
Plagiarism and Collaboration: Suggestions for “Defining and Avoiding Plagiarism: The WPA Statement on Best Practices”

Amy Martin

Plagiarism is a perennial concern of professors across the curriculum who assign any amount of writing in their classes.¹ However, as Henry Wilson notes in a chapter of Lise Buranen and Alice Roy’s *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World*, institutional statements on plagiarism are often vague or nonexistent, leaving students and faculty confused about what behaviors constitute plagiarism (211–18). In the same volume, Edward White chastises institutions that do not recognize the complexity of plagiarism:

I get weary of self-righteous professors and administrators fulminating against immoral student plagiarists, when the institutions they represent and whose policies they shape have not taken the trouble to provide the information and guidance students need to avoid plagiarism. Indeed, we should all expect that much plagiarism will naturally occur unless we help students understand what all the fuss is about; many students simply are clueless about the issue and many faculty think the issue is simpler than it is. (207)

White goes on to note that as most colleges have a freshman composition requirement, a ready-made venue exists for instructing students about plagiarism. Yet he also states that such instruction must be reinforced by instructors of courses across the curriculum, or else students will fail to understand plagiarism or take it seriously as a universal academic offense.

In initiating discussions about plagiarism and plagiarism policies with their own faculty and with administrators and faculty across the curriculum, WPAs have an important document to support them—The Council of Writing Program Administrators’ “Defining and Avoiding Plagiarism: The WPA

Statement on Best Practices.” The WPA statement defines plagiarism: “In an instructional setting, plagiarism occurs when a writer deliberately uses someone else’s language, ideas, or other original (not common-knowledge) material without acknowledging its source” (1). The statement notes that most plagiarism discussions do not account for the fact that students may misuse or incorrectly cite sources in the course of their research-based writing. By extension, students who fail to cite or document sources correctly and who nevertheless make some attempt to acknowledge their sources have not plagiarized because their actions are not a deliberate attempt to mislead (2). In addition to outlining the responsibilities of students, faculty, and administrators regarding plagiarism, the statement offers suggestions for classroom practices that make plagiarism difficult, including discussing the conventions of different genres and disciplines with students with regards to writing and citation use (6).

Although WPAs and writing faculty have the WPA statement to support them, initiating discussions of plagiarism on college campuses can be difficult when faculty and administration are not unanimously invested in the value of writing across the curriculum and may hold definitions of and attitudes toward plagiarism that are as disparate as their academic disciplines, particularly when the issue is seen in terms of the value of collaboration in research and writing. In this essay, I will show the various definitions of collaboration that exist across disciplines at one college that had no plagiarism policy.² I will also discuss the implications of these definitions for WPAs who may be relying on the WPA plagiarism statement to guide them and their institutions as they attempt to define plagiarism across the curriculum.

THE STUDY AND THE PARTICIPANTS

To determine their definitions of plagiarism, I gave faculty at a small Catholic college (“SCC”) a survey adapted from one designed by Phillip Marzluf, formerly of the University of Oklahoma. The survey asked instructors to rank nine hypothetical writing scenarios along an ethical continuum from “completely unethical” to “not plagiarism,” categories which were then abstracted during analysis into the three categories of “unethical,” “ethical,” and “not plagiarism.”³ Faculty members received the surveys through campus mail, and I instructed them in an accompanying letter to return the surveys to me by a specified date. To protect subjects’ anonymity, the survey instrument requested that instructors identify themselves only by their academic disciplines. For the purposes of analysis, I categorized faculty responses by disciplinary affiliation and placed them into one of three cat-

egories: humanities, social sciences or sciences.⁴ By the end of the semester-long period of data collection, twenty-eight of sixty-eight full-time professors had responded to the survey.

WRITER-TEXT COLLABORATION

Four scenarios in the survey feature students working with text within and outside the traditional research paradigm of incorporating sources into their work. For example, in scenario 1, Kathy develops her own text using her friend's text on a similar subject as a source. However, we do not know within the context of the scenario whether or not Kathy acknowledged her friend's paper as a research source. The SCC faculty as a whole clearly made a distinction between Kathy interacting with her friend's text versus Kathy interacting with her friend through conversation while writing her English 115 paper; a majority of faculty across all disciplines rated Kathy's interaction with her friend's text as unethical, with 100 percent of social science faculty rating this scenario as such. Similarly, a strong majority of faculty across all disciplines rated scenario 5, in which Cody neglects to cite the author of the analysis of *The Tempest* on which he bases his analysis of *King Lear*, as unethical; scenarios 1, 5 and 9 (in the last of these, a student purchases a paper from the Internet) were the only scenarios that all professors rated as "unethical."

Cody and Kathy are not collaborating with other people but are using the texts other people have produced—a sort of collaboration once removed. With the invention of the printing press (and the mass market ability to publish writings that followed) putting a premium on the originality of ideas, the unacknowledged use of another's ideas—both within and outside the academy—became a punishable crime.⁵ Therefore, in academia, when students fail to acknowledge the ideas of others, they can suffer what Rebecca Howard terms the "academic death penalty," expulsion from school ("Plagiarisms, Authorships, and the Academic Death Penalty" 789). In the case of faculty, the unacknowledged use of another's ideas can result in another type of academic death penalty—denial of tenure and subsequent loss of employment.⁶ Given the severe academic penalties involved in participating in behavior similar to that of Kathy and Cody, the SCC faculty's strong response to their scenarios is not surprising.

However, given the emphasis that academia puts on originality, faculty responses to scenario 2 appear somewhat anomalous. In this scenario, Michael closely paraphrases and cites, albeit inappropriately, a passage from *The Concise Columbia Encyclopedia*. That is, according to Howard, Michael patchwrites (*Standing* xviii). While there has been considerable resistance to patchwriting in both popular culture and academia, SCC faculty appear

to be more receptive to the concept.⁷ For example, all science faculty viewed Michael's behavior as either ethical or "not plagiarism," and 63 percent of humanities and 80 percent of social science faculties accepted Michael's patchwriting.

The research of Miguel Roig suggests that although patchwriting has been maligned in academia, Michael may be writing according to models set forth by faculty. Roig, writing from the field of psychology, posits that professors "from certain disciplines, such as English, have stricter criteria for paraphrasing than professors from the hard sciences, such as chemistry and biology, and these [more relaxed] writing practices are somehow conveyed to students" (310).⁸ Roig conducted two studies to gauge professors' paraphrasing criteria: one study asked professors to compare original paragraphs to paraphrases, and the second study asked professors to paraphrase paragraphs themselves. Roig discovered that not only did professors' criteria for plagiarism vary within disciplines, but their ability to paraphrase was discipline-dependent, too. He notes that professors whose fields are different from that of the source text that they were asked to paraphrase may have felt forced to patchwrite (to use Howard's term) "to stay as close as possible to the original language to avoid conveying inaccurate information" (319). At the end of his article, Roig issues a call to action of sorts, noting that professors and administrators should turn their attention to the fact that "substantial differences" exist in the definition of plagiarism across and within disciplines (321). In light of Roig's study, the acceptance by SCC faculty—with the exception the English department—seems less an anomaly and more a product of the confusion that even professors seem to face when confronted with the questions of what constitutes appropriate paraphrasing and what constitutes plagiarism.⁹

Further evidence of faculty acceptance of patchwriting is also evident in their mostly positive responses to scenario 8, involving Lynn's imitation of *Catcher in the Rye*. Howard categorizes patchwriting as a form of *mimesis*, "a process of evaluating a source text, selecting passages pertinent to the patchwriter's purposes, and transporting those passages to the patchwriter's new context" (*Standing* xviii). In scenario 8, Lynn uses words and short phrases from *Catcher in the Rye* as she attempts to imitate the tone of the book in an essay for her composition course. The last line of the scenario suggests that Lynn is quite aware that while she wants to interact with and imitate the text, she also needs to be "careful" to avoid plagiarism. The tension that Lynn apparently feels about avoiding plagiarism in this circumstance reflects the shifting attitudes toward *mimesis* throughout history. While *mimesis* has little place in the contemporary academy that valorizes the individual and originality, Howard reminds us that *mimesis* has at times held sway in Western culture, most notably during the Middle Ages (*Standing* 64–66). The medieval concept of

mimesis is what Howard seeks to recover in her separation of patchwriting from plagiarism and is what best explains the interaction between Lynn and the text of *Catcher in the Rye*:

A common contemporary response to patchwriting focuses on appropriation—the patchwriter’s appropriation of the source. From this perspective, patchwriting is theft, a criminal act. But medieval textual theory reminds us that patchwriting’s merger of self is bi-directional: The patchwriter is acknowledging his writing persona as entailed rather than autonomous, and he is acknowledging the authority of the source text. (66)

In other words, Lynn’s patchwriting shows her indebtedness to the source text that helps her establish the persona she wants to get across to her English instructor, behavior that not only English instructors but their colleagues across the curriculum at SCC found acceptable.

While faculty had little problem with Lynn and Michael’s patchwriting, only humanities faculty viewed scenario 4 as either “ethical” or “not plagiarism”; in it, Sandra cites direct quotations but not facts “such as names, dates, statistics, and geographical facts” (Appendix) in a paper on the Vietnam War. While no specific information is given about the discipline for which Sandra writes her paper (although, given the subject matter, one could assume she is writing for a social science or humanities course), this scenario turns on a question that composition teachers often hear from students learning how to cite sources: “What counts as a fact?” As Margaret Price notes in her article “Beyond ‘Gotcha!’: Situating Plagiarism in Policy and Pedagogy,” the definitions of such concepts normally associated with plagiarism—terms such as “fact,” “common knowledge,” “collaboration,” and “ownership”—shift across time, discourse communities, and cultural contexts. To borrow an example from Price’s article to illustrate, most of us accept as fact the mathematical equation $2 + 2 = 4$; however, faculty whose primary discipline is mathematics would know that $2 + 2 = 4$ only if one is dealing with a Base-10 mathematical system. In other words, “facts are facts because they behave relatively stably within a given context, not because they possess inherent stability” (92). When faculty respond to Sandra’s citation practices, they do so through the lens of their respective disciplines’ perspectives about notions of fact and common knowledge, although that lens can be somewhat murky. For example, the *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers* states that writers have plagiarized if they have “presented facts without saying where [they] found them” (75); elements that do not have to be cited are familiar proverbs, well-known quotations, and “common knowledge,” yet “you must indicate the source of any information or material that you took from someone else” (73). *The Publication Manual*

of the American Psychological Association offers its associated disciplines no more guidance regarding facts and common knowledge than does the MLA, noting that exact quotes and paraphrases should be cited and that a writer should not “present the work of another as if it were his or her own work. This can extend to ideas as well as written words” (293–294). Given that the publication manuals have such general statements on what constitutes fact and common knowledge, and given the shifting nature of facts and common knowledge across time, community, and context, a consensus on whether Sandra is plagiarizing would be hard to come by, indeed.

COLLABORATION OR PLAGIARISM?

Collaboration by writers, whether in the workplace or academia, is certainly not a new concept. Yet as several composition scholars, among them Andrea Lunsford, Lisa Ede, and Karen Burke LeFevre, have pointed out, collaboration in composition studies has often meant collaboration as peer responses to a text a student has produced in isolation (Ede and Lunsford 7; LeFevre 13–22). Even in the sciences, where teams of researchers working and writing together on projects are more the rule than the exception, tension exists between individual and corporate ownership of a research project and the writing that reports that research.¹⁰

The tension between collaboration and individual ownership in writing is evident in the responses of the SCC faculty to the three scenarios (3, 6, and 7) that deal with a student interacting with another with regard to his or her writing. While a majority of faculty across disciplines agreed that Lysay behaved unethically in receiving editing help from her mother, a former English teacher (scenario 6), Frank’s behavior during his peer response session (scenario 7) and John’s behavior in turning to his girlfriend to help him with a conclusion to his English 115 paper (scenario 3) produced varied responses across disciplines.¹¹ While science faculty viewed John’s behavior as clearly unethical, humanities and social science faculty were less convinced of John’s transgression. And while science faculty also viewed Frank’s behavior as unethical, humanities faculty viewed his behavior as ethical; social science faculty rode the fence (Appendix).

While the SCC science faculty may value collaboration in their own professional writings, they regard any form of collaboration in their students’ writings with suspicion. On the other hand, survey respondents from the humanities are more receptive to the idea of collaboration in writing—except in Lysay’s case. A possible explanation for the humanities faculty’s response to these three scenarios lies in the particulars of the survey respondents. Of the humanities faculty who responded to the survey, nearly half were members of the English department, all of whom have taught the required

freshman composition courses at one time or another. If the scenario that features Frank also featured a description of what may take place during a peer response session in the typical composition classroom, the English professors would be more likely to rate Frank's behavior as ethical and rate the two "out-of-class" scenarios as unethical or state mixed responses to Frank's decisions. One English professor made comments on the survey that may explain why she thought her colleagues would view Frank's behavior as ethical but Lynsay's behavior as unethical:

My biggest problem with Lynsay's behavior isn't so much that she goes to her mother for peer response, but that her mother is an English teacher. That seems to give her an unfair advantage over other students. And it's a shame because what she's doing, seeking out feedback to her work, is what we seem to want to encourage in writing classes.

In other words, this teacher is happy that Lynsay is seeking feedback on her writing beyond the confines of the classroom. However, Lynsay has access to someone with more expertise in proofreading than her fellow students, which pushes her behavior into the realm of the unethical for this particular teacher.

Lynsay, however, not only has access to someone with additional expertise, but that someone, if one looks at the language of the scenario closely, is also appropriating her text. Lynsay and her mother are not engaging in "peer response," as suggested by the comments of the teacher quoted above. Her mother "reworks" her papers, leaving ideas alone but inserting words and altering punctuation. In other words, she is acting as Lynsay's *editor* rather than her *responder*, giving Lynsay assistance beyond what her fellow students could expect from fellow classmates and even from writing tutors, should they take the same assignment to SCC's Academic Resource Center.¹² Likewise, when John's girlfriend summarizes his paper and he writes that summary verbatim as his conclusion, she may have given him more assistance (or perhaps John has *taken* more assistance, since we do not know if she is present when John writes out her words) than John would have received had he gone for a tutoring session. We do not know enough about John's girlfriend (Is she an English major? Has she taken many writing courses?) to know how "expert" her summary of John's paper is compared to the editing done by Lynsay's mother.

ONE POLICY FITS ALL?

While all faculty agreed that a student purchasing a paper from the Internet (scenario 9) is plagiarism, the other hypothetical scenarios dealing with collaboration in its various permutations proved more problematic in terms of defining what behaviors constitute plagiarism. So how does an institution formulate its plagiarism policy?

While the WPA plagiarism statement explicitly addresses responsibilities of students, faculty, and staff with regard to the use of sources in writing, the statement offers individual departments and their institutions little guidance on how to address collaboration. While the statement consistently notes that academic writing conventions vary between and within disciplines—and so definitions of plagiarism will vary between and within disciplines—the statement does not explicitly address definitions of acceptable person-to-person collaboration other than noting that faculty should include “support for researched writing (such as the analysis of models, individual/group conferences, or *peer review*) into course designs” (3, emphasis added). In the “Best Practices” section, under “Explain Plagiarism and Develop Clear Policies,” the WPA statement does include the following passage about collaborating with the *written* work of others: “Remind students that the goal of research is to engage, through writing, in a purposeful, scholarly discussion of issues that are sometimes passed over in daily life. Understanding, augmenting, engaging in dialogue with, and challenging the work of others are part of becoming an effective citizen in a complex society” (4). Overall, however, the WPA statement offers little guidance to WPAs or to their colleagues across disciplines concerning acceptable collaboration within academic fields. Revising the WPA statement to define every allowable and unallowable instance of collaboration would be impractical (that is, saying “Editing from your retired English teacher mother is not allowed; however, using words and ideas obtained during a peer response session in your composition class is acceptable.”); however, including more specific language about what constitutes allowable collaboration would assist WPAs in setting the boundaries for plagiarism at their institutions and assist colleagues across disciplines in viewing writing as a social process. In Henry Wilson’s 1999 study of college plagiarism policies, 63 percent of schools surveyed had plagiarism policies that did not address issues of collaboration (213). While these institutions have policies that go beyond simple admonitions not to plagiarize, that their policies do not define what constitutes acceptable collaboration may be just as harmful as having no plagiarism policy at all. Wilson notes:

When students engage in such composition strategies as peer editing and tutoring—which are increasingly presented as essential collaborative writing strategies—blanket prohibition against “using the words or thoughts of others” can plant unwarranted suspicion in the minds of both teachers and students that something untoward may be occurring in their writing activities, even if these activities consist of the entirely ethical application of collaborative writing techniques. (215)

At the relatively few schools in Wilson’s study that have plagiarism policies addressing both plagiarism and collaboration, the lengthy and detailed policies “tend to work from a specific theoretical viewpoint, one that explicitly acknowledges that writing is inevitably a socially based process” (216). Many of these policies do not use the term “collaboration” but instead refer to writing center tutoring or peer response as acts that are encouraged and that do not constitute plagiarism.

I would argue that the WPA statement, which at seven pages is already lengthy, should be further lengthened to guide WPAs, our students, and our colleagues across disciplines about the boundaries of acceptable person-to-person collaboration—no easy feat, considering the responses regarding acceptable collaboration that emerged from my study of faculty across the curriculum in one small college. However, regardless of whether an institution has a WAC program, the differences in the interpretations of acceptable collaboration in writing point to a need for those of us in composition to continue or perhaps initiate discussions of plagiarism and collaboration with instructors in other fields. Although Lise Buranen writes about interpretations of plagiarism across cultures, her call to action applies to issues related to plagiarism and collaboration with our colleagues from different academic “cultures”:

[W]e must recognize, acknowledge, and continue our research and inquiry into the complexities and nuances of what we call plagiarism, while at the same time taking care not to send overly simplistic or conflicting messages to students, no matter who they are. We need to keep investigating, for instance, where we believe collaboration in the classroom ends and “plagiarism” begins, even if—or especially if—there are no easy answers to that question. (72)

To further Buranen’s point, we need to investigate what constitutes acceptable collaboration outside the classroom setting as well and to invite our colleagues across the curriculum to engage in these investigations with us.

Just as writing teachers—particularly those who teach freshman composition—frequently shoulder most of the burden of teaching college students about plagiarism, WPAs frequently shoulder the burden of advising an entire faculty about classroom practices that can avoid plagiarism. WPAs should be supported in this endeavor by a document that recognizes the complexities of appropriately incorporating sources into writing *and* recognizes the various conventions for collaboration that exist across disciplines and outside traditional classroom settings.

NOTES

¹ An earlier version of this article was presented as a paper at the Conference on College Composition and Communication in New York City on March 21, 2003. I would like to thank the students and faculty at SCC who generously donated their time to this project and Phillip Marzluf for his permission to use and alter his original survey.

² The institution under study has an academic integrity policy that forbids plagiarism (in addition to other dishonest practices, such as presenting false data and giving and receiving information on tests). The policy, however, does not define for students and faculty what acts constitute plagiarism. Required composition courses at this institution use Diana Hacker's *A Writer's Reference* as a standard text. Hacker defines plagiarism as "(1) failing to cite quotations and borrowed ideas, (2) failing to enclose borrowed language in quotation marks, and (3) failing to put summaries and paraphrases in your own words" (331). While all sections of composition courses use *A Writer's Reference*, no data exist to show whether students in these courses are specifically assigned to read Hacker's definition of plagiarism.

³ Survey respondents were advised to mark as "not plagiarism" scenarios which they felt no one under any circumstances would interpret as plagiarism. Respondents were directed to mark as "completely ethical" scenarios which they personally viewed as ethical but could foresee a situation in which another person might interpret the situation as plagiarism—in other words, the respondent felt that his/her personal ethical view of the scenario could be different from that of someone else interpreting the same situation.

⁴ SCC defines humanities disciplines as the following: English, fine arts, history, modern foreign languages, philosophy, and religious studies. Biology, chemistry, health and human services, mathematics and computer science, and nursing constitute the sciences, while business, communications, psychology, sociology, and teacher education are considered social science disciplines at SCC. The humanities had the most survey participants (11) while the sciences had the fewest (7).

⁵ For a more detailed discussion of the invention of the printing press and its impact on intellectual property, see Elizabeth Eisenstein and Mark Rose.

⁶ Thomas Mallon's *Stolen Words* devotes a chapter to a discussion of the "undoing" (151) of a Texas Tech University history professor because of plagiarism.

⁷ Howard detailed the criticisms in popular media and academia to her publications on patchwriting in a conference presentation entitled "Public Intellectual, or Public Object? Mass Media Representations of Plagiarism Scholarship."

⁸ Note that the SCC humanities faculty, composed primarily of English professors, had the highest number of "unethical" responses in this portion of the study, supporting Roig's hypothesis.

⁹ Ironically, in paraphrasing Howard's discussion of patchwriting, Roig misrepresents her position. Throughout "The New Abolitionism Comes to Plagiarism," which Roig cites as a reference, Howard argues that although patchwriting is "customarily regarded as a subset of the category of plagiarism" (89), it should be regarded instead as indicative of students' attempts to enter an academic discourse community, rather than as a transgressive act.

¹⁰ See, for example, the discussion of the human genome project research in Andrea Lunsford and Susan West, "Intellectual Property and Composition Studies."

¹¹ English 115 (ENGL 115) is SCC's required composition course.

¹² For a concise discussion of asking questions during tutoring sessions and the difference between tutoring and editing, see Paula Gillespie and Neal Learner.

APPENDIX

Assessments of Plagiarism Scenarios

1. Kathy is having difficulty finding a suitable writing topic for her final ENGL 115 paper. After discussing her problems with a friend, she finds out that her friend had to write a similar paper the previous semester. Using a draft of her friend's paper, Kathy rewrites it to make it sound more like herself. Also, she completely changes her friend's introduction and, in the body of the paper, includes some additional information.

	<i>Unethical</i>	<i>Ethical</i>	<i>Not Plagiarism</i>	<i>No Response</i>
Humanities	91%	---	---	9%
Sciences	72%	29%	---	---
Social Sciences	100%	---	---	---

 Note: The percentages given in these tables do not always equal 100% for a variety of reasons.

2. In *The Concise Columbia Encyclopedia*, Michael looks up some information on occupational disease for a paper and finds the

following summary: Occupational disease, illness resulting from the conditions or environment of employment. Some time usually elapses between exposure to the cause and development of the symptoms of an occupational disease. Among the causes of such diseases are toxic chemicals, such as benzene and dioxin. In a paper for his business communications class, Michael includes the following: Occupational disease is an illness resulting from job-related conditions. Usually, there is an elapse of time between exposure to the cause and development of the symptoms of this disease. Toxic chemicals, such as benzene and dioxin are common causes (*The Concise Columbia Encyclopedia*).

	<i>Unethical</i>	<i>Ethical</i>	<i>Not Plagiarism</i>	<i>No Response</i>
Humanities	36%	18%	45%	---
Sciences	---	43%	57%	---
Social Sciences	20%	30%	50%	---

3. John hates writing conclusions. Thus, instead of summarizing the paper himself, he reads his sociology paper aloud to his girlfriend and then asks her to briefly sum up the paper. He writes down exactly what she says and, after making a couple of grammatical changes, he includes this at the end of his paper.

	<i>Unethical</i>	<i>Ethical</i>	<i>Not Plagiarism</i>	<i>No Response</i>
Humanities	54%	36%	9%	---
Sciences	71%	29%	---	---
Social Sciences	50%	40%	10%	---

4. Sandra, a student writing about the Vietnam War, has collected over ten separate newspaper accounts depicting an important battle in preparation for a lengthy research paper. As she writes her description about this battle, she makes sure to include proper citations whenever she uses direct quotations from the newspaper articles. However, she doesn't cite the sources of facts such as names, dates, statistics, and geographical places.

	<i>Unethical</i>	<i>Ethical</i>	<i>Not Plagiarism</i>	<i>No Response</i>
Humanities	18%	36%	36%	9%
Sciences	43%	57%	---	---
Social Sciences	60%	20%	10%	10%

5. The assignment in Cody's English class asks to write a three-page interpretation of a Shakespeare play. Glancing through a book about Shakespeare, *Elizabethan Playwrights*, Cody finds an analysis of *The Tempest* that he likes. Cody then extends the analysis to write his

paper on Shakespeare’s *King Lear*. Although he cites the Shakespeare anthology he is using, he doesn’t indicate his use of *Elizabethan Playwrights*.

	<i>Unethical</i>	<i>Ethical</i>	<i>Not Plagiarism</i>	<i>No Response</i>
Humanities	90%	9%	---	---
Sciences	85%	14%	---	---
Social Sciences	80%	10%	---	10%

6. In her opinion, Lynsay feels that she has a lot to say but at the same time feels she can never find the right words to express her thoughts. All her sentences are always the same length and start in the same way. Her mother, fortunately, is a retired high school English teacher. She reworks Lynsay’s papers until they sound more professional and academic. “She only touches the grammar, and stuff like words and punctuation,” Lynsay says. “The ideas are mine. That’s the important part.”

		<i>Ethical</i>	<i>Not Plagiarism</i>	<i>No Response</i>
Humanities	82%	18%	---	---
Sciences	57%	28%	---	---
Social Sciences	80%	20%	---	---

7. In Frank’s ENGL 115 class, multiple drafting and soliciting responses to and editing of those drafts are requirements of the class; students work in groups during class time to respond to and edit each other’s papers. Frank’s usual partners, Erica and Gail, are recognized as the best students in the class; therefore, Frank feels that rewriting the final drafts of his papers and including the exact words and sentence structures that they suggest would be in his best interest. Incorporating their exact words and sentences structures is especially easy, since the instructor tells students to write, in a different color ink, directly on their group members’ rough drafts.

		<i>Ethical</i>	<i>Not Plagiarism</i>	<i>No Response</i>
Humanities	36%	45%	9%	9%
Sciences	72%	29%	---	---
Social Sciences	50%	30%	20%	---

8. Lynn’s favorite book in high school was *The Catcher in the Rye*. She liked the smart-alecky tone of the book and how the main character’s thoughts were depicted with mild swears and informal phrases. The first sentence of this book, for example, reads, “If you really want to hear all about it, the first thing you’ll probably want to know is where I

was born...and all of that David Copperfield kind of crap.” In her first paper for ENGL 115, a description of a real experience from her past, Lynn tried to imitate the tone of *The Catcher in the Rye*. Yet, though she wanted to make herself sound like the main character from that book, she was careful to only directly use single words or short, two-to-three word phrases.

	<i>Unethical</i>	<i>Ethical</i>	<i>Not Plagiarism</i>	<i>No Response</i>
Humanities	18%	36%	45%	---
Sciences	---	86%	14%	---
Social Sciences	40%	20%	40%	---

9. Ashley, a chemistry major, finds out that her final history paper is due on the following day. Since there is no time left to do research and plan her topic—and since she still has to study for her final chemistry exam—she can think of only one solution to her problem; she jumps on the Internet, finds the www.collegepapers.com site, and pays \$42.50 to download what is advertised as “the perfect paper.”

	<i>Unethical</i>	<i>Ethical</i>	<i>Not Plagiarism</i>	<i>No Response</i>
Humanities	100%	---	---	---
Sciences	100%	---	---	---
Social Sciences	100%	---	---	---

WORKS CITED

- Buranen, Lise. “‘But I *Wasn’t* Cheating’: Plagiarism and Cross-Cultural Mythology.” Buranen and Roy 63–74.
- Buranen, Lise, and Alice M. Roy, eds. *Perspectives on Plagiarism and Intellectual Property in a Postmodern World*. Albany: SUNY P, 1999.
- “Defining and Avoiding Plagiarism: The WPA Statement on Best Practices.” (Southern Illinois UP, 1990.
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change: Communications and Cultural Transformations in Early Modern Europe*. 2 vols. Cambridge, England: Cambridge UP, 1979.
- Gibaldi, Joseph. *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*. 6th ed. New York: MLA, 2003.
- Gillespie, Paula and Neal Learner. *The Allyn and Bacon Guide to Peer Tutoring*. 2nd ed. New York: Pearson Longman, 2004.
- Hacker, Diana. *A Writer’s Reference*. 5th ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2003.
- Howard, Rebecca Moore. “The New Abolitionism Comes to Plagiarism.” Buranen and Roy 87–95.

- "Plagiarisms, Authorships, and the Academic Death Penalty." *College English* 57 (1995): 788–806.
- "Public Intellectual, or Public Object? Mass Media Representations of Plagiarism Scholarship." Intellectual Property Caucus. College Composition and Communication Caucus. New York Hilton and Towers, New York City. 19 Mar. 2003. Accessed 1 June 2004 <<http://wrthoward.syr.edu/Papers/CCCC2003.caucus.htm>>
- Standing in the Shadow of Giants: Plagiarists, Authors, Collaborators*. Stamford, CT: Ablex, 1999.
- Lagassé, Paul, ed. *The Concise Columbia Encyclopedia*, 3rd ed. New York: Columbia UP, 1994: 637.
- LeFevre, Karen Burke. *Invention as a Social Act*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1987.
- Lunsford, Andrea, and Susan West. "Intellectual Property and Composition Studies." *College Composition and Communication* 47 (1996): 383–411.
- Mallon, Thomas. *Stolen Words: The Classic Book on Plagiarism*. San Diego: Harcourt, 1989.
- Marzluf, Phillip. "Cheats and Copycats: Ethical Attitudes of Students and their Instructors toward Plagiarism." Conference on College Composition and Communication. Adam's Mark Hotel, Denver. 16 Mar. 2001.
- Price, Margaret. "Beyond 'Gotcha!': Situating Plagiarism in Policy and Pedagogy." *College Composition and Communication* 54.1 (2002): 88–115.
- Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*. 5th ed. Washington, DC: APA, 2001.
- Roig, Miguel. "Plagiarism and Paraphrasing Criteria of College and University Professors." *Ethics and Behavior* 11.3 (2001): 307–21.
- Rose, Mark. *Authors and Owners: The Invention of Copyright*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1993.
- White, Edward M. "Student Plagiarism as an Institutional and Social Issue." Buranen and Roy 205–10.
- Wilson, Henry L. "When Collaboration Becomes Plagiarism: The Administrative Perspective." Buranen and Roy 211–18.

