of having been taught correctly, whether our institutions are doing enough to support both teachers and students regarding plagiarism learning and its consequences when it occurs, whether testing should occur and who should be tested, and whether they would prefer to be free of having to deal with plagiarism altogether in their classrooms. The next section of this chapter reveals and analyzes those responses that came from Phase II.

Phase II – E-mail Survey

Once participants were finished with the online survey of Phase I, they were asked if they wanted to participate in Phase II. To participate, they moved forward by providing their names and e-mail addresses. Then, by e-mail, the participants received the Phase II questions (see Appendix F).

The intent of this section of the study is not to analyze all of the questions individually, but rather to place the questions into categories that provide deeper revelations and understandings of these five major participants who did move into this phase. These instructors were Ann, Betty, Conway, Fran, and Hannah. The four categories of discussion and analysis are:

- Assurance – What assurance(s) do you have that you were taught correctly about how to avoid plagiarism? How would you feel if you discovered that your teaching has been incorrect or partially incorrect all this time?

- Testing – Should teachers be tested to learn if they can correctly teach students how to avoid plagiarism? If so, what would that testing look like?

Should students be tested in some formal way to determine whether they understand how to use sources correctly? If so, how would that testing look?

- Institutional Support – Is there enough support from our teaching institutions, from each other as instructors, and are current policies adequate?

- Plagiarism Free – Would you like to be free of all responsibility of teaching and detecting plagiarism? Should students be tested as they entered college to determine their knowledge about how to avoid plagiarism?

Assurance

In the Phase I portion of the survey, every instructor expressed assurance in the teaching they had received from their instructors regarding the instruction of how to use sources correctly and how to avoid plagiarism; and yet, at the same time, a few of the participants expressed how they never thought to question whether that teaching had been correct or not; they assumed that the teaching they had received had been correct.

Ann states that she never

"questioned what was being taught by my instructors regarding plagiarism. I know my *students* have questioned me when I tell them something they write is plagiarized, sometimes even citing high school teachers as telling them the opposite" (personal communication, February 28, 2013).

While Ann admits that she would be frustrated if she were to learn that her teachers had provided her with incorrect information in dealing with plagiarism, she also admits that she would see the incident as a "learning moment" and would definitely

share her learning moment with her students. Ann concludes that she "doubt[s] that discovery would change [her] attitude much about how we currently teach our students . . . although, [she] would like to see all teachers properly trained in this area" (2013).

Betty is "very assured that [she] was taught correctly" (personal communication, February 25, 2013), and like Ann, "never questioned what [she] was taught by instructors" (2013). Betty's assurance comes from the fact that her instructors were credentialed professors; there were no adjunct instructors. While Betty can remember the college instructors, she cannot, however, remember if there was written material or not that was supplied with their instruction.

Conway reports that his "learning methodology was lacking" (personal communication, February 25, 2013), though he is not totally clear if that lack occurred because of his learning skills or if the instructors were unable to help him learn the information. He does state that there was self-learning involved because of the frequent changes that were made within the styles, which required that he stay diligent about the changes. Conway's response to how he would feel if he were to discover that his teaching of how to use sources was incorrect was interesting in that he would not take that information at face value; he would have to "research how exactly I was wrong and why to prove it to myself" (2013). Conway was immediately forthcoming, however, in saying that he would "share it with everyone, including my peers and my students" (2013).

Fran is not only sure that her instructors taught her how to use sources correctly, she is "definitely assured" (personal communication, February 19, 2013)

that they did so; but, she does not "recall ever questioning" (2013) that teaching.

Fran does admit that if she were to discover that her teaching of students in how to

avoid plagiarism was incorrect, she would be hurt, that she would be angry and

frustrated and

> "that my anger or frustration would be directed toward my doctoral program
>
> because they were the last 'barrier' between myself and a tenure-track
>
> composition position and, as a doctoral student, I worked one on one with an
>
> advisor and committee on my dissertation. If none of them corrected me or
>
> told me I was wrong at that stage, I would be very unhappy with them. And, I
>
> suppose it trickles down from there . . . MA program, BA, high school . . .
>
> (2013).

Even though she would not like to learn that what she was taught was incorrect, Fran

believes that overall her attitude toward teaching students about how to avoid

plagiarism would not be any different than it is right now. She states that she wants

to remain "honest and forthcoming with [her] comp students about distinctions

between high school English and college English" (2013).

Hannah, like Betty, is "very confident" about what she learned from her

teachers about how to avoid plagiarism, stating that her "teachers never indicated that

[she] lacked basic citation skills (personal communication, March 2, 2013). Hannah

was extremely assured, as well, that she "correctly understood how to cite sources

correctly" (2013). Hannah does admit that she would

> be upset knowing I had inadvertently mislead some of my former students. I
>
> would definitely share my teaching moment with others—peers and students. .

. . I am not embarrassed by lack of knowledge. I am quick to admit my shortcomings and am eager to learn new knowledge. I would hope my peers and students feel the same way (2013).

Testing

Ann believes that all teachers should be tested regarding their knowledge of how to avoid plagiarism, even teachers of "other (non-composition) subjects" (personal communication, February 28, 2013). As for testing students, Ann believes that the idea is not a "bad idea" but she is not sure if "'mass testing' would solve the problem" (2013).

Betty believes teachers should be tested although "passing a test is still no guarantee that a teacher will choose to disseminate that information to students" (personal information, February 25, 2013). Betty worries that too much focus from too many instructors as students move from class to class could have an inverse effect and that students will "end up becoming immune to the gravity of the issue" (2013). Betty does believe that there should be a "standard lesson that instructors are required to use in first-year composition classes" (2013), although she also acknowledges that such learning would be more ideally learned in the classroom.

Conway states that instructors should be tested on their knowledge of how sources should be used but that the testing should occur when, as students, they are writing their exams. Even though Conway does not teach English and does not assign traditional composition assignment, he does believe that any teacher who assigns "a writing component should teach plagiarism" (personal communication, February 25, 2013).

Fran's response to whether teachers should be tested about their plagiarism

knowledge was not said with the strongest of convictions, since she said, "I *suppose*

so" [my emphasis] (personal communication, February 19, 2013); but she did add that

instructors probably should be tested in other areas as well and that the testing should

be addressed in "teacher education" (2013) as future teachers are being prepared for

their future teaching. Fran believes any testing that could be done on instructors to

determine their knowledge on how to avoid plagiarism could be considered as

"artificial assessment" (2013). She strongly believes that "if an instructor never turns

in a student for plagiarism then there is a problem" (2013).

Hannah makes the case that because "there are various forms of plagiarism"

(personal communication, March 2, 2013) and that there may not be a good way to

test students or teachers. As an example Hannah states that students could "cite

outside sources" correctly, but then later, "as professionals[,] 'steal' another scholar's

[creation of an][4] idea and commit plagiarism in that respect" (2013). Hannah also

implies that since plagiarism-detection tools are used at many teaching institutions

that those tools can "assist teachers in detecting plagiarized papers" (2013) to check

on students. Additionally, since teachers should already understand "the basic

characteristics of plagiarism and how to avoid it," and because student teachers have

so little time in the schedules to take formal training that institutions trying to

implement testing teachers would be hard pressed to do so. Later, Hannah does state

---

[4] While Hannah talked about stealing another scholar's idea, I believe she meant *the creation of the idea*, hence my insertion to provide clear meaning. I do wonder, though, if Hannah is misinformed on this notion of ideas being copyrighted as many instructors erroneously are, not fully understanding that it is the creation of the idea that is copyrighted.

that she does "not think students should be tested on plagiarism" because their knowledge should be based on what they should have learned and then they "should be held accountable (by teachers)" (2013) for that learning. Consequently, she believes "that students should assume the burden of responsibility when it comes to plagiarism" (2013). Overall, it could be said that Hannah is testing her students, as many instructors are inclined to do, through the accountability factor.

Institutional Support

Ann believes that the teaching of plagiarism should be "emphasized in the required comp courses for students" (personal communication, February 28, 2013), though immediately after making that statement wonders if it "would be useful for all teachers to have a seminar explaining the plagiarism policy at the institution and the procedures for dealing with it" (2013).

Betty believes a "university-wise standard plagiarism-avoidance curriculum" could be implemented to "ensure all students are exposed to the same information" (personal communication, February 25, 2013). However, she also believes when dealing with a student who has plagiarized and in reporting that plagiarism that the responsibility rests with the instructor to prove how the student plagiarized. Through having witnessed a friend's unfortunate experience, Betty appears to be gun-shy about reporting herself. Betty goes on to say that even her dealings with a student's plagiarism issues in class cannot guarantee that the student will become plagiarism-free in other classes, though she would like to believe that the student would have learned their lesson and would conduct themselves better as they move forward academically. Betty believes that most instructors would rather keep plagiarism

issues inside the classroom rather than inviting the stress or responsibility that accompanies plagiarism being reported.

Unlike most of the participants, Conway reports that his teaching institution "takes plagiarism extremely seriously" (personal communication, February 25, 2013), that there is plenty of in-house professional development to assist instructors who need guidance in learning how to help their students avoid plagiarism. Conway comments that while plagiarism was discussed in some of his classes when he was an undergraduate student, plagiarism was "never graded" (2013). Therefore, he did not understand why it was not discussed in the first place. Was it possible that his teacher did not want to deal with the institutional procedures? As for institutional support in a possible model of how teaching about plagiarism should look, Conway suggests that the school "take a sample of online submitted papers from each class papers and run them through plagiarism software, then compare the results with the instructor's results" (2013). While Conway admits that this process would be occurring after the class was over, it would be "a way to review instructors' adherence to policy" (2013).

Fran states of plagiarism that there is a "terrible plague [in] higher education and we don't keep track of it" (personal communication, February 19, 2013). Fran believes that better records of plagiarists need to be maintained by institutions and that consequences should be enforced. In fact Fran believes that there "are not harsh enough punishments for this behavior. We need more" (2013). Because Fran has taught at several different higher learning institutions, she has had the ability to observe how plagiarism has been handled; and, she claims that "there is typically little support for instructors to have appropriate (or harsh) punishments" (2013). As a

result, she knows "a number of English instructors [who] just avoid assigning writing assignments so that they don't have to handle the inevitable plagiarized paper" (2013).

Hannah believesthat writing should cross the curriculum, that all teachers should be assigning writings, which then means teaching writing should occur across the curriculum, along with teaching students how to avoid plagiarism. Hannah strongly believes that learning how to use "sources and avoiding plagiarism are recursive skills" (personal communication, March 2, 2013) but that some students first learn those skills in "elementary school; for others, they may first learn about plagiarism at the secondary level . . . [and that] they should have opportunities to review their knowledge plagiarism and be given opportunities to practice citing sources" (2013).

Plagiarism Free

Ann definitely would prefer not to have to teach her students how to avoid plagiarism, first because English is not her field, and second, because she feels that she is taking away from the class content and learning outcomes by doing so. She performs the teaching service to her students because "I don't like to see my students fail, and I don't want them to fail simply because they don't understand how to avoid plagiarism" (personal communication, February 23, 2013). Ann admits that she has considered not assigning a research paper for her class, because if there is no research writing, there would be no need to plagiarize; but, because she feels in a deep way that it is "important to learn how to write well" (2013), she will be keeping the research paper in her line-up of assignments.

Betty claims that dealing with plagiarism is "the worst part of teaching composition" and that she would be "happy if [she] never had to deal with plagiarism again" (personal communication, February 25, 2013).

Conway, essentially, implies he is okay with dealing with plagiarism in his teaching, for he believes that "checking for plagiarism is the same as grading a person's learning of the submitted matter. If a student copies from the text book or another book, what have they really learned?"(personal communication February 25, 2013).

Fran replies, "Of course, I don't want to deal with [plagiarism.] I want my students to be interested in the topics" (personal communication, February 19, 2013) and content of the class. She would rather focus on the learning outcomes of the course than having to deal with plagiarized papers.

Hannah is the sole participant of Phase II who states outright that she would not want to be plagiarism free. She writes,

> No, I think my attitude has always been to create assignments that are innovative, so it is less likely student will be able to plagiarize. Almost all of my writing assignments also require students to submit multiple drafts (with revisions); this strategy helps eliminate the possibility of plagiarism (personal communication, March 2, 2013).

Summary

This next section is a short summary of what I learned from these participants and possible trends that I see. The next chapter will explore those trends more thoroughly as I talk about possible projects that I see coming out of this research.

The figure below (see Figure 14) recaps the various levels of plagiarism understanding—whether correct or incorrect, caring or uncaring, open or resistant—of instructors. Categorized with those levels are the beliefs and views that these instructors hold. Initially, when I began this study, I thought that I might find that instructors belong solidly in one category. However, as the study progressed, particularly as the research was analyzed, I found that it was the categories that had to change. My original goal was to be able to place instructors neatly into a category, because it is only when we can identify the problem that we can begin to find a real solution. What I discovered instead is that while I could fairly easily place instructors on a tier based on their correct or incorrect knowledge, as between Tier 1 and 2, and then where they were caring or uncaring, between Tier 2 and 3, I discovered that sometimes all it took was one trait to place an instructor between the two boxes on the same tier or even between tiers. Basically, their placement in my mind came down to how resistant were they, and how open were they in wanting to learn what they did not know.

Tier 1	**Correct Caring Instructor** **(Informed)** • Stays up-to-date with style changes • Believes teaching plagiarism is not their job but will do it and make a difference • Works to help students and provide teaching moments when needed • Will report students who fail to use sources properly after receiving teaching moment(s)

Tier 2	**Incorrect Caring, Open Instructor** **(Uninformed/Ill-informed)** • Believes teaching plagiarism is not their job but will do it and make a difference • Is open to learning that what they thought they knew was incorrect • Is open to learning, open to fixing their mistakes, open to talking about their learning mistakes to others, including students and peers • Works to help students and provide teaching moments when needed • Will report students who fail to use sources properly but only after many teaching moments	**Incorrect Caring, Resistant Instructor** **(Uninformed/Ill-informed)** • Believes teaching plagiarism is not their job but will do it because it is the right thing to do but will provide just enough teaching so that the student should be informed provided the student pays attention. • Does not want to learn that what they think they know is incorrect. • Tends to remain silent about their own mistakes in what they were teaching, but will make adjustments as needed. Likes to have others believe they knew how to help students correctly all along. • Will NOT report students for plagiarism. Prefers to handle entirely in the classroom.
Tier 3	**Correct Uncaring Instructor** **(Informed)** • Has the ability to teach students how to avoid plagiarism correctly. • Believes teaching about plagiarism is not their job and will not do it. • Will either report plagiarism without conferencing with student first, or will not report at all; does not want to waste time on procedures. • Will learn about style updates for own personal use, but does not share information with students.	**Incorrect Uncaring Instructor** **(Uninformed/Ill-informed)** • Believes can teach students how to avoid plagiarism but will do so incorrectly and does not realize it. • Believes teaching about plagiarism is not their job and will not do it. • Will report plagiarism because it is required; does so without conferencing with students first; believes students need to be punished, that all plagiarism is intentional; or, will not report at all; does not want to waste time on procedures. • Believes more is being made out of plagiarism than needs to be.

Figure 14 Tiers of Plagiarism Understanding and Instructor Beliefs and Stance

So, in this final figure, as the last shift to naming these different categories

occurred, the *Informed* label became a sub label to the main label of *Correct.* The

Uninformed and *Ill-Informed* labels became sub labels with the main label becoming *Incorrect*. Generally, using the words *incorrect* or *correct* are indicative of being right or wrong; but that is not the connotation that I attach to these two words. Instead, the idea is to indicate that the instructor is *correct* as in being *informed* or *incorrect* as being *uninformed* or *ill-formed*. Now, I can more easily create initialed labels for these various categories without them being so similar to one another.

- Correct (informed) Caring Instructor becomes CC

- Incorrect (uninformed/ill-informed) Caring, Open Instructor becomes ICO

- Incorrect (uninformed/ill-informed) Caring, Resistant Instructor become ICR

- Correct (informed) Uncaring Instructor becomes CU

- Incorrect (uninformed/ill-informed) Uncaring Instructor becomes IU

As I move forward, taking this figure into future discussions, I would like to take these initialed labels with those writings.

As I have journeyed through this rabbit hole of plagiarism and met various characters who play a role in our educational system of higher learning, I have been both fascinated by the participants' responses, and yet I was not surprised. What I had seen occurring in my students appears to be occurring with instructors, too: **they don't know that they don't know**. The overall take-away that I have received is that this subject of plagiarism is a complex one. Discussing it in greater detail, gathering more research on just one of my sub questions could become a interesting study; however, now that I have placed those responses into categories, it is the categories that I want to explore in the future, which I'll talk about more in the next chapter.

While I believe many readers will be surprised to learn how incorrect were the answers by these participants in the short activity, as to what correct paraphrasing and correct rewriting looks like, I was not surprised. For so many students coming into my classes not understanding what correct paraphrasing and rewriting looks like, I could only imagine that they were modeling that which they had previously learned, which meant that it was possible that incorrect teaching had occurred in their past somewhere in earlier classes. I was surprised to learn, however, that should these instructors discover that their learning was not correct, that a number of them would feel hurt that they had not been taught correctly.

What I have really learned through this research is that there is no real blame. Definitely, there is a problem, but how can we blame anyone for using sources incorrectly when they have not received totally correct teaching? Yet, are we not blaming students before we examine the teaching they received in the past? Granted, those students who plagiarize intentionally by blatantly copying and pasting, or those students who procrastinate, and thus, do not provide themselves enough time to proof their work properly should be blamed, and they should be reported. In reporting such students, they receive notice that their behavior needs to change. From this study, I have learned that the trend of our high learning institutions is to place the sole responsibility about understanding how to plagiarism on the students, and in a way that is damaging to the students, the instructors, and ultimately the institutions. If a student is fortunate enough to get through college and achieve a degree or several degrees and gets caught plagiarizing while in a career, it is often the institution that is reviewed along with individual who plagiarized. What I have learned from this study

is that all chief players in this plagiarism problem—the instructors and institutions—need to do more to provide our students with solid, and correct, teaching of how to avoid plagiarism.

So, what does all this data mean? There are key issues that have surfaced as important to these participants that could be classified as trends, such as their frustration in plagiarism occurring in their classrooms and then having to deal with it, in most instances when it was not considered part of the learning outcomes of the class. There was also the acknowledgment of not feeling supported by their institutions. Neither of these trends surprised me. Nor was I surprised that not one participant was able to achieve 100% percent correctness in choosing the appropriate paraphrase or rewrite in the short activity section of the survey. I was surprised, however, the more correct choices were made from instructors who do not teach English classes or composition.

Even though the participants fit onto Level 2 of the Tier Paradigm, which did not surprise me, I was a surprised to see that few fit squarely or solidly into one category. Generally, a participant would have a trait or two, which they expressed in their own responses, that could have them fitting between tiers or between the two categories on Level 2. All it took was one characteristic that slanted them toward another direction, which did surprise me, such as not wanting to report students, or not willing to teach plagiarism until it makes it first appearance in papers despite those papers being written in an English writing class, or being willing to help students avoid plagiarism even though the instructor does not teach English classes. So, what does this mean? It means, as teachers, we are fluid as we are continually

adjusting to our circumstances, which changes every semester as we manage a new group of students. We are fluid as we are continually changing, learning, and adjusting, whether that change, education, or adjustment occurs as a result of our dealings with students, receiving professional development, or dealing with the requirements that change around as from our teaching institutions. With all this fluid momentum, is it any wonder then that instructors are frustrated, feel intimidated, or feel like they are not in total control of the situation, that they are fighting an uphill battle?

The one thing that I was not surprised at and expected to find was that teachers are not aware of the incorrect knowledge they have when it comes to the topic of plagiarism, particularly in the realm of correct paraphrasing and rewriting. I believe it is a skill that could be easily fixed, which could have a huge impact on our students. That remedy would be to give instructors the correct knowledge, thus making a needed correction in our teaching.

In the next chapter, I ask the question of *where do we go from here*. I will discuss what I see as possible new trends as we move forward in providing our students *and instructors* better support and better learning in how to avoid plagiarism. I will briefly discuss the changes that we have made at my teaching institution and how those changes have influenced both instructors and students. Additionally, I will discuss possible projects I see that are a result of this study and how I intend to use what I have learned as I move forward in my academic career.

CHAPTER V

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

"Truth is like the town whore. Everybody knows her, but nonetheless, it's embarrassing to meet her on the street."

Wolfgang Borchert (author), *The Outsider*

"People need revelation, and then they need resolution."

Damian Lewis (British actor), in *Homeland*

Plagiarism has become the whore that many in academia have come to know and would have preferred not to have met; however, meet her and acknowledge her we must. Lewis' statement indicates that resolution follows revelation, but when it comes to dealing with plagiarism, in academia we appear to have reversed that process. We appear to have offered resolutions without fully revealing the real cause(s) of the problem; in particular, placing the bulk of the responsibility on students. As teachers, we assume students know what plagiarism means as they begin their college education, and then we are dismayed when they do plagiarize.

As teachers, we often do not realize that that our students do not know how to avoid plagiarism. Our students tell us they know and we believe them, but then we become dismayed to learn differently. In trying to understand how they could not know, we question them about what they learned in previous English classes and discover, more often than not, that their former education was lacking in that they learned only not to copy and paste, that they have received misinformation, that their education was totally devoid of any discussion about plagiarism, or that they never had to write any research papers. So, when we ask students, do you know what it means to avoid plagiarism, they will say *yes,* but that their *yes* is invariably based on

their *do-not-copy-and-paste* only education.

Calkins (1986) tells us that we should "not assume that students know what plagiarism is, even if they nod their head when you ask them" (p. 193). Ann learned that lesson the hard way, and as a non-English teacher, finds herself having to teach students on a subject she believes should have been taught long before they arrived in her class. Sadly, Ann, the reluctant proactive adjunct; Conway, the business online adjunct; Elliott, who is concerned that his plagiarizing students will impact how his institution will view his teaching; and Hannah, who currently teaches graduate English students, are not alone. Many instructors like them are struggling across the curriculum to deal with a subject that many would rather not have to deal with, let alone acknowledge.

Tara Brabazon (2012), a professor in education and who has taught on four continents, claims that "we are replacing teaching and learning with blaming and shaming." Research from this project backs Brabazon's comment as while the participants did not officially blame others, they certainly were surprised that they had to deal with plagiarism issues in their class, indicating that they had expected someone else to have done the job. The instructors in this particular study said that they basically teach how to avoid plagiarism once they see it occur and that the teaching, and learning, does not occur until then. They expected other teachers to have taught their students about plagiarism in earlier classes or even high school so they would not have to. "Students are assumed to know what plagiarism is and how to avoid it, thus relieving faculty of the responsibility to teach it" (Howard & Robillard, 2008, p.140). So, when students plagiarize in our classes, are we not

blaming those who taught these students before us? Are we not upset that we either

have to find a way to include this instruction in an already busy agenda or are faced

with knowing if we don't provide this instruction that the student could end up

plagiarizing in another class—or worse in their careers?

Unfortunately, plagiarism in many classes is addressed only in the syllabus

with the institutional-policy reading until it occurs in the students' final papers.

Power (2009) claims that in her study, "[e]very student . . . knew that the plagiarism

policy could be found in the student handbook. However, not 1 of the 31 students

had read it. In fact, only two had read any part of the handbook at all" (p. 655). My

own students back up Power's study in every class, every semester when they tell me

that they do not look at their handbook. They all know where the *brief* academic

integrity statement is located—in every syllabus, which they are handed—but they

have never gone to the location and actually read the entire policy. Power (2009) also

states that "[w]hile many students reported that their professors told them briefly at

the beginning of the semester that they should not plagiarize, it generally was just a

warning rather than an explanation" (p. 655). Students do want to learn and

understand how to avoid plagiarism. Wang's (2008) study on students shows the

> necessity for training to avoid unintentional plagiarism. It is insufficient to
>
> hand out students a copy of the institutional policy. . . . Students need to grasp
>
> essential concepts and acquire skills to recognize and prevent plagiarism (p.
>
> 752).

Blum (2009) asks, "What do students understand when they hear the term

'plagiarism'? Is it the same thing that is understood by faculty?" (p. 11). I know as I

educate my students they are stunned at the complexity of the subject, and they

wonder why their previous learning was so lacking. They are stunned that they have

taken many English classes without receiving correct information.

It was this student lack of understanding that had me asking the guiding

question of *what do teachers understand?* Based on the responses that my research

participants made in the short activity, I believe that teachers understand plagiarism

less than they think; thus, they are part of the overall problem. Howard and Robillard

(2008) state that when plagiarism workshops are provided at their institutions that

"they are poorly attended even though faculty have asked for them" (p. 57).

Callahan (2004) claims that "faculty are a big part of the cheating program—with

students commonly reporting that teachers and professors let [the] cheating go on" (p.

288). This statement speaks of students who want to learn correctly and to be able to

do the right thing by their sources in their writing.

If as Yancey writes in her chapter, "Beyond Plagiarism," that "plagiarism is a

symptom, not a cause" (Howard & Robillard, 2008, p. 159), then what is the cause?

Is it incorrect teaching? It is suggested that plagiarism is the result of "poor teaching"

yet teachers cannot "be expected to shoulder the burden alone" (Eisner & Vicinus,

2008, p. 203). I do believe there are many instructors who are frustrated at the

institutional policies, as reflected in Betty's determination not to report plagiarizing

students. I do believe there are many instructors who care so much about their

students that they do not want to see those students fail, so they provide repeated do-

overs on assignments, hoping the student will finally learn as Ann, Betty, and Hannah

often provide. Additionally, I do believe that good teaching is going on, *but that the*

teaching is filled with erroneous beliefs and misinformed instructors.

Based on information in Figure 3, found earlier in this project, where two studies were performed thirty years apart, showing relatively little difference in the plagiarism rate *despite the addition of the Internet and personal PCs* that were available by students for the second study, I believe that instructors are teaching that which they have learned, which was fraught with misinformation, thus turning them into uninformed or ill-informed students, who took that information into their own teaching and has now made them uninformed or ill-informed teachers.

I believe that the frequency of plagiarism and the plagiarism headlines are symptoms because we tried to resolve a problem without looking for the revelation of the problem. We have tried to resolve it through the use of plagiarism detection programs only to find the problem is more pervasion than we first thought. The reveal that detection software achieved is that our problem is far bigger than we ever realized.

So, what can we do, as teachers, as institutions? How can we get to the cause without losing students, without loading more work upon our instructors? What follows are my beliefs based on what I have witnessed in my own classes, what the literature has revealed, what the research participants have revealed, and what this study has revealed.

Potential Implications of the Study

As a result of this study, many important implications began to reveal themselves. The following are implications that highlight various areas of concern as

we attempt to face the revelation of where plagiarism may reside and what have become my beliefs, as a result of this study is:

- That there is a gap in our education of teaching students on how to avoid plagiarism, and that this gap pertains to the process of how to avoid plagiarism being taught and accessed.

- That the gap has existed for some time; and in trying to make changes, it does not matter where the gap occurred or with whom. All that matters now is that we do make changes that can significantly improve and strengthen the teaching and writing abilities of our instructors *and* our students.

- That many of us who are teaching writing are ignorant of some part of the complexities of using sources correctly, particularly when it comes to paraphrasing and rewriting. I know I was ignorant of those complexities and had to be shown the error of my way.

- That teaching our students how to correctly avoid plagiarism needs to start at the top, with our academic integrity offices, and then trickle down by offering full support to the instructors through training sessions, assistance with assignment creations providing tools that will help instructors, and **to consider how this skill can be accessed as students first enter college**.

- That our teaching institutions need to involve all instructors who assign projects that use resources. Plagiarism is not an English instructor problem; plagiarism is a teaching institution problem.

- That students need to be reported for all plagiarism, including those students who

were provided "teaching moments." Only by recording and tracking what students do from class to class, can we become aware of those students who have teaching moments in every class, which then becomes an intentional plagiarism issue.

- That when students are reported that their consequences are not suspensions or even complete failures of a class where they may have performed well otherwise, but rather a period of special learning where the plagiarists may have to attend special workshops and then later serve as workers in a training/support system where they may have to pay forward what they have learned by speaking to other students or assisting as a tutor with students who are struggling. If learning is reinforced through teaching, then why not have students who have mastered the skill teach it to others. I know I have always been rewarded hearing students who were in my class and who once struggled with the concept teaching other students what they have learned.

- That all students coming into a higher-learning institution should be tested as to their knowledge of how to avoid plagiarism. The test can be as simple as Appendix A, where a paragraph with source material listed is provided and students are asked to

  1. List the source as it would appear on a References, Bibliography, or Works Cited page.

  2. To create a quote (which requires an in-text citation).

  3. To paraphrase the paragraph (which requires an in-text citation, and allows only the use of nouns that cannot be changed).

4. To rewrite the paragraph (which does not use an in-text citation or any of the paragraph's words whatsoever).

- That all teachers should be tested to their knowledge of how to avoid plagiarism, using the same above criteria.

- That any student and any teacher who passes the test with 100 percent compliance could receive "certification" of that skill.

- That any student or teacher who cannot pass the test with 100 percent certainty, would be required to attend a session about using sources properly, and that "graduation" or the ability to teach or attend classes for another semester cannot be attained until certification has been achieved. I believe one-credit, short sessions provided multiple times each semester could easily provide the necessary one-time *thorough* training on how to use sources, which then gets practiced in every class with some kind of writing assignment, so that students become better skilled and are less likely to forget how to use those skills.

- That if all students and teachers are certified about their ability to understand how to use sources correctly, that our teaching institutions will see a huge drop in plagiarism incidents. If such incidents do occur after that, the only assumption that can be made is that it was intentional—blatantly with intention, or unintentional due to a lack of time management, which then makes it intentional because student planning was not engaged by choice.

- That department heads should be reviewing random writing assignments to ensure that their instructors are reporting as required.

- That once a student body understands that plagiarism is no longer just an English department issue, that they will comply and treat writing assignments with the respect they deserve.

- That we need to rethink our first-year composition classes and create writing assignments that provide the practice of using sources in the majority of assignments, not just with the final research paper. After all, through practice comes perfection.

- That if we want to retain our students, we need to ensure our instructors become *informed* instructors, who are correctly teaching students how to avoid plagiarism.

What Can Be Learned From This Study?

If plagiarism is a single student, single teacher issue as Gilmore (2008, p. 7) states, should we, as an institution, not take responsibility to ensure *each* student, as an individual, understands the full concept and complexity of using sources and avoiding plagiarism? If we can test students for math and writing skills before they are allowed entry into college, how less important is testing them for their plagiarism skills, their use of sources? If a student does not test well for math, we have remedial classes that helps them become college ready. How is not providing plagiarism teaching sessions any less important? I believe sessions on how to use sources properly are just as important. Hannah believes that students should not be tested but should be held accountable for their plagiarism because they should have learned how to use sources previously, but isn't that what we are already doing, and yet not resolving the issue? In order to hold accountability, the assertion is that students

should know, but how can we know that the students know unless we test them?

As Betty, the tough self-contained TA, made a comment earlier about her need to be conscientious of her teaching institution's focus on retention, Betty struggles in "a sense of hopelessness [where she feels she has] little control or . . . institutional support" (Sutherland-Smith, 2008, p. 15). Betty is not alone in her feelings or of her institution's focus on retention, which has become the focus of many colleges and universities today. Many institutions are concerned about retention. Betty reveals that her school does not want to lose students due to plagiarism issues; nor does any school want plagiarism headlines drawing negative attention toward them. My experience mirrors these same issues. Thus, identifying which students need help with how to use sources in their writings and providing that help in a more individual manner through special one-credit instruction could be a way for institutions to make positive moves in helping instructors help their students. This kind of early instruction also allows institutions to provide much needed support to their instructors, allowing them to focus on the course content. In the end, students will receive a better education.

Overall, as was stated by some of this study's participants, instructors would rather not have to deal with plagiarism. Ideally, dealing with plagiarism and helping students avoid it will become everyone's job: all instructors, all academic leaders, and the institution. As Hannah stated in Chapter IV that learning how to use sources correctly is a *recursive skill*, this early style of instruction with research writing in all classes will provide students the practice they need to learn these all-important writing skills.

If students are tested as they enter college, and they show that they do fully understand the concept of using sources correctly, teachers across the curriculum— including English teachers—would not have to be teaching how to avoid plagiarism in their classes. Class time could be spent fully on the course learning outcomes instead. Institutions could be dealing with fewer reports.

I believe one-credit sessions could be offered three times per semester as four-week class sessions, easily providing students with both practice and deep learning in how to use sources so that by the time the students are writing papers in their first class that minimal instruction needs to be provided by the instructor of that class. By offering one-credit sessions, any student could easily add a session to their schedule during the semester as needed for additional training or review, especially toward the end of their degree when the students are writing their capstones, which often occurs a couple years or more after their last writing class.

As a result of this idea that has evolved from this study, schools may want to examine how plagiarism is taught by their teachers, whether that teaching and learning process is effective, and how that teaching is measured. Schools may want to examine if the teaching of plagiarism is taught consistently by all teachers, and if not, to consider why not. Secondary audiences are department chairs, deans, academic integrity offices, and those departments in charge of faculty development. As a result of schools and teachers examining current teaching practices and improving them, students would benefit, as well.

As a result of this study, teachers could be inclined to re-examine how they currently teach about avoiding plagiarism, to reconsider whether they are effective in

that teaching or not, and they could check their knowledge, for example, against the information provided in this study (see Appendices B & C). While it is difficult to get whole departments to make or require a change, an instructor can easily make small changes in how they teach students about avoiding plagiarism and achieve huge results. As teachers, we can demonstrate more and lecture less. Howard and Robillard (2008) claim that as teachers, we "spend twice as much time *lecturing* about plagiarism than actually teaching students how to *avoid* plagiarism" (27). We can stop grading drafts, but instead, give points for completing a draft, teaching our students that writing is a process; then, we grade the polished, final paper that is turned in for specifically for a grade. Both critical thinking skills along with writing skills are perfected by practice "and through work on multiple drafts" (Howard & Robillard, 2008, p.146-147).

While Betty expressed concern about too much attention on plagiarism and how to avoid it as coming from "too many instructors as students move from class to class," with students "becoming immune to the gravity of the issue" (personal communication, February 25, 2013), I believe that such attention will have students paying attention more. With practice, after all, does not a skill become second nature? As teaching and academic scholars, we understand how we are joining a conversation through our research papers. Our students, however, unless they are told specifically about this methodology directly, do not understand this concept (Howard & Robillard, 2008, p.159). As a result, we need to educate our students as to how their class writings are part of the ongoing scholarship and discussion in their fields and in their programs.

One Example of a Changing Institution

As I struggled with plagiarism issues at my teaching institution, I talked about it any chance I got—to anyone and everyone who would listen; and then, it happened. One instructor, said, "You've got to talk to my boss. He's having the same problems with his students." As a result, a meeting was set-up with me, this teacher, her boss—an assistant dean from another department, and an academic leader connected to the provost's office. After presenting the various problems I saw with students plagiarizing, the difficulty of reporting, and no real consequences even when a report was made, I was asked, "So, what do you think should be done?"

A task force, that I chaired, was set up and throughout that year, more and more people became involved. First, there was a committee. Guidelines in how to avoid plagiarism and how it would be handled when it occurred in entry-level, mid-level, and graduate-level classes were written. The guidelines were given to all instructors, with a second document written for students.

The academic integrity office took over and the academic integrity statement was rewritten with specific policies and consequences; precise details about what would occur should plagiarism be found in their work, how the consequences would occur, and when were provided to students. The reporting form was simplified and placed online with drop down menus so that important details could be included with a click; the form was designed for faculty ease of use. The reporting system was overhauled allowing the academic integrity office to track students who had not only blatantly plagiarized but those who had a teaching moment in class. The academic integrity officer and I began teaming up for University presentations regarding

plagiarism about the same time the reporting system was rolled out.

If multiple teaching moments showed up in every class in multiple semesters for a student, it was acknowledged that intentional plagiarism was occurring due to student lack of time management or sloppiness. Overall, the academic integrity office was enabled in their discovery of intentional patterns of plagiarism because the incidents were reported as "unintentional learning moments" with that instructor, which reveal an unflattering pattern of intentional plagiarism disguised as unintentional by students. With instructors across the curriculum reporting more and finding support from the University, students began to pay attention as first notices showed up in their electronic mailboxes.

The real moment I realized that a difference had been made was when, at a student orientation a week before the new fall began, a technology department supervisor spoke about plagiarism and the need to avoid it. Someone not from the English Department was talking about plagiarism and why students needed to pay attention; it was an exciting moment for me. Students began to realize that the topic of plagiarism did not reside with just the English instructors anymore or in the English Department. Students began to understand that learning how to avoid plagiarism was just as important as learning critical thinking skills, computer skill, speaking skills, other skills required for their field, and how to write a resume that ultimately will help them find employment. Those first few notices that students received, which were basically a *heads-up, you've been warned*, garnered a lot of attention and the students were talking to each other, warning each other. Students were learning that they needed to change some of their writing behaviors as in

proofreading more and procrastinating less, as well.

Future Projects

This study was an initial exploration of teachers with the lens turned onto their knowledge regarding plagiarism and what it looks like, and then how they teach their students how to avoid it. The number of questions that have arisen as a result of this project serves to deepen my interest and curiosity as I continue forward on this journey, as I attempt to further reveal the cause of why it has been a struggle to get student plagiarism under control. As I conclude this study, more ideas for future projects have accumulated, and so I list them here. Projects I would like to pursue in the future either through my teaching institution or with the assistance of other institutions, instructors, and students are:

- To perform a study to determine if age signifies correct or incorrect knowledge.

- To test all incoming students as to what they know about plagiarism.

- To examine the levels of frustration that instructors have as they deal with plagiarism occurring in their classrooms.

- To examine a number of syllabi in first-semester classes across the curriculum, to determine what discussion, assignments, activities, and so forth are provided to students during the course of that all-important first semester.

- To examine a pedagogy class of graduate teaching assistants, to determine what they already know about how to teach students in using sources correctly, what they have learned in the past, and what they may not know.

- To survey only freshman composition classes and learn what type of writing assignments are made and to discover how many of those assignments require research with source citations.

- To follow three students from their entry into college through their first year, to discover their starting knowledge about how to use sources in research writing, how many assignments they receive that allow them to practice that knowledge, and to determine who is teaching about using sources with those assignments and who is not.

- To follow a semester of first-year comp students in one class, gathering the same kind of information as the previous project.

- To gather for a semester starting information from first year college students, both traditional & non-traditional, their knowledge about using sources and then follow up at the end of the semester with the same questions to determine if any growth or changes have occurred in their ability to avoid plagiarism.

- To follow up on Jonathan Bailey's article of "Should There Be a Statute of Limitations on Plagiarism Claims?" (2013, March 20). I would like to collaborate with Bailey in a survey regarding this particular topic.

- To survey higher education teaching institutions and obtain their view regarding their reporting instructions and on the number of instructors who report plagiarism versus those instructors who never report students, and how they view those numbers.

These studies would do more to deepen the reveal that this study has begun, to bring

light into the corners where instructors have felt they alone have stood. These proposed studies could do much to bring more discussion to the forefront and begin to fill the gap of information that my project did not provide. These proposed studies could provide us with more important discoveries and knowledge.

Overall, I believe the benefits of this study will be far-reaching to institutions, to instructors, and to students. In particular, I believe the instructors who participated in this study are already pondering more about how plagiarism is handled in their classrooms, how they respond, and what changes they would like to make in future semesters. Hopefully, this study will create new dialogue within the teaching community. If nothing more, this study will provide increased self-awareness regarding reflective pedagogy and its relationship to plagiarism and the need for more correct and effective teaching across the curriculum.

REFERENCES

A fundamental breach. (2010, August 13-19). *The Filipino Express, 24*(33), 12.

A president retires, and plagiarism probe ends. (2009, January 21). *Inside Higher
Ed.* Retrieved from www.insidehighered.com

Allen, M. (2008, February 18). Clinton aide accuses Obama of plagiarism. *Politico.*
Retrieved from www.politico.com

Anderman, E. M. and Murdock, T. B. (Eds.). (2007). *Psychology of academic
cheating.* Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press.

Ashworth, P., Bannister, P., & Thorne, P. (1997). Guilty in whose eyes? University
students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and
assessment. *Studies in Higher Education, 22*(2), 187-203.

Ashworth, P., Freewood, M., & Mcdonald, R. (2003). The student lifeworld and the
meanings of plagiarism. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology, 34*(2),
257-278.

Bailey, J. (2009, March 31). Famous plagiarists: Could it happen today? *Plagiarism
Today.* Retrieved from http://www.plagiarismtoday.com

Bailey, J. (2011, July 28). Plagiarism answers: 5 ways caught plagiarists react.
Plagiarism Today. Retrieved from http://www.plagiarismtoday.com

Bailey, J. (2011, July 5). The role of copyright in fight plagiarism: Part 1.
Plagiarism Today. Retrieved from http://www.plagiarismtoday.com

Bailey, J. (2011, July 7). The role of copyright in fight plagiarism: Part 2.
Plagiarism Today. Retrieved from http://www.plagiarismtoday.com

Bailey, J. (2011, June 28). 3 reasons to suspect a student of plagiarism. *Plagiarism*

Today. Retrieved from http://www.plagiarismtoday.com

Bailey, J. (2012, April 17). What to do when plagiarism isn't illegal. *Plagiarism*

Today. Retrieved from http://www.plagiarismtoday.com

Bailey, J. (2012, January 10). Life after plagiarism: Forgiveness or Condemnation?

Plagiarism Today. Retrieved from http://www.plagiarismtoday.com

Bailey, J. (2012, July 2). The plagiarism insanity in Romania. *Plagiarism Today*.

Retrieved from http://www.plagiarismtoday.com

Bailey, J. (2012, July 26). 5 key takeaways from the 5th International Plagiarism

Conference. *Plagiarism Today*. Retrieved from

http://www.plagiarismtoday.com

Bailey, J. (2013, March 20). Should there be a statue of limitations on plagiarism

claims? *Plagiarism Today*. Retrieved from http://www.plagiarismtoday.com

Bailey, J. (n.d.). 3 copyright myths. *Plagiarism Today*. Retrieved from

http://www.plagiarismtoday.com

Bartlett, T. (2010, October 14). Alan Sokal, the 1996 hozxer, takes aim at an

accused plagiarist at Rutgers. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved

from http://chronicle.com

Bashin, K. (2011, July 20). NYU professor catches 20% of his students cheating,

and he's the one who pays for it. *Business Insider: War Room.* Retrieved

from http://www.businessinsider.com/nyu-professor-class-cheating-2011-

7#comment-4e273a85cadcbb434e020000

Berrett, D. (2010, November 17). Cheating and the gnerational divide. *Inside*

Higher Ed. Retrieved from http://www.insidehighered.com

Berrett, D. (2011, April 11). Skimming the surface. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved

    from www.insidehighered.com

Bjornstad, H. (ed.). (2008). Borrowed *feathers: Plagiarism and the limits of imitation*

    in early modern Europe. Unipub, Norway: Oslo Academic Press.

Blum, S. D. (2009). *My word!: Plagiarism and college culture.* New York: Cornell

    University.

Blum, S. D. (2010, March 18). *My word!: Plagiarism and college culture*. Lecture

    at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI.

Bowers, W. J., Ph.D. (1966). *Student dishonesty and its control in college*.

    (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University). Ann Arbor, MI: University

    Microfilms, Inc.

Bradley, C. (2011). *Plagiarism education and prevention: A subject-drive case-*

    based approach. Oxford, United Kingdom: Chandos Publishing.

Brabazon, T. [Keynote presenter #3]. (2012, July 18). Turnitin? Turnitoff: How to

    migrate from software to wetware. [Webcast file.] *5th International*

    Plagiarism Conference. Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom. Retrieved

    on February 4, 2013 from

    http://archive.plagairismadvice.org/conference.programme

Breidthardt, A. (2013, February 9). Merkel confidante resigns in German plagiarism

    scandal. *Yahoo! News*. Retrieved from http://news.yahoo.com

Brown, B. S., & Emmett, D. (2001, December). Explaining variations in the level of

    academic dishonesty in studies of college students: Some new evidence.

    College Student Journal, 35(4), 529-538.

Byrne, J. A. (2012, February 2). UCLA rejects 52 MBA applicants for plagiarism. *CNN Money.* Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com

Calkins, L.M. (1986). *The art of teaching writing.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Callahan, D. (2004). *The cheating culture: Why more Americans are doing wrong to get ahead.* Orlando, FL: Harcourt Books.

Carter, S. L. & Punyanunt-Carter, N. M. (2006, September). Acceptability of treatments for cheating in the college classroom. *Journal of Instructional Psychology 33*(3), 212-216.

Carvajal, D. (2011, January 5). French TV journalist accused of plagiarism. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Cheating scandal snares hundreds in U. of Central Florida course. (2010, November 9). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com

Colorado: Candidate pays for plagiarism. (2010, August 6). *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Constable, G. (1983). Forgery and plagiarism in the middle ages. *Archiv für Diplomatik; Schriftgeschichte, Siegel, und Wappenkunde, 29,* 1-41.

Cook, P. (2010, November 16). Names of famous plagiarists might surprise you. *Yahoo! Voices.* Retrieved from http://voices.yahoo.com/names-famous-plagiarists-might-surprise-7208026.html

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Crowley, D. (2010, November 17). Cooks Source calls it quits after copyright infringement dispute on internet. *GazetteNET*. Retrieved from http://www.gazettenet.com

Dant, D. R. (1986, February). Plagiarism in high school: A survey. *The English Journal, 75*(2), 81-84.

Davis, S. F., Drinan, P. F., & Gallant, T. B. (2009). *Cheating in school: What we know and what we can do.* West Sussex, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.

Dee, T. S., & Jacob, B. A. (2010, January). Rational ignorance in education: A field experiment in student plagiarism. (Working Paper No.15672). Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/papers/w15672

Dempsey, J. (2011, February 22). German Defense Minister defies calls to quit over plagiarism. *The New York Times*. [World Briefing/Europe section]. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Dempsey, J. (2011, March 1). Plagiarism in dissertation costs German defense minister his job. *The New York Times*. [Europe section]. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

den Ouden, H., & van Wijk, C. (2011, June). Plagiarism: Punish or prevent? Some experiences with academic copycatting in the Netherlands. *Business Communication Quarterly, 74*(2), 196-200. doi: 10.1177/1080569911404405

DeSena, L. H. (2007). *Preventing plagiarism: Tips and techniques.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Dionne, E. J, Jr. (1987, September 18). Biden admits plagiarism in school but says it was not 'malevolent.' *The New York Times.* Retrieved from

http://www.nytimes.com

Dodson, A. (2011, May 26). Michigan State University dismisses professor who plagiarized school consolidation study for Booth papers. *MLive*. Retrieved from blog.mlive.com

Drum, A. (1986, May). Responding to Plagiarism. *College Composition and Communication, 37*(2), 241-243.

Edward Waters College President Jimmy Jenkins resigns following plagiarism scandal. (2005, February 24). *Black Issues in Higher Education 22*(1), 18.

Eisner, C. and Vicinus, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Originality, imitation, and plagiarism: Teaching writing in the digital age.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Elfrink, T. (2010, May 20). Posner plagiarizes again. *Miami New Times.* Retrieved from http://www.miaminewtimes.com

Evans, R. (2009, March 29). 5 great men who built their careers on plagiarism. *Cracked.com*. Retrieved from http://www.craked.com

Express News staff. (2011, June 17). University of Alberta medical dean steps down. *Express News*. Retrieved from http://www.news.ualberta.ca

Gallant, T. B. (Ed.). (2011). *Creating the ethical academy: A systems approach to understanding misconduct and empowering change in higher education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Gazette Staff. (2010, August 24). MSU to review plagiarism complaint against professor's school consolidation report. *Kalamazoo Gazette*.

Gekker, K. (2012, August 12). The struggle to ensure that learning takes place. *The*

Chronicle of Higher Learning. Retrieved from http://www.chronicle.com

German: Ex-Minister's plagiarism was deliberate, university says. (2011, May 6).

 The New York Times. http://www.nytimes.com

Germany: Defense minister accused of plagiarizing Ph.D. dissertation. (2011,

 February 18). *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Gilmore, B. (2008). *Plagiarism: Why it happens. How to prevent it.* Portsmouth,

 NH: Heinemann.

Goral, T. (2011, March). Penn State battles growing problem of applicant

 plagiarism. *University Business, 14*(3), 16.

Granitz, N., & Loewry, D. (2007). Applying ethical theories: Interpreting and

 responding to student plagiarism. *Journal of Business Ethics, 72*(3), 293-306.

 Retrieved from ABI/INFORM Global, ProQuest database.

Grimes, P. W. (2004). Dishonesty in academics and business: A cross-cultural

 evaluation of student attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics, 49,* 273-290.

 Retrieved from

 http://www.springerlink.com.libproxy.library.wmich.edu/content/k7k9502656

 62381l/fulltext.pdf

Head, A. J., & Eisenberg, M.B. (2010, July 12). Assigning inquiry: How handouts

 for research assignments guide today's college students. [Data file.] Project

 Information Literary Progress Report. The Information School, University of

 Washington. Retrieved from

 http://projectinfolit.org/pdfs/PIL_Handout_Study_finalvJuly_2010.pdf

Headlines—Plagiarism in the news. (n.d.) *WarOnPlagiarism.org—News Headlines*.

Retrieved from http://www.famousplagiarists.com/news.htm

Hockenos, P. (2013, February 25). High-profile plagiarism prompts soul-searching in German universities. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/High-Profile-Plagiarism/137515/?cid=at

Hoover, E. (2002, May 3). Honor for honor's sake? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *48*(34), A35.

Howard, R. M. (1995, November). Plagiarism, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English, 57*(7), 788-806.

Howard, R. M. (2001, November 16). Forget about policing plagiarism. Just teach. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com

Howard, R. M. (2002, January). Don't police plagiarism: Just teach! *The Education Digest, 67*(5), 46-49.

Howard, R. M., & Robillard, A. E. (Eds.). (2008). *Pluralizing plagiarism: Identities, contexts, pedagogies*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Itzkoff, D. (2010, October 22). South Park creators apologize for using other writers' lines. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Jacobs, A. (2010, October 6). Rampant fraud threat to China's brisk ascent. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Jenkins, R. (2011, August 14). Toward a rational response to plagiarism. *The Chronicle of Higher Learning.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com

Johnson, C. Y. (2011, July 8). 2 works by Harvard experts questioned. *Boston Globe*. Retrieved from http://articles.boston.com/2011-07-08/news/29752705_1_biology-authors-journal

Kerkvliet, J. & Sigmund, C. L. (1999, February). Can we control cheating in the

classroom? *The Journal of Economic Education, 30*(4), 331-343.

Kewes, P. (Ed.) (2003). *Plagiarism in early modern England.* New York, NY:

Palgrave Macmillan.

Kirchner, S. (2010, February 18). German teen's debut novel: Plagiarism or

sampling? *Time.* Retrieved from http://www.time.com

Kulish, N. (2010, February 11). Author, 17, says it's 'mixing,' not plagiarism. *The

New York Times.* [World Briefing/Europe section]. Retrieved from

http://www.nytimes.com

Lathrop, A. and Foss, K. (2000). *Student cheating and plagiarism in the Internet

era: A wake-up call.* Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Lathrop, A. and Foss, K. (2005). *Guiding students from cheating and plagiarism to

honesty and integrity: Strategies for change.* Westport, CT: Libraries

Unlimited.

Lindey, A. (1952). *Plagiarism and originality.* New York, NY: Harper & Brothers

Publishers.

Lynch, J. (2006). The perfectly acceptable practice of literary theft: Plagiarism,

copyright, and the eighteenth century. Writing-Word.com (Originally appear

in *Colonial Williamsburg).* Retrieved March 3, 2012 from

http://www.writing-world.com/rights/lynch.shtml

Lyons, M. (2010). *A history of reading and writing: In the western world.* New

York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Malouff, J. M., & Sims, R. L. (1996, September/October). Applying an employee-

motivation model to prevent student plagiarism. *Journal of Education for Business, 72*(1), 58-61.

Mangan, K. (2009, January 20). President of U. of Texas-Pan American, accused of plagiarism, will retire. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research*. (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

McCabe, D. (2001, Winter). Cheating: Why students do it and how we can help them stop. *American Federation of Teachers.* Retrieved from http://www.aft.org

McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1996, January/February). What we know about cheating in college. *Change*, *28*(1), 28-33.

McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (1999, March-April). Academic integrity in honor code and non-honor code environments: a qualitative investigation. *Journal of Higher Education*, *70*(2), 211-234.

McGowan, S., & Lightbody, M. (2008). Enhancing students' understanding of plagiarism within a discipline context. *Accounting Education, 17*(3), 273-290.

Menager, R., & Paulos, L. (2009). *Quick coach guide to avoiding plagiarism.* Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Miller, A., Shoptaugh, C., & Parkerson, A. (2008, June). Under reporting of cheating in research using volunteer college students. *College Student Journal*, *42*(2), 326-339.

Miller, D. Z. (2012, March 12). A lesson in academic integrity as students feel the

injustice of plagiarism. *Faculty Focus*. Retrieved from

http://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/teaching-and-learning/a-lesson-in-

academic-integrity-as-students-feel-the-injustice-of-plagiarism/

Miller, Keith D. (1993). Redefining Plagiarism: Martin Luther Kings use of an Oral

Tradition. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 39*(20), A60. Retrieved from

ProQuest Education Journals database.

Muldoon, A. (2009, Spring). A case for critical revision: Debunking the myth of the

enlightened teacher versus the resistant student writer. *College Teaching,

57*(2), 67-71.

National Bureau of Economic Research. (2010, January). Rational ignorance in

education: A field experiment in student plagiarism. [Data file]. Cambridge,

MA: Dee, T. S., & Jacob, B. A. Retrieved from

http://www.nber.org/papers/w15672

Nelson, M. (2002). The good, the bad, and the phone: Six famous historians and their

critics. *The Virginia Quarterly Review, 78*(3), 377-394. Retrieved on

September 20, 2010 from ProQuest database.

Pappas, T. (1998). *Plagiarism and the culture war: The writings of Martin Luther

King, Jr., and other prominent Americans*. Tampa, FL: Hallberg Publishing

Corporation.

Parameswaran, A. (2007). Student dishonesty and faculty responsibility. *Teaching in

Higher Education, 12*(2), 263-274.

Parry, M. (2011, July 21). NYU prof vows never to probe cheating again—and faces

a backlash. *The Chronicle of Higher Learning*. Retrieved from

http://chronicle.com

People: Elizabeth Paige Laurie, Antonio Banderas, Princess Sayako of Japan. (2005,
October 20). *The New York Times.* Retrieved from www.nytimes.com

Plagiarism on college campuses explored in ethics talk. (2010, March 9). *WMU
News.* Retrieved from http://www.wmich.edu

Power, L. G. (2009, November/December). University students' perceptions of
plagiarism. *Journal of Higher Education, 80*(6), 643-662.

Rettinger, D. & Kramer, Y. (2009). Situational and personal causes of student
cheating. *Research in Higher Education*, *50*(3), 293-313.

Rich, M. (2006, May 3). 'Opal Mehta' won't get a life after all. *The New York
Times.* Retrieved from www.nytimes.com

Roberts will sue Dailey after all. (1997, September 8). *Publishers Weekly, 244*(37),
15. Retrieved from ABI/INFORM Global, ProQuest database.

Scanlon, P. M. (2003, Fall). Student online plagiarism: How do we respond?
College Teaching, 51(4), 161-165.

Schuetze, C. F. (2011, September 11). German tries to save prestigious title of
doctor. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Schuetze, C. F. (2011, April 24). The whiff of plagiarism again hits German elite.
The New York Times. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Slattery, L. (2008, January 11). Plagiarism plagues an Australian university. *The
Chronicle of Higher Education, 54*(18), A36.

Smyth, M. L., & Davis, J.R. (2003, Summer). An examination of student cheating in
the two-year college. *Community College Review*, *31*(1), 17-32.

Soto, J.G., Anand, S., & McGee, E. (2004, July/August). Plagiarism avoidance: An empirical study examining teaching strategies. *Journal of College Science Teaching 33*(7), 42-48.

Stancill, J. (2011, May 16). NCCU law graduate accused of commencement speech plagiarism. *The News & Observer*. Retrieved from http://www.newsobserver.com

Staples, B. (2010, July 12). Cutting and pasting: A senior thesis by (insert name). *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Stetler, B. (2010, December 30). Anchor is sidelined. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Stewart, D. (2010, November 10). Cooks source apologizes for plagiarism. *CTnow*. Retrieved from http://www.ctnow.com

Student body size: Small, medium, or large? (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.collegedata.com/cs/content/content_choosearticle_tmpl.jhtml?articleId=10006

Sutherland-Smith, W. (2008). *Plagiarism, the Internet and student learning: Improving academic integrity.* New York, NY: Routledge

Sutherland-Smith, W., & Pecorari, D. (2010, June). Policy and practice in two academic settings: How the administrative structures of Australian and Swedish universities serve a culture of honesty. [Paper presented at the 4th Plagiarism Conference.] Newcastle upon Tyne, England. Retrieved from http://www.plagiarismadvice.org/conference/previous-plagiarism-conferences/4th-plagiarism-conference-2010

Terry, R. (2007, Spring). 'Plagiarism': a literary concept in England to 1775. *English*, *56*, 1-16. *Oxford Press University Journals*. Retrieved from http://english.oxfordjournals.org.libproxy.library.wmich.edu/content/56/214/1 .full.pdf+html

Terry, R. (2010). *The plagiarism allegation in English literature from Butler to Sterne*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan.

U of Alberta dean stole speech: med students. (2011, June 12). *CBC News Canada*. Retrieved from htttp://www.cbc.ca

U. S. Copyright Office. (2011, August) Copyright basics. [Data file, Circular 1]. Retrieved from http://www.copyright.gov/circs/circ01.pdf

University of Alberta won't release plagiarism probe results. (2011, September 12). *The Canadian Press.* Retrieved from http://www.cbc.ca

Van Gelder, L. (2006, May 4). Newspaper investigates 'Opal Mehta' author. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Vega, T. (2011, Mary 17). Washington Post suspends reporter. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Wang, Y. (2008). University student online plagiarism. *International Journal on E—Learning, 7*(4), 743-757.

Wexler, D. P. (1997, August 4). Romance author Dailey admits plagiarism. *Publishers Weekly*, 244(32), 20. Retrieved from ABI/INFORM Global, ProQuest database.

Whitley, B. E., Jr., & Keith-Spiegel, P. (2002). *Academic dishonesty: An educator's guide.* New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Wilson, J. (1997, July 30). Romance novelist Janet Dailey apologizes for plagiarism.

    Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, p. D-2.

Yale College Writing Center. (2011). Warning: When you must cite. Retrieved

    from http://writing.yalecollege.yale.edu/warning-when-you-must-cite

Appendix A

Plagiarism Activity

Created by Diana Stout, 2003

Using the source paragraph below, you are to plagiarize a sentence, paraphrase the paragraph, and then rewrite the paragraph. You may work in groups and use your handbook and/or text. Perform the activity to receive full participation points; you will not be penalized should you outcomes be incorrect. This exercise is about demonstrating what you understand about plagiarism, and then learning how to avoid it.

Source information comes from: *Ben Franklin's 12 Rules of Management*, page 75, by Blaine McCormick, published in 2000 by Entrepreneur Press, 2445 McCabe Way, Irvine, CA 92614, taken from *The Autobiography and Other Writings* (Penguin Classics).

> Franklin despised using the bald eagle as our national symbol primarily
>
> because of its inherent lack of hard work. He compared the bald eagle to men
>
> who make their living as thieves and robbers and condemned the society that
>
> is populated solely by such 'workers.' Franklin's own choice for our national
>
> symbol was the turkey, which he preferred because it was native to North
>
> America (as cited in McCormick, 2000, p. 75).

(Students: Please note the lack of quote marks. When text is without quote marks and fully indented inside the paper in this same manner, *but should be double-spaced to be written accurately in your own research papers*, the above text becomes a direct quotation; hence, no quotation marks are needed.)

A. Plagiarism

B. Paraphrased

Appendix B

Plagiarism Activity – Instructor Key

Created by Diana Stout, 2003

Using the source paragraph below, you are to plagiarize a sentence, paraphrase the paragraph, and then rewrite the paragraph. You may work in groups and use your handbook and/or text. Perform the activity to receive full participation points; you will not be penalized should you outcomes be incorrect. This exercise is about demonstrating what you understand about plagiarism, and then learning how to avoid it.

Source information comes from: *Ben Franklin's 12 Rules of Management*, page 75, by Blaine McCormick, published in 2000 by Entrepreneur Press, 2445 McCabe Way, Irvine, CA 92614, taken from *The Autobiography and Other Writings* (Penguin Classics).

Franklin despised using the bald eagle as our national symbol primarily because of its inherent lack of hard work. He compared the bald eagle to men who make their living as thieves and robbers and condemned the society that is populated solely by such'workers.' Franklin's own choice for our national symbol was the turkey, which he preferred because it was native to North America (as cited in McCormick, 2000, p. 75).

A. Plagiarism
Word for word copying, with no citation, no quotes.

B. Paraphrased
Example: Benjamin Franklin wanted the turkey rather than the bald eagle as our nation's emblem not only because the turkey is indigenous to North American, but also because he felt the turkey was a bird with integrity (2000, McCormick, p. 75).

[Sentence structure is change, with just a few words used that couldn't be changed.]

C. Rewritten – examples:
Example: When choosing an emblem, not only do the characteristics of that person, animal or object need to be considered, but also what does that object represent to its own world, how it functions, and how those functions are viewed.

[Note: no reference to Franklin or the birds.]

Appendix C

Defining Plagiarism, Paraphrasing, and Rewriting

a Student Handout
created by Diana Stout, 2003

Ideas are not copyrighted. The creation of how that idea is expressed is copyrighted, but the idea within is not copyrighted[5].

Plagiarism occurs when:
- *Three or more words* are copied word for word from another source, and used without quotes.
- Quotes are used but no citation is used.
- A paraphrase has no citation.
- A paraphrase is used, with only a few words changed or synonyms are substituted, a citation is used, and/or sentence structure remains identical to the original.
- A graphic is copied and pasted, *without the author's permission*, even though there is a citation. (In the real world graphics fall in the same copyright category as animations, films, tables, and figures. The creation of these materials is an author's invention/creation of *how the material is presented*. Therefore, use of another's graphic always requires author permission, otherwise copyright infringement has occurred, which is plagiarism.)
  - **Ideally, students should create their own graphics, and use the citation because the material in their own graphics comes from another source, and should ideally use only 10% of the materials from another's graphic(s).**
  - For educational purposes one-time use only, students can use a graphic for a *one-time use only* for one class, but their citation must state "without author permission." These graphics and/or papers, then, cannot be used be posted or published anywhere (not even a class online program seen only by the class members) by instructors or students elsewhere unless author permission has been obtained from the author who created the graphic(s).
  - Students may not use graphics from websites or texts that implicitly state that author permission must be obtained before using. Students must obtain author permission in these cases.

To paraphrase correctly:
- Sentence structure is changed.
- Only a few words (as single or double use words) are retained.
- The author's idea is retained but presented in a different way.

---

[5] United States Copyright Office, Circular 1and 31.

To rewrite correctly:
- The writer takes the *idea* and makes it his/her own by using all new words and structure.
- There should be no similarity between the two writings, whatsoever.

Sample paraphrasing and rewriting:
Here are a few quoted sentences taken from *College Writing Skills with Readings 7e* by John Langan, published by McGraw-Hill, New York, 2008, page 706. The article is written by Ann McClintock, entitled "Propaganda Techniques in Today's Advertising." This quote does not have quotes as it is more than four lines; the double indentation indicates that the material is being quoted. Because the emphasis is on the author of the article, the Reference page entry would look like this:

McClintock, A. (2008). Propaganda techniques in today's advertising. In J. Langan, *College writing skills with readings* (7th ed.) (p. 706). New York: McGraw Hill.

> Americans, adults and children alike are being seduced. They are being brainwashed. And few of us protest. Why? Because the seducers and the brainwashers are the advertisers we willingly invite into our homes. We are victims, content—even eager—to be victimized. . . . *Propaganda* is a systematic effort to influence people's opinions, to win them over to a certain view or side. Propaganda is not necessarily concerned with what is true or false, good or bad. Propagandists simply want people to believe the messages being sent. Often propagandists will use outright lies or more subtle deceptions to sway people's opinions. In a propaganda war, any tactic is considered fair (McClintock, 2008, p. 706).

Paraphrasing examples:
- Bad: Americans, adults and children are being swayed by advertisers, all because we allow these advertisers and their propaganda into our homes willingly. [Problem: synonyms are substituted while using the same sentence structure, plus there is no citation.]

- Better: Propaganda is a way that advertisers brainwash and seduce Americans, both adults and children, which allow them to become victims in their own homes (McClintock, 2008, p. 706). [While a number of McCormick's words are being used, they are not strung together and the sentence structure (order) has changed.]

- Best: McClintock states that the goal of any advertiser is to have consumers purchase their projects; therefore Americans as consumers, whether the consumers are children or adults, need to be watchful of what we watch and read through advertisements (McClintock, 2008, p.706). [The only words retained are advertiser, children, adults, all of which are acceptable as the words are nouns, and there aren't any better substitutes.]

Rewriting example:
The goal is to make this a new expression of the same idea. Ideas are not copyrighted; therefore, ideas can be used without permission. However, the *expression of an idea* is copyright protected.

Propaganda and advertisers is the way McClintock expressed her main idea, so our goal is to use the idea but without her words of expression.

- Best: No advertisement is really bad; after all advertisements are about selling a product. What is bad is that often consumers fail to educate themselves on how to think critically about the advertisements that bombard them in newspapers, on television, at the movies, whether they are at home or at work. Even worse are parents who fail to educate their children on how to become critical consumers. [Notice there is no reference to propaganda, being victimized, being brainwashed. Instead, the idea was flipped upside-down. Because this is a now a *new expression* of the idea, there is no need to quote, cite, or reference.]

Appendix D

English Course Survey

Created by Diana Stout, 2003

On a scale of 1-5 with *5 being the best*, rate your present skills in these categories

1. Able to compose and revise clear and coherent essays and basic documents	5 4 3 2 1
2. Able to develop essays with clear thesis statements and topic sentences as well as specific support	5 4 3 2 1
3. Able to analyze readings	5 4 3 2 1
4. Able to express critical thinking skills in discussions	5 4 3 2 1
5. Able to apply argumentation in writing	5 4 3 2 1
6. Able to express critical thinking skills in my writing	5 4 3 2 1
7. Able to proofread my own papers	5 4 3 2 1
8. Able to provide feedback to other writers regarding their papers	5 4 3 2 1
9. Able to apply library and research skills to locate and organize research data	5 4 3 2 1
10. Able to employ appropriate tone, diction (voice) in writing	5 4 3 2 1
11. Able to employ appropriate grammar and punctuation correctly	5 4 3 2 1
12. Able to use appropriate computerized and word processing technology to facilitate the writing process	5 4 3 2 1
13. Able to write a paper based on a case study	5 4 3 2 1
14. Able to employ the American Psychological Association (APA) style correctly	5 4 3 2 1
15. Able to demonstrate how to use quotes and citations correctly	5 4 3 2 1
16. Able to demonstrate how to paraphrase correctly	5 4 3 2 1
17. Able to demonstrate how to rewrite research material correctly	5 4 3 2 1
18. Able to demonstrate what an abstract should look like	5 4 3 2 1
19. Able to demonstrate what a summary should look like	5 4 3 2 1
20. Able to ask questions when I don't understand	5 4 3 2 1

Appendix E

Online Survey Questions and Short Activity

Online Survey Questions

- Please describe how, when, and where you were taught to avoid plagiarism. What was the extent of that experience?

- How do you pro-actively address plagiarism in the classroom? For example, do you have a plan to address how to avoid plagiarism from the beginning or do you not have a plan at all and wait to see plagiarism occurring before you address it?

- Do you worry that plagiarism in your students' writings might be seen as a reflection of your teaching? If so, how?

- How do you show your interest in helping the student who is plagiarizing or struggling to understand the concept? Are you willing to put in the time? If so, how? Or do you feel frustrating that you don't have the time to spare to help them? If so, what are those frustrations in particular?

- How do you react when you see plagiarism occur? Do you take it personally? Are you disappointed or frustrated?

- What procedures do you take to deal with plagiarism once it occurs? Do the procedures stay inside the classroom, or are there institutional procedures that you are obligated to follow despite your own feelings or beliefs? Are the procedures known to students prior to their work being conducted or after the plagiarism has occurred?

- How do you structure your assignments to enable students to create original writings, thus help them avoid plagiarism? Do you consider the possibilities of plagiarism occurring as you develop your writing assignments, or is plagiarism not on your radar at all? Are there topics you choose because they force students to be more original than other assignments?

- What assessment methodology do you employ to ensure that your teaching of how to avoid plagiarism is fully learned?

Short Activity: Paraphrase and Rewrite This Paragraph
Paraphrasing is quite different from rewriting, and in the classroom experience of teaching freshman composition, Diana has discovered that 99% of the students don't understand the difference. In fact, more often than not students paraphrase believing they are rewriting.

How well do instructors paraphrase and rewrite in comparison? In the interest of research please perform the short activity, which merely asks that you make a choice.

Below is a reference as it would appear on the *References* page of a research paper using APA style, followed by the quoted material with its citation.

Following the quoted material, you are asked to choose an appropriate paraphrase from five choices, and then choose an appropriate rewrite from another five choices.

McCormick, B. (2000). Ben Franklin's 12 Rules of Management. Irvine, CA: Entrepreneur Press.

> Franklin despised using the bald eagle as our national symbol primarily because of its inherent lack of hard work. He compared the bald eagle to men who make their living as thieves and robbers and condemned the society that is populated solely by such 'workers.' Franklin's own choice for our national symbol was the turkey, which he preferred because it was native to North America (as cited in McCormick, 2000, p. 75).

Paraphrase choices:
- Franklin disliked using the bald eagle as our national symbol because of its lack of hard work.
- Franklin compared the bald eagle with men who make a living as criminals and condemned society solely populated by such "workers."
- Franklin compared the bald eagle with men who make a living as criminals and condemned society solely populated by such "workers" (McCormick, 2000, p. 75).
- Franklin wanted the turkey rather than the bald eagle as our nation's emblem because the turkey is indigenous to North American. He believed the turkey was a bird with integrity (McCormick, 2000, p. 75).
- Franklin didn't like using the bald eagle as our national emblem because he thought it represented laziness. He said the bald eagle was like men who make their living as thieves and robbers (McCormick, 2000, p. 75).

Rewritten choices:
- If Franklin had gotten his way, our national symbol would be the turkey instead of the bald eagle because the turkey is native to America.
- Franklin opposed using the bald eagle as our country symbol primarily because of its laziness.
- The Statue of Liberty should be our national symbol instead of birds. The Statue of Liberty is what our ancestors saw when they came to this country, and now that we are a melting pot of people, the Statue of Liberty represents all of us as a community.
- Choosing a symbol is not easy, especially if the chosen symbol has any negative traits. When choosing a symbol, how it's viewed needs to be considered.
- Because the bald eagle steals food from other animals, thus making it a lazy bird, it should not have been considered as a national symbol for America.

Appendix F

Phase II E-mail Survey Questions

1. Responses from the Phase I survey that asked participants "to describe how, when and where you were taught to avoid plagiarism" and "What was the extent of that experience" were that they were overall 1) taught in high school, 2) self-taught, 3) expected to know as a college student, 4) or by college instructors early on in college.

    As a result of this learning methodology, how assured are you that you were taught correctly? For consideration when writing your response, did you ever question what you were being taught by your instructors? Did these instructors guide you to textbooks and sources that verified that teaching? If taught in college, did it make a difference if you were being taught by full-time faculty, adjunct instructors, or graduate assistants?

2. While a subject teacher is *tested* by virtue of their master thesis and/or exams of their knowledge in their field of study, there is no test given to teachers to check their knowledge of how to avoid plagiarism. Some would claim by virtue of these subject teachers having successfully written papers without plagiarism detection claims that successful knowledge, and yet, there have been a number of individuals in various fields who have lost their jobs or are facing claims of plagiarism that has been found in their college papers, generally in a dissertation.

    c. Why do you believe that the plagiarism was never detected at the time of the papers' production? Why is plagiarism becoming a problem decades after their graduation?

    d. Should teachers be *tested* to discover if they can correctly teach students how to avoid plagiarism?

3. Should only composition teachers be responsible for teaching students how to avoid plagiarism; or, should all teachers regardless of their subject, be charged with teaching students how to avoid plagiarism if that teacher assigns a paper that uses research material? Please explain why.

4. Are we doing enough as higher-learning institutions to support our students in the learning of how to avoid plagiarism? If not, what more can we do, should we do?

5. Are we placing to much responsibility on the student in making it their responsibility in knowing how to avoid plagiarism, without determining if they have received the correct teaching or not? Should we be testing students in some manner?

6. Disappointment and frustration appears to be a common reaction of Phase I participants when discovering a student has plagiarism; and yet participants also believe that they have provided quality teaching about avoiding plagiarism to their students, whether it was in the form of feedback on drafts of the papers, in-class activities, one-on-one conferences, and so forth.

That disappointment and frustration appears aimed at the students in that they are lazy, not willing to do the work that would allow more attention to details, or that they have blatantly chosen to plagiarize. Additionally, participants expressed that they generally take care of the plagiarism issues inside the classroom. Is that because to report the problem to your institution could have severe repercussions for the student? Do you keep the problem in the classroom, because you don't want to be THE teacher that resulted in those consequences for that student? Or is it your intention to provide a solid teaching moment for your student. If so, how are you assured that the student won't go forward into other classes and plagiarize there despite all the work you did with that student?

7. What is the overall atmosphere in your institution of higher-education where you teach regarding plagiarism? Do the instructors talk about it? Is it a topic of discussion at any of the faculty meetings, kickoffs, in-house seminars or conferences? Do instructors report students or do they avoid doing so? Why or why not? Do you feel the policies at your institution are adequate and have a role in instructor attitudes and whether they report it or not?

8. If you currently take the plagiarism of your students personally, why do you think you do so? If you do not take it personally, was there ever a time that you did? If so, how did your make the conversion to not take it personally?

9. Overall, would you like to be free of having to detect plagiarism? Do you feel as if the focus on the subject matter receives less attention because there are plagiarism issues?

10. If you could create an ideal model of how a student who comes to your college or university—whether as a new student coming directly from high school, a transfer student who brings a degree or two with them, or as a re-entry student from years prior—what procedure(s) would you like to see in place to ensure that all students receive the same education/treatment to ensure knowledge of how to avoid plagiarism.

11. If you could create an ideal model of how your college or university's instructors were checked to determine if they were teaching students how to avoid plagiarism correctly, what would that model look like?

12. How would you feel if you were to discover that your learning and what you believed to be true on how to avoid plagiarism was incorrect? What if you discovered what you have been teaching or are teaching was incorrect? Would you be upset? Would you take it in stride as a learning/teaching moment but keep it to yourself, or would you share that learning/teaching moment with others—with your peers, with your students? Would that discovery change your attitude about how we currently teach our students, how responsibility is placed on them to know how to avoid plagiarism, who should ultimately be responsible for teaching this skill, and when it is taught?

Appendix G

Approval Letter from the Human Subjects International Review Board

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board

Date: October 16, 2012

To: Jonathan Bush, Principal Investigator
         Diana Stout, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 12-08-19

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project titled "Teaching Students about Plagiarism: What It Looks Like and How It Is Measured" has been **approved** under the **exempt** category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note: This research may **only** be conducted exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project (e.g., *you must request a post approval change to enroll subjects beyond the number stated in your application under "Number of subjects you want to complete the study")*." Failure to obtain approval for changes will result in a protocol deviation. In addition, if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

Reapproval of the project is required if it extends beyond the termination date stated below.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: October 16, 2013

Walwood Hall, Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5456
PHONE: (269) 387-8293 FAX: (269) 387-8276

Appendix H

Revised Approval Letter from the Human Subjects International Review Board

(Due to project revisions)

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Human Subjects Institutional Review Board

Date: December 6, 2012

To: Jonathan Bush, Principal Investigator
          Diana Stout, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Amy Naugle, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number 12-08-19

Thank you for submitting revisions for the changes requested to your research project titled "Teaching Students about Plagiarism: What It Looks Like and How It Is Measured." The change requested in your memo received December 5, 2012 (to expand participant pool to include graduate/teaching assistants, adjunct instructors, to modify the short activity procedure; and to revise consent document to reflect these changes) have been approved by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board.

The conditions and the duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University.

Please note that you may **only** conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: October 16, 2013

Walwood Hall, Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5456
PHONE: (269) 387-8293 FAX: (269) 387-8276