

CCCC 2008 Sessions on Issues of Intellectual Property, Copyright, Plagiarism, and Authorship

Appropriation and Fair Use in the Academy: What Every Faculty Member Needs to Know

Session: L.07 on Apr 5, 2008 from 9:30 AM to 10:45 AM Cluster: 105) Research
Type: Concurrent Session (3 or more presenters) Interest Emphasis: not applicable
Level Emphasis: all Focus: not applicable

Speakers on this panel discuss implications compositionists face in their teaching, research, and publication missions by examining limitations on academic inquiry associated with Intellectual Property (IP), Copyright Law, including work for hire, and fair use. For example, Cornell University recently adopted official "Guidelines" circumscribing the actions of faculty in providing electronic content for educational- purposes. While educators aren't being sued yet, it is rumored that these guidelines will be used by publishing industries to pressure additional institutions to adopt similar restrictions. Simultaneously, faculty (and students) negotiate a delicate balance between the need to protect their own work from institutional appropriation, and the need for open access to information for the larger public. In this talk the speakers will outline findings from their own intellectual property research and related issues.

Speaker 1: "Cause" and "Effect": Exploring Relationships between Free Expression and Fair Use.

Having completed a two year study on knowledge and understanding of fair use among digital composers, the speaker will outline general findings of how copyright law interacts with rhetorical invention and the composing decisions of U.S. digital writers in professional writing programs. The speaker discusses her methodology, involving the use of a refined survey along with discourse-based interviews. As an outcome of this research, the speaker provides audience members with a survey instrument measuring knowledge of fair use and levels of "chilled" digital speech, including an answer key that audiences can use to further explore these issues.

Speaker 2: Ambiguous and Overreaching: A Case Study of Work for Hire in 14 Institutions.

Adding to the complexities of "use" and ownership in educational settings as outlined by speaker 1, this speaker discusses trends found in data gathered from a study examining the language universities use to define: 1) "who" universities consider authors they may control; 2) "what" texts produced by these authors universities claim control of; and 3) "when and how" works produced impact these claims. For instance, one university's policy may lay claim to works authored by students in a computer lab, whereas another institution would not.

Speaker 3: Musings on Community College Teaching and Intellectual Property.

Drawing upon the framework and issues provided by speakers 1 & 2, speaker 3 provides an overview of the way a sampling of community colleges are applying commonly accepted notions of intellectual property and fair use to what happens on their campuses. He will also describe what some faculty are doing to influence the manner in which these standards are applied to their work in the classroom while also sharing some strategies for influencing and disseminating knowledge of such issues to academic audiences, particularly those in techno-rhetorics and faculty in community colleges.

Participant	Affiliation	Speech Title (if known)
Bump Halbritter (Chair)	Michigan State University	Appropriation and Fair Use in the Academy: What Every Faculty Member Needs to Know
Martine Courant Rife (Speaker 1)	Michigan State University & Lansing Comm. Coll.	“Cause” and “Effect”: Exploring Relationships between Free Expression and Fair Use.
Timothy R. Amidon (Speaker 2)	Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne	Ambiguous and Overreaching: A Case Study of Work for Hire in 14 Institutions
Bradley Bleck (Speaker 3)	Spokane Falls Community College	Musings on Community College Teaching and Intellectual Property

Academic Freedom in the 21st Century: Teaching Writing in a Changed Reality

Session: O.04 on Apr 5, 2008 from 2:00 PM to 3:15 PM Cluster: 107) Institutional and Professional

Type: Concurrent Session (3 or more presenters) Interest Emphasis: not applicable
Level Emphasis: all Focus: not applicable

Since 2004, legislation that could modify Academic Freedom has been introduced in 21 states (Maitland). In 2006, SB1331 was introduced to the Arizona Legislature. This bill “Alternative Coursework and Materials” proposed that each university and community college would adopt procedures allowing students to “object” to “any course, coursework, learning material or activity on the basis that it is personally offensive” and be provided, without cost, an alternative course or course materials, or activity. Objections may be raised on the grounds of conflict “with a student’s beliefs or practices in sex, morality or religion.” Although the Arizona Senate defeated this bill 17-12, the Arizona Board of Regents urged each university in Arizona to adopt policies that create methods to notify students at the beginning of courses of the course content, including materials to be covered. Therefore faculty are urged to communicate to students on the syllabus “that some course content may be considered sensitive.”

In 2007, SB 1542 was introduced. Republican Senator Thayer Verschoor, with co-sponsors Senators Linda Gray and Karen Johnson introduced this bill prohibiting teachers in public schools, charter schools and universities from advocating one side of a social, political or cultural issue that is a matter of partisan controversy or taking positions on legislation or

candidates. Any teacher convicted any of these is guilty of "an unprofessional act" and is subject to a fine of \$500. Someone who --helps-- a teacher teach students is also subject to a \$500 fine. The bill was defeated this time.

Most teachers of writing understand academic freedom to mean that they can exercise their professional judgment in teaching and research. Teachers, therefore, have academic freedom in a professional capacity which involves the right to study, communicate ideas, and publish the results of research. Most teachers expect that they can develop and modify course content within the constraints of the intellectual demands of the course.

However, according to Maitland, threats to academic freedom are many and now include legislative and court action, students for Academic Freedom and the Horowitz proposal, corporate attitudes in state and for-profit institutions, and the increasing numbers of contingent faculty who courts often find against in matters of academic freedom. In this panel presentation, 3 speakers will explore the issue of Academic Freedom.

Speaker one, a member of Arizona State University's Academic Senate, will explore what we mean by academic freedom and recent threats to this fundamental tenet of academia. Speaker one will suggest why the Academic Senate did not oppose the "sensitive course content" language the university adopted and what this implies about the changing reality of faculty governance in a state institution. Furthermore, speaker one will address how this individual policy will now affect academic freedom in the composition classroom.

Speaker two will consider the implications of academic freedom in a private for-profit setting in which online course materials are copyrighted by the institution, a level of standardization in course content for ground and online programs is mandated, full tenure has been abolished, and part-time contract faculty staffing is encouraged. Historically, academic freedom has always been a problematic concept for mission-driven institutions. Though they have embraced a concept of tenure, they have always mandated a level of "faculty fit" with institutional mission statements. The speaker will describe the structure of online-delivered composition courses that raise questions about the academic freedom of online instructors. Further, the speaker will consider the processes of "unbundling faculty roles" practiced by for-profit institutions that "de-professionalize" faculty and negate most exercises of academic freedom.

Speaker Three will discuss how restrictions on academic freedom affect full-time contract faculty teaching writing who do not have the protection of tenure. Due to the sometimes controversial nature of topics read, discussed and written about in class, legislative attempts to restrict curriculum choices and free interaction within the classroom pose particular risk to writing instructors. Ironically, the faculty who staff such courses are primarily contract faculty and teaching assistants, the very faculty with the least job security and institutional protection. Should any academic freedom challenge arise, the protection afforded such faculty can be limited as was the case with SB 1331 and, according to Hoeller, many other cases. Without tenure, contract faculty, according to Holub, might avoid "unpopular, challenging or even innovative ideas." They may also make decisions based on student evaluations because they are concerned that receiving lower student evaluations will damage their ability to keep

their jobs. Speaker three will suggest what options contract faculty have to deal with these problems.

Works Cited

Hoeller, Keith. "An Adjunct Bill of Rights." Chronicle Careers. 29 November 2006.
Holub, Tamara. "Contract Faculty in Higher Education." Eric Digest. ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. <http://www.ericdigests.org/2005-1/contract.htm>
Maitland, Christine. "Academic Freedom." Presentation Wenatchee Valley College. 15 September, 2006. NEH. 8th Jan 2007.
<http://www2.nea.org/he/freedom/images/cmpresentation.pdf>
NEA. "Policy Statement: Academic and Intellectual Freedom and Tenure in Higher Education" <http://www2.nea.org/he/policy1.html>

Participant	Affiliation	Speech Title (if known)
-------------	-------------	-------------------------

Sarah Duerden		
---------------	--	--

(Speaker 1)	Arizona State University	Changed Realities: Legislative threats to Academic Freedom and Faculty Governance
-------------	--------------------------	---

James Helfers		
---------------	--	--

(Speaker 2)	Grand Canyon University	Alternate Realities: Threats to Academic Freedom at For-Profit and Online Institutions
-------------	-------------------------	--

Christine Helfers		
-------------------	--	--

(Speaker 3)	Arizona State University at the Polytechnic Campus	Reality Bites: Contract Faculty and Academic Freedom
-------------	--	--

Writing Economies: Toward a New Lexicon for Composition

Session: O.08 on Apr 5, 2008 from 2:00 PM to 3:15 PM Cluster: 103) Theory

Type: Concurrent Session (3 or more presenters) Interest Emphasis: not applicable

Level Emphasis: all Focus: not applicable

This panel proposes that composition's recent engagement with various understandings of writing and teaching as economic activity (Brandt, Carter, Lu) requires a more nuanced and explicit economic vocabulary. The presenters focus on economies of writing at both the theoretical and practical levels in order to construct such a language of economy. This language accounts for a heterogeneous economic terrain of transactions, relations, labor, and enterprises in order to re-write composition as a space of economic diversity that offers the possibility for student and teacher agency at the economic level.

Queering Composition's Economic Imaginary

Presenter 1 examines how economic concerns in composition have been constructed as Burkean scapegoat. Marxist perspectives represent capitalism as all-commodifying and hegemonic influence on pedagogy, while neoliberal perspectives represent such critique as unrealistically ideological and blind to market realities. Both bar economy from the writing classroom. Presenter 1 demonstrates instead that the classroom cycle of textual work, appropriation, ownership, and use is an aspect of economy; and uses Latour's Actor Network

Theory to trace actors' unpredictable motivations for engaging in heterogeneous economic practices of writing in order to offer an account of the composition classroom as economic space.

Beneath Copyright: Property Rights in Student Texts

In contrast to the extension of corporations' intellectual property rights are the diminishing rights that colleges extend to their students. The year 1998 illustrates those opposing trends, with passage of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, the extension of copyright term, and the ascendancy of Turnitin.com. Student writing is now widely understood in terms of capital: the rights to intellectual property produced by students are held by the college and by the corporation to which the college donates that property. The entire field of anti-plagiarism activity has come to be understood in economic rather than educational terms.

The Affective Economics of Plagiarism

Our primary metaphor for plagiarism, which conceives of authorial economics as a market, depicts texts as commodities and renders relationships among writers alienated and detached. To reconceive of authorial economics as a gift economy is to acknowledge that text work establishes bonds and relationships among writers. Presenter 3 argues that what is at stake in such a reconception is scholars' property rights to affective relationships. We claim affective textual relationships for ourselves while we encourage students to establish affectless, detached relationships to their sources. Thus we preserve plagiarism's extra-textual functions of eliciting student shame and securing the academy's gates.

From Managed to Managing Programs: Mapping Local Economic Conditions

Framing the capitalist economy as relentless necessity, as Presenter 1 suggests, can lead to stultifying feelings of anger and hopelessness for academics, especially writing program faculty, who watch institutional funding for instruction continue to be drained. But rather than just critique a totalizing entrepreneurial or managerial university system, Presenter 4 argues that faculty might do better to map the heterogeneous financial networks within which their own programs, departments, universities, and states function, in order to make more strategic and targeted arguments for change.

Audiovisual Request: We are requesting an LCD because three out of four of the proposed presentations will depend upon visual evidence: Presenter 1 will use tabular data, Presenter 2 will include screenshots of Turnitin.com and related sites, and Presenter 4 will provide illustrative maps of financial networks.

Participant	Affiliation	Speech Title (if known)
-------------	-------------	-------------------------

Mike Edwards		
--------------	--	--

(Chair)	United States Military Academy	
---------	--------------------------------	--

Mike Edwards		
--------------	--	--

(Speaker 1)	United States Military Academy	Queering Composition's Economic Imaginary
-------------	--------------------------------	---

Rebecca Moore Howard		
----------------------	--	--

(Speaker 2)	Syracuse University	Beneath Copyright: Property Rights in Student Texts
-------------	---------------------	---

Amy E. Robillard		
------------------	--	--

(Speaker 3)	Illinois State University	The Affective Economics of Citation
-------------	---------------------------	-------------------------------------

Donna Strickland
(Speaker 4) University of Missouri From Managed to Managing Programs: Mapping
Local Economic Conditions

[Print]

States of the Unions: Experienced Academic Co-Authors and the Reality of Collaborative
Writing

Session: B.16 on Apr 3, 2008 from 12:15 PM to 1:30 PM Cluster: 103) Theory
Type: Concurrent Session (3 or more presenters) Interest Emphasis: not applicable
Level Emphasis: all Focus: not applicable

Speakers # 1 & #2

Why Still Write... Together? Collaborative Writing in the Twenty-First Century

The co-presenters of this talk have been researching the theory and practice of collaborative writing for more than twenty years. In their presentation, they will provide a brief overview of research on collaborative writing in rhetoric and composition and related areas, particularly English studies. They will then discuss the challenges and opportunities facing collaboration today -- so very, very different from the ones scholars and teachers faced 20 years ago.

.

Speakers #3 & #4

Ten Years Later: The State of Co-Authoring in the Academy

From our 1997 research we learned – from both student writing groups and from experienced academic co-authoring teams – that trust, respect, and care were essential elements for successful co-authoring. This holds today. However, we are skeptical that enough academic writers and student writers have been able to reshape attitudes regarding the value of co-authoring. What is often still seen as “cheating,” “too easy,” “too hard,” “too messy” and “too difficult to evaluate” (for grades and for tenure and promotion) masks the important values we account for. How can co-authoring benefits become more visible and viable? How does this work fit with current initiatives such as the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning? Or with current technology that makes social networking appear to be collaboration? Our presentation will describe persistent challenges and surprising gains in teaching collaborative writing and practicing co-authoring in the academy.

Speaker #5

Changing Realities of Collaborative Practice: Emergent Forms and Implications

With the new century, more academic authors are exploring new collaborative or cooperative writing spaces. Some of these are represented in the pages of journals, while others appear

online in multimedia forms.

This presenter will consider what academic authors in composition--and their field as a whole--may stand to gain or lose as new collaborative forms take hold. How do new forms differ in the approach to collaboration they imply or enforce? What differences do we see in coauthor identity configurations or transformations? How does our understanding of collaborative writing need to adapt? What adjustments will be needed in the reward and accountability structures of the academy? The presenter will reflect on these and other issues, with reference to established research in collaborative authorship and the patterns identified there

Participant Affiliation Speech Title (if known)

Kathleen Yancey

(Chair) Florida State University States of the Unions: Experienced Academic Co-Authors and the Reality of Collaborative Writing

Andrea Lunsford

(Speaker 1) Stanford University States of the Unions: Experienced Academic Co-Authors and the Reality of Collaborative Writing

Lisa Ede

(Speaker 2) Oregon State University States of the Unions: Experienced Academic Co-Authors and the Reality of Collaborative Writing

Kami Day

(Speaker 3) Johnson County Community College States of the Unions: Experienced Academic Co-Authors and the Reality of Collaborative Writing

Michele Eodice

(Speaker 4) University of Oklahoma States of the Unions: Experienced Academic Co-Authors and the Reality of Collaborative Writing

Michael Spooner

(Speaker additional) Utah State University States of the Unions: Experienced Academic Co-Authors and the Reality of Collaborative Writing

Ownership, Authorship, and Representation in Digital Space

Session: E.20 on Apr 3, 2008 from 4:45 PM to 6:00 PM Cluster: 106) Information Technologies

Type: Concurrent Session (3 or more presenters) Interest Emphasis: not applicable

Level Emphasis: all Focus: not applicable

x [More]

Participant Affiliation Speech Title (if known)

Lucretia Yaghjian

(Chair) x

Danielle Nicole DeVoss

(Speaker 1) Michigan State University Composition in/and Ownership Culture: Feminist Digital Interventions

Catherine Matthews Pavia

(Speaker 2) University of Massachusetts Amherst The Constraining and Enabling Effects of Corporate Sponsorship on Women's Online Writing

Mary Elizabeth Sullivan

(Speaker 3) Kent State University
in visual representations

Designing Women: Gender potential and constraint

Convergence Composition: Bridging the Digital Divide

Session: E.29 on Apr 3, 2008 from 4:45 PM to 6:00 PM Cluster: 101) Practices of Teaching Writing

Type: Concurrent Session (3 or more presenters)

Interest Emphasis: not applicable

Level Emphasis: 4-year Focus: not applicable

Definitions of texts, writers, and writing are undergoing significant change, and in doing so are challenging the boundaries of composition as a field (Takayoshi and Selfe, 2006; Selber, 2004; Wysocki et al., 2004). Yet as recently as 2006, NCTE published the seemingly definitive collection *What Is "College-Level" Writing?* without any mention of new media, computers, or technology. Composition and Rhetoric is experiencing a digital divide – between those who “do technology” and those who don’t. This divide is further enforced in Janet Eldred’s September 2006 CCC review essay of recent publications on new media and composition. While Eldred gestures towards a sense of united purpose in the discipline as we work towards “imagining alternatives to alphabetic print forms,” she nevertheless maintains the divide between those with coding expertise and those without (“Review: To Code or Not to Code” 120). We contend that to code or not to code is a false binary. Writing teachers will increasingly be called upon to negotiate between arenas of traditional print literacies and emerging networked composing practices. Our panel suggests an alternative position – “convergence composition” – as a means of bridging the digital divide.

In *Convergence Culture*, media analyst Henry Jenkins uses the term “convergence” to describe the moment in which old and new media co-exist, compete, and collude. As Jenkins writes, “[o]ld media are not being displaced. Rather, their functions and status are shifted by the introduction of new technologies” (14). We see an instructive parallel between this cultural phenomenon and the current bifurcation in composition. This panel investigates the current “convergence culture” in the field by investigating the spaces where best practices in print media co-exist, compete, and collude with the emerging demands of digital media. Our panel focuses on three specific terms that have inspired significant research in composition: collaborative writing, authorship, and reflection. The first two terms also hold privileged positions in research in new media (although the first appears as “collective intelligence”). The third term, reflection, however, is strikingly absent from the latter body of work. Not only does this suggest that composition theory is poised to make a significant contribution to new media, but also that the two fields have a productive combined future.

Speaker #1: ‘The Water Cooler has Gone Digital’: Conversation, Negotiation, and Collaboration in Online Spaces

Though Kenneth Bruffee’s work on collaborative learning came more than a decade before the internet gained its public face, his ideas on intellectual negotiation and collective decision making are resounded in the concept of online collective intelligence as described in the work

of Pierre Lévy and Henry Jenkins. Jenkins claims, “the age of media convergence enables communal, rather than individualistic modes of reception” (Convergence Culture 26). But how does a community of students and teachers shift from a traditional sense of collaborative writing into an online space such as a wiki – a space designed as collaborative technology?

Speaker #2: “Killer Apps?”: Competing Social Software and the Role of Student Authorship

In a recent CultureCat post, Clancy Ratcliff questions the lifespan of blogs in the writing classroom. She explains, “The blog was a space for personal writing. However, the class blog became superfluous in terms of social software; Facebook and MySpace are the killer apps for that” (12/10/06). As Ratcliff notes, the viral adoption of Facebook and MySpace – online communities in which constituents present a digital identity by composing text, embedding video and posting pictures and music – threatens to obviate the promise many composition scholars saw in blog technology. Fernheimer and Nelson (1999), for instance, cite the development of an intellectual community, writing across the private and public realms, and the maintenance of an autonomous self as three fundamental composing processes encouraged by blogs. They, among many, echo the foundational terms of student authorship that emerge from studies in print media. But have these processes now simply migrated onto MySpace, or worse, disappeared entirely? In this paper, I argue that the evolution of the blogosphere and its particular conventions maintain an important online space for the development and maintenance of the elements of student authorship vis-à-vis the ubiquity of new social software.

Speaker #3: Networked Reflection: Making Space Online

The Read/Write web of the 21st century celebrates that content is now dynamic, interactive, published, and immediate. These same qualities, however, also pose distinct challenges for reflection and metacognition – habits of mind that have traditionally required distance, time, and meditation. The collaborative and public modes of networked composing provide opportunities for the performative acts of reflection that Kathleen Blake Yancey has termed “reflection-in-presentation” (69). But where is the space for “constructive reflection” --the private and inner language of a learner? In this paper I argue that the landscape of networked composition is changing the role of reflection for both students and teachers.

Participant	Affiliation	Speech Title (if known)
-------------	-------------	-------------------------

Jennifer Marlow		
-----------------	--	--

(Speaker 1)	The College of Saint Rose	‘The Water Cooler has Gone Digital’: Conversation, Negotiation, and Collaboration in Online Spaces
-------------	---------------------------	--

Kim Middleton		
---------------	--	--

(Speaker 2)	The College of Saint Rose	
-------------	---------------------------	--

Megan Fulwiler		
----------------	--	--

(Speaker 3)	The College of Saint Rose	Networked Reflection: Making Space Online
-------------	---------------------------	---

“That shit is plagiarism by any definition”: Conceptualizing Cheating in an Academic Context

Session: F.17 on Apr 4, 2008 from 8:00 AM to 9:15 AM Cluster: 110) Academic Writing
Type: Concurrent Session (3 or more presenters) Interest Emphasis: not applicable
Level Emphasis: all Focus: first year composition

Session Overview: The realities of plagiarism are vexed: it is often an occluded and ignored reality of academic life; alternatively, it can consume us by preoccupying our time, defining our pedagogies, and even limiting our assessment strategies. This panel will interrogate the reality of how students construct and define plagiarism in differing rhetorical contexts. To this end, we will examine practices of and conversations about plagiarism among students, as evidence upon which to build new conceptualizations of the compositionist's response. Speaker #1 will investigate student-generated definitions of plagiarism derived from a composition classroom in order to provide a rhetorical context for our conversation: this is what students say when they know when we are listening in. Speaker #2 will share and examine the verbal and visual text of an unsolicited online discussion among students as they explore, debate, and construct definitions, methods, and possible consequences of plagiarism in the “privacy” of cyber-space. Of course, we cannot simply settle for understanding the rhetorical realities surrounding plagiarism; we must also generate and implement effective strategies for educating and correcting the would-be plagiarist. Speaker #3 will thus close our panel by proposing a formalized study of the shapes and histories of plagiarism within writing communities as a means of challenging current assumptions and understandings of plagiarism.

Speaker 1: "Plagiarism 101: How Students Construct Rhetorics of Plagiarism within the Composition Classroom"

Discourses of plagiarism vary widely depending on who's listening. Our first presentation will interrogate how students define plagiarism by examining their work in a first-year composition course at a Research I university. Specifically, six sections of approximately 22 students were all given a passage of source material and asked to plagiarize, as well as correctly summarize, the text. While the students were instructed to produce the most sophisticated form of plagiarism they could, their paragraphs primarily contained examples of direct textual appropriation. In contrast, actual cases of academic plagiarism often consist either of “patchwriting” (Howard, 1995) or the repetition of more elusive syntactical or ideological structures, moves which raise far more complex questions about the ownership and use of text. This rhetorical divide is troubling: clearly our students practice far more sophisticated forms of plagiarism; however, they are unwilling or unable to identify them within the classroom. Reviewing, categorizing and examining student-constructed definitions of plagiarism will form the starting point for our conversation. This discussion will uncover some of the rhetorical expectations that govern students when they discuss plagiarism in the composition classroom.

Speaker 2: "The 'efficient bad person': When Students Construct the Plagiarist in Cyber-space"
Presenter #2 shares and examines the verbal and visual text of an unsolicited online discussion among students at a Research I university as they explore and debate definition/s,

methods, and possible consequences of plagiarism, outside the purview of instructors and administrators. First, this presenter will consider how students struggle to construct a definition of plagiarism, or to conceptualize plagiarism, in light of their individual and shared realities. Convergent and divergent notions of plagiarism are identified with the aim of theorizing a “space” of reconciliation. In so doing, this presenter investigates students’ rationales for plagiarizing as responses to particular cultural and institutional imperatives, like efficiency and contestable notions of success. Second, this presenter will explore students’ verbal and visual constructions of the institution’s ethical gatekeepers, including other students, instructors, and its academic integrity officers, to suggest how their perceptions from inside the culture of suspicion re-inscribe particular narratives of the teacher’s role, which themselves foster a cycle of suspicion and misconduct. As a result, an argument in support of the de-escalation of the teacher’s role as “hunter of cheaters” is posited. Finally, this presenter attends to the specific rhetorical context of the students’ discussion and emphasizes possible connections between the “space” (the not private / private, safe but dangerous e-world) in which the students’ constructions of plagiarism are presented and the “un/reality” of their arguments.

Speaker 3: "Knowing What to Cite: Discerning Ownership in Disciplinary Discourse"

A writing in the disciplines (WID) curriculum challenges us to help students negotiate source materials. Whether or not students intend to plagiarize, many of them do not know how to distinguish their own ideas and words from others’. Our students must understand and apply formal and stylistic conventions of particular academic communities and they use a variety of sources and rhetorical models to do so. Students claim they do not see a problem taking a paper they have written for a different course or taking a paper they find on the Internet and using it as a “model” for a writing assignment. But the complicated nature of “models” as a tool in the writing classroom necessitates a more nuanced understanding of plagiarism. Indeed, students appear confused by a curricular insistence that they “copy” rhetorical moves they see in other texts but not copy other people’s writing generally. This poses a complicated question: Can writing be distinguished from the rhetorical moves used to create that writing? In response, I propose a formalized study of plagiarism that engages students in a systematic program of inquiry throughout the semester to facilitate a more holistic understanding of authorship. The study will help them move beyond divisive categories of plagiarism in order to answer the larger question at hand: what does it mean to author something original and conventional simultaneously?

Participant	Affiliation	Speech Title (if known)
-------------	-------------	-------------------------

Susan Miller-Cochran		
----------------------	--	--

(Chair)	NC State University	“That shit is plagiarism by any definition”: Conceptualizing Cheating in an Academic Context
---------	---------------------	--

Katherine Hagopian		
--------------------	--	--

(Speaker 1)	NC State University	Plagiarism 101: How Students Construct Rhetorics of Plagiarism within the Composition Classroom
-------------	---------------------	---

Roy Stamper		
-------------	--	--

(Speaker 2)	NC State University	The “efficient bad person”: When Students Construct the Plagiarist in Cyber-space
-------------	---------------------	---

Evelyn Audi		
-------------	--	--

(Speaker 3) York Country Day School Knowing What to Cite: Discerning Ownership in Disciplinary Discourse

Rethinking Realities of Authorship and Ownership through Response to Student Writing

Session: H.23 on Apr 4, 2008 from 11:00 AM to 12:15 PM Cluster: 101) Practices of Teaching Writing

Type: Concurrent Session (3 or more presenters) Interest Emphasis: not applicable
Level Emphasis: 4-year Focus: not applicable

Since the early 1980s, composition studies has constructed a powerful disciplinary narrative in which student writers can (and should) control and claim exclusive authorship over the texts they produce. This idea, undergirded by the popular mythology of the autonomous author, exerts heavy influence over the practices of many writing tutors and teachers. In our efforts to avoid being too directive or interfering, we ask students to hold the editing pen, or we make exclusively positive or “readerly” comments on student drafts. However, such gestures ignore the dialogic nature of texts, the many other voices and texts that shape written discourse (see, e.g., Bakhtin, Wertsch, Prior, Bazerman, Phelps). Moreover, they may mask important power dynamics and differentials without actually erasing them. In the academy and outside it, power is inescapable, and we would do well to find ways to work productively with(in) it (e.g., Faigley).

The papers in this panel draw on the speakers’ qualitative research on teaching practices to explore the complex realities of textual ownership and (co)authorship in teaching and tutoring situations. By examining response to student writing in three different contexts—a composition course, a writing center, and a WAC-influenced political science course—we hope to portray these textual realities in a way that offers more productive ways of thinking about authorship, ownership, and the politics of response.

Speaker 1: Exploring Ideologies of Control through the Instructor-Led Peer Conference

One key marker of process pedagogy has been the notion that students must maintain ownership or control over their own texts. Composition instructors have received consistent advice over the past few decades to avoid “appropriating” student writing, whether through written comments (Brannon & Knoblauch; Sommers, Straub & Lunsford) or in student-teacher conferences (Garrison; Murray; Ulichny & Watson-Gegeo). Even with regard to peer response groups, there has been concern over the scope of teacher influence (Gere) or peer influence (Berkenkotter). Such formulations figure both writing and response to writing as isolated, unidirectional activities.

Speaker 1’s paper explores these ideologies of control and ownership in the context of case study research on a rarely-examined response activity: the instructor-led peer conference (ILPC). In these conferences, a teacher meets with small groups of students outside of class to discuss student drafts. Close examination of conversational discourse in ILPCs reveals a dialogic negotiation of texts and evaluative criteria, blurring otherwise easy distinctions between teacher authority and student autonomy. This paper ultimately argues for

approaching response to student writing as a site for collaborative co-authoring, as opposed to a struggle for the control of texts.

Speaker 2: Beyond Directive and Nondirective: Redefining Writing Center Tutoring

Like composition instructors, writing center tutors and administrators have struggled to achieve a balance between assisting writers while maintaining student control and ownership over their texts. Traditionally, writing center administrators ask students to take a nondirective approach, which asks tutors to gently suggest approaches to students through open-ended questions rather than issuing directive advice. The success of these tutoring strategies continues to be debated in writing center scholarship by Trimbur, Severino, Welch, and Cogie. These critics, however, still use the terms “directive” and “nondirective” to describe tutoring protocols.

This presentation argues for a move beyond the binaries of directive and nondirective tutoring strategies. Speaker 2 reports on a case study of a writing tutor working with two different students in front of a computer terminal. Through analysis of audio and video recordings and screen captures, this presentation maps some of the power dynamics of these mediated tutoring sessions. Instead of fitting into directive or nondirective categories, these interactions represent complex and frequently shifting power differentials. This presentation also offers suggestions for helping tutors surmount easy categories to consider the multilayered interactions that occur in tutoring sessions.

Speaker 3: Teacher Authority and Student Autonomy in the Disciplines: From Ideal to Reality

Speaker 3’s paper looks at issues of teacher authority and student autonomy in disciplinary writing settings. It focuses on a case study of response to student writing in an undergraduate, WAC-influenced political science course, paying specific attention to how the professor’s feedback shapes students’ writing processes and products. Through analysis of interviews, class documents, and comments on student texts, this paper attempts to uncover the teacher’s and students’ attitudes about who should control student texts. It then compares these attitudes to the teacher’s response practices to show how this disciplinary instructor paradoxically maintains an ideology of himself as an objective evaluator while very actively coaching and co-authoring his student’s texts.

Prior, Bazerman, Phelps, and others have pointed to the intertextual, dialogic nature of writing and the complications this poses for an ideal of the autonomous student writer, but scholars have also noted that many writing teachers prefer not to acknowledge these complications. This paper concludes by offering ways that, through pedagogy and research, we might bridge the gap that often exists between ideals about student writers and the realities of literate activity and pedagogical practice.

Participant	Affiliation	Speech Title (if known)
Paul Prior (Chair)	Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	
Kory Ching		

(Speaker 1) Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Exploring Ideologies of Control through the Instructor-Led Peer Conference

Amber Buck

(Speaker 2) Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Beyond Directive and Nondirective: Redefining Writing Center Tutoring

Samantha Looker

(Speaker 3) Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Teacher Authority and Student Autonomy in the Disciplines: From Ideal to Reality

University as Text : Helping non-native speakers “read” the culture

Session: D.39 on Apr 3, 2008 from 3:15 PM to 4:30 PM Cluster: 110) Academic Writing
Type: Concurrent Session (3 or more presenters) Interest Emphasis: not applicable
Level Emphasis: all Focus: not applicable

Administrative, social, pragmatic, and cultural barriers often exist between non-native speakers of English and university classes. International students are immersed in an environment that challenges not only their academic language proficiency (reading/writing/listening/speaking) but their cultural fluency, as well.

Speaker 1 : “Barriers to assimilation into the broader campus culture” Culture exists on two levels: Surface Culture (those things that are visible, readily explained and fairly easily changed) and Deep Culture (those aspects of culture that embody deeply held values and beliefs and are therefore not easily changed). Surface Culture in the writing classroom includes the formats to use for various types of documents and procedures to follow in creating and submitting assignments. Deep Culture affects such things as classroom behavior, views of collaborative versus independent work, and, often, writing style. In many cultures, sophistication of writing style is an important means of demonstrating one’s class status and educational level; students may resist instruction to write “simple, clear” sentences.

Speaker 2: “Integrating IEP students into academic courses” One way of addressing Deep Culture issues is to integrate Intensive English Program students into a regular academic course. In this project, IEP students were embedded into a university classroom and used that experience to complete task-based activities in their intensive English classes. Activities were designed to have the students experience the cultural, pragmatic, and academic challenges and requirements for university studies.

In the first year of the project, Speaker 2, an IEP instructor, worked with a university instructor to blend the IEP students into a children’s literature class. The students fully participated in the class, but their evaluation was process-based and carried out by the IEP instructor. It was crucial to the project to find a topic which lent itself to multi-cultural discussion and to find an instructor who would maintain the normal dynamics of the class. In the second year, the course was in History, taught by a university faculty member who was interested in exposing his own students to different perspectives on the class topics.

The project resulted in multi-level benefits. IEP students benefited on intellectual, emotional,

cultural, and professional levels. The university core instructor and students gained experience and insight by teaching and learning in a globalized classroom. The institution benefited, as well, through retention of a substantial number of students

Speaker 3: "Plagiarism and the International Student" M. Cortazzi (1990) addresses the complications surrounding the idea of intellectual ownership:

In a number of countries, particularly in Asia, there is considerable respect for the printed word and those in authority. Consequently, it is quite normal for students to quote from authorities/books without feeling the need to acknowledge the source; nor is it necessarily expected.

This view is in sharp contrast to the American position that the printed word is owned by the writer and, consequently, protected -- copying is theft. The American university definition of and attitude towards plagiarism has to be explained and discussed with the non-native writer.

Most university policies on plagiarism contain wording such as "[t]he term 'plagiarism' includes, but is not limited to, the use, by paraphrase or direct quotation, of the published or unpublished work of another person without full or clear acknowledgment. It also includes the unacknowledged use of papers or other academic materials." It is often unclear, even to the native speaker, how much of the original language can be retained in a paraphrase, and when the line has been crossed into plagiarism. At what number or combination of words has the student borrowed too much from the original? To the NNS, even the policy may be unclear. What does the phrase "but is not limited to" mean? What is being left out - not said? To the NNS student who does not share the concept of intellectual ownership, this policy is not only confusing, but morally perplexing. Failure to address this topic in a globalized classroom could lead to significant misunderstanding and possible academic sanctions. Speaker C will share with the audience an exercise inspired by a real case of plagiarism committed by a U.S. business leader. Analysis of his offense has been used to help NNS better understand the concept of plagiarism and the ways that source material can, and cannot, be used.

With the growth of globalization in the market place, and the avowed intention of most U.S. universities to globalize their curriculum, we hope that this session will provoke discussion of ways to encourage U.S. and international students and faculty to act as resources for each other in understanding the role of culture in academic success.

Participant	Affiliation	Speech Title (if known)
Emily A. Thrush (Chair)	University of Memphis	University as Text : Helping non-native speakers "read" the culture
Angela B. Thevenot (Speaker 2)	University of Memphis	University as Text : Helping non-native speakers "read" the culture
Teresa S. Dalle		

(Speaker 3) University of Memphis University as Text : Helping non-native speakers "read" the culture

The Reality of Writing: Alternative Perspectives of Turnitin.com

Session: E.21 on Apr 3, 2008 from 4:45 PM to 6:00 PM Cluster: 110) Academic Writing
Type: Concurrent Session (3 or more presenters) Interest Emphasis: not applicable
Level Emphasis: all Focus: not applicable

The Reality of Writing: Alternative Perspectives of Turnitin.com

One of the emerging realities writing instructors and educators across the curriculum face is the increasing availability of and dependence on internet-based research. Internet plagiarism is a growing problem our students face in our changing world. Plagiarism detection services (PDSs) like Turnitin.com are internet subscription services available to academic institutions to instruct students on issues of academic honesty as well as help deter internet plagiarism. Turnitin.com has been most widely known as one of these perceived plagiarism "policing devices"; however, this is a narrow and somewhat naïve view of the program's uses and purposes. The program allows students to submit their written assignments and provides the student as well as the faculty an "originality report" which highlights content in color that is similar to the internet. Students can even make changes to their writing once they see the color-coded material that Turnitin flags as similar to the internet. Therefore, students are able to visually recognize errors in sourcing and then correct those errors prior to submitting the final draft of an essay. In fact, faculty can use the color-coded report to more effectively teach academic honesty to students who might exhibit poor scholarship and lack a firm understanding of plagiarism. When students visually see their reports, they recognize what they can and cannot do when borrowing information. The ability of students to self-evaluate their academic work, better prepares them to ethically engage in the writing realities within the academy.

Speaker 1 will address the "CCCC-IP Caucus Recommendations Regarding Academic integrity and the Use of Plagiarism Detection Services" on two main fronts. The statement claims that "the use of plagiarism detection services can have the effect of transferring responsibility for identifying and interpreting instances of plagiarism from the instructor to the computer software." This statement assumes Turnitin.com will be used solely for plagiarism detection and not as an instructional tool to illustrate potential plagiarism in student writing. In fact, this technology can aid instructors in being "clear about the roles and mutual responsibilities inherent in college writing," what CCCC-IP argues is the instructor's duty. Furthermore, providing students with information about plagiarism does not significantly change student behavior, but plagiarism detection devices provide the necessary and immediate feedback that can educate students about potential plagiarism and how to avoid it in their writing. Secondly, CCCC-IP suggests that PDSs compromises the role of the instructor as a coach. However, Turnitin offers faculty a game plan and the necessary material to work with the student at his or her own level of understanding regarding academic honesty and plagiarism; using the students' own papers and highlighted examples provides the necessary feedback instructors can discuss with their students individually, and offers

students the means for self-evaluating their source integration and citation skills. Rather than this technology being a “substitute for good teaching,” Turnitin can be a supportive instructional program.

Speaker 1 will also address how the use of Turnitin as an instructional tool requires faculty training and support in the program. The Turnitin campus administrator needs to look carefully at how training and implementation guidelines can ensure that faculty are aware of the expanded capabilities of Turnitin beyond plagiarism detection.

Speaker 2 will address two important programmatic benefits of Turnitin. The first benefit is that with Turnitin, faculty in other disciplines are more willing to give meaningful writing assignments. Title V requirements mandate that all courses include writing assignments that demonstrate critical thinking. Often this involves doing research or synthesizing information from a variety of texts; however, faculty in non-composition courses are reluctant to give the kinds of assignments that would require the students to interact with texts in a meaningful way because they are not confident in their ability to guide students in the technical requirements of citing and documenting sources. Anecdotal and empirical evidence show that faculty outside of English Departments and writing programs also feel unprepared to detect incidences of deliberate or inadvertent plagiarism. Software such as Turnitin provide faculty with additional resources that they can use to guide and evaluate students’ use of outside sources, making it more likely that they will give meaningful writing assignments. The speaker will present case studies from one two-year college that found a resurgence of meaningful writing assignments after acquiring a license for Turnitin.

The second benefit of Turnitin relates to program assessment. Simply put, education requires assessment, and at the programmatic level, this means compiling a database of student work from many sections of a course, many courses within a department, and departments across campus. Turnitin provides a way to gather student work into a secure database that can be accessed to conduct assessments. In the presentation, the speaker will demonstrate how Turnitin can be used to assess English and Composition Student Learning Outcomes.

Speaker 3 will look at Turnitin beyond its plagiarism detective function, but as an innovative, web-based, course management tool, looking at the course calendar, internet discussion board, email function, and library of assignments and student essays, offering practical ideas for instructors to implement these in their writing and content-area courses.

Participant	Affiliation	Speech Title (if known)
Renee Bangerter		
(Speaker 1)	Fullerton College	From Plagiarism Detection to Plagiarism Play Book
Danielle Fouquette		
(Speaker 2)	Fullerton College	Programmatic Benefits of Turnitin.com
Miquel Powers		
(Speaker 3)	Fullerton College	Practicing with Plagiarism and Turnitin.com

Plagiarism

Session: I.28 on Apr 4, 2008 from 12:30 PM to 1:45 PM Cluster: 101) Practices of Teaching Writing

Type: Concurrent Session (3 or more presenters) Interest Emphasis: not applicable
Level Emphasis: all Focus: not applicable

x

Participant	Affiliation	Speech Title (if known)
-------------	-------------	-------------------------

Daniel Eiland		
---------------	--	--

(Chair)	x	
---------	---	--

Kendall Kelly		
---------------	--	--

(Speaker 1)	Texas Tech University	New Perspectives on Plagiarism
-------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------

Catherine Savini		
------------------	--	--

(Speaker 2)	Columbmia University	New Perspectives on Plagiarism
-------------	----------------------	--------------------------------

Christy Zink		
--------------	--	--

(Speaker 3)	The George Washington University	"Rewriting the Offender: Restorative Justice Practices and Plagiarism"
-------------	----------------------------------	--

Gerald Nelms		
--------------	--	--

(Speaker 4)	Southern Illinois University Carbondale	Between Detection and Adjudication: The Changing Realities of Plagiarism and the Underlife of Student Writing
-------------	---	---

Changing Plagiarism's Reality: Writing as Academic Growth

Session: O.06 on Apr 5, 2008 from 2:00 PM to 3:15 PM Cluster: 105) Research

Type: Concurrent Session (3 or more presenters) Interest Emphasis: race/ethnicity
Level Emphasis: all Focus: not applicable

Changing Plagiarism's Reality: Writing as Academic Growth

Our concept of the reality of plagiarism should change if we are to be consistent with Richard Haswell's concept of writing as an ongoing developmental process. Although many instructors equate plagiarism with cheating it is a much more complex issue than merely identifying a copied passage. Writing as development has redefined how instructors view the act of plagiarism and consequently redirects our interpretations to be more student focused (versus text focused). Our panel will build on the current scholarship of Patricia Moore Howard, Lisa Buranen, and Elaine Whitaker, and Alice M. Roy by focusing on the need to change our reality of plagiarism. We will discuss the new definitions of plagiarism, new ways to discuss plagiarism in the classroom, the pedagogical implications of plagiarism, and how writing centers should handle/perceive plagiarism, and the pedagogical implications of plagiarism.

During the 2006-2007 academic year, fFour faculty members at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi (TAMU-CC) surveyed first-year students enrolled in a first-year seminar course, faculty members who teach in the first-year learning communities, and students who used the writing center during the 2006-2007 academic year. The survey was developed to identify perceptions of the concept of plagiarism and the eeffects accusations of plagiarism have on

minority and first-generation students. It asked open-ended questions in regard to the meaning of the word plagiarism, and the effect an accusation of plagiarism has on a student's relationship with their writing and the student-instructor relationship. The results of the survey revealed that plagiarism is equated with ethical and moral wrongdoing and minority and first-generation students are more likely to be accused of plagiarism. Our panel argues to change the reality/definition of plagiarism from disciplinary punishment to academic progress. In order to do this, instructors must separate intentional plagiarism – cheating – from unintentional plagiarism – learning how to write. This new reality of plagiarism will validate all students as writers, especially empowering minority and first-generation students. We will share strategies to implement this new reality of plagiarism pedagogically in the classroom and in the writing center environment.

Speaker 1, will explain how the results of the study indicate that instructors must redefine what constitutes plagiarism and the disciplinary consequences that come with it. She will suggest and explain a new academic taxonomy for plagiarism to be used in order to change its reality.

Speaker 2, will discuss ways in which to bring a new discussion of plagiarism into the classroom. By making the class student-centered, and by constructing the definition of plagiarism according to genre and discipline, students become more engaged in understanding the concept as a part of learning to write.

Speaker 3, will discuss the definitions of plagiarism within the writing center. She will reveal how the writing center can communicate the new definitions of plagiarism across the curriculum and to individual students.

Speaker 4, will explain the instructor's role in implementing the new reality of plagiarism. She will focus on strategies pertaining to minority, first-generation students.

Participant Affiliation Speech Title (if known)

Sara Slaughter

(Speaker 1) Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi Changing Plagiarism's Reality: Writing as Academic Growth

Erica Rangel

(Speaker 2) Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi Changing Plagiarism's Reality: Writing as Academic Growth

Misty Lassiter

(Speaker 3) Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi Changing Plagiarism's Reality: Writing as Academic Growth

Heather Dorn

(Speaker 4) Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi Changing Plagiarism's Reality: Writing as Academic Growth

"'The Ecstasy of Influence': (Four Plagiarisms)"

Session: P.04 on Apr 5, 2008 from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM Cluster: 107) Institutional and Professional

Type: Concurrent Session (3 or more presenters) Interest Emphasis: not applicable
Level Emphasis: all Focus: not applicable

“The Ecstasy of Influence’:
[Four] Plagiarisms”*

In the February 2007 issue of Harper’s Magazine, novelist and essayist, Jonathan Lethem argues for a certain understanding of plagiarism that sees it as both favorable and necessary to cultural production. Drawing upon historical illustrations from literature, music, drama, film, and other visual media, Lethem points out that artists have always borrowed from other artists, using their predecessors’ creations as inspiration and challenge, often revising or re-imagining old or existing materials into new forms. Our current intellectual property laws, however, reflect a disturbing tendency to view all cultural products strictly as commodities, a view that ultimately prohibits artists from giving their works freely to the community and to other artists. For Lethem, then, aesthetic works “exist simultaneously in two economies, a market economy and a gift economy (65).” Lethem maintains that it is crucial for us to protect – indeed, to foster – a gift economy, and that therefore we need a different attitude toward creative appropriation, i.e., plagiarism, than the one we have now.

Almost all of Lethem’s examples are taken from the various imaginative arts. What then, if anything, does his argument have to do with our classrooms? Does his argument have any implications for those of us who teach composition or creative writing? Does his argument extend to student texts or to rhetorical genres? Lethem does not explore these questions, but he is aware that they exist. Upon first realizing that William S. Burroughs, for example, “had incorporated snippets of other writers texts into his work,” and realizing that this, too, was part of Burroughs’s genius, Lethem nonetheless knew all too well that “my teachers would have called [this] plagiarism (60).”

As colleagues to those unknown teachers, our panel will explore some of the implications of Lethem’s argument for those of us who grapple with such issues on an everyday basis. Writing from the perspectives of a poet, a teacher, and a writing program administrator, our panel will offer three responses to Lethem’s article, each of which will attempt to recontextualize Lethem’s argument for the disciplinary work we do in rhetoric and composition. A respondent will offer a summary observation and point out some curious implications of Lethem’s argument.

*Lethem, Jonathan. “The Ecstasy of Influence: A Plagiarism.”
Harper’s Magazine 314 February 2007: 59-71.

Speaker One

“‘Weiner Shrapnel’ the Poem and ‘Weiner Shrapnel’ the Newspaper Article: A Poet’s Perspective on Gifts and Where They Come From”

Often a known idea is placed in a new context, leaving the author's indebtedness to the original source of the idea unacknowledged. This is sometimes the case in poems written about contemporary events. This talk will focus chiefly on a single poem written by the speaker based upon material discovered in a newspaper article. Did the poet plagiarize? Jonathan Lethem’s notion of “gift” – “works of art exist simultaneously in two economies, a market economy and a gift economy” – illuminates this question as it applies to creative work drawn from news media (65). The speaker will focus on one of his poems but create a context for that effort by placing it alongside other poems by contemporary writers that have also participated in the gift economy, as Lethem uses the term. The speaker will conclude by offering a comparison between the gift economy as it applies to poetry – his and others’ – and the way it applies more routinely to other genres.

Speaker Two

“The Reality of Plagiarism for Students:
A Teacher Considers Lethem’s Omission”

Lethem’s position outside the sphere of those who teach writing is made obvious by his omission of a common subject of plagiarism – student writing. This exclusion implies that student writing is not “art” and therefore cannot participate in the “gift economy,” the right to influence and to be influenced, and thus is always the subject of plagiarism rather than gift influence. Certainly, plagiarism in student writing is a real problem, but continuing to think of student writing as, at best, a debased art merely perpetuates the problematic definitions of plagiarism that Lethem asserts plague our society. Speaker Two contends that in order to understand the realities of plagiarism in composition studies, composition scholars must consider whether or not our students share our definitions of plagiarism and its implications. Speaker two will present the findings of groups of First Year Writing students who will research and write a collaborative paper on the realities of plagiarism both inside and outside the academy, working from mutually agreed upon group definitions of plagiarism. Speaker Two will speak on the implications of the disconnect between the reality of students’ notions of plagiarism and that of composition instructors and the larger academy.

Speaker Three

“Turnitin to Something Else:
Jonathan Lethem and The Paradox of Plagiarism Detection for the WPA”

Jonathan Lethem’s essay raises important questions for writing program administrators because it questions conventional views about plagiarism and thus, by extension, the policies

enacted by composition programs (in particular) and academia (in general). Despite the fact that the Council of Writing Program Administrators recommends using plagiarism detection services with caution, the wide use of Turnitin.com is a telling indication of how the discipline feels about plagiarism. Recent backlashes against Turnitin (e.g., institutional bans, student lawsuits), however, along with an increasingly permissions-based view of intellectual property force WPAs to confront an intriguing paradox. If Turnitin aims to preserve academic integrity by catching plagiarizers, it seems to do so as a pirate of students' intellectual property, since it does not ask students for permission to use, nor grant students compensation for, their work. Therefore, Turnitin would seem to violate academic integrity in its attempts to protect it. Speaker Three will analyze the Turnitin paradox in light of Lethem's ideas about differences in gift and market economies.

Speaker Four
(Respondent)

"Whose Words These Are, I Do Not Know":
A Response to My Colleagues

Participant	Affiliation	Speech Title (if known)
-------------	-------------	-------------------------

Dale Bauer		
------------	--	--

(Chair)	University of Illinois	
---------	------------------------	--

Frank Farmer		
--------------	--	--

(Respondent)	University of Kansas	"Whose Words These Are, I Do Not Know": A Response to My Colleagues
--------------	----------------------	---

Patrick Bizzaro		
-----------------	--	--

(Speaker 1)	East Carolina University	"'Weiner Shrapnel' the Poem and 'Weiner Shrapnel' the Newspaper Article: A Poet's Perspective on Gifts and Where They Come From"
-------------	--------------------------	--

Erin Williams		
---------------	--	--

(Speaker 2)	University of Kansas	The Reality of Plagiarism for Students
-------------	----------------------	--

Matthew Hollrah		
-----------------	--	--

(Speaker 3)	University of Central Oklahoma	"Turnitin to Something Else: Jonathan Lethem and the Paradox of Plagiarism Detection for the WPA"
-------------	--------------------------------	---