

Chapter XII

Plagiarism, Instruction, and Blogs

Michael Hanrahan
Bates College, USA

ABSTRACT

This chapter takes as its point of departure the Colby, Bates, and Bowdoin Plagiarism Project (<http://leeds.bates.edu/cbb>), which sought to approach the problem of undergraduate plagiarism as a pedagogical challenge. By revisiting the decision to publish the project's content by means of a weblog, the article considers the ways in which weblogs provide a reflective tool and medium for engaging plagiarism. It considers weblog practice and use and offers examples that attest to the instructional value of weblogs, especially their ability to foster learning communities and to promote the appropriate use of information and intellectual property.

INTRODUCTION

Alarmist news accounts of student dishonesty and cheating abound. More often than not, such stories describe how universities, colleges, and even high schools have resorted to plagiarism detection services to fight a veritable epidemic of student cheating. The preferred method of combating academic dishonesty, after-the-fact detection, is not the only and is perhaps not the best way to address the problem of student plagiarism. Instead of fighting the lost cause of plagiarism retroactively, technologists and librarians at Colby, Bates, and

Bowdoin colleges (CBB) collaborated to develop a program of instruction to educate students about the principles of academic honesty. The resulting plagiarism resource site (<http://leeds.bates.edu/cbb>) includes an introduction to plagiarism, an online tutorial that tests one's understanding of plagiarism and that provides guidance in the conventions of citation, and a dedicated weblog that publishes links to newsworthy articles, notices, and projects dedicated to plagiarism.

Conceived as a case study, this chapter discusses and evaluates the project's reliance on a weblog to develop, manage, and publish learning

resources dedicated to plagiarism. In the matter of technical choices, the project developers were influenced by their commitment to Open Source Software as well as Creative Commons licensing. The former influenced the choice of weblog software, Drupal (<http://www.drupal.org>), and the latter informed the decision to make all of the project's learning objects and resources available under an "Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share-Alike" Creative Commons license. These decisions, it turns out, have allowed the project to model the appropriate use of online materials and have retrospectively provided an occasion to reflect on weblogs as an effective medium for engaging plagiarism.

BACKGROUND

Over the past several years, national, regional, local, and campus newspapers across the globe have regularly featured articles on student cheating. While academic dishonesty takes any number of forms (using a PDA, cell phone, or crib notes during an exam; submitting unoriginal work copied from an existing publication, cut and pasted from an online source, or purchased from a paper mill; or simply peering over a classmate's shoulder during a quiz), plagiarism has emerged as the most visible form of student cheating. In many ways, the term threatens to subsume all other categories of academic dishonesty. A passing visit to the statistics page at Turnitin's Web site (plagiarism.org) reinforces this tendency. Turnitin, the world's leading plagiarism detection service, claims that "A study by The Center for Academic Integrity (CAI) found that almost 80 percent of college students admit to cheating at least once." Besides generalizing and rounding up the center's published summary ("On most campuses, over 75 percent of students admit to some cheating"), Turnitin's claim isolates a common tendency to conflate a number of dishonest "behaviors" with plagiarism. Donald McCabe

(personal communication, August 4, 2004) explains that the 75 percent figure published by the CAI "represents about a dozen different behaviors and was obtained in a written survey." Plagiarism is certainly one form of cheating, but not all cheating is plagiarism.

Reports of plagiarism in the media tend to indulge in hyperbole: it is consistently described as nothing less than an epidemic on campuses. McCabe (1996), who conducted extensive surveys between 1996 and 2003, repeatedly found that the facts do not correspond with "the dramatic upsurge in cheating heralded by the media." McCabe (2000) has elsewhere observed: "Even though I've stated on previous occasions that I don't believe these increases have been as great as suggested by the media, I must admit I was surprised by the very low levels of self-reported Internet-related cheating I found." McCabe has subsequently further qualified his view of the problem: "Although plagiarism appears to have remained relatively stable during the past 40 years, . . . it is actually far more prevalent today because many students don't consider cut-and-paste Internet copying as cheating" (Hansen, 2003, p. 777). More recently, McCabe's evaluation of his 2002-2003 Survey of U.S. Colleges and Universities identifies an increase in certain kinds of cheating and a continued misunderstanding of plagiarism among undergraduates: "The past few decades have seen a significant rise in the level of cheating on tests and exams. . . . While the data on various forms of cheating on written assignments do not reflect the same trend, this may be due to a change in how students define cheating" (2004, p. 127).

To complicate matters further, statistical estimates of academic dishonesty seem to vary due to contexts (including education level and geography). For example in a recent survey of graduate students enrolled in 32 business programs in the United States and Canada, McCabe, Butterfield, and Treviño (2006) have reported that business students tend to cheat more than other graduate students: "Fifty-six percent of graduate business

students, compared to 47 percent of their nonbusiness peers, admitted to engaging in some form of cheating . . . during the past year” (p. 299). The level of self-reported cut-and-paste plagiarism in this survey, in turn, was “33 percent of the graduate business students . . . compared to 22 percent for nonbusiness students” (p. 300). A recent study conducted by the University of Guelph and co-administered by McCabe and Christensen Hughes (2006) has estimated that 53 percent of Canadian undergraduate students engage “in serious cheating on written work” (Gulli, Kohler & Patriquin, 2007). According to Christensen Hughes, “Serious cheating on written work includes copying a few sentences without footnoting, fabricating or falsifying a bibliography, or turning in a paper that someone else has written” (Cooper, 2007). To help put matters in a global perspective, a recent survey of British higher education conducted by Freshminds.co.uk (with the assistance of the JISC’s Plagiarism Advisory Service and the Center for Academic Integrity) found that “75 percent of respondents have never plagiarized.” This figure in turn approximates what Turnitin representatives have elsewhere estimated: in an interview for the student newspaper at University of California, Santa Barbara, Paul Wedlake, director of sales for iParadigms, the parent company of Turnitin.com, is reported to have claimed that “approximately 30 percent of all students in the United States plagiarize on every written assignment they complete” (Ray, 2001).

Regardless of the figures and statistics, the Internet very much lies at the center of the current fascination with plagiarism. As a result, the fundamentally ethical nature of the offense often gets confused with a technological one. As Patrick Scanlon of the Rochester Institute of Technology has acknowledged: “Plagiarism is not a technological problem—it’s a problem that has to do with ethical behavior and the correct use of sources. And it existed long before the advent of the Internet” (Hansen, 2003, p. 791).

Whether attributed to hype or misperception, plagiarism and the Internet remain entangled in the popular and the academic imaginations. The association is further reinforced by student study habits, especially their research practices. A recent Pew report found that “nearly three-quarters (73 percent) of college students” in the United States claim to “use the Internet more than the library” (Jones, 2002, p. 3). An even greater percentage of students no doubt resorts to the Internet for leisure—to game, surf, IM, and share music files. This reliance on the Internet for study and entertainment has blurred the lines between appropriate and inappropriate cyberpractice and has promoted the intentional as well as unintentional misuse of intellectual and creative property.

The Internet is not the sole source of undergraduate plagiarism. The current manifestation of the problem also can be attributed to non-technological developments, including the increased tendency among students and their parents (at least in the English-speaking world) to perceive higher education as a service industry. That is, the relegation of higher education to a service for which one pays has created a scenario in which students-as-consumers readily expect performance (in the form of good grades) as something to which they are entitled. This sense of entitlement, in turn, overrides concerns about academic honesty. Plagiarism, in this light, emerges as symptomatic of wide-ranging cultural shifts that are not simply or easily reducible to technological shifts and developments. Recent commentary on student plagiarism has provoked observations on this phenomenon. For example, Frank Furedi, professor of sociology at the University of Kent, has observed that “In the ‘customer-client culture’, degrees are seen as something you pay for rather than something you have to learn. It’s the new ethos of university life” (A Quarter of Students Cheating, 2004). This cultural shift and attendant “ethos” may very well lie at the root of the misrecognition of plagiarism among undergraduates

that McCabe has observed (Hansen, 2007, p. 777; McCabe, 2004, 127).

Another significant contributing factor to the rise of plagiarism is an educational culture that resists adapting its instructional methods in the face of advances in technology. This resistance is forcefully demonstrated by the widespread adoption of plagiarism detection services. In an ostensible attempt to counter technology with technology, schools have settled for a punitive solution to what is a basically an instructional problem, and in doing so have escalated rather than engaged the problem. Turnitin, for example, adds each assignment submitted to its service to its databases. This ethically questionable practice of collecting content has been widely criticized as ignoring the intellectual property rights of students: the issue was raised several years ago by Howard (2001); it surfaced in 2003 at the center of a controversy at McGill University (McGill Student, 2006); more recently Mount Saint Vincent University in Halifax, Nova Scotia, has banned Turnitin for this reason (MSVU bans anti-plagiarism software, 2006); and high school students in suburban Washington, D.C., have protested their school's subscription to Turnitin on the same grounds (Glod, 2006). In most of these cases, iParadigms has defended its product against this allegation. In a surprising move, however, the company recently took the issue into account when renegotiating its contract with the University of Kansas: "Because Turnitin.com retains student papers, the service has raised intellectual property and copyright issues ... Turnitin.com addressed the issue by agreeing to remove papers from the database if requested by the KU Writing Center, which administers the service for KU" (Maines, 2006).

Intellectual property matters aside, the discourse of combating and surveillance that commonly attend the use and promotion of plagiarism detection technology seems ill-suited in an instructional setting. Colleges and universities, after all, have the luxury of privileging learning

in their approach to problem solving. Recognizing that after-the-fact detection of plagiarism is a lost cause, faculty, educational technologists, and librarians at Colby, Bates, and Bowdoin jointly developed a plagiarism resource site that attempts to discourage student plagiarism through a program of instruction.¹ The project takes for granted that plagiarism is an inescapable condition of learning. Such a view is by no means unique: Howard (1999, p. xviii), who has published widely on the subject, likens plagiarism to imitation: that is, while trying to find their own voices as writers, inexperienced students invariably adopt and imitate the voices of others and rarely in accordance with the scholarly conventions of attribution. With this view of the problem in mind, instruction would seem to be the desirable as well as the necessary solution to plagiarism. Many educators share this view, and few have been more vocal over the years than librarians, including Burke (2004).

Plagiarism certainly has caught the attention of instructors, librarians, and administrators, but students by-and-large continue to have a vague grasp of it. As Jackson (2006) recently discusses, "there is clearly evidence to support the notion that students, in fact, do not understand plagiarism and lack the necessary skills to avoid it ... Many authors agree that students lack understanding of what constitutes plagiarism, how to properly paraphrase, what needs to be cited, and how to cite sources" (p. 420). The many acts of negligence or ignorance that constitute plagiarism also vary in degrees of magnitude: failure to observe accurately the rules for citing sources, for example, is a different order of offense than the inadvertent, unattributed incorporation of another's language or ideas into a written assignment. These lapses, in turn, are potentially more easily remedied than the conscious, pre-meditated submission of another's work or ideas as one's own.

With this range of plagiaristic practices in mind, Howard (1995, pp. 799-800) has usefully identified three categories: outright cheating; non-attribution as a result of unfamiliarity with

the conventions of citing sources; and “patch-writing,” or stringing together someone else’s language or ideas without proper attribution. The CBB plagiarism project seeks to promote instruction as the best remedy to help teachers and librarians prevent the last two categories of plagiarism, which inexperienced students are especially prone to commit. Based on responses to the project’s instructional materials, these goals are being met. For example, Suffolk Community College has used the project’s online tutorial in library workshops on Understanding Plagiarism and Documenting Sources. Students there have found the tutorial helpful, and “they are always particularly interested to learn about the need to cite paraphrases” (Beale 2006). In a recent survey of an online tutorial on plagiarism, *Plagiarism: The Crime of Intellectual Kidnapping*, created by San Jose State University, Jackson (2006) has produced convincing evidence that “students need more instruction and practice with proper paraphrasing” (p. 426).

To achieve its goal of providing an instructional solution to plagiarism, the project takes full advantage of the Internet and responsible cyberpractice: its developers chose an open source content management system to store, manage, and publish resources; and its resources are freely available not only to be viewed and used via the WWW, but also to be shared, adapted, and re-published under a Creative Commons copyright license.² The resources include a general overview of academic honesty, an introduction explaining different kinds of plagiarism, an online tutorial for testing one’s understanding of the various practices that constitute plagiarism, and dynamic examples of citations and paraphrasing. The project’s Web site also boasts a dedicated weblog that serves as a clearinghouse on all matters plagiaristic, including news items from around the world and notices on resources, tools, activities, and events concerning plagiarism in higher education. Taking advantage of Web syndication, the project’s weblog makes its content available via RSS feeds.

As a result, anyone can import the project’s news updates into individual, departmental, or institutional Web sites or weblogs by means of prepared JavaScripts.³

The CBB Plagiarism Project promotes the responsible use, re-use, and re-purposing of its resources so instructors and librarians can address the problem of plagiarism at the level of local institutional practices, values, and concerns. While plagiarism undoubtedly is a global problem, its solution might best be sought at the local level, where definitions, policies, and expectations vary widely. The decision to publish content by means of a weblog has in retrospect leveraged a technology that has unexpectedly provided a reflective tool and medium for engaging plagiarism. A consideration of weblog practice and use, guided by the concept of plagiarism, provides a framework for understanding the instructional value of weblogs, especially their ability to foster and promote learning communities that discourage plagiarism.

ISSUES, CONTROVERSIES, AND PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH WEBLOGS

Weblogs basically aggregate meta-data: that is, they compile information about information in the form of chronological postings and do not generally publish original content per se. More often than not, weblogs refer and link to other weblogs or Web sites, and the result is a highly interconnected network of communication. The resultant mode of disseminating information has reinforced certain practices that are commonly understood as plagiaristic. Researchers at Hewlett-Packard (HP) Labs have tracked the flow of information in what they call “blogspace” and have identified how ideas, regularly unattributed, spread among blogs (Asaravala 2004). The RSS feeds, moreover, that enable blogs to publish content in various ways are often understood as contributing

to plagiarism because they allow unscrupulous users to capture content (specifically textual data) and re-purpose it without attribution. Dishonest practices aside, the HP researchers assert that the dynamic flow of information in blogspace has a generative function: individual weblogs “link together” to create “a complex structure through which new ideas and discourse can flow.” The HP researchers, Adar, Zhang, Adamic, and Lukose (2004), conceive of the circulation of information among blogs as ultimately creative rather than iterative and original rather than plagiaristic. This interpretation of blogs isolates tensions that have attended the reception of the World Wide Web from its earliest days. Such tensions similarly inform cultural perceptions of our students’ use of the Internet. Their habitual cutting and pasting and sampling and repurposing are commonly dismissed as purposeless, narcissistic self-expression and are censoriously viewed as indicative of their disregard for intellectual and creative property rights and laws. In a recent article, Ellis (2003) productively has situated youth culture’s creative as well as plagiaristic practices in contemporary contexts.

High school and college students operate with the conscious or unconscious understanding (based on a lifetime of practice) that any content available on or accessible via the Web is public property and free. By re-using and re-purposing what they find online, students not only contribute to and reproduce a sub-culture founded on pastiche, but they also develop and acquire the transferable skills that Ellis (2003) suggests will enable those interested to join “the ever-growing ranks of knowledge workers in post-industrial economies.” There are drawbacks as well as benefits to what Ellis envisions as the evolving “new knowledge environment . . . chunks up human experience into multiple, cross-referenced nuggets dispersed in oceanic cyberspace. Stripped of our distinctively human purposes, the new knowledge environment is what George Trow famously called ‘the context of no context.’”

This cutting adrift of knowledge results in its circulation without respect to historical or cultural contexts and creates a number of potential abuses and ethical problems—plagiarism among them. According to Ellis (2003), however, the “new knowledge environment” has some potential benefits that he describes in terms similar to the HP researchers’ description of blogspace: “This environment favors those who can apprehend the interconnectedness of things, create bridges and connections, spark associations and create the *éclat* of montage. . . . Social network analysis, network topology and other new perspectives are being framed to help us understand the ‘natural’ dynamics of this new environment.”

The dynamics of the blogosphere represent potentially exciting developments in cyber-communication, but they simultaneously revisit many of the criticisms commonly invoked to condemn the WWW. The Web is many things to many people: a commerce tool for business; a recruitment tool for new religions; a protest space for political activism; a play space for dedicated gamers; and so on. Regardless of its intended use or unintended abuse, the WWW has provided interested parties with a readily available means to publish content of all sorts, and its users have responded by taking advantage of its publishing capabilities: according to a recent Pew report, practically half (or 44 percent) of adult users of the Internet in the United States have created and published content (*Online Activities and Pursuits*, 2004). The value, usefulness, and originality of that content are an endless source of debate, and the popularity of weblogs has provided additional fodder for critics who question the informational and instructional value of the WWW.

Weblogs tend to promote a confessional mode of discourse that celebrates self-referentiality (McDonald 2004). This tendency has fueled the criticism that blogs have ushered in a new era of navel-gazing. The form and content of many personal blogs reinforce this view, but virtual personal diaries do not exhaust the uses and applications

of blogs. Adar and Adamic (2005) have suggested that “beyond serving as online diaries, weblogs have evolved into a complex social structure, one which is in some ways ideal for the study of the propagation of information.” Their observation posits an interrelationship of information and its circulation that previous scholars have variously noted—from McLuhan’s “The Medium is the Message” to Clanchy’s *From Memory to Written Record* to Brown and Daguid’s “The Social Life of Documents.”

In their approach to the interconnectedness of information and its circulation, Brown and Daguid (1996) have considered the ways in which “developing technologies” have historically “supported social relations in new ways.” A wide range of disciplines and historical examples inform their understanding. Enlisting Anselm Strauss’s notion of “social worlds,” Brown and Daguid (1996) describe a dynamic of group formation that can further the understanding of the culture of weblogs. Following Strauss, Brown and Daguid (1996) observe that “once formed, social worlds continually face disintegration (as dissenting members split off into ‘sub-worlds’).” The blogosphere seems largely populated by such sub-worlds that all too often appear to celebrate a community of one; that is, if one is viewing weblogs as repositories of content rather than as nodes within a network. The flow of information that populates many weblogs, as tracked by the HP researchers, establishes a social matrix that assumes both implicit and explicit communities. Dedicated weblog writers can be roughly divided into two main types: political bloggers and technobloggers. This overly simplistic distinction falls short of capturing the full range of representative blogging sub-worlds (edubloggers, for examples), but it conveniently describes two influential communities of bloggers.

Drawing on the theory of the “imagined community” proposed by political scientist Anderson (1991), Seeley and Daguid (1996) further consider the ways in which “popular” cultural items, such

as journals, novels, pamphlets, lampoons, ballad sheets, and so forth” contributed to the formation of national identity in the American colonies leading up to the Revolution. Citing daily newspapers, in particular, they point out that it was their widespread circulation and not just their content that helped foster Colonial America’s sense of nationhood. The similarities between newspapers and weblogs are instructive. Many observers have noted that blogs have greatly contributed to if not forever changed journalism. McDonald (2004), for example, understands blogging to be “a genuinely positive development in mass communication, and particularly in publishing and journalism.” He attributes the popularity of weblogging to its adoption by “the journalistic establishment.” I would attribute their popularity to their embrace by alternative journalists, especially the proliferation of “warblogging” in the aftermath of 9/11 and the subsequent events leading up to the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003.

Weblog pioneer and advocate Dave Winer, moreover, has speculated that newspapers will ultimately be replaced by weblogs as news sources in the not too distant future. This prediction is based in no small part on the publishing ability of weblogs, which has greatly extended the publishing capacity of the WWW. According to Winer, “In a Google search of five keywords or phrases representing the top five news stories of 2007, weblogs will rank higher than *The New York Times*’ Web site” (*Long Bet*).

SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: BUILDING LEARNING COMMUNITIES VIA WEBLOGS

Blogs are powerful and flexible publishing tools: they publish content rapidly and easily; they provide an archive for content that is readily searchable by date, subject, or keyword; and they can also publish their content in a number of ways,

including dedicated Web sites as well as RSS feeds that can populate other Web sites, weblogs, aggregators, e-mail clients, and Web browsers. That which has secured their popularity and wide reception (the rapid creation, publication, and circulation of information) also represents their greatest potential for instruction. Librarians, technologists, and instructors can capitalize on blogs for making available a range of resources and information to targeted users—students, staff, faculty, and colleagues—both on their own as well as on other campuses. They can do so, moreover, with their own content or with content developed entirely by other institutions. This latter ability, importing content from elsewhere, demonstrates how blogs can reinforce the responsible and productive use and circulation of information.

The hallmark features of weblogs (the rapid creation and dissemination of content) are extremely useful for fostering learning communities whose members resort to various methods and media for instruction and information. Certain integral aspects of weblogs further promote their instructional potential. Weblogs have not only made publishing content easier but more social—they open content development up to a group by means of their ability to allow various levels of access to different groups of users; and they invite dialogue between creators and readers of content by permitting the exchange of comments within the blog as well as between blogs. Weblogs are dynamic in a couple of ways: the content posted on them changes as information is added and they allow users to interact by carrying on a dialogue. This dialogic aspect of blogs enables content developers to work towards breaking down the distinction between the creator and the user of content. This feature of blogs participates in the trend already discerned by Pew: that the consumers of Web content are also largely the producers of it.

FUTURE TRENDS: ENGAGING PLAGIARISM VIA MULTI-MEDIA

The controlled dissolution of boundaries between producers and users of content (or between instructors and students, for that matter) has emerged as a valuable lesson of the CBB project's use of a weblog. Successful instruction in plagiarism must strive to increase the awareness of the difference between the creation of new and the appropriate use of existing content. The project has sought to promote this awareness in practice by example and in theory by instruction. The content is freely available to be used and re-purposed according to an "Attribution-Non-Commercial-ShareAlike" Creative Commons Deed. The project developers have also sought to create learning objects that help socialize students into the culture of academics, which is founded on what Green (2002, p. 171) has described as the "norm of attribution." Most teachers take for granted the scholarly conventions used to avoid plagiarism. Recognizing the profound difference that exists between the initiated and the uninitiated, the CBB Plagiarism Project has set out to provide students with guidance and instruction in the standards of academic integrity. In doing so, it strives to facilitate our students' initiation into the norms and practices of the academic community.

Looking ahead to further development, the project's next phase will involve creating a more adaptive learning environment for engaging plagiarism. While the weblog provides a valuable means to deliver, create, and respond to content, the text-based nature of that content may reinforce some of the limitations of online tutorials as instructional resources. Jackson (2006, pp. 423-26) has recently considered the effectiveness of plagiarism instruction online. By developing media-rich content about the subject (including audio, video, and animation), the project would

create a range of resources that better suit diverse learning styles. In doing so, the project would be more responsive to the needs of its users and would further realize its goal of helping to integrate students into academic cultural practice.

CONCLUSION

An increased use and understanding of media in the curriculum, moreover, may very well allow faculty to harness the creative energies of students in a way that deals with plagiarism in both practical and theoretical terms readily understood by students. Current wisdom on how to avoid plagiarism has emphasized the need to rethink written assignments—for example, essays should be conceived of as ongoing processes consisting of specific, discrete stages or components, all of which are submitted for review, evaluation, and assessment, rather than a single finished product submitted in its entirety only once. In rethinking assignments, instructors may also want to begin to rethink what writing is and to encourage non-traditional forms of writing. I have in mind here the creation of fictional and non-fictional narratives, reports or accounts by means of multimedia—digital video and audio or computer animation and graphics or any combination of these and other media. Just as the weblog has emerged as a reflective tool for considering plagiarism, a media-rich learning environment would allow students to begin to understand plagiarism in new and perhaps more compelling ways. In a recent essay on plagiarism, the novelist Jonathan Lethem (2007) describes what it is like to be cut adrift in our contemporary media environment:

The world is a home littered with pop-culture products and their emblems. I also came of age swamped by parodies that stood for originals yet mysterious to me . . . I'm not alone in having been born backward into an incoherent realm of texts, products, and images, the commercial and cultural

environment with which we've both supplemented and blotted out our natural world. I can no more claim it as "mine" than the sidewalks and forests of the world, yet I do dwell in it, and for me to stand a chance as either artist or citizen, I'd probably better be permitted to name it.

In the academy, students are encouraged to name and when appropriate cite their sources, influences, and inspirations. However, finding themselves, like Lethem, in a world already created and populated with signs, they need to learn how to negotiate the conventions and practices of that world and to decode its constituent signs. Educators should begin to make use of the multitude of media that figures our manifold experiences of the world. The energy and creativity generated by such a diversely constituted learning environment would permit powerful models for rethinking our engagement of plagiarism.

REFERENCES

- Adar, E. & Adamic, L. A. (2004). Tracking information epidemics in blogspace. Retrieved October 5, 2006 from <http://www.hpl.hp.com/research/idl/papers/blogs2/index.html>
- Adar, E., Zhang, L., Adamic, L. A., & Lukose, R. M. (2004). Implicit structure and the dynamics of blogspace. Retrieved October 2, 2006 from <http://www.hpl.hp.com/research/idl/papers/blogs/index.html>
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Asaravala, A. (2004). Warnings: Blogs can be infectious. *Wired News*. Retrieved October 2, 2006 from <http://www.wired.com/news/culture/0,1284,62537,00.html>
- Beale, P. (2006). E-mail, October 6.

- Blog Epidemic Analyzer. Retrieved October 5, 2006 from <http://www.hpl.hp.com/research/idl/projects/blogs/index.html>
- Brown, J. S. & Daguid, P. (1996). The social life of documents. *First Monday*, 1(1). Retrieved October 2, 2006 from <http://www.firstmonday.dk/issues/issue1/documents/index.html>
- Burke, M. (2004). Deterring plagiarism: A new role for librarians. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 6(2), 1-9.
- Center for Academic Integrity. Retrieved October 2, 2006 from http://www.academicintegrity.org/cai_research.asp
- Clanchy, M. T. (1979). *From memory to written record, England, 1066-1307*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cooper, L. (2007). Cheating a big problem. *At Guelph*. Retrieved February 22, 2007, from <http://www.uoguelph.ca/atguelph/06-10-25/featurescheating.shtml>
- Ellis, L. (2003). MP3s, Plagiarism, and the Future of Knowledge. *The ClickZ Network*. Retrieved October 2, 2006, from <http://www.clickz.com/showPage.html?page=3080961>
- Freshminds.co.uk. Retrieved October 2, 2006, from http://www.freshminds.co.uk/FreshMinds_plagiarism_survey.pdf
- Glod, M. (2006). Students rebel against database designed to thwart plagiarists (p. A01). *Washington Post*. Retrieved October 2, 2006 from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/09/21/AR2006092101800.html>
- Green, S. (2002). Plagiarism, norms, and the limits of theft law: Some observations on the use of criminal sanctions in enforcing intellectual property rights. *Hastings Law Journal*. 54(1), 167-242
- Gulli, C., Kohler, N., & Patriquin, M. (2007). The great university cheating scandal. *Ma-*
- cLeans*. Retrieved February 22, 2007 from http://www.macleans.ca/homepage/magazine/article.jsp?content=20070209_174847_6984
- Hansen, B. (2003). Combating plagiarism: Is the Internet causing more students to copy? *The CQ Researcher*, 13(32), 773-796.
- Howard, R. M. (1995). Plagiarisms, authorships, and the academic death penalty. *College English*, 57(7), 788-806.
- Howard, R. M. (1999). *Standing in the shadows of giants*. Stanford, CT: Ablex.
- Howard, R. M. (2001). Point of view: Forget about policing plagiarism. Just teach. *The Chronicle Review*. Retrieved October 2, 2006 from <http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v48/i12/12b02401.htm>
- Jackson, P. A. (2006). Plagiarism instruction online: Assessing undergraduate students' ability to avoid plagiarism. *College and Research Libraries*, 67(2), 418-427.
- Jones, S. (2002). *The Internet goes to college: How students are living in the future with today's technology*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.
- Lethem, J. (2007). Ecstasy of influence: A plagiarism. *Harper's Magazine*. Retrieved February 22, 2007 from <http://www.harpers.org/TheEcstasyOfInfluence.html>
- Maines, S. (2006). KU renews anti-plagiarism software subscription. *LJWorld.com*. Retrieved October 7, 2006 from http://www2.ljworld.com/news/2006/oct/04/ku_renews_antiplagiarism_software_subscription/?ku_news
- McCabe, D. L. (2000). *New research on academic integrity: The success of "Modified" honor codes*. College Administration Publications. Asheville, NC. Retrieved October 2, 2006 from <http://www.collegepubs.com/ref/SFX000515.shtml>

McCabe, D. L. (2004). E-mail August 4, 2004.

McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D. & Treviño, L. K. (2004). Academic integrity: How widespread is cheating and plagiarism? In D. R. Karp & T. Allena (Eds.), *Restorative justice on the college campus: Promoting student growth and responsibility, and reawakening the spirit of campus community* (pp. 124-35). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D. & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Academic dishonesty in graduate business programs: Prevalence, causes, and proposed action. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5(3), 294-305.

McCabe, D. L. & Christensen Hughes, J. (2006). Understanding academic misconduct. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 36(1), 49-63.

McCabe, D. L. & Treviño, L. K. (1996). What we know about cheating in college. *Change*, 28(1). Academic Search Premier.

McDonald, N. (2004). The future of weblogging. *The Register*. Retrieved October 2, 2006, from http://www.theregister.co.uk/2004/04/18/blogging_future

McGill student continues fight against anti-plagiarism Web site. (2003). *CBC.com*. Retrieved October 6, 2003 from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/story/2003/12/27/plagiarism031227.html>

McLuhan, M. (1964). The medium is the message. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: McGraw Hill.

MSVU bans anti-plagiarism software. (2006). *CBC.com*. Retrieved October 2, 2006, from <http://www.cbc.ca/canada/nova-scotia/story/2006/03/08/ns-msvu-plagiarism20060308.html>

Online Activities and Pursuits. (2004). Retrieved October 2, 2006, from http://www.pewinternet.org/report_display.asp?r=113

Plagiarism.Org. Retrieved October 2, 2006, from http://www.plagiarism.org/plagiarism_stats.html

A Quarter of Students Cheating. (2004). *BBCNews*. Retrieved February 16, 2007 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/education/3852869.stm

Ray, D. (2001). Web site may catch, deter plagiarized work. *Daily Nexus Online: UC Santa Barbara's Student Newspaper*. Retrieved October 3, 2006 from <http://www.ucsbdailynexus.com/news/2001/1252.html>

Winer, D. *Long Bet*. Retrieved October 2, 2006 from <http://www.longbets.org/>

ENDNOTES

¹ Original project members included Judy Montgomery and Sue O'Dell, Bowdoin College; Zach Chandler and Marilyn Pukkila, Colby College; and Thomas Hayward, Bates College. Jim Hart at Bates College served as a technical consultant from the project's inception and generously provided extensive support by administering the Linux server that continues to host the project's weblog and resources.

² The site is driven by Drupal, a PHP-MySQL-based open-source content management system, which is freely available to download at <http://www.drupal.org>. For further details on Creative Commons, see <http://creativecommons.org>.

³ See <http://leeds.bates.edu/cbb/rss/rss.html> for instructions and guidelines. For an example of the feed in action, see the Missouri State University Libraries, <http://library.missouristate.edu/resources/cheating.shtml>.