Transforming Students into Leaders through the Literary Arts and the Social Sciences

Transforming Students into Leaders through the Literary Arts and the Social Sciences

Edited by

Mary Alice Trent,
Meaghan Peggy Stevenson Ratliff
and Don Pardlow

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Transforming Students into Leaders through the Literary Arts and the Social Sciences

Edited by Mary Alice Trent, Meaghan Peggy Stevenson Ratliff and Don Pardlow

This book first published 2020

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-5275-4731-0
ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-4731-5

This book is dedicated to our colleague and coeditor, Dr. Don Pardlow, who passed away in April of 2019. May he rest from his labor and may his good works live on to influence the lives of others.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

The originator of visionary leadership, the political scientist James Macgregor Burns, designed the style of transformative leader (1977). In his work, Deepak Chopra introduces several qualities of a transformative or visionary leader. One, in particular, is that of critical thinking, creativity, and logical reasoning (2012). The aspiring transformative leader should be an expert in his or her area of endeavor, acquiring not only an increasing breath of knowledge but also an increasing depth of knowledge. In addition to deep content-knowledge, a transformative leader should master a variety of creativity-related and critical-thinking techniques, as well as develop interpersonal skills to communicate and work in a culturally inclusive workplace with diverse groups of people. Transformative leaders should utilize technology in innovative ways across the curriculum. To this end, the contributing authors, showcased in this book, teach language and literature courses or psychology courses or education courses that are designed to foster such development of transformative leaders.

The book is divided into four sections. Part One is entitled, "Paradigm Shifts in Teaching College Reading and Writing to Digital Natives." In his chapter, Dr. Chris M. Anson challenges the conventional notions of intellectual property. Anson encourages his audience to consider "a more complex understanding of discourse practices as a function of social context," not limited by prescriptive rules of engagement of the academic community. In doing so, Anson claims that professors will equip college students to leave the academy and enter the workplace better prepared to navigate intellectual property as decent, ethical leaders.

In his chapter, Dr. David McCracken encourages those teaching in higher education to reconsider how they teach writing to include surfing the Internet as an option for prewriting since Centennials are more likely to Google an assignment prompt before they begin writing about it. Twenty-first century leaders or learners are "digital natives," and should, therefore, be encouraged and coached to use multimedia in the classroom in meaningful, ethical, practical ways.

In her chapter, Dr. Julie O'Connell stresses the importance of scaffolding techniques in cognitive development and critical thinking and strategic

thinking—all of which are necessary tools for effective leaders. O'Connell claims that scaffolded reading promotes "a student's sense of self-efficacy."

Part Two is entitled, "Identity, Gender, and Race Talks in Literature." In their chapter, Dr. Delila Owens, Dr. Mary Alice Trent, Ms. Carese Bates, and Ms. Shanice Lockhart examine the historical literary representations of black women, and the authors admonish black women today to mentor a new generation of black women for leadership and service in their respective fields.

In her chapter, Dr. M. Peggy Stevenson Ratliff explores William Shakespeare's depiction of strong, complex, intelligent females in two of his comedies. A forerunner of his time, Shakespeare challenges the social norms of gender identity of his day in these two comedies. Ratliff's essay cultivates conversations around gender roles and leadership.

In his chapter, Dr. Patrick L. Stearns explores Ntokake Shange's portrayal of black womanhood through her characters, as well as Shange's own self-worth and self-actualization as examples of the multifaceted nature of black women living in America.

In her chapter, Dr. Joann Allen examines gender stereotypes and oppressive treatment of Latina women through the works of Sandra Cisneros, who is a proud Mexican-American whose devoted much of her life to bridging the gap of understanding between the mainstream American society and the Mexican and Mexican-American societies, particularly women. Allen's essay lays the foundation for cultivating leaders who are culturally aware of gender stereotypes against Latina women.

Part Three is entitled, "Multicultural Pedagogy in the College Classroom." In their chapter, Dr. Alessandra Sartori Nogueira and Professor Jéssica Brilio argue for the "Critical Pedagogy" theory, which trains students how to question and challenge dominant beliefs and assumptions as opposed to the "Banking Education" theory, where educators primarily deposit knowledge in students. According to the authors, who support Critical Pedagogy theory, 21st century leaders will need to think critically and creatively, and educators will need to create a more culturally responsive classroom. Using the Critical Pedagogical approach in second language acquisition sets the environment for this type of learning.

In her chapter, Dr. Ima L. Hicks argues for a paradigm shift in foreign language instruction, one that leads to the development and implementation

of a more inclusive return in "language education policy, critical language pedagogy, and teacher preparation programs in language and literacy education." It will be imperative for leaders to be multilingual and culturally adept.

In his chapter, Dr. Jason Youngkeit encourages foreign language educators to use photography from foreign countries to enhance foreign language and cultural instruction and intercultural understanding—all of which 21st century leaders must have.

Part Four is entitled, "Multimedia and Multidisciplinary Pedagogies in the College Classroom." In their chapter, Dr. Nan Li and Dr. Verlie Tisdale claim that pre-service teacher training must prepare teachers to serve a diverse group of students who will need to be prepared to work in a global society.

In her chapter, Dr. Denise Williams examines the role of the educational psychology supervisor, as "gate keeper," who trains and prepares the next generation of clinicians, often by demonstrating empathy, insight, and intuition, among other attributes. Supervisors often coach clinicians in exploring their personal worldview, especially as clinicians navigate social justice issues and a plethora of other topics in their training.

In her chapter, Dr. Kumkum Singh challenges college educators to introduce innovative technological applications into the academic curriculum to encourage college students to use their smart phones and other smart devices for academic quality control. It is no secret that 21st century leaders will need to use their smart devices professionally and effectively in the global workplace.

James Macgregor Burns envisions the transformational leader as a "creative problem-solver," a leader who in a period of crisis can synthesize new approaches and methods to handle a problem. The teaching of critical thinking, the capacity of the mind to think creatively and to generate solutions to any problem, is important in the development of the transformational leader in the 21st-century. Moreover, training and preparing students to understand and collaborate with diverse people is also imperative.

Dr. Mary Alice Trent and Dr. Don Pardlow

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to the Claflin University Conference on Contemporary English and Language and Arts Pedagogy and to the conference founders: Dr. M. Peggy Stevenson Ratliff, Dr. Zia Hasan, and Dr. Mitali Wong.

Thank you to Mrs. Mae R. Pardlow, the late widow of Dr. Don Pardlow, for believing in the vision of this book.

PART ONE

PARADIGM SHIFTS IN TEACHING COLLEGE READING AND WRITING TO DIGITAL NATIVES

FRAUDULENT PRACTICES: ACADEMIC MISREPRESENTATIONS OF PLAGIARISM IN THE NAME OF GOOD PEDAGOGY

CHRIS M. ANSON
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

This article describes analyses of three contexts (civic, business, and "military") in which understandings of intellectual property differ from those taught in the schools. In each of these contexts, it is possible to document specific examples of unattributed material that would be considered to violate most academic plagiarism policies. Yet in these contexts, entirely acceptable purposes for non-attribution relate to the specific goals of the communication; whether original authors stand to gain, in Latour and Woolgar's sense, either credit or credibility from their creations; and how the broader community's goals are defined relative to individuals working within it (see Adler-Kassner, Anson, and Howard). After a brief synthesis of this research, the essay returns to the problem of discursive "representation" and the honesty with which we teach students about worlds of written discourse.

The Reality of Patchwriting

Consider the following typical descriptions of plagiarism found at the Internet sites of two universities:

> [I]t is unacceptable to copy something out of a book, newspaper, journal or any other printed source. The most blatant example of this is to directly copy something word for word. It does not matter if it is only a phrase. If it is not yours, either do not use it or place it in quotes and reference it. There are different methods for doing this. The important thing is that the reader can tell what is yours, and what is someone else's. . . . If you use something word for word it **MUST** be acknowledged. Things start to get a bit gray when you paraphrase. There is one simple solution to this dilemma. **DO NOT PARAPHRASE!** Only use someone else's writing when it serves a purpose.

> Only use someone else's writing when you want to quote precisely what they wrote. If this is not your goal, **USE YOUR OWN WORDS**. (van Bramer)

> Using verbatim material (e.g., exact words) without proper attribution (or credit) constitutes the most blatant form of plagiarism. However, other types of material can be plagiarized as well, such as ideas drawn from an original source or even its structure (e.g., sentence construction or line of argument). ("Plagiarism")

In the context of these explanations, now consider the following excerpt from a section on "severe weather driving tips" at the Website of the State Farm Insurance Company:

> Driving on Ice
> - Bridges and overpasses freeze first, so always slow down and avoid sudden changes in speed or direction.
> - Keep windows clear.
> - Keep your speed steady and slow—but not so slow that your car gets stuck in deeper snow.
> - Use your brakes cautiously. Abrupt braking can cause brake lock-up and cause you to lose steering control.
> - To make Antilock Brakes work correctly, apply constant, firm pressure to the pedal. During an emergency stop, push the brake pedal all the way to the floor, if necessary, even in wet or icy conditions.
> - If you get stuck in snow, straighten the wheels and accelerate slowly. Avoid spinning the tires. Use sand or cinders under the drive wheels. ("Severe Weather Driving")

Elsewhere on the Internet, we find word-for-word replicas of this information without attribution. For example, at the Turner Agency, a small, independent company, the State Farm text appears to have been duplicated, but with some slight editing. Text identical to the State Farm excerpt appears in bold; deletions are marked by strikethroughs in brackets.

> Driving On Ice
> - It's always a good idea to head over to a large empty parking lot in your neighborhood (i.e. mall or superstore parking lot) when the seasons first snowfall hits. The reason for this is to give you a little time to re-acquaint yourself with your winter driving abilities in an empty parking lot, and the feel of your car on the slippery road.
> - **Bridges and overpasses freeze first. Slow down and avoid sud- den changes in speed or direction.**
> - **Keep windows clear** of snow and ice.

- **Keep your speed steady and slow — but not [~~so~~] too slow [~~that your car gets stuck in deeper snow~~].** In deeper snow, it's often necessary to use the car's momentum to keep moving.
- Use [~~your~~] brakes **very cautiously. Abrupt braking can cause brake lock-up, which causes you to lose steering control**.
- Antilock brakes are designed to overcome a loss of steering control on wet or slippery roads. Yet they have little or no effect on ice. **To make antilock brakes work correctly,** or work at all, you should **apply constant, firm pressure to the pedal. During an emergency stop, push the brake pedal all the way to the floor** [~~, if necessary, even in wet or icy conditions~~]. There is an old saying . . . "If the roads are wet, then drive like it's snowing. If the roads have snow, then drive like they're icy. If the roads are icy, then don't drive." ("Automobile Insurance")

A comparison of the two texts shows that the State Farm material has been slightly edited, but the order of the bullet points is the same. Although it is impossible to know which is the "progenitor" text, we might hypothesize that the much smaller Turner Agency appropriated giant State Farm's "mate- rial" and represented much of it as its own.

In taking large parts of State Farm's text, the Turner Agency also appears to have added its own original contributions, such as the poorly-edited "mate- rial" in the first bullet point. However, this additional material also appears at the site of another insurance company (NewCarInsure.com) that provides information about specific automobiles, perhaps as a way to induce car shoppers to sign up for a policy with the company. In the following excerpt, notice that a reference to the Honda Accord has been spliced into the Turner Agency text with some minor differences. Additional text about driving in icy conditions is identical to the text at the Turner Agency site.

> If you live in a cold area, and you have a new 2009 Honda Accord Coupe **It's always a good idea to head over to a large empty parking lot in your neighborhood** [~~(i.e. mall or superstore parking lot)~~] **when the seasons first snowfall hits. The reason for this is to give you a little time to [~~re~~]acquaint yourself with your winter driving abilities** in your new Honda Accord Coupe, **and [~~the~~] feel of your car on the slippery road. Remember bridges and overpasses freeze first. Slow down and avoid sudden changes in speed or direction. Keep** your Accord Coupe **windows clear of snow and ice. Keep your speed steady and slow** [~~but not too slow~~]. **In deeper snow, it's often necessary to use your** [~~car~~'s] Accord Coupe's **momentum to keep moving**. ("New Honda Accord Coupe")

RepCo, a firm in New Zealand, replicates the Turner Agency version of the safety tips, not State Farm's, again without attribution (see "Driving Safety Tips"). We also find the Turner Agency text reproduced verbatim at the site for the Kalavrita Ski Resort in Greece, which includes other "information" relevant to skiers and those who drive to the resort. At this site, the following additional material on wind chill appears together with the tips found at the State Farm and Turner sites:

> "Wind chill" is a calculation of how cold it feels outside when the effects of temperature and wind speed are combined. A strong wind combined with a temperature of just below freezing can have the same effect as a still air temperature about 35 degrees colder. ("HellasCams – Kalavrita Ski Center")

Curiously, this additional wind chill information appears verbatim at over a dozen other sites (without the information on safe driving tips), including several town or county sites with public information, sites that promote emergency preparedness, and a site put up by the 1991 class of the United States Air Force Academy, which offers miscellaneous information and advice for soldiers.

In these and countless other examples found at hundreds of Internet sites, text is freely copied and pasted without attribution, or with varying degrees of attribution. In most cases, it is impossible to determine the source of the progenitor text—the one originally authored by a specific person or team. In some cases, multiple possible progenitor texts are spliced together; in other cases, what appear to be modified progenitor texts become mixed and matched with other progenitor texts and repurposed to fit the author/copier's rhetorical and informational needs.

This process of "patchwriting" (Howard 233) is especially common with information disseminated in the public interest: how to handle meat safely in the kitchen, what to do when a severe storm approaches, facts and myths about lightning, how to fell trees, and so on. Often what appears to be a government text (for example, material provided by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration) is copied verbatim without reference, or appears in altered form depending on the nature and source of the borrowing organization (Adler-Kassner, Anson, and Howard 237).

The insurance examples represent the use of "public-interest" information by businesses that want to appear helpful or supportive to consumers. Yet non-attribution and patchwriting also abound in the world of direct business competition, which usually operates with great

proprietary interest and a litigious attitude toward the theft of logos, slogans, names, and other artifacts of product identity. The descriptions of thousands of products— texts written by the manufacturer or commissioned from advertising and public relations agencies—are freely reproduced without attribution at the sites of "brokers" who market these products and profit from small retail markups. Consider, for example, this description of a digital camera found at manufacturer Canon's official site:

> The ultra-powerful 12x optical zoom on the PowerShot S5 IS means you'll get the shot you want with no compromise, yet that's only the beginning of what makes this camera so exciting. (Canon Powershot S5 1S)

Without a hint that this text comes from Canon itself, Internet sales brokers such as Pricegrabber.com, Dealtimejr.com, and Rssmicro.com all represent the camera with the identical description. This "theft" of text is ubiquitous in the marketing of hotels and resorts as well as homes and properties. Descriptions of Disneyworld's numerous resorts appear at the sites of "hundreds" of vacation brokers, but almost never are these descriptions said to have come from Disneyworld itself, which obviously paid for them to be written. Real estate agents use the same process. Eager to divide the sale commission with the listing agent, other agents replicate the listing agent's (or Multiple-Listing Service's) text verbatim without attribution. Furthermore, parts or all of the descriptions found at home sale sites often appear in the context of other homes, so that the lines between original text and boilerplate begin to blur. Yet such appropriations differ from the use of pure boilerplate, common in the law because of the need for precise language and the importance of interpretive precedence (see Ben-Shahar); rather, each case here is a unique creation, although it may rely on some stock phrases.

It is tempting to interpret these cases as blatant plagiarism, and therefore as a sign of moral turpitude and the decay of respect for individual property rights. This view, however, results when we adopt a singular conception of plagiarism such as those quoted earlier. Instead, these cases represent "varying" textual practices based on social, economic, and educational purposes that often subvert the simplistic notion that every text is written by a specific author who deserves credit for what he or she has written.

With its roots in interdisciplinary perspectives on reading and writing activities, scholarship known collectively as the New Literacy Studies helps us to interpret these practices by moving beyond individualistic, cognitively- based approaches and viewing literacy as a set of complex processes that are fundamentally social and cultural in nature, determined

by shared goals, tools, genres, and expectations (see Russell; Street, Social). As Street puts it, literacy and literacy learning are therefore not "autonomous" processes, and don't result in a "technical and neutral skill":

> [Literacy] is always embedded in socially constructed epistemological principles. It is about knowledge: the ways in which people address reading and writing are themselves rooted in conceptions of knowledge, identity, and being. It is also always embedded in social practices, such as those of a particular job market or a particular educational context and the effects of learning that particular literacy will be dependent on those particular contexts. ("What's 'New'" 77-78)

Among the more important constructs of the New Literacy Studies, borrowed from the work of activity theory (see Bazerman and Russell; Russell), is the idea that writing takes place within social systems where particular practices evolve locally based on the purposes and goals of participants, and represents both periods of stasis and normativity as well as flux, contestation, and evolution. To understand what goes on within various activity systems, we need to adopt a sociocultural view of practice that considers goals, motivation, histories, actions, norms, hierarchies, and other elements of human interaction (see Prior). As Kostogriz puts it,

> literacy learning is the result of the work of powerful discourses and practices that define what counts as knowledge and literacy. Social constructions of the institutional literacy learning activity and of its major components are materialised in texts that become organisational tools for this activity system. They not only structure learning activity but also provide ideological basis for the semiotic centre of activity (n.p.).

The socially situated and mediated nature of literate activity is easily revealed when we compare practices across cultures, but it is also "apparent" when what appears to be a violation of a norm within a culture, or a practice "outside the mainstream," turns out to be entirely acceptable and of functional value within the community where that alternate practice occurs. To understand what motivates the creation of these Internet cut-and-paste pastiches, we must consider concepts that surround and determine the uses of text, including motivation, authority, shared or individual goals, "collective" enterprises, traditions, and socially inscribed norms of textual behavior. Why would any of the creators of thousands of Internet texts that include unattributed material not want to cite their sources?

Disincentives to Attribution

In higher education, student plagiarism is usually blamed on a lack of knowledge about the standards of authorship and attribution (see Wells), excessive procrastination that leads students to risk violating codes of conduct when failure is a worse option, or the conscious act of cheating one's way to higher grades. None of these motivations, however, applies easily to the cases described above, considering the public nature (and broad exposure) of the sites, and how easily their authors could include simple references, links, or notes of attribution. Instead, practices clearly fitting the descriptions of plagiarism quoted earlier exist in a domain of "cooperative competition," a tacit understanding between the creator and usurper of a text that both are cooperating in a mutual desire for profit. It would be counterproductive for Canon to sue Pricegrabber.com for the appropriation of a description that Canon paid someone to produce as long as Canon is profiting from Pricegrabber's use of that text. This unwritten rule of plagiarism forgiveness applies across vast landscapes of the business world.

That the progenitor company accepts the unattributed use of its text does not, however, fully explain why a secondary marketer would still "re- sist" pointing a consumer to the original. To understand more deeply this resistance to attribution, we must consider the concept of trust. When a firm wants to profit from booking vacationers into a Disney property, citing Disney as the source of its resort description breaks a bond it is trying to establish with the vacationer: Trust what I say about the resort. Let me be your guide. It avoids pointing the consumer to Disney itself for fear of losing the consumer's business. At the same time, the broker risks misrepresentation if it creates its own description. Non-attribution allows the broker to have it both ways, gaining the confidence of the consumer but risking nothing by replicating the resort's own description.

The concept of trust helps to explain situations in which one group or entity fails—without malice—to cite the source of a text produced by another. In one case, the University of Oregon copied parts of Stanford University's teaching assistant handbook, including its plagiarism section, without attribution. (Oregon officials conceded the error, apologized, and revised their guidebook; see Morgan and Reynolds). From the perspective of trust, we can understand Oregon's reluctance to attribute the material; students, parents, donors, and others might wonder why a large, respected institution was so unable to produce its own text that it had to adopt that of another, competing university. But as we will see in the context of the armed

forces, there is also no incentive for the Oregon to take valuable time and resources to reinvent perfectly useable material. By adopting Stanford's text, Oregon could save time and resources; by adopting the text without attribution, it could also save face.

Some degree of competition between these two universities, together with the document's subject, turned this case of appropriation into an amusing national scandal. Yet members of higher education institutions routinely produce documents that are willingly shared, adopted without attribution, or repurposed. Large national teaching conferences often feature tables of sample assignments, course syllabi, instructional strategies, mission statements, and other artifacts free for the taking; some are identified by author or institution, but many others are not. As these documents circulate and undergo cycles of adaptation and revision, they lose their original author- ship, blending into a textual world of shared goals and activities. Like real estate agents' descriptions of homes for sale, many university administrative documents such as mission statements, learning outcomes, and strategic plans offer language suitable for adoption (with modifications) at other institutions or within different units of the same institution.

These and countless other examples of textual appropriation characterize the very context—higher education—that professes so deep a concern about plagiarism and that has spent so much energy and resources on the detection and punishment of students who commit it (see Anson, "Cops"). How can one set of standards, operationalized in the routine work of these institutions, coexist with another set of standards demanding that writers cite even brief phrases they have taken from other sources? The answer to this question lies in the distinction between text produced for communal or common goals and text produced for the purpose of advancing an individual's or group's individual "worth," as measured through cycles of production and consumption of intellectual property—a concept to which we'll now turn.

Credit and Credibility

In their analysis of the system of rewards that operates within scientific circles, sociologists of knowledge Latour and Woolgar document a cycle of "credit and credibility" (Latour and Woolgar 189) that allows researchers to gain reputation and capital. Credit is earned through material rewards such as grants, royalties, honoraria, research assistants, and the publication of

books and articles. As this credit accrues, it yields increased credibility—reputation and notoriety within the scientific community, name recognition, frequent citation. In turn, increased credibility yields more opportunities for credit, such as income-generating speeches or consultations, book contracts, larger grants, and positions on boards and important international councils.

Although based on ethnographic study of scientific communities, Latour and Woolgar's analysis describes the professional academic scene more generally. In virtually every field, academics strive to gain name recognition through their work, and the system of rewards and punishments in higher education almost daily reifies their struggle. Accumulated credit garners credibility through stages of promotion; greater credibility earns positions on editorial boards, invitations to speak or join collaborative projects, election to positions of organizational leadership, and access to more resources.

Textual production and ownership in this cycle play a powerful role, motivated as much by the desire for intellectual and material capital as by altruism and the creation of new knowledge. In such an activity system, academics form their professional identities partly through documents—especially books and refereed journal articles—that carry their personal insignia. For someone engaged in the credit cycle that drives most research-based academic institutions, text ownership is sacrosanct. In this context, plagiarism is a frontal attack on one's worth, dignity, and professional recognition. Yet the passion of a scholar's response to this violation increases in proportion to the text's contribution to his or her intellectual capital. Very few academics would permit a paragraph from one of their research articles or creative works to be included, verbatim and without attribution, in another academic's own article or public address, but will often readily agree to "lend" a colleague a section from the policy statements in a course syllabus, or would not be offended to see that section adopted by strangers at other institutions without attribution. Such a text has little value to the person's scholarly reputation, only to the collective enterprise of education, in much the same way as when the woodworker who (competitively) crafts handmade furniture for a living donates time to build benches at a community center. The woodworker might hope that the donation is temporarily recognized, but is willing to give up the otherwise crucial long-term branding of the furniture out of an interest in contributing to the common good. In a similar way, authors of AIDS-awareness pamphlets hope only that their work is massively circulated (with or without

attribution and in any alternate form); credit for authorship is beside the point.

As complex activity systems, academic institutions present a curious blend of textual values. The multiple discursive communities that make up colleges and universities place differential value on text depending on its contributions to personal (or group) credit cycles or to communal efforts in which individual authorship fades away by virtue of shared goals. Cases of non-attribution in these settings sometimes exist at the borders of different discursive value systems and are especially difficult to characterize as plagiarism or the acceptable use of text, even when the writers are students (compare a student organization's adoption of another organization's by-laws with a student's replication of another student's lab report or history paper). Conflicts occur when an assumed ideology of text production and consumption is invoked to interpret cases that should operate under a different set of assumptions, such as the Oregon/Stanford case cited earlier, or the case of Southern Illinois University's 2001 unattributed adoption of large portions of a strategic plan produced at Texas A&M University in the 1990s (see Smallwood).

When we examine other activity systems, the terms of the credit cycle often determine alternate values concerning the use and attribution of text. For example, like most military organizations, the United States Army has strict rules for professional conduct, imposes considerable control over the behavior of its members, and represents a rigid positional hierarchy with meticulously inscribed roles and rules for advancement. Written text is employed in this system to achieve countless purposes, yet, unlike academia, textual production is more often an activity designed to sustain and improve the collective effort of the organization's members than one that allows individual members to accrue credit and credibility within the hierarchy (see Anson and Neely). Sheldon, an informant in my research on written discourse in the military, is an officer who has spent sixteen years in the Army and now teaches writing at the United States Military Academy at West Point. As he explains it, the Army not only encourages the free, unattributed use of text but actually relies on a kind of internal plagiarism as part of its credo of efficiency; repeatedly, he referred to texts written and circulated in the Army as "tools" or "products" that are oriented toward pragmatic goals:

> In general, we are expected to do so much in the Army that anything we can "plagiarize" to make life easier is not only useful, but often encouraged. A general motto is "work smarter, not harder." Nobody cares, particularly

> outside of a unit, where the tool or format came from. All that leaders care about is whether or not the product is effective and can reduce time-consuming work. Time is a precious and exhaustible resource. If a Soldier can produce a tool or format that the boss likes, fantastic. He/she may ask if you made the product yourself if they've never seen something like it before. If you created it, they'll tell you "good job" and to pass it on to your peers. You don't care that the product will be used by everyone be- cause it's useful and will only make your job easier in the long run. What tends to happen is something gets passed on between friends and a net- working of useful ideas spreads across the Army. Then people gradually improve upon the idea, and it mutates into something even more effective than the original.

Among the artifacts Sheldon shared with me were several policy letters sent to all company personnel. Sheldon explained that he produced all his policy memos from scratch, relying on many other texts as he did so.

> This policy letter is an example where people plagiarize until their heart is content. I had to write 17 different policy letters to cover topics required and inspectable by regulation. The regulation dictates what must be present in the policies, but the verbiage isn't dictated. It is common for one commander to simply change the signature block at the bottom and the date on the top if he/she keeps the same policy. There may be a tweak or two of language or emphasis, but the majority will be completely plagiarized. I started out doing that, but the prior policy memorandums appeared to be written by a seventh grader, so I rewrote most of them. Some I didn't feel as if they covered the subject very well, so I added what I felt to be important. I passed on these files to my replacement who promptly changed the signature blocks and signed off on them. I was happy to pass them on and didn't care what he did with them.

Similar processes apply to operations orders, which are documents that tell soldiers and their commanding officers what to do. Sheldon explained that

> Operations Orders (OPORDS) are another good example where parts are definitely plagiarized if the opportunity presents itself . . . . It's the officer's responsibility to read it for quality and consistency, but they don't care who wrote it, or if it's original. They don't have time. It's all about time. The 1/3-2/3 rule dictates that leadership has 1/3 the time available to create and disseminate their plan in order to leave their subordinates 2/3 the time to receive it and plan their part of the execution.

Sheldon also explained that texts are continually modified even in the midst of what looks like boilerplate copying.

> A lot of times tools mutate to fit specific units, commanders and missions. Tools show up in several different formats, and then there are choices to be made as to which will be used. Then a commander decides he/she doesn't like something about it and "recommends" a change. Of course, the change happens, and the tool is now modified from its original. You might even have to combine different things to make something entirely new. You end up seeing a lot of similar things, but their use and format are unit/commander dependent.

As to attribution, Sheldon discusses how Army norms allow the free adoption of others' texts but not the accrual of credit from them.

> If you didn't create something, you don't take credit for it . . . . Half the time it's more about what you did with your available tools than where the tools came from or who created them. Credit for inventing a tool, or system, or format usually is acknowledged on an evaluation report. But it only counts for that one report period. After that, it's old business and something new and innovative needs to appear. I guess in this way we encourage change and improvement on existing tools and formats.

Credit within the hierarchy obviously matters, and, high up the chain of command, certain texts are attributed. Sheldon explained that

> What you produce at platoon and company level is different from battalion, brigade or division. The higher up the chain you go, the less plagiarism you see because missions necessitate inventing the wheel to begin with. Once a high-level staff creates something, the product is then disseminated to the applicable lower echelons. These lower echelons will tend to use the same product or format, because you typically have to send things right back up the chain at some point.

Like civic contexts, much of the textual world of the Army does not operate under the same norms of authorial attribution and ownership that we find on the scholarly side of academia. However, in some ways the Army's textual world mirrors the organizational and administrative side of academia; both contexts produce, borrow, recycle, repurpose, and cut and paste text as needed for the efficient operation of the organization but with much less concern for the strict word- and sentence-based attribution that characterizes student papers, research reports, journal articles, and scholarly books.

Representations of Plagiarism in Schooling

The social construction of plagiarism is generally shaped by notions of textual ownership and intellectual property rights. Many of these come from academia, a context passionate about the ownership and attribution of text, for all the reasons of the accrual of material and reputational gain as well as the advancement of knowledge through a paper trail of scholarship. But in other activity systems, attribution is unnecessary or even unhelpful. If no credit or credibility accrues from the production of texts, as in a collective enterprise, those texts become freely available to all. Accepting these practices means taking a view of discourse as a set of constantly evolving, contextually-mediated and contextually-determined practices, influenced by social and institutional histories, conventions, and expectations (see Anson, "Cops"). The "rules" are unstable, just as all social rules are. As Sheldon explained, students who must scrupulously follow plagiarism edicts in military school find themselves in a completely different system, if and when they join one of the armed forces, and must "unlearn" those edicts in order to perform effectively and efficiently.

When we teach students about the world of discourse, our descriptions of the complex rhetorical and linguistic situations in which people write usually reflect the truth. Yet our teaching about plagiarism often misrepresents the many ways in which people use text and the conditions in which they provide attribution or deliberately fail to do so. Our misrepresentations first arise when we confuse our own scholarly and academic values with those that apply in a learning context. "Credit and credibility" for students begins as a function of assessment—teachers want to be sure that students create original material because we are charged with determining their abilities and the outcomes of our instruction (see Anson, "Closed"). As students move into higher realms of academia—especially into preprofessional work and graduate studies—the assessment of accumulated knowledge and ability gradually gives way to a concern for students' adherence to standards of scholarly work in the professional communities they are joining. Plagiarism no longer violates the credit associated with the assessment of learning; now it violates the credit associated with the certification of an individual's contributions to the advancement of knowledge and the subsequent accrual of intellectual capital. When we apply our own professional standards to our pedagogy, we represent the uses of text from a limited perspective, implying that all activity systems behave the same way.

Some will argue that as long as students are working in a specific discursive community, little is gained by disclosing processes, values, and behaviors that characterize other contexts. Yet among all aspects of rhetoric and written communication, representations of plagiarism often suffer the most from a kind of pedagogical myopia, and it is curious that we would deliberately conceal the truth about how sources are or are not attributed in the world of discourse in order to compel students to believe in a specific perspective, even if just for the time being. When we show students the range of textual and discursive practices used in various contexts, and help them to understand the relationship between these practices and their underlying social and ideological sources, students begin to see plagiarism not as "rules" to be memorized uncritically and without regard to situation, but as socially constructed practices of utmost importance to the academic community they have joined. This higher-level understanding inevitably builds greater responsibility than simplistic dualisms rendered in threatening language associated with the control of behavior, not the creation of thoughtful, responsible, and adaptive citizens.

The version of what is now called "post-process pedagogy" that sees the composition classroom as a place not just to write but to learn about writing holds promise for more intellectually substantive coverage of citation practices, text ownership, and plagiarism. As Downs and Wardle put it,

> Though we complain about public misconceptions of writing and of our discipline, our field has not seriously considered radically reimagining the mission of the very course where misconceptions are born and/or reinforced; we have not yet imagined moving first-year composition from teaching "how to write in college" to teaching about writing—from acting as if writing is a basic, universal skill to acting as if writing studies is a discipline with content knowledge to which students should be introduced, thereby changing their understandings about writing and thus changing the ways they write. (553)

In such a course, students could learn about or even study contexts for writing in order to deepen their understanding of the assumptions, processes, tools, values, discursive histories, and social practices that entail there. The resulting metaconsciousness would be far preferable for students who move into and among different activity systems than sets of isolated skills, such as learning how to write topic sentences.

In the domain of plagiarism, for example, students could study specific cases of citation practice to complicate their understanding of the factors that led to accusations of plagiarism, such as the scandal surrounding the

Army's 2006 counterinsurgency manual (FM 3-24), in which the values of attribution described earlier came into conflict with the values of academia when the manual was published by the University of Chicago Press (see Anson and Neely). Dozens of other cases that blur the lines between "accept- able" and unacceptable attribution, falsification and parody, imitation and theft, repurposing and appropriation, cooperative competition and copyright violation can serve to stimulate deeper and more critical explorations of the relationships between socially constructed norms of behavior and varied "com- munities" of practice. In addition, emerging technologies continue to create fascinating new questions about the nature and ownership of text, images, sounds, and other artifacts of digital production—questions students must ask if they are to be prepared to work in a world dominated by computers.

Within academia itself, students can explore a number of important issues. In addition to the disparities between texts that do and do not lead to enhanced credit and credibility (and the resulting attitudes toward ownership), students can explore the ways that scholars draw on prior knowledge in their work. One especially complex area concerns the attribution of "known" or "assumed" knowledge and knowledge associated with particular individuals. As new research is demonstrating, these decisions are not only "text- and domain-dependent", but also are affected by writers' identities and assumptions about their standing within a particular intellectual community. As relative novices, students often use text in ways that try ineffectively to mirror what academics do, but without an understanding of the deeper functions of source work, they have no frames of reference to develop their own practices (see Howard, Serviss and Rodrique).

Such explorations can be heuristically preceded by simpler but no less thought-provoking vignettes or statements that students can analyze. For example, students could be given a list of hypothetical situations (such as "Susan pastes her own paragraph word-for-word from a paper she wrote for another course without explaining where the paragraph came from" or "Brian quotes some text and then includes its source in parentheses [as in 'Smith, 2004'] but forgets to put quotation marks around the actual words"). The students then could be asked whether these statements represent cases of plagiarism, unethical behavior, or acceptable practice—and what other factors would help to make those judgments.

Discussions resulting from these and other kinds of judgments almost always break down the simplistic rules and admonitions students have learned in previous instruction and rebuild them as part of a more complex understanding of discourse practices as a function of social context. This new awareness, alongside more precise instruction in how the values of the academic community have formed the specific citations practices students are asked to use, promises to give students a framework from which to make principled decisions about their writing, both in school and eventually in the workplace and, perhaps, in their roles as future leaders.

Works Cited

Anson, Chris M. "Closed Systems and Standardized Writing Tests." *CCC* 60.1 (2008): 113-28. Print.

—. "We Never Wanted to be Cops: Plagiarism, Institutional Paranoia, and Shared Responsibility." *Sites of Plagiarism, Sites of Pedagogy*. Ed. Rebecca Moore Howard and Amy Robillard. Portsmouth: Boynton/ Cook, 2008. 140-57. Print.

Anson, Chris M., and Shawn Neely. "The Army and the Academy as Textual Communities: Exploring Mismatches in the Concepts of Attribution, Appropriation, and Shared Goals." *Kairos* 14.3 (2010): n. pag. Web. 9 June 2011.

Adler-Kassner, Linda, Chris M. Anson, and Rebecca Moore Howard. "Framing Plagiarism." *Originality, Imitation, and Plagiarism: Teaching Writing in the Digital Age*. Ed. Martha Vicinus and Caroline Eisner. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2008. 231-46. Print.

Bazerman, Charles, and David Russell, eds. *Writing Selves/Writing Societies: Research from Activity Perspectives*. Fort Collins: WAC Clearinghouse and Mind, Culture, and Activity, 2002. WAC Clearinghouse. Web. 9 June 2011.

Ben-Shahar, Omri, ed. *Boilerplate: The Foundation of Market Contracts*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2007. Print.

"Canon Powershot S5 1S." Advertisement. Canon U.S.A., Inc., n.d. Web. 27 Sept. 2010. <http://www.usa.canon.com/consumer/controller?act=ModelInfoAct&fcategoryid=144&modelid=15207>

Downs, Douglas, and Elizabeth Wardle. "Teaching About Writing, Righting Mis-conceptions: (Re)Envisioning 'First Year Composition' as 'Introduction to Writing Studies.'" CCC 58.4 (2007): 552-84. Print.

"HellasCams – Kalavrita Ski Center – Snow Cam - Eng." *Kalavrita Ski Center*. N.p., 8 Jan. 2004. Web. 9 June 2011.

<http://www.hellascams.gr/snowcam.html>
Howard, Rebecca Moore. *Standing in the Shadow of Giants: Plagiarists, Authors, Collaborators*. Stamford: Ablex, 1999. Print.
Howard, Rebecca Moore, Tricia Serviss and Tanya Rodrique. "Writing from Sources, Writing from Sentences." *Writing and Pedagogy* 2.2 (2010): 177-92. Print.
Kostogriz, Alexander. "Activity Theory and the New Literacy Studies: Modelling the Literacy Learning Activity System." Australian Association for Research in Education. Sydney. 5 Dec. 2000. Address. Web. 9 June 2011. <http://www.aare.edu.au/00pap/kos00161.htm>
Latour, Bruno, and Stephen Woolgar. *Laboratory Life: The Construction of ScientificFacts*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1979. Print.
Morgan, Peter W., and Glenn H. Reynolds. *The Appearance of Impropriety: How the Ethics Wars Have Undermined American Government, Business, and Society*. New York: Free Press, 1997. Print.
"New Honda Accord Coupe." Advertisement. *NewCarInsure.com*. N.p, n.d.. Web. 14 Sept. 2010. <http://www.newcarinsure.com/honda-accord-coupe.html>
"Automobile Insurance." *Turner Agency*. N.p, n.d. Web. 9 June 2011. <http://www.turnerinsur.com/lob=automobile.php>
Prior, Paul A. *Writing/Disciplinarity: A Sociohistoric Account of Literate Activity in the Academy*. Mahwah: Erlbaum, 1998. Print.
"Driving Safety Tips." *RepCo.com*. Repco Limited, n.d. Web. 9 June 2011. <http:// web.archive.org/web/20070626164645/ http://www.repco.co.nz/services/tipsntricks.asp>
Russell, David. *Activity Theory and Composition*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2003. Web. 9 June 2011. <http://www.mhhe.com/socscience/english/tc/russell/ RussellModule2.htm>
"Severe Weather Driving." *State Farm Insurance Company*. N.p., 6 Jan. 2010. Web. 9 June 2011. http://www.statefarm.com/learning/be_safe/road/learning_ besafe_onroad_weatherdrive.asp>
Smallwood, Scott. "Plagiarism Hunters at Southern Illinois U. Say Campus's Strategic Plan Was Lifted." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 8 Sept. 2006. Web. 9 June 2011. <http://chroniclecareers.com/article/Plagiarism-Hunters-at-Southern/117948/>
Street, Brian. Social Literacies: *Critical Approaches to Literacy in Development, Ethnography, and Education*. London: Longman, 1995. Print.