Integrating discipline-based anti-plagiarism instruction into the information literacy curriculum

Lynn D. Lampert

The author

Lynn D. Lampert is the Coordinator of Library Instruction and Information Literacy at California State University Northridge, Northridge, California, USA.

Keywords

Copyright law, Information facilities, Document management, Academic libraries, Ethics

Abstract

This paper discusses the importance of developing a discipline-based approach to the issue of plagiarism in information literacy instruction sessions. Through an examination of how both higher education and academic librarianship view plagiarism, the growing need for anti-plagiarism instruction, and the role librarians can take in anti-plagiarism instruction, this article will offer insight into effective ways for librarians to reach out to both faculty and students facing the difficulties inherent in higher education in the wake of the cut and paste age. Practical examples of discipline-specific, collaborative approaches and process-based assignments in journalism will be discussed to show how both librarians and discipline faculty can successfully make connections between student needs and collective information literacy instruction activities.

Electronic access

The Emerald Research Register for this journal is available at
www.emeraldinsight.com/researchregister

The current issue and full text archive of this journal is available at
www.emeraldinsight.com/0090-7324.htm

Reference Services Review
Volume 32 · Number 4 · 2004 · pp. 347-355
© Emerald Group Publishing Limited · ISSN 0090-7324
DOI 10.1108/00907320410569699

Introduction

To say that librarians and discipline faculty often face Orwellian practices when it comes to the current treatment of plagiarism and academic dishonesty on college campuses is not an exaggeration. Orwell (1992) defined "doublethink" as the willingness "to forget any fact that has become inconvenient, and then when it becomes necessary again, to draw it back from oblivion for just as long as it is needed". Plagiarism, an arch nemesis of academic integrity, remains one of those ever-present and yet inconvenient "facts" of university life. It often grabs the fleeting attention of students, librarians and administrators only to fall into the background until recalled by pressing demands and uncomfortable instances of academic dishonesty. Recent high profile cases of plagiarism in journalism and other unethical uses of information both beyond and within the walls of academia (Jayson Blair of *The New York Times*, Jack Kelley of *USA Today*, Stephen Glass of *The New Republic*, and California State University, Stanislaus students involved in jury surveys on the Scott Peterson murder trial) require that we reexamine how we prevent instances of academic dishonesty in order to prepare our students to use information ethically in their professional lives beyond the college experience.

Discussions about plagiarism on college campuses typically focus on ways to catch guilty students rather than grappling with how to teach students effectively to integrate outside information resources ethically and correctly into their work. While it is important for librarians and discipline faculty to discuss plagiarism detection software and web-based term paper mills, more attention needs to be collaboratively placed on developing effective ways to capture student attention about required citation styles, the ethics of information in various disciplines, and assess their understanding of these concepts. Plagiarism is an area where librarians and discipline faculty already agree there is a need for instruction. So, how can librarians and discipline-based faculty best develop anti-plagiarism based information literacy curricula? What are the roles of the librarian and faculty members dedicated to implementing methods for educating students about how to ethically cite and integrate outside information into their own writing? These are questions that must be considered in order to create successfully a discipline-based approach to integrate anti-plagiarism tactics deeper into information literacy instruction. Through a

Submitted: 30 June 2004
Accepted: 4 August 2004

Reference Services Review
Volume 32 · Number 4 · 2004 · 347-355

discussion of how both higher education and academic librarianship view plagiarism, the growing need for anti-plagiarism instruction, and the role librarians can take in anti-plagiarism instruction, this article will offer insight into effective ways to reach out to both faculty and students facing the difficulties inherent in higher education in the wake of the cut and paste age. Practical examples of discipline specific collaborative approaches utilizing process based assignments in journalism will be discussed to show how both librarians and discipline faculty can successfully make connections between our students' needs and our collective information literacy instructional activities.

Literature review

A review of recent literature on information literacy shows the benefits of discipline-based collaboration between librarians and faculty (Smith, 1997). The process of collaborating with faculty to incorporate information literacy skills into discipline curriculum is a rewarding process that ultimately benefits students as well as librarians and faculty. In her article "A discipline-based approach to information literacy", Grafstein (2002) maintains that the success of a discipline-based approach to information literacy is dependent on the sharing of information literacy instruction responsibilities. Librarians and faculty must agree on complementary responsibilities as information literacy skills are introduced to students to cement the importance of the subject matter and increase the opportunities for transfer of learning. In addition, Grafstein argues that information literacy training outside of a discipline lacks the chance of catching student interest, as it will not be connected to assignments or progression in learning a discipline's required research skills. Grafstein (2002) challenges both librarians and faculty to see that:

> Imparting IL skills to students involves equipping them [students] with both knowledge about the subject-specific content and research practices of particular disciplines, as well as the broader, process-based principles of research and information retrieval that apply generally across disciplines.

Anti-plagiarism instruction, led by both librarians and faculty, primarily through process-based assignments, provides a nexus where disciplinary context and information literacy skill needs can be met through thoughtful collaboration. The key to a successful collaboration in this effort lies in both librarians and faculty reinvestigating what plagiarism means in the context of a particular discipline and its corollary professions that lie beyond the major.

A great deal of research has been conducted about academic dishonesty and plagiarism in the literature of higher education. Up until recently the majority of research and writing tended to bury issues of plagiarism under the larger categorization of academic dishonesty. Therefore, it is essential in a review of this literature to examine both plagiarism and academic dishonesty as the two are often conflated. The literature covering academic dishonesty can be summarized into the following thematic discussions: definitions and types of academic dishonesty (Whitley and Keith-Spiegel, 2002), explorations of who tends to commit acts of academic dishonesty and why (McCabe and Trevino, 1997), and faculty, student, and institutional perceptions and responses to academic dishonesty (McCabe and Trevino, 1993; Higbee and Thomas, 2002, Pincus and Schmelkin, 2003). Of the most interest to this author are the key studies on faculty perceptions and responses to academic dishonesty (McCabe and Trevino, 1993; Pincus and Schmelkin, 2003) which have focused on how inconsistencies in institutional policies and responses to academic dishonesty impact attempts to curb unethical student behavior. The research of McCabe and Trevino (1993), and later Pincus and Schmelkin (2003), with their multidimensional scaling analysis of faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty, shows how variances in faculty definitions and perceptions of what constitutes egregious academic dishonesty often lead to an ambiguity and lack of action in dealing with perceived "less severe" infractions.

The overriding uncertainty about what constitutes an ethical breach of academic dishonesty and variances in how faculty and campuses deal with the problem epitomizes the uneven treatment of plagiarism across the disciplines on college campuses. As Pincus and Schmelkin (2003) showed in their research, plagiarism is not always uniformly viewed as a severe academic offense when compared to other offenses such as cheating, stealing answers, etc. Moreover, the often blurred roles of whose responsibility it is to deal with academic dishonesty (faculty, administrators, students service officers or even librarians) begs the question of why more emphasis cannot be collaboratively placed on sharing the responsibility for educating students, rather than focusing on ways to detect and punish offenders. Undoubtedly, discipline faculty bear the brunt of time and effort required in policing and responding to acts of plagiarism. Yet what research has yet to show is how much time and effort faculty across the disciplines spends on teaching students

Reference Services Review
Volume 32 · Number 4 · 2004 · 347-355

the skills needed successfully to integrate and document outside information into their writing and research.

Just like the muddiness involved in defining instances of academic dishonesty, there is no shortage of definitions when it comes to working to define plagiarism. For the non disciplinary specific purposes of this paper, plagiarism will be defined as it is in the 11th edition of *Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* (Merriam Webster, 2003) as:

> To steal and pass off (the ideas or words of another) as one's own or to use (a created production) without crediting the source.

It is important to note that according to the research on faculty perceptions of plagiarism there are varying degrees and working definitions of the act of plagiarism. As Wilhoit (1994) notes:

> Defining plagiarism is not as simple as one might think. Everyone seems to know it is wrong, including those who commit the offense, but few know how to completely define it. There are auto-plagiarism and self-plagiarism, substantial plagiarism and incidental plagiarism, and finally there is unconscious plagiarism or cryptomnesia, which seemingly would allow an excuse to all but the most obvious plagiarists.

Unlike earlier studies, which swept plagiarism under the rug of larger academic dishonesty studies, there have been several recent studies on plagiarism in the literature of higher education. While most of the recent research has focused on automated detection methods like Turnitin.com (Royce, 2003) and theorizations about why students plagiarize (Sankaran and Tung, 2003; Love and Simmons, 1997), another stream of research has emerged calling for a proactive approach through process-based learning (Hurlbert *et al.*, 2003) and the adoption of techniques used in writing programs across undergraduate institutions nationwide (Spigelman, 2002). Both Spigelman (2002) and Howard (2002) call for moving the primary onus of understanding about documentation in the student research and writing process from the student to the instructor and the learning community. Noting the rise in more discussions about stricter honor codes and punishments for plagiarism, Spigelman (2002) laments how many of these policing activities shift student writing and research from a process-based enterprise to a "solitary activity" laden with potential pitfalls. She writes:

> Indeed, universities seem to be mandating stricter and more elaborated academic integrity policies . . . many instructors continue to view clumsy paraphrasing or missing quotations marks as ethical infractions . . . Widespread belief in deteriorating student morality contribute to what I see as an increasingly negative climate for teaching students about how writing gets done.

Overall the literature on plagiarism tends to follow the same conclusions made on most college campuses; some students plagiarize in a direct attempt to circumvent the research process. Clearly a small population of students is often very well aware of what is means to plagiarize. They are able to select blatant examples of what constitutes plagiarism (verbatim lifting of passages, etc.) in classroom exercises and assessment instruments. However, as Roig's 1997 study confirmed, undergraduate students by in large do not always have the skills or training necessary to understand the more common slippery slope of plagiarism involved in incorrect instances of paraphrasing (Roig, 1997). Representing a much smaller section of the literature covering plagiarism, Roig's (1997, 1999) research examines problematic areas of student understanding such as paraphrasing. According to Roig, students cannot discern whether paraphrased text has been plagiarized. Concerned with instances of "inadvertent plagiarism", Roig's research represents one of the first attempts to document the need for educators to insert instruction to improve student understanding and skill level in properly documenting and synthesizing retrieved information in their research. Citing how his research contradicted earlier findings (Hale, 1987), Roig (1997) notes that his study found:

> . . . that over 50 percent of the sample incorrectly judged 6 of the plagiarized versions of the original to be correctly paraphrased... These data indicate that students appeared to be confused as to the extent to which original text needs to be modified, and about the conditions under which a citation is necessary.

We can do more than read all about it – journalism and plagiarism

While articles on the process of integrating information literacy into pre-professional disciplines such as nursing and education have appeared in library literature, less research exists on the integration of information literacy skills into the curriculum of journalism. This dearth of research poses an interesting question as to why it has taken so long for librarians and faculty involved in journalism education to integrate information literacy learning outcomes into their collaborative offerings. It also shows that there is a need for librarians and faculty to act jointly to thwart the unethical usage of information in courses before it spills into post-collegiate work in journalism. The

Reference Services Review
Volume 32 · Number 4 · 2004 · 347-355

linkage between journalism and information literacy curricular needs is strong. As Brown and Duguid (2000) note in *The Social Life of Information*:

> News is not some naturally occurring object that journalists pick up and stick on paper. It is made and shaped by journalists in the context of the medium and audience.

There are examples of how information retrieval skills represent a valued component of journalism studies within the literature of journalism education and library and information science. With the rise of computer-assisted reporting (CAR) and online journalism at the end of the twentieth century, both journalism educators and librarians realized the need to train students and practicing professionals. Both parties became increasingly "concerned that students were not developing basic research skills ... as they progressed from beginning to advanced courses they were being asked to jump from a world of personal sources ... to one of database construction and manipulation" (Drueke and Streckfuss, 1997). This realization gave way to the creation of some information retrieval courses in journalism programs in the 1990s. In her discussion of the different approaches necessary in teaching information retrieval skills to future journalists, Wien (2000) emphasized fact checking, researching, and obtaining contexts as important skills that should be emphasized. However, ethics and the ethical usage of the retrieved information were not mentioned as critical components in the development of journalism information retrieval skills. For the most part, earlier literature tended to be concerned with ensuring that journalists could find the information they needed for their research. Up until the disintermediation provided through desktop access to web-based information databases many new journalists relied on their newspaper libraries, librarians, and clipping services to obtain information. This does not mean that ethics and plagiarism have not been an issue prior to the emergence of the internet. Instances of unethical journalistic practices have always been present. The difference in what we see today is the preponderance of the occurrences and our increased ability to detect these acts through internet search engines which can search texts much faster than one ever imagined possible. As Deuze (2001) notes:

> The Internet as a reporting tool and as the arena for a new kind of journalism particularly challenges professional ideals of credibility, reliability and objectivity, since the information and sources obtained ... is considered to be too "immediate" and hard to verify ... yet the pressure to do so is rising throughout the field of journalism.

Like all disciplines that rely heavily on the synthesis of information garnered from research, the integrity of journalism and journalists is dependent on the ethical usage and dissemination of information. Recent exposures of breaches in journalistic integrity have rocked the core of many of the premier newspapers and magazines in the USA. Jack Kelley was fired from *USA Today* for plagiarism. Jayson Blair was fired from *The New York Times* for plagiarism and story fabrications. Instances of unethical behavior have also extended into photojournalism. Brian Walski, a photojournalist, was fired by *The Los Angeles Times* for combining and manipulating the composition of two photos to garner the "right shot" through use of Adobe Photoshop. The photo appeared on the front page of the newspaper. Journalists are supposed to present pictures on the basis of the actual scene or event that they have witnessed. Any digital enhancing before and/or after the pictures are taken is usually considered unethical to journalistic standards. When apologizing for his unethical act to colleagues at the newspaper Walski wrote:

> ... I offer no excuses here. I deeply regret that I have tarnished the reputation of the *Los Angeles Times*, a newspaper with the highest standards of journalism, the Tribune Company, all the people at the *Times* ... I have always maintained the highest ethical standards throughout my career and cannot truly explain my complete breakdown in judgment at this time. That will only come in the many sleepless nights that are ahead (in Irby, 2003).

Unlike Walski, many other journalists recently exposed for plagiarism, story fabrication or other unethical behavior have gone on to profit from the fallout examination of what led to the deterioration of reporting standards. For example Stephen Glass, a former writer for *The New Republic*, fired for plagiarism in 1998 has recently authored a fictional account of his downfall in a novel entitled *The Fabulist*. In this work Glass creates a fictional account of the reaction of his editor to his acts of plagiarism. He writes:

> Journalism is fragile. Our only asset is the credibility readers place in us. If our readers no longer believe what we print, if they think we are reporting anything less than what is literally true, if they can't bank on what we say happened, we don't have a magazine anymore (Glass, 2003).

Many experts contend that we are witnessing a critical mass moment in the history of journalism. The profession is reevaluating its ethics through the fall of its newest generation of professionals. We can only hope that the culprits of plagiarism are not the only ones to benefit from the fallout through book and movie deals. Journalism educators and leaders are beginning to take notice and implement practices to thwart further

Reference Services Review
Volume 32 · Number 4 · 2004 · 347-355

misdeeds in the classroom and in the field. Plagiarism is not an unethical act that is taken lightly in the field of journalism. In the "Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics" journalists pledge to "seek the truth and report it . . . to be honest, fair and courageous in gathering, reporting and interpreting information . . . and [to] never plagiarize" (SPJ, 2003).

Anti-plagiarism and information literacy instruction

Journalism instructors at California State University Northridge (CSUN) have consistently brought students into the library to learn online research techniques over the years. Faculty interest mirrors the importance that the discipline and profession has placed on research skills development prior to and since the emergence of CAR and the internet. Like other disciplines weighing the impact of publication accessibility via the internet, journalism's rapid transition to online communication caused journalism educators and their corresponding associations to devote a great deal of emphasis to enhancing the computer skills of future journalists. Since 2001, requests for library instructional sessions for journalism courses have grown considerably at CSUN. In the 2003-2004 academic year, 388 students enrolled in journalism courses were reached through information literacy sessions held in the Oviatt Library. Some of the courses that have traditionally visited the library include Journalism 110 News Reporting, Journalism 300 Reporting Governmental Agencies, Journalism 310 Article Writing, Journalism 371 Women and the Media, and Journalism 372 Diversity in the Media.

In partial response to the recent rise in high profile cases of plagiarism and the unethical use of information in both print and photojournalism, journalism faculty and librarians at CSUN modified course offerings, curriculum, and pedagogical approaches to include deeper discussions of journalistic ethics. During the 2003-2004 academic year, the department changed its shared core curricular offerings by changing its standard introductory news reporting course (Journalism 110) to a two part offering entitled (Journalism 110 and 210) Writing, Reporting and Ethics. This intensified focus on ethics reflects the department's dedication to high journalistic standards and the need to spend greater instructional hours on the training of core journalistic skills emphasized by their profession and accrediting body.

The Journalism Department at CSUN is one of 109 journalism programs in the USA accredited by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (ACEJMC). The Journalism Department received a positive accreditation review by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications in the 2003-2004. The department passed on all 12 standard areas of examination. The curricular standards of the ACEJMC (2003) require that: "Students learn to gather, analyze, organize, synthesize and communicate information in formats appropriate to particular forms of journalism and mass communications and systems of delivery". These accreditation standards have helped strengthen the relationship between librarians and journalism faculty over recent years. It is also important to note that the ACEJMC as an accrediting body also seriously views the ethics skill set of information literacy as a high learning outcome goal of the programs it sanctions. Plagiarism is an issue that the ACEJMC views as a serious issue in journalism education. In a recent speech upon the end of his ACEJMC presidency Ceppos (2003) stated:

> My gut tells me that every newsroom employs plagiarists, or at least staff members who don't understand what plagiarism is. Incidentally, an Ohio State professor who wrote a piece for the *Columbus Dispatch* said that he hadn't actually plagiarized because you can copy up to 150 words without penalty. My guess is that our newsrooms, and probably this Council, are full of people with varying interpretations of what plagiarism is. Shouldn't we at least engage the discussion in every school of journalism?

Sharing Mr Ceppos's gut feeling, a faculty member in journalism and I decided to embark on a new approach to strengthen our anti-plagiarism instruction modules in the information literacy instruction sessions for Journalism in the 2003-2004 academic year. We moved to expand on earlier discussions of plagiarism and journalistic integrity by incorporating our information retrieval exercises with examples of how to check for the accuracy of retrieved reported information. The ethical use of information under journalistic standards became the focus of intermediate information literacy sessions for journalism students. In the spring of 2004 the department began offering its new Journalism 210 course that focuses a great deal of attention on ethics in reporting and writing. Here faculty and librarians planned to expand on earlier emphasized exercises of online retrieval from Journalism 110 and focus on the use of Associated Press style standards and plagiarism.

The changes in information literacy session content for Journalism 210 were not difficult for librarians and faculty to develop. Almost all of the students from the earlier semester offerings of

Journalism 110 received information literacy instruction prior to their attendance in Journalism 210. In the Journalism 110 sessions students were introduced to key library and journalism research resources including the library online catalog, *Lexis-Nexis*, and *ProQuest Newsstand*. Realizing that these students had this basic core knowledge of resources and searching skills, the curriculum of Journalism 210 structures itself around the principals of critically thinking about retrieved information and correctly documenting the usage and synthesis of that information.

Just as in other journalism courses, instructors leading Journalism 210 require students to submit stories that will be vigorously fact checked for accuracy and ethical reporting. As students learn and reinforce the basic tenants of reporting from Journalism 110, they are also called upon to demonstrate a greater understanding of the correct usages of journalistic standards on quotations such as the direct quote, the partial quote, and the indirect quote. Students are also required to show their reporter's notes revealing sources that they used to write the stories they submit for grading and often publication in the campus newspaper. This process-based learning technique mirrors the structure of keeping a reporter's notebook. This activity holds a valued meaning to students who plan on being future journalists. They understand that a reporter's source notebook is often his or her most important resource in the field. This process-based approach is similar to the information literacy technique of requiring students to keep a research log.

Like other disciplines, journalism instructors find that requiring work in process-based assignments throughout the semester helps enforce the necessary steps of the research process. They are also trying to show their students that fact checking on stories is a normal part of a journalist's and editor's work routine. After Jayson Blair's plagiarism and fabrication of stories at *The New York Times* led to the dismissal of chief editors, many newspapers have taken new steps to enforce ethics codes and policies to prevent future infractions. Fact checking is commonplace practice in journalism and the recent problems in reporting integrity have caused many editors and newspapers to really hone in on checking on a reporter's sources, facts and information to corroborate a story. Students enrolled in Journalism 210 are advised that a reporter's usage of anonymous sources is also being more closely monitored to avoid fabrications and plagiarism. These changes in the profession and its practice have cemented the rationale behind many of the exercises conducted in information literacy sessions for Journalism 210 for both students and faculty. Librarians working with Journalism 210 and other journalism classes have achieved success in increasing student awareness about plagiarism and how documentation and information ethics work within their discipline and future profession. The collaboration between librarians and discipline faculty has allowed the library to provide supplemental instruction to support the exercises and assignments conducted throughout the semester. Some helpful hints for how to approach anti-plagiarism instruction integration into information literacy sessions in any discipline include:

- Reinvestigating what plagiarism means in the context of a particular discipline.
- Familiarizing oneself with a discipline's preferred style format and codes of ethics.
- Examining the curricular standards required for disciplinary accreditation.
- Identifying discipline/professional associations that have a focus on ethics.
- Demonstrating a willingness to make resources available to aid in study of ethics of information in ever discipline where it is appropriate.

In addition to the points listed above, it is also essential for librarians and discipline faculty to consider adapting information literacy sessions so that they include student centered approaches to learning. Within a process-based approach that applies constructivist pedagogy to instruction, students should be asked to demonstrate learning through a series of exercises that require them to connect and apply their prior knowledge about plagiarism to newly introduced skills and methods. By acknowledging existing student knowledge in information literacy sessions that focus on anti-plagiarism, librarians increase the likelihood that students will question previously conceived notions of what constitutes the ethical use of information. Librarians and faculty should develop learning activities that require students to model their understanding of the ethical uses of retrieved information within their respective discipline. Examples of additional exercises used within the collaboration between journalism faculty and librarians at CSUN include:

- Utilizing case studies that include examples of plagiarized and correctly integrated text.
- Asking students to report back or model what a correct citation looks like under their discipline's required format style.
- Using framing and sourcing exercises (Dilevko, 1998) to have students demonstrate their understanding of why citations are helpful to both scholars and general readers.

Reference Services Review
Volume 32 · Number 4 · 2004 · 347-355

These process-based student centered learning activities allow students better to explore their own understanding of plagiarism and reflect on why and how documentation standards elucidate further evidence of the research they conducted in their work. In addition, these activities also provide excellent opportunities for assessment of student learning.

While attending information literacy sessions held in the library, students in selected sections of Journalism 110 and 210 were asked to complete a survey to assess how well they understood the ethics of information and plagiarism in the spring of 2004. The results were encouraging and the discussions that ensued between librarians, faculty, and students showed that there truly is a need to understand what constitutes plagiarism on a college campus and how that may differ by discipline or profession. Students were asked to complete a survey conducted in real time via a web interface from computer terminals available in a library instructional lab. After completing ten questions developed by the course instructor and librarian, correct answers were discussed and an open forum of journalistic ethics and plagiarism issues emerged. While the majority of students seemed to grasp the need to use quotations for verbatim uses of text, it is interesting to note that out of 105 students surveyed 14.29 percent thought that they did not need to use quotation marks or provide a source when they used information from a source but did not quote it directly. The journalism faculty members involved in the assessment of student knowledge about plagiarism and the ethical use of information plan to continue on with the current anti-plagiarism content of information literacy sessions for Journalism 210. In addition, librarians and faculty are also working on ways to infuse the content of the material into other courses where it is needed.

Librarians and journalism faculty plan to share their new experiences about collaborative discipline based anti-plagiarism instruction at the upcoming faculty retreat in 2005 and through the writing of a grant to fund more research in this area. The journalism faculty and librarians who have participated in these new information literacy sessions are finding that students are more open to discuss their confusion about documentation and the ethical usage of information after they have received guidance though instruction. There is a great amount of interest in this topic throughout our campus. The journalism faculty members involved in the integration of anti-plagiarism tactics into information literacy session also led several popular faculty wide discussions about plagiarism at CSUN during the fall semester of 2003. In these sessions, faculty shared their experiences in confronting students they suspected of plagiarism. They also offered suggestions for dealing with plagiarism in the classroom. Their recommendations included: educating students on what constitutes academic dishonesty, developing process-based assignments and tests that thwart cheating, and being creative in working to develop new ideas on how to change the overall climate of acceptance about dishonest behavior. The collaborative work that has taken place between the library and journalism faculty represents a new approach to dealing with the problem of plagiarism on our campus.

Conclusion

The intersection of information literacy efforts and the need for education on plagiarism represents a key area where discipline faculty and librarians can join forces to educate students. According to Hurlbert *et al.* (2003):

> Librarians that teach work at the intersection of the educational program and the information environment and can thus shape the academic experience for both students and faculty . . . emphasis on integrity and process is a welcome remedy to the broadly evident compromised publishing environment in many disciplines.

Hurlbert *et al.* (2003) goes on to note that most faculty welcome collaboration with librarians who are willing to collaborate on ideas to "monitor the steps of the research process, with respectful attention to the particular challenges of the discipline."

A central question that arises from Hulbert is whether or not librarians are paying attention to discipline specific challenges related to plagiarism? Clearly this is an area where future research and collaboration with discipline faculty needs to occur. Despite the growth of collaborative practices between academic librarians and discipline faculty involved in information literacy programs, relatively few discipline based instructional innovations have been implemented to improve on the problem of plagiarism and the unethical use of information in student research. This is surprising as the fifth standard of the ACRL "Information competency standards for higher education" calls for students to be able to, "understand the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information, and access and use information ethically and legally" (ACRL, n.d.). Another element of this skill set is also described in standard four's performance indicators and learning outcomes. The desired learning outcome states that the student successfully, "integrates the new and prior

Reference Services Review
Volume 32 · Number 4 · 2004 · 347-355

information including quotations and paraphrasings in a manner that supports the purposes of the product or performance" (ACRL, n.d.).

Librarians can and should play a critical role in this area of information literacy instruction. Auer and Krupar (2001) implore instructional librarians to take on added responsibilities in the role of combating plagiarism through information literacy instruction opportunities:

> Instructional sessions would seem the perfect method for providing students with information about how to appropriately use Web pages and full-text articles in their research. Librarians have an ethical obligation to teach bibliographic citation methods and strategies for how to best avoid plagiarism, especially of Internet sources.

Unfortunately most recent attempts to integrate instruction on plagiarism have only scratched the surface of instructional intervention through the use of intermediary web based tutorials. Perhaps this tendency toward the creation of stand-alone tutorials geared at educating potential plagiarists, explains why relatively little has been written about information literacy in respect to the fifth ACRL information literacy standard on the ethical usage of information within library science literature.

Stand-alone tutorials that do not integrate subject specific concerns pertaining to the ethical use and documentation of information will not be as effective in education students. As Norgaard (2004) states:

> Stand-alone, generic computer tutorials on information literacy, no matter how glitzy, high-tech, and efficient can never speak as effectively to the needs of our students as our own willingness to situate instruction in the lived academic and social lives of those students.

Undoubtedly the paucity of successful instructional innovations in the area of anti plagiarism instruction emerges from the tendency of many information literacy collaborations to adhere strictly to the ACRL standards rather than exploring parallel learning outcomes offered by disciplinary approaches. Kuhlthau (2004) correctly notes:

> Although the standards are useful for defining information literacy, as specific objectives for instruction they may not accomplish the intended purpose of developing information literate students. Engaging students in inquiry that embeds information literacy in authentic learning may be more helpful for preparing them to apply knowledge to the information tasks in their lives.

This kind of instruction not only requires collaboration on the parts of librarians and discipline faculty, but it also calls for librarians to gain a better understanding of how students' different disciplines and their prospective professions require, train, and enforce the ethical use of information and its documentation outside of academia. Anti-plagiarism instruction represents one of Kuhlthau's (2004) "zones of intervention" that academic librarians and discipline faculty can no longer ignore.

Orwell once said, "Early in life I had noticed that no event is ever correctly reported in a newspaper" (Orwell and Angus, 1968). Regardless of what one interprets "correctly reported" to mean, there are striking parallels in the notable cases of journalistic dishonesty making headlines today. While these headlines have caused journalism educators to reevaluate the training of journalism majors and future journalists in undergraduate programs, up until now there has been little published research or discussion on the role that academic librarians can play. More importantly journalism is not the only discipline where plagiarism and academic dishonesty take place.

The time has come for instruction librarians to expand the content of our instructional offerings. This expansion in our repertoire will help us be valued as educators with expertise in the many areas of complexity involved in teaching the skills surrounding critical thinking about information documentation in conjunction with information retrieval. Despite our frequent lack of sole ownership in credit bearing information literacy courses, librarians remain in a prime position to offer our faculty partners supplemental instruction in this area. We should not feel exempt from Wilhoit's assignment for instructors to inform and prepare discipline based approaches to anti plagiarism instruction. Wilhoit (1994) calls for instructors to:

> Define and discuss plagiarism thoroughly. Instructors in every field who assign essays ought to distribute to their students a printed statement defining plagiarism from that discipline's perspective, offering examples and outlining the penalties that will result from intentional plagiarism. Plagiarized work in a biology class may look and sound very different from that in a music composition course. Students in every class need to know clearly which acts that discipline considers to be plagiaristic.

Even if librarians are not assigning the essays or research projects, we are supporting the research process involved in their creation and therefore we should either provide this information to students and faculty through lecture, lecture materials or supplemental web-based handouts. Providing resources to foster a clearer understanding of what constitutes plagiarism in different disciplines increases the likelihood of greater student understanding of what measures must be taken to

both cite and integrate newly found information into the research process.

References

Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (ACEJMC) (2003), "Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (ACEJMC) accrediting standards", available at: www.ukans.edu/~acejmc/BREAKING/New_standards_9-03.pdf

ACRL (n.d.), "Information literacy competency standards for higher education", available at: www.ala.org/acrl/ilcomstan.html

Auer, N. and Krupar, E. (2001), "Mouse click plagiarism and the librarian's role in combating it", *Library Trends*, Vol. 49 No. 3, pp. 415-32.

Brown, J. and Duguid, P. (2000), *The Social Life of Information*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.

Ceppos, J. (2003), "Jerry Ceppos: remarks on stepping down as president of the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications", available at www.ukans.edu/~acejmc/BREAKING/ceppos_new.shtml

Deuze, M. (2001), "Educating 'new' journalists: challenges to the curriculum", *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator*, Vol. 56 No. 1, pp. 4-17.

Dilevko, J. (1998), "Teaching news media practices in bibliographic instruction classes: a strategy involving framing and sourcing theory", *Research Strategies*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 53-69.

Drueke, J. and Streckfuss, R. (1997), "Research for journalism students: from basics to computer-assisted reporting", *Research Strategies*, Vol. 15 No. 2, pp. 60-7.

Glass, S. (2003), *The Fabulist*, Simon & Schuster, New York, NY.

Grafstein, A. (2002), "A discipline-based approach to information literacy", *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 197-204.

Hale, J.L. (1987), "Plagiarism in classroom settings", *Communication Research Reports*, Vol. 4, pp. 66-70.

Higbee, J.L. and Thomas, P.V. (2002), "Student and faculty perceptions of behaviors that constitute cheating", *NASPA Journal*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 39-52 (online).

Howard, R.M. (2002), "Don't police plagiarism: just teach!", *Education Digest*, Vol. 67 No. 5, pp. 46-9.

Hurlbert, J.M., Savidge, C.R. and Laudenslager, G.R. (2003), "Process-based assignments: how promoting information literacy prevents plagiarism", *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 39-51.

Irby, K. (2003), "*LA Times* photographer fired over altered image", available at: www.poynter.org/content/content_view.asp?id = 28082

Kuhlthau, C. (2004), *Seeking Meaning: A Process Approach to Library and Information Services*, Libraries Unlimited, Norwood, NJ.

Love, P.G. and Simmons, J. (1997), "Factors influencing cheating and plagiarism among graduate students in a college education", *College Student Journal*, Vol. 32 No. 4, pp. 539-50.

McCabe, D.L. and Trevino, L.K. (1993), "Academic dishonesty: honor codes and other contextual influences", *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 64 No. 5, pp. 522-39.

McCabe, D.L. and Trevino, L.K. (1997), "Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: a multicampus investigation", *Research in Higher Education*, Vol. 38 No. 3, pp. 379-96.

Merriam Webster (2003), *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 11th ed., Merriam-Webster, Springfield, MA.

Norgaard, R. (2004), "Writing information literacy in the classroom: pedagogical enactments and implications", *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, Vol. 43 No. 3, pp. 220-6.

Orwell, G. (1992), *Nineteen Eighty Four*, Knopf, New York, NY (originally published in 1948).

Orwell, S. and Angus, I. (1968), *The Collected Essays, Journalism, and Letters of George Orwell*, Harcourt, Brace & World, New York, NY.

Pincus, H.S. and Schmelkin, L.P. (2003), "Faculty perceptions of academic dishonesty: a multidimensional scaling analysis", *The Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. 74 No. 2, pp. 196-209.

Raspa, D. and Ward, D. (2000), *The Collaborative Imperative: Librarians and Faculty Working Together in the Information Universe*, Association of College and Research Libraries, Chicago, IL.

Roig, M. (1997), "Can undergraduate students determine whether text has been plagiarized?", *Psychological Record*, Vol. 47 No. 1, pp. 113-23.

Roig, M. (1999), "When college students' attempt at paraphrasing become instances of potential plagiarism", *Psychological Reports*, Vol. 84 No. 3, pp. 973-82.

Royce, J. (2003), "Has Turnitin.com got it all wrapped up?", *Teacher Librarian*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 26-30.

Sankaran, S. and Tung, B. (2003), "Relationship between student characteristics and ethics: implications for educators", *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 240-53.

Scanlon, P.M. (2003), "Student online plagiarism: how do we respond?", *College Teaching*, Vol. 51 No. 4, pp. 161-5.

Smith, R.L. (1997), "Philosophical shift: teach the faculty to teach information literacy", paper presented at the ACRL 8th National Conference, available at www.ala.org/ala/acrlbucket/nashville1997pap/smith.htm

Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ) (1996), "Society of Professional Journalists code of ethics", available at: www.spj.org/ethics_code.asp

Spigelman, C. (2002), "Lessons from Forrester: nurturing student writing in a climate of suspicion", *Issues in Writing*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 27-57.

Whitley, B.E. Jr and Keith-Spiegel, P. (2002), *Academic Dishonesty: An Educator's Guide.*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.

Wien, C. (2000), "Teaching online information retrieval to students of journalism", *Aslib Proccedings*, Vol. 52 No. 1, pp. 39-47.

Wilhoit, S. (1994), "Helping students avoid plagiarism", *College Teaching*, Vol. 42 No. 4, Fall, pp. 161-4.

Further reading

Ashworth, P., Bannister, P. and Thorne, P. (1997), "Guilty in whose eyes? University students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment", *Studies in Higher Education*, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 187-203.

Harris, R. (2001), *The Plagiarism Handbook: Strategies for Preventing, Detecting and Dealing with Plagiarism*, Pyrczak, Los Angeles, CA.