Tamara Jones
SI 615
03/20/05

Walt Disney's *Streamboat Willie* was not an original creation. The concept was borrowed from the silent film *Streamboat Bill, Jr.*, itself inspired by the song "Steamboat Bill,"[1] In the music industry, it is common for artists to re-make older songs or borrow sections of preexisting songs in order to create a new piece. In academia, checking the list of citations in a research paper reveals it to be an amalgamation of other papers which, in turn, often draw their ideas from still more papers.

What these examples all have in common is the fact that they draw upon the works of others to form a new creative concept. With the exception of copyright holders, few would argue that this sharing and borrowing of ideas is not inherently wrong; indeed, "information commons" initiatives such as Creative Commons and the Knowledge Conservancy are devoted to the concept of "free culture" and encourage writers, musicians, and other authors of creative works to post their creations on such web sites so that others may make use of their works. What is potentially problematic is when those who wish to borrow ideas fail to acknowledge their origins. This appears to be quite prevalent in academia, where the advent of the Web has, for the first time, made vast quantities of information available to those with a computer and an Internet connection who are willing to do the requisite searching. This has resulted in a number of high-profile plagiarism cases involving college students, although they are hardly the only guilty ones.

In this paper, I will explore the phenomenon of plagiarism, including the ways in which those in academia and elsewhere have attempted to combat the trend. In addition, I will discuss other possible means of thwarting students who may attempt to take advan-

---

1 Lessig, 2003, p. 23.

tage of the ease of access to information in today's society. Finally, I will propose that, perhaps focusing on technology may not be the only solution to combating the problem, which often eludes those who which stem the tide of academic dishonesty.

Plagiarism, especially by students, is hardly new; as the potentially unpleasant flipside of text reuse, it has been around in some form or another since the advent of writing, although it was not always known as such or condemned as harshly. What has changed is the way in which it is done. Computer technology has not only made it easier for students to gain access to others' works, it has also made it easier for documents posted online to be tampered with and for individuals to cut, copy, and paste portions of several papers into a new document which can then be turned in with little or no alteration (i.e. re-wording) and few, if any, citations. Detection tools have been able to thwart this to some extent, but such methods are hardly foolproof, evidence of which will be explained in further detail. In addition, the use and reuse of text, whether by the original writer or by others, has become increasingly difficult to accept. Must this be so? Wilks (2004) argues that "reuse is an independent form of language activity, a very traditional one, and that methods for detecting it computationally may differ subtly from those for plagiarism.[2] Certainly, in age of computers, it is easier than ever to reuse portions of one's own work, and the fact remains that the majority of written papers contain fragments from the works of other authors. In addition, it is common in the academic world to find chunks of theses that have been incorporated by a student from a supervisor's work, often with the tacit approval of the supervisor.[3] A case such as this could be referred to as "benign plagiarism," as the intent is not to deceive others who read the new work.

---

2 p. 2.
3 Wilks, p. 3.

How Prevalent is plagiarism?

Much has been made of plagiarism in recent years, as a spate of scandals involving students has made faculty and administrators increasingly aware of the Internet's ability to provide tremendous amounts of information available for students to download and turn with little or no effort on their part. Recent statistics regarding this particular form of dishonesty have been startling:

- At the University of Virginia, 122 students were accused of cheating on term papers in introductory physics. As many as half faced expulsion or loss of degrees awarded in earlier years.[4]
- A neurobiology professor at the University of California-Berkeley found that 45 of the 320 students in his class had plagiarized at least part of their term paper from the Internet. Nearly 15% of his students plagiarized even after they had been warned that he would use anti-plagiarism technology.[5]
- As of 2001, Cheater.com, a term paper mill, had 72,000 members, with new members joining by the hundreds every day.[6]
- AP Business wire reported that traffic to these sites exceeded 2.6 million a month.[7]

Why do students continue to engage in this practice knowing the potential consequences they face if they get caught? One explanation may be simple laziness; as the due date for a paper comes nearer, they may become so desperate to turn in something that they resort to downloading a paper from a term paper mill without considering that they may be found out. Such a student weighs the likelihood of being caught, and the penalty of that would be imposed, against the benefit of passing a course or obtaining a degree with minimal effort.[8] Often times, it may be that the student, having passively ab-

4 Diana Jean Schemo, "U. of Virginia Hit by Scandal Over Cheating," *New York Times,* May 10, 2001. Qtd. in Groark et al, 2001, p. 42.
5 Verne G. Kopytoff, "Brilliant or Plagiarized? Colleges Use Sites to Expose Cheaters," *New York Times*, January 20, 2000. Qtd. in ibid.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid.
8 Green, 2002, p. 187

sorbed some bit of information from elsewhere, may then put the information in a paper, thinking all the while that it was his or her idea and not even realizing that it came from someone else. Such a phenomenon is known to psychologists as "cryptomnesia" and may be considered less nefarious than someone who knowingly attempts to pass off the work of another as one's own. A more peculiar example is that of the plagiarist who turns in a paper without attempting to hide its origins. He leaves clues that are easy to detect and is often a repeat offender.[9] He acts out of an unconscious desire to be caught, rather like a kleptomaniac.[10]

The difficulty of combating plagiarism

Although a rather common practice, plagiarism has often been difficult to confront for a number of reasons, one of which is the difficulty of properly defining it as a concept. The general consensus is that attempting to claim credit for a previous work constitutes plagiarism, but even this is not always a sufficient definition. According to Snapper (1999), there is a plethora of academic definitions of plagiarism, each differing somewhat in their descriptions. Therefore, although we may not be capable of producing an *exact* definition, we may claim that "we know it when we see it," even though plagiarism remains a notion with no generally recognized body of classical examples.[11] Writings have been reported in the literatures of education, psychology, and library and information studies, each looking at academic dishonesty from different perspectives.[12]

Plagiarism can also be difficult to grapple with because it is often mistaken for copyright law. Although commonly confused, the values inherent in copyright policy

9 Green, p. 186.
10 Ibid.
11 p. 128.
12 Ercegovac and Richardson Jr., 2004, p. 301.

are different from those inherent in scholarly standards for the proper accreditation of ideas.[13] Plagiarism is the failure to give credit for a cited work, while piracy specifically refers to copyright infringement. For example, it would plagiarism for someone to copy the works of a nineteenth century poet and pass them off as one's own,[14] but it would not be considered piracy, as the copyright has since expired. It would be piracy, but not plagiarism, to edit a volume of modern poetry and neglect to get copyright permission for a single item in the volume.[15]

Defining plagiarism can often be subjective. In the United States, original ideas and individual problem solving are prized qualities. Therefore, passing off the ideas of one's own is often looked down upon, which is why many do not do it, despite frequently lax enforcement policies (the reluctance of faculty to enforce the rule is often blamed for this). The stigma of being potentially outed as a plagiarist is what Green (2002) refers to as the "norm of attribution." Those who violate this norm risk the disesteem of their peers.[16] Such a sanction is particularly appropriate because the plagiarist is denied exactly the social good his unattributed copying is designed to elicit-namely, the esteem of his peers and the benefits that flow from such esteem.[17]

However, the norm of attribution does not always apply. Cultures which place greater emphasis on collaboration do not necessarily feel a moral obligation to give credit to another's work. This can create problems when students from these cultures come to the United States or other countries with differing notions of academic conduct retain these habits and are confronted with accusations of plagiarism.

---

13 Snapper, p. 127.
14 Ibid.
15 Ibid.
16 Green, p. 196.
17 Ibid.

Finally, the increasing reliance on technology has made plagiarists savvier when attempting to pass off bought or stolen papers. The emergence of Internet term paper mills has necessitated the creation of detection tools in an effort the stem the rising tide of this particular form of cheating. Technology has also affected students' mindset to the point where they may see nothing wrong with using Web-based research services to answer their questions. One manager at Santa Clara University's Markkula Center for Applied Ethics often receives student requests for help which are essentially homework assignments pasted into an e-mail.[18] However, this does not necessarily mean that students are trying to be deceptive. The computer is their mechanism for getting things done quickly[19] and see nothing odd about firing off an e-mail to someone they do not know and expecting timely homework help,[20] as they are used to e-mailing their professors whenever they need assistance. Nevertheless, Internet theft in the form of term paper mills has been fingered as the primary culprit in student plagiarism in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. The next section is devoted to some of the more common forms of detection currently used by schools to root out plagiarists, in addition to other technological advances which may prove to be effective in the years to come.

Methods of detection

Technological solutions for stopping plagiarists generally fall into two categories: semantic detection tools and databases provided by vendors and available to any school for the price of the subscription fee.

Semantic detection tools

Technological approaches to combating plagiarism generally strive to perform

18 Schulman, 2004.
19 Ibid.
20 Ibid.

five basic actions: 1) partition each file into contiguous chunks of tokens, 2) retain a relatively small number of representative chunks, 3) digest each retained chunk into a short bite string, 4) store the resulting byte strings into a hash table along with identifying information, and 5) determine that any two files are related if they share bite strings in their signatures. The closeness of relation is the proportion of shared byte strings.[21] In one method, documents are divided into and stored as ten word chunks known as "shingles." However, as this method takes up too much space, a slightly different approach may be used. Some methods omit stopwords. Another possibility is to use sentences as chunks to be indexed.[22]

One technology being used is known as the Common Semantic Sequence Model (CSSM), a component of work known as Document Copy Detection. DCD operates in two ways: a string matching scheme and a global word frequency scheme. Although the system is designed to detect plagiarized documents that have even be re-worded to some extent, the method is far from perfect: the string matching approach can find exactly which string is copied, but changing some words of a string can easily cheat it.[23] The word frequency model, based upon the Vector Space Model, can find partial sentence copy, and has better performance against "noise,"[24] but also has a greater likelihood of generating false positives. CSSM, in contrast, is a hybrid of the two methods, although a major weakness of the tool is its inability to easily handle documents that have been re-worded; therefore, CSSM may miss some plagiarized documents.[25]

Semantic Sequence Kin is another plagiarism tool, similar to CSSM. Experiments using SSK to compare both verbatim and re-worded documents ultimately concluded that

---

21 Monostori, et. al., 2002.
22 Ibid.
23 Bao, et. al., 2004, p. 640.
24 Ibid.
25 Bao, et al, p. 644.

SSK has a lower incident of positive error (i.e. it seldom mistakes non-plagiarism for plagiarism[26]) compared to other detection tools.

Databases

Some vendors have taken to providing various services to professors who wish to have some way of detecting student plagiarism. One vendor, iParadigms, has developed a search engine, iThenticate, that is able to clearly identify matching texts between two text-based documents of any language or size.[27] The system works by examining chunks of text (common words are eliminated) and turning them into numbers. The search engine also turns Internet content into numbers. The system then compares the number patterns of the two sets of numbers using a number of complex mathematical algorithms.[28] This search engine is used by such sites as Turnitin.com, as well as Slysearch.com, which is devoted to music and movies. This technology had its origins in a site known as Plagiarism.org, but Turnitin.com was created soon thereafter when demand for the former exceeded the University of California at Berkeley's (the original creators) ability to provide it.[29] Turnitin.com's users must be registered, although students as well as faculty may access the site; students may submit completed papers to ensure that they have not inadvertently missed citations.[30] Submitted documents are checked against those stored in an extensive database containing company-specific content.[31] This database can be added to through the submission of student papers and/or those obtained through term paper mills. As of 2001, Turnitin.com's website contained a plethora of information that can potentially be plagiarized: student papers, papers that have been posted online, material from

26 Bao, et al, 2004, p. 537.
27 Groark, et al, 2001.
28 Ibid.
29 Ibid.
30 Ibid.
31 Ibid.

academic web sites, and documents indexed by major search engines.[32] Its database contained at least 800 million Internet pages and more than 100,000 papers.[33] Not surprisingly, this constant addition of papers and Web content makes it increasingly difficult for students to recycle material and pass it off as their own work. Papers to be tested for plagiarism are submitted to the search engine, and an originality report is issued. The report contains a percentage that indicates the probability of a paper being plagiarized. If the instructor suspects that a document has been plagiarized, he or she may then click on links to direct them to the possibly plagiarized material.[34] Another technology, Essay Verification Engine (EVE2), operates in a manner similar to Turnitin.com An instructor submits a paper; the software then sifts through Internet material for possible matches. The difference between EVE2 and Turnitin.com is that instructors must convert the document to a .txt file before the latter can begin searching. If EVE2 detects any suspect sites, it then searches through these sites to determine if they contain work that matches the paper in question.[35] As with Turnitin.com, the system returns a percentage-based report with links to the sites in question. The report also includes an annotated copy of the paper with all plagiarism highlighted in red.[36] According to the tool's website, EVE2 performs a large number of complex searches to find material from any Internet site[37] and has been developed to be powerful enough to find plagiarized material while not overwhelming the professor with false links.[38]

Copycatch works in a similar manner to EVE2. The system allows a user to

---

32 Ibid.
33 Ibid.
34 Ibid.
35 Ibid.
36 Ibid.
37 EVE2 Plagiarism Detection for Teachers. http://www.canexus.com/eve/abouteve.shtml.
38 Ibid.

browse and select the files to check,[39] and the results are almost immediate.[40] As with EVE2, it relies on a percentage-based comparison to determine the extent of plagiarism, and can accept files in text, rtf, and HTML formats without requiring the document to be reformatted. It outputs a list of pairs sorted by percentage of match between them[41] in addition to flagging suspected passages in the manner of TurnItIn. In an experiment performed by Medori et al which compared various copy detection tools, Copycatch was able to detect the pair "Colin-David" in a paper, which was not an obvious case of plagiarism and would have been missed using TurnItIn.[42]

As potentially beneficial as these tools might be, a new problem has arisen as a result. Because Turnitin.com stores all submitted papers in its database, there is the distinct possibility of copyright infringement, as well as violation of students' privacy (in contrast, EVE2 and Copycatch do not keep submissions). Lawyers claim that Turnitin.com's service violates copyright because the entire paper is retained, and copyright law automatically gives an author the right to his or her works. Since becoming aware of this possibility, Berkeley chose not to subscribe to the service (ironic, given that Turnitin.com had its beginning there). However, the company encourages professors to warn students that copies of their papers will be checked and kept by the plagiarism-detection service, and to request that students themselves upload their work to the company's database.[43] This serves to prevent students from complaining that their works were submitted without their knowledge or consent. However, this action raises questions as well. Although the company founder claims that some 70% of the papers received by the service each day are submitted by students,[44] it may be due to the feeling

39 Medori, et al, 2002, p. 230.
40 Ibid.
41 Ibid.
42 p. 230.
43 Foster, 2002.

that students are being forced to do the submitting, as well as any repercussions that may come about if a student refuses. Others, especially professors, object to the database for still more reasons: the students' papers are copied in their entirety, they are often creative works as opposed to compilations of scientific facts, and they are submitted to a commercial enterprise, not an educational institution. [45] The third concern became even more relevant when two plagiarism-detection services-PlagiServe.com and EduTie.com-were suspected of having ties to online paper mills, meaning that these sites may have been selling the papers they were checking to websites that offer term papers for sale to students. The connection became further suspect when it was revealed that the individual responsible for PlagiServe.com and EduTie.com was also listed in a public database of Internet registrants as the "administrative contact" for a company called Cyber Breeze Networks, a company that runs at least three sites that sell papers to students: mightystudents.com, essaymill.com, and essaysonfile.com.[46]

Although such technologies have shown promise and have been quite popular with teachers, they are far from perfect; not even a detection tool as powerful as EVE2 can truly search every single site on the Internet. However, these are not the other methods that schools have used. One of the most popular strategies is the use of a plagiarism statement in an effort to stop the habit before it starts. But how well does this work? The following section details two experiments, one performed by a university in Scotland and another by a school in the United States, which attempt to determine if the presence of a defined plagiarism statement has any bearing on students' attitudes.

---

44 Ibid.
45 Ibid.
46 Young, 2002.

The effect of policy statements on students: Two case studies

The use of plagiarism statements to discourage students has, in some cases, proven surprisingly effective. Several sources have indicated that students are more likely to cheat on academic papers both when instructors fail to give an exact definition of plagiarism and when they do not emphasize the consequences of doing so. Does this mean that students who are warned in advance are less likely to cheat?

At the time of their writing, Brown and Howell (2001) determined that there had been no experimental studies designed to examine the efficacy of plagiarism statements in terms of reduced likelihood of cheating.[47] To determine if the hypothesis was true, they conducted an experiment in which they distributed questionnaires to each of four compulsory psychology classes at the University of St. Andrews. The questionnaires consisted of booklets with identical cover sheets; depending on the booklet the student picked up upon arriving for the experiment, the next page would either contain one of two statements on plagiarism or no statement at all. The third page contained two samples of plagiarism (either a word for word copy or a close paraphrase, presented in either order)[48]. The different booklets were arranged in random order to prevent the first arrivals from receiving the same booklet. The plagiarism sections were divided into "educational," "warning," and "no information." In the "educational" condition, the passage contained an explicit description of plagiarism and an example of the correct way to cite material.[49] This was the more serious of the two passages dealing with plagiarism. The "warning" condition was worded so as to appear more informal in tone, and the passage was shorter (137 words versus 270 for the "educational" passage). The definition of plagiarism was not only less concrete, it was also more inaccurate. In addition, it em-

47 p. 104.
48 p. 106.
49 p. 107.

phasized that the actual levels of plagiarism were low, and described the offense as "misbehavior" and a "stupid" risk. Also, there was no example of how to properly cite material. In the "no information" condition, the respondent was given no instruction about plagiarism and proceeded to complete the questionnaire.[50] The students then turned to the two passages. On one side was a passage students were told came from a psychology textbook; on the other side was a passage from a student's essay.[51] Depending on the booklet, the passage was either written verbatim or paraphrased. The students then answered five questions: how seriously the students considered the offense, how seriously respondents thought it would be viewed by staff, how prevalent respondents thought plagiarism was, how well plagiarism was understood, and how well the student thought other students avoided plagiarism.[52] The students rated their responses on a scale of 0 to 100 based on seriousness, frequency, necessity, and likelihood.[53] The questions were the same despite the differences between the passages.

The results were largely as expected. Those students who received a booklet with the educational condition were more likely to view plagiarism as a more serious offense than those who received the warning or no information booklets. They also felt that staff would be less tolerant of plagiarism, and that instances of cheating were fewer. Students who received either warning or no information booklets tended to think instances of plagiarism were a more frequent occurrence.

In another experiment, undergraduates at a small school in the southwestern United States were asked to fill out surveys in order to determine how severe they considered plagiarism to be. At this school, students are required to include a signed certification of

50 Ibid.
51 Ibid.
52 p. 108.
53 Ibid.

authorship statement on their title pages for all out-of-class work.[54] However, not all of the participants included in the study had signed the statement; approximately 100 participants had been students before the institution of the policy, while approximately another 100 had signed the statement. Based on these conditions, it was assumed that those who had signed the statement were more likely to view plagiarism as a serious offense. The survey that the participants filled out consisted of 18 dishonest school-related behaviors; each statement described a behavior and students were asked to rate each of these behaviors on a 6 point scale ranging from "not at all dishonest: (0) to "very dishonest"(6).[55] Four of the questions specifically dealt with the issue of authorship, such as "using someone else's paper for their course" and "using direct quotes from sources without giving the proper reference."[56] The students who had to sign the statement were given two additional questions, one which asked, on a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (very often), how often instructors required their signature.[57] Over 80% of the students in the "after" group (those who had to sign the statement) indicated that instructors required the statement often or very often. In addition, 95% of the students said that they always turn in the statement; 3% submitted it when it was required or when they remembered, 1% never did so, and 1% indicated that they were unsure what the signed certification of authorship was.[58] In three of the four categories pertaining to authorship, the "after" group considered the offenses more dishonest than did the "before" group.

Both of these examples are proof that plagiarism policies can be effective. While only two universities were studied (and thus it cannot be assumed that it will be as effective at all schools), the fact that the majority of students are more likely to view plagiar-

54 Sims, 2001, pp. 477-478.
55 Sims, p. 479.
56 Ibid.
57 Ibid.
58 p. 480.

ism as a serious offense and less likely to engage in it sends a strong message to faculty and administrators. To adopt this policy, or a similar one, faculty support is essential.[59] In the example given by Sims, the idea of having students sign a statement of authorship came from the faculty. However, it is not only important that more institutions adopt such a policy, but it is also essential that standards be implemented across departments. Also, although neither article makes mention of it, it may be beneficial to implement plagiarism policies in high schools, as the students are often knowledgeable enough to know that their works must be properly cited.

In addition to plagiarism statements, some instructors have resorted to other common sense solutions. For example, several teachers' guides suggest assigning papers on a very specific topic in order to prevent students from obtaining papers online, as term paper mills tend to distribute reports covering very general topics and are hence very tempting for students to submit.

Creating plagiarism policies, however does not guarantee that students will not cheat, since the fact remains that some will always choose to ignore the policy and the potential ensuing punishment if caught. Furthermore, professors may not express sufficient interest in pursing an instance of plagiarism, even with the ability to detect theft online.

Also,despite the various techniques that have thus far been used to combat plagiarism, they are far from perfect. Detection technologies, such as Semantic Sequence Kin, as well as the submission sites that may make use of them, are hardly infallible; as few as one in five texts may be relocated by inserting a random string of text into a system that makes use of webcrawlers, which implies that with current, commercially

---

59 p. 481.

available Web search technology, a student copier has only a 20% chance of being caught.[60]

Given these shortcomings, some have proposed that, perhaps, the solution to at least stemming the tide of plagiarism is to make the act less heinous. Ideally, some suggest, text authorship and ownership would return to a time in which the reuse of text was less of an issue than in the present climate, and the notion of copyright was not as strict.

What else can be done?

As we have seen, attempts to discourage plagiarism have been mixed at best. It is possible that, over time, detection tools will become increasingly effective, and the same may be true of statements designed to prevent the theft of creative works before it begins. But are there other ways in which the problem may be effectively addressed?

The question that some ask when addressing the issue of plagiarism is, "who, exactly, is being hurt?" Unlike the case of copyright violation, an instructor whose work has been plagiarized does not suffer any monetary loss; unless there is also copyright infringement, an author has few legal grounds for claiming economic loss for a plagiarized use of his work.[61] At worst, an author whose work has been plagiarized may run the risk losing his or her reputation, but Snapper argues that this is hardly grounds for criminalizing plagiarism to the extent of copyright violation. Some others appear to share his idea; in his essay "In Praise of Plagiarism," Russ Hunt says, "If the apprehension that it's almost impossible to escape the mass-produced and purchased term paper leads teachers to create more imaginative, and rhetorically sound, writing situations in their classes, the advent of the easily-purchased paper from schoolsucks.com is a salutary challenge to practices which ought to be challenged (schoolsucks.com is often credited with launch-

60 Wilks, 2004, p. 2.
61 Snapper, p. 128.

ing the trend of online term paper mills)."[62] Martin (1994) argues that both the standard and revisionist views of plagiarism focus on the wrong *type* of plagiarism. The former contends that plagiarism is a serious offence against scholarship and should be condemned and penalized. It is strongly discouraged among students. It is thought to be rare among scholars.[63] The latter view is more commonly subscribed to by those who have studied plagiarism and holds that it is much more common among both students and scholars than usually recognized and hence infrequently punished.[64] It is Martin's belief that focusing on this form of plagiarism (which he terms "competitive plagiarism") at the expense of "institutionalized plagiarism" (e.g. speech writers, ghostwriters, and others who write material for figures such as politicians and authors) is counterproductive. Some, such as Wilks, advocate a return to an era in which it was acceptable to write a paper or and article multiple times without fear of self-plagiarism or violation of copyright.

Given these notions, the question I would propose is, what room is there in our current society for the reuse of text and other materials to continue the trend of creating a new cultural form without being in total violation of copyright and intellectual property laws? Currently, I believe the solution may lie in the recent wave of "intellectual commons" initiatives. Founded by cyberlaw and intellectual property experts such as Lawrence Lessig, James Boyle, Molly Shaffer Van Houweling, and others, Creative Commons operates under the idea of "some rights reserved," using private rights to create public goods.[65] Like the free software and open-source movements, the ends of the Creative Commons are cooperative and community-minded, but the means are voluntary

62 http://www.stu.ca/%7Ehunt/plagiary.htm.
63 "Plagiarism: a Misplaced Emphasis."
64 Ibid.
65 http://creativecommons.org/about/history

and libertarian.[66] The principle of some rights reserved is to strike a balance between the current, near-oppressive copyright law under which we operate, and the completely free exchange of ideas. To this end, the site encourages artists, authors, and others to post their works online for use by the general public. In return, their rights are preserved through the use of one or more of the four licenses offered by Create Commons. Users may distribute, copy, perform, or otherwise use original works as long as they credit the original creator. Alternatively, they may do the same solely for noncommercial use, if they retain the original creative verbatim, or if they adhere to the terms of the original copyright. There is also a fifth option, which is based upon the original notion of copyright: the creator has the work for 14 years initially, but has the option of extending the copyright for an additional 14 years, after which it enters the public domain. Such an initiative allows users to easily obtain works that, in some cases, they may alter to suit their needs, while still recognizing the rights of the creators.

To this end, I would study the increasingly common use of sites such as Creative Commons as well as other sites devoted to the open access of scholarly materials. It is possible that the open source movement will become widespread enough to attract the attention of other entities, who might then be willing to shoulder the burden (e.g. by offering hosting services, footing the bill etc.) for offering works at no cost. In addition, this may also be a way for grey literature to be more easily available. Very little of it is known, as it resides in areas beyond the reach of the digital library, such as in unpublished papers, lecture notes, and other items. Admittedly, finding a method by which plagiarism can be combated, while at the same time allowing for the free and open exchange of ideas, is quite difficult. The knowledge conservancy initiatives and open

66 Ibid.

source movements are a beginning, but until the laws governing both copyright and plagiarism are lessened to some extent, dealing with the problem of term paper mills through technological means and policy statements will continue to dominate the discourse on academic integrity.

Additional References

Bao, Jun-Peng, Jun-Yi Shen, Xiao-Dong Liu, Hai-Yan Liu, and Xiao-Di Zhang. "Finding Plagiarism Based on Common Semantic Sequence Model." *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Vol. 312 (2004), pp. 640-645. Accessed via SpringerLink http://www.springerlink.com.

-----"Semantic Sequence Kin: A Method of Document Copy Detection." *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Vol. 3056 (20040, pp. 529-538. Accessed via SpringerLink.

Creative Commons. http://creativecommons.org/.

Ercegovac, Zorana and John V. Richardson, Jr. "Academic Dishonesty, Plagiarism Included, in the Digital Age: A Literature Review." *College and Research Libraries*. Vol. 65, no. 4 (July 2004), pp. 301-318.

EVE2. http://www.canexus.com/eve/abouteve.shtml

Foster, Andrea L. "Plagiarism-Detection Tool Creates Legal Quandary." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, May 17, 2002. http://chronicle.com/free/v48/i36/36a03701.htm

Green, Stuart P. "Plagiarism, Norms, and the Limits of Theft Law: Some Observations on the Use of Criminal Sanctions in Enforcing Intellectual Property Rights." *Hastings Law Journal*. Vol. 54, no. 1 (2002), pp. 167-242. http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=315562.

Groark, Marie, Diana Oblinger, and Miranda Choa. "Term Paper Mills, Anti-Plagiarism Tools, and Academic Intergrity." EDUCAUSE. http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ERM0153.pdf.

Hunt, Russ. "In Praise of Plagiarism." Presented Dec. 7, 2001, revised May/Nov. 2002. http://www.stu.ca/%7Ehunt/plagiary.htm.

Lessig, Lawrence. *Free Culture: How Big Media Uses Technology and the Law To Lock Down Culture and Control Creativity*. New York: The Penguin Press, 2004.

Martin, Brian. "Plagiarism: a Misplaced Emphasis." *Journal of Information Ethics*. Vol. 3, no. 2 (Fall 1994), pp. 36-47. http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/94jie.html.

Medori, Julia, Eric Atwell, Paul Gent, and Clive Souter. "Customising a Copying-Identifier for Biomedical Science Student Reports: Comparing Simple and Smart Analyses." *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Vol. 2464 (2002), pp. 228-233. Accessed via SpringerLink.

Monostori, Krisztian, Raphael Finkel, Arkady Zaslavsky, Gabor Hodasz, and Mate Pataki. "Comparison of Overlap Detection Techniques." *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Vol. 2329 (2002), pp. 51-60. Accessed via SpringerLink.

Schulman, Miriam. "I Have a Question." Santa Clara Magazine, Fall 2004. http://www.scu.edu/scm/fall2004/research.cfm.

Sims, Randi L. "The Effectiveness of a Plagiarism Prevention Policy: A Longitudinal Study of Student Views." *Teaching Business Ethics*. Vol. 6, no.4 (Nov. 2002), pp. 477-482. Acessed via SpringerLink

Snapper, John. W. "On the Web, Plagiarism Matters More Than Copyright Piracy." *Ethics and Information Technology*. Vol. 1, no. 2 (1999), pp. 127-136. Accessed via SpringerLink.

Wilks, Yorick. "On the Ownership of Text." *Computers and the Humanities*. Vol. 0, no. 0 (2004), pp. 1-13 (**Note:** I received conflicting numbers for volume, number, and page count. The numbers here were taken directly from the paper.)

Young, Jeffrey R. "Anti-Plagiarism Experts Raise Questions About Services With Links to Sites Selling Papers." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 12, 2002. http://chronicle.com/free/2002/03/2002031201t.htm.