Engaging with the Question of Plagiarism from the Perspective of Confucian Heritage Culture: A Challenge to the Internationalization of Western Universities

By

Xiaodong Yang

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Secondary Education

University of Alberta

Abstract

With the globalization and internationalization of higher education, an increasing number of international students choose to come to Canada to pursue their education. Coming from different social, cultural and educational backgrounds, these international students encounter in Canadian academia numerous challenges in that they bring with them unlike or even conflicting views on literacy, writing, knowledge, learning, and communication. Dwelling in between their home culture and Canadian culture, and bearing different values and ethics, these students are confronted with risks of infringing on academy integrity and committing plagiarism, caused by the difficulty in understanding the meaning of plagiarism.

This study explores the meaning of plagiarism for international students with a Confucian Heritage Cultural (CHC) background by investigating and understanding their experiences through in-depth and authentic conversations with two CHC students, who were charged with committing plagiarism on a Canadian university campus. Hermeneutics is utilized as the methodology and method in this study because: (a) it has an interpretive nature that supports personal narratives and explores into students' lived experiences; (b) it encourages students to approach the meaning of plagiarism through understanding the concept interpretatively; and (c) it guides the writing of this study via situating the meaning of plagiarism in a historical and contextual context. Hermeneutics lends powerful tools and essential insights into the exploration of the highly sensitive and complex issue of plagiarism.

Examining two CHC students' lived experience of plagiarism, the study presents Confucian Heritage Cultural impact on students' identity and learning, the psychological and social dynamics of CHC students' negotiation in understanding plagiarism, and the complexity of dwelling and thriving in a cross-cultural space. A hermeneutic interpretation of the conversations discloses how the precepts of Confucian Heritage Culture impact students' understanding of plagiarism in four dimensions, namely, identity, morality, ownership, knowledge and learning. New discourses for enhancing cross-cultural understandings in these four dimensions are discussed and new perspectives in understanding and addressing plagiarism issue through a cultural lens is suggested.

Preface

This thesis is an original work by Xiaodong Yang. The research project, of which this thesis is a part, received research ethics approval from the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board, Project name "*The Cultural Meaning of Plagiarism*", No. Pro00009603, November 8, 2010.

Dedication

To my parents

To all students and scholars with Confucian Heritage Cultural background who study in Western Academia and struggle with plagiarism.

Acknowledgements

The following dissertation, a reflective and interpretive journey in understanding the meaning of plagiarism, would not be possible without the support and help from many people. Their inspiration, guidance, support, love and encouragement over the course of this research benefit me enormously. I would like to express my deepest gratitude to

Dr. William Dunn, my co-supervisor, for his consistent guidance and support. He encouraged me to continue and finish my pursuit of this study. He has been an excellent mentor during the program and provided me with invaluable suggestions, coaching, and mentoring for the completion of this study.

Dr. George Buck, my co-supervisor, for offering me guidance and insights in the research topic and methodology. I thank him wholeheartedly for his patience, suggestions, and insightful comments on this project.

Dr. Tom Dust, my supervisory committee member, for his critical comments and thorough review for this study and my writing, as well as his support in helping me to finish the dissertation on time.

Dr. Lucie Moussu, my external examiner, for her insightful questions.

Dr. Colleen Kawalilak, my external examiner, for providing thoughtful perspectives in the cultural aspect.

Dr. Terry Carson, for leading me to the research question and the project, and for his challenging questions and comments to improve the research.

Mrs. Carol Arnold-Schutta, for all her encouragement, mentorship and support.

Mr. Robert Gopaul, for his friendship, support, encouragement and advice along my journey.

My research participants, for being so willingly and openly engaged in the sensitive conversations and sharing their difficulties, struggles, challenges and understandings with me.

Staff in the Department of Secondary Education, for their continuous support.

My parents, for believing in me and encouraging me to fulfill this pursuit.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 The Question of Plagiarism

"*Culture is not an exotic notion studied by a select group of anthropologists in the South Seas. It is a mold in which we are all cast, and it controls our daily lives in many unsuspected ways…[C]ulture hides much more than it reveals, and strangely enough what it hides, it hides most effectively from its own participants*."

— Edward T. Hall

"*Plagiarism continues to draw the attention of scholars and educators in part because the problem, while often dismissed as a simple matter of textual misuse, betrays a range of complexities not easily managed via simple, straightforward solutions*."

— Bill Marsh

This study explores the meaning of plagiarism for international students who live and study in Canadian universities from a Confucian Heritage Culture (CHC) perspective. These students might be said to live a life of translating the meaning of plagiarism as defined in Western academic culture from a Confucian cultural perspective, and handling Western academic tasks in the form of Confucian norms. Dwelling in between the two cultures and deciphering the meaning of plagiarism through Confucian heritage culture could cause these international students the problem of infringing on universities' rules of academic integrity and committing plagiarism.

Plagiarism is often defined in Western universities as the inappropriate use/presentation of others' work as one's own. It is regarded as academic dishonesty and

represents a serious moral offence in academia. If students are caught committing plagiarism, the consequences could include a grade of zero for an examination, failure in a course, and even expulsion from the school/university. If professors or researchers are caught committing plagiarism, their positions could be suspended or terminated, with loss and/or damage to their credibility, integrity, and professional esteem.

Because of plagiarism's serious consequences to offenders, its negative impact on the university's reputation, and its result in the erosion of ethics in academia, the issue of plagiarism has been investigated in many research studies, among which how and why international students struggle with understanding plagiarism has become a hotly debated topic (Howard, 1999, 2000; Pennycook, 1996; Scollon, 1995, 2000, 2004). Many scholars indicate that the causes of plagiarism for international students are related to different or even conflicting views on learning, writing, literacy, and copyright, etc. As Chandrasoma, Thompson, and Pennycook (2004) state, plagiarism is not only an academic phenomenon, it is also a cultural construct. Within different cultures, plagiarism may be interpreted much differently because social and cultural values shape people's identities, power relationships, and discourse in a way that impacts the definition of plagiarism. Plagiarism is a complex issue in that it concerns legal aspects of copyright and intellectual property, moral aspects of cheating, and other aspects of literacy appropriation, language learning, and knowledge creation. Misunderstandings of any aspect noted above could result in plagiarism. Because the notion of plagiarism was developed in a Western economic, social, and cultural context, international students and scholars who are from non-Western cultures and hold different literacy rules or cultural

values could have a different understanding of intellectual property, knowledge, and literacy propriety. They may also have different norms surrounding their academic practice, which leaves space for plagiarism — as it is defined by Western academia — to occur. The different and/or conflicting worldviews open a door for conversation and invite scholars to investigate the issue of plagiarism for international students. This study, therefore, explores the conditions under which plagiarism may occur for international students who may not understand exactly what it means, and who may not consciously commit it because the foundations of the notion of plagiarism are beyond their frame of reference.

This study attempts to explore CHC students' difficulties in understanding plagiarism through examining their frame of reference that is housed in the perception of their identity. Identity is formed within a specific context and culture, and it is a fluid concept. Though the following statement could be criticized for presenting a simplified dichotomy, it can be readily recognized that identity formation is influenced by individualism in Western cultures, whereas in CHC, culture norms determine identity in a collective manner. Individualism shapes identity differently from collectivism, especially in terms of personal boundaries and property rights. The research will explore in depth these differences and the results of the perception that CHC students have of plagiarism, and it will offer new lenses to understand the phenomenon of plagiarism in internationalized universities in a Western setting from a cultural perspective. This is not to refute that perceptions of plagiarism formed from specific cultural sources should be subject to change or reassessment, or that adapting concept of plagiarism should be held

to ransom by new cultural values imported into the new context. It is suggested that there may be processes of (re-) acculturation into new contexts with different rules of conduct, and thus the research is geared toward finding new understandings from the fusion of different horizons between the cultural norms of Western academia and those of students from a CHC background.

Autobiographical Reflection

First encounter — a plagiarism story in China. The first time that I encountered plagiarism was through an upsetting experience in a mid-term exam from my undergraduate studies over 10 years ago. Our English literature teacher, who was from the United States (U.S.), asked us to write a reflection paper on one of Shakespeare's works that we had read in class. It was not a difficult task because we were not unfamiliar with Shakespeare. In fact, we had read many of his plays in middle school and high school even before taking the course. The difference was that in middle and high school, we had read them in Chinese. We all submitted our papers on time. However, our American teacher came to the following class with an astounding result: 42 out of 45 students in the class had failed the exam, and she was furious. She criticized the entire class sharply and fiercely with words like "cheating" and "plagiarism," but nobody in the class had a clue what this meant or why she was so angry. When our papers were returned to us, our American teacher explained that 42 students had copied from the textbook without citation. She claimed that we had copied the book deliberately, and said that this was cheating.

The whole class was shocked. We felt that we were innocent and had been

unfairly treated by being charged with plagiarism when we did not know what plagiarism was. Nobody, including our American teacher, had ever taught us how to write an academic paper or how to quote. I felt very strongly that I had been unjustly treated and appealed the result. In my case, I was charged with plagiarism because of one sentence I had written: “Shakespeare is one of the most famous writers in the world.” The teacher reported that I had written it verbatim from our textbook. I still remember my appeal clearly that “I had not copied at all.” First, I had read the textbook two days before I wrote the article. When I wrote my paper, I did not have the textbook at hand. Second, although this sentence did appear in the textbook, it was also a very common expression in Chinese. We used it extensively on many occasions. I suspected that the editor had actually translated this sentence from Chinese. Even if I had not read this text, I would have written it the same way. From my perspective, I had only translated my own thoughts in my assignment. Third, our American teacher had not explained to us how to write and how to quote before giving us this assignment. Fourthly, this sentence was not even central to my paper. The assignment read perfectly well without it. If I had known it was plagiarism to use this sentence, there would be no reason for me to keep it in my assignment and risk a grade of zero. My classmates all had similar explanations for the instructor.

A strong tension between the American teacher and the class of Chinese “plagiarists” lasted for two weeks because of mutual incomprehension. The class was complaining that our American teacher had not explained how to write the assignment, but nevertheless charged us with something that we had not known about. Some students

quoted the instructions of the assignment attempting to prove that nothing about plagiarism was mentioned in the requirements. In the meantime, the American teacher continued to accuse the class of plagiarizing, and of having a bad attitude by finding excuses and not being willing to admit dishonest conduct. The American teacher believed that as university students, we should have had a clear understanding of plagiarism and that it was our responsibility to write the assignment in a proper manner under the code of academic integrity.

Clearly, there was a gap between our mutual expectations and our understandings of plagiarism. Not only did the tension reside in different understandings of whether the charge of plagiarism was fair or not, but also in the solution of how to deal with plagiarism. It was a difficult time for both the teacher and the students, and in subsequent discussions the questions around plagiarism and writing were discussed frequently. Finally, the discussion was focused on whether we should get a chance to rectify our mistakes. The class felt strongly that we should at least have the opportunity to redo the assignment, because we did not understand the concept of plagiarism and because our American teacher had not explained it to us when she originally gave us the assignment. The Chinese students experienced an invisible concept crisis from "totally unfamiliar with the concept of plagiarism" to "forming a competing understanding" through their cultural lens, in which a single definition of plagiarism split into different ones. Our American teacher, on the other hand, held firmly to the conviction that plagiarism as a serious academic offence could not be forgiven and needed strict punishment. The American instructor and the Chinese students obviously did not share a common

understanding of why plagiarism happened and how to respond to it.

The incident ended with a peaceful agreement reached through the mediation from the coordinator of the foreign teachers at the university. The American teacher finally agreed to give us another chance to write the examination and we promised that we would not "plagiarize" again. Although we were not happy being labelled with the title of "plagiarists," it was good enough for us to rewrite the paper and get rid of the zero from our transcripts. We were grateful to the coordinator and thought he was our saviour. The coordinator was a gentleman from the U.S. in his 50s with many international experiences, who had taught English in China for nine years before he came to our university. He was familiar with Chinese culture and Chinese education. The coordinator mediated the conflict by explaining the incident as a cultural difference resulting from both sides having different understandings of plagiarism. On one hand, the American teacher believed that plagiarism was seen as a serious offence in higher education from both a moral and legal perspective; as such, she believed the act of plagiarism should be punished severely to protect academic integrity. On the other hand, the Chinese students' lack of familiarity with the concept of plagiarism made them ignorant of it. Even after the notion of plagiarism was explained by the American teacher, the Chinese students could not comprehend the gravity of plagiarism and insisted on the opportunity for correction. From a learning perspective, they believed that school was the place for students to learn, and making mistakes was acceptable in the cycle of the learning process. For Chinese students, their mistake was "not following the rules of writing, which were not explained to them," rather than "the unethical and illegal conduct of cheating." Eventually, both the

American teacher and we, the Chinese students, were convinced that cultural differences lay at the root of the misunderstanding of the issue of legality in the educational domain and morality in academic integrity. This experience of accused plagiarism left a deep mark on me, one that I did not want to experience again. Nonetheless, the shadow of plagiarism remained for me, and henceforth, I always felt nervous whenever I wrote in English.

Second encounter — a story of plagiarism in a Canadian high school. A friend immigrated to Canada with his 16-year-old daughter in October 2006. (I will call his daughter Jessica as a pseudonym.) After arriving in Canada, my friend sent Jessica to an urban high school to continue her studies in grade 10. Jessica's new life was interesting and challenging at the same time: a new city, new language, new school, and new friends. Jessica was most excited about her new school. Her class was much smaller in terms of the number of students compared to her class in China, her classmates were from various backgrounds, all courses were taught in English, and students had much fewer assignments. What impressed her most was that teachers appeared to teach with an open attitude and encouraged students to ask questions and explore their own interests. That was very different from her experience in China, where all high school students had to do the same academic work under the pressure of a standardized national entrance examination to universities.

In the first couple of months in her new school, everything seemed to go well for Jessica. She liked both Canada and her school. She felt that teachers were nice, classmates were friendly, and most courses, except for English, were easy. The difficulty

for Jessica occurred six months later in February 2007. The principal summoned Jessica to her office and informed her that she was in violation of school policy with regard to academic integrity. She would be given a zero score in her social science course because she had copied a paragraph directly from the Internet without using the proper citation. For Jessica, the most humiliating aspect of the incident was having to go through several offices to confess and explain her misconduct of plagiarism to the principal, the vice-principal, the instructor, and the guidance counsellor. Jessica felt that her life was completely ruined. With great empathy, I listened to her story, which mirrored my experience of many years ago.

The only difference between her story and mine was the result. In my case, I had a large number of companion plagiarizers and benefited from a mediator who understood the difference between the two cultures in terms of plagiarism. The mediator played a significant role in bridging the cultural gap between our understanding of plagiarism and that of our American teacher. In addition, our particular geographic location within China, Chinese cultural context, and the large number of students that made us the majority in comparison to our American teacher made it possible for our voices to be heard. Whereas we solved the problem with charges being withdrawn, nobody helped Jessica in her case and she had to accept being charged as a plagiarizer and failing the course with her voice ignored by the school.

It should be noted that Jessica knew nothing about plagiarism before this incident. She had done research on the Internet to find some resources in order to prepare for the assignment. Happening upon a paragraph that seemed to fit her topic perfectly, Jessica

copied the paragraph and integrated it into her assignment. She did not feel confident with writing in English. Jessica could not find a better way to express herself than with that paragraph. While this explanation was accepted by her school, her hidden belief was ignored that integrating the paragraph into her assignment was part of her learning. She also explained that the paragraph was not her whole assignment; it was only a small portion. The questions Jessica did not ask were about how she could learn English without memorization and mimicking others, and where the safe space was for English language learners to learn and make mistakes in order to master English.

Jessica's story and my own story are only two examples among many. Many international students from non-Western cultures might have had similar experiences with and similar confusion about plagiarism, which leads one to consider several questions. For example, to what extent is the student personally responsible for plagiarism? Should new technologies like the Internet be blamed for luring students into plagiarism? Is there some culturally-based reason why such students initially find it difficult to come to grips with understanding the concept of plagiarism? What roles do the different cultural norms and practices play in these cases? How can universities reconcile the two different conceptualizations in the context of education internationalization? If indeed it is primarily a question of individual fault, assigning blame or fault relegates the research to legal aspects of infringement, and thus closes off any deeper investigation into the phenomenon of plagiarism. As an international student who had the experience of being charged with plagiarism, I am interested in the question of whether there is some different perspective from which to understand the phenomenon of plagiarism as it applies to

international students from Confucian heritage culture. My research attempts to investigate these questions through recovering the lived difficulties of CHC students who are charged with plagiarism.

Locating the Research — The Complex Question of Plagiarism

Although the two aforementioned incidents are isolated from each other in terms of place and time, the key elements appearing in both stories are similar. Both cases were related to English academic writing and were the result of copying from other sources without proper referencing. The different understandings in both of these cases of plagiarism seemed to be a result of cultural differences. In both incidents, students were from China and represented a Confucian heritage culture, whereas all instructors were from North America and represented a Western Enlightenment culture. Both cases ended with certain forms of resolution in a practical sense, but the difficulties in understanding plagiarism and its consequences were not resolved for these students. My classmates and I continued to struggle with questions concerning how to write in a language that was totally borrowed from others and how to avoid plagiarizing others while speaking our own minds. Jessica could not understand why she was punished and received a grade of zero for the whole assignment while she had only copied one paragraph. The students involved were not persuaded fully as to the reasons why they were charged or the solution the instructor/school used to deal with the incidents. Jessica and my classmates in China had different understandings of how plagiarism should be treated than the instructors.

Would students in both cases have been charged with plagiarism if the instructors

were from a Confucian heritage culture? I attempt to identify some of the specific cultural differences, which apply to what is labeled as plagiarism in situations as Jessica and myself experienced. The question then is whether the whole concept including the application of rules and consequences as they pertain to plagiarism in a Western sense is (should be) a universally accepted and applied system. There seems, therefore, to be the need for an understanding both of the principles that underlie the concept of plagiarism and the cultural heritages that may conflict with this understanding in any internationalization program. These understandings may help to address the difficulties for some international students in understanding plagiarism by uncovering the reasons and conditions through which plagiarism may occur, and may also serve to shed light on a new perspective to understand the meaning of plagiarism in a cross-cultural context.

As the experiences described above suggest, CHC students were confused by the notion of plagiarism while their Western instructors did not seem able to understand their students' confusion and difficulty in understanding the notion of plagiarism. There were apparent gaps in both cases between CHC students and Western instructors in their comprehension of the concept. The conflicting understandings in these two incidents raise the question of how to bridge the gap of understanding plagiarism between students from a Confucian heritage culture and instructors from Western cultures. CHC students who live and are trained in Confucian heritage culture view plagiarism from their cultural lens of Confucianism, while Western instructors who live and are trained in Western cultures view plagiarism from the lens of Western cultures. In other words, the meaning of plagiarism is interpreted from two different perspectives. It is reasonable to assume

that the different meanings of plagiarism result from different cultural sources.

The questions presented then are what the cultural sources are that cause the difficulties for CHC students in understanding plagiarism as it is interpreted by Western universities and schools, and how do these struggles or difficulties prevent CHC students from understanding plagiarism in the same way that their Western instructors do. These questions have challenged me and ultimately became the reason why I chose to carry out a study to explore the issue of plagiarism for students like Jessica and myself who are from a Confucian heritage culture and who study in a Western cultural context. This study seeks to explore the meaning of plagiarism from a cultural perspective in an attempt to compare the cultural meanings of plagiarism between a Confucian perspective and a Western perspective. Through this study, I intend to understand how CHC students comprehend the notion of plagiarism in the Canadian academic context. I also endeavour to examine the cultural sources that influence the understandings of plagiarism of CHC students.

O'Dwyer (2017) questions the impact of Confucian Heritage Culture on Asian students' learning in intercultural and English language education. He argues that political views, socio-economical status, and major historical events play a more important role in forming Asian students' values and shaping their learning practices. Whereas I agree with O'Dwyer regarding the importance of historical, political and social factors, I believe that his argument fails to identify the evolving and fluid essence of culture (the political, socio-economic and historical elements are changing the culture and simultaneously part of the culture), ignores the widespread similar values, expectations,

thinking/writing patterns and learning habits among Asian students over the course of history, and exaggerates staged features caused by political and socio-economical events in a short term. Bearing in mind the changing and stable nature of culture, I am convinced of the value of Confucian Heritage Culture in this study and take a different approach compared to O'Dwyer.

This study focuses on Confucian heritage culture students for three reasons. First of all, as a former "plagiarist" who was trapped in the gap between Confucian and Western cultures, I have a strong empathy towards international students studying in Western countries. I also have a deep understanding of Confucian heritage culture. My past experience and my empathy for international students from Confucian heritage culture are the sources of my passion and drive me towards understanding the meaning of plagiarism. Secondly, more and more CHC students are coming to Canada to pursue their education. Statistics show that there were over 130,000 international students in Canada in 2013-2014 and over 60% of these students were from Asia (Statistics Canada, 2016). China is the top source country of international students: Chinese students account for 40% of international students at the Bachelor's level, 25.5% at the Master's level, and 16.4% at the Doctoral level. There is a need to help CHC students to understand the meaning of plagiarism because many of them are confronted with the risk of plagiarizing. In this era of widespread globalization, world citizenship becomes a popular pursuit in the education domain. The study of CHC students contributes to the world citizenship by opening the possibility of an alternative ethical code. This alternative moral code encourages open and authentic conversation, appreciates different perspectives, and

allows shared values in a diversified environment. In cross-cultural environments, internationalized universities are now confronted with challenges from the presence of international students who approach the question of plagiarism from different cultural perspectives. Focusing on plagiarism from the perspective of the case studies of two CHC students, I explore alternative meanings of plagiarism.

Significance of the Study for Internationalized Canadian Universities

In the past 20 years, there has been an increasing emphasis on internationalization in post-secondary education in general, and in universities in particular. "The international activities of universities [have] dramatically expanded in volume, scope, and complexity" (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 290). With the development of internationalization of higher education, especially the commercialization of higher education and cross-border movement of students and programs (Altbach & Knight), more and more international students come from developing countries to countries considered "more developed." Canada is among the developed countries hosting a large number of international students, and the internationalization of Canada's higher education is growing at a rapid pace. The number of international students studying in Canada has increased from 66,000 in the 2004-2005 academic year to 124,000 in the 2013-2014 academic year (Statistics Canada, 2016), which represents almost an 88% increase. In the province of Alberta, the percentage of international students increased from 6% in the 2004-2005 academic year to 9.7% in 2013-2014 academic year (Statistics Canada). All major post-secondary institutions in Alberta have large international student populations. These institutions are endeavoring to build their campuses as thriving

international communities. The University of Alberta, for example, launched a global citizenship education program in order to internationalize its undergraduate curricula.

There is a realization, however, of the complexities associated with programs of internationalization. In the University of Alberta's *Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Educational Framework*, Karimi and Anley (2016) indicate that "the University of Alberta's new *Institutional Strategic Plan* (ISP) signals a strong determination to 'build a diverse, inclusive community of exceptional students, faculty, and staff' while valuing 'diversity, inclusivity, and equity across and among our people, campuses, and disciplines'" (p. 1). This framework based on the importance of diversity and inclusivity inspires me to conduct this study exploring the issue of plagiarism, from the perspective of the different ethics and ways of doing things among different people.

Plagiarism has become a cultural issue in Canadian campuses because international students from different cultural backgrounds other than Western cultures have difficulties in understanding plagiarism. In their research, Babaii and Nejadghanbar (2016) identified in an Iranian university that unfamiliarity with the concept is one of the major causes of plagiarism. Similarly, Chien (2017) found students in the study believed plagiarism was not just an English literacy issue, but also a cultural issue. What Jessica and I experienced shows students from Confucian heritage culture backgrounds have different understandings of plagiarism from those held by Canadian educational institutions. Lacking sufficient social, cultural, and academic knowledge, having an English language deficiency, as well as having different understandings about the learning process all serve to militate against comprehending plagiarism from a Western perspective.

Misunderstanding does not release CHC students from serious punishment. Confronted with plagiarism cases that relate to international students, Canadian universities and other educational institutions have a tendency to view plagiarism as a problem corrupting academia. Some scholars are frustrated with international students' "persistence for plagiarism" (Park, 2003). Many CHC students who have no intention to plagiarize and do not understand plagiarism comprehend the nature and seriousness of plagiarism only after they are caught. One might argue that in relation to plagiarism, CHC students become the "lost subjects" in the Western academy. For Confucian heritage culture students, the concept of plagiarism appears like a goalkeeper standing in their way to success in Western academia (Park).

Academic expectation from Canadian universities. Influenced by liberalism and individualism, Western academia holds strongly to Western Enlightenment understandings of learning, teaching, and pedagogical relationship (Kim & Lee, 1994) and conducts academic practices towards this belief that emphasizes authenticity and originality. For example, the University of Alberta is following the lead of Clemson University and promoting a "Truth in Education" (TIE) project, which aims to protect academic integrity and emphasizes five core values of "Honesty, Trust, Fairness, Respect, and Responsibility." In the University of Alberta's A Guide To Academic Integrity For Graduate Students, it is stated that, "the basic assumption is that everything you submitted for credit has been created entirely by you" (Eerkes, 2012, p. 4). Thus, the process of learning is viewed as a process of knowledge creation through questioning and challenging authorities. Comparatively, memorization and imitation are not celebrated learning strategies and represent surface learning, which is not recommended. Consequently, knowledge as the product of a private learning process can be owned and priced in the market. Writing, as one type of learning product, requires originality that is often presented as a personal voice, and any imitation of the work of others is frowned upon. In practice the University of Alberta, like many other Canadian universities, devotes great efforts to combating plagiarism. It publishes various publications for instructors and students to analyze that explain the reasons for plagiarism and approaches to detecting and preventing plagiarism. These resources can be found through the University of Alberta's library, TIE website, the Office of Student Judicial Affairs website, and International Centre website. Chinese students arriving at a Canadian

university enter a vastly different academic landscape and encounter different academic expectations. Not only are some of these Canadian academic expectations strange to CHC students, but some of them also conflict with CHC students' Confucian identity.

Confucian cultural values. Students from CHC backgrounds bring with them sets of rules and values that are shaped within a collectivist Confucianism that emphasizes the importance of virtue (or "德,") De and a natural order of things (or "道," Tao) (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2006). As Guo (2009) argues, "Confucian teachings…. form the foundation of much subsequent Chinese thinking on education and social conduct, including the importance of moral concepts in Education, [concerning] how an individual should live and interact with others" (pp. 4-5). The stress on virtue and natural order was translated into rules on how to live and interact with others in society (Guo, 2002). These rules prescribe people's social practices: to be benevolent to others, to be loyal to family and group, to be obedient to seniors and traditional authority, and to be righteous to strangers. These rules are called "礼" Li (ritual) (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy) and can be realized through self-restraint. Subjecting oneself to "礼" Li (ritual) can help one achieve "德" De (virtue).

Core Confucian values are defined by different relationships: between self and other, self and group, and self and society. Individuals from Confucian culture pursue "仁" Ren (benevolence) through suppressing themselves and sacrificing their individual interests to protect social harmony and follow the natural order. Confucianism accentuates collectivism and holds the belief that individuals are part of the group and should be for the group. Individual identity is defined and only exists on the basis of

group existence. Guo (2002) notes that "[Chinese] ethics (伦理, Lunli) mean moral principles governing human relationship, since Lun means two, even or in pairs, and Li, principles, i.e., always attaching more importance to others" (p. 55). This Confucian value of "attaching more importance to others" defines for CHC students their relationship with others, which suggests to them to always be prepared to sacrifice their own interests for others (especially seniors or authorities) or for the group's interest. Confucian teachings have a significant influence on defining CHC students' philosophies and practices of teaching, learning, pedagogical relationship, and learning strategies (Guo, 2009). These teachings emphasize the significance of long and lasting efforts of study and tend to downplay the idea of natural understanding or inborn ability (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2006). Confucianism holds firmly to the principle that every individual has the same potential and that ability can be developed through long and effortful study. Study is often referred to as the process of self-development by reflecting on and imitating the master. Hence, the best learning strategies for Confucians are memorization and imitation. For CHC students, it is a recommended practice to mimic a master's work. Even Confucius himself claimed that he was a knowledge transmitter rather than creator.

Featuring "examination-orientedness" and the "content-based nature of teaching and learning" (Guo, 2009, p. 5), the Confucian educational system also plays an important role influencing CHC students' teaching and learning practices. Content-based teaching and learning enhances the learning and teaching techniques of memorization and drill practice. Confucius in his time was famous for opening education to anyone

regardless of one's background or social class. Knowledge, from a Confucian perspective, is something that should be shared with the public. The teacher is called Lao Shi "老师" (old master), who is distinguished as having an exceptional amount of knowledge representing traditional authority (Watkins & Biggs, 2001). Teachers' responsibilities include teaching knowledge, moral mentoring, acting as role models, and caring about students. In contrast, students' obligations are to always respect their teachers, obey their orders, and be loyal to their teachers. An ancient Chinese saying is, "Once a master, forever a father." The relationship between a teacher and a student is a hierarchical one that lasts for life and extends outside the classroom.

Lost in dwelling between the two cultures. Without understanding social and cultural norms in Western universities, although equipped with Confucian learning strategies and philosophy and trained by a traditional Confucian educational system, CHC students readily become lost subjects in Western academia because their academic values and practices conflict with those of their host institutions. They are lost in the disjunction between originality and imitation, and in distinguishing between private and public knowledge; they are lost in between being Confucian decedents and Canadian university students, and in making sense of a new and strange cultural and academic environment. It is not easy for CHC students to thrive as lost subjects in Western academia. Living in a foreign culture, CHC students face an impossible mission to unlearn their previous knowledge in order to re-learn new knowledge; in the process of trying, they experience processes of transformation through which they lose part of their original identities and must negotiate new ones.

Plagiarism is one major difficulty confronting CHC students. CHC students (and also other international students) often have difficulties in understanding plagiarism as it is defined by Western cultures. From the Canadian institutional perspective, the notion of plagiarism helps students learn how to write in English because it defines "correct" and "wrong" ways of writing in English. The principles of plagiarism also help to define the morality and legality of academic conduct pertaining to the use of others' texts or ideas. However, it may adversely affect CHC students' writing in English by confusing those who do not have the necessary knowledge and experience to understand the concept of plagiarism. For example, CHC students may feel that it is impossible to write in English when they are told to quote language borrowed from others, because they perceive that all the language they use is actually borrowed from others. The concept of ownership, as the core concept supporting the notion of plagiarism, is coined in an individualistic and capitalist society. This could be the reason why the concept is readily accepted in the Western world that is made up by individualistic and capitalistic societies, but difficult to understand for CHC students who come from a Confucian collectivist culture. As Chandrasoma, Thompson, and Pennycook (2004) argue, the notion of plagiarism "obfuscates" the situation of writing in English more than it clarifies the experience of international students.

Plagiarism is a complex cultural issue that is embedded in additional language learning, shaped by culture, reflected by writing, and that mirrors ethics. The process of writing is a process of identity construction. For instance, students' cultural backgrounds can significantly affect their understanding of text and literacy appropriation (Yamada,

2003). In Western cultures where originality is emphasized, one is encouraged to express one's personal voice when writing. However, in Confucian culture where respect for authority is stressed, it is more appropriate to use a third person voice to express one's opinion. Moreover, plagiarism has a broad meaning closely connected with authorship, copyright, and property ownership, which masks issues of identity, power relations, knowledge understanding, and discourse (Pennycook, 1996). Authorship, copyright, and ownership all reference the independence and autonomy of a person, his/her position in society, and his/her relationship to others. In some occasions in CHC counties, it is acceptable to use common knowledge/authority without noting the resource because of the respect for authority and in accordance with the social tradition. Western and Eastern cultures might collide on the definition and extent of "common knowledge." One's position in society and relationship with others are determined by identity and power relations within society. The definitions of identity, knowledge, discourse, and power relations are derived from cultural values in a specific tradition (Sowden, 2005). In an individualist culture, one's identity is comparably independent and one's position in society is comparably mobile, while in collectivist culture, one's identity is more dependent on the community and one's position is more fixed within the social hierarchy.

While they help to analyze and explain differences among cultures and values, these concepts (identity, West, East, individualism, collectivism) are not unquestionable themselves. Some post-colonialists (Bhabha, 1994; Said, 1978) have questioned the notions of East and West, which undoubtedly are slippery signifiers because the dichotomy of East and West itself is a Western way of thinking; furthermore, this

dichotomy as a legacy of colonialism originally denotes the superiority of West and the inferiority of East. Recognizing the problem of the terms (East and West) helps educators to go beyond a Western method and listen to the voices of those from other cultures through paying attention to the different tendencies among cultures. Is there a more effective educational pedagogy to help international students understand plagiarism? Could educators make use of students' cultures and traditions when explaining plagiarism? As Sowden (2005) suggests, is it an appropriate time for educators to reconsider the concept of plagiarism?

Purposes and Objectives of the Study

When addressing the issue of plagiarism, it is very tempting to simply condemn this practice as an illegal and immoral activity rather than to inquire more deeply into understanding what constitutes plagiarism. Many instances of plagiarism, in fact, can be attributed to unintentional misconduct in writing and communication caused by cultural differences concerning knowledge, learning, ownership, and social values. Through analyzing my personal experience and Jessica's experience, I am convinced that CHC students because of Confucian cultural backgrounds are confronted with difficulties in understanding the meaning of plagiarism. With more and more CHC students studying in North American institutions, there will be more encounters of differences between Confucian culture and Western cultures in that CHC students are trained with rules, regulations, and norms that are different from those of Western cultures. The encounters of cultural differences may cause confusion and difficulty for CHC students to function properly in Canadian academia. The potential problems they have are not only the

difficulties in understanding the meaning of plagiarism, but also challenges in articulating their difficulties in understanding the meaning of plagiarism.

The purpose of this investigation is to examine how the notion of plagiarism is comprehended from the cultural perspectives of students from Confucian heritage culture compared to the conventional definition adopted by Canadian universities. The goal of this study is to explore the cultural meaning of plagiarism by helping CHC students to articulate their lived difficulties and crises in comprehending learning, knowledge, ownership, and social values between Confucian culture and Western academia. It is my hope that this study will enhance our understanding of plagiarism from a cross-cultural perspective. Plagiarism in the global age is not just a personal issue, but also an institutional and cultural issue for the internationalized university. Hopefully, this study will provide a theoretical basis to help resolve the misunderstanding between CHC students and Western academia around the issue of plagiarism. Therefore, it could provide a space for both universities and CHC students to negotiate a better way of protecting academic integrity by preventing plagiarism rather than by focusing on punishment.

With internationalization, there is an increasing realization that historically and culturally the concept of plagiarism is a contemporary Western notion. It is my hope that the examination of CHC students' lived experiences of plagiarism and the exploration of the meaning of plagiarism from CHC students' eyes will help educators to understand in a profound way the complexity of the meaning of plagiarism, and be aware of the nuances when handling it rather than treating plagiarism cases from only an ethical and

legal perspective. As Walden and Peacock (2006) note: “It is better to address and respond to the cause of plagiarism and so avoid it, rather than to place the emphasis on its detection and punishment” (p. 201).

I recruited two graduate students with CHC backgrounds who had experienced plagiarism on Canadian campuses, and their cases make up the present study. There are three objectives in this case study of two CHC students’ experiences. Firstly, I seek to problematize the notion of plagiarism in the process of conversing and interpreting the conversation with the two participants by surfacing the cultural differences between Confucian culture and Western cultures in order to explore the nature of cultural misunderstanding that lies beneath the issue of plagiarism. Here I want to investigate more deeply what constitutes plagiarism in the eyes of the university, what CHC students understand plagiarism to be, and their misunderstandings of the concept. Secondly, I attempt to explore the cultural origins of these conflicting notions of plagiarism, through examining the historical roots of ownership, authorship, and intellectual property. I investigate how the Confucian cultural meanings of ownership, authorship, and intellectual property impact CHC students’ experiences of language learning and knowledge creation, and how the cultural and historical origins of plagiarism define academic practices in the Western university. Thirdly, I endeavor to explore the role the experience of plagiarism plays in relation to the process of the CHC students’ identity negotiation in Canadian academia, and how this ongoing negotiation of identity relates to their understanding of plagiarism.

Summary of Chapters

The following summary outlines the structure of the present study and illustrates how the following chapters are inter-related and contribute to the development of the study, which is an ongoing and personal experience of interpreting and reinterpreting the meaning of plagiarism.

Chapter 1 introduces the origin of my interest in plagiarism stemming from my own and others' experiences. It sketches the causes and impact of plagiarism on international students from a CHC background within the internationalization process in Western universities. A survey of relevant literature outlining the complexity and difficulty in understanding the concept of plagiarism and in defining it are undertaken in Chapters 2 and 3, together with differing and possibly conflicting approaches to the main conceptual foundations of plagiarism.

Chapter 4 describes and defends hermeneutics as the methodology and the mode of inquiry of the study focusing on the understanding and interpretation of the research participants' experiences from critical reflection. Drawing on Gadamer's (1975) notion of conversation and Jardine's (1988) notion of fecundity of lived experience, I explore hermeneutic conversation as the inquiry mode to unpack participants' lived experiences and difficulties and as a process of interpretation that connects their identities, experiences and contexts, and makes the participants the others. The meaning of plagiarism is created in the conversation process of expressing self and understanding others.

Chapters 5 and 6 explore the various themes emerging from the experiences of

two research participants accused of plagiarism, and highlight the differences in the understanding and approach to the act of plagiarizing. Chapter 7 identifies and analyzes certain precepts which apply to students of a CHC background and explains the possible cultural sources which guide these students' interpretations of their actions as they apply to plagiarism. Chapter 8 explores and compares the differences of views on plagiarism between Confucian culture and Canadian universities through the perspectives of ownership, learning, knowledge, morality, and identity, which reveals the cultural gap in understanding the phenomenon of plagiarism and points to the moral and pedagogical reason to combat it. The cultural gap concealed behind the understandings of plagiarism contains the tension of balancing the philosophical relationships between self and others and between future and history. Chapters 9 and 10 summarize the findings and recommendations of the study suggesting adjusted stances and academic rethinking on how plagiarism is viewed, and urge further and ongoing hermeneutic investigation.

Research Questions

The key question leading this study will be what cultural understandings are implicated in the notion of plagiarism. I used the following questions to guide the study to pursue the cultural meaning of plagiarism with an emphasis on different understandings of knowledge, learning, ownership, and intellectual property:

1) What have the participants' experiences of plagiarism been? What might be the reasons that caused plagiarism to happen?

2) How do the two participants understand plagiarism differently than how it is defined by Canadian universities, from the perspectives of knowledge, learning,

ownership, and intellectual property?

3) Why do the two participants have difficulties in understanding plagiarism as it is interpreted by Canadian universities? What might be the reasons that cause these difficulties?

- What were the understandings of knowledge and learning from the perspective of participants? Where did these understandings of knowledge and learning come from? How did these understandings of knowledge and learning help or not help with understanding plagiarism?
- What were the understandings of ownership and intellectual property from the perspective of participants' eyes? Where did the understanding of ownership and intellectual property come from? How did these understandings of ownership and intellectual property help or not help with understanding plagiarism?

4) How do the two participants negotiate the meaning of plagiarism confronted with the cultural differences in understandings of knowledge, learning, ownership, and intellectual property between Confucian heritage culture and Western cultures?

5) How does the experience of plagiarism help the two participants to understand plagiarism, cultural others (which in this case are Canadian universities), and themselves?

Chapter 2 The Complex Landscape of Plagiarism

"...it (the problem of plagiarism) has continued to draw considerable interest over the years in part because it continues to serve a larger debate about literacy convention, social and technological progress, cultural difference, and human creativity, identity, and morality."

— Bill Marsh

"The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways. The point, however, is to change it."

— Karl Marx (Thesis 11)

A Snapshot of Plagiarism in North American Higher Education

Although most educational institutions are making a great effort to apply regulations combatting plagiarism, research shows that plagiarism still happens among a high percentage of students in higher education. Willen's (2004) study shows that 38% of students surveyed admitted to "cut and paste" plagiarism and 40% confessed to plagiarism from written sources. Hughes and McCabe (2006) researched 11 Canadian universities and found that 73% of students reported at least one instance in which they were involved in plagiarism. Bartzis and Hayner (2007) note that over 75% of students in U.S. universities admit to some cheating (including academic misconduct in exams and plagiarism). Kier (2014) examined the ability of students to identify plagiarized passages and plagiarizing behaviours in an online university in Canada and concluded that students

in general lack the ability to recognize plagiarism. If those students were aware of the concept of plagiarism, this study seems to indicate that identifying plagiarism requires more skill and knowledge than only awareness can provide. Heckler and Forde (2015) found that 84% of the participants in their study believed that plagiarism was rampant on campus. Research shows that plagiarism is not only occurring in spite of stricter regulation, but has a tendency to increase rather than decrease. The rising number of plagiarism cases in universities and colleges is reported in different research projects. Twenty-two years ago, McCabe and Trevino's (1996) study (of 6,000 students across 31 campuses) showed that compared to Bowers' (1964) survey of 5,000 students across 99 campuses, the cases of copying had doubled, assisting another student in cheating increased by 14%, and illegal collaboration increased by 11%. More recently, Bartzis and Hayner's (2007) study reported that Internet plagiarism increased from 10% in 1999 to 41% in 2001 and cheating increased from 11% in 1963 to 49% in 1993, according to students' self-reports. There have been researchers (Curtis & Vardanega, 2016) who obtained the opposite result in a time-lag designed study, where they compared data collected three times from a group of same-aged students from the same university over a period of 10 years. But the research had apparent limitations. There were three major events related to anti-plagiarism that happened over the10 years that could have affected their results: (a) the implementation of an online plagiarism detection system, (b) the introduction of a new standard and criteria of assessment mechanism, and (c) major

changes in curriculum. In general, the majority of the research on the subject indicates an increasing number of plagiarism incidents.

The numbers in the reports mentioned above reveal the severe situation with which universities are confronted. Some may argue that the increasing number of plagiarism cases may be connected to increasing awareness among faculty and students of the issue. Therefore, more plagiarizing cases were reported in comparison to earlier times when the awareness of plagiarism was not as high and some plagiarizing cases may not have been reported. It is questionable why the increasing awareness would not have helped reduce the number of plagiarizing cases. A number of researchers have identified other possible reasons for the increase in plagiarism including the introduction of the Internet, an increase in diversified assignments (such as project work), and the growth of group-based learning (Ashworth, Freewood, & Macdonald, 2003; Thorley & Gregory, 1994). These reasons do help us to understand why plagiarism cases have increased, but they cannot help solve the problem of plagiarism in a fundamental way. This is because all of them focus on external factors, but none of them address the subjects of plagiarism (students) and how they understand plagiarism, which should be the key to combatting plagiarism.

The real situation could be worse than what the numbers reported in the above studies show. Newton (2016) researched new undergraduate students' perceptions of plagiarism in the United Kingdom and found that students felt confident in their

understanding of plagiarism but performed poorly in simple tests of referencing. This implies a gap between students' perceptions of plagiarism and the regulated practice of referencing. Hughes and McCabe's (2006) study investigated students' academic misconduct and summarized "sharing an assignment, illegal collaboration, receiving unpermitted help, faking data, and hiding sources" as the five most common types of academic misconduct (p. 9). Aligning to the definition of plagiarism, which is inappropriate use of others' text or ideas, four out of the five misconducts in Hughes and McCabe's study are related to plagiarism. It is interesting to note that compared to Hughes and McCabe's study, neither McCabe and Trevino's (1996) study nor the study of Bartzis and Hayner (2007) reported on the misconduct of hiding sources, which indicates that there might be more plagiarism cases that are not reported.

It seems clear that sharing an assignment, illegal collaboration, receiving unpermitted help, and hiding sources are improper behaviors in that students obtain help from others that should not be used. The important question behind these improper behaviors is why these four seemingly obvious misconducts are the most common mistakes made by students. If the reason is that students are not very clear on why these conducts are wrong, or students do not know when, where, and how they should get help from others, then would students not also be confused when drawing the line between getting "legal" help and "illegal" help? If students understand that this type of conduct is wrong, what makes students engage in this type of misconduct? To answer these

questions, further study is required to understand stories behind this misconduct.

In order to achieve the goals of academic integrity and authentic learning, universities employ various ways to prevent plagiarism: strict policies, new technologies (e.g., Turnitin), different writing programs, and ethics education on plagiarism (Marsh, 2007). Generally, Western universities focus on how to identify and penalize the instances of plagiarism, and this approach uses technical ways to solve a technical problem. The other approaches mentioned above focus on the writing aspects and ethical aspects of plagiarism. Many universities offer writing courses and training for first year undergraduate students to help them with academic writing. Universities also provide workshops and seminars on academic integrity and learning ethics. However, both McCabe and Trevino's (1996) study and Bartzis and Hayner's (2007) study showed that efforts by universities to prevent plagiarism did not stop the increasing number of cases of plagiarism.

Nonetheless, the key to improving the situation is in understanding plagiarism and preventing it before it happens. As the two stories in Chapter 1 demonstrate, the different norms and practices that CHC students bring with them may influence their understandings of plagiarism. Youmans and Evans (2000) point out, "Some students misunderstand U.S. notions of plagiarism, while others understand them, but choose to plagiarize nonetheless due to attitudes they brought from their native culture" (p. 50). It is not surprising that CHC students do not understand the meaning of plagiarism, or that

they understand it in a different way from how Canadian universities interpret it. Therefore, plagiarism is a multifaceted issue that is beyond simply an issue about writing or morality. Instead, it spans many disciplines and covers the social, cultural, economic, and political arenas. In this section, I will explore the complexity of plagiarism focusing especially on key issues of controversy.

Intentional versus Unintentional Plagiarism

One of the most hotly debated issues surrounding plagiarism is the role of students' intentions when they plagiarize. Admittedly, it is hard to distinguish whether students have "plagiarized" intentionally or unintentionally. But to make a fair and just decision on whether it is plagiarism, we cannot escape two questions as Thomas (2007) suggests: "What role does the intention play?" and "Is there a distinction between a documentation error and plagiarism?" These two questions will help determine whether we are protecting academic integrity and honesty, or only the economic interests of the legal owner in the name of academic integrity and honesty. When dealing with plagiarism in the context of educational institutions to protect academic honesty and ethics, it is important to ask the question of whether unintentional plagiarism should be treated in the same way as intentional plagiarism. To use an analogy, our laws distinguish clearly between intentional murder and unintentional killing. If we go back to the example of my own story, the case could be considered plagiarism defined in its strictest sense. However, in that case, I had no intention to copy others and my conduct did not conflict with the

goal of the assignment, which was to develop my English skills and understanding of Shakespeare. Would it be fair if I received the same penalty as somebody who copied from others on purpose without honesty and integrity, in which case learning would not occur at all?

In fact, when the notion of plagiarism was first developed, it was defined as intentional stealing. Plagiarism was not defined for or within the educational domain in the beginning. Rather, plagiarism was first a social and economic crime outside of the educational domain. Examining plagiarism from a historical perspective by tracing the history of literacy, Marsh (2007) asserts that to plagiarize somebody's work was to steal the status and credit of the original author, and plagiarists assumed a "false, fraudulent, or anti-author identity" by misusing others' words or ideas. Marsh's assertion of stealing status and credits suggests an intention within plagiarism. The word "fraudulent" also implicates plagiarism as a purposeful conduct. There is no doubt that there are students who plagiarize with an intentional attempt to steal credit from others. But in many cases, there are students who do not have the intention to steal others' status or credit but instead misuse others' words and/or ideas in an attempt to complete their assignments in the process of learning. Students come to schools and universities to learn language, knowledge, and social rules in order to assist them with future integration into society, which implies an initial imperfection of knowledge and language. The learning process itself predicts possible mistakes when using other's words or knowledge.

In an attempt to define and deter the practice of plagiarism, the Council of Writing Program Administrators (2003) in the U.S. defines plagiarism as having occurred "when a writer 'deliberately' uses someone else's language, ideas, or other original (not common-language) material without acknowledging its source" (p. 1). It clearly notes that "a student who attempts (even if clumsily) to identify and credit his or her source, but who misuses a specific citation format or incorrectly uses quotation marks or other forms of identifying material taken from other sources, has not plagiarized" (p. 2). Nevertheless, most universities do not take into consideration the writers' intentions (Howard, 2000), which indicates that these universities use technical tools to identify plagiarism, which emphasizes only the evidence of plagiarism and ignores the reason for plagiarism, and is a process through which the intention of plagiarism is overlooked. This technical way of detecting plagiarism makes plagiarism a demarcated issue and makes it impossible to discuss the issue of intention. In other words, it is reasonable to speculate the policies of some institutions of plagiarism contain little grey area in that any similarities between what students write and what is contained within the database are looked at as plagiarism; this closes off any dialogue that could explain the occurrence. It is confusing for international students who are facing a large area of unknown when it comes to plagiarism. Hu (2001) found in his research that students were confused even at the technical level about what constituted plagiarism. Some of his students asked the question, "How many words count as the paraphrasing of a source or a quotation?" (p.

52) in order to determine what would be classified as plagiarism.

English as an Additional Language (EAL) Issue

Most international students not only study academic courses like their Canadian peers, but they are also studying English, which is a foreign language or an additional language, at the same time. From this perspective, the issue of plagiarism is also an issue of learning English as an additional language (EAL). As EAL learners, all the words or phrases they use are borrowed from others (mostly native English speakers, and sometimes their peers too) and the most effective way to acquire the English language is to imitate native speakers/writers. In order to learn the language and acquire adequate skills in it, they have to memorize new words, grammar, and sentence structures. It is difficult for international students to determine when they can claim ownership of the language. Bakhtin (1982) argues that, "[The word] becomes 'one's own' only when the speaker populates it with his own intention, his own accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention" (p. 293). In other words, language learning is also an appropriation of other people's words. Marsh (2007) holds a similar point that for the purpose of presenting oneself and through the process of transmuting and re-contextualizing, one could claim ownership of texts transcribed from other contexts. From this point of view, international students can have a claim on the language they borrow from another context, as long as they are presenting themselves and they re-contextualize the text. However, in reality, what makes the transition of ownership of language happen and when it happens often remains unclear for international students who speak English as an additional language. Contextualization

and appropriation are such arbitrary and subjective processes that it is difficult to define them in an intricate way. EAL students may have questions about how much appropriation results in claiming the words and phrases. Or they may encounter similar contexts or situations that are beyond their English capacities to differentiate in such a fine way that they can easily recognize the transition of language ownership process as Bakhtin and Marsh describe.

From the perspective of EAL, the plagiarism issue can present difficulties in dealing with the following three situations: (a) how to use others' words to express one's own ideas, (b) how to use one's own words to express others' ideas, and (c) how to use others' words to express others' ideas (Scollon, 1994). Literally, all international students who are not native English speakers are using others' words to express themselves until they can make a claim on the language they are speaking It requires advanced language skills to express oneself by integrating one's own ideas with the language of others properly. The difficulty of using others' words to express one's ideas resides in the paradoxical process of integrating the language of others within one's own expression while at the same time differentiating the language of others from one's own idea. The most common cases of plagiarism that occur among international students are those that involve "patchwriting," which in many cases can be categorized as using the words of others to express their own ideas. When using others' words carelessly, EAL students may steal the ideas of others accidentally. If this is true, many EAL students may be caught involved in plagiarism because of their language incapability. To use one's own words to express the ideas of others requires language capability to express ideas in one's

own words and the comprehension of others' ideas. EAL students may be trapped within patchwriting when using others' words if they do not have enough language capacity. To use others' words to express others' ideas is direct citation, which has specific rules to follow. More often than not, this type of plagiarist either does not properly understand the rules and regulations of referencing or steals others' ideas without intention.

In addition to these three difficulties, "ESL writers' native cultures and their accompanying rhetoric influence the way in which they write in English" (Prochaska, 2001, p. 67). For international students, words and ideas are most often inseparable, to the extent that when they wish to express their ideas in a language foreign to them, they find it difficult to separate words used by others from their own to express their ideas. Similarly, language is inseparable from culture. Some students, especially students from Confucian heritage culture backgrounds (Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Taiwan, and Hong Kong), are trained from a very young age to use a method of rote memory (Yamada, 2003) and to not challenge authority. In China, because Chinese is an ideographic language, students have to memorize each character to learn the language. Hence, the culture and native language of international students may play an important role in understanding language learning and influence how they use language to express themselves. Hollins, Lange, Dennis, and Longmore (2016) examined social influence on plagiarism. They cited an experimental study of unconscious plagiarism, or cryptomnesia, which began in 1898 and suggested that the level of distraction one experiences can increase the incidence of plagiarism. In Western academia, creative thinking and contribution to new knowledge is a significant aspect of study. In the attempt to be

"novel," it is "likely, at rates above chance, to mis-recall other people's ideas as their own" (p. 884). One can only imagine, therefore, how this finding exacerbates the situation for CHC students where the level of distraction as it pertains to second language use and interpretation, together with a prior learning style that emphasizes memorization, could cause this unconscious plagiarism to occur.

Contextual Issues of Plagiarism: Discipline-oriented Writing Genres

Many scholars (Hu, 2001; McDonnell, 2003; Myers, 1998) question the practice of applying the same rules of plagiarism to different writing genres in various disciplines. When examining the difference in the understandings of plagiarism between college students and faculty in Taiwan, Chen and Chou (2015) identified a statistically significant difference in college students' perceptions of plagiarism. In their study, arts and communication students revealed more antagonistic views against plagiarism than students in humanities, science, and engineering. Jameson (1993) indicated that the determination of plagiarism depends on many aspects such as "context, circumstance, audience expectations, writers' intentions, and genre or subgenre*"* (p. 18). He regarded plagiarism as inappropriate documentation; however, the rules/styles of documentation rely on the purpose of the discourse. Because different disciplines and different texts require different kinds of writing, genre becomes one of the key contextual factors in defining plagiarism. It is necessary for educational institutions to distinguish between the different writing genres in different fields to offer specific training on documentation in specific styles, so that students who are not familiar with different genres will not be confused by different styles of documentation. For example, textbooks often include little

documentation because their purpose is to teach, and most of the content within textbooks is often widely recognized and accepted in the field. The content of textbooks falls more in the domain of common knowledge and the purpose of the textbook is for fair use. With their main aim being the production of research and new knowledge, academic papers require full documentation so that other researchers can trace the sources and test the findings. Being for entertainment rather than education, and often recognized as fabrication, novels and fiction require less references so that the audience's pleasure of reading is not interrupted.

It is not enough only to understand different requirements for documentation; it is equally important to know how to document for different genres, which is to a large extent relevant to the audience, and their purposes and specific expectations. The concept of common knowledge alters when the audience and community changes. When writing for colleagues within the same field, it is less important to document well-known theories and concepts and more important to document data sources and ideas, whereas it becomes a different story when writing for outsiders because much "common knowledge" becomes uncommon (Jameson, 1993). On some occasions, the writer seems to be expected to document less than they would when writing for colleagues than they would when writing for the public unfamiliar with the topic. For instance, when writing for the purpose of the popularization of science, the audience is the public who do not have much of a science background, and so references are not strictly required. When writing for college students who are learning both the subject and academic writing, strict referencing is required in the writing although some students may not be familiar with the

background knowledge (Jameson). Furthermore, Angstrom and Widen (2016) in a study about military doctrine argued that there are situations/contexts which may encourage plagiarism so that the doctrine becomes clearer and more universally understood, such that the interpretation of it is consistent over all contexts. This poses a particular problem for academics who may view their context as one that is universally understood. According to this study, doctrine as a tool of education should serve a more constructivist function rather than a utilitarian one.

In specific fields or disciplines, writing has to meet the unique disciplinary needs accordingly. In the business field, it is a common practice that large projects are undertaken by a group of people, and the final report is therefore the achievement of many. It becomes difficult to determine to whom ownership belongs. Another situation is when employees repeatedly use the exact same business letters/reports/templates (regardless of who they are written by) for different customers or clients; nobody charges them with plagiarism because the audience has no expectations in terms of originality of writing.

Intellectual Property Issues

Intellectual property is another important concept that affects our understanding of plagiarism. The notion of intellectual property is established upon the concept of property. A dominant Western concept of property comes from John Locke (1690) who argued that one can properly make a claim of a natural thing as his property after the input of his labour. Locke described the ideas of property as, “The labor of his body, and the work of his hands, we may say, are properly his. Whatsoever then he removes out of

the state that the nature hath provided, and left in, he hath mixed his labor with, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property" (Locke, p. 9). Intellectual property then can be defined as "a collection of concepts that attempts to equate physical property ownership with the notion that one can 'own,' and consequently assert exclusive control over, an idea or concept" (Stark, 2005, p. 59). However, intellectual property is a problematic notion in that when property is stolen, the owner cannot use it anymore, whereas when intellectual property is stolen, the owner can still enjoy his property, such as music or software (Stark). In addition, the definition of intellectual property has been changing through an ongoing interpretation process (Langran, Langran, & Bull, 2005). This consequently influences the notion of plagiarism as a violation of intellectual property laws in a profound way.

Unlike physical property, intellectual property is a slippery concept. It is quite a challenge to define and protect intellectual property. One difficulty in protecting intellectual property is that intellectual property is invisible, intangible, and impossible to draw a boundary around. For example, in the present age of knowledge explosion, this "craft notion" of property cannot respond to current reality when more and more work has been done cooperatively, collaboratively, or collectively (Gilbert & Lyman, 1989). When a group of people collaboratively create "intellectual property," there is no way to clearly determine what percentage each contributor should own. Moreover, in the open environment of the Internet, there is yet to be an agreement over the ways in which intellectual work could be seen as property. Protecting intellectual property is even more unlikely when different countries have different definitions and different intellectual

property laws. Some scholars have also found challenges concerned with intellectual property in other areas. For instance, in global cross-cultural interactions, how shall we determine the property rights of oral traditions that are written and published by cultural others (Aronson, 2003)? It is challenging but necessary to think about where these ideas come from when talking about intellectual property of ideas. The extent to which the idea is actually the author's also needs to be considered. Even within the educational system, we need to ask how schools can balance between writing creatively, working collectively, and attributing property rights accurately (Gilbert & Lyman).

Not only is the notion of intellectual property questioned by scholars (Aronson, 2003; Gilbert & Lyman, 1989), the protection of intellectual property is also questioned by advocates who support knowledge sharing. Ultimately, the purpose of protecting intellectual property is believed to be to encourage creation and invention in consideration of the public interest. Queau (2000) argues that it is more advantageous for humanity to have ideas and knowledge circulate freely than to limit their circulation. Queau believes that protection of intellectual property should be based on the premise that it will ultimately increase the "pool of common property of humanity" and benefit human civilization most. Nonetheless, increasingly strong intellectual protection is impeding access to knowledge and information in order to safeguard individual interests. "If nothing is done, even universities cannot afford information in the near future" (Queau, p. 1).

With respect to plagiarism, stealing others' ideas infringes on others' intellectual property, which refers to the ownership of ideas and/or knowledge. Before the notion of

authorship, knowledge was more widely understood as something collaborative and something that was shared (DeVoss & Rosati, 2002). But now, the knowledge economy forces knowledge to be owned, priced, and capitalized. The definition and purpose of knowledge as the common property of humanity and for the benefit of human civilization has been redefined by intellectual property. Knowledge was traditionally used for self-improvement, self-formation, or to improve society. In an age of global capitalization, knowledge has become regarded as market property attached with exchange values. The role of knowledge for moral uplift and the improvement of human civilization has given way to serving an economic interest (Queau, 2000). When knowledge is priced and put on the market, it is not difficult to understand why some students buy papers from paper mills.

The notion of intellectual property, by defining knowledge as property, can strongly skew the student's attitude, understanding, and practice in education. The message delivered to students by the notion of intellectual property is to get the most in terms of knowledge in the most effective manner. The process of learning may not be for self-improvement per se but for the purpose of obtaining better grades, and eventually better jobs that earn them higher incomes. In effect then, self-improvement comes by way of grades, jobs, and incomes, where education may not be an end in itself but a means to an end. Jenson and Castell (2004) show their deeper concerns of "a species of anomie and alienation which has been a direct result of the (technologically mediated) reorienting of public education towards economic models of investment and return, rather than cultural and educational models of social identity and self-formation" (p. 319). Ashworth et al.

(2003) note that even universities in their official documents regard students as clients and education as an exchange, which fundamentally affects students' understandings of "education" and "examination." Saltmarsh (2004) holds a similar idea in that

> the tactic of plagiarism can thus be understood beyond its traditional constructions of 'cheating' or academic 'misconduct,' and instead be considered as a productive practice which disrupts and subverts the consumption of education as a 'product,' from which consumers are expected to derive benefits, as prescribed by the institution, while simultaneously submitting to its strategic demands. (p. 454)

From this perspective, the solution to uprooting plagiarism seemingly ought to start with the way in which people's understanding of education is corrupted by the concept of the knowledge economy.

Furthermore, Lehman (2006) problematizes the concept of intellectual property from a cultural perspective and argues that the concept is not compatible with traditional Chinese values. After reviewing Chinese historical social development and comparing views of intellectual property between laws in China and laws in ancient Rome, Lehman indicates that the major difference between Roman society and Chinese society was "law versus ethics as a means to centralization" (p. 3). He points out that intellectual property is an alien concept in traditional ethical, legal, and philosophical Chinese thought and that the concept is missing in ancient Chinese law code, which as a result had little influence on people's daily practices even though the Chinese adopted the Western legal system (particularly around intellectual property). In Chinese society, ethics based on Confucianism such as "financial drive is low class" (Lehman, p. 8) and the definition of

knowledge as "rediscovery of ancient sage" and "for public good rather than personal" (p. 5) scaffold people's mentalities, frame the foundation of social structure, and as a result, influence people's perceptions around intellectual property.

Plagiarism in the Virtual World: The Internet

Kewes (2003) separates the behavior of plagiarism and the vehicle of the behavior of plagiarism. He argues that in order to understand the issue of plagiarism, it is impossible not to discuss the media in which plagiarized content circulates. According to Bartzis and Hayner (2007), over half of the plagiarism cases dealing with written plagiarism on U.S. campuses are now related to using the Internet. Stephen Morris, a lecturer at the University of San Francisco, also believes that ease of getting information is one of the major reasons that plagiarism is growing (Baum, 2005). Kayaoglu, Erbay, Flitner, and Saltas, (2016) argue that the Internet has little to do with the increasing number of plagiarism cases. No matter what the reasons are, the undoubtable fact is that plagiarism has increased with the popularity of the Internet as discussed in the beginning of this chapter. DeVoss and Rosati (2002) assert that the Internet facilitates the situation of plagiarism because of its three features: "no universal cataloging or categorizing, rhetorically complex, and incompatibility between web design and its purpose" (p. 199). Because of its chaotic cataloguing and easy access to knowledge, the Internet opens enormous possibilities for students to plagiarize. Students can surf the Internet and search for texts that can be downloaded and incorporated into their own papers via word processing software. Marsh (2007) points out the emerging question that confronts educators in the 21st century: "How do today's educators perceive and respond to the

problem of plagiarism in a manner sensitive to the changing 'cultural ecology' of literacy activity in today's computer-mediated, multimodal writing environment?" (p. 153).

Beyond the apparent reasons discussed above, the Internet profoundly alters some of the core values regarding plagiarism. As some scholars (Jenson & Castell, 2004) illustrate, new technology has changed both how we know and what we know. The explosion of information has changed and is still changing our practice in education. Before the birth of the Internet, students were taught how to come up with compositions which were creative, original, and new. Students were encouraged to come up with their own ideas and trained to prove or support their ideas through logic and rational argument. Nowadays, students are facing a massive amount of information that is said to double every two years (Xplanevisualthinking, 2007). In the current global environment, competition seems to be based on the depth and scope of information that becomes accessible to any particular student. It seems that the most efficient way for students to win the competition is to go online and find as much information as possible, and then quickly put that information together to make up their own articles. Jenson and Castell note that the essay compiled in this way is "no longer a practical or useful tool for the development and dissemination of one's idea; the essay as a scholastic ritual functions as itself a commodity, traded primarily for marks" (p. 315).

The contemporary copyright system is based on and enabled by print technology, which makes ideas, thoughts, and literary and intellectual work tangible and concrete as private property. Authorship and property rights of ideas are the essence of the copyright system (Gilbert & Lyman, 1989). However, the Internet respects no boundaries;

represents a “single global consciousness” (Nayyer, 2002; The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, 1999). Technology, especially electronic media, creates a shadow that blurs the definition of copyright both ethically and technologically. From an ethical perspective, electronic publication challenges our previous assumption of plagiarism based on print (DeVoss & Rosati, 2002). From a technological perspective, the Internet also upsets the “legal, economic, and moral controls” that work for copyright in print (Gilbert & Lyman).

There are many other questions which relate to information use that need to be asked when we use the Internet; for example, is the information reliable, and is it academic information refereed and verified by research? It seems that we can hardly tell where and who information comes from anymore, or whether it is legal to use the information we find online. It is impossible for us to determine whose knowledge it is because of the instant communication and interaction that occurs between the audience and the writer. Myers (1998) doubts whether it is realistic to expect full citation in the Internet age when writers are indistinguishable from readers, and when most knowledge is produced by large-scale collaboration.

Plagiarism is a complex issue with many facets: questions of intention, differences among disciplines, learning English as an additional language, different understandings of intellectual property, understanding of copyright, different ethical values, and problems caused by new technology. All these aspects mentioned above inform the discourse of this research.

Chapter 3 The Difficulty with Defining Plagiarism

"If you steal from one author, it's plagiarism; if you steal from many, it's research."

— Wilson Mizner

"The secret to creativity is knowing how to hide your sources."

— Albert Einstein

A Brief History of Plagiarism

The notion of plagiarism is not only modern, but also Western. It took centuries for plagiarism to be defined by its current meaning, during which time the meaning and definition of the term were continually changed and refined. Generally, the origin of the word plagiarism is argued to come from several sources. Lipson and Reindl (2003) suggest that plagiarism can be traced back to the Latin word "*plagiarius*," which means intruding on one's property. Marsh (2007) tracked it back to the Roman word "*plagirum*," which means kidnapping one's slave. The Oxford Dictionary traces plagiarism back to a Greek word "*plagion*," which means "kidnapping." According to the Classic Encyclopedia,

> The Lat. plagiarius meant a kidnapper, stealer or abductor of a slave or child, though it is also used in the modern sense of a literary pilferer or purloiner by Martial (I. 53, 9). The word plagium is used in the Digest[1] of the offence of kidnapping or abduction, and the ultimate source is

[1] A term used generally of any digested or carefully arranged collection or compendium of written matter, but more particularly in law of a compilation in condensed form of a body of law digested in a systematical method. *Classic encyclopedia*

> probably to be found in plaga, net, snare, trap…. The idea of plagiarism as a wrong is comparatively modern, and has grown up with the increasing sense of property in works of the intellect. (Classic Encyclopedia, 1911)

Either the meaning of kidnapping a slave or child, or the meaning of intruding on one's property, indicates that plagiarism was born a commercial concept (Jameson, 1993). "Steal" not only signals a violation of ethics, but also refers to private property rights and economic interests.

The meaning of kidnapping a slave remained the definition of plagiarism until the 17th century. It was first used in a literary context by Bishop Richard Montagu in 1624 (Jameson, 1993). Marcus Valerius Martialis raised the meaning in a literacy context to a new level and referred to it as "literacy theft" (Marsh, 2007). The concept of plagiarism as literacy theft was not widely accepted until the period of neoclassicism, when scholars started to emphasize originality in writing; the current notion of plagiarism came into being in the 18th century when the individual ownership of non-material property became accepted (Jameson). From then on, the meaning of plagiarism remained stable in the literacy domain, referring to something morally and ethically wrong (Marsh). Hence, plagiarism is not simply an issue of the relationship between the writer and the audience; the concept also has a strong historical mark on the issue of ownership of property.

Plagiarism is often defined by the concept of copyright, which is also a property concept. Myers (1998) summarized the two supporting values of the notion of copyright as: (a) the cherished notion of individual rights and truth, and (b) the protection of economic interests in the market. While most people assume that copyright involves the

protection of the author, Ashworth et al. (2003) note that the original concern of copyright was less about the author than to "restrict the competition among printers/publishers" for their commercial interests (p. 260). The current concept of copyright began and was established in the 15th century with the creation of printing technology.

> Copyright, in law, the right, belonging exclusively to the author or his assignees, of multiplying for 'sale copies' of an original work or composition, in literature or art. As a recognized form of property it is, compared with others, of recent origin, being in fact, in the use of literary works, mainly the result of the facility for multiplying copies created by the discovery of 'printing.' It is with copyright in literary compositions that we are here primarily concerned, as it was established first, the analogous right as regards works of plastic art, &c., following in its train. (Classic Encyclopedia, 1911)

Through the lens of copyright, plagiarism is related to commercial property ownership of writing. Ownership of writing was not granted to authors until 30 years after it was granted to publishers/sellers (Ashworth et al., 2003). In this light, it may be misleading to consider plagiarism solely as an ethical issue that values originality and credits the writer, and ignores the historical fact that the original purpose of copyright was to protect the interest of the publisher rather than the originality of the writer.

Institutional Definitions of and Values behind Plagiarism

There is no universal definition of plagiarism, and most institutions have their own ways of defining it. Under the *Code of Student Behaviour* (2018) of the University of

Alberta, plagiarism is defined as follows: “No student shall submit the words, ideas, images or data of another person as the student’s own in any academic writing, essay, thesis, project, assignment, presentation or poster in a course or program of study” (p.10). The University of Michigan (2003) states that “to use another person’s ideas or expressions in your writing without acknowledging the source is to plagiarize” (p.1) . The University of Toronto (2016) describes plagiarism with explicit reference to its historical antecedents: “The present sense of plagiarism is contained in the original (1621) meaning in English: ‘the wrongful appropriation and purloining, and publication as one’s own, of the ideas, or the expression of the ideas ... of another’” (p. 18).

More definitions can be easily found, but these three examples suffice to illustrate common themes among institutional definitions of plagiarism in North American academia. Plagiarism as defined by educational institutions refers to inappropriate presentation of the work of others as one’s own. Plagiarism, then, constitutes “intellectual theft” (Gibaldi & Achert, 1995, p. 26), relates to the issues of authorship, integrity, and honesty, and implies illegal misconduct of stealing and the flawed value of education. The two main supporting values presented by universities’ plagiarism policies include individual rights and originality, which are typical markers of Western cultural values. The definition of plagiarism in Western universities represents the cultural and social values inherited from Western history. It was understood and revered, and widely accepted among Western universities through a shared history in which this concept was developed.

Some scholars (Lindey, 1952; Mallon, 1989; Marsh, 2007) liken plagiarism to

ancient alchemy. Alchemy, according to them, is not the magic that simply transforms metal into gold, but the ancient sacred wisdom that elevates the human spirit from sinfulness to perfection. Plagiarism, correspondingly, is the wrongful alchemy of textual transformation (like ancient wicked alchemy) that targets only the material transformation while neglecting the process of spirit improvement (Marsh, 2007). They differentiate copying from borrowing by analyzing the writing process with respect to whether the writer contextualizes the text by removing it from its original context and providing it with a new meaning. The metaphor of alchemy vividly presents the Western cultural value of originality and demonstrates the strong historical heritage of the notion of plagiarism.

It is obvious that definitions of plagiarism all use technical and specific terms. Universities and other educational institutions inherited the tradition of defining plagiarism in a rather technical way, which is convenient and applicable for institutional settings, but ignores the historical and cultural meanings that plagiarism bears by assuming that every student understands plagiarism naturally. However, these definitions may not be self-explanatory to students, especially students from other cultures. In a study by Kokkinaki, Demoliou, and Iakovidou (2015), students shared quite different understandings of plagiarism from those that were held by faculty members. Without considering and diving into the deeper issue of plagiarism, institutional strategies that only focus on technical detection and punishment may result in "reducing education/writing papers to a meaningless task" as described by Hubick (2016, p. 454). As more and more international students come to Canada, the notions pertaining to

plagiarism become questionable for students from different political and economic cultures and contexts who do not share the same history and historical understanding. In this sense then, international students may possibly understand the notion of plagiarism differently, and consequently they may engage in "the misdeed" without even knowing it.

The Ambiguity of Ownership: Using Others' Words/ideas

The notion of plagiarism that is established upon individual rights of ownership over literary and intellectual property is seemingly clear, but actually ambiguous. One should respect others' rights and ownership over text and ideas. A scholar should always be original and authentic in his/her writing. It is integral and ethical to acknowledge and give credit to the author when borrowing other's text and/or ideas. However, there are different understandings and arguments about authorship and originality within Western academia. For example, Richardson (1931) and Lindey (1952) held the view that all writers "plagiarize." Richardson particularly used Chaucer and Shakespeare as examples in "The Ubiquitous Plagiarist" and argued that they made use of works (words, phrases, storylines) of early artists (Baccaccio and Marlowe, respectively). Comparatively, Mallon (1989) argued that "the writer need not blush about stealing if he makes what he makes completely his, if he alchemizes it into something that is, finally, thoroughly new" (p. 25).

These arguments make it an ambiguous task for international students to write when borrowing other's words and/or ideas. Coming to a very different academic culture, international students are readily puzzled by the expectations of Western academic writing, which requires not only original, authentic, and new ideas, but also the citation of

existing sources and materials that support the original ideas (DeVoss & Rosati, 2002). It is reasonable to understand the challenges these students encounter when they are required to connect their personal opinions with those of others, while at the same time having to distinguish their own ideas from those of others. In addition, the notion of "common knowledge" (Liddell, 2003), or the public domain, is unclear to a newcomer in the new discourse community. It is not surprising that many international students ask the same question: Shall I cite everything?

The ambiguity of ownership is also caused by the discipline and the discourse community. In academic research, for example, in order to establish a new theory, researchers have to be able to duplicate the result of an experiment at a different place and time. In other words, the theory has to be testable. The scholarly community might have the need to verify an experiment or an article cited in the discourse, with the expectation that there would be full documentation. In the field of mathematics, teachers would expect students to understand and apply formulas and equations to practical problems. Students might be expected to use an identical logic and strategy without being charged with plagiarism.

Within educational institutions, the reader-writer relationship is mainly an apprentice relationship. More often than not, professors expect full documentation because full documentation builds up the relationship of the student with their colleagues, and writing is the practice that prepares students to become part of academia. To cite sources properly requires knowledge and experience in the field. It also requires ethics that are highly embedded in cultures. International students are often unfamiliar with both

academic culture and Western cultures. In both discourse communities, international students struggle with negotiation of new identities and their belongingness in a new culture. Being apprentices to the disciplines, international students are being inducted into a discipline, but they also bring their own cultural understandings of authority, of text, and the expectations of teachers and students, among other aspects. As Bartzis and Hayner (2007) indicate, the topic of academic ethics needs to be approached as a cultural and social construct. To understand the ambiguity of using others' words requires not only the understanding of different academic cultures, but also the understanding of different historical and social cultures.

Towards Understanding Plagiarism as a Question of Culture

Some scholars (Chandrasoma, Thompson, & Pennycook, 2004; Howard, 2000) problematize the notion of plagiarism within academic culture and try different ways/terms to explain the phenomenon and notion of plagiarism. Howard focuses on a technical perspective of plagiarism and summarizes common plagiarist activities as "insufficient citation, failure to mark quotations, failure to acknowledge sources, and taking brief strings of discourse from a source and patching them, verbatim or slightly altered, into one's own sentences" (p. 10). Howard's approach of understanding plagiarism can be encapsulated into two types of stealing: "stealing" ideas and "stealing" texts, which introduces two different perspectives of intellectual property and copyright respectively. The former is concerned more with an intellectual issue, while the latter pertains to a literacy problem. However, the seemingly obvious unethical behavior of stealing becomes questionable in the context of the internationalized university because

of the ambiguity of ownership of ideas and/or text that is defined by culture, history, and discourse community. What makes "stealing" illegal and unethical is the infringement of ownership of private property. But the ownership of property, especially of ideas and words, is often contestable in different cultural/social traditions. For example, people from an oral tradition and collectivist culture may have a different understanding of ownership than people from a more individualist culture.

Some scholars (Chandrasoma, Thompson, & Pennycook, 2004; Jameson, 1993) employ a contextual relationship perspective (rather than employing a technical approach like that used by Howard) to understand plagiarism, which looks at plagiarism with a broader view from the perspective of discourse community. Patchwriting, authorial selves, common knowledge, and discourse and interdisciplinarity are utilized to examine the notion of plagiarism. Patchwriting refers to the specific way of writing that recompiles others' texts into one's own text. Authorial self means the writing genre that presents the voice of the author. Common knowledge is understood as the knowledge that is widely known and belongs to the community. Discourse and interdisciplinarity are used to define the social and academic community in which plagiarism happens. Different from the technical approach that focuses on individual practice, Chandrasoma, et al. and Jameson explore the social and cultural environment in which plagiarism occurs. Jameson views that the existence of plagiarism depends on the expectations in a specific "discourse community." These expectations within the discourse community are shaped by the relationships among the elements within the discourse community (writers, readers, and texts), which determine what plagiarism is. Similarly, plagiarism can be

analyzed within any of these various relationships from the perspectives of patchwriting, authorial self, and common knowledge. When discussing economic interests, it is about the ownership between producers and users; when talking about patchwriting, it is concerned with the relationship between the authors and readers (borrowers); when we think of the discourse community, we refer to the relationship among researchers/colleagues. Both ends of these relationships are connected by and with texts, which can be regarded as a form of communication. Jameson defines "discourse community" within the domain of disciplinary academia, whereas Chandrasoma et al. focus more on lingual and cultural communities. But both "discourse communities" implicate the notion of identity (i.e., outsider and insider), which is a highly culturally embedded concept.

The different views of plagiarism within various discourse communities show that plagiarism is not simply a matter of borrowing or stealing the ideas/words of others. Rather, as in the technical approach, the discourse approach manifests that plagiarism is a cultural notion that is beyond the technical misdeed, which could be the reason why technical solutions cannot solve the problem of plagiarism in a fundamental way. If plagiarism is the iceberg, the concept of stealing and discourse community are only the tip of the iceberg. The cultural essence of plagiarism is the part of the "iceberg" that hides beneath the water, which defines and rationalizes the particular behavior of plagiarism. The issue of plagiarism for international students, then, is really the issue of conflicting understandings of ownership ambiguities, which points to different meanings among different cultures.

Understanding Plagiarism in View of Culture

Culture plays a central role in understanding plagiarism. It is wrong to assume that a universal self-evident notion of plagiarism exists to international students who have different values, cultures, and expectations (Walden & Peacock, 2006). Ehrich, Howard, Mu, and Bokosmaty (2016) conducted research to study Chinese and Australian university students' attitudes towards plagiarism and concluded that there were "significant differences between cultural groups in their attitudes towards plagiarism" (p. 242). Kayaoglu et al. (2016) did a similar study comparing perceptions of plagiarism among Turkish, Georgian, and German students. They reached a similar conclusion that students from different cultures behave differently in recognizing and committing plagiarism. In their study, German students were more sensitive towards plagiarism and more capable of identifying it. Haitch (2016) summarizes factors that influence international students' perceptions of plagiarism: "unclear rules, different language, intense pressures, and different ethical practices" (pp. 268-270). Plagiarism cannot be fully understood without examining the dynamics of the social and cultural environment (Ninnes, Aitchison, & Kalos, 1999). The issue of plagiarism boils down to the tension between different cultural understandings.

Different understandings of cheating. Students' attitudes determine their practices. If the central value of students' morality is not threatened, students obviously will not take plagiarism seriously. How students interpret plagiarism is essential to the understanding of why a student plagiarizes and how to prevent it. The central value of Western academia is originality and ownership, and these values determine the levels of

seriousness and intolerance that Western academia applies towards plagiarism. But in many other cultures, knowledge is shared and believed to belong to the whole society (Hu, 2001). International students from these cultures may feel reluctant to question their teacher or lecturer. They often take the opinions of a book or lecturer as the truth without question, because that knowledge has come from someone considered to be a superior authority. In these cultures, sharing is not a problem and borrowing others' ideas/words is acceptable. When quoting an authority's words means showing respect and paying compliments, it is not hard to understand why some students copy their professors' work. Ashworth et al. (2003) point out that some students think copying others' ideas is part of learning.

Students from different cultures hold different views of cheating and plagiarism. Bartzis and Hayner (2007) surveyed a group of international students from different cultures and summarized their views as follows:

> **Russia**: sharing notes, talking in class are ok, not hidden; goal is to bring the whole class level up; bribes routinely expected for grades;
>
> **Germany**: sharing of answers common, but understood as student vs. teachers; not sharing is a social taboo;
>
> **Mexico**: sharing is common, but students will deny; professors do not expect citation in paper;
>
> **Costa Rica**: Teamwork is the rule in personal and academic life, including supporting those who do not contribute to the group;

China: students openly admit cheating is a way of life; "intellectual property" is a foreign concept; save face, maintain group harmony; cheating seen as a skill everyone should develop to succeed in the world. The world is corrupt;

Burma: student learning seen as a task shared by the group; worst accusation in the culture is selfishness; pursuing own goals at the expense of others.

India and Bangladesh: student riots when test cheating was prevented.

(Bartzis & Hayner, pp. 2-3)

According to Hazlitt (1998), students in Korea are encouraged to imitate rather than create, Japanese students are taught group solidarity and collaboration, and Mexican students are motivated to share homework and/or answers. Sowden (2005) shares a similar view that good students from Confucian heritage culture (CHC) "do not challenge their teachers or authorities, but faithfully copy and reproduce them" (p. 227). Some plagiaristic misconduct results from students' attitudes towards plagiarism, and in turn, their attitudes are determined by their cultural and social backgrounds. Bartzis and Hayner recommend that we see academic ethics as a cultural construct.

Different understandings of common knowledge. The public domain is defined by Liddell (2003) as "material that is understood to be common or general knowledge" (p. 45). Common knowledge is built on the basis of mutual understanding, which enables individuals to function effectively and quickly within the particular discourse community (Chandrasoma et al, 2004). But the discourse community is scripted according to

discipline, writing purpose, and cultural settings. Common knowledge becomes uncommon when it is used within and for a specific occasion. In other words, intertextuality manifests the defining of common knowledge. Imamichi (1992) asserts that language should be regarded as a public good because of its communicative function. According to Imamichi, "there was no theft in language itself without plagiarism regarding linguistic composition" (p. 163).

On one hand, students often struggle with questions such as: Shall we credit the common knowledge and to whom shall we give credit? It is believed that "common sense, folklore, or generally known facts" do not need referencing (Liddell, 2003, p. 46). However, even professors cannot determine how private a word is in order for it to need to be cited, so it is not surprising that international students have difficulties in differentiating private words from public words. On the other hand, more and more collaboration in education/knowledge production also complicates the concept. With the development of technology, more and more information is easily accessible through the Internet; it seems a more difficult task now to determine "fair use" from traditional perspectives. The question of whether the information posted online can be considered common knowledge is not easy to determine, because it is accessible to everybody and, in most cases, not properly referenced. New technology and the Internet blur the line between intellectual property and fair use. Another problem that needs to be mentioned here is the reliability of online information. Information found on the Internet can be false, or even plagiarized from somewhere else. With the popularity of the Internet, the challenges of defining common knowledge, judging its reliability, and tracing its real

source will remain debated for a long time.

Different understandings of text and literacy appropriation. Western culture and Eastern culture have different ways of presenting and representing knowledge (Chandrasoma et al., 2004), which lead to different understandings of text and literacy appropriation. The rules and regulations of Western academia are not apparently self-evident to CHC students. Sometimes, these rules are not compatible with the practice of students who come from a culture of oral tradition (Scollon, 1994). Ashworth et al. (2003) found in their study that although the referencing system and its rules may be alien to international students, many international students never question or challenge the system and the rules. From this perspective, the unity of textual understanding and practice that is implied by plagiarism does not necessarily exist (Howard, 2000).

Some cultures hold the belief that it is impolite for students to reference cited material for teachers, as this indicates that the teacher does not know that the text exists (Ryan, 2000, as cited in Keenan & Jemmeson, 2004). Students from a CHC background very much admire authority, and they believe they can use an authority's words and ideas freely because everybody will recognize the words and ideas that originated from the authority. It is not uncommon for students to credit everything to the authority without crediting anything to themselves. Students from these cultures are discouraged to credit sources in their writing. As Stockall and Cole (2016) argued in their study, "Misappropriation of textual sources or textual borrowing without proper acknowledgement can be attributed to a number of reasons other than plagiarism" (p. 344). Some of these reasons may include teacher-pleasing behaviors, compensatory

writing strategies, dumping strategies, my words or ideas (appropriating others' words/ideas as ones' own after learning), and facts and data (regarding facts and data as common knowledge), etc. They suggest that ESL students are more prone to using these strategies which do not exactly fit into the definition of plagiarism or for which there is a contextual reason for the action which does not relate to taking ownership of the ideas of others.

Paraphrasing is used by some teachers to help international students avoid plagiarizing. Nonetheless, it is not always clear what kind of paraphrasing is acceptable. Prochaska (2001) categorizes ESL students as amateur patchwriters, compared to scholars who are professional patchwriters. As noted by Howard (2000),

> The truth, though, is that we are all plodders, in the sense that we all collaborate with source texts, not conceptually, but also linguistically. . . When the inability or failure to hide those traces is conflated with the willingness to fraudulently represent someone else's text as one's own, a lack of advanced textual skills becomes a crime. (p. 96)

Chandrasoma et al. (2004) use the concept of intertextuality to understand the relation between texts and plagiarism. They argue that the cultural tradition and its related value system determine what kind of intertextuality to use and how to use it, and that intertextuality reflects power relations (between writer and the audience, and between texts), authorial self, and common knowledge, all of which are also culturally defined and determined. The authorial self is generated by how the writer positions himself/herself in the academic discourse community (according to power relations). According to

Chandrasoma et al., this positioning of the writer is determined by the power relationship and determines the common knowledge at the same time. Writers' historical and cultural backgrounds shape how they present and represent themselves in their writing. In addition, writers' identities in the target culture, host culture, and in academia interrelate and can conflict with one another. This is because on one hand, international writers cannot get away from their conventional identities, which allow them to understand and interpret new things; on the other hand, they have to adjust their identities to meet the expectations of the new requirements. The fluidity of their identities allows a conflict between target culture and host culture, and between personal writing habits and academic expectations.

Different ways of recognition, learning styles, and attitudes toward learning. Writing is not only a linguistic practice, but also reflects fundamental ways of recognition and communication (Madigan, Johnson, & Linton, 1995). How people learn about and understand the world influences people's practices in writing, which could lead to plagiarism. Compared to the Western representationalist approach that holds the belief that the world we see is only the perceptual copy of it in our minds, the Eastern (especially Chinese) world has quite a different way of understanding it (Pennycook, 1996). Many students in Eastern culture learn by listening, as opposed to critiquing and questioning, which are highly praised methods in Western society. Because these two methodologies are so different, understanding plagiarism only from one (Western) perspective leads to negligence of students' learning styles, which affects their propensity to cheat or plagiarize (Anderman, Griesinger, & Westerfield, 1998). To further explain

some of the methodological differences, Chinese people, according to Pennycook, believe that linguistic ability forms before an understanding of the external world does, which means that understanding the text is the prerequisite to understanding the world. Like a Chinese proverb says: Read the book a hundred times; the meaning of the book will show automatically. This belief emphasizes memorization as an important way of learning and understanding, and also gives plagiarism a very different meaning. What is fundamental to Chinese students' understanding is that language is shared by everybody rather than owned by individuals. Hence, writers who hold this view are more prone than others to plagiarizing by stealing others' words.

Scollon (1994) argues that writing is inseparable from learning style, because both learning and writing are self-construct processes that establish the authorial self. This process is assumed to be influenced strongly by ideology, and authorial selves are formed differently as cultural selves are constructed differently. The different cultural understandings may conflict, and different culturally formed relationships among writers, sources, and texts determine the shape of writing products. How students write and voice themselves depends on their understandings of learning. It is notable that universities tend to ignore the learning process when paying full attention to referencing mechanics (Scollon). Of course, how learning happens is still arguable and to be determined. After comparing English writers and Chinese writers, Li, Shing, Poon, Yee, Rogerson-Revell, Scollon, Scollon, Yu, and Yung (1993) found that English writings are presented in a tone of "autonomous and named individuals," while Chinese writings are often presented in the "collective authorial voice" (cited in Scollon, 1994, p. 41). On one hand, group

consensus is more important than the individualist "show-off" in Chinese culture (Sowden, 2005). On the other hand, a "collective and authorial voice" is a safe and acceptable way to express oneself in Chinese culture.

Learning is characterized by some scholars (Brennan & Durovic, 2005) as deeper learning and surface learning. Deeper learning is defined as learning activities with a strong will/purpose of self-improvement and to acquire certain skills or knowledge. Deeper learning also involves complex processes and the effect lasts a long time. Comparably, surface learning is often discussed with simple processes and short-term effects, etc. Brennan and Durovic argue that students using deeper learning strategies are less likely to plagiarize compared to those who use surface learning strategies. They also indicate that students with deeper learning strategies aim for the development of skills, while students with surface learning strategies more often learn to gain a credential. This explains the increasing plagiarism rate in that (capital) globalization changes people's understanding of education from self-perfection to a business exchange between money, time, and grades, and this results in more and more students using surface learning strategies.

Chinese students are often believed to use surface learning strategies because they are accustomed to and trained to use rote memory in their learning. However, deeper and surface learning theory fails to explain the fact that some students often use "surface learning" strategies, but develop deep understanding in their studies. In some educational systems such as China's, teachers are faced with having a large number of students in each class. It is necessary for teachers to maintain authorial identities for better classroom

management (*The Economist*, 2003, cited in Brennan & Durovic, 2005). Classroom management is achieved by teaching the conventional beliefs and values, which emphasize morality and respect for teachers, by utilizing strict rules and regulations and by practicing traditional teaching activities. All of these practices reinforce a non-Western ideology. Simultaneously, in order to succeed in a highly competitive environment, teachers and students are emphasizing performance in examinations, which is the only possible type of evaluation in the national competition in China. In such a situation, surface learning strategies are used more often. However, Brennan and Durovic explain that the Confucian notion of self-development focuses on deeper learning strategies, which could be the reason that the negative influence from surface learning strategies is balanced.

Plagiarism, writing, and identities. Plagiarism has a broad meaning closely connected with authorship, copyright, and property ownership, which masks issues of identity, power relations, knowledge understanding, and discourse (Pennycook, 1996). Authorship, copyright, and ownership are all referencing the independency and autonomy of a person, his/her position in the society, and his/her relationship to others. One's position in society and relationship with others are determined by identity and power relations within society. The definitions of identity, knowledge, discourse, and power relations are derived from cultural values in a specific tradition (Sowden, 2005). In individualist cultures, one's identity is comparably independent and one's position in society is comparably mobile, while in collectivist cultures, one's identity is more dependent on the community, and one's position is more fixed within the social

hierarchy. As Chandrasoma et al. (2004) state, plagiarism is not only an academic phenomenon, it is also a cultural construct. Within different cultures, plagiarism may be interpreted much differently because social and cultural values shape people's identities, power relationships, and discourse in a way that impacts the definition of plagiarism.

For international students who speak English as a second language and who are from different cultures, they are, in a sense, negotiating new identities through writing. Geertz (1986) claims that academic argumentation is not only constructing the fact, but also constructing the self of the writer. "The 2003 MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers states that the 'essential intellectual tasks of a research project' require that student writers 'rigorously distinguish between what they borrow and what they create'" (Marsh, 2007, p. 99). Student writers are doing three things when they write: constructing fact, constructing what they create, and creating the relationship between what they create and what they borrow from others. Students may have different conventions, epistemological approaches, and strategies for writing, and they may have received considerable training in how to write. Scollon (2004) indicates that when students write, what they focus on is presenting the fact as they see it from their end, rather than concerning themselves with the originality of the fact. Plagiarism is, therefore, a cultural issue, and it involves negotiating understandings from various cultures and organizing the relationships among fact, self, and others. Writing is the medium through which these relationships are established. Writing can be understood as a logical process that composes an argument and constructs an identity through positioning oneself in the argument. Therefore, writing is a cultural construct. It is important to understand

plagiarism through writing in that writing reflects not only the cultural practice of thinking and argumentation, but also the negotiation of students' identities.

If we further analyze the complexity that lies between writing and identity, there are four dimensions that need to be explored. First, some international students do not feel safe in sharing their personal experiences, nor do they feel comfortable writing in their own voices. This idea may come from Confucian caution of speech. Confucius thought that speech was dangerous because it separated things from the whole and distinguished the speaker from the whole as well, which allowed for deception and was against the integrity to heaven or Tao (Froese, 2008). Some students simply will not credit themselves; some hold the belief that they have no opinion as students. These customs, emotions, and mentalities are deeply embedded in their cultures. As Cadman (1997) quotes from one of her students on how she felt about writing in English, the student likened writing in English to swimming without breathing: "I can swim effectively so long as I do not breathe. But once I take a breath, my swimming form will break down completely. In the same way, my writing broke down as soon as I put in my voice" (p.10).

Second, students have different learning styles and attitudes towards the presentation of knowledge. Presentation of knowledge reflects the relationship between the writer, audience, references, and text. Scollon (1994) thinks that part of the difficulty of plagiarism is the problematic authorial self that is caused by taking an "unacceptable ideological position" (p. 35). Some international students seem not to have their own voices. The books international students read and people they quote are their voices

because they are trained not to challenge “authorities,” but instead learn through watching and listening instead. The relationship between these international students with references is more like that between the novice and the expert. These international students are learning from those authorities. The most common practice for these international students is to speak as these authoritative figures that they agree with. These students regard and present themselves like a medium within the paper, and ignore demonstrating an authorial self. According to Western scholarship, students have to respond to their readings through a process of questioning, challenging, and assessing, which is articulated in a first-person voice. Many people do not realize that those students already respond to readings and create an authorial self through the way they present their arguments. The authors they choose to quote, the logical orders they use, and the ways in which they organize these materials for their argument all show their opinions in a subtle and intricate way. When they respond with a different approach to what is expected, their traditional ways are not recognized by their professors. When a professor’s expectations conflict with a student’s expectations, it becomes only the student’s responsibility to differentiate “ownership of the text, personal thoughts, and interpretation of the facts and the facts themselves” (Keenan & Jemmeson, 2004, p. 6). It is arguable that professors often fail to distinguish the student’s interpretation and subsequent contextualization and application from the student’s original ideas. In cases like these, student’s cultural voice is silenced and her efforts dealt with as plagiarism, as was the case with Jessica, the international student whose story I mentioned earlier.

Third, it seems that Western academia uses a narrow concept of originality and

creativity with which to define "critical and authentic" writing. That is, good writing has to be creative, original, and reflective of the author's own points (Scollon, 1995). Many people take it for granted that the best way to implement this criterion is to use the personal voice, or "I." In this way, the author can judge, evaluate, and assess the work of others. Students are expected to agree or disagree with or critique others' work so that they can learn through critical understanding and interpretation. Some professors believe in this approach and detect plagiarism via judging whether students have created their own voices or not. However, focusing only on the result, the product of writing, blinds one to the complexity of the writing process which is equally important as its result, especially in the educational domain. An important question that needs to be considered is whether it is fair to judge students' writing without thinking of their writing process. From different cultural, geographic, religious, social and economic backgrounds, in order to understand the work of others they have to put it in their own context or contextualize the theories of others. In this process, they are evaluating and understanding others' work reflectively and critically. They are learning in their own way. When international students paraphrase, it is based not only on their understandings and interpretations, but also on the application and contextualization of such, which rely heavily on critical evaluation and assessment. Would it be prudent to ask international students to doubt their contextualization while at the same time encouraging them to use critical thinking? Unfortunately, this question is frequently ignored in this discourse.

Fourth, one of the basic practices for showing dis/agreement with a reading is to say: I agree/hold the same idea. Therefore, it can be extremely dangerous for international

students to use their own way to write. It becomes plagiarism when they do not simultaneously use these language markers to create their own voice in their writing. Sometimes, international students concentrate on "the facts evidenced by research of others" rather than how to present the facts and/or represent themselves. Missing a core "marker" like "I agree with…" for whatever reason, they risk the danger of plagiarism. From this perspective, similar learning experiences receive different treatments: native English speakers write a good paper because they are (accustomed to) using their voices in this academic setting, while non-native English-speaking students could be judged as having plagiarized.

The ideal campus, as Todd (1997) proposes, opens up to the cultural value and traditional educational practices of non-native English speaking students, and maintains the Western academic convention at the same time. In doing so, students' traditional identities can be recognized and credited, while a new identity that has been created through encountering Western academic convention can easily be accepted by students. As Montaigne used his lived experience as a valuable resource, the lived experience of writing for student writers can also be a valuable educational resource. It is not right to reduce their valuable experiences to simple technical steps as described in research writing guidelines found in research handbooks.

Authorial self and ownership of text. Western tradition, inheriting from the Aristotelian assumption that things are known best through being separated from other things (Smith, 2008), inspires the notion of "identity." In academic writing, identity is always marked by presentation and representation of authorial self. The authentic author

is supposed to distinguish her own idea (creation) from other sources to claim her ownership of the text. It is rooted in Western cultures that man distinguishes himself from other animals by self-transcending creativity (Tong, 1992). Eastern tradition instead believes more in the connection among things. It is believed that everything is interconnected and inseparable from each other. When one writes, the focus of the writing often concentrates on the interconnection or relationship of the writing to the authority. Even for Confucius, he thought that "he 'transmits' (Shu 述) more than 'creates' (Zuo 作)" (Tsai, 2008, p. 361). Fox (1999) holds a similar idea that "Confucius feared that too much talking (that is, self-regard) could lead to a person to forget their relationship with t'ien through Li" (p. 193). Furthermore, the presentation and representation of authorial self in Chinese writing is always in the forms of reinterpretation of authority and silencing oneself. Taking a stance, according to Fox, involves uniting private and social life, which implicates organizing oneself but also creating a social meaning. The ownership of the text is seen as the collective wisdom. When international students borrow others' words to validate their arguments, any mistake in their practices of borrowing native speakers' language and/or ideas can result in plagiarism.

Derrida (1992), from a postmodern and deconstructive perspective, regards identity as emerging and evolving from deferment and distinction, in which sense, presence, and absence are contained in and reflected by each other. If we consider that every idea has an origin and every idea is presented in a special context, then both Western writing and Eastern writing contain authorial others and authorial selves. In Western writing the authorial self is foregrounded as "presence," and authorial others

sometimes become “absence.” In opposition to Western writing tradition, Eastern writing, in order to emphasize relationships with and the respect of authorial others, often foreground authorial others as the “presence” and hide authorial self. As Smith (2008) reminds us, “Everything is always everywhere already present, but whether or not it is in evidence is a matter of mind and perception conditioned by culture and politics” (p. 23). From this perspective, some plagiarism incidents might be caused by different academic writing practices.

Discourse is seen by Gee (1999) as “ways of being in the world, or forms of life which integrate words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes and social identities” (p. 127). From the perspective of discourse, the notion of an authorial self, implicated by use of language, does not only present simply the linguistic relationship between writer and reader, and/or author and source, but also indicates the social relations and power relations in the discourse. Miller (2003) indicates that language use, as a form of self-presentation and representation, involves negotiation and renegotiation of identity, and implies the social value attached to the discourse in certain contexts. International students, in order to participate in mainstream dominant discourse, have to present themselves in an acceptable way that is defined and confined by social and power relationships. In a sense, international students are disadvantaged in the process of writing because language is used to legitimate and maintain ideologies (Miller, 2003). Similarly, Giroux (1992) notes that subordinate groups of students, lacking language proficiency or cultural capital, often are silenced or silence themselves because of intimidation. The inclination to maintain harmony while resolving conflicts silences

Chinese students and makes them unheard. This voicelessness, when appearing in their writing, hides self-representation and often draws suspicion of plagiarism. Language, at this time, functions to marginalize and disempower international students (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2001).

Plagiarism for Students in Confucian Heritage Cultures (CHC)

This study originated from my fear of writing in English, which is the shadow cast over my early academic career. The two plagiarism incidents discussed in the first chapter haunt me whenever I write. I struggle to distinguish my words from the words of others and my ideas from the ideas of others. But so often, it is as though a flashing red light stops me when I cannot be sure of where the idea comes from. It is not uncommon for me to feel as though everything I say is from somebody else. I was told to write for myself and the writing reflects who I am. However, I do not write this way where I come from. It appears a paradox: I am required to write from my identity, which requires me not to write this way. If I wrote in this way, I would not write from my identity. In other words, I would lose my identity when writing in this specific way. Not only was I trapped with how to write, but also I was trapped with my identity. It is a painstaking process to learn to write in English through unlearning habits developed through writing in Chinese.

Possibly my fear reflects the fear of other CHC students. The fear of writing in English comes from the fear of the ambiguity of using others' words. The ambiguity causes self-suspicion or even denial of my culture and identity. Identity is based to a significant extent on culture. Many CHC students have had successful learning experiences before coming to Canada. Their past success may have depended upon rote

memory or other strategies, and required no critical analysis of source material. In contrast, Western universities place a strong emphasis on applying and manipulating information from a variety of sources. The traditional Chinese education practice is to reproduce Confucian teaching, and it has been in practice for 2,000 years (Sowden, 2005). It is not only appropriate but a norm in Chinese culture to use, quote, and reproduce Confucian teaching without referencing (Sowden). CHC students experience cultural dispossession when writing in English. When removed from their familiar context, the fear of writing in a foreign language interferes with one's own self-understanding or identity. This type of situation aggravates the loss of identity and increases the feeling of fearfulness. Writing in English, to CHC students, is like living in darkness. The fear urges me to clear up this ambiguity, and the only way for me to do so is to understand plagiarism.

My cross-cultural experience has exposed me to the differences, based on the context involved, around how information can be interpreted. I will focus in this study on international students from Confucian heritage countries, where my own background lies, to examine how plagiarism is culturally interpreted and how these cultural others transform their identities. The process of identity negotiation is directly related to the process of understanding plagiarism. This question will enable me to look deep into the root of the difficulties CHC students experience while studying in foreign academia. It will help CHC students to have their voices and struggles with plagiarism heard, which gives possibilities and hope for a better future.

Brennan and Durovic (2005) use Hofstede's "cultural dimension theory" to

examine the implications of culture on plagiarism. They argue that the stronger tendency toward collectivism and against individualism significantly influences Confucian Heritage Culture (CHC) students in their understanding of and attitude toward learning. Western academia idealizes individual achievement in knowledge production, which greatly emphasizes authenticity and originality. Learning is an individual practice and achievement is creation. It is an alien concept for CHC students to "work alone" and "develop original ideas" (Brennan & Durovic). It is acceptable to achieve success with others' help in a CHC background, but this can generate misconduct such as plagiarism when CHC students "cross the line between collaboration and collusion" (Brennan & Durovic, p. 4).

Another important cultural signifier in social practice is one's comfort level towards uncertainty. According to Brennan and Durovic (2005), CHC students tend to have a low tolerance for uncertainty, and they prefer "strong social conventions, formalized behaviors and rules" to guide their performance (p. 32). As a result, CHC students pay more attention to conformity, feeling that it is dangerous to be different. Brennan and Durovic conclude that learning is culturally defined. CHC students have their own learning strategies and are reluctant to engage in the Western academic context. In addition, social and economic factors such as power relations also have an impact on the practice of learning and understanding of plagiarism.

It might be argued that culture is connected closely with geography. Confucian heritage cultures are located in East Asia. In the Islamic culture of South Asia and the Middle East also, there is a stress on sharing rather than working alone. This collectivist

rather than individualist trait certainly, to some degree, helps determine the understandings held about many things, including intellectual property. This aspect of the effect and, in some instances, function of culture is threaded through the writing, reflecting differences within the concepts of authorship, tolerance for borrowing, and even expectation (on the part of universities) of the research conduct of students. This of course complicates the issue of plagiarism when we define it as purely a Western construct without taking into consideration different cultural tolerances. This is not to say that there should not be a common set of regulations that apply to plagiarism in any particular context. My study is meant to inform the research community on how a set of regulations should and could be established upon sharing understandings.

Chapter 4 Hermeneutic Inquiry into Plagiarism

"*A great philosophy is not one that passes final judgments and establishes ultimate truth. It is one that causes uneasiness and starts commotion.*"

— Charles Peguy

"My real concern was and is philosophic: not what we do or what we ought to do, but what happens to us over and above our wanting and doing."

— Hans-Georg Gadamer

"Nothing in life is to be feared, it is only to be understood. Now is the time to understand more, so that we may fear less."

— Marie Curie

The Meaning of Plagiarism for CHC Students

In Chapter 3, I discussed that the notion of plagiarism in Western academia was originally coined from the concerns of ownership of intellectual property and texts, which were rooted deeply in recent Western history. Defined in that specific social, historical, and economic environment, the meaning of plagiarism may not necessarily apply to other contexts. Focusing on the unethical exploitation of others' words or ideas and how to write an academic paper to prevent plagiarism, some scholars overlook the difficulties and struggles that non-native English speakers are confronted with when writing in the context of a second or foreign language (Yamada, 2003). These scholars ignore different cultural values and practices behind the academic "crime." Prochaska (2001) argues that

as a purely modern concept, our notion of plagiarism is now being used as a gatekeeping device employed chiefly against non-native English writing academics.

The endeavor to define plagiarism in a more comprehensive way that covers many aspects, however, serves only to make things worse by creating more definitions. My interest is not in defining plagiarism, but in understanding it by focusing on CHC students' experiences of difficulties in comprehending plagiarism in the academic world. Chandrasoma et al. (2004) suggest that the best way to deal with plagiarism is to understand it before policing it. I would like to explore why and how plagiarism happens, the stories behind it, and the meaning beyond it, because the ultimate way to prevent plagiarism should be, as Macdonald and Carroll (2006) have suggested, a "value-driven, holistic, and institution-wide approach" (p. 235). Focusing more on the process and the reasons, rather than the result of technical tools (such as "Turnitin") allows for a more in-depth analysis of the meaning of plagiarism.

In order to understand plagiarism in an environment of cultural difference, it is important to ask questions such as what does it mean to live in a foreign culture? The experience of living in an alien environment not only means the illness, physical or otherwise, and nostalgia that emerge from being away from home, but also the emergence of problematized identities that are hard to articulate. The implication of the need to better understand students and their perceptions of plagiarism calls for a hermeneutic study. It is the domain of the hermeneutic scholar when there is the need to interpret from

information generated in an environment foreign to someone who may not be able to articulate a self or an identity to suit the current context. Identity is constructed through experience, exposure, and environment. Experience, exposure, and environment, all of which have a dynamic nature, make identity a fluid entity. Culture and identity can then be conceptualized as "moving inventories" (Matus & McCarthy, 2006). I intend to understand what kind of role the cultures of students play in understanding plagiarism from this type of hermeneutic inquiry.

Hermeneutics as Methodology and Method

As an interpretive methodology, hermeneutics was originally defined and confined in the paradigm of text interpretation. Schleiermacher developed it as an art of understanding by following "particular rules of *exegesis* and philology to the general problematic of understanding" (Ricoeur, 1981, p. 45). Hermeneutics, to Schleiermacher, became an art of refraining misunderstanding. Dilthey, Schleiermacher's student, extended his teacher's hermeneutic methodology from text interpretation to social sciences through interpreting life as a form of text and elucidating historical relationships in life (Gallagher, 1992). However, influenced by his teacher who was occupied by text interpretation, Dilthey brought life to textual expression. Heidegger moved the hermeneutic project further via recognizing the pre-structures which permit and qualify the conditions of life in its present form — the ontology of being (Ricoeur). Accepting that understanding is located in one's historical becoming, Gadamer (1990) advanced Heidegger's hermeneutic work through transcending the limits of understanding by

encountering the unfamiliarity of others. Encountering others makes one's taken-for-granted values and beliefs observable, and exposes one's prejudice. Gadamer (1975) argued that prejudice not only constrains our understanding but also enables it. The notion of prejudice is deeply rooted in the question of "how understanding comes into being" (Kanu, 1993, p. 60). Ricoeur integrates the long-standing controversial concepts of "explanation" and "understanding" in the process of appropriation. Ricoeur explicated the link between the self and the symbol in a dialectic way by "distanciation from" and "participation in the text" at the same time, due to the fact that he believed that the goal of hermeneutics was achieving self-understanding via understanding others. This study of plagiarism is mainly grounded in Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics, which has an "ontological grounding" because of the notion of prejudice. The purpose of hermeneutics is not to solve the problem, but to recover the difficulties of life. Difficulties are the moments that knowledge can be questioned and certainty can be shaken, and in which understanding starts to emerge. Hermeneutic study aims at an understanding that is meaningful and responsible to students and all people involved in educational practices. Consequently, this study of plagiarism is built around issues such as relationships between the concepts of plagiarism and the practice of learning, self-understanding and situation, and self and others. Hermeneutics adheres to openness, which keeps the central question "what is the right thing to do" open and uncertain (Smits, 1994, p. 82). As Gadamer (1975) stated, "The openness of what is in the question consists of the fact that the answer is not settled" (p. 326). Hermeneutic philosophy established the foundational structure of this research in that the study in its entirety was guided by an exploration of

the hermeneutical meaning of plagiarism in the life experience of Confucian heritage cultural students dwelling in Western academia. Key notions such as self and identity, narrative, meaning/understanding, and openness are derived from CHC students' struggles and difficulties within the gap of understanding plagiarism.

First, hermeneutics conceptualizes this research and threads together the entire process of this study. Hermeneutics explores the meaning of plagiarism through interpretive exploration of CHC students' experiences and relationships. Hermeneutic study emphasizes personal narratives and supports investigating the meaning of CHC students' lived experiences in understanding plagiarism in a foreign culture, endeavouring to interpret the concept of plagiarism through experiences and integrate experiences into the concept, rather than stopping at a superficial and technical rationality. In this way, both the concept and experiences of plagiarism become more meaningful. This study explores the meaning of plagiarism through the experiences of two CHC students in Canada, and their experiences were defined by "participation in" and "distanciation from" Confucian heritage culture at the same time. Ricoeur (1981) argues that understanding depends on "both ontological and epistemological dimensions of text," which inspired me to engage in the research into Confucian culture while in Canada. Difficulties guide the study to seek the understanding of life struggles in relation with others, which oriented to CHC students' daily practices of learning. The orientation concentrates on difficulties of understanding and difficulties of learning. The identities of CHC students are constructed through the narratives of these difficulties.

Second, hermeneutics is an important tool deployed in this study to encourage

CHC students to approach understanding plagiarism interpretively. Hermeneutics' insistence on meaning and narratives enables understanding to be constructed and reconstructed through CHC students' experiences. In this way, it allows space for dialogue with others and possibility for narratives from otherness. Hermeneutics focuses on language and holds the belief that understanding and meaning only reside in the complex relationship between language and the world. Gadamer (1975) notes that human beings experience the world through language. Human beings are born, formed, shaped, and grow up in and through language. Languages maintain a certain independence while transformed by human beings simultaneously. Gadamer states, "A view of language is a view of world" (p. 401). "Meaning does not derive from an isolated human subject, but grows as possibility from engagement with others through language" (Kerby, 1991, p. 5). According to hermeneutics, understanding is created by "appreciation of outside encounters," which orients this research to the experience and meanings of plagiarism from CHC students' encounters of difficulties in Western academia. Therefore, this study driven by defining the meaning of plagiarism changes to a study driven by opening possibilities for CHC students to negotiate understanding of plagiarism through narratives and experiences. Ricoeur's concept of meaning as segments of self-understanding and Kerby's theory that self can only be understood by reflective engagement with others leads this study to focus on CHC students' personal experiences.

Third, hermeneutics guides the writing of this study in a way that it situates it in a historical and contextual location, which grounds the meaning of plagiarism and CHC students' understanding of plagiarism. As Smits (1994) notes, "The homelessness of

reflection is painfully experienced when such orientation is absent or ignored, when the self cannot be located in the language and discourses" (p. 117). This is why this paper focuses on historical and cultural landscapes and the writing follows students' narratives. The study tightly connects the meaning of plagiarism to a larger narrative with reference to the self, and with engagement with others. It is not the participants who present the stories, but the difficulties in CHC students' stories that stand out of the narratives and present themselves in a hermeneutic way. The focus is not on the participants themselves, but on the lived experience of CHC students. This lived experience grounds the possibility of meaning of plagiarism and enables our understanding of it by engaging CHC students and Western academia. This engagement, as a hermeneutic state, provides a space for conversation and negotiation. Therefore, understanding does not come from CHC students or from me, nor does it come from the narratives. Understanding emerges within conversational negotiation through engagement and relationships. In this way, meaning is connected to the situation, which legitimizes our interpretation and understanding.

Hermeneutics is not only the philosophical basis of this study but also its practical guide, for the purpose of this study is to explore how the meaning of plagiarism is comprehended from the cultural perspective of CHC students and the study is concerned more with understanding the human situation, rather than only objective explanation. Ricoeur (1981) guides the study in that he projects both "explanation/science" and "understanding/human science" as necessary conditions in appropriating text/context. He points out the problem of this dichotomy by noting the danger of technological rationality

and the validity of understanding. The main task of hermeneutics is to understand through interpretation. Language is the key element for understanding. According to Gadamer (1975), understanding is constructed in a dialectic way on the basis of pre-understanding. New understanding emerges from the "fusion of horizon," in which our understanding is deepened and enlarged through the constant encounter of the history and the present.

This study is conducted following the hermeneutic notions of "question" and "conversation." Hermeneutics provides conversation as a tool for openness. Conversation allows the openness of the study in that "conversation is a personal form of discourse in which one dominates or is intimidated by the other" (Kanu, 1993, p. 71). According to Gadamer (1975), questioning realizes understanding and a "radical negativity" allows this possibility. This requires us to admit that we do not know, which leaves the question open. The true question presents itself and remains open by itself, which orients researchers to see what still needs to be investigated. Thus, questioning sustains the conversation in openness for possibility and the search for meaning, and interpretation becomes an ongoing process that never ends.

In short, hermeneutics provides holistic support from methodology to method in this research. On methodological perspective, hermeneutics problematizes the definition of "plagiarism" and orients the study towards "understanding" and interpretation. It mediates subjective understanding and objective explaining. It also helps the study to be rooted in lived experiences. From a practical perspective, hermeneutics leads the study by questioning and "radical negation." It also uses a dialectic conversation to keep questions open. Hermeneutic research is not simply a research method that follows strict rules. It is

a continuous inquiry process achieved through endless exploration of meaning and understanding of lived experiences in the form of dialectic conversation. Because understanding is constructed on the basis of pre-understanding, and understanding turns into a new pre-understanding with further inquiry, hermeneutic study never ends in certainty. It always goes back to the difficulties of lived experience that invites deeper understanding. As Ricoeur (1981) argued, the adequacy of the interpretation is judged only by returning to the texts.

Hermeneutic Inquiry into Cultural Others and Impact on Identity

As Jardine (1988) indicates, the goal of hermeneutic inquiry is to educe understanding and to bring forth the presuppositions in which we already live. Hermeneutics is not neutrality provided in that it neither abandons tradition, nor does it ignore the concerns for the future (McLean, 1992). It adjusts our horizons in dialogue in search of new implications of our tradition. In so doing, hermeneutics pays attention to language, culture, and history in human life and to how life is conditioned and contextualized.

Hermeneutics creates awareness of different ways of interpretation. In Kondo's (1990) terms, people "craft their identities or subject positions in response to real dilemmas and situations, and with culturally available symbols and understandings" (p. 104). Kondo reinforces the impact that cultural circumstances have on shaping one's identity, and by extension, allowing one to assess symbols and understandings held if circumstances change. Furthermore, Prochaska (2001) describes this process as an "intertextual exercise whereby meaning may be constructed, experience is informed of

narrative or story, and our life stories invite interpretation" (p. 66). This allows a determination of how one's life text and identity are formulated and reformulated through interpretation and reinterpretation.

The nature of this research project is best explained through interpretative study. This study is concerned with the question of how international students understand the meaning of plagiarism within foreignness, as well as how others in the Canadian university context understand plagiarism. A hermeneutic approach holds that being alien to a particular tradition is a condition of understanding. CHC students' cultural identities directly determine their interpretation of plagiarism, which this study seeks to understand. The diverse cultural environment in Canada allows the possibility for me to interpret the cultural meaning of plagiarism in a manner that may be significantly different from an interpretation that originates from a more homogeneous type of culture. Lacking in encounters of cultural differences, the interpretation of plagiarism from a homogeneous culture will readily be rooted in one culture and be understood from one perspective, which could be narrow. A diverse cultural environment offers opportunities for cultural conversations and encounters, and the cross-cultural conversation creates new channels through which to interpret the meaning of plagiarism by uncovering hidden and taken-for-granted cultural assumptions and making familiar assumptions strange.

In order to formalize some ideas that will emanate from the troubling of the above concepts like cultural identity and the meaning of plagiarism, and to allow a more hermeneutic interpretation as a meaning-making process, the hermeneutic conversation will start with the history of the participants' educational and cultural experiences, which

reflect the formation of their identities. Identity is not a static concept, but is formed, and informed, by one's understandings of the other. CHC students can play a greater role in the conversation around plagiarism if they can better understand the context in which they are viewed as the "other." The core issue is, as Ricoeur (1981) comments, "making one's own what was initially alien" (p. 159). This research offers that there are strong connections among context, identity, and self, and will attempt to juxtapose these against the explanations given when CHC students "commit plagiarism." This process requires interpretive research into the participants' own cultures and into the history of plagiarism in relation to their new environment. At the same time, Western academia may be called on to bring greater openness, in terms of understanding foreign contexts, to the conversation. The relationships between self and the other (participants and the university), between the part and the whole (participants and the present academia), and between the past and the present are exposed to examination in the hermeneutic circle. It is in this way that the encounter with difference and even aspects of difference are articulated into identities, which may be more conducive to conversations and which lead to meaningful interpretation.

There is a close relationship among academic writing, culture, and identity. Plagiarism often refers to students' misconduct in writing; writing is an identity-forming process that involves presentation and representation of information and is, to a large extent, shaped by cultural and social conventions. As such, CHC students' understanding of plagiarism, which is developed with a focus on writing, is greatly influenced by their identities and cultures. Hence, interpreting the meaning of plagiarism for CHC students is

a process of negotiation of identities between two cultures in which they dwell.

Meaning of Plagiarism from the Ontology of Being

Through this study, I intend to explore CHC students' encounters with plagiarism in Canadian universities and what plagiarism means to them as they occupy the intersection between the conceptual frameworks of Western academia and Eastern philosophy. The different understandings of plagiarism can be investigated by appealing to different cultures and histories, which according to Ricoeur (1981) is the "model of intelligibility borrowed from natural science" (p. 145). When CHC students use English and the conceptual framework brought from Eastern philosophy to interpret the concept of plagiarism developed in Western cultures, most of the expressions used are taken verbatim from Western cultures; terms and concepts such as individual property rights are foreign and do not apply to their Eastern philosophy, as their Eastern philosophy does not apply to the concept of plagiarism. This requires the research to explore the narrative of the cultural and historical data of Western academia as the origin of plagiarism, of Eastern philosophy as the foundation of CHC students' identity, and of the encounter as the context of investigation to interpret the meaning of plagiarism.

Appreciation of ontologies recognizes not only the individual experiences of CHC students but also their cultural milieu, both of which are different from Western cultures. As Gadamer (1975) indicated, the recognition of difference proposes the question (either this or that). And the meaning of plagiarism, as a Western local symbol, becomes questionable in front of the different ontologies, which will lead to a productive intellectual conversation. This is not to say that being culturally different is always an

accurate signifier of why behaviors or attitudes or perceptions occur because, according to Aoki (2005), these could actually be only "slippery signifiers." Nonetheless, cultural identity is affected by the social environment in which one has dwelled and remains an important determinant of one's perception and behavior. The goal of hermeneutic interpretation is not merely to understand the text being studied, but also to understand the self through an interpretive process. CHC students can learn by re-examining their interpretations of plagiarism through the lens of identity to find out how their understandings deviate from the university's perspective.

Informed by hermeneutics, these two cultures (Confucian cultures and Western cultures) are the two horizons from which understandings of plagiarism for CHC students emerge. The two horizons are formed within and developed from different ontologies. By ontologies, I am referring to the social and cultural beings (or existence) of Eastern and Western societies, which include social norms, cultural practices, and moral beliefs, etc. As Amour (2004) has pointed out, "psychological, social**,** economic, political, and cultural realities are intrinsically constituted by particular meanings, and are effectively motivated by particular values that have been originated, interpreted, expressed and validated by particular communities in the course of their own historical self-constitution" (p. 262). It is the different self-constituted historical and cultural ontologies that lead to distinctive values, beliefs, and norms between Eastern and Western cultures in which the meanings of plagiarism are interpreted, unlike methods. The unique understandings of plagiarism formed in specific ontologies of being are at the same time evolving with shifting social, cultural, and political realities, which brings about the

possibility and openness of re-interpretation. The encounter of the two ontologies that resulted from CHC coming to Western cultures enables and calls for a re-interpretation of plagiarism.

"A person who is trying to understand is exposed to distraction from fore-meanings that are not borne out by the things themselves" (Gadamer, 1990, p. 267). By this, Gadamer suggests that one must deal with certain interpretations of any phenomenon, which come from preconditioned understandings, and which may not reflect the truth about that phenomenon. As Gadamer (1975) asserts, the task of an historical hermeneutic in finding truth is "to consider the tension that exists between the identity of the common object and the changing situation in which it must be understood" (p. 276). If we apply this to plagiarism, identity of the common object is the meaning of plagiarism, whereas the changing situation refers to the Confucian cultural lens that CHC students use to interpret the meaning of plagiarism. However, to understand plagiarism, we must be exposed to these distractions within a conversation that tries to make sense of the phenomenon. As such, this issue needs to be explored hermeneutically, because these students are living between two cultures. The emphasis will be placed on justifying and negotiating the difference in meaning between what is said by someone and what is understood by the other. It will be a learning process for all of the participants, including me, to arrive at a new understanding of what plagiarism is with consideration of its special historical and social context. The new understanding is a shared one that embraces both cultural perspectives, inherits meaning from the past, and emerges from a new context. Inspired by Smith's (2003) assertion that "what makes life life, what makes

living living*"* (p. 105), I would like to explore: What makes plagiarism plagiarism from a philosophical perspective?

"The constitution of the self is contemporaneous with the constitution of meaning" (Ricoeur, 1981, p. 159). New meaning emerges from the meeting of different hermeneutic horizons, which is based on the willingness to express self and understand the other. Conversation will be focused on the following questions: What was the encounter of plagiarism for CHC students? What are participants' understandings of plagiarism? What is the difference between cheating and plagiarism? What is the relationship between property rights and plagiarism? What are participants' interpretations of the relationship among learning, knowledge, and plagiarism? What do the participants think learning is? What for the participants is knowledge? In this way, the conversation starts with participants' individual experiences, continues with their cultural milieu, and finally ends up with the recognition of the differences between Eastern and Western cultures. Along with the conversation, all of the themes such as knowledge, learning, and intellectual property act as part of the whole topic of plagiarism, which help one understand the meaning of plagiarism through interpretation of these themes.

Interviews trace the participants' relevant experiences from the past to the present. I, together with the participants, will review their education experience, cultural beliefs, and values in terms of learning and writing specifically in order to get an indication of the effects of these on their identity. We will also discuss how these conceptions are formed and how they influence their understanding of plagiarism. We will find from the conversation how plagiarism becomes an issue to them after they come to Canada, which

is the process of fusion of different horizons. Hermeneutics pays attention to language, culture, and history, and how life is contextualized, which opens the question and returns the question to the original difficulties of life. For example, the questions of participants' original educational experiences and perceptions of plagiarism and their current experiences and perceptions will be unpacked naturally in the exploration of the meaning of plagiarism. The pursuit of need and possibility of conversation drives the study and keeps questions open. Participants will be encouraged to ask questions because each question is itself subject to questioning. In the process of interpreting the meaning of plagiarism, the language change and perception change lead to the next question, which is around the changing identities of participants. Through asking questions which are sensible and have some direction, (Gadamer, 1975, pp. 325-326), and by doing so, producing openness, the intercultural meaning of plagiarism will be unpacked from conversation.

Conversation as a Research Mode

Conversation is regarded as a process of interpretation of "the objective reality" of conversers, with immediate contextual application (Gallagher, 1992). The conversation will be attentive to students' lived experiences and their narratives relating to their experiences with plagiarism, which situate the answers to the questions and allow the possibility and space for interpretation. Interpretation is a creative process that occurs in expressing self and understanding others, and meanings will be created in the interpretive process of conversation.

Conversation develops through attending to the other. Smith (1991) states,

"Hermeneutic pedagogy, for example, requires a giving oneself over to conversation with young people and building a shared common reality in a spirit of self-forgetfulness, a forgetfulness which is also a form of finding oneself in relation to others" (p. 198). In this way, the ontological roots of and the relationships between the West and the East, plagiarism and culture, and ethics and technology can be unearthed through constant dialogue and interpretation.

The hermeneutic circle is often used to describe the process of understanding. It seems that to understand the text as a whole requires a reference to each part and to understand each part requires a reference to the whole (Heidegger, 2010). Understanding of the whole and the part is established through mutual reference in a circle. Hermeneutic circle emphasizes to understand the text within its social, cultural, and historical context. Only through conversation can understanding transcend its limit and arise from the fusion of different horizons by attending to the hermeneutic circle, in terms of time, location, and relations. As Heidegger suggests, the whole (of reality) should be found in the detailed experience of individual existence (parts). Gadamer (1990) further developed this concept as a repeating process of forming new understandings of the whole (reality) via exploring the parts (detailed experience). Conversations and interpretations never end (Carson, 1984; Smith, 1991). The questions will always be kept open-ended to accommodate any unfamiliarity of the other, which foregrounds one's taken-for-granted values and beliefs; the meaning arising from the conversation will remain contingent on the historical and cultural context. As Gadamer (1990) said, "Given the intermediate position in which hermeneutics operates, it follows that its work is not to develop a

procedure of understanding but to clarify the conditions in which understanding takes place" (p. 295). In other words, in the efforts of manifestation of conditions, understanding occurs and meaning is created.

Smith (2008) asks the question "What makes interpretation authoritative?" Within this question, there are preconditions that actually determine the authoritativeness of any interpretation. For instance, CHC students, seen as the other, may not enjoy advantages in the power relations structure. Nonetheless, interpretation requires understanding of self, as well as understanding of others. This brings into question the interpretation of the definition of CHC students' identities where, as the others and in lower hierarchical positions in terms of power relations, they see themselves as not being in authority when it comes to interpretation. Because interpretation is usually purposely oriented and defined by context, it becomes unavoidable to encounter prejudice, which is itself a product of power relations and of the alien context in which these CHC students find themselves. According to Heidegger (1910) and Gadamer (1975), understanding cannot be achieved in an arbitrary way. When reading a text, the reader tends to project the whole of the meaning with expectations when the initial meaning of the text emerges. With more meanings emerging from the text, the reader keeps adjusting the projection or projections until the reader finds the closest meaning. This process involves both the objectivity of the text and the prejudice or fore-meaning of the reader. Prejudice not only limits our understanding, but also makes interpretation possible. It plays a significant role in building relationships between self and others, between knowledge and personal engagement, between the past and the present, and between relationships between

cultures. The interpreting process involved in the struggle of CHC students is key for this study. Through hermeneutic inquiry, I hope to unearth the participants' perceptions and interpretations of plagiarism within the original difficulties of the lived experiences in which the participants did not fully grasp why, in their academic pursuits, they were considered as having plagiarized.

Attending to the Text of Life

Hermeneutics returns to the ground of lived human experience and provides the possibility of interpreting the text of life. Smits (1994) states, "Hermeneutics reminds us that the space of human understanding is within the lived world of practice and human relationships" (p. 293). Life cannot be reduced to only textual expression, and interpretation must be oriented to the speaker's life rather than the text. When one reads text, one interprets according to one's exposure and pre-understanding. As such, text may have a different meaning to each reader depending on that reader's particular lived experience. In order to seek a detailed description of plagiarism, Ashworth et al. (2003) focused their research on "selfhood, sociality, embodiment, temporality, spatiality, project and discourse" in a phenomenological way (p. 265). It is enlightening and helpful to understand the lived experience of students. According to Heidegger, phenomenological facts of lived experience are always already meaningfully (hermeneutically) experienced; all description is already interpretation. But narrative is never life itself. Hence, apart from making use of thick narrative, which is a comprehensive and unabridged version of events, this study focuses more on the hermeneutic aspect — the meaning of plagiarism, which not only involves what the meaning of plagiarism is to students, but also how and

why they understand it this way. This meaning can only be achieved by reaching an agreement of understandings through (re)interpretation of reality with reference to the detailed experience. As the hermeneutic circle suggests, the interpretation never ends and understanding always reaches beyond its limit, which differs from defining a meaning of plagiarism. However, plagiarism may be understood, it has been created as a definable entity, which is an integral part of the rules of conduct in an academic environment. Although we may understand it in terms of its meaning as a rule of conduct, this research reasserts that it is not always possible for everyone to interpret plagiarism in the same way. Thus, there may be instances, as with CHC students, where "misinterpretations" of what plagiarism is may occur. In short, through application hermeneutics, this study attends to the humanness of being in the world through understanding (Gadamer, 1990).

Understanding the meaning of plagiarism requires the interpretation of the actions of plagiarizers. As Ricoeur (1981) posits, human action "may become an object of science without losing meaningfulness, can be detached from its agent, has significance beyond relevance, and can open up new references" (p. 208). The action of plagiarism qualifies four criteria of what a text is, and what can be interpreted as a text. If a student's lived experiences can be seen as text, then the text of the student's life has to be understood in the context of the difficulties of his/her life. It cannot be explained with only scientific logic. This explanatory attitude based on scientific logic, which is referenced to other text and is considered applicable, simplifies the complexity of life. The meaning of plagiarism also has to be interpreted and understood in the living context of the participants. This is the "province" of understanding that fixes the problem of

explanation (Ricoeur). However, demands of interpretation for objectivity conflict with the psychologizing character of understanding. Interpretation through this conflict bridges explanation and understanding, and enables openness of the question and the possibility of creating new meanings. As such, participants share CHC culture, Canadian academia, and their own personal experiences, which create the space for new interpretations. Participants' individual experiences will be interpreted in the spirit of maintaining openness in the question.

Attending to Language

"Not only is the world 'world' only insofar as it comes into language, but language too, has its real being only in the fact that the world is presented in it" (Gadamer, 1990, p. 443). Thus, emphasis will also be placed on the language used in conversations. Language mediates our actions and encounters in the world. As a medium, language also connects self, others, and the world. Hermeneutics asks the question "How is it, how has it come about, that I use the words or act in these ways?" (Smith, 1983, p. 28). To understand and reproduce lived experiences entails responsibility for understanding the language we use (Ashworth et al., 2003). Language selection depends on when we talk and who we talk to. The language we use implicates the real meaning we want to express, the cultural values we hold, the struggle we are fighting with, and the tension we live in. Tension refers to the condition of being held between two forces. The tension in our life is the conflict between self and others, between old and new, and between part and whole. It implies difference and otherness. "All traditions open up onto a broader world which can be engaged from within the language of one's own space"

(Smith, 1991, p. 195). Plagiarism is the relationship between "self" and "others," and between "private" and "public." Specifically, its interpretation is embedded in the relationship that is described within the realm of "my language," "your language," and "our language." Universal acceptance of interpretation of language may only be possible within the communal horizon, which develops "our language." This requires, then, the opportunity for dialogue, which pays special attention to language; it is this attention to language, which makes hermeneutics naturally oriented to the issue of plagiarism.

The conversations with the two participants in this study occurred in Mandarin, the native language of both participants, and eloquently articulated their taken-for-granted assumptions, norms, beliefs, and values, resulting in a better reflection of their cultural identities and their struggles in between Confucian culture and Western cultures. Because participants dwell in both Confucian and Western cultures with their different beliefs and worldviews, the conversations incorporate different and conflicting cultural values, which opens the possibility for the situated meanings to be created in between the Confucian cultural linguistic mentality and the concept of plagiarism coined and adopted in Western cultures. Situated meanings are negotiated and revealed in the process of communicative social interaction rather than residing in participants' minds.

Role of the Researcher

In hermeneutic conversation, the researcher's role is more that of a participant and listener of the conversation rather than that of an expert on the issue. I did not intend to convince my participants that they should hold any particular view, nor did I accept all that they said. I respected the differences so that I could blend ideas to create meanings.

Being a responsible listener, I could better attend to the participants and facilitate the conversation without indulging in the research. In this way, the knowledge I already had brought to the conversation facilitated rather than suffocated the conversation. That knowledge was also used to open up more possibilities of conversation through opening more perspectives. Every case was interpreted within its unique contextual situation. Orienting the conversation to the difficulty of understanding and practice makes explicit the underlying assumptions about knowledge. Amour (2004) says that understanding and questioning never ends. The conversation started with questions and ended with questions as well.

Participants

Two participants who were CHC graduate students studying social sciences took part in this study. The selection criteria specified that the students: (a) must be international students who finished their undergraduate study outside North America and are doing their graduate study in North America, (b) must be studying in a social science field, (c) must have had/are having personal experiences of plagiarism in Canadian universities, and (d) must come from Confucian heritage culture background countries/areas. This group of students is assumed to have extensive experience in different cultural academia. They experienced/are experiencing the struggle of plagiarism and have much to say and share. It can be assumed that students in the social science fields are more attentive to language and writing, and are influenced more by cultural issues than those in natural science fields who work more with positivist formulations of science. I assumed that because they are likely dealing with questions of language and

culture that students in the social sciences would perhaps be the most eager or willing to participate in my topic.

I contacted the coordinators of the graduate program in each department in two social science Faculties to ask their permission to post information about this research and a letter of recruitment in their departments and the materials included my contact information. Email invitations (including a research introduction and consent form) were sent out several times in a two-month period to several mailing lists (e.g., the international student mailing list, edgrad mailing list, and CSSA [Chinese Students and Scholars Association] mailing list) that have access to international graduate students. Recruitment posters were posted in many locations on campus including the International Student Centre, Housing Union Building, Student Union Building, and social science department buildings. However, the number of recruited participants was fewer than expected. The reason might be because of the sensitivity of the issue. Only three people contacted the researcher, and one of them was not qualified because she was never accused of plagiarism and she was only interested in sharing some of her thoughts about plagiarism. The remaining two volunteers took part in the study. Both participants were from China. They had very similar backgrounds but very different stories. Their experiences will be presented in the following chapters.

Data Collection and Analysis

Before interviews took place, subjects were informed of their rights in the study. They could choose to be in the study or withdraw from the study at any time. They could withdraw from the study and take out their data at any time during the study. They also

had the right not to answer some questions and still be in the study. All of this information had been included in the consent form. Both participants received a copy of an information letter outlining the nature of the research before the first interview. They were also asked to sign the consent form before the interviews. In the letter of consent, participants were alerted to the possible evaluative interpretation and they were notified of their right to withdraw from the study.

Participants were informed that all information about them in the study would remain confidential and participants would not be identified in any way. Pseudonyms are used throughout the study to maintain the anonymity of participants. They were also told that all information obtained from this study would be kept secure: all of the tapes, emails, and other files would be kept in a locked drawer in the researcher's office. Only the researcher would have access to these files. Lastly, they were told that all of the files, tapes, and disks would be destroyed five years after the study finished. Participants' personal information was not reported.

I interviewed both participants twice. Each interview took from 45 minutes to an hour in a semi-structured interview format of informal conversation. The interviews were conducted in Mandarin; however, participants occasionally used English vocabulary when they could not find a corresponding word in Chinese to express themselves. After the interviews, I kept in contact with both participants through email so that our conversation continued. Interviews were recorded on audio tapes. Observations and reflections on participants' body language and emotional changes were also recorded directly after each interview. The emerging data were shared with the participants for

their feedback. All interviews took place at the two participants' homes respectively as requested by the participants. Their own homes may have been the only places where they felt safe and confidential when talking about a sensitive issue of plagiarism. The first conversation concentrated on their backgrounds and personal experiences with plagiarism, while the second conversation focused on themes generated from the first conversation and the influence of plagiarism on the process of their identity negotiation.

The most important portions of the conversations were transcribed and translated with detailed narratives as guided by hermeneutics, being that the focus of hermeneutic study is not only on interpretation of the text, but also on the life text, or ontological existence of being, context with the present, and relationship between text and its history. The priority is to interpret not only what was said, but also what was unsaid, which urged me to have further conversations with participants rather than only use the transcribed text. I then categorized the information and developed it into major themes according to research questions concerning their lived experiences and the difficulties that they encountered when understanding plagiarism. The main themes included learning, knowledge, language, morality, and identity. I organized stories and questions from transcripts fitting each theme after the central phenomena were identified, and sub-themes were generalized at the same time. Initial data analysis started with the conversations with participants and continued with transcribing, translating, and interpreting as an ongoing process. The process of transcribing was a process of interpreting.The underpinning data analysis framework for this study is hermeneutics, which guided me to interprete the situated meanings of participants' words, phrases, and

expressions about their experieces and difficulties in understanding plagiarism. Seeking meaning and understanding is a dialectical process of recognizing my prejudice and comprehending the interaction of the self and the symbol (words, phrases, and expressions).

Further analysis is deeply located within the historical and contextual web of time, place, and subjects. It is a mediation connecting participants' identities with their life difficulties of living in foreignness and understanding plagiarism. Both their identities and difficulties are embedded in the complex relationships between the past and the present, and between self and others. The stories and questions were presented by using descriptive narratives and/or by describing the negativity of experience. As Gadamer (1975) argued, "The dialectical negativity of experience found its fulfillment in the idea of a perfect experience, in which we become aware of our absolute finitude and limited being, the logical form of the question, and the negativity that is part of it, find their fulfillment in a radical negativity… which opens up the way, amid the most extreme negativity of doubt, to the true superiority of questioning" (p. 325). Through thick description and narratives, both participants returned to the difficulties of life, which is the negativity of their experiences. Not only does this negativity invite questioning and sustain the openness for possibilities, it also involves the "essence of question" — the direction of questioning. This direction allows the answers to be meaningful, and the questions at the same time "open up the being of the object" and place the questioned in its context. The direction is towards meanings and relationships, which are the nature of hermeneutical experience. Through questioning the meaning of plagiarism and its

relationship with learning, knowledge, and ownership in different contexts, this study opens up dialogues between two cultures, CHC students and Western institutions, and learning to write and writing to learn. And through the dialectics of questioning and answering, knowledge is developed through and within questions.

Chapter 5 Meaning of Plagiarism for David — "I Only Want to Be a Good Student"

"There is a concept which corrupts and upsets all others. I refer not to Evil, whose limited realm is that of the ethics; I refer to the infinite."

— Jorge Luis Borge

"The needs of the society determine its ethics."

— Maya Angelou

Background

David was pursuing his PhD degree in education in a large university in Western Canada. David came from a northern province in China. He grew up and was educated in China, where he received his Bachelor's and Master's degrees. He was a teacher in China and he taught physics for many years at both the high school level and university level. It was his first experience abroad studying in Canada. His teaching subject area (sciences) does not involve opinion or interpretation for the most part. This is critical in understanding why the perception of plagiarism might not be as important as in subjects that involve aspects of opinion or interpretation. It is difficult to imagine having to cite formulae when solving a problem in mathematics. This might be one of the difficulties in how people schooled in different disciplines perceive plagiarism.

David's research topic is about science education and culture. David said the experience of studying in Canada brought significant change to his philosophical worldview. He was born during the "cultural revolution" and the education he received was strongly influenced by dialectic materialism and Marxism. Studying and teaching

physics for many years, David holds closely to the idea that the world is materialist and there are some universal rules that apply to any situation, like in mathematics and the natural and physical sciences. He said, “Science is always truth. You will not be afraid of anything after mastering math, physics, and chemistry.” His positivist philosophy has been challenged and changed significantly after taking courses like “curriculum theories” and “traditional wisdom.” The authority/unchallengeability of science is challenged by these courses. What he learned through these courses was that science can be perceived differently in different cultures and knowledge is heavily culturally embedded.

Plagiarizing Story

David’s plagiarism incident happened in a science philosophy course when half of the term was already over. It was a midterm examination (assignment). The instructor expected students to work in teams to discuss the current issues in science education and find out from the discussion the topics that interest them. All students were required to do a presentation and then write a three-page reflection paper about their presentations. The assignment counted for 30% of the final grade. Within the assignment, group discussion and research counted for 40%, presentation counted for 40%, handouts counted for 10%, and the reflection paper counted for another 10%. David finished the group work with his teammates and did the presentation. But he forgot to write the reflection paper until right before the deadline. Because of the time pressure, David copied some passages from his PowerPoint presentation that were quoted from other sources and submitted the paper. For this reflection paper, David was accused of copying something from other articles and was charged with plagiarism. The result was that he received a grade of zero for the

assignment as a penalty and failed the course because of it.

David was unhappy and felt that he had been treated unjustly. He believed that the fair and just solution to his problem should be a zero for only the reflection paper because he completed the discussion, the presentation and handout, etc. The act of plagiarism, in his view, should have been restricted to that section of a course requirement in which the act was committed. David did not agree that in these requirements in which he did not plagiarize he should be punished. David also argued about the purpose of education. He questioned,

> What is the purpose of education? Why do we come to school? Aren't we coming to get educated, to improve ourselves, and to acquire knowledge? If we already knew everything, who would come to school at all! If we don't make mistakes, how can we learn?

The question David raises here is whether we shall believe "once a thief, forever a thief," or whether we believe people can improve themselves and become better through education. This raises a hermeneutic question in terms of how plagiarism should be understood and defined: Because of David's culturally developed worldviews, should plagiarism be punished as an overriding moral crime or as a localized mistake? Moral overriding crimes refer to severe crimes that are more important for judging one's morality than any other aspect. Is plagiarism a moral overriding crime? In which situation is plagiarism a moral overriding crime? Is there a way to remain in "rehabilitation" when dealing with plagiarism?

Reflection on the Topics Discussed in the Conversation

Handing in the assignment is more important than the assignment itself.

David explained why he copied from other sources. Because the assignment consisted of several parts and the main focus was on the presentation and group discussion, he ignored the writing part until a couple of hours before the deadline. David noticed that his team members all completed their papers and he began to worry about his own. There was not enough time for David to write the paper in his own words and he copied some paragraphs from other articles. David illustrated the situation: "The class was about to start in one hour; there is not enough time for me to write the whole thing. If I didn't copy, I would not be able to submit the assignment on time." David's explanation indicates that it was a bigger offence for him not to hand in the paper at all than to hand in a low-quality paper with some problems. According to David's explanation, it seems clear that handing in a paper on time means the completion of the assignment, which displays his correct attitude as a student and shows his respect to the instructor. In terms of a low-quality paper, he could fix the problem and improve the paper later. David said the reason why he admitted easily to "copying from other sources" when the instructor asked him was that "I thought the instructor would give me a chance to redo the paper so I admitted it even without thinking. I was just waiting for the instructor's request to redo it." However, that did not happen. David was charged with plagiarism and only since then has he realized how bad the situation was.

The understanding that handing in the assignment is more important than the

assignment itself comes from David's cultural and educational background. David told me a story to justify his explanation:

> In ancient times in China, a poor man was invited to a formal dinner. As a courtesy, all the guests were supposed to bring some gifts to the dinner. The man was so poor that he could not afford to buy a gift. But it would be impolite to reject the invitation without a proper reason. (It would bring shame for him to miss the dinner because he could not afford a gift.) This man finally found two empty wine bottles, filled them with water, and took the two bottles of water to the dinner. Other guests all assumed that he brought two bottles of wine. And this behavior is regarded as a virtue that should be practiced in similar situations.

From the perspective of this story, to bring fake gifts is the right thing to do, rather than attending without bringing a gift or not attending. What is revealed by the story is that conforming to social norms/rules is prioritized and attached with more value than being honest and breaking social rules/norms. This value has been deeply rooted in Confucian culture for over 2,000 years and still influences Chinese people in that social harmony, represented by existing social hierarchy and enforced by social norms/rules, is regarded as the foundation of Chinese society. David restated that when he could not submit the paper, he saw it as shameful.

Apart from the priority of the submission of the assignment over the quality of the assignment itself, there is another underlying difference between Western cultures and Chinese culture in the relationship between teacher and student. There is a reluctance on

the part of the student to ask favours from the teacher as this itself produces some degree of shame, because asking for favours from teachers implies the incompetence of the student in understanding the teacher and finishing the task, which is not a sign of a good student. The deadline for assignments, like instructors themselves, to some extent represents the authority of the social hierarchy and should not be challenged, no matter what reason a student has. Hence, this is why David did not approach the professor for an extension, or give some explanation in order to get a special concession. Furthermore, this raises the point that even the relationship between instructor and student is culturally interpreted, even to the extent that there is "shame" attached to certain concessions that a student may seek from an instructor. David, it must be noted, did not at this point understand the full repercussions of committing plagiarism, and was concerned more with the shame of the inability to submit his assignment on time. His interpretation of how plagiarism would affect his standing in the course was that it would be clearly insignificant.

The understanding of the seriousness of plagiarism. An important reason why David made the mistake is because of his misunderstanding of the seriousness of plagiarism. Being in a new environment, he was not familiar with rules of academic conduct in Canadian academia. Previously he had already had an experience of handing in an inappropriate assignment in Canada. In that experience, David misunderstood the assignment and did it the wrong way. Being aware of the cultural issues facing international students, the instructor of that course was kind enough to ask him to redo the assignment. David deciphered the handling of that incident as something universal in

Canadian academia whereby he could always correct his (mistakes in) assignments when the instructor thought it was appropriate. David stated, “I thought students could always get opportunities to correct their mistakes (assignments), so I thought it was no big deal to submit this one improper paper.” This misinterpretation led David to assume that in this case (plagiarism), if the instructor found his paper unacceptable (because of copying), he would be given the chance to redo it. To David, copying was not a serious moral issue but a technical problem that could be rectified. David argued, “It is more important to ask why students did it than how they did it.” Obviously David thought copying was how to do the assignment in that situation, which should be understood from a technical perspective. David thought more about “handing in the paper on time” and “redoing the assignment if the instructor thought it was unacceptable” than about how he would complete the paper.

The necessity for references in presentation. The instructor also charged David with plagiarism for his PowerPoint presentation. The instructor believed that the PowerPoint content was plagiarized too, using text from other articles. David argued that he did not copy anything, and that he used his own words in his PowerPoint presentation. David said, “The content belonged to other people (articles), but I did not claim that the content was mine. If that were the case, everything that I talked about was plagiarism because the assignment was to summarize interesting topics in this field.” To David, as the point of this assignment was to summarize the main schools of thought in the field, it was self-explanatory that the presentation would be “copying others’ ideas.” In addition, David also mentioned that none of his classmates during their talks referenced each and

every idea. This, to David, seemed a unanimously agreed upon understanding that proved his opinion that there was no necessity for references in the assignment.

The casual and informal nature of the classes led David to interpret the assignment in a different way. In his previous educational experience, classrooms and other educational environments were serious places and often required corresponding rules and protocols for conduct and practices; instructors and students were always very serious when treating important assignments or academic topics. It seems to me that David holds the view that the importance of a class/assignment is determined by the seriousness of the attitude and practices conveyed by the instructors. For example, David distinguishes a formal academic paper (like a thesis) from a reflection paper. According to him, an academic paper should be in a certain format with all references, while a reflection paper can be anything. Because of the nature of the assignment and the casual classroom environment, David interpreted the assignment (reflection paper) as an informal paper, which recorded his thoughts and reflections on the readings and discussions with his colleagues. “Because this assignment was informal, it was not necessary to reference everything and make detailed citations,” as David described. The informality of this exercise perceived by David indicates that the formality of referencing was not required. David rationalized that there were only certain scenarios when referencing was required, and that this was not one of them. However, David did not realize that the friendly and casual class did not lessen what was required of an academic paper.

In China, form and content are equally important and reflect one another.

Confucius defined Li (Etiquette) as the ritual propriety, which is essential to civil society and an important component of education. Li can be understood as the form, which displays the content. A formal class always implies the seriousness of the content. In Western cultures, form is not as important as content, and discussion of serious issues can happen in informal settings.

"Cheating is bad, but copying is not necessarily cheating." David rationalized his act of plagiarism by arguing that copying was not necessarily cheating. David had strong feelings against cheating in exams and copying classmates' assignments. David said that those practices were seriously wrong because they were immoral and unethical. But David distinguishes copying books from cheating and considers copying classmates' assignments as cheating. David insists that his behavior was different from these "obvious" acts of cheating, because he did not copy his classmates' work.

The point David was making was that plagiarism should be defined according to the purpose behind the copying. According to his understanding, copying with the purpose of claiming another's (intellectual) property is plagiarism. That is why, to David, plagiarism is a moral issue. If the purpose of copying is learning, and/or has nothing to do with claiming another's property, it should be distinguished from plagiarism. It is for this reason that David believes that copying from books is different than copying from classmates' assignments. It seems that copying from books or journal articles to David, more or less, indicates a learning experience because the students have to interpret both the assignment and the books, and this kind of copying involves students' efforts of learning and thinking to process the information. Oppositely, David considers copying

from classmates to be a practice that involves no learning. It is a direct claim on other classmates' work, which is private property. Comparatively, he thinks that it is much different from copying published articles which are symbolic of authority or authoritative knowledge and which fall within the public domain. David argued that, in his case, he did not copy by claiming others' intellectual property. Instead, he categorized and assembled those ideas together to fit in one article and therefore it reflected his learning process and experiences. As a result, he thought his copying from journal articles should be not considered plagiarism. This is reflective of David's Confucian cultural background, which adheres to deference to authority.

Furthermore, David challenges the notion of copying as plagiarism in a deeper sense by questioning the notion of knowledge. David said, "You are knowledgeable. I learn a lot from you while talking with you and become knowledgeable as well. Does it mean that I plagiarized from you?" David believes the ultimate purpose of learning/education is to obtain knowledge, which should be shared. This is also the reason why he thinks plagiarism (without claiming another's property as the purpose) should not be a moral issue and that his case should not be considered plagiarism as it is considered to be by the university. David's argument reveals the "arbitrary nature of plagiarism" from the perspectives of culture. Just like Saussure (1916) believed that the relationship between signifier and the signified is arbitrary and based on convention, David questions the arbitrariness of the definition of plagiarism. The question of knowledge ownership reveals David's confusion around the privatization of intellectual property, which cannot be in the best interest of knowledge if it is not shared. As a matter

of fact, the words “intellectual” and “property” in Confucian culture do not fit together in the same sense as they do in Western cultures. Knowledge, in Confucian culture, is often seen as a collective good and not as something that can be individually owned.

“School is the place in which students can make mistakes.” Obviously, once something has been interpreted as an act of plagiarism in a Canadian academic environment, it will result in serious consequences. What the university then considers is only the evidence of whether the student plagiarized or not. The question then becomes how to deal with plagiarism, while the reasons or causes of why students did it are often neglected. When the reason why one plagiarizes and the context in which plagiarism happens are overlooked, the concept of plagiarism remains unclear and vague to CHC students. For instance, David in this study believes that once someone has interacted with another’s idea and has interpreted, reinterpreted, accepted, rejected, or modified the idea, new ideas have been created as a result, and these ideas can no longer be attributed to the original author. This is especially considered to be the case if the new author independently generates the same or similar ideas.

Once a university instructor has laid a formal charge of plagiarism against a student, the matter becomes more serious. David mentioned several times in our conversation that he was very afraid that he might be expelled from the university. To most CHC students, this is the most feared result. Once they are expelled from school, they lose their student identity and have to go back home with nothing. Considering the fact that only very wealthy or academically outstanding students/scholars in China have the opportunity to study abroad, the sense of failure and charge of plagiarism become

very shameful and hard to accept. It is more than an academic misdeed. It is about the full impact of the charge on their lives. For David, academic success means his future and everything important to him, and it is his sole purpose for going abroad to Canada. For many CHC students, academic life is their whole life while they study in Canada, and this is also true for David. When talking about this issue, David was very emotional and spoke with a higher tone than usual. I perceived from his way in which he was talking that the shadow is still haunting him. David said that he has been very careful since the incident. It was a traumatic experience, which has changed him permanently. David said, "I was furious and very upset when I was charged with plagiarism. I was really worried whether I could be expelled or not. I really did not know what to do. I was so frustrated. I even imagined the situation in the airport when I was expelled.

David seemed not to regard this incident of supposed plagiarism as an ethical and legal problem, and certainly not in as serious a manner as the university (instructor) did. David thinks that it is overly punitive to expel students from school because of plagiarism, which had never happened before in his educational experience. He said, "In my experience, both as a student and as a teacher, I never saw anybody that was expelled from school because of copying…unless it was in exam." Apparently, David did not take it (copying) seriously enough. According to David's description, the instructor sounded as though he regarded it as a legal infraction. Apart from the moral and ethical issue, David's conduct was infringing upon the legal regulation of using others' intellectual property and copyright. To David, copying from other sources without appropriate citation is only an error in judgment that has nothing to do with ethics per se. David holds

tightly to the idea that ethics pertain only to one's intention of claiming others' intellectual property. Regarding his plagiarism incident, he was concerned more with the moral aspect and emphasized that he had no intention of stealing others' property. To him, all he did was complete the assignment to show his respect to the teacher and educational system. the incident was not a big deal and should not affect his academic career. However, David did take cheating seriously in the sense of morality. David seemed to mix morality with legality in the way in which he viewed plagiarism. To David, in the educational domain, immoral behavior (like cheating) should receive legal punishment, while a mistake that does not relate to morality should not be punished legally. As Niu (2008) points out, Confucius believed in the rule of virtue more than the rule of law. Obviously, David understood cheating and plagiarism as two different things. He understood cheating as a serious offence against morality and education, which should be punished according to the law or regulation. On the other hand, he saw plagiarism as incorrect behavior but not necessarily as detrimental to a student's education, and not necessarily as a moral issue but one that could be solved without referring to the law. In the view of this student, plagiarism was not necessarily connected with moral issues, as it was in the eyes of the university. There is a gap between David's understandings of plagiarism and the taken-for-granted meaning of plagiarism, and this gap was not brought to the attention of the instructor. This gap might be the hint that calls for new strategies to address the challenge of plagiarism in higher education.

Hermeneutic Interpretations of David's Rationalization

Responsibility of oneself versus being responsible for oneself. There are apparent contrasting understandings of responsibility as indicated in the conversation with David. He emphasized several times: "All I thought was to hand in the assignment on time. Only after you (instructor) have the assignment, can you then talk about the quality of the assignment." To David, acting on the responsibility of handing in the paper on time was a virtue that showed both a proper attitude towards learning and respect towards the teacher. And this responsibility was more important than the quality of the paper, as indicated in the ancient story which he had told. David's sense of responsibility towards handing in the assignment reflects the relationship between teacher and student. To David, students are not supposed to make any requests of the teacher. However, in Canadian academia, it is acceptable for students to ask the teacher for concessions. In David's situation, the responsibility of submitting the paper on time precluded any choice that Western cultures might have felt that he had. Because David did not see it fit to ask for an extension, and because he would be ashamed if he did not hand in the paper on time, it has to be interpreted that he was left with no choice but to hand in the paper as it was, to preserve his virtue as he had been schooled to do through his Confucian culture.

In Confucian culture, the history of what is considered to be good academic behavior can be traced back 2,000 years. In accordance with Confucian doctrine, individuals should obey their masters, fathers, and instructors as their primary responsibility. It is considered to take priority to be responsible for others instead of for oneself. A similar idea is reflected in the concept of a transcendent self. After comparing

the Nietzschean and Confucian concepts of transcendence, Tong (1992) indicates that the Nietzschean superman portrays a self-transcending individual, while the knight in Confucian concept is "forever burdened with the solemn sense of responsibility issuing from a vital sympathetic feeling of kinship towards all life" (p. 51). There was an old saying in Confucian culture that once a teacher, forever a father. In David's case, the responsibility of respecting teachers and submitting the paper was more important than personal development (writing a good paper). The priority of his responsibility over being responsible for others implicates David's moral value system. O'Dwyer (2003) argues from a self-cultivating perspective that the obligation has moral forces by itself because "fulfilling them involves exercising moral dispositions that are integral to the realization of moral character, to the cultivation of the self" (p. 44). From both points of view, handing in the assignment in this scenario seemed more important to David than other duties.

From an Eastern perspective, one's first and primary responsibility as a student, as defined by collectivism, should be to respect the instructor, which symbolizes compliance with authority, and to do a students' duty (e.g., by submitting an assignment) symbolizing obedience to the institution; these practices guarantee the harmony and benefit of the system. In contrast, in Western cultures, responsible behavior is geared towards innovation and individual development. It encourages students to challenge teachers rather than obey them. Compared to a good quality paper, late submission or asking a teacher for an extension is not a big problem. In comparison to the Confucian perspective, the Western world sees students' first and primary responsibility in terms of

individual development — that is, to be responsible for themselves first. Thus, the issue eventually highlights the question of responsibility that is defined from two different perspectives: collectivism and individualism. David's perception of his responsibility was, in terms of academic conduct, getting the paper in on time. It is obvious, then, that students may see their responsibilities in terms of academic conduct not only as being different, but also as being prioritized differently. There is a serious challenge for students as to whether responsibilities or their prioritization remain valid for someone who is placed in a new context, and who has been schooled in a different way. If this challenge invalidates one's perception of what their responsibilities are, this is equivalent to invalidating their values. But the questions themselves, like who defines the responsibility and why it is defined or prioritized in a particular way, remains questionable.

Authoritative voice of tradition versus the autonomy of the individual voice. One of the themes that emerged from the conversation with David was the relationship between the authoritative voice of tradition and the autonomy of the individual's voice. Several times during the conversation, when David tried to justify his copying, his explanation referred to how to use recourses from authority. For example, David argued that: "In some situations, especially informal situations, is it necessary to keep references?" David questions the necessity to reference, especially in casual/informal situations, which partially relates to China's oral tradition and partially is because of the Chinese academic tradition in which it is acceptable to quote authorities without referencing in some cases. In Chinese history, it was appropriate to quote classic texts

(like Analects of Confucius) without referencing because it was recognized as common knowledge that all literate people knew. In addition, David distinguishes between cheating and copying, as well as between copying classmates' work from copying authoritative articles, which implies his understanding of learning as obtaining knowledge from authority and his emphasis on the voice of authority over individual voices.

In Chinese history, not only was it morally and literally appropriate to quote and use Confucian Analects, but individuals were also encouraged to learn from authoritative writings, and their own writing was supposed to be a new understanding of and further development of authoritative writings. However, Western cultures place greater emphasis on innovation and creation, which draw attention to individual voices and encourage challenges to authority. In Western academia, scholars are encouraged to voice their own opinions. This conflict between the Eastern and Western horizons causes David to be unable to fully comprehend the new environment. The conduct of writing and quoting authorities that David had practiced for decades was denied in this type of dialectic of being Chinese and adapting to Canadian academic discourse. The questions then are around why there is a conflict and where it comes from. The answer seems to lie within the understanding of what the differences really are between authoritative voices and individual voices in the two cultures.

Within both voices, there might be the perception that truth can be derived, but in different ways. With an authoritative voice, there is deference to traditions and institutions that have survived for centuries. With an individual voice, there is actually a

challenge to traditions and institutions in order to explore individual freedoms. Truth then is contextually interpreted and becomes difficult for any individual schooled, for example, in Confucian culture to reinterpret truth only because he is placed in the context of Western cultures. This reinterpretation is premised on the recognition that David must deconstruct, but not necessarily abandon and then reconstruct, a contextual interpretation of rules of conduct so that a full understanding both of the practice and of the consequences of plagiarism guide his conduct. In ancient China, emperors amplified Confucianism, which stresses loyalty and faith. In the thousands of years of Chinese culture, this became an ingrained tradition and custom. It is a virtue not to challenge authority because this is the path to truth, because "in Confucian terms, a person in authority should possess that authority in virtue of his competence" (Deutsch, 1992, p. 115). However, recent Western cultures, having inherited the spirit of Enlightenment in order to seek truth, encourage individuals to challenge authority, which is seen as the only way to realize individual value and derive truth. According to Kant's (1785) well-known principle of Enlightenment, authority is a source of prejudice and individuals should seek truth from their own understanding. In the Enlightenment spirit, in order to be "free from superstition and the prejudice of the past," reasoning rather than authority determines judgment on everything (Gadamer, 1975, p. 242). Truth can, therefore, be defined differently in Western and Eastern cultures in terms of authoritative versus individual voices.

Cultural understandings of the ownership of knowledge. Another important theme that emerged from the conversation is the cultural understanding of knowledge and/or learning within the context of property rights. The perception of knowledge and its nature determines how people use it and practice it. Knowledge, from a Western perspective, can be categorized as being in the public domain or as private property, and there is a clear distinction between public and private knowledge. Public knowledge can be used, shared, and published freely, while private knowledge, known as intellectual property, should be protected and not shared or used without proper recognition and compensation to the owner. In general, ownership of knowledge is demonstrated when knowledge is made public regardless of the size of the audience and regardless of the form in which it is made public. So long as knowledge is made public, ownership attaches to the producer, especially if there exists a witness to this knowledge. In the Western context, then, it becomes difficult to separate the two concepts of knowledge and ownership, especially in an academic environment which promotes academic freedom. The notion of knowledge is closely related to ownership and can be capitalized in the Western world.

David, influenced strongly by Eastern Confucian culture, does not perceive any clear distinction between public knowledge and intellectual property, especially in educational settings. As David argued,

> University is the place where I come to learn knowledge. If it is not mine after learning, why would I bother to learn it? Furthermore, even though the knowledge

belongs to others, I did not use it to make any profit. If they talk about money, I paid tuition fees to learn the knowledge.

David believes that knowledge should be owned by all people and the purpose of knowledge is to improve the whole human race. If it is for educational purposes, knowledge should be allowed to flow and be shared freely. That is the reason why he questioned the necessity of quotes, and why he emphasized the purpose of copying. David did not have a strong sense of ownership of knowledge and it was difficult for him to understand that knowledge can be owned and priced.

Another difference is the understanding of education based on the perception of the ownership of knowledge. The Western university expects students to create knowledge in the university and regards this creation as an achievement both of the student and of the institution while David expects to learn/obtain knowledge from the university only. These different views can be examined from cultural and social perspectives. From the social aspect, Western society is basically capitalistic — that is, driven by the market and based on privatization, which allows for private ownership of knowledge. Hence, it is easy to understand and accept that knowledge can be owned by individuals. In Eastern China, the societal framework is socialist, where the state is the owner of everything. In this sense, people are owners of all that is produced, including knowledge. It is to be noted that "people" here does not mean individual persons but a collective adhering to the doctrinal belief that individual rights of ownership are abrogated to the collective through the state. It can be argued that the reality of the situation does not always conform to this ideal, but this does not detract from individuals'

perceptions of the system as doctrine that private ownership is not allowed regardless of whether is it physical property or not. Everything is owned by the nation. Knowledge, as part of national property, can be used and shared by its people. From a cultural perspective, Western cultures emphasize the creation of new knowledge and distinguishes new knowledge from established knowledge, which requires individual authors to clearly mark the boundaries around what David's knowledge is and what belongs to others. Confucian culture emphasizes learning knowledge from others and stresses the relationships among people. In Confucian culture, it is considered to be a virtue to hide one's own voice or express one's voice as the extension/development of the ideas of others, which blurs the distinction between different types of knowledge and between the founder of ideas and who owns those ideas.

What is behind the conflicting understandings of knowledge is the concept of ownership. The haunting questions are: Should knowledge be owned, and to what extent? If the ultimate goal is the same, to evoke creation of new knowledge for the benefit of the human species, what is the best way to control the ownership of knowledge? From the standpoint of the participant, knowledge as a concept is to be freely used without necessarily attaching a stamp of ownership to it. Furthermore, when this is done within a learning institution, the objective is for the student to benefit (in terms of education) from past histories in the hope that in the future he or she, as part of history, can make contributions that become a part of the body of communal knowledge. Of course, in the Western context meanwhile, the rules of conduct may not support this worldview; this is what has to be learned by CHC students who come from differing traditions. The process

of learning this may be traumatic and with serious consequences, which leads to the next section.

Punishment or rehabilitation for infractions? One of reasons that David thinks he was unjustly treated is that he got a zero for the assignment. David said,

> I copied other's stuff in the paper; you can grade that paper zero, but you can't fail me on the whole assignment. I did the research, I did the discussion, and I did the presentation. To make an analogy: you don't have to cut off the arm because of necrosis on the body.

According to David, he should have received a zero only for the reflection paper rather than for the whole assignment. David thinks that the university pays attention only to punishment, while neglecting rehabilitation. As an institution with education as the primary purpose, it is against its goal of education to only punish students and not to give them a chance to change. Punishment should only be used as a means to cope with plagiarism rather than a purpose. Punishment, from this sense, is supposed to be managed within a certain scope so that students can remember the punishment and learn from their mistakes, but not be traumatized with their academic lives destroyed. From the perspective of the university, it is right to enhance the educational mandate, protect intellectual property, and recognize honesty and students' efforts by punishing those who plagiarize. In order to protect academic integrity, universities apply strict laws to punish plagiarism.

Essentially, the dilemma is about how we shall understand and perceive the purposes of punishment and rehabilitation. Rehabilitation provides individual students

with opportunities to correct their errors and improve themselves. Punishment protects academia, which hopefully provides a healthy environment for students to learn and develop. To some degree, too much rehabilitation punishes academia, and too much punishment harms individual rehabilitation. The relationship between the university's benefit (academic integrity) and the rights of students (rehabilitation) when it comes to plagiarism becomes seemingly contradictory, and the current strategies used by universities to deal with it become questionable. The dialogue then becomes a balancing act between the welfare of the university and the good of the student. An understanding of the other's worldviews may serve to produce a system or program whereby the meaning behind definitions, perceptions, responsibility, ownership, and punishment issues are made clearer to obviate the continuing conflict between differing perceptions of fairness, honesty, protocol, etc.

Another theme behind the issue of rehabilitation is the relationship between scholars and neophytes. An experienced scholar is familiar with academia; he or she is able to understand the assignment properly and knows when and how to reference. For a neophyte, or someone who is unfamiliar with academia, it is easy to misunderstand the assignment and how to reference. As Marsh (2007) indicates, the dominant writing conventions (quoting, summarizing, and paraphrasing) usually require a certain level of genre knowledge that new writers do not necessarily have. For David, there are three signs that relate to his status as a neophyte. First, David misunderstood the inflexibility of dealing with an improper assignment because of his previous experience; second, David wrongly equated the informal class and teaching environment with low requirements for

the assignment; third, David was not clear when and how he should use references. David states,

> The class was very informal. We talk and discuss issues in class. I enjoyed the class. And this paper counted for such a small percentage of the whole assignment. It was the least important part. How could I expect it to cause such a big problem?

This reasoning led David to make errors in judgment. It seems a prerequisite in Western academia to be able to understand academic rules and assignments, and David was expected to perform as a real scholar.

While David struggled to transition from a neophyte scholar to an experienced one, there is no such line that distinguishes between them, so it is necessary to consider What are the differences, and what do these differences mean to scholars? Even if there were such a line to help us determine the difference, how would we treat neophyte and experienced scholars differently but fairly? Moreover, students like David encounter an extra identity crisis that is generated in the process of transitioning from one culture to another. David is becoming a student after being a teacher, he is becoming a neophyte after being an experienced scholar, and he is becoming the other after being an insider. His cultural values and practices are becoming marginalized from the mainstream, and he is becoming a different person. Schooled for many years in China, David's identity was as an experienced scholar, and it is difficult for him to easily return to being a neophyte after coming to Canada. The question of identity as neophyte or experienced scholar then points towards the ambiguity of culturally defined scholarly practice in academia.

Chapter 6 The Meaning of Plagiarism for Nancy — "I Did not Plagiarize; the Computer Did It"

"What gets us into trouble is not what we don't know. It's what we know for sure that just ain't so."

— Mark Twain

"*Non Judgment: In our world where it seems we are taught to judge everything all around and about us and we spend so much of our time doing just that, it might be wise to ask if we can judge anything. To judge anything with any degree of clarity and accuracy we would need all the information past, present and future and how it will affect all concerned to make a perfect judgment. Because no one has that skill, ability or information, you might agree, it may be unwise to judge. This idea may be hard to accept, but when you look back over your life and the judgments you made, ask yourself. How many of your judgments, when you made them, were you perfectly sure they were correct, would you want to change now with the benefit of 20/20 hindsight? Since every judgment is only an opinion based on the limited information at hand, filtered through one's personal value system, it might be safe to assume no two people will judge anything exactly the same. Even concepts of right and wrong, good or bad, good or bad morals and ethics are only opinions, for what may be good in one case may be a disaster in another*."

— Sidney Madwed

Background

Nancy came from a northern inland province in China. She grew up and was educated in a rural area and her parents are both peasants. Nancy said, “Education changed my fate; otherwise, I would be a peasant like my parents.” Nancy obtained her Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees in China in English Education. Before Nancy came to Canada, she had a couple of careers in China. Nancy was very successful in both of her careers and had years of experience of teaching at different levels. It is safe to say that Nancy was a successful professional in China. Nancy immigrated to Canada a few years ago with her family and then started her doctoral studies one year later. Nancy was pursuing her PhD degree in a comprehensive university in Western Canada.

Nancy’s research interest originated from her personal experiences. Comparing it to how she had achieved success in China, Nancy found that it was very difficult to even find a professional job after she immigrated to Canada, because most employers required a North American degree and/or North American working experience. Because Nancy could not find a job, she started her PhD studies, hoping that this study experience could help her find a professional job. Nancy continued to look for a job while she was doing her degree. However, Nancy’s job search was still not successful. Many of Nancy’s immigrant colleagues had the same problem and this reality made her think about why this was happening to new immigrant students in their search for a job. Nancy’s studies are focused on career development.

Plagiarizing Story — Thesis Paper

Nancy’s plagiarism incident happened in the third year of her studies when she

had finished all the coursework and was writing her dissertation. After Nancy finished a rough draft, she sent it as an attachment to her supervisor via email, not realizing that she would be accused of plagiarism because of this paper. Nancy's supervisor replied to her quickly and requested to see her immediately. In her office, Nancy's supervisor furiously demanded her to confess her wrongful conduct of plagiarism and questioned Nancy about why she would do it, while Nancy was stunned and did not know what was happening. Nancy told me, "I could feel that something very bad had happened. It was very stifling to sit in the office. I felt that it was hard to breathe. It was like waiting for adjudication in the court." The major reason that Nancy was suspected of plagiarism was because her supervisor found in the paper many places that were marked "edited by xxx." The name of the editor "xxx" was a stranger's name rather than Nancy's name. Hence her supervisor believed that Nancy had somebody else write/edit the paper and that this was plagiarism. In fact, Nancy did not plagiarize. Nancy felt wronged but she could not explain why the stranger's name was in her paper. After two days of suffering, Nancy figured out the puzzle with her spouse's help. The truth turned out to be that Nancy had used a second-hand computer which was installed and configured under that "stranger's" name. All of the things Nancy did within Microsoft Word were tracked and marked as the computer user's editing. Finally, the incident was solved in a peaceful way, but it left a shadow on Nancy.

Nancy's Rationalization — "Trust Your Students"

Initially it seemed that this incident had little to do with the "cultural meaning" of plagiarism. However, in the process of conversing with Nancy, the hidden cultural themes

below the surface were gradually uncovered. The interpretation of the cultural meaning of plagiarism is not only about academic honesty, or ethics; it is also a process of knowing oneself and becoming the other.

Technology could be evil. The most direct cause of this incident seemed to be the editor's name shown in the document. It was this name that made Nancy's supervisor believe "the fact" of her plagiarism, and ask for Nancy's confession. After receiving no confession from Nancy, her supervisor showed Nancy the "evidence." On her supervisor's computer was the article sent by Nancy, in which all the changes in the article were marked in red with a stranger's name. Nancy was not familiar with computer technology and she was very confused when seeing the strange name, because she did not know this name and did not remember having seen this name before. Nancy was puzzled about why this strange name was all over her paper because this name had not appeared in her paper on her computer. Nancy asked the professor where this name had come from. The professor had to explain to her that it was a function called "track changes" in Microsoft Word. This function records all of the changes made to the document, as well as information on the author who made the changes. Nancy explained to her supervisor that there was no such name when she sent out the document. Obviously, Nancy also did not know that this function could have been turned on or off. Nancy said, "I did not know that name and did not know where it came from at all. I told my supervisor, 'I swear that I never hired anybody and I don't know where this name came from.'" Unfortunately, the professor did not believe her and insisted that Nancy hired this person to edit her paper. The professor was trying to force Nancy to admit it. Nancy was totally confused and

shocked, because she had not engaged in any plagiarism. The word plagiarism only existed in her colleagues' conversations before this happened. Now Nancy had to face her supervisor's suspicion and her academic career was at risk because of it. Nancy was very scared and felt helpless. In front of the hard evidence, Nancy had nobody to turn to. The worst part was that Nancy could not explain what had happened even though she had done nothing wrong.

Nancy said, "The main reason for this happening was because of a feature of computer technology. If you were in my shoes, it wouldn't happen to you because you are familiar with technologies." We can boldly make a hypothesis that the incident might have not happened if the function of track changes did not exist, if her spouse had bought her a brand new computer, if Nancy had reinstalled the system after her husband had bought her an open-box computer, if she had known the track changes function well enough to be able to explain it to her supervisor, or, finally, if her supervisor had been familiar enough with computers to know that using others' computers may result in others' names shown as editors. On the surface, it was the computer/technology that "caused" the plagiarism. Nancy thought of so many possibilities, putting all the blame on computers and technology. However, she did not blame her supervisor. A computer can record changes but it cannot judge the conduct of plagiarism. If her supervisor had trusted her and helped her to find the reason, it would have been a different story. Nancy's rationale exposed her cultural norm, which is "respect authority and never question authority, even when they are wrong." In Eastern Confucian culture, a good student is not supposed to confront authority in order to save face for the authority. It is natural and

even moral for a student to defer to the judgment of the teacher, especially in public. As such, to diminish the teacher is a deviant act and not commonly engaged in by students. Because all students believe this, the teacher is protected not only by this deference from an individual student, but by the deference of all the other students as well.

Another topic discussed by Nancy and me was the name in the document, which was a marker that indicated ownership of the editing by another person. In this case, the ultimate reason for this incident was that the participant's ownership of the editing was blurred by the computer she used, because it showed the name of the computer's previous owner instead. The unclear ownership of the computer delivered the wrong message to the reader (supervisor) and caused the problem. In other words, the relationship between the computer owner, the writer (Nancy), and the reader (supervisor) was confused by the medium (computer). The supervisor made her judgment of ownership based on the marker shown in the document, which was defined by the medium. However, human beings are not machines, and they are not confined by technology. They may use different computers that belong to different people. In this case, the conflicting characters of the flexibility of humans and the stability of technology make it hard to identify the ownership of a paper. The computer is only a tool or a medium. It can be used for good purposes or it may lead to bad results. It is human beings who commit plagiarism and judge it. Sometimes technology traps human beings, in that how technology is programmed is not always understood by everyone. As such, it may produce a situation that is not the intention of the person who uses it. If it duplicates or replicates something from its memory because it is programmed to respond in that manner within a context,

where that is not the user's intention but the information it produces is not noticed precisely because it was not intentionally produced, then technically this cannot be considered plagiarism. It is an error in editing caused by a specific type of ignorance.

Shall we trust virtue or virtual evidence? What disturbed Nancy most in this incident was the reasons that her supervisor gave her for why she had plagiarized. Firstly, the supervisor felt that Nancy wanted to graduate soon, so she needed external help and hired somebody to edit the paper and write some sections. Second, the supervisor said that the writing style of the paper was not Nancy's style, which meant that somebody else had written the paper. And third, the name of the stranger that appeared in the electronic document seemed to be the solid evidence for the supervisor proving that the paper had been written/edited by another person. Nancy could not explain what had happened because she did not know. Nancy felt both helpless and speechless. Nancy's speechlessness might have been what assured her supervisor that Nancy had plagiarized. As she described how she had been under severe pressure and felt incapable of clarifying the mystery, Nancy told me: "I almost confessed to the crime although I never did it. I just wanted to escape the overwhelmingly serious situation." The only reason why Nancy did not confess was that she felt that it was wrong to admit to something she never did. It is a culturally developed deference which caused Nancy's first response to nearly confess to something she did not do. Nancy may not have been prone to do this if she had been faced with someone else who was not in a similar authority position as the professor.

Nancy was very upset because it seemed her supervisor did not trust her; despite this fact, Nancy repeated several times that it was understandable that the situation could

cause suspicion, when her supervisor saw something unusual in her student's writing. It is possible that the professor might have seen other similar cases of plagiarism in her teaching career. However, this experience and pre-knowledge did not help in Nancy's case because every student is a unique individual, and every case would have happened at a different time and in a different situation. Because of the gravity of the situation, and especially of the potential damage which could result, the professor could have been more admissive of her own ignorance of technology and delved further into the matter to determine the truth. For the professor, the truth was already determined much like a programmed response, and this may have resulted from a kind of predisposition to one of many things. The truth as far as the professor was concerned should be acted upon according to the set rules for that situation, and herein lies the potential for errors of judgment. It is important for students to have opportunities to defend their positions if it becomes a matter of law or of survival in academia because judgment can be made out of prior experiences and a lack of exploration into why or how something might have occurred. Without considering the context and the uniqueness of individual circumstances, it is risky to make judgments only according to one's own past experiences, which may turn rationale into rationalization.

I noticed that Nancy had very different attitudes in talking about her story in the two interviews. In the first interview, I saw that Nancy was upset about being wronged and she was passionate about telling me her story. For most of the interview, she kept talking and I could hardly interrupt with a remark. However, in the second interview, Nancy did not talk very much about plagiarism, and focused instead on open and honest

communication between instructors and students. Nancy did mention that her family wanted her to withdraw from the study, and she really struggled for some time with the decision. Finally, she decided to stay in the study because she felt strongly that international students needed to be heard.

Nancy posited that students deserved to be listened to and that they should not be treated as if they were inherently bad. Nancy said, “Students are not bad people. Students come to study and have no intention to plagiarize. Even if they make mistakes, there must be reasons why they do.” This idea is actually seated in an old Chinese belief. The Three Character Classic says that men are born good and with similar characters. Their habits differentiate gradually because of their different living environments. Confucian culture believes in the benevolence of human beings, whereas in Western Christian culture, although the debate is continuously ongoing on whether people are born good or bad, many people hold strongly to the belief that humans are born sinners.

Nancy’s emphasis on trust between teachers and students can be traced back to a famous story of Confucius. One day, Confucius was sick during his journey and Yan Hui was the only disciple accompanying him. Yan Hui cooked lunch while Confucius was sleeping in bed. Confucius woke up around noon due to hunger. He sat up and noticed that Yan Hui had lifted the lid of the pot, grabbed a handful of rice, and had eaten it. Confucius was not happy, because a person with good manners should always ask his master to eat first. However, Yan Hui had not asked him and ate the rice without telling him. Confucius lay down again and pretended to be asleep. When Yan Hui asked him to have lunch, Confucius said to him, “I dreamed of our ancestors; maybe it is time to

worship them. Since the rice is ready, let us use it to worship our forefathers with rice before we eat." Yan Hui answered, "No, we cannot. The rice is not clean. Some dust dropped on the rice when I was cooking it. I did not want to waste rice, so I ate it." Hearing this, Confucius was sorry to have wronged Yan Hui. Confucius said, "We should trust our eyes, but sometimes we cannot believe solely what we see. The only thing we should trust is one's virtue. It is very difficult to know a person."

Writing style changes. One of the reasons why Nancy's supervisor believed she had committed plagiarism was that the writing style of the paper was perceived to be different from that of the papers Nancy had written before. Nancy had been working with her supervisor for more than three years. Her supervisor was familiar with Nancy's writing style, and felt that the paper she saw was better than the ones Nancy had written before. However, the supervisor ignored the fact that one's writing style is not unchanging and one's language (English) ability and skills can be improved. The improved writing ability, aligned with the "stranger's name" in the paper, provided satisfactory evidence of plagiarism for the professor. At least, it was enough to cast suspicion. This reveals her supervisor's expectations of Nancy's writing abilities, as well as the fact that Nancy's writing style had changed.

Nancy explained that she had been teaching ESL students how to write academic papers in English for a year. Nancy had learned so much about academic writing in English and her writing had improved significantly during that year. Nancy said,

> It really helps your own writing in English when you teach others how to write in English. Because you have to demonstrate the skills and strategies to your

students, it makes you conscious of the things you teach when you write in English.

Nancy learned how to organize a paper, how to support an argument, how to cite, and various other writing skills, which had changed her writing style in a significant way. In addition, Nancy had not met with her supervisor often during that year. This is why her supervisor did not recognize her writing.

This incident seems to inform us that it is not reliable to judge plagiarism only through one's writing style. What is hidden behind the writing style issue is actually a language learning issue. Some ESL instructors encourage their students to mimic their favourite writer's writing style in order to learn academic writing. Shall we call this kind of patterning plagiarism? If so, how else should international/immigrant students learn English? If not, how long can international students demystify and appreciate the new language before they can claim ownership over it? As Nancy told me, when she first started learning English, the only place to access English was in school. Nancy was always the best student and got the highest score in English class. The key to her success was repetition and memorization, which influenced her understanding of learning a language. Later, the supervisor admitted that Nancy's writing style had improved remarkably, which might have been because she had been teaching academic writing for ESL students for a year.

For CHC students like Nancy, through constantly reading, writing and memorizing, students gradually learn English as an additional language. The process of learning English is the process for them of improving their writing skills and language

ability. It is even the process of reconstructing Nancy's identity. As the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (Whorf, 1964) illustrates, language influences the way people think via encoding the culture and cognition. Language, to some extent, determines how we recognize the world and who we are. Acquiring a new language is a process of creating a new identity and acquiring a new way of thinking, through which process the learners re-identify themselves from a different window and reconnect with the outside world. The new language not only brings new possibilities but also challenges the "old" values, practices, and ways of thinking. Writing in a second language is learning a different way to present oneself. Therefore, it is not always reliable to judge plagiarism through one's writing style.

Intention defines plagiarism. It is interesting to note that Nancy talked at length about one of her student in Canada who had come to her for help after being charged with plagiarism, rather than only talking about her own story in the second interview. This plagiarism charge had also taken place in Canada. In her student's case, the student did not know how to write well or how to quote. The young man did not want to plagiarize at all and he had studied hard to learn to write in English. But he had been and still was an amateur with English writing. He copied a few paragraphs and was charged with plagiarism. When charged with plagiarism, this student was so stressed that he could not finish his program and had to go back to his country. The student later returned to Canada and took the course a second time. This student happened to register in Nancy's class when he took the course again. The student came to Nancy one day and asked for help about issues of plagiarism. He said to her, "If you find something I did wrong, let me

know. I can change it or whatever. Please do not think I am plagiarizing. I am really not meaning to do that. Remind me please if I did something wrong."

In Nancy's case, she did not know much about computers and was accused of accidently committing plagiarism. Comparing both cases, Nancy summarized that international students do not usually want to take advantage of others' writings no matter whether they have "technically" plagiarized or not. They have no intention to steal others' papers or ideas. They are only ignorant and/or unfamiliar with the concept of "plagiarism" as based on the various aspects of culture, environment, and philosophy which have been brought up earlier. Feeling the fear of alienation, failure, and shame caused by plagiarism, Nancy had strong sympathy for international students after her own incident. Nancy said that university professors expect students to know what plagiarism is; however, many international students have not even heard about it before coming to Canada. International students do not share the same historical and educational experiences as do Canadian students. Nancy believes that in these cases it should not be regarded as plagiarism, so long as the intention of students is not based on stealing ideas, etc. Nancy states that "you have to consider students' intentions when judging whether it is plagiarism. It is not fair to punish students who plagiarized without intention as you would those who plagiarized with intention." As a language teacher, she holds strongly to the idea that international students' mistakes in writer are not necessarily a matter of ethics or morality. I agree with this only to the extent that there is a change in environment where the rules of conduct and the interpretation of specific actions are different. If what is considered unethical or immoral in the new environment is not so in

the former one, then certain types of problems can arise. Time and practice will help a person to master a language. This in fact is an issue of neophytes in academia as I discussed in Chapter 5.

The ownership of knowledge. Another topic that emerged from the conversation is intellectual property and knowledge. Nancy has her unique perspective of knowledge. Nancy believes strongly that education changes one's fate! It was the "national entrance examination" which was restarted in 1978 that changed her life. Both of her parents were peasants and education gave her the chance to become socially upwardly mobile from the worker/peasant class to the intellect class. At that time, the Chinese education system was elitist. Only few people could go to universities and they would be assigned a job to serve the country after graduation. In that age, the whole idea of education was to serve one's county and everything students learned would not be theirs, but would belong to the country and be for the country's use. Nancy had no ownership of education and the knowledge she learned, of course, belonged to the country.

Nancy also talked about her understanding of knowledge through her experience of learning and writing. Nancy feels the need to read a lot before writing. To her, reading helps her understand issues better, and reading teaches her new vocabulary through which to express herself and new ideas with which to work. Nancy stresses that she needs quite a bit of time to digest/understand new words and ideas. She said,

> I want to write my own theory. I feel the need to read and learn others' ideas. But when I write, I want to filter others' theories and add my perspectives. After adding my personal ideas and my data, it should not be another person's idea

anymore.

This is not very different from what Nietzsche said, that to be authentic is an aesthetic process that involves "a matter of imaginative ordering" of others' work enabled by the creative power of interpretation and projection (Tong, 1992). Nancy spends much time internalizing and contextualizing knowledge through her personal experience and perspective after reading and before writing. She believes that, in this way, the knowledge becomes her personal knowledge and she accomplishes authentic creation via interpretation and thinking. Nancy suggests that to prevent plagiarism, educators should focus on how the knowledge was produced and by whom. Nancy believes that after thinking, processing, contextualizing, and personalizing the knowledge, it becomes one's own. In this case, Nancy would not reference the original information, because she considers the knowledge already hers, after being internalized in her unique experience and understanding.

Hermeneutic Interpretation of the Conversation

Social role of instructors and students. Nancy's supervisor believed the evidence and tried to urge Nancy to confess to plagiarism. The professor claimed that if Nancy confessed, she would help Nancy to solve the problem and this would not affect her graduation. Otherwise, she would have to report it to the Faculty, and Nancy may not be able to continue her academic career and studies. On one hand, the professor's intention to help solve the problem and save Nancy's academic life showed her concern about her student and Nancy's academic integrity. On the other hand, her assertion also displayed her bias against students like Nancy. Even though they had worked together for

several years, the professor still could not trust her student and chose to trust a "writing style" and "the evidence of the editor's name." However, this bias could be from the cultural expectation of a teacher's role in that Nancy seems to hold quite a different understanding of the role of an instructor.

Nancy described her understanding of instructors' social roles when talking about punishment for plagiarism and education's rehabilitation role. Nancy said,

> Supervisors and supervisory committees are the judges and mentors who are responsible for helping students with their writing. They are the people who guide students, teach students, and protect students. They are the ones who should identify the problem and fix it rather than punish the students and let them take all of the responsibility.

Nancy believes that students should not in every instance be held accountable for plagiarism. They are in the process of learning and should be given opportunities to correct their mistakes, if any. At the same time, instructors should take responsibility for weighing the positive and negative influences of a punishment before punishing students.

Nancy's point is also demonstrated in how she talks about her students. It is not a coincidence that Nancy talked about her students at length in the interview. The reason could be Nancy's strong sense of obligation to talk about the meaning of plagiarism. Nancy felt that her problem was not really plagiarism as she did not commit plagiarism; however, plagiarism was her problem for her being a English teacher whose responsibility is to teach students how to write. In order to accomplish her duty, she talked about issues in real cases of plagiarism. Nancy also seems to feel it is her

obligation to help her students. This sense of obligation highlights an important character of Confucian culture: role is identity. Ho (2003) says that "in the Chinese context, teachers have the moral responsibility to ensure good behaviour in students not only regarding discipline in the classroom but also guidance in daily life" (p. 103). As Ho found in his research, it is common in collectivist societies with a Confucian background for teachers and students to share collectivist responsibility for the individual problems of students. Nancy proved Ho's point in her teaching. Nancy said that "I became very careful not only when I write, but I also spend time talking about plagiarism to my students."

The message implied by this is the different social roles of teacher/instructor in Confucian culture and Western cultures. In Confucian heritage culture, the teacher's role is not limited to teaching in the classroom. In China, teachers have two responsibilities: "教书" (Jiaoshu) and "育人" (Yuren). "教书" (Jiaoshu) can literally be translated as "teaching books" and it means to teach or instruct knowledge. "育人" (Yuren) can be translated as "cultivating the person." The combination of the two phrases is translated as education. A teacher is also a mentor to the students. Teachers teach not only knowledge, but also teach about living, life, and how to be a human. The relationship between a teacher and his or her students is like the relationship between father and son. As noted above, there is a Chinese saying that "once a teacher, forever a father." Teachers are supposed to guide, mentor, and protect students in and out of the classroom. There are no clear boundaries for teachers' responsibilities. To be a teacher in Chinese culture means much more than just having a professional job. More often than not, it is understood from

a historical, cultural, and traditional function.

Compared to Nancy's understanding of the role of a teacher that is set in the context of partial and whole relationships of Confucianism, the Western concept of a teacher is defined as a job of a free and autonomous individual. Mencius once said the greatest wish in his whole life was to learn from Confucius. While in the Western tradition, influenced by Aristotle, the teacher is separated from what she teaches. As Aristotle once said: "I love my teacher Plato, but I love truth much more" (Qian, 2001, p. 173). In Western cultures, especially within educational institutions, the teacher's social role is always defined by professional and legal terms, according to which the teacher's responsibility has no concern for the private lives of students. Therefore, from a Western perspective, the professor's duty is to be a professional. A professor should first be rational and objective when facing issues like academic integrity. It is then easy to understand why Nancy's supervisor chose to believe in "evidence" rather than the student. To this professor, it was her responsibility to deal with the problem properly under the university regulations. The difference in the role of instructors lies in the fact that, in Eastern culture, teachers tend to hold more accountability for students' misbehavior because they are the "mentors and guides" of their students; while in Western cultures, teachers tend to trust the individuality of their students and believe that as independent individuals, students are capable and supposed to be accountable for themselves.

During the interview, Nancy kept speaking for her supervisor and rationalizing why it would be natural for her supervisor to think she had plagiarized. Nancy assumed

that the professor may have encountered this kind of thing before, and that the professor's previous experience made her believe this could happen again. She was trying to tell me that her supervisor did not charge her intentionally and that it was only an accident because of miscommunication. Some may argue that the power relations between student and teacher made Nancy defend the supervisor. But she could have changed supervisors after the incident, which she did not choose to do. I believe it was her social role as a student that persuaded her to stay with the same supervisor. In Confucian culture, the teacher represents authority, which should be respected and forgiven even though in this case she made mistakes. A good student should never challenge or betray her teacher. The loyalty to her teacher is a basic virtue, and obedience is a student's role. In addition, the extended relationship beyond the classroom as a strong connection could have also been the reason why Nancy tried hard to save face for her supervisor and continued to work with her.

"Mianzi" and loyalty. As mentioned, one of the questions that bothered Nancy after she solved the plagiarism issue (receiving apology from her supervisor) was whether to stay with her supervisor to finish her PhD or change to another supervisor. During this whole process, Nancy was fully supported by her family and a couple of Canadian friends. It was her family who helped her find out the truth of "the stranger's name." After Nancy went home and talked with her spouse who is a Canadian (born and raised in Canada), her spouse was shocked and angry that the professor had doubted his spouse's virtue and morality. At the same time, her spouse noticed that the stranger's name sounded familiar. He turned on the computer finding that the name was the user name of

the computer, which was a new but open-boxed product that had been returned by another customer. Nancy's spouse had bought this computer as a gift for Nancy. Not expecting it to be a big problem not to change the user name, they kept the old system and did not bother to reinstall it. And accidentally, the track changes function in Microsoft Word was turned off, so Nancy did not see the stranger's name on her computer.

Nancy and her whole family were very distraught by the incident. A couple of close friends were also involved because this was an important matter that concerned her name and the honour of the family. Although the misunderstanding was resolved peacefully, Nancy's family and friends (Canadians) suggested changing supervisors because the trust between Nancy and her supervisor had been broken. It was awkward for both the professor and Nancy to work together after this incident. However, Nancy finally chose to continue to work with her supervisor. Nancy did not elaborate on this topic. But from our conversation, I can sense that this is because of the Chinese concept of "面子" (Mianzi), which means face. Face in China is not only about one person, but also the reputation and honour of the whole family. Chinese face can be distinguished as "面子" (Mianzi) or "脸" (Lian). "面子" (Mianzi) is the public perception of a person and his or her family. "脸" (Lian) often refers to private morality. As a social norm, people should not only retain their own "面子" (Mianzi), but also protect others' "面子" (Mianzi).

Another reason for Nancy to have chosen to continue to work with the supervisor might have been because of the loyalty of a person to his/her master. As discussed earlier,

it is a student's virtue and obligation to obey his or her teacher and prevent the teacher from losing face. Loyalty is one of the most important virtues in Confucian culture. Nancy's friends and family apparently thought individual dignity was more important than loyalty or harmony. Although they strongly suggested changing to a new supervisor, Nancy selected the other option. In order to retain her loyalty and protect her supervisor's "面子" (Mianzi), Nancy chose to continue working with her supervisor. In Confucian culture, personal morality is closely connected with universal harmony (Smith, 2008). On some occasions, people are required to sacrifice their personal morality in order to pursue universal harmony, which is seen as a higher-level ethics.

Different understandings of ownership of knowledge. Nancy had never heard of plagiarism in her home country, although she had taught English in a university for about 20 years. The first time she heard of plagiarism was after she had become a sessional English teacher in a Canadian university. Nancy teaches international students ESL and her colleagues always talk about the issue of plagiarism. But Nancy cannot agree with some of the views her colleagues discuss because she shares a different understanding of the ownership of knowledge.

Nancy holds a strong belief that "wherever the mind is, the conduct follows," which is influenced by conventional Confucian understandings of learning and individual development. Salili (2003) in his study compared Chinese culture and Western cultures and concludes that Chinese people believe that ability is controllable and can be increased by people's efforts, while Westerners think ability is a kind of inborn and stable characteristic. Similarly, Nancy believes that as long as she understands the problem, her

conduct will automatically change (led by her understanding) to solve the problem. In Confucian culture, the best way of learning is repetition and memorization (Biggs & Watkins, 2003; Liu 2005). This understanding of knowledge makes students with CHC backgrounds more tentative to claim and use their knowledge/language that they learned without referencing to the words and ideas of others which may cause suspicion of plagiarism.

Different understandings of knowledge are also one of the reasons why CHC students find it difficult to understand the notion of plagiarism and why they make less reference to the original sources of knowledge. Eastern culture, influenced by Buddhism, Confucianism, and Taoism, believes strongly that life cannot be separated into parts and is a whole. Buddhism, for example, believes that all situations are created by the human heart, which implies that knowledge cannot be separated from the knower. In China, the teacher symbolizes the moral person and she embodies what she teaches (Zhang, 2008). The teacher's spiritual life is known as "师道" (Shidao) which means "teacher's way," and also implies that knowledge is inseparable from the teacher. For students from a CHC background, when they learn knowledge, that knowledge is theirs because knowledge cannot be separated from them. From a Western perspective, knowledge is separated from the knower, and belongs to its original owner even after one learns it. Smith (2008) says that current Western academia, representing the heritage of Immanuel Kant and the European Enlightenment, privileges "reason" and aims at knowledge emancipation. This Western academic tradition attempts to free knowledge from prejudice and self-will and implies separation between knowledge and knower. French Renaissance writer Michel de

Montaigne borrowed words, sentences, and writing styles freely from ancient wisdom without any quotation. However, he is known as a model authentic writer in that Montaigne merged his theories and hypotheses with stories and autobiographies. Montaigne is thought to have been an authentic writer also because he used his own judgment to examine the world and his writing. Montaigne successfully accomplished literacy transmutation and identity construction through incorporating others' text into his (Marsh, 2007). Taking Montaigne as an example, it is arguable whether borrowing others' styles is plagiarism or not. Or maybe it is more accurate to say that it is difficult to draw the line when the writer completes literacy transmutation and identity construction to be able to make a claim over language and knowledge.

Chapter 7 How the Precepts of Confucian Heritage Culture Impact the Understanding of Plagiarism

"Science is organized knowledge. Wisdom is organized life."

— Immanuel Kant

"Culture is a problem-solving resource we need to draw on, not a problem to be solved."

— Terry Cross

After discussing David's and Nancy's cases, some precepts of Confucian culture that had strong influences on both participants in terms of their understanding of plagiarism emerged from our conversations. David's understanding of plagiarism is revealed by his academic conduct of quoting books (authority) without reference, his understanding of knowledge, and his interpretation and prioritization of students' obligations. Nancy's understanding of plagiarism was disclosed in both her understanding and articulation of knowledge and in how she handled the relationship with her supervisor. It seems obvious that the influence of Confucian precepts affected both David's and Nancy's decisions and practices in the two case studies. This influence plays a significant role in the process of interpreting plagiarism in that it percolates the concept from its unique perspectives of collectivism and group harmony and guides the academic conduct of both participants. The precepts of Confucian culture recognized from both case studies include filial piety, the concept of identity/role, Confucian beliefs

in learning, and the ownership of knowledge.

In the Western sense, Confucianism may be seen as a philosophy or a religion. Confucianism, however, plays a vital role in Eastern Asian society and it goes beyond being just a philosophy; Confucianism is not only used as wisdom that enlightens the spiritual world, but it also guides people's everyday lives, thus maintaining the social structure. Zhang (2008) summarizes Confucianism as follows:

> As a life philosophy, Confucianism is a continuous learning process in which a person persists in raising his life vision by self-cultivation. As a social ideology, Confucianism advocates a harmony-based social arrangement that upholds a system of rites and music. As a way of life, Confucianism permeates everyday life and forms a whole package of social customs and norms that emphasizes family relationships, filial piety, morality, and education. (p. 336)

Confucianism, together with its long history and rich culture, shapes people's identities, nurtures people's beliefs, and influences people's practices. It is the life of the people who come from this culture, and is undeniable and irremovable. For people from a Confucian culture, any new understanding will unavoidably be filtered through it. In the following section, I will explore the historical meanings of these precepts in Confucian culture and discuss how these precepts influence CHC students' understandings of plagiarism.

Overview of Confucianism

In Confucianism, no apparent distinction is made between self and others (Manuel, 1992). Influenced by Taoism, Confucianism believes in the harmony between heaven and human beings, and the essence of this harmony is "德" (Te), which means virtue, goodness, or moral excellence. "德" (Te) is the fundamental source of wisdom and brings harmony to society. "德" (Te) consists of two interrelated aspects: "仁" (Ren) or humaneness and "义" (Yi) or righteousness. Confucius says that "'仁' (Ren)or humaneness consists in loving others; the man of "仁" (Ren) or humaneness is one who desires to sustain himself and sustains others, and desires to develop himself and develop others" (Confucius, 7: 6). Although it could be expressed via the relationship between humans and nature, "仁" (Ren) is mainly expressed through human relationships (Chan, 2001; Niu, 2008). Tong (1992) posits that "the life of Jen (Ren) is ruled by the cohesive-empathetic tendencies towards bonding, by the longing to unite with others in the mutual belonging and harmony which characterizes the oneness of the greater whole" (p. 51). Confucius thought all human beings were interrelated, and the only way to govern the relationship was through "义" (Yi) or righteousness, which articulates expectations and emphasizes people's obligations and responsibilities defined by their roles. Individuals should fulfill duties defined by their roles to achieve "仁" (Ren) and "义" (Yi), through which process the society achieves harmony and peace.

Confucius was born in 551 BC and was recognized as the founder of

Confucianism. Confucianism was developed in an agrarian society based on small family units, usually of three generations. Tu (2007) explains that it is undeniable that Confucius established Confucian philosophy, but it is not accurate to think that Confucianism is only what Confucius said. Confucianism is a fully developed ethical and philosophical system which has been built by countless Confucians (such as Mencius, Wang Shouyuan and Zhu Xi, etc.) over a period of 2,000 years. There are six core values, or precepts or virtues, in Confucianism: “礼” (Li), “孝” (Xiao), “义” (Yi), “信” (Xin), “仁” (Ren), and “忠” (Zhong). “礼” (Li) means etiquette, “孝” (Xiao) refers to filial piety, “义” (Yi) denotes righteousness, “信” (Xin) stands for being honest and trustworthy, “仁” (Ren) represents benevolence or humanism, and “忠” (Zhong) signifies loyalty.

Among the six virtues, “仁” (Ren) (benevolence or humanism) is often referred to as the core of Confucianism. Once Mencius said, “Being benevolent is being humane.” In order to achieve “仁” (Ren), one has to follow “礼” (Li), which are sets of rules for everyday practice. “礼” (Li) in a practical sense represents social norms and prescribes people’s desirable daily behaviors. If “仁” (Ren) is the spirit of being benevolent, “礼” (Li) can be seen as the structural body of social rules. “仁” (Ren) and “礼” (Li) are reciprocally interdependent in that the achievement of “仁” (Ren) scaffolds the practice of “礼” (Li) through nurturing people’s minds, while the practice of “礼” (Li) embodies “仁” (Ren) via aligning people’s conduct with social norms. Together, “仁” (Ren) and “礼” (Li) generate a type of conformity to social norms which suppresses individualism

and promotes a more collective behavior.

Lu (1994) states that "仁" (Ren) means "to subdue one's self to '礼' (Li) (propriety or rationalized social order)" (p. 691). "礼" (Li) has detailed and intricate rules in terms of handling relationships between superiors and inferiors. According to "礼" (Li), inferiors respect and subdue superiors in a manner that the superiors' interest is always protected and they are always able to save face. Confucius once said that "respectfulness uncontrolled by '礼' (Li) becomes labored effort, caution uncontrolled by '礼' (Li) becomes timidity, boldness uncontrolled by '礼' (Li) becomes insubordination, uprightness uncontrolled by '礼' (Li) becomes rudeness" (Confucius, 8: 2).

Another central theme of Confucianism is "义" (Yi), which refers to righteousness. According to Xin (1994), Confucianism emphasizes "[t]he shaping of human character, maintaining integrity, self-respect, perseverance and dedication to a just cause" (p. 90). Compared to "仁" (Ren) or benevolence or humaneness, which emphasizes developing human character towards oneself (usually by discipline), "义" (Yi) accounts for people's obligation towards the society. "义" (Yi) is often understood in accordance with people's specific roles in society. If "仁" (Ren) can be understood as the natural basis of being benevolent, "义" (Yi) is the social responsibility assigned in a specific social and moral structure to preserve and dedicate oneself to social justice. It is regarded as "仁" (Ren) to share food with the hungry, and it is seen as "义" (Yi) to stop the bullies against weak people who has no relation to oneself. In Chinese history, "仁"

(Ren) and "义" (Yi) were often used together to refer to morality and to define social norms and righteous behaviors.

Filial Piety and Its Reflection in Education

Filial piety ("孝," Xiao) is among the most important virtues in Confucianism. Lu (1994) notes that "[f]ilial piety is the root of all virtues in Confucianism" (p. 691). Filial piety is also the way to obtain unity, which leads to harmony and which eventually brings peace to oneself and the world (Zhang, 2008). Originally, filial piety characterized children's respect for their parents. Gradually this respect was expanded to "五伦" (Wulun) (five relationships: the ruler and the ruled, father and son, brother and sister, husband and wife, and friends). With regards to filial piety, specific obligations are prescribed for every individual in the five relations "五伦" (Wulun).

What filial piety projects is one's identity which determines his or her position in the family and the society. Filial piety declares a strong belongingness and close relationship within groups, and also reinforces the subordination of an individual's will to parents, authority, and the social hierarchy. To put it differently, filial piety shapes one's identity by supporting and sustaining his or her social status through respect for authority and maintenance of the social status quo. This is also the reason why filial piety is recognized in Confucian culture as the basic virtue of being human over its 2,000 years' history. As the basis of Confucian virtue, filial piety becomes a marker of Confucian society. There is an ancient Chinese saying: " 百善孝为先," which can be translated as

“among hundreds of (all) the virtues, filial piety should be prioritized.” It is like the passport or identity card of the culture, by which one can be recognized and accepted for being humane by society. Other major virtues like “仁” (Ren) and “义” (Yi) can only be established on the basis of filial piety, because filial piety is the foundation of one’s identity established by the sense of belongingness to the group. And in order to achieve “仁” (Ren), one starts with practicing filial piety that is scaffold by “礼” (Li).

To demonstrate one’s filial piety, one is required to respect elders, obey their orders, protect their interests, and help to maintain their status in the group. All of these actions discourage acts of questioning and challenging authority. The practice of filial piety emphasizes the elders’ interests and group interests above personal interests, and demands a subordination of personal interests to group interests in order to guarantee filial piety. Lu (1994) notes that “[t]he principal doctrine of Confucianism is not personal freedom as it is in liberal, democratic Western cultures, but harmony and union (oneness) between heaven and man…(where) great emphasis is laid on human relationship” (p. 691). In Western cultures, personal freedom is the basis of civilized society and the principal doctrine is to protect individual liberty (of conscience and expression, etc.) and rights (to life and belief, etc.). Conversely, in Confucian culture, the basis of civilized society is established on sacrificing personal freedom for the harmony of the society for the sake of filial piety. The subordination of self-suppresses or even sacrifices personal interests, if necessary, when they are in conflict with group interests.

In Nancy's case, in order to protect her professor's interests and save face for her professor, she almost admitted to the charge of plagiarism against her when she could not explain what happened with her paper, even though she did not commit plagiarism. All of these thoughts and practices can be traced back to the notion of filial piety. Nancy had no willingness to admit to something that she did not do. But she felt obligated not to challenge her supervisor, especially in a situation where she could not explain what happened. The truth as to whether she plagiarized or not was not as important to her as her supervisor's authority. Similarly, regardless of the opposition she faced from friends and family, Nancy chose to complete her studies with her professor in a situation where the trust between them had been damaged, and her feelings were hurt. This models the typical practice of "filial piety" ("孝," Xiao) by saving face for her supervisor, respecting her supervisor's authority, and maintaining the status quo via self-damage and self-sacrifice.

Similarly, David demonstrated the practice of "filial piety" ("孝," Xiao) when he chose not to ask for an extension for the assignment, but rather to submit the assignment on time even though the assignment was not ready. Apparently, David knew that it was wrong to copy from other resources without referencing, but he still chose to do so. From David's perspective, it was a more important responsibility to submit assignments on time, which displayed his respect for the instructor (authority) and prevented him from causing inconvenience to class organization and management. The priority and emphasis

on respecting the instructor and maintaining class organization in this case represent the value he places on social harmony and group interests; David's efforts to demonstrate his respect to his instructor and obedience to class organization exposed his strong sense of belongingness and his perceived identity as a group member, concepts which are rooted in the notion of "filial piety." It is safe to conclude that filial piety plays a significant role for CHC students in understanding the institutional system in education and interpreting their obligations as students, which impacts their translation of the meaning of plagiarism in an intricate but profound way.

Identity/role

In Confucian culture the role defines the identity of an individual and determines his or her conduct. Identity as such cannot be separated from role and context. In conversations with my two participants, I noted their courage and efforts to live through the darkness of suspicion, fear, anxiety, and losing trust in an unfamiliar cultural context. The difficulties of both participants included living in a new culture, struggling with different norms and practices, and negotiating meanings and solutions for survival. The instances of their frictions within Canadian academia present the complexity of in-dwelling between the two cultures, of living in a third place, being foreign, and alienating self and engaging in the process of becoming the other. Among all the difficulties and struggles, the concepts of role and identity as a student stand out in this study as the essence of understanding plagiarism.

In the face of the ultimate goal of social harmony, each individual in Confucian culture is supposed to fulfill his or her obligation according to his or her role assigned by the society. Confucianism holds the belief that the individual is only the starting point in the sense of his or her contribution to society (Xin, 1994). This starting point is actually the individual's role that is defined by the society and determines his or her responsibility and obligations in the society. "Confucius considers society to be hierarchically ordered, necessitating that each person must fulfill his or her duties as a moral imperative" (Kim & Lee, 1994, p. 174). Personal freedom, instead, is discouraged in Confucian culture. Confucius believes that true freedom can only be gained through "仁" (humaneness) and "义" (righteousness), which can only be achieved through self-cultivation and overcoming material desires. For example, a good student should respect his teacher because that is his role or duty, and to fulfill his role or duty is to respect his teacher. This is exactly what Nancy did in her case, regardless of what happened in the end between her and her supervisor. The fundamental duty or virtue to achieve as a student is not to pursue personal achievement, but rather to obey and respect his or her master. Having an individual identity itself is a difficult concept for students with a CHC background. Guo (2002), an English-Chinese translator who has dwelled in both cultures for many years, still finds identity a difficult concept to translate and explain.

Students with a Confucian heritage easily confuse their identities with their roles. Chinese students have a strong sense of group belongingness. Group members share responsibilities, honour, and shame. In this circumstance they are one, and credit for success, as well as blame for failure, is distributed evenly to every member in the group.

When introduced to outsiders, each member in the group has one and the same identity (group member), and each of their identities (who they are) depend on what the group is. Compared to identity in Western cultures, which is defined by difference from others, in Confucian culture identity is understood through the belongingness to a group. When faced with a dispute within the group, group members prefer negotiation through a third party medium to avoid any confrontation to maintain the group identity, while their Western counterparts may prefer to solve the problem directly even through confrontation. Kim and Lee (1994) found that in Japan, it is considered disruptive to harmony if one expresses himself or herself in a forceful and assertive way. They go on to explain that "[i]n Confucian societies that emphasize interdependence, communication is based on empathy rather than rationality" (p. 195). Confrontation within the group is discouraged because it endangers both the harmony of the group and also the identity of the group as a whole. It is not surprising that behaviors which may cause confrontation are discouraged in Confucian culture. Furthermore, empathy, as one of the virtues to achieve "仁" (Ren), is always promoted in Confucian culture. In Confucian culture, understanding is often built upon empathy instead of rationality. To put it another way, the obligation to maintain group harmony and retain group identity reinforces CHC students' strong sense of their roles, which at the same time suppresses their individual voices and covers up their individual identities. For this reason, identity to students with a CHC background is often understood in terms of collectively defined roles.

CHC students' academic conduct (including their writing) is often guided by their understanding of their roles as students. The case studies show that both David and

Nancy emphasized their roles as students, but never directly spoke about their identities. Both participants seemed to have difficulties distinguishing their roles as students from their identities as autonomous individuals or scholars. In our conversations, both participants kept using phrases like "as an international student" and "teachers should," which projected their strong sense of their roles as students. These phrases also showed their confusion around the competing differences between their roles as students in terms of social conduct and obligation in Confucian cultural settings, and identity as autonomous individuals in terms of learning and development in Western cultural settings. David, for example, when asked why he copied from another source and submitted the paper when he knew that was wrong, answered: "I think, as a student, the most important task is to hand in the assignment on time to show the respect to the teacher." By positioning himself as a student in the class, David muted his identity as an autonomous individual whose top priority in this course was to be an authentic learner and writer, and he gave way instead to his role as a student whose top priority was to keep the norm of the social order. As I pointed out in Chapter 3, in Western cultures writing is a process of independently identifying oneself among other sources. Authenticity of writing is to voice oneself, which depends on one's autonomy and individual stance. By contrast, in Confucianism, "[e]ach individual has to fulfill his or her pre-defined role and position" (Kim & Lee, 1994, p. 169), which is to say, people's roles are internalized as their characters in their daily conduct; this causes some confusion because their roles/characters can be misunderstood as their identities.

This comparison between role and identity is similar to the Confucian distinction

of "private self" (invisible side of self that is related to intention) and "public self" (visible self that is complying with social norm and rules) (Doi, 1985). Accustomed to suppressing the private self for the group interest, students with a Confucian heritage background tend to maximize their public self and in so doing, equate their role with their identity. This way of writing could silence the voices of their autonomous identities and run counter to the most important principle of writing in Western academia whereby tension found in one's writing mirrors their learning process of inquiry and creation. It is necessary for CHC students to experience this tension and disclose it, so that they can understand plagiarism from the perspective of identity construction via learning to write. The tension between silencing personal voice and voicing the self that is found in writing approaches reflects the different inquiry/learning approaches that CHC students use.

Lacking proper channels to address personal interests, CHC students confuse their identities with their roles. Britzman (1994) explains: "Role speaks to public function, whereas identity voices subjective investment and commitments. Role or what one is supposed to do, and identity, or what one believes and thinks, are often at odds" (p. 59). As Britzman observes, the notion of role, defined in accordance with one's social position in society, is born with one's social obligation, while identity, created for the uniqueness of individuals, presents individual voices and separation from others. Though it is true that role and identity are at odds in many situations in Western cultures, it is a different story in Confucian culture. As I discussed earlier, because of its emphasis on collectivist interests, Confucian culture suppresses individual interests for harmony and forces subordination of individuals to the group through public functions and obligation,

which strengthens and magnifies the concept of role. Being unfamiliar with the Western concept of identity, CHC students readily misinterpret their roles as their identities. The interpretation of role as identity prevents CHC students from understanding the notion of plagiarism as Western universities interpret it, in that it confuses CHC students with its relationships among individuals, and between individuals and the group/community.

Confucian Beliefs in Learning and Knowledge

The Confucian understanding of learning can be summarized from two perspectives: the process of learning and the ultimate goal of learning. In terms of the learning process, Confucius sang high praise of effort, and he believed that one's ability can be improved from the effort one exerts towards learning. For Confucius the effort exerted in learning represents one's virtue. Confucius seemed to believe that learning and thinking were two distinctly different processes, but that these processes were inextricably linked. He said, "He who learns but does not think, is lost; he who thinks but does not learn is perilous" (Luo, Guo, Li, & Zhang, 1989, p. 117). The ultimate goal of learning for Confucius was to achieve "仁" (Ren) or humaneness through pursuing virtue. Confucianism encourages people to learn from ancient virtuous exemplars, which somehow prescribes the means of learning as imitation. Confucius said, "I wasn't born with innate knowledge. By learning from ancients, I sought it through diligence" (Luo, Guo, Li, & Zhang, p. 123).

Through analyzing Confucian theory, Tweed (2000) summarizes the essence of Confucian learning as "effortful learning, behavioral reform, pragmatic learning, acquisition of essential knowledge, respectful learning and collectivist learning" (pp. 9-

11). The ultimate goal of learning for Confucius was self-improvement or self-perfection, and learning is considered to be reflected in behavioral reform. Confucius believed that learning should be pragmatically oriented. When referring to his own learning, Confucius said, “There may well be those who make up things while they do not know actually; but I for my part am certainly not one of them. To hear much, pick up what is good and follow it, to see much and take due note of it, is just inferior to the innate knowledge” (Luo, Guo, Li, & Zhang, 1989, p. 124). Confucius viewed learning as a process of observation and imitation, which changes and improves self. Compared to the Western concept of knowledge, Confucius was concerned less about truth, and emphasized more about virtue (Li, 2003). In addition, Confucianism is concerned less about creation and originality but emphasizes pragmatic application.

Confucianism holds the view that knowledge is not something that can be found from within oneself, but rather that knowledge can be acquired in the learning process of pursuing virtue, and the ultimate virtue lies in harmony with nature and the way of nature (“道,” Dao). As Ahmad (1995) argues, “Confucianism considers true knowledge to consist of understanding the attributes of God and adopting them in one's own conduct” (para. 7), which echoes Tweed’s argument on Confucian pragmatic learning. Confucius negated the private ownership of knowledge. He believed that knowledge belongs to nobody and can be acquired by searching and observation. Confucius said that “I was not born with knowledge. I love what is old and am assiduous in pursuing it” (Eno, 2015, p. 47). As Lehman (2006) notes, “This view of knowledge as something to be recovered rather than discovered led to innovation being concealed as rediscovery and thus to the

devaluing of the role of innovation in improving society" (p. 5). Confucius seemed to emphasize more the pragmatic value of knowledge by saying that

> if a man who knows the three hundred Odes by heart fails when given administrative responsibilities and proves incapable of exercising his own initiative when sent to foreign states, then what use are the Odes to him, however many he may have learned? (Confucius, 13:5)

Confucius also said, "When three of us are walking together, I am sure to have a teacher. I'd select his merits to follow and his demerits to correct myself" (Luo et al., 1989, p. 123). This Confucian belief of knowledge is not as concerned with the ownership of knowledge as it is with the application of knowledge. As Tweed and Lehman (2002) said, "Confucius urged his students to learn the essentials…. truly to understand and be reformed by the knowledge contained in those words" (p. 92).

It is indirect but clear that both David and Nancy questioned the private ownership of knowledge and emphasized their efforts of acquiring knowledge from other sources, which reflects a strong influence from Confucian heritage culture. David seemed to question the necessity of referencing in the assignment. Nonetheless, he questioned the concept of ownership of knowledge and struggled with the concept of transfer of knowledge without transfer of ownership. Likewise, Nancy, through defending her students who plagiarized with no intention and explaining her improvement in writing, revealed her belief that knowledge is acquired. Her explanation and emotions exposed that comprehending the concept that knowledge/language can be owned was a challenging task for her. Similarly, the understandings of learning and knowledge impact

CHC students' writing practices as well. Authority in Confucian culture should not be narrowly understood only as powerful people in certain positions, but also as the social hierarchy or social system that is represented by authorities, because Confucius believed that only those virtuous people can be the rulers and become authority. Authority and virtue in Confucian culture are united in most cases. On one hand, the method of learning from and imitating authority encourages students to use the ideas and texts of authority in their writing; on the other hand, the respect for authority hinders CHC students from being creative in their writings, because to challenge authority is perceived as disruptive conduct that defies authority and damages harmony. The writing practice resulting from the Confucian learning method and respect for authority usually employs a third person voice to address the argument and discourages the act of overusing authoritative sources. This writing style inherited from Confucian culture, which hides individual voice and relies on authoritative sources, to a large extent increases the chances of suspicion and charges against CHC students for plagiarism from their instructors in Western academia. The understandings of knowledge and learning directly determine CHC students' academic practices and beliefs around how to write and how to interact with (the ideas and texts of) their peers and other scholars, which can cause difficulties for them in understanding the notion of plagiarism properly.

Chapter 8 Negotiating Meaning of Plagiarism between Confucian Culture and Canadian Universities

"*…to be educated is to be ever open to the call of what it is to be deeply human, and heeding the call to walk with others in life's ventures*."

— Ted Aoki

"*...from what is familiar and everyday and enter a third space, neither home nor abroad, but in-between, a liminal or third space…*"

— William F. Pinar

The act of conversing with and interpreting both participants' lived experiences in their encounters with plagiarism presents the complexity of the issue of plagiarism, the friction and conflicts between Eastern and Western cultures, as well as the dynamics between identity change and construction. Our conversations were a process of negotiation and interpretation through creating situated meanings and recognizing those meanings in various contexts or situations. These meanings do not only reside in the conversers, but are also situated in culture, and culture is simultaneously negotiated in and through our communications.

By examining the struggle in each individual case, I found that the misunderstandings of plagiarism occurring in both cases reflected a close connection to the cultural differences in interpreting some of the key concepts that are used to define the notion of plagiarism: ownership, knowledge and learning, and morality and identity. This chapter will further discuss a hermeneutic understanding of the spoken and unspoken dynamics of culture that influence CHC students' understandings of plagiarism.

I would like once again to emphasize that I am fully aware of the problem and danger of falling into the trap of dualism or relativism by using the slippery words "West" and "East" as cultural labels. Although culture is permeable and dynamic, and although we know that it is impossible to draw firm boundaries around or sketch nuances of cultures, we can by no means deny the continuity and essence of a culture. Furthermore, it is inevitable to oversimplify, to some extent, the complexity of the issue when discussing cultural differences of understanding plagiarism.

Identity

The notion of identity is a key element that influences CHC students' understanding of plagiarism, as it is the fundamental concept for ownership of knowledge. An individual's identity is defined by the understanding of self. The concept of self is defined differently by individualism and collectivism in Western and Eastern cultures respectively. With a clear-cut boundary between self and society, the Western concept of identity becomes the cornerstone of the concept of authenticity and makes possible the possession of knowledge, thoughts, and language. From this aspect, the Western concept of selfhood supports the notion of plagiarism by allowing the private ownership of knowledge and language. By contrast, lacking a clear-cut boundary between self and society, the Eastern concept of self is incapable of making a claim over knowledge, thoughts, and language. Consequently, it is hard for the concept of plagiarism to take root in Eastern culture without having the "soil" of private ownership of knowledge and language to articulate or sustain it.

Western metaphysicists tend to define self from the perspective of identity and

contradiction, while Eastern philosophy interprets it as a process in terms of virtue (Lokuang, 1992). Comparing the epistemological difference of individualism and collectivism, Kim and Lee (1994) point out that individualism arises with the development of liberalism and science (e.g., Newtonian Physics and Darwinian Evolutionary Theory). It emphasizes "the position of rationalism, universalism, detachability and freedom of choice" (Kim & Lee, p. 178), and rejects arbitrary authorities and metaphysical explanations. An individual is considered to be an independent entity separated from others with a solid and firm boundary. This boundary is extended to apply to thoughts, feelings, actions, and ideas. "Humans in this context are separate, isolated entities, alienated from both the natural and communal environments in which they live and to which they are an integral part" (Tsai, 2008, p. 357). This "self-contained, self-controlled, and self-determined" concept of being cherishes freedom, uniqueness, and independence (Tsai, 2008). This self-actualized and context-free concept of the self also respects integrity as its core value, which implies a strong sense of possession of thoughts and language and shapes the concept of authenticity.

By contrast, East Asian society is built on the basis of Confucian collectivism that emphasizes social order and harmony over individual interests. A Confucian self takes group needs and goals as its own, and it can only be understood "in its concrete life and development" (Lokuang, 1992, p. 13). Traditionally, a Confucian self did not exist in isolation, but only in the totality of various roles that are related to others and defined by society (Fox, 1999; Rosemont, 1991). Norms and duties are defined collectively in the society according to one's role and position. An individual shares group beliefs and is

always ready to cooperate (Triandis, 1988), or to make a sacrifice in exchange for harmony or group interests. Kim and Lee (1994) state "[t]he Confucian view of the self upholds collective values and interdependence" (p. 182). In other words, the Confucian concept of self is embedded in a web of relationships shared by others. The value and ultimate goal of an individual is geared towards his or her group. If there is a boundary between self and group, this boundary is vague and flexible rather than clearly defined. Tsai (2008) asserts that the dynamic relationship between the human person and the community is reflected by the stress upon "ultimate self-transformation as a communal act" (p. 359). As I discussed in previous chapters, self and group are only slippery signifiers from a post-structuralist point of view. Nevertheless, the Confucian self is always ready to compromise and sacrifice its independence and freedom for group interests. Manuel (1992) argues, "To be a man of humanity is to be self-effacing, to be a non-ego. The man of jen is naturally humble" (p. 73). Compared to the Western concept of self in individualism, the Confucian concept of self is non-self and inseparable from the context.

Some scholars (for example, Doi, 1985) define the Confucian concept of self as having both a public self and a private self. Public self is the visible side of the self that complies with social norms and sacrifices self-interest for the sake of group harmony, while private self is the invisible side of self that is related to one's true intentions and personal desires. In Confucian culture, the suppressed private self is like the Western self with respect to independence and universal rights. However, the private self, deviating from the pursuit of group harmony, is always discouraged and suppressed when there is a

conflict with the group interest or goal. Hence, private self, as the dark side of self, is against Confucian virtues and is supposed to be overcome by the efforts of following "礼" (Li). In general, Confucian self is collective, holistic, contextual, relational, and dependent on others (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Another difference in the concept of self in Western and Eastern culture is the approach with which the concept of self is defined in relation to others. In Western cultures, self is the core and defines the other by detachment from the outside world, whereas in Eastern culture, relationship is the core and self is defined in relation to others. With a clear-cut boundary between self and others, the Western concept of the self focuses on individual integrity, while without a clear boundary between self and others, the Confucian concept of self understands integrity from a more collectivist perspective. Korea is one of the Eastern Asian countries that is influenced greatly by Confucianism. Maday and Szalay (1976) studied Korean and American adults to compare "the four most frequent themes of views of self." While the Korean sample ranked "family, love" as number one, the American sample ranked "I, person, individual" at the top. This result clearly showed a difference between collectivist culture and individualist culture. The concept of identity and one's relationship with others have a significant impact on CHC students' understanding of knowledge and attitudes towards learning.

On one hand, the concept of identity influences CHC students' comprehension of the relationship between knowledge and ownership. In Western cultures, influenced by liberalism, interpersonal relationships are built upon self-autonomy and independence. This kind of interpersonal relationship emphasizes a strong sense of ownership with

boundaries, and is constructed and maintained mainly within legal systems. In Eastern culture, influenced by Confucianism, interpersonal relationships are constructed upon interdependence and group harmony. This kind of collective interpersonal relationship prioritizes group interests, is realized by everyone taking his or her social role, and features a shared ownership and responsibility. This kind of interpersonal relationship is based on virtues. When facing issues like authenticity and originality, it is difficult for CHC students to understand pure originality without a sense of boundaries. As discussed in earlier chapters, intellectual property is a challenging concept for CHC students to understand. The notion of plagiarism, while it is coined and widely accepted in Western cultures emphasizing individualistic rights, becomes difficult to understand for CHC students from collectivist Confucian culture emphasizing interpersonal relationships.

On the other hand, the concept of identity/self also determines CHC students' attitudes towards their academic practice (learning). O'Dwyer (2003) differentiates Western and Eastern culture with the conflicting philosophies of liberalism and Confucianism, and the contrasting approaches taken by the two philosophies to resolve particularistic and fundamental obligation. O'Dwyer refers to fundamental obligations as basic responsibilities that are universally recognized and prioritized under any conditions, and particularistic obligations as responsibilities that are only recognized locally and contextually and do not apply to all situations. For liberalism, fundamental obligations prevail over particularistic obligations, while for Confucianism, there are no fundamental obligations as all obligations are regarded as particularistic. Influenced by a collective sense of self, the core value of international students with a Confucian heritage cultural

background is not simply having a genuine and authentic self, but being part of an authentic and genuine social group in harmony. Confucian self focuses on group harmony and, therefore, has a rather weak impulse for self-fulfillment. The best self-actualization is not creation but group harmony. To those students, harmony is neither yours, nor mine, but ours; their role in the social hierarchy is more meaningful than their identities as individuals.

One way to problematize the notion of identity is as Clark (1999) suggests, from "the language of otherness" (p. 254). Identity often refers to the uniqueness of one entity, which makes it only to be identical to itself. Though identity seemingly depends on the unique property of itself, in essence, the uniqueness of identity can only be identified and recognized by otherness because of its differences from others. The emphasis on their roles as students, which is reflected in their writing, encourages CHC students to hide their own voices, which could expose their identities, and to only discuss the issue of plagiarism from an objective third voice, which represents the voice of the student group. However, the fact that they are speaking from a third voice, instead of from an individual voice, precisely reflects their Confucian cultural background and CHC identity. It seems then that the irony of it all is that their efforts to prevent being othered actually cause them to be othered. Their efforts to understand plagiarism seem to be impeded by the over-emphasis on deciphering their roles without talking about identity. Hence, identity seems to be a difficult notion for CHC students and needs to be problematized from a cultural perspective.

Principles of Morality

Plagiarism is a moral offence in the Western educational domain. Though both Western and Eastern (Confucian) philosophies agree that to be an authentic human requires that human to be moral (Tong, 1992), they share different principles of and approaches towards morality. As Saha (2017) argues, "Ethics can mean different things to different people and therefore issues related to legitimacy of one point of view as against another will always remain debatable" (p. 2375). Miller and Hashmi's (2001) study posits that people's moral judgments are influenced by their cultural and philosophical assumptions. Morality is derived from specifics of concrete experience of a people in history and denotes its cultural heritage (McLean, 1992). It is not surprising that people holding different cultural and philosophical assumptions will make different moral judgments when dealing with academic writing (Kim & Lee, 1994). As demonstrated by David's and Nancy's cases, CHC students' moral assumptions play an important role in understanding and articulating plagiarism. In the following section I will discuss where morality comes from and where morality resides. The most influential theories that shape the concept of contemporary Western morality include consequential imperative represented by Jeremy Bentham's principle of utility, John Stuart Mill's utilitarianism, as well as the categorical imperative represented by Immanuel Kant's metaphysics of morals.

According to Jeremy Bentham (1780), morality is based on the principle of utility. In this regard, the underlying principle for moral action is governed by the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people. Bentham argued that

> Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. On the one hand the standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects, are fastened to their throne. They govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think. (p. 13)

Bentham believed that "it is in vain to talk of the interest of the community, without understanding what is the interest of the individual" (p. 2). According to Bentham, morality is producing the greatest happiness for the community, which comprises the happiness of individuals, and it is acceptable to sacrifice the minority's happiness in order to achieve the majority's greater happiness.

Bentham's student John Stuart Mill (1863) further developed Bentham's theory of utility by specifying qualitative and quantitative accounts of pleasure. While Bentham equalized all forms of pleasure, Mill ranked intellectual and moral pleasures higher than physical forms of pleasure. The higher and lower forms of pleasure are defined by Mill by the principle that individuals experience both forms of pleasures. Mill acknowledged the "morality of self-devotion" that sacrifices individual happiness for the greater quality and quantity of happiness of others or for all. Mill's definition of morality might sound different from individualism, but it is congruent with individualism for pleasure (at a higher or lower level) that is calculated for each individual and based on the assumption that each person is equal. Furthermore, Mill made the point that to hurt others' happiness is immoral because one (society) can only do this when it values its own happiness higher

than that of others. In a liberal society founded on the principle of equity and equality, individuals are considered equal constituents and it is immoral to obtain personal happiness, which results in hurting the happiness of others. Mill separated the ultimate purpose and result of morality, and argued that "moral feelings are not innate, but acquired" (Mill, p. 12). Bentham's theory of utility and Mill's utilitarianism established the fundamental principles of Western morality that guide people's moral judgment and lays the moral foundation for the notion of plagiarism by defining the wrongness of stealing. The act of stealing that hurts the happiness of others in order to gain personal happiness infringes upon the moral principle. Plagiarism, defined as stealing others' ideas and/or text, is naturally seen as an immoral behavior.

Disagreeing with Bentham and Mill, Kant (1785) argued that morality was not based on the principle of utility, but on reason, the categorical imperative (Lomasky, 2001). Kant set a sharp distinction between duty and inclination (or between human and nature) and believed that the only moral obligation is derived from the concept of duty. Kant believed that "[d]uty is the necessity of acting from respect of the law" (p. 6) and that nature is the impediment against which human beings construct morality (Froese, 2008). Morality is given birth by the tension between the empirical and natural world. The sense of morality is unconditional, but only applies to rational agents. Kant pointed out, "What is essentially good in it [imperative] consists in the mental disposition, let the consequence be what it may" (p. 12). In other words, the moral value does not depend on the means (the action) or the end (result of the action), but comes from how the person feels when he conducts the action. In other words, Kant negates the "moral value of

actions or states which incline spontaneously towards the good" (Deutsch, 1992, p. 113). According to Kant, the moral imperative requires "that the maxims be chose as though they should hold as universal laws of nature" (p. 436). Kant's morality is established autonomy by an individual person's reason, and reason is the medium that relates to others. To be moral, we need to manifest our independence by creating our own laws to replace the natural law. Kant's moral imperative on the basis of reasoning emphasizes the autonomy of human beings as independent entities detached from nature, which differentiates itself from the Confucian concept of the harmony between humans and heaven. Compared to Confucian morality that believes in responsibilities as not taken by individuals but for the group, Kant's morality holds that an autonomous individual should take responsibility for himself/herself. Plagiarism then is regarded as immoral behavior according to Kant's morality, in that the plagiarist shows no respect for individual autonomy and takes no responsibility for himself/herself in front of the tension between duty and inclination.

We can see that the notion of morality in Western cultures has evolved through history with social and cultural development, which is not universal or absolute, but relative and based on ideology. It has been established by many philosophers in particular historical, social, cultural, and political contexts over a long period of time. As Hegel (1991) posits:

> [e]ducation [Pädagogik] is the art of making human beings ethical; it considers them as natural beings and shows them how they can be reborn, and how their original nature can be transformed into a second, spiritual

> nature so that this spirituality becomes habitual to them. In habit, the opposition between the natural and the subjective will disappear, and the resistance of the subject is broken; to this extent, habit is part of ethics. (p. 195)

It is not surprising to see morality in a different form and essence in a different historical and cultural environment. Resembling other cultural concepts, morality has its limit to presenting different cultures, especially in the globalization age. The historical development of morality determines the cultural nature of morality and how it defines plagiarism. At the same time, the evolution of morality indicates the hope of understanding the issue of plagiarism through education.

Compared to Western morality, the moral vision in the Eastern Confucian world is inherited and passes along through generations with a strong tradition, and is determined by its four core values: benevolence or "仁" (Ren), righteousness or "义" (Yi), fittingness or "适" (Shi), and wisdom or "智" (Zhi) (Lokuang, 1992). Confucius used "义" (Yi) to present the moral norm, moral obligation, and our acting toward virtues (Shen, 1992). Mencius believed that "义" (Yi), or righteousness is the basis of a society. Morality is determined by one's internal orientation to achieve "义" (Yi) and to become a full human being "仁" (Ren). However, "义" (Yi) or righteousness was prescribed hundreds of years ago by Confucius, Mencius, and other sages. This might be the place where Western and Eastern civilizations diverge in understanding the notion of authenticity. This tradition and its long history in Confucian culture give people a strong sense of rootedness. For people from Confucian culture, authenticity is not something that can or should be

created by the self, but instead it involves a set of values inherited from the past. Even Confucius regarded himself to be a tradition transmitter rather than convention creator (Chan, 2001). In the Eastern Confucian world, the concept of authenticity is a collectivist concept, and the self plays a comparably less important role than its Western counterpart.

The core value of Confucianism is to pursue harmony through self-cultivation towards "仁" (Ren) and "义" (Yi). In contrast to Western morality, Confucian morality is based on virtue rather than rights. Confucius says:

> If the people are led by laws, and if they are guided by punishment, they will try to avoid punishment, but they will have no sense of shame. If they are led by virtue, and if they are guided by the rites, they will have the sense of shame, and moreover will become good. (Confucius 2:3)

Freedom, from the Confucian perspective, can only be achieved by self-overcoming and self-realizing (Lee, 1996). From a personal aspect, individuals are situated in particular roles defined by society which require them to put collective interests before their own individual pursuits. From a social aspect, individual rights are tempered by ascribed relationships that stress the common good, and people are supposed to fulfill their obligations and duties prescribed by their roles (Kim & Lee, 1994). As Kim and Lee indicate, "concessions and compromises are essential ingredients in promoting a role-based and virtue-based conception of justice" (p. 180).

In contrast to Western morality, Confucian morality involves conscious harmonization with nature/heaven (Froese, 2008). It takes the approach of extending oneself to include others. For example,

> For Wang Yang-ming, this objective order of importance is the natural order of relationships. One begins his movement of love with the family, in filial piety and brotherly respect, extending this to the state and finally to the rest of the world. (Manuel, 1992, p. 80)

The core values of autonomy and the will for duty against inclination in Kant's morality become strong concepts in Confucian culture. There was a story of morality in Analects. A young man's father stole a sheep, which he hid in the young man's home. The young man faced a dilemma on whether to turn his father in or cover for his father. Confucius made it clear in his comments that the proper action for the young man was to cover for his father because his father represented the root of his morality, which was more important than national law. This echoes Wang Yang-Ming's point of natural order of relations. However, Kant would have had a totally different answer, because he based morality on shared common humanity (Forese, 2008). According to liberalism, the nation should be governed by the rule of law and officials share the same social status with other professions, whereas Confucianism supports the view that the country should be governed by the rule of virtue (as the law system is supplementary to the system of Li), and officials should be moral superiors (Niu, 2008).

Confucian morality is transcendental and relational. Confucius believed that human beings are created by and constitute heaven. To be moral, human beings need to harmonize with Tao (the way of heaven) in a unique human way through observing "礼" (Li). Compared to Kant's assertion of the independence of morality, Confucian philosophy insists on the integrity of morality with heaven (Froese, 2008). The ultimate

goal of morality, according to Confucius, is to extend self to include others and to interconnect with others rather than to be separated from others. Froese argues that "[i]f Kantian philosophy depends upon tension and the often Herculean efforts of the will, Confucian philosophy endeavors to ensure an enduring sense of continuity and integration" (p. 262).

Moral principles in educational domain. Morality in the academic domain in Western cultures is directly connected with the notion of authenticity. According to Ivanhoe (1994), the Western notion of authenticity was first clearly discussed in "The Ethics of Authenticity" by Charles Taylor, who traced this notion back to the 18th century notion of how individuals possess a moral sense. The notion of authenticity was widely accepted in Western civilization after Rousseau proposed that the means to becoming a full human being was to make our own decisions of what the "ultimate concerns" were in our lives. Ivanhoe continues that because of the "severe fragmentation of value" (p. 142) caused by "the decline of traditional sources of shared meaning" (p. 142), many people (in the Western world) started to rely on themselves and create their own meaning for their lives. Authenticity, hence, becomes something that is created by the self and belongs to individuals. In addition, it becomes the marker and symbol of social morality; that is, the society which affords its citizens the right or freedom to self-direct has become labelled as a free society, and in this way, prescribes a model for other societies to follow. It is an indicator of what morality is in a social setting. The infringement of rules on writing authentically, on the contrary, becomes an unacceptable social taboo.

The key concept to understanding authenticity is originality. If we define

authenticity as being oneself and creating one's own meaningful life, originality is the prerequisite to being authentic. That said, in order to keep authenticity in writing, all of the ideas and language have to be originally created by the author as an aspect of his or her own self-creation. Following this line of thinking, our next task is to understand what originality is. Lindey (1952) defines originality as one's individuality. He says,

> [It] is the artist's gift of viewing life through the prism of his sensibility, his own way of reacting to experience, his own way of expressing his reaction. It is the vital force which inheres in his personality and constitutes his uniqueness. (p. 20)

It sounds, then, that it is not very difficult to be original. All one has to do is to be oneself, see the world through one's own eyes, interpret in one's own way, and express oneself in one's own words. All of these simple tasks require an identity through which a personal stance can be supported. However, the concept of identity is not a universal one. Jung (1999) argues that "the logic of identity is monologic because it reduces the otherness of the other to the 'self' same and thus is intolerant of difference and multiple realities" (p. 287).

Authenticity and originality are developed from a strong individualistic cultural background, and both concepts are tied closely to a monologic sense of identity, which is alien or even opposite to Confucian collectivist culture. This monologic sense of identity conflicts with the very basis of Confucianism in that Confucianism defines a person according to his or her role in relation to others. Confucians believe that they interpret and understand the world through a web of relationships rather than through our own eyes. This difference is what causes the difficulty for CHC students to understand the

meaning of plagiarism. Consequently, appropriateness of academic conduct is defined differently in Confucian culture and Western cultures, which becomes a difficulty for CHC students in understanding plagiarism.

Ownership

Ownership of knowledge and text is the foundation of the notion of plagiarism. Ownership is defined by the freedom of the subject and the rights of the subject. The concept of ownership in Western cultures has been greatly influenced by liberalism. Liberalism is a dominant political philosophy in Western civilization, and it advocates universalism and detachment of individuals. The root word of liberalism is "liber" — the Latin word meaning freedom. Liberalism was born in the English Civil War. Hobbes, being the first English thinker of liberalism, proposed in his hypothesis that individuals give up their political rights to a commonwealth through a social contract to maintain civil peace (Niu, 2008). Locke further developed liberalism out of the desire to form a social contract in order to protect individual rights. Liberalism holds beliefs in universal values and principles in rights and freedom — to free the human spirit in individuals (Lerner, 2011). Liberalism deems that individuals have fundamental rights to life, liberty, and property, and that the government should be subject to its people. The essences of liberalism are individual rights and freedom to pursue self-fulfillment. Montesquieu, when criticizing Rousseau's republicanism, argued that liberty is an individual concept in a commercial society and that it promotes and protects social members to pursue their personal end (Niu, 2008). In a sense, the prerequisite of civil peace is to respect others' freedom and rights, including rights of ownership.

In accordance with liberalism, individuals are autonomous, rational, and free to choose or determine their conduct. Rousseau (1968) noted that, “man is born free; and everywhere he is in chains” (p. 3). Based on the freedom of individuals, private rights of claiming ownership become possible and applicable. John Stuart Mill (1863) defined freedom in a negative sense: you can do whatever you want so long as you do not interfere with another’s liberty. Western cultures support the view that individuals are born equal and hold the same basic rights (Kim & Lee, 1994; Niu, 2008). True freedom comes from the rights defined by institutions and laws. At the same time, these rights define the responsibility of citizens as respecting the rights of others. The liberal concept of rights emphasizes individual rights at both the personal level and the social level. At the social level, conduct is the natural result of liberalism’s emphasis on “rule of law” and “limitation of government power”; as Rousseau acknowledges by the Social Contract, there is some abrogation of rights by individuals.

In spite of the fact that there are also collective rights emphasized in the United Nations’ Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), Kim and Lee (1994) argue that the relationship with others expressed within it is self-oriented, and that negative rights (such as the right to non-interference, or not to be subject to interference) are reinforced both in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the European Convention of Human Rights (1987), which allows dissonance/difference without infringing on others’ rights and encourages the pursuit of personal goals. Lee (1996) argues that liberal morality, like a legal system, is an external morality that carries no individual significance.

Moral problems are always discussed and solved through legal channels in terms of rights individualist society (Lee, 1996). For example, “The Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States guarantee and protect the inalienable rights for all citizens (such as freedom of speech, being considered innocent until proven guilty, the right to bear arms, and democratic representation)” (Kim & Lee, 1994, p. 170). The purpose of morality for liberalism, according to Lee (1996), “is merely to secure more options in action and choice by securing a maximum degree of noninterference, and nothing more” (p. 369).

Although there is some abrogation of rights for the greater freedom in social contract theory, liberalism differs from socialism in that the abrogation of rights in socialism leads to the freedom of the collective and only indirectly to individual freedom. In Western liberalism, societal freedom seems to be preconditioned by individual freedom and society is free when individuals are free. The concepts of rights and freedom in liberalism produce a strong sense of self and self-interest, which support the notion of authenticity and property rights (including copyright and intellectual property right). At the personal level, individuals are autonomous, self-sufficient, and respectful of others’ rights. At the social level, individuals are recognized by the society through their achievement rather than their roles (Kim & Lee, 1994). They interact with others based on principles like equity, non-interference, and independence. Plagiarism, from the Western perspective, is wrongful conduct when one crosses the boundary and infringes upon others’ benefits (e.g., the publisher’s interest or the author’s credit).

The concept of ownership in Confucian culture is defined in a different way. As

Guo (2002) argues, "A theology-based, trade- and industry-oriented culture could be hardly translated into the Chinese common sense-guided and agriculture-based culture." In contrast with Western liberal culture, Confucianism comes into being through a long history and it is an inherited accumulation of generations of wisdom. For Confucius, the problem was not to limit government's power, but to reinstall the moral virtue within officials, rulers, and ministers who then could execute the "rule of virtue" (O'Dwyer, 2003). Confucianism represents traditional social order (Kim & Lee, 1994), which is a system of interpersonal relationships. Therefore, Confucian morality is not based on rights claims or self-assertion, but on virtues of benevolence (Lee, 1996), which concern the common good more than reciprocal tolerance does. As Lee states,

> Confucians emphasize the primacy of virtues over rights, the primacy of substantial justice over procedural justice, and the primacy of common good over rational self-interest. In summary, then, what Confucianism focuses on is not a morality of autonomy but a morality of harmony, not a possessive individualism but on an organic holism. (p. 368)

Personal freedom is not an ultimate goal and individual rights are subordinate to social harmony. In other words, freedom and rights, the key supporting concepts for the notion of ownership, are of no importance in Confucian culture. Focusing on personal virtue and social harmony, Confucian culture advocates sharing and self-sacrifice, yet disincentivizes freedom and personal rights. In a society where personal interests are oppressed for the common good, claiming ownership of knowledge becomes obtrusive and unpopular. Thereby, it is difficult for CHC students to associate the ownership of

knowledge with their core values and morality.

Knowledge and Learning

Western cultures and Confucian culture share quite different understandings of knowledge and learning. A classic Western learning approach is the Socratic approach of learning. The Socratic method is exemplary of a Western approach to developing one's own ideas, and is a learning strategy that uses repeated questioning to evaluate others' knowledge and generate one's own knowledge (Tweed & Lehman, 2002). Socrates promoted this method of learning and encouraged his students to question their beliefs and the beliefs of others, in search for their individual truths. The Socratic method reveals "esteem for self-generated knowledge" and lays the groundwork for the growth of the concept of "authenticity" (Tweed & Lehman, p. 91). Learners using this approach tend to create knowledge from within themselves through a learning process of questioning and challenging existing knowledge.

In contrast, Confucian learning emphasizes individual effort towards self-perfection with an ultimate goal of "圣人" (Shengren) or sage, and respects to a much greater degree the ability to pursue behavioral reform and social harmony through virtuous activities of self (Tweed & Lehman, 2002). Stressing an acquisition learning approach, Confucius encouraged learners to acquire virtues through observing, learning, and imitating virtuous figures who should be respected and obeyed. When someone asked Confucius how he wrote his books, Confucius said: "I transmit, but I don't innovate; I am truthful in what I say and devoted to antiquity" (Confucius, 7:1). In contrast to the Socratic method of learning, Confucian learning puts more emphasis on

the inheriting of knowledge from antiquity. The ultimate goal of learning, according to Confucius, is service in civil service jobs for societal harmony, rather than for the pursuit of personal truth.

The Socratic method suggests the importance of originality in the learning process and implies a relationship between learning and knowledge. Knowledge is created through the learning process. Nonetheless, the concept of originality and even the concept of knowledge are contentious philosophically, even among some Western scholars. Hunnekuhl (2017) traced the core question around knowledge back to the difference between Kant and Schelling, considering "whether ideas are regulative or constitutive, whether they organize sensory input in the process of knowledge acquisition or exhibit a 'living potency' of cognition" (p.51). In other words, does our experience form our knowledge/ideas, or does our knowledge/ideas shape our experience? Is it even possible to separate human minds from experience, or vice versa? John Locke asserted that the human brain at birth is like a blank slate with nothing written on it, and that our minds are produced through experiences (Scollon, 1995). According to Locke (1690), everything in our minds comes from what is outside of us: language, thoughts, and even experience. Our minds are shaped by and shape the outside world. Originality exists only in imagination. Bakhtin (1982) holds a view similar to John Locke that our language and voices are all borrowed from society. Originality, if possible, "arises out of a struggle with 'alien' voices presented by society," which may be in direct conflict with the non-conformist (Scollon, p. 17). Even if there is such a thing as originality, it exists only in the shadow of the outside world and the presence of its connectedness to the outside

world negates its purity. Self-generating knowledge is only accepted in certain contexts with extensive preparation. Although some scholars (Bakhtin, 1982; Locke, 1690) question the purity of originality, this concept is widely accepted in Western cultures and is regarded as the essence of learning. The concept of originality makes the ownership of knowledge possible only when knowledge can be created by individuals.

In contrast to Western cultures, knowledge from a Confucian perspective is regarded as acquired from an outside collective domain rather than created individually (Tweed & Lehman, 2002). Both David and Nancy clearly expressed their understandings of learning and the learning approach. David believed that knowledge is something that can be acquired through personal effort. He said: "You are a knowledgeable person. After talking to you and learning from you, I learn the knowledge." Similarly, Nancy described her learning approach as "I will read it first, then think about it. When I can describe it in my own words, it becomes my knowledge." In this study, both participants show strong characteristics of a Confucian learning approach, which is to acquire knowledge from outside sources. Their understanding of learning implies their assumption that knowledge is intended for the public good.

Tu (2007) holds a different opinion that Confucianism does emphasize creativity in learning. He argues that Confucians view human beings as more than "creatures but co-creators of the cosmic process" (p.118), who learn to create the heaven-human mutuality and participate in heaven's creative work through following Tao and self-effort. However, Tu (2002, 2007) agrees that the focus of the Confucian approach of learning is on acquisition through sympathy and rationality, as well as through harmony with Tao or

the unity of heaven and humans. Tu's argument seemingly opposes the idea that the Confucian approach does not stress creation; in fact, it reinforces the aspects of Confucian learning that respect obedience to authority (the heaven), and learning take place through acquiring instead of questioning. In other words, learning and knowledge in Confucian eyes are rooted in, and developed upon, the existing knowledge. Hence, when learning is viewed from different perspectives, originality loses its core status within the Confucian learning approach, and this differs from the Socratic learning approach.

Confucianism emphasizes "a holistic whole person view of teaching that focuses on the development of students' values, morals and conduct inside and outside the classroom" (Biggs & Watkins, 2003, p. 18). One's concepts of learning and knowledge determine his or her learning practice. Chan (2001) summarizes Resnick's three key principles of learning as "(a) having prior knowledge — learning is related to what students already know, (b) strategy — learning is related to learner strategy, and (c) social contexts — learning is socially constructed" (p. 187). From this perspective, to learn means to transform from old identities to new identities via generating new meanings. When accepted and becoming a part of the cognitive system, new meanings becomes new knowledge. When new knowledge helps us to redefine our boundaries and relationships with others, our new identity is constructed. If knowledge can be interpreted as our cognition of self and the relationship between self and outside world, it helps us to identify who we are and what we are (in terms of providing our context). Consequently, knowledge determines one's identity, and prior knowledge determines one's prior

identity. The knowledge construction process is the process of identity formation.

McLean (1992) observes that "the identity of a person or people as constituted through a past (or tradition) and through present free acts is a central factor in the determination of what is appropriate" (p. 148). This is a long and complex process that involves cognitive conflict, concept change, identity (re)construction, and so forth. The ultimate goal of education determines appropriate academic performance — learning. It seems then that in Confucian culture, the knowledge acquired is the ultimate end of any learning process, whereas in the Western tradition, the process of producing that knowledge is what authenticates it. In the case of the former, knowledge produced becomes common property and can be used to produce further knowledge, whereas in the latter, there are rules that govern the use of both the process that produced that knowledge and the knowledge itself. These rules are based on the assignment of property rights to the knowledge produced.

Beyond Relativist Morality

In order to explore the cultural meanings of plagiarism, this paper discusses in-depth the cultural differences between Western and Eastern cultures and compares the relativity of Western and Eastern morality regarding plagiarism. Some parts of this paper may sound like an argument from a relativist perspective, which is one of the most influential and controversial perspectives in morality; however, what has been discussed in this paper is beyond moral relativism. In the following section, I will discuss moral relativism and the understanding of morality in terms of plagiarism.

Relativism often refers to truth relativism, which holds that there is no absolute

truth and that all points of views are equally valid and relative to particular contexts, especially in terms of language and/or culture (O'Grady, 2002). Baghramian (2004) defines relativism as "the view that cognitive, moral, or aesthetic norms and values are dependent on the social or conceptual systems that underpin them, and consequently a neutral standpoint for evaluating them is not available to us" (p. 1). From the relativist perspective, truth is relative and knowledge depends on its context. It is impossible to rank the judgment of truth or falsity, and all judgments are equally valid because our reason and rationality are both confined and defined by our cultures; pure objectivity and neutrality do not exist. Van Der Dussen (1993), when writing introduction for *the Idea of History*, alleges that "any suggestion that any one system of absolute presuppositions is superior to any other is improper" (p. 38). Relativism is always compared to absolutism or universalism, both of which believe that there should or could be one unconditionally true and correct view that is absolute and universal (Bagharmian, 2004; Wong, 2006). Many philosophical discourses are labeled as relativist, such as postmodernism, post-structuralism, phenomenology, feminism, etc., because they question and/or challenge the universality of meanings and laws philosophically or methodologically.

Cultural relativism and moral relativism are two popular forms of relativism. Cultural relativism argues that human beliefs and activities should be understood from within their own cultures, and different cultures have different moral codes. In other words, people from different cultures view the world differently. It challenges ethnocentrism (especially, Western ethnocentrism) and promotes orientalism. Cultural relativism implies that our judgment of other cultures can never be justified. Baghramian

(2004) points out that "relativism … is the best weapon we have against the temptations of moral arrogance and cultural imperialism" (p. 274). Not only is it an attitude but also the methodology to interpret and understand other cultures. According to Keesing (1981), moral beliefs and rules are products of tradition and culture. Because moral values are relative to cultures and individuals (Baghramian), the relativist perspective on morality believes that one's moral standard only makes sense in its own cultural context, which suggests that moral principles that are correct in one culture might not be correct in another culture. As Harman and Thomson (1996) posits, "people's values differ with respect to the relative weight given to liberty versus equality, and to general welfare versus the development of art and science" (p. 17). Harman (2001) makes a claim that there is no independent or non-relative domain for values and obligations.

Relativism is criticized by different philosophers from different aspects (Popper, 2001; Rachels, 2001; Scanlon, 2001). One of the most popular criticisms is that if relativism claims that there is no absolute truth, it contradicts itself by this statement. If this claim is true, then there is an absolute truth; if this sentence is false, it means that relativist view is wrong from the very beginning. In terms of morality, Scanlon argues that relativism undermines morality and authority by negating a universal principle of morality, which implies that every individual/culture has its own value system and consequently all moral values become worthless. In addition, relativism negates that harming others is wrong in an absolute sense. Even though it does deny the morality of harming others, it allows the opposite beliefs.

Although, in this paper, I compared Western and Eastern culture and their

different understandings of morality, I am fully aware of the deficiency of relativism and abstain from its trap of relativism. My argument, in fact, deviates from moral relativism in a fundamental way. First, moral relativism (metaethical relativism) negates that there is one single true morality (Brandt, 2001), whereas I do not deny the possibility of a universal morality. The discussion in this paper suggests that moral truth in Western perspective is not the universal principle and Eastern Confucian perspective holds a different moral perspective. Descriptive moral relativism describes the various ethical forms and norms without suggesting what the solutions should be (Baghramian, 2004; Brandt, 2001; Moser & Carson, 2001). If people accept this principle, morality becomes only a social convention and people are free to do whatever they want. By considering moral relativism for a solution to understanding plagiarism, I maintain the possibility that absolute truth may be more able to produce a meaning of plagiarism.

Second, normative relativism, by acknowledging cultural relativity, limits its understanding of the fluid nature of culture and identity. Normative relativism holds that moral judgment is not universal and humans are incapable of making a neutral and universally applicable evaluative standard to make moral judgments, because our moral judgment is relative to the prevalent ethical rules based on conventions and tradition (Baghramian, 2004; Mackie, 2001). However, even within a society, there are always disagreements and dissonance around the prevalent ethical principles. From my standpoint, I am strongly convinced that culture is constantly evolving and changing. The meaning of plagiarism is changing and evolving with the changes of the cultural and historical context. Individual identity shares a fluid and changing nature with culture.

Moreover, one individual could belong to multiple cultures and have several cultural identities, or at least one cultural identity which embraces other cultural identities.

Third, I disagree with normative relativism in that normative relativism believes in tolerance when encountering confronting moral standards because there is no universal moral standard (Harman & Thomson, 1996). In contrast to this view, I am dedicated to a solution of understanding plagiarism through conversation. I would agree with Baghramian (2004) that we should accept neither moral relativism nor moral absolutism, but instead acknowledge the perplexing moral diversity and embrace the plurality of moral values so that we can critically engage with them. Furthermore, I believe in hermeneutics to employ authentic conversation to reach a mutual understanding rather than only to tolerate the different moral standards. This becomes increasingly necessary in the process of globalization inasmuch as people from different cultures/histories no longer live separately, but live in a diversified and shared environment. To conclude, although I hold similar views with relativism that morality is rooted deeply in historical, political, cultural, social, and economic contexts (Baghramian), I do not agree with the rudimentary beliefs and principles of relativism to tolerate all the different moral standards. However, I am dedicated to exploring a solution which may enable us to understand the meaning of plagiarism.

Although there are differences and conflicts existing between Confucianism and liberalism, they are not completely inconsistent. Niu (2008) argues that the essential difference between liberalism and Confucianism is methodological: Confucianism positively promotes should-dos while liberalism negatively defines should-not-dos. They

can be valuable resources from which to find solutions to solve our problems caused by modernity (Tu, 2002). For example, although Confucianism has no concept of rule by law, "礼" (Li) or rites in Confucianism can play a similar function to limit governmental power, much like the legal mechanism in liberal society (Tu). This concept of "礼" (Li) defines and prescribes the social and academic conduct of students from CHC backgrounds and consequently prevents them from challenging their teachers.

McLean (1992) indicates that the condition of morality resides profoundly in culture, which is transmitted and inherited as a cumulated sense of appropriateness. Differences in the fundamental notions of authenticity, self, interpersonal relations, and morality between Eastern Confucian culture and Western cultures evoke that plagiarism is a cultural issue, which suggests a cultural rather than technical approach to addressing plagiarism. From the perspective of post-structuralism, self is understood as experience and is comprised tensions of different knowledge, rather than existing as a singular and coherent entity. Meanings and allowing multi-interpretation subject the author's meaning to the reader's interpretation. The discrepancy in the meaning of plagiarism between Eastern and Western cultures may reach a compromise through a more thoughtful approach.

To respond to the debate between relativism and absolutism, Wong (2006) asks the question, "Would people be any more inclined to be more cooperative, less self-serving, when moved to recognize that there is a set of universal moral truths?" (p. 178). After exploring the cultural understandings of plagiarism and seeking the fusion of different horizons, I am inclined to ask a further question in terms of plagiarism: Will

there be a much smaller number of plagiarism incidents when everyone holds a universal understanding of plagiarism? The issue of plagiarism is not only about how we act towards "others" with whom we do not share the same commitments, but also about how we live together with each other harmoniously in such a global age. It invokes a call to look inward at our own commitments as well as to look outward at the commitments of others, so that we can learn from each other (Wong). As Collingwood (1993) reminds us, historical explanation unifies the past and the present, and changes the known and the knower. The pedagogical significance of this study resides not only in the continuity but also in the fluidity of history. Bearing in mind appreciation of diversity (in morality), the question of the meaning of plagiarism is still open, and educators are required to be prepared for new meanings over time from the tension of different values and for the common good.

Chapter 9 Plagiarism: A Cultural Perspective

"About the most originality that any writer can hope to achieve honestly is to steal with good judgment."

— Josh Billing

"As time goes on, new and remoter aspects of truth are discovered which can seldom be fitted into creeds that are changeless."

— Clarence Day

"Education is not to reform students, to amuse them, or to make them expert technicians. It is to unsettle their minds, widen their horizons, inflame their intellects, teach them to think straight, if possible."

— Robert M. Hutchins

The University's Role in Anti-plagiarism

It has been more than 10 years since my plagiarism experience; however, there seems to be no indication that the issue of plagiarism is waning. In 2011, the dean of the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Alberta, Dr. Philip Baker, was alleged to have plagiarized a speech by Dr. Atul Gawande of Stanford University when he gave an address at the convocation banquet in 2010. The university quickly took action and started the process of examining the allegation, and Dr. Baker resigned a week later. The event is ironic because Dr. Baker as a dean at the university was the person who handled student plagiarism, and so this was seen as setting a bad example for students. Plagiarism

is still happening, and this case will not be the last one. The battle against plagiarism will continue.

The case of Dr. Philip Baker once again reminds us that we do need rules of conduct to govern the behavior of academic integrity and to combat plagiarism. This is because plagiarism does cause negative consequences, because it is in many ways a moral as well as legal topic from the standpoint of it being an infringement on property rights (intellectual property and copyright). This case brings to light again the scope and limitations of this study. It explores the meaning of plagiarism from a cross-cultural perspective, but cannot stop intentional plagiarism. The university, as academia, where knowledge is created and students are educated and socialized, plays a natural role in guarding academic integrity and in guiding students' academic behavior.

In order to accomplish their historical missions, universities keep adjusting their anti-plagiarism policies to respond to the constantly changing meaning of plagiarism. The original university policies against plagiarism represented a concern for improper attribution of authorship, which is mainly reflected in students' papers. The concern was primarily from the standpoint of intellectual property. Universities employed strategies of identifying and policing to protect academic integrity. Considering students' imperfect academic writing skills and knowledge, universities prepared different writing programs and courses to help prevent students from making mistakes and errors when writing papers. Writing as a "scriptural enterprise" became the basis of university policies to solve plagiarism (Certeau, 1984). When the meaning of plagiarism experienced semantic changes in the 19th and 20th centuries because of the diversity of assignments, especially

in the increased number of group projects, universities' anti-plagiarism policies shifted from focusing on a technical and managerial policing solution to embracing a pedagogical approach of offering training and guidance in academic writing in order to address the changing needs of academic integrity (Marsh, 2007). Universities also incorporated ethical training programs into their course offerings to help students understand the issue of plagiarism. The focus of the new approaches changed from result — detection of plagiarism, to stressing "the cause" — the lack of academic writing skills. Universities' endeavors to regulate students' writing practices and to prevent potential authoring errors implied that the universities' primary measures for fighting plagiarism would somehow focus on technical solutions. Nowadays university anti-plagiarism policies have evolved from purely technical instructions around appropriate documentation to include more pedagogical instruction that also defines and redefines research papers and assignments. Many universities endeavor to establish a healthy academic mechanism through formalizing the process of "ethical research/inquiry," to balance the focus on copyright infringement and intellectual property protection. These changes reflect not only a "pedagogical solution," but also a "regulatory apparatus." (Marsh, p. 62)

Challenges Confronting Universities' Anti-plagiarism Policies

While still struggling to address traditional challenges from plagiarism, universities' anti-plagiarism policies also face new challenges from globalization and the Internet. Stuhmcke, Booth, and Wangman (2016) found in their research that though the policies are the same, plagiarism is often dealt with differently because of individual

professors having different attitudes and approaches. This inconsistency in management together with uncertainty surrounding the policies corrupts the university's anti-plagiarism mechanism and challenges the university's role in plagiarism management. The combination of changing strategies and stricter laws are now failing to stem the tide of an increasing number of cases of plagiarism. This is because universities are facing new challenges in the cosmopolitan age from internationalization and technology evolution, and current anti-plagiarism policies cannot address and respond to the new challenges in an effective way.

Universities are faced with two major new challenges: first, from new computer technologies and the Internet; and second, from increasing numbers of international students with different cultural heritages. With globalization, more and more international students come to North American universities to pursue higher education. These students are from different cultural and religious backgrounds, and they hold different values and beliefs in terms of learning and knowledge. Lacking historical, social, and cultural background knowledge, these international students are not fully prepared for thriving in the new Western academia. Encouraging co-existence of various value and belief systems and advocating a chaotic anarchism for academic conduct, relativism fails in either helping international students succeed or facilitating mutual understanding among different cultures. It is the historical mission of universities to address these challenges. Current anti-plagiarism policies may not yet have been updated to address the needs and difficulties of international students. For example, these writing programs focus only on technical knowledge and language and behavior skills to socialize students into the

academy, and do not present international students with the opportunities to explore questions around who created the "discursive behavior and character traits" as defined in those writing programs, and why they are important. Moreover, writing habits and technical literacy knowledge are deeply connected and influenced by their specific cultures. The focus and investment of higher education administration on preventing plagiarism seems to shift more and more towards mechanical aspects in writing, whereas the social and cultural aspects are, to a large extent, ignored. It is dangerous to overemphasize the technical aspect and ignore the pedagogical side and cultural root of the issue, because overemphasis on the technical aspect of writing misses the essence of education.

The other major challenge confronting universities is caused by computer technologies and the Internet. In the technology field, new tools and new functions are changing the writer and reader relationship. For example, by enabling readers to interact directly with texts written by others, the "cut-and-paste" function of Microsoft Word has blurred the traditional boundaries between writer and reader established by physical books. The Internet (especially Google) together with the knowledge explosion has revolutionized our way of searching for and collecting information, and changed our way of writing academic papers. The old way of writing academic papers by finding material to support the argument has gradually been replaced by the sorting out of arguments from overabundant resources collected from the Internet. The explosion of knowledge and web 2.0 technologies such as wikis and blogs, which promote sharing and connecting in a revolutionary way, make it difficult to locate the original sources of information. Many

times, students find it difficult to distinguish or define whether the ideas belong to them or come from somewhere else.

In order to address the new challenges of plagiarism, universities are called upon to adjust their old policies and incorporate new solutions. Apart from the approaches I discussed earlier, such as various writing programs, ethics workshops, and stricter rules, etc., many institutions have started to employ plagiarism hunting services to deal with plagiarism in the new media age in the hope of responding to plagiarism with computer and Internet technologies. Anti-plagiarism has become a type of business, and many software companies and products have become popular among universities, such as Glatt (http://www.plagiarism.com/), EVE2 (http://www.canexus.com/), Viper (http://www.scanmyessay.com/plagiarism-finder.php), Plagiarism-Finder (http://plagiarism-finder.en.softonic.com/), plagiarismdectect (http://www.plagiarismdetect.com/), and Turnitin (turnitin.com). According to the information on the Turnitin website, more than 2,500 institutions in over 50 countries have adopted Turnitin services. They use these services to hunt for plagiarism by comparing papers in the database, identifying students' writing styles via a test, or both. These universities hope to use technologies to fight against problems caused by technology. Although new technologies also provide universities with the powerful tools to detect plagiarism more efficiently, they make universities more heavily reliant on the same technologies to deal with plagiarism. This could result in a more and more technical rather than pedagogical approach to look at and respond to the issue of plagiarism.

Leaving aside the limited power new technologies have to address the challenges

of plagiarism, the technical approach focused on writing to solve plagiarism seems flawed in addressing the complexity of plagiarism. Crowley (1988) taking a Foucauldian approach to examine university writing programs, argues that the various writing programs in higher education function as a social engine that institutionalizes students through training in "discursive behaviors and character traits" in order for students to become qualified to join the academy (pp. 8-9). These anti-plagiarism policies, through the management of writing practices, oversimplify the complexity of plagiarism, and the focus on the moral/ethical aspect of plagiarism is shifted to emphasize the literal and written aspect of plagiarism as it is understood from a legal standpoint in terms of property rights. The byproduct of these anti-plagiarism approaches is that they define plagiarism in a rather confined space — that of improper textual authorship.

Limitation of Current Anti-plagiarism Policies

The strategies employed by universities in the 19th and 20th centuries that relied on writing programs to maintain the purity of academia will not be able to satisfy the needs of anti-plagiarism in the 21st century, because future challenges from combating plagiarism will not be managerial and resource issue-based caused by the large population of students (as perceived in 19th century), but the conflicting notions among different cultures in the cosmopolitan age and the revolutionary change in information literacy and technology. The old strategies focusing on literal writing programs are not effective against plagiarism anymore because of the new challenges, which have already caused the increase of plagiarism, and a wider range of policies may be needed to address these new challenges.

According to the Classic Encyclopedia (1911), plagiarism was first coined and defined in English in Western academia, but it was, is, and will be understood from the standpoints of predispositions and background assumptions of the people who experience it. To understand the meaning of plagiarism in a cosmopolitan age only from a Western academia perspective obviously is narrow and limited, and causes confusion for students and scholars from other cultural academia, as was the case with David and Nancy in this study. When the concept of plagiarism is defined and employed in a singular social, economic, and political context of Western cultures, it inevitably becomes questionable when encountering other perspectives developed in different social, economic, and political contexts. It is therefore not surprising that the anti-plagiarism policies established within the limitation of a singular perspective with predisposed assumptions diminish in effectiveness.

I would agree with Price (2002) when he suggests that university policies might become more meaningful if they explain plagiarism as a learning activity rather a crime. Considering plagiarism as a crime indicates an attitude that is rooted in legal systems which are developed as cultural products in human civilization, while explaining plagiarism as a learning activity represents a pedagogical approach. The legal system takes charge of making judgment and executing the punishment, but has little intention of explaining causes and is not primarily for the purpose of improvement. The legal system protects a society by punishing illegal conduct, but it cannot eliminate crimes because it assumes insufficient responsibility for educating people to prevent them. Explaining

plagiarism as a learning activity gives students an opportunity for improvement and aligns closely with the mission of universities, which is education. This pedagogical approach is potentially more effective in that it elaborates and addresses the spirit of academic integrity directly and associates the spirit of academic integrity with students' individual learning and development. For example, Howard (2000) recommends that patchwriting, as an attempt at textual transmutation, may be encouraged in terms of the students' efforts of learning to write. The complexity of plagiarism determines that it cannot be easily explained or solved from a singular perspective in the short term. Because laws or rules are impotent to subsume explicit measures to respond to possible cases that did not occur in history, it is necessary for universities to pay special attention to students' real and concrete circumstances when dealing with plagiarism. That being said, intentional plagiarism caused by various factors still needs to be punished and policies of guarding fairness and honesty are necessary.

Addressing the Issue of Plagiarism from a Cultural Perspective

Many scholars (Brennan & Durovic, 2005; Howard, 2000; Jameson, 1993) have tried to respond to the issue of plagiarism from various perspectives. Heckler and Forde (2015) argue that cultural values play a significant role in shaping students' perceptions of plagiarism and, as a result, either encourage or prevent plagiarism behavior. They concluded that in American society, values encouraging plagiarism include "personal success (individualism), science, freedom and leisure," while values preventing plagiarism consist of "freedom of doing the right thing (individualism), hard work, and equal opportunity/fairness" (pp. 68-69). If this is true, it is safe to imagine that values in

other cultures play a similar role in understanding plagiarism and influence corresponding behaviors. Babaii and Nejadghanbar (2016), for example, suggest enhancing training in ethics and literacy development. Different technical and pedagogical solutions have been created and applied. However, the number of incidents of plagiarism continues to increase and new forms of plagiarism appear to place significant challenges on the current anti-plagiarism mechanisms, as I discussed in Chapter 2. The existence of this phenomenon calls on educators to re-examine the issue of plagiarism from a deeper perspective. I have discussed in previous chapters how culture shapes and influences our understanding of plagiarism. An old Chinese saying tells us to "let the mischief maker undo the mischief." This means that the one who plagiarizes must first understand what wrong he or she has done and find a solution to correct that wrong, even if it means a re-education of that person. This then puts the onus of the correction on the perpetrator who gains from the correction. Punishment attached to plagiarism does not necessarily rehabilitate the perpetrator; it is just a means of enforcing the rules. Culture creates the problem of plagiarism, and culture could be the place where the problem is solved.

From the research and the conversations with the participants, the questions around understanding the meaning of plagiarism, which forms the basis of my argument, remain rooted in differences of cultural context. The explication of this argument leads the study to illuminate the complexities of this question and present new perspectives in how both Western and Eastern cultures could promote a better understanding of this phenomenon.

To combat plagiarism, institutions and educators are challenged to respond with wisdom from a pedagogical and philosophical aspect rather than from a technical aspect. This requires a re-understanding of the meaning of plagiarism with reflection, introspection, appreciation, and open-mindedness towards the complexity of the issue to address the emerging issues caused by culture, technology, and other new situations in the age of globalization. In an attempt to find the answer to the cultural meanings of plagiarism, I examined in this study two cases of plagiarism and found that the complexity of plagiarism can best be comprehended from the lived difficulties of CHC students who are charged with plagiarism. Through hermeneutic conversations about the lived difficulties of two CHC students, the two case studies of plagiarism in this study demonstrate in a subtle way how plagiarism can be interpreted and understood differently from a cultural perspective through examining the notions of morality, identity, ownership, and knowledge and learning. The intricate differences in perceiving notions like morality provide me with no easy answer to the meaning of plagiarism, but lead me back to the original question: What is the meaning of plagiarism? How shall educators address the issue of plagiarism in the global age with students who come from all over the world? Haitch (2016) proposed that "plagiarism has a cultural history tied to concepts for individual creativity, but its future may look quite different in an era with increased communal sharing of ideas and images" (p. 264).

As I discussed earlier, universities' current anti-plagiarism policies are not sufficient to address the complexity of plagiarism and simultaneously face new challenges. Haitch (2016) suggests that more and more institutions are trying to adopt "an

educate-and-prevent" model for combating plagiarism (p. 264). He continues,

> International students and the problem of plagiarism can also be a gift to institutions, an opportunity to reflect on the basis of their rules, the extent to which these rules are rooted in specific cultural values and social norms, and the extent to which these values and norms are shifting in an age of communal information and communal creativity. (p. 265)

The focus of current university anti-plagiarism policies on writing and ethical programs represents only part of the cultural dimensions of plagiarism; other cultural dimensions like knowledge, learning, the legal system, and the academic system also play a vital role in understanding plagiarism. Addressing the issues of plagiarism from a cultural perspective presents itself as a necessary approach for universities in their attempts to reduce the incidence of plagiarism. Some discourses may see culture in a different way and hold that culture can be dismissed through education and personal efforts. For example, "[l]iberal modernity tends to reduce the idea of roles to 'stereotypes' that are to be shattered by individuals through a process of education and general enlightenment." (Fox, 1999, p. 201) However, roles or stereotypes cannot be eliminated simply because both concepts are culturally-based phenomena. Dwelling in between cultures, we may not be able to eliminate stereotypes or roles because stereotypes, as misunderstandings, are, according to Gadamer, the beginning of understanding. Education serves as a powerful tool that allows us to negotiate the roles and stereotypes among cultures through conversation and understanding, but does not necessarily shatter them. Thus, the issue of plagiarism in the cultural domain cannot be removed from education. It can only be

negotiated through authentic conversation.

Addressing the issue of plagiarism from a cultural perspective not only requires us to examine plagiarism from broader cultural dimensions, but it also encourages us to inquire about the issue in a more profound way. Marsh (2007) indicates that universities' anti-plagiarism remedies to some degree have not changed from the same error-checking mechanisms that identify, label, and define, followed by punishment. These "panaceas" may be somehow manageable and effective in a technical way, but may not always be able to represent and respond to the new century that has undergone massive transformation (and is still being transformed) by new technology, new knowledge, and a new economy. It also does not address the deeper layer of the problem: What is the meaning of plagiarism? If CHC students have the opportunities to learn and practice the rules and regulations of the new academic discourse, such as through writing courses or research handbooks, the incidence of plagiarism in this student population may be reduced. Their difficulties in mastering the knowledge of writing genres may be addressed in the writing program from a cultural perspective.

The two case studies indicate that CHC students do encounter various difficulties in understanding plagiarism, which leaves us much space for discussion and exploration. This calls for all educators who care about this issue to think about and rethink it. For students from a Confucian heritage culture, the premise on which the legality is based (around property rights) is not entirely clear, but often the context, rather than the law, is the determining factor when a judgment is made. David, when expressing his disagreement over how his case was dealt with, stressed a few times that the university,

as an educational institution, should focus on its educational role by offering students chances for rectification rather than punishment. David's arguments on the distinction between cheating and plagiarism, the purpose of copying, and the collectivist property of knowledge are also clear evidence that he did not perceive the issue of plagiarism from a legal perspective, but interpreted plagiarism mostly from a moral perspective based on filial piety and harmony. On one hand, legal issues to David seemingly only refer to criminal cases and have nothing to do with academic misconduct like plagiarism, the nature of which has already been defined in the name of education as a moral issue because the ultimate purpose of education is virtue through self-development or self-perfection through which process mistakes and misconduct relate only to morality. On the other hand, David's ignorance of the legal aspects of plagiarism reflects the justice system of Confucian society, which is based on "rule by virtue" instead of "rule by law." Confucianism holds the view that the ruler should be virtuous and rule on the basis of benevolence. Fox (1999) notes that the notion of "legal rights" is absent in classical Confucianism and "codified laws" are only used as supplementary to "traditional ritual practices" in the traditional Confucian social justice system (p. 191). This suggests the importance of a discussion of plagiarism from a legal perspective with CHC students as part of the solution.

The participants' difficulties and struggles in understanding plagiarism displayed in the two plagiarism cases of this study warn us of the intricacy of life in how CHC students interpret and negotiate the meaning of plagiarism between two cultures. Instead of viewing plagiarism as an illegal infringement, David sees plagiarism as a localized

fault that should be distinguished from cheating, which is the intention of copying. He questions the concept of private ownership of knowledge. He understands knowledge as shared property in the educational domain. This interpretation results from a Confucian cultural background, which holds a collectivist understanding of knowledge and tolerates the act of copying in some situations of quoting authorities, and causes David to prioritize the responsibility of submitting his assignment on time over writing a high-quality paper.

Similarly, Nancy, influenced by Confucian culture, has a strong sense of hierarchy, loyalty, and deference to authority, which results in her hesitation to deny the charge of plagiarism against her and in her insistence to complete her studies with the same supervisor/professor after the loss of trust from that supervisor. Nancy showed "stubborn" loyalty to her supervisor. In order to protect her supervisor's "面子" (Mianzi) and authority, Nancy was not hesitant to sacrifice her own interests, which reflects a strong influence of the Confucian notion of filial piety. Nancy's understanding of a teacher's role as a life mentor can be traced back to the Confucian concept of "师道" (Shidao), which is the way of teaching. Nancy's interpretations of knowledge as public property that can be acquired through learning demonstrate the impact of her Confucian belief that knowledge cannot be privately owned. It is manifest that both David and Nancy endeavor to understand plagiarism through the practice of interpreting the Western context and reconciling Western concepts with Confucian perspectives. To put it another way, understanding plagiarism for David and Nancy is an exercise in understanding self (Confucian culture) and others (Western cultures) from different horizons. It seemingly establishes a strong foundation for a potentially shared understanding for both sides to

understand and appreciate “the other’s” point of view.

These lived difficulties cannot be deniable and are not selectable. CHC students are encountering cultural tensions and even conflicts every day. Every time they interpret, make a judgment, and put their decisions into practice, they are risking making mistakes that could induce negative consequences. For instance, CHC students have to determine whether to call their professors by first name as they have learned from local peers, or by their titles and last names. Some instructors may not feel respected when students call them by their first names. CHC students have to make judgments about when an appropriate time is to interrupt their instructor’s lecture to ask a question as their Western peers do, or whether they should not ask until later. It requires strong language skills and a high sense of cultural cues to find the right time to ask questions. They feel that they are at risk of either offending the instructor or forgetting the question. All of their decisions are generated from the negotiation between their previous experiences and knowledge acquired from Confucian culture and their interpretation of the current Western context. When both cultures conflict, they may have to make a decision to select which one to follow. Any effort to include one thing or exclude another becomes a political move, and results in a painful experience to be aligned with or to alienate a part of oneself. In David’s case, he struggled with whether to plagiarize and hand in his paper on time or to ask for a late submission. While in Nancy’s case, she contended with whether to admit to the crime that she did not commit, and whether to complete her studies with her supervisor. Consequently, CHC students are struggling with every single decision or practice when two cultural norms are different, and these struggles are often impossible

to be expressed fully. Smith (2008) calls on us to face the challenge and confront the truth that no one condition can "say everything that can be said" (p. 26).

Marsh (2007) asserts that most research writing guidelines found in research handbooks have failed in clarifying and qualifying their relevance to "rhetorical practice" in the international academic context, but rather "objectify and standardize" themselves into a rather narrow local community of discourse. He suggests that the best way to avoid plagiarism is to take off the camouflage of Western rites of social literacy, and define its connection to rhetorical practice and distinction from other socioliteracy rites. By way of explanation, research and writing guidelines in Western universities may achieve a better result if they are written in a specific way that connects to and distinguishes from other social literacy rules rather than as the one and the only standard guideline. A more pedagogical way to avoid plagiarism may require that Western universities' policies on this matter reflect greater cultural sensitivity, and become aware of the literacy practices of cultural others, recognize the limitations of the current understanding of plagiarism, and redefine the meaning of plagiarism from multiple perspectives that address the cultural property of plagiarism and the ever-evolving development of technology and society. Similarly, Haitch (2016) recommends a lifelong learning commitment by institutions and faculty to have authentic conversations with international students apart from clear instructions and training programs. It may serve universities well to continue prioritizing the pedagogical solutions for plagiarism over technical solutions such as technical detection and teaching the technical writing process, etc.

At the same time, culture cannot be ignored in anti-plagiarism remedies because it

is the place where ethics are shaped and identities are constructed. Writing, as a social behavior of communication, cannot be discussed in a vacuum. It would not serve the interests of academia if its participants were not able to decipher the other, and if we held tightly to our views and were unwilling to accommodate change. Conceiving heritage as "fore-understanding" or "pre-judgment," McLean (1992) suggests that heritage, as the basis upon which we evaluate and respond to current emergence, should be revitalized and revalidated in order to make connections and become relevant to the new age. Confucians echo McLean that embedded within history and culture, human existence and experience depend much more on inherited and shared meanings (Fox, 1999). Similarly, it is time to generate new meanings of plagiarism that are updated and relevant to the current global condition. Moreover, the meaning of plagiarism could be searched for within the daily lives of those who encounter and live with it.

The broad themes that emerged from the conversations with the participants suggest that it might be prudent for a pedagogical anti-plagiarism strategy to focus on the difficulties of individual students in understanding various aspects of plagiarism. How plagiarism is detected and judged depends on how "ideologies of language and identity guide ways in which individuals use linguistic resources to index their identities and to evaluate the use of linguistic resource by others" (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2001, p. 14). If plagiarism can be seen as an issue of discourse in writing, it would be valuable to research how Chinese students position and reposition themselves while they are writing in English (Scollon, 1995). Powell and Singh's (2016) research provides us with the hope of combatting plagiarism when they succeeded in improving students' understanding of

plagiarism and its application after incorporating a training program embedded in their specific cultural academic and discipline-oriented context. If plagiarism can be seen as a cultural issue that relates to one's values and beliefs in knowledge, learning, and ownership, it is worthwhile to examine CHC students' identity transformation because these CHC students are potentially the generators of new meaning and values. Because CHC students bring new dimensions to this discourse, knowing how they perceive the other and how they articulate themselves as the other may be very informative to help enlighten the cultural meaning of plagiarism. It is the educators' inescapable obligation to contribute new meanings to plagiarism through appropriate judgment and action within the new global age.

David's different understanding of responsibility mirrors his understanding of identity and morality. The issues around knowledge and ownership obviously show a strong tie to the concepts of selfhood, interpersonal relationships, and morality. In Nancy's case, to understand her issue concerning social roles, loyalty and "面子" (Mianzi), one has to start with the meanings of morality, interpersonal relationships, and selfhood, while her different understandings of knowledge and learning lead to a deeper layer of understanding in authenticity. The barriered ways of living and communicating in Western academia caused by cultural differences in values and conduct provide an opportunity to reflect and examine Western universities' taken-for-granted perceptions of plagiarism, which opens a new window to understanding ourselves and others. As Dallmayr (1999) and Jung (1999) suggest,

[w]hat is required in an age of cosmopolitics is not merely the discovery of 'a

> Plato, an Aristotle, a Machiavelli, a Descartes, a Kant, or a Hegel in the non-Western world' but also the engagement with 'a Confucius, Mencius, a Nishida, a Watsuji, a Hu, a Tagore, or a Radhakrishnan in the West.' (Arisaka, 1999, p. 9)

When defining and creating the meaning of plagiarism, engaging CHC scholars and embracing Eastern perspectives are as important as referring to Western wisdom from Western perspectives. In order to live harmoniously with each other in the global village that features more communication and interaction across and among cultures, it is not enough to only disseminate Western wisdom to the Eastern world.

As far back as 1893, the World Parliament of Religion was convened in Chicago, where the leaders of all major religions and traditions in the world gathered in an attempt to address a better inter-religious understanding. This parliament was based on the hope that a "universal communication theory" might be developed. As Smith points out, this idea of a "universal communication theory" already contained a prejudice of Western science and Kantian rationalism (Smith, 2008), because not all cultures share the rationale or assumption that there is such a universal theory that would apply in all circumstances. Although these efforts to convene a World Parliament of Religion signaled the importance and necessity of conversation among religions, between East and West there was already a prejudice or bias in favor of the Western tradition in science and methodology. The Parliament did make it clear that our values, beliefs, and conduct can be rooted in culture. This is echoed by the two cases in this study, which demonstrate that the meaning of plagiarism is understood and interpreted from a cultural perspective that is informed by the "plagiarizer's" home culture. David plagiarized to submit his

assignment on time because in his perception, it was not necessary for students to reference for an informal assignment (e.g., reflection paper), and handing in the assignment on time was a way to show respect to the instructor and comply with the university's rules, which were more important factors than writing a high-quality paper. Nancy almost accepted a wrongful charge of plagiarism only because she was taught in her culture to obey authority and respect her instructors. Both cases can be explained with reasons that can be traced back to the cultural values and cultural conducts of Confucian culture.

Confucianism actively promotes social welfare and the common good, and naturally prioritizes collective interests over self-pursuit. As such, Confucian culture does not promote individual property rights. Individuals are expected to sacrifice when their interests are against that of the collective. This may help to explain why David thought that submitting his assignment on time was more important than writing a high-quality original paper. Handing in an assignment on time guarantees the smoothness of the operation of class organization, which contributes to collective harmony. Writing a high-quality paper results in good marks for the student, which reflects the student's learning experience and implicates the student's self-development, all of which was in self-interest as opposed to the collective interest. In a sense, both the process and the result of writing a high-quality paper benefit the student only, but do not directly contribute to group harmony or interests. Consequently, handing in the paper on time and representing group interests should be prioritized over writing a high-quality paper that stands for individual interests. A virtuous student is supposed to sacrifice his own interests to retain group

interests/harmony. Confucian moral and political philosophy is other-oriented. People from a Confucian background have a comparably looser sense of self and a stronger sense of the duties ascribed by their roles that are defined collectively in the society. Consequently, in an academic context, students with a Confucian heritage background understand authenticity and rights in a collective way.

It might be argued that CHC students' efforts to understand plagiarism start with the horizon of Confucian culture. Their beliefs about memorization and understanding, respect for teachers and authority, value of "面子" (Mianzi), or face, cause many differences in perception and interpretation of writing and plagiarism. Both participants in the study see memorizing and understanding as inseparable, and repetition ensures retention and enhances understanding. As Watkins and Biggs (2001) argue, "Whereas Western students see understanding as usually a process of sudden insight, Chinese students typically think of understanding as a long process that requires considerable mental effort" (p. 6). Chinese learners, influenced by their traditional culture, regard repetition as a "tool for creating meaning" (Watkins & Biggs, 1996) because skills of repetition develop before meaning and interpretation. As mentioned earlier in this paper, a traditional Chinese saying states that "the meaning displays itself when you read the book a hundred times." These traditional Chinese understandings and beliefs in memorization and repetition play a vital role in CHC students' learning because they are significant and the only source from which CHC students can draw in order to achieve success in the new environment. The learning style dominated by memorization and repetition conforms to an understanding that learning to write in English can only be

acquired by memorization and repetition, and the process of learning writing itself is a creative activity that develops new meaning for the writer. Accordingly, plagiarism defined as stealing other's language by copying becomes a strange notion for CHC students in their learning process.

To summarize, as English language learners and new writers, students from Confucian heritage cultures find it difficult to avoid bringing their learning/writing habits to the new learning environment. In essence then, the concepts of filial piety, subordination to authority, preservation of harmony, and non-defined intellectual property rights seem to have influenced both participants in a way that establishes how significant cultural context is in understanding plagiarism, and that it should not be overlooked in addressing the issue of plagiarism. In addition, as Hu and Lei (2016) argue and as demonstrated in this study, the understanding of plagiarism is also largely influenced by one's personal experience in learning and literacy. Hence, it is recommended that anti-plagiarism policies include strategies or mechanisms to create a safe environment and that students from other cultures are provided opportunities of continuously exploring "appropriate and inappropriate intercontextual practices" (Hu & Lei, p. 117). Hubick (2016), from a philosophical perspective, problematizes plagiarism as students' false participation in the education process and calls for restoring an authentic relationship between teachers and students through facilitating genuine participation. A holistic approach from a cultural perspective provides us the opportunity to address the challenges of plagiarism facing academic institutions via inviting students into an

authentic conversation around ethics, learning, and identity, and empowering them with responsibilities as genuine students.

Chapter 10 A Hermeneutic Journey between East and West

"*We don't listen to others simply in order to understand them; we listen to others also in order to understand ourselves, because others can read our lives, and our deafness and blindness, back to us in ways that we cannot read them alone*."

— David Jardine

"*The furthest west is but the furthest east.*"

— David Geoffrey Smith

Understanding the meaning of plagiarism is not simply a journey for me to understand Western cultures. It is a process of understanding myself through others and through being the other. This journey enables me to obtain self-consciousness and to extend beyond the limit of subjectivity through exploring different cultural traditions (Shen, 1992). Cultural tradition is not everything in history, but it is significant (McLean, 1992). Cultural tradition in this study is not merely a given past, but "a living process of meaning formation" (Shen, p. i), which supports my horizon of meaning. It connotes that the life of a people and their values are defined, defended, and precipitated through time (McLean). In understanding my cultural tradition, I learned an essential part of myself; through dialoguing with other cultural traditions and putting my horizon at risk, I am aware of the specifics of my cultural tradition and realize that my cultural tradition is one

of many (Shen).

This journey teaches me and also unsettles me, by confronting me with things that I have already known but are applicable to a different context. It took what I take for granted from the familiar and the unquestioned, and made it strange. It estranged me from the familiar not by providing more information, but by inviting and provoking a new way of seeing — a way of seeing from others' eyes. This process cannot be unthought of or reversed. There is no undo button in our lives like on our computers. Once something becomes strange, it can never be the same. I am not the one I was; the meaning of plagiarism is not what I had originally understood it to be. The conversations with the participants started with questions, and ended with questions. But the conversations provide hope and possibilities to understand each other, and for to understanding plagiarism. Hopefully, through the conversations with two CHC students, this study can help educators in Western academia to understand not only CHC students but also themselves. This is particularly important for understanding curriculum in the globalization age because curriculum inquiries "cannot probe beneath and reach beyond the surface of globalization without sustained intercultural dialogue on fundamental education issues" (Eppert & Wang, 2008, p. XIX). This study, through exploring the issues of plagiarism, demonstrates the process of an intercultural dialogue by risking opening up our minds to the possibility of jeopardizing encounters with cultural others.

Biggs and Watkins (2003) argue that:

> part of this East-West difference is the old polarity between analytic and holistic thinking…you isolate those independent variables you want to examine and vary them systematically, hold constant those factors that you are not currently interested in, and then observe what the effects are on one or more variables. (p. 280)

Similarly, part of the plagiarism problem is the Western positivist tradition that isolates plagiarism rather than thinking of it in a systematic and holistic way. For the convenience of management, universities employ technical detection tools and writing programs as their main strategies for handling plagiarism, and these ignore the complexity of the issue and localize it into a narrow domain of literacy crime or mistake. These strategies also limit the possibilities of preventing plagiarism from a systemic and profound perspective. This study helps, through stories of two CHC students, to distance us from our conventions, assumptions, and beliefs, and to view plagiarism within a global perspective.

Confucian teaching emphasizes "teaching a person their role in society, with collectivist obligations to behave within that role in socially acceptable ways" (Biggs & Watkins, 2003, p. 282). CHC students have a strong sense of their positions, or their roles, in the society. The responsibilities assigned by their roles are so important to CHC students that their roles determine their characters. In some cases, their roles are their characters. Scollon (1995) argues that "[a] social role in this sense is a role which is

provided to an individual by society which carries with it both privileges and responsibilities for performance" (p. 9). And the social roles defined by societies organized around individuals versus societies organized around collectives are very different (Oetzel & Ting-Toomey, 2003).

The Western world had a long-held misunderstanding of Confucianism. Kant once said that Confucius was not a philosopher and Confucianism is not philosophy at all. He thought Confucianism was only a system of social conduct and norms that calls upon people to be moral and ethical through being loyal to the social hierarchy. However, the real Confucianism is not only Analects from Confucianism, but a systematic ideology that has been refined over thousands of years and by many Confucians such as Mencius, Xu zi, Zhu Xi, etc. This also reflects the deep cultural heritage behind Chinese students.

Hegel held similar stereotypes against Confucianism and condemned it as childish. He thought of Chinese philosophy as "something provisional, which we speak about only when we account for not considering it in greater detail and for not examining its relation to thought in general, ie., to true philosophy" (as cited by Wohlfart, 1994, p. 280). Hegel comments on Confucius as "only a practical worldly man of wisdom. In his ideas there is not an iota of speculative philosophy, but some kind of sophisticated moral doctrines, from which however we can learn nothing special" (Kuang, 1988, as cited by Dam, 1994, p. 641). It was a shared common sense by Hegel and other Western thinkers in the 19th century that the Chinese were "incapable of free reason and fantasy and

consequently did not have any sense of conscience or honor" (Wohlfart, p. 280). However, Kuang argued that Hegel's incapability of "interpreting the social realm of human life in simple terms" and "comprehending the speculative essence of Confucianism" was because of the language barrier (as cited by Dam, p. 641).

Apart from the long history of misunderstanding Chinese philosophy, the Western world lives in a different social ideology. In an effort to analyze his famous question "why had modern capitalism first originated in western civilization only," Max Weber compared Western and Eastern cultures' societies and economic ethics (Yang, 1994). Weber summarizes seven principles of spirit of modern capitalism: "diligence, frugality, economizing one's time (time is money), honesty, keeping one's word (credit is money), being enterprising, making money as much as possible, and controlling one's instinct for pleasure and luxury" (Yang, p. 662). In Western society achievement motivation emphasizes individual achievement (Lu & Gilmour, 2004); however, the achievement motivation of Chinese students has a social/collective orientation, which means that Chinese students' emphasis is more on collective harmony than on personal achievement. They would prefer to gain little achievement rather than to obtain achievements through challenging authority and disturbing the social harmony.

"Western thinkers have commonly framed the question of plagiarism as a matter of our freedom in choosing between good and evil while Confucians have thought in terms of responding appropriately to a given situation" (Kalton, 1994, p. 105). This

explains the current conduct of some anti-plagiarism software used by many higher education institutions, while many CHC plagiarists cannot understand/accept that they are punished without even an investigation into whether or not they know what plagiarism is when, in fact, they do not know what plagiarism is. According to Chan (2001), "Western tradition emphasizes learning as an inquiry into the nature of phenomena" (p. 183), while CHC tradition stresses "moral and ethical" dimensions. To CHC students, the ultimate purpose of learning is for personal perfection and improvement and to contribute to social welfare rather than creating knowledge or claiming knowledge. The difference between the two traditions leads not only to different understandings of learning, but also to different presentations and representations of learning. Therefore, the differences in writing systems in the two traditions are not surprising.

Implication of My Identity

My interest in the meaning of plagiarism is, in part, a response to the struggles I am engaged with after my own incident of plagiarism in college and after studying in Canada. Plagiarism is one of the encounters that painfully reminds me of being different from who I was before (Smith, 2008). "In a sense, the other is now 'in' me, and I 'in' her/them, and the mutual dwelling is not something that can ever be surgically rectified or purified out" (Smith, p. 4).

As a Chinese person, who was born and raised in the birthplace of Confucius and

has been immersed in Western academia for the last six years, I understand that the concept of identity is a long and painful process. It requires constantly learning and unlearning, remembering and forgetting, losing and finding. I had to constantly remind myself to remember or forget that I am Chinese to respond to cross-cultural experiences that I have been exposed to. I had to expose my schooling, teaching, values, and beliefs for examination, like peeling off layers of myself in front of a mirror. Many times, I felt that I was lost, displaced, marginalized as a minority in a Western white-dominated society. I thought living in Canada could enculturate me, but, on the contrary, it makes me more aware of how different I am. I understand myself more through trying to understand others. My intention to understand them ends up with me understanding myself. Simultaneously, I understand others more by just being myself. This long journey interestingly makes me appreciate more my own identity of being Chinese and becomes a journey for me of coming home. I felt empowered by this process of understanding and trying to be understood, and illuminated by the subsequent interpretation and understanding.

During my conversations with the participants, I realized that we share many similar experiences, struggles, and feelings of being the other living in an unfamiliar and foreign place. We experience the same uneasiness around change and the same process of identity transformation. The conversations with these two participants remind me of how similar we are and, at the same time, of how different we are. Their stories are not mine,

but they are about me. Our similarity made it easy for me to understand them because all of the cultural anecdotes and social cues sound familiar. At the same time, it may be very difficult for me to avoid my stereotypes and biases towards Western cultures and Confucian culture. I also enjoyed the bias of contextualizing my learning among different cultures and societies, places and spaces. As Gadamer (1990) continues to remind me, prejudice provides the horizon of my understanding and enables me to interpret and understand plagiarism from a cultural perspective.

Hermeneutics as Pedagogy

Jardine (1998) indicates that "there is an intimate connection between interpretation and pedagogy" because both generate new understandings in a familiar world in which we already live (p. 35). The research of participants' narratives and our conversations offer a unique perspective for examining the tension and struggle CHC students experience as they attempt to construct links between past and present, East and West, self and others. Gadamer (1975) made it clear that "[l]ike it or not, we are all the creation of our own historical traditions, both in our acceptance and our rejection of them" (p. 195). The learning journey does not end with this thesis; it is one without destination. I started this study with a practical concern around the meaning of plagiarism from the perspective of international students with a Confucian heritage background. However, the process of hermeneutic inquiry taught me how to understand epistemology and ontology, and being and becoming in an interpretive way. The process of interpreting

the texts was a journey in which I consciously and unconsciously reflected on the new knowledge and new identity I gained from this study. It forced me to re-examine myself, my education, my lived experience, and my changes in order to find the connection between myself and the research topic and to locate my horizon of understanding. My attempt to seek meaning and to understand and be understood has been a joyful journey. During this study reflection, interpretation and understanding became part of me. In some sense, this hermeneutic study has been a therapeutic experience for the participants. Their muted voices were made to be heard throughout this study; the interpretive and collaborative efforts experienced by the participants empowered them to understand plagiarism and humanity, and to change. It was a transformative learning experience both for me and for the participants.

Shen (1992) asserts that "[m]orality and moral traditions are but modes of the manifestation of Being in human history" (p. iii). For international students who come to a new culture, new country, and new academia, they are introduced to new ideas, practices, and rules, but their old cultural values and practices still exist (Salili, 2003). What they learned and trained for as children will also remain with and influence them, causing conflicts and difficulties in their studies and in their lives in the new environment. Hermeneutic inquiry offers unique insights and perspectives to cross-cultural conversations. It is more than just a methodology but a lived pedagogy. It reminds us of Heidegger's notion of Abgrund, and warns both educators and students

"not to choose any particular manifestation of Being as our foundations" in this global era (Shen, p.iii).

Plagiarism as a concept that emerged from a specific social, cultural, and historical context needs to be understood from a cultural perspective. By asking questions about what makes plagiarism plagiarism and what gives CHC students the sense of morally wrong academic conduct, I learned that plagiarism is defined and shaped by the key concepts of authenticity, self, interpersonal relationships, and morality, which developed in Western history along with liberalism that is based on monologic sense of identity. It fails to respond to Confucian collectivist culture that has a distinctive notion of authenticity, self, and social relationships, and that holds harmony and unity as the most important political value. Plagiarism, as embedded in certain historical and cultural contexts, is currently perceived from a singular perspective. It would make more sense to view plagiarism from multiple perspectives when we stress the notion of global citizenship in the global era. In the struggle of globalization and localization of curriculum, it makes more sense to comprehend plagiarism also from a pedagogical perspective rather than from a legalistic perspective only, because morality, legality, and their social forms are shaped differently in different cultural contexts. At the same time, we have to bear in mind that culture is not essentialist, but changing and evolving along with the development of human civilization. The meaning of plagiarism needs to and should be interpreted and understood through the lens of culture in a more dynamic way.

References

Ahmad, M. T. (1995). *Confucianism*. Retrieved on October 4th, 2011 from http://www.alislam.org/library/books/revelation/part_7_section_4.html

Altbach, P. & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 2007, SAGE on behalf of ASE. http://jsi.sagepub.com/content/11/3-4/290

Amour, P. St. (2004). Cultural pluralism and the limitations' of the classicist conception of culture. *American Catholic Philosophical Association*. Proceedings of the ACPA, Vol. 77.

Anderman, E. M., Griesinger, T., & Westerfield, G. (1998). Motivation and cheating during early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90, 1–9.

Angstrom, J. & Widen, J.J. (2016). Religion or reason? Exploring alternative ways to measure the quality of doctrine. *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, 2016, 39 (2), 198-212. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Aoki, T. T. (2005). *Curriculum in a new key: the collected works of Ted T. Aoki*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2005.

Arisaka, Y. (1999). Beyond "east and west": Nishida's universalism and postcolonial critique. ed. *Board crossing: toward a comparative political theory*. DallMayr F., 1999, Lexington Books.

Aronson, J. D. (2003). Protecting international intellectual property rights: winners and

losers. Presented at *Globalization, civil society and philanthropy: toward a new political culture in the 21st century*.

Ashworth, P., Freewood, M. & Macdonald, R. (2003). The student life word and the meanings of plagiarism. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology*. 34 (2). Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, the Netherlands, 2003.

Babaii, E. & Nejadghanbar, H. (2016). Plagiarism among Iranian graduate students of language studies: perspectives and causes. *Ethics & Behavior*, 27 (3), 240-258. DOI: 10.1080/10508422.2016.1138864. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Baghramian, M. (2004). *Relativism*. London & New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis group.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1982). *The dialogic imagination*. Ed. Michael Hoquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bartzis, O. L. & Hayner, A. (2007). 'Cheating' or 'sharing'? Academic ethics across cultures. Presented at *AACRAO National Conference*, Boston, 2007.

Baum, J. J. (2005). Cyber ethics: the new frontier. *TechTrends*, 49 (6), 54-56.

Bentham, J. (1780). *Principles of morals and legislation*. Retrieved on July 5th, 2010 at http://www.justiceharvard.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=51:chapter-i-of-the-principle-of-utility&catid=21:episode-one&Itemid=7

Bhabha, H. K., (1994). *Location of culture*. London; New York : Routledge, 2004.

Biggs, J. B. & Watkins, D. A. (2003). Insights into teaching the Chinese learner. In

Watkins D. A. & Biggs J. B. (Eds), *Teaching the Chinese Learner: Psychological and Pedagogical Perspectives*, 277-300. Comparative Education Research Center, The University of Hong Kong, and The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.

Bowers, W. J. (1964). *Student dishonesty and its control in college*. New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University.

Brandt, R. (2001). Ethical relativism. Eds, Moser P. K. & Carson T. L. (2001). *Moral relativism: a reader*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001, 1-25.

Brandt, R. (2001). Relativism refuted? Moser P. K. & Carson T. L. (2001). *Moral eelativism: a reader*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001, 277-286.

Brennan, L. & Durovic, J. (2005). "Plagiarism" and the Confucian Heritage Culture (CHC) student: broadening the concept before blaming the student. *Proceedings of the Australian and New Zealand Marketing Academy (ANZMAC) Conference* 2005, 5-7, December 2005, Fremantle, Western Australia, 30-38.

Britzman, D. (1994) Is there a problem with knowing thyself ? Towards a poststructuralist view of teacher identity, in: T. Shanahan (ed.), *Teachers thinking, teachers knowing: reflections on literacy and language education* (Urbana, III, National Council of Teachers of English Press), 53–75.

Cadman, K. (1997). Thesis writing for international students: a question of identity?

English for Specific Purpose, 16 (1), 3-14, 1997. The American University.

Carson, T. (1984). Closing the gap between research and practice: conversation as a mode of doing research. *Phenomenology & Pedagogy*, 4 (2), 3-85

Certeau, M. de (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California, 1984.

Chan, J. (2001). Territorial boundaries and Confucianism. *Boundaries and justice*: *diverse ethical perspective*, Miller D. and Hashmi S. H., 2001, Princeton University Press.

Chandrasoma, R., Thompson, C. & Pennycook, A. (2004). Beyond plagiarism: transgressive and nontransgressive intertextuality. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 3 (3), 171-193. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Chen, Y. & Chou, C. (2015). Are we on the same page? College students' and faculty's perception of student plagiarism in Taiwan. *Ethics & Behavior*, 2015. DOI:10.1080/10508422.2015.1123630. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Chien, S. C. (2017). Taiwanese college students' perceptions of plagiarism: cultural and educational considerations. *Ethics & Behavior*, 27 (2), 118-139. DOI: 10.1080/10508422.2015.1136219. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Clark, J. J. (1999). Taoist politics: an other way? ed. *Board crossing: toward a comparative political theory*. DallMayr F., 1999, Lexington Books.

Classic Encyclopediea (1911). Retrieved on May 4th, 2008 from http://www.1911encyclopedia.org/Plagiarism

Code of Student Behavior of University of Alberta. retrieved on Sept. 10, 2018 from http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/gfcpolicymanual/content.cfm?ID_page=37633#38363

Collingwood, R. G. (1993). *The idea of history*. Revised edition, Edited with an introduction by Jan Van Der Dussen. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1993.

Confucius (1979). *The analects* (D. C. Lau, Trans.). New York: Penguin Books.

Council of Writing Program Administrators (2003). *Defining* a*nd avoiding plagiarism: the WPA statement on best practice.* Retrieved on April 22, 2007 from http://www.wpacouncil.org

Crowley, S. (1988). *Composition in the university: historical and polemical essays*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P. 1988.

Curtis, G. J. & Vardanega, L. (2016). Is plagiarism changing over time? A 10-year time-lag study with three points of measurement. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 35 (6), 1167-1179.

Dallmayr, F. (1999). *Board crossings: toward a comparative political theory*. Lexington Books, Lanham, 1999.

Dam, T. (1994). Social welfare and individual self-interest: some western perceptions in relation to principles of Confucian culture. In *The Universal and Particular Natures of Confucianism, 639-660*. Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Korean Studies. The Academy of Korean Studies, 1994.

Derrida, J. (1992). *The other heading: reflections on today's Europe*. Bloomington:

Indiana University Press.

Deutsch, E. (1992). Principles of a creative morality. Chapter VIII, *Morality, metaphysics and Chinese culture*. Metaphysics, Culture and Morality, Vol. I. Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Changes Series III. Asia, Vol. 4. Foundations of Moral Education, Vol. 6.The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.

DeVoss, D. & Rosati, A. C. (2002). "It wasn't me, was it?" plagiarism and the web. *Computer and Composition*, 19, 191-203. Elsevier Science Inc.

Doi, T. (1985). *The anatomy of self: the individual versus society*. Translated by Mark A. Harbison. Tokyo; New York: Kodansha International, 1985.

Eerkes, D. (2012). *A guide to academic integrity for graduate students,* University of Alberta. Retrieved on January 13， 2012 from http://www.uofaweb.ualberta.ca/TIE/pdfs/AI%20Grad%20Guide.pdf

Ehrich, J., Howard, S. J., Mu, C. & Bokosmaty, S. (2016). A comparison of Chinese and Australian university students' attitudes towards plagiarism. *Studies in Higher Education*, 2016, 41 (2), 231- 246. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Eno, R. (2015). *The analects of Confucius – An online teaching translation*. Retrieved on March 18, 208 from http://www.indiana.edu/~p374/Analects_of_Confucius_(Eno-2015).pdf

Eppert, C. & Wang, H. (2008). Preface: openings into a curriculum of the way. In Eppert C. & Wang H. (Eds), *Cross-cultural studies in curriculum: Eastern thought,*

educational insights, pp.XVII-XXII. New York and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Taylor & Francis Group.

European Court of Human Rights (1987). *European convention on human rights*. Retrieved on September 10, 2018 at https://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Convention_ENG.pdf

Fox, R. A. (1999). Confucianism and communitarianism in a liberal democratic world. ed. *Board crossing: toward a comparative political theory*. DallMayr F., 1999, Lexington Books.

Froese, K. (2008). The art of becoming human: morality in Kant and Confucius. *Dao*, 2008, 7, 257-268. DOI 10.1007/s11712-008-9070-0.

Gadamer, H. G. (1975). *Truth and method*. London, Sheed and Ward, 1975. Translation edited by Garrett Barden and John Cumming.

Gadamer, H. G. (1990). *Truth and method*. NY: Crossroad. 2nd rev. ed./ translation revised by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall.

Gallagher, S. (1992). *Hermeneutics and education*. Albany: State University of New York.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis — theory and method*. London and New York. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Geertz, C. (1986). "Making experiences, authoring selves." *The Anthropology of Experience*. Ed. Victor W. Turner and Edward M. Bruner. Urbana: U of Illinois, 1986, 373-380.

Gibaldi, J. & Achert, W. S. (1995). *MLA handbook for writers of research wapers*. 4th Edition. New York: The Modern Language Association.

Gilbert, S. W. & Lyman, P. (1989). *Intellectual property in the information age — issues beyond the copyright law*. Change, May/June, 1989.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border crossings: cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York: London: Routledge, 1992.

Guo, L. Y. (2009). *A hermeneutic inquiry into the meaning of curriculum change for Chinese teachers*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta.

Guo, Y. S. (2002). *Chinese translation of the West: a history for a global era*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Alberta.

Haitch, R. (2016). Stealing or sharing? Cross-cultural issues of plagiarism in an open-source era. *Teaching Theology & Religion*, 19 (3), 264-275. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Harman, G. (2001). Is there a single true morality? Moser P. K. & Carson T. L. (2001). *Moral relativism: a reader*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001, 165-184.

Harman, G. & Thomson, J. J. (1996). *Moral relativism and moral objectivity*. Cambridge:

Blackwell publishers Ltd.

Hazlitt, W. (1998). Cultural influences on context: the educational setting. In Somovar, Porter & Stefani, *Communication between cultures,* 3rd ed. Belmont, CA.: Wadsworth.

Heckler, N. C. & Forde, D. R. (2015). The role of cultural values in plagiarism in higher education. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 2015 (13), 61-75. DOI: 10.1007/s10805-014-9221-3. Springer Science+Business Media Dordrect.

Hegel, G. W. F. (1991). *Elements of the philosophy of right*. Ed. Allen W. Wood. Trans. H. B. Nisbet. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.

Heidegger, M. (2010). *Being and truth.* Translated by Gregory Fried and Richard Plot. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010.

Ho, I. T. (2003). Are Chinese teachers authoritarian? In Watkins D. A. & Biggs J. B. (Eds), *Teaching the Chinese learner: psychological and pedagogical perspectives*, 99-114. Comparative Education Research Center, The University of Hong Kong, and The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.

Hollins, T. J., Lange, N., Dennis, I., & Langmore, C. A. (2016). Social influences on unconscious plagiarism and anti-plagiarism. *Memory*, 2016 (24), 7, 884-902. Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Howard, R. M. (1999). *Standing in the shadow of giants: plagiarists, author, collaborators*. Norwood: Ablex, 1999.

Howard, R. M. (2000). Sexuality, textuality: the cultural work of plagiarism. *College English*; 62 (4), 1-13, Urbanan.

Hu, G. & Lei, J. (2016). Plagiarism in English academic writing: a comparison of Chinese university teachers' and students' understanding and stances. *System,* 56, 107-118. Elsevier Ltd.

Hu, J. (2001). An alternative perspective of language re-use: insights from textual and learning theories and L2 academic writing. *English Quarterly*, 33 (1), 52-62.

Hubick, J. (2016). A philosophical response to plagiarism. *Teaching Philosophy*, 39 (2), 453-481. DOI:10.5840/teachphil201612158.

Hughes, J. M. C. & McCabe, D. C. (2006). Academic misconduct within higher education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 36 (2), 1-21.

Hunnekuhl, P. (2017). Constituting knowledge: German literature and philosophy between Colerdige and Crabb Robinson. *European Romantic Review*, 28 (1), 51-63. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Imamichi, T., (1992). Moral crisis and metatechnical problems. Chapter XII, *Morality, metaphysics and Chinese culture*. Metaphysics, culture and Morality, Vol. I. Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Changes Series III. Asia, 4. Foundations of Moral Education, Vol. 6.The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.

Ivanhoe, P. J. (1994). Early Confucianism and contemporary Western ethics. In *The Universal and Particular Natures of Confucianism, 137-154*. Proceedings of the

8th International Conference on Korean Studies. The Academy of Korean Studies, 1994.

Ivanhoe, P. J. & Bloom, I. (2009). *Mencius*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Jameson, D. A. (1993). The ethics of plagiarism: how genre effects writers' use of source materials. *The Bulletin*, June 1993,18-28.

Jardine, D. W. (1988). Piaget's clay and Descartes' wax. *Educational Theory*. 38 (3), 287-298.

Jardine, D. W. (1998). *To dwell with a boundless heart: essays in curriculum theory: Hermeneutics and the ecological imagination*. Peter Lang Publishing, Inc. New York.

Jenson, J. & Castell, S. D.E. (2004). 'Turn It In': technological challenges to academic ethics. *Education, Communication & Information*, 4 (2/3), July/Nov, 2004, 311-330. Taylor & Francis Ltd.

Jung, H. Y. (1999). Postmodernity, Eurocentrism and the future of political philosophy. ed. *Board crossing: toward a comparative political theory*. DallMayr F., 1999, Lexington Books.

Kalton, M.C. (1994). Extending the Neo-Confucian tradition: questions and reconceptualization for the 21st century. In *The Universal and Particular Natures of Confucianism, 95-120*. Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Korean Studies. The Academy of Korean Studies, 1994.

Kant, I. (1785). *Groundwork for the metaphysics of morals*. Retrieved at July 05, 2010 at http://www.justiceharvard.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=55:fundamental-principles-of-the-metaphysic-of-morals&catid=26:episode-six&Itemid=7

Kanu, Y. K. (1993). *Exploring critical reflection as a possibility for teacher education in a post-colonial context* (Sierra Leone) (Order No. NN82161). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (219981277). Retrieved from http://login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.login.ezproxy.library.ualberta.ca/docview/219981277?accountid=14474

Karimi, A. & Anley, C. (2016). *Equity, diversity, and inclusion educational framework, sustainability scholars*. University of Alberta and City of Education.

Kayaoglu, M. N., Erbay, S., Flitner, C., & Saltas, D. (2016). Examining students' perceptions of plagiarism: a cross-cultural study at tertiary level. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 2016, 40 (5), 682-705. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Keenan, C. & Jemmeson, P. (2004). International students and plagiarism: a review of the literature. *Plagiarism among International Students*, Ed., Edited by Bethany Hall.

Keesing, R. M. (1981). *Cultural anthropology: a contemporary perspective* (2nd edition). New York: Holt, Rinchart & Winston.

Kerby, A. P. (1991). *Narrative and the self*. Bloomington, IN Indiana University Press.

Kewes, P. (2003). *Plagiarism in early modern English*. Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003.

Kier, C. A. (2014). How well do Canadian distance education students understand plagiarism? *The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 2014, 15 (1), 228-248, Athabasca University.

Kim, U. & Lee, S. (1994). The Confucian model of morality, justice, selfhood and society: implications for modern society. In *The universal and particular natures of Confucianism, 167-210*. Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Korean Studies. The Academy of Korean Studies, 1994.

Kokkinaki, A. I., Demoliou, C., & Iakovidou, M. (2015). Students' perceptions of plagiarism and relevant policies in Cyprus. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 2015, 11 (3), 1-11. DOI: 10.1997/s40979-015-0001-7.

Kondo, D. K. (1990). *Crafting selves: power, gender, and discourses of identity in a Japanese workplace*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Langran, E., Langran, R. & Bull, G. (2005). Copyright law and technology. *Learning and Leading with Technology*, 38 (7), 24-26.

Lee, S. (1996). Liberal rights or/and Confucian virtues? *Philosophy East & West*, 46 (3), 367-379. University of Hawai'i Press.

Lehman, J. A. (2006). Intellectual property rights and Chinese tradition section:

philosophical foundations. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2006, 69, 1-9. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-006-9059-8. Springer.

Lerner, M. (2011). In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved from on May 27, 2012 from http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/337027/Max-Lerner

Li, J. (2003). The core of Confucian learning. *American Psychologist*, 8, 2, February 2003.

Liddell, J. (2003). A comprehensive definition of plagiarism. *Community & Junior College Libraries*, 11, 3, 2003.

Lindey, A. (1952). *Plagiarism and originality*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1952.

Lipson, A & Reindl, S. M. (2003). The Responsible plagiarist— understanding students who misuse sources. *About Campus*, July-August, 2003.

Liu, D. (2005). Plagiarism in ESOL students: is cultural conditioning truly the major culprit? *ELT Journal*, 59, 3, July, 2005.

Locke, J. (1690). *Second treaties of government*. Retrieved on July 7th, 2010 at http://www.justiceharvard.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=54:the-second-treatise-of-civil-government&catid=24:episode-four&Itemid=7

Lokuang, S. (1992). Ching-Hsing (FulFillment of Nature) in the doctrine of the mean, Chapter I, *Morality, metaphysics and Chinese culture*. Metaphysics, Culture and Morality, Vol. I. Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Changes Series III. Asia, Vol. 4. Foundations of Moral Education, Vol. 6.The Council for Research in

Values and Philosophy.

Lomasky, L. (2001). Toward a liberal theory of national boundaries. *Boundaries and justice*: *diverse ethical perspective*, Miller D. and Hashmi S. H., 2001, Princeton University Press.

Lu, D. (1994). Confucian heritage and Singapore's economic policy. In *The Universal and Particular Natures of Confucianism, 689-706*. Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Korean Studies. The Academy of Korean Studies, 1994.

Lu, L., & Gilmour, R. (2004). Culture and conceptions of happiness: individual oriented and social oriented swb. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 5 (3), 269-291.

Luo, C., Guo, L., Li, T., & Zhang, J. (1989). *A collection of Confucius's saying*. QiLu Press, Jinan.

Macdonald, R. & Carroll, J. (2006). Plagiarism — a complex issue requiring a holistic institutional approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31 (2), 233-245, April 2006.

Mackie, J. L. (2001). The subjectivity of values. Moser P. K. & Carson T. L. (2001). *Moral relativism: a reader*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001, 259-276.

Maday, B. C. & Szalay, L. B. (1976). Psychological correlates of family socialization in the United States and Korea. In T. Williams (ed.), *Psychological anthropology*.

Hague: Mouton.

Madigan, R., Johnson, S. & Linton, P. (1995). The language of psychology: APA style as epistemology. *American Psychologist*, June 1995, 50 (6), 428-436. American Psychological Association.

Mallon, T. (1989). *Stolen words: forays into the origins and ravages of plagiarism*. New York: Penguin, 1989.

Manuel, B. D. Y. JR. (1992). The movement of love in Wang Yang-Ming and Max Scheler. Chapter VI, *Morality, Metaphysics and Chinese Culture*. Metaphysics, Culture and Morality, Vol. I. Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Changes Series III. Asia, Vol. 4. Foundations of Moral Education, Vol. 6.The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.

Markus, H. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and self: implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 961-978.

Marsh, B. (2007). *Plagiarism — alchemy and remedy in higher education*. State University of New York Press, Albany, 2007.

Matus, C. & McCarthy, C. (2006). *The triumph of multiplicity and the carnival of difference: curriculum dilemmas in the age of postcolonialism and globalization*. University of Illinois. Course pack of 2006 for course 504 Curriculum Inquiry.

McCabe, D. & Trevino, K. K. (1996). What we know about cheating in college: longitudinal trends and recent developments. *Change*, 28 (1), 28-33, Jan-Feb

1996.

McDonnell, K. E. (2003). *Academic plagiarism rules and ESL learning — mutually exclusive concepts?* TESL 501 English Language Teaching I, American University, Washington D.C.

McLean, G. F. (1992). Hermeneutics and heritage. Chapter XI, *Morality, Metaphysics and Chinese Culture*. Metaphysics, Culture and Morality, Vol. I. Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Changes Series III. Asia, Vol. 4. Foundations of Moral Education, Vol. 6.The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.

Mill, J. S. (1863). *Utilitarianism*. Retrieved on July 6th 2010 at http://www.justiceharvard.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=53:utilitarianism&catid=22:episode-two&Itemid=7

Miller, D. and Hashmi, S. H., (2001). *Boundaries and justice*: *diverse ethical perspective*. Princeton University Press.

Miller, J. (2003). Identity and language use: the politics of speaking ESL in schools. In Pavlenko A. and Blackledge A. (Eds), *Negotiation of identities in multicultural contexts*, 290-315. Florence Production Ltd.

Moser, P. K. & Carson, T. L. (2001). *Moral relativism: a reader*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Myers, S. (1998). Questioning author(ity): ESL/EFL, science, and teaching about plagiarism. *Tesl-EJ.*, 3 (2), 1-15. Retrieved on March 3, 2008 from

http://www.writing.berekley/TESL-EJ/ej10/a2.html.

Nayyer, K. (2002). *Globalization of information: intellectual property law implications*. Retrieved on March 20, 2007 from http://firstmonday.org/issues/issue7_1/nayyer/index.html

Newton, P. (2016). Academic integrity: a quantitative study of confidence and understanding in students at the start of their higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41 (3), 482-497, 2016. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Ninnes, P., Aitchison, C. & Kalos, S. (1999). Challenges to stereotypes of international students' prior educational experience: undergraduate education in India, *Higher Education Research and Development*, 18 (3), 323-342.

Niu, G. (2008). Section IV: Solutions? Comparing liberalism and Confucianism, from the perspective of multiculturalism. *Global COE Program Ars* Vivendi of Ritsumeikan University October 15, 2008 Identity and Alterity in Multiculturalism and Social Justice: "Conflicts", "Identity", "Alterity", "Solutions?", Report Issued by Research Center Ars Vivendi of Ritsumeikan University, 4, 350

O'Dwyer, S. (2003). Democracy and Confucian values. *Philosophy East & West*, 53 (1), 39-63. University of Hawai's Press.

Oetzel, J., & Ting-Toomey, S. (2003). Face concerns in interpersonal conflict: a cross-

cultural empirical test of the face negotiation theory. *Communication Research*, 30, 599-624.

O'Dwyer, S. (2017). Deflating the 'Confucian Heritage Culture' thesis in intercultural and academic English education. Language, Culture and Curriculum, 2017 Vol. 20, No.2, 198-211. Http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2016.125931

O'Grady, P. (2002). *Relativism*. Montreal & Kinston, Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University press.

Park, C. (2003). In other (People's) words: plagiarism by university students - literature and lessons. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28 (5), 471-488.

Pavlenko, A. & Blackledge, A. (2001). Introduction: negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts. In Pavlenko A. and Blackledge A. (Eds), *Negotiation of identities in multicultural contexts*, 1-33. Florence Production Ltd.

Pennycook, A. (1996). Borrowing others' words: text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30 (20), 201-230.

Popper, K. (2001). Facts, standards, and truth: a further criticism of relativism. Moser P. K. & Carson T. L. (2001). *Moral relativism: a reader*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001, 26-32.

Powell, L. & Singh, N. (2016). An integrated academic literacy approach to improving students' understanding of plagiarism in an accounting course. *Accounting Education*, 2016, 25 (1),14-34. DOI: 10.1080/09639284.2015.1133311.

Price, M. (2002). “Beyond ‘gotcha!’: situating plagiarism in policy and pedagogy.” *College Composition and Communication* 54 (1),88-115.

Prochaska, E. (2001). Western rhetoric and plagiarism: gatekeeping for an English-only international academia. *Writing on the Edge*, 12 (2), 65-79.

Qian, M. (2001). *On modern Chinese disciplines*. Beijing, China: Sanlian Book Store.

Queau, P. (2000). *Defining the world's public property: who owns knowledge?* Retrieved on May 20, 2007 from http://www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/special/patent.htm

Rachels, J. (2001). The challenge of cultural relativism. Moser P. K. & Carson T. L. (2001). *Moral relativism: a reader*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001, 33-53.

Richardson, E. R. (1931). The ubiquitous plagiarist. *Readings in present-day writers*. Ed. Raymond Woodbury Pence. New York: MacMillan, 1933, 323-330.

Ricoeur, P. (1981). *The task of Hermeneutics*. In J. Thompson (Ed. and trans.), Paul Ricoeur, Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosemont, H. Jr. (1991). *A Chinese mirror: moral reflections on political economy and society*. La Salle, IL: Open Court Publishing Company.

Rousseau, J. J. (1968). *Social contract and discourses*. trans. G. D. H. Cole. Dutton, New York.

Saha, R. (2017). Plagiarism, research publications and law. *Current Science*, 112 (12),

2375-2378. DOI: 10.18520/cs/v112/i12/2374-2378.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. Vintage Books, 1978.

Salili, F. (2003). Teacher-student interaction: attributional implications and effectiveness of teachers' evaluative feedback. In Watkins D. A. & Biggs J. B. (Eds), *Teaching the Chinese learner: psychological and pedagogical perspectives*, 77-98. Comparative Education Research Center, The University of Hong Kong, and The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.

Saltmarsh, S. (2004). Graduating tactics: theorizing plagiarism as consumptive practice. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 28 (4), 445-454.

Saussure, F. de (1916), "Nature of the linguistics sign", in: Charles Bally & Albert Sechehaye (Ed.), *Cours de linguistique générale*, McGraw Hill Education.

Scanlon, T.M. (2001). "Fear of relativism," in Rosalind Hursthouse, Gavin Lawrence, and Warren Quinn (eds.), *Virtues and reasons* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 219-45.

Scollon, R. (1994). As a matter of fact: the changing ideology of authorship and responsibility in discourse. *World Englishes*, 13 (1), 33-46, 1994.

Scollon, R. (1995). Plagiarism and ideology: identity in intercultural discourse. *Language in Society*, 24, 1-28.

Scollon, R. (2000). Plagiarism. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 9 (1-2), 188-190.

Scollon, R. (2004). Teaching language and culture as hegemonic practice. *The Modern*

Language Journal, 88 (2), 271-4

Shen, V. (1992). Lao Tzu's metaphysics and his critique of Confucian ethics. *Morality, Metaphysics and Chinese Culture*. Metaphysics, Culture and Morality, Vol. I. Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Changes Series III. Asia, Vol. 4. Foundations of Moral Education, Vol. 6.The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.

Smith, D. G. (1983). *The meaning of children in the lives of adults: a hermeneutic study* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from Dissertation and Thesis database. OCLC No: 65844552.

Smith, D. G. (1991). Hermeneutic inquiry: the hermeneutic imagination and the pedagogic text. Chapter 10, *Forms of curriculum inquiry*, edited by Edmund C. Short, State University of New York, Albany, 1991.

Smith, D. G. (2003). The mission of hermeneutic scholar. In: *Wolfe, Michael and Pryor, Carolyn* (Eds). The mission of the scholar—research and practice: A Tribute to Nelson Haggerson. New York: Peter Long.

Smith, D. G. (2008). "The farthest West is but the farthest East": the long way of oriental/occidental engagement. In Eppert C. & Wang H. (Eds), *Cross-cultural studies in curriculum: Eastern thought, educational insights, 1-33*. New York and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Taylor & Francis Group.

Smits, H. (1994). *Interpreting reflective practice: a hermeneutically inspired action research. Ph. D. Dissertation*, University of Alberta.

Sowden, C. (2005). Plagiarism and the culture of multilingual student in higher education

abroad. *ELT Journal*, 59, 3, July 2005. Oxford University Press.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. (2006). Retrieved on November 14, 2011 from http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/confucius/#ConEdu

Stark, C. D. (2005). Patently absurd: the ethical implications of software patents. *TechTrends*, 49 (6), 58-61.

Statistics Canada (2016). *International Students in Canadian Universities*, 2004-2005 to 2013-2014. Retrieved on August 3, 2017 at http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/81-599-x/81-599-x2016011-eng.htm

Stockall, N. & Cole, C. V. (2016). Hidden voices: L2 students' compensatory writing strategies. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 2016, 21 (3), 344 -357. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Stuhmcke, A., Booth, T. & Wangmann, J. (2016). The illusory dichotomy of plagiarism. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 2016, 41 (7), 982-995. Routlege Taylor & Francis Group.

The Academic Senate for California Community College (1999). *Academic freedom, privacy, copyright and fair use in a technological world*. Retrieved on Sept. 11, 2018 from https://asccc.org/papers/academic-freedom-privacy-copyright-and-fair-use-technological-world

Thomas, P. L. (2007). Of flattery and thievery: reconsidering plagiarism in a time of virtual information. *English Journal*, 96 (5), 81-84.

Thorley, L. & Gregory, R. (1994). *Using group-based Learning in Higher Education*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Todd, E. S. (1997). Supervising overseas students: problem or opportunity? In *overseas students in higher education: issues in teaching and learning*, David McNamara; Robert J Harris, London; New York: Routledge, 1997

Tong, L. K. (1992). Self-transcendence and morality: human creativity in Nietzschean and Confucian thought. Chapter IV, *Morality, Metaphysics and Chinese Culture*. Metaphysics, Culture and Morality, Vol. I. Cultural Heritage and Contemporary Changes Series III. Asia, Vol. 4. Foundations of Moral Education, Vol. 6.The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.

Triandis, H. C. (1988). "Collectivism and individualism: a reconceptualization of a basic concept in cross-cultural psychology". In G. K. Verma & C. Bagley (eds.). *Personality, attitudes and cognitions*, 60-95. London: MacMillan.

Tsai, Y. (2008). Selfhood and fiduciary community: a Smithian reading of Tu Weiming's Confucian humanism. *Dao*, 7, 349-365. Springer Science+ Business Media B.V. 2008.

Tu, W. (2002). Confucianism and liberalism. *Dao: A Journal of Comparative Philosophy*. II (1), 1-20. Global Scholarly Publications.

Tu, W. (2007). Creativity: a Confucian view. Special topic: creativity in Christianity and Confucianism. *Dao*, 2007, 6, 115-124. Springer.

Tweed, R. G. (2000). *Learning Considered within a Cultural Context: Confucian and Socratic Approaches*. Doctoral Dissertation, The University of British Columbia

Tweed, R. G. & Lehman, D. (2002). Learning considered within a cultural context: Confucian and Socratic approaches. *American Psychologist*, 57 (2), 89-99,

American Psychological Association, Inc.

United Nations General Assembly (1948). *The universal declaration of human rights*. Retrieved on September 10, 2018 at http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/

University of Michigan (2003). *Defining and avoiding plagiarism: the WPA statement on best practices*. Council of Writing Program Administrators, January, 2003. Retrieved on September 10, 2018 at http://wpacouncil.org/files/WPAplagiarism.pdf

University of Toronto (2016). *Code of behaviour on academic matters.* Retrieved on September 10, 2018 at http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppjun011995.pdf

Van Der Dussen (1993). Introduction. In Collingwood, R. G. (1993). *The idea of history*. Revised edition. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1993.

Walden, K. & Peacook, A. (2006). The i-map: a process-centered response to plagiarism. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31 (2), 201-214.

Watkins, D. A. & Biggs, J. B. (1996). *The Chinese learner: cultural, psychological, and contextual influences*. Hong Kong: CERC; Camberwell, Melbourne, Vic, ACER, 1996.

Watkins, D. A. & Biggs, J. B. (2001). The paradox of the Chinese learner and beyond. In Watkins D. A. & Biggs J. B. (Eds), *Teaching the Chinese learner: psychological and pedagogical perspectives*, 3-23. Comparative Education Research Center,

The University of Hong Kong, and The Australian Council for Educational Research Ltd.

Whorf, B. L. (1964). *Language, thought, and reality: selected writings.* M.I.T. Press.

Willen, M. S. (2004). Reflection on the cultural climate of plagiarism. *Liberal Education*, 90 (4), 55-61.

Wohlfart, G. (1994). Philosophical remarks on the concept of silence in East and West. In *The universal and particular natures of Confucianism, 279-302*. Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Korean Studies. The Academy of Korean Studies, 1994.

Wong, D. B. (2006). *Natural moralities: a defense of pluralistic relativism*. Oxford University press, 2006.

Xin, R. (1994). Confucian philosophy and its role in contemporary China. In *The universal and particular natures of Confucianism,65-94*. Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Korean Studies. The Academy of Korean Studies, 1994.

Xplanevisualthinking (2007, June, 22). *Did you know 2.0* [Video file]. Video posted to http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pMcfrLYDm2U

Yamada, K (2003). What prevents ESL/EFL writers from avoiding plagiarism?: Analysis of 10 North-American college websites. *System*, 31, 247-258. Elsevier science Ltd.

Yang, S. (1994). Confucian ethics and the spirit of oriental entrerprise. In *The universal and particular natures of Confucianism, 661-689*. Proceedings of the 8th

International Conference on Korean Studies. The Academy of Korean Studies, 1994.

Youmans, M., & Evans, F. B. (2000). Perceptions of plagiarism in ESL writing: student perspectives. *Journal for Language Teaching*, 34 (2), 113–125.

Zhang, H. (2008). Toward a Confucian vision of curriculum. In Eppert C. & Wang H. (Eds), *Cross-cultural studies in curriculum: Eastern thought, educational insights,* 335-358. New York and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Taylor & Francis Group.

Appendix I Invitation Letter for Participants

Engaging with the Puzzle of Plagiarism: Dilemma of Internationalized Universities

Invitation letter for participants

Dear Participant,

My name is Xiaodong Yang, a graduate student at Faculty of Education, the University of Alberta. I am writing to invite you to take part in a research project entitled "**Engaging with the puzzle of plagiarism: Dilemma of Internationalized Universities**" for my dissertation. The purpose of this study is to explore the cultural meaning of plagiarism from hermeneutic perspective. I intend to examine international students' understanding of plagiarism and to understand how plagiarism influences the process of international students' identity formation.

During this research project, you will be invited to participate three audio-recorded conversations to talk about your experiences and understandings about plagiarism. You are also encouraged to keep a journal of reflection on the experience of participating this study and what influence this research has had on your understanding of plagiarism.

The three conversations will be conducted with in two months and each conversation will take approximately one to two hours to complete.

The following is the procedure that will take place in each conversation:

1. The first conversation will be an introductory dialogue on ourselves as well as this

study. In this session, we will get to know each other and become acquainted with our backgrounds. We will also talk about your experience of plagiarism in Canada or/and in your home country.

2. In the second conversation, we will talk about your cultural beliefs, values and attitudes in terms of learning, education and writing. We will also discuss how these conceptions influence your understanding of plagiarism and the differences between your understanding and institutional regulations.
3. In the third conversation, we will talk about your study experiences after the incident of plagiarism. We will discuss how the incident influences your academic life and your understanding of plagiarism.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may withdraw from this research at any time with/out taking your contribution to the study. There will be no negative consequences. The time and location of our conversation will be selected according to your most convenience.

The study will use anonymous strategy and you will not be identified in any way in this study. All the information related to your identity will be confidential and will only be disclosed with your permission. The information collected for this study will be kept in a secure and locked place which only myself have access. This information will be kept for five years after the completion of this research.

These will be only minimum potential risk in this study. You will contribute to a better

understanding of plagiarism from a cultural perspective which hopefully will benefit yourself in your future academic career and intercultural communication.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me via email: xy@ualberta.ca or via telephone (780) 993-6596, or contact my Faculty supervisor, Dr. Terry Carson by email terry.carson@ualberta.ca or by phone (780) 492-3674.

Your signature on the bottom of this indicate that you have read and understand the information provided above, that you willingly agree to participate, that your may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation with penalty, and that you will not be identifiable in any documents resulting from this research.

Yours sincerely

Xiaodong Yang

_____ _____ _____

(Print Name of Participant) (Signature) (Date)

_____ _____

(Email) (Phone)