This is a pre-publication version of an online article published in Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy. The published version is available at:
http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/14.3/topoi/anson-neely/index.html

The Army and the Academy as Textual Communities: Exploring Mismatches in the Concepts of Attribution, Appropriation, and Shared Goals

Chris M. Anson
North Carolina State University

Shawn Neely
United States Military Academy at West Point

Introduction

The field of writing studies has shown increasing interest in understanding the contextual nature of discursive practice. Based on activity theory, new genre theory, and related scholarship, research is revealing how the varied social, intellectual, and disciplinary norms and conventions of different communities influence these communities' writing practices (Bazerman & Russell, 2003). However, our conceptions of authorial attribution—of the relationship between a text and the degree to which it is credited to its author—have remained less fully explored than other contextually varied aspects of text production and reception. Instead, the dominant view of attribution is based on academic conceptions of intellectual property, where credit and credibility accrue from the production of original text and notions of individual authorship (Anson, in press). Taught and reinforced in schools, this narrow view of the relationship between texts and their authors denies students a full understanding of the ways that writing is socially and culturally determined within specific communities, and leads to the uneasy transfer of knowledge as students move out of school and into professional settings that adhere to different norms and practices.

In this article, we will analyze the social and authorial assumptions informing the processes and functions of writing in the U.S. Army. From the perspective of contextually and socially based theories of language, understandings of intellectual property in the Army differ from those commonly taught in the schools (including military academies) and generally assumed in public conceptions of authorship. We will briefly describe the processes used to write such documents as field manuals, standard operating procedures (SOPs), and policies—texts that are often recycled, repurposed, and appropriated without the need for individual authorial attribution. In our analysis, we will show that the acceptable absence of attribution is justified by the purpose of the communication; what (if anything) the author will receive, materially or reputationally, from the text; and how the text contributes to communal goals (Adler-Kassner, Anson, & Howard, 2008). Our analysis of much of the routine text produced in the Army demonstrates its highly functional view of attribution and source use, where the presence or absence of attribution is equated less with moral behavior than with getting jobs done effectively and efficiently in support of carefully articulated goals. The contrast between this view and the view that applies in

academia suggests that the authorial use of others' texts is not governed by universally inviolable rules but by highly contextualized practices which, across different communities of readers and writers, are often contradictory.

It is not our purpose here to question the discursive practices of either the military academies or the armed forces for which these academies prepare future officers. Each context has developed specific norms for the creation and use of writing that are the outcomes of the way writing supports the institution's purposes and mission. Instead, we want to consider the problem of discursive representation and the way that students (in all of higher education) are taught about source use, text ownership, and citation practices. We argue in favor of a higher-level pedagogy that shows students variations in understandings of intellectual property while also helping them to adhere to the standards practiced in specific contexts. Although we focus here on the mismatches between the practices of military schooling and those of the military itself, similar disjunctions also obtain between most colleges and universities and many of the business settings that graduates of such institutions will join. Like Susan Miller (1991), Amy Robillard and Ron Fortune (2007), and other post-process scholars, we argue the importance of helping students to understand how writing is socially determined by members of academic and nonacademic settings and is shaped by situational rather than universal standards.

Conceptions of Attribution in Military Academies

Among all higher-education institutions in the United States, military academies take pride in their stringent rules for student conduct, including the use and attribution of source material in papers and other written projects. Just as cadets learn to respect the authority of their superiors, they follow an ethic that honors those who have produced text that they cite in their academic work. These standards of textual attribution echo more general principles that are reinforced by student honor codes and codes of conduct unrivaled in academia. Honor is, for example, the "most cherished principle" at the Citadel in South Carolina, and students are strongly warned about the consequences of missing or improper citation of sources, which is considered a form of theft to be tried in Honor Court and potentially punishable by dismissal (Citadel, 2009). At the United States Military Academy at West Point, similar rules apply, as described by Mike Edwards (2007):

> Here at West Point, the plagiarism policy is literally graven in stone at the black granite Cadet Honor Code monument: “A cadet will not lie, cheat, or steal, or tolerate those who do.” The prevailing consensus here is that plagiarism violates the first three prohibitions: as a misrepresentation of another’s work as one’s own, it is a lie; as an attempt to get away with not doing the expected work, it is a cheat; and as the appropriation of another’s work, it is theft.

At these and almost all other military academies, the attribution of sources in writing is an integral part of the honor code, "the bedrock" (United States Air Force Academy, 2009), the "hallmark" (Virginia Military Institute, 2009), and the "cornerstone" (Valley Forge Military Academy and College, 2009) of moral and character education, and failure to acknowledge others' text represents "dishonorable" behavior (United States Naval Academy, 2009). Within the various academic and training divisions of the armed forces, similar provisions apply. In the Army's Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), for example, strict policies of plagiarism govern individual student work, while honor code and ethical violations are the fastest way to

end a promising career. The following plagiarism policy is typical: “Violations are serious breaches of ethics and are cause for academic elimination, administrative action, and/or punishment under the provisions of the Uniform Code of Military Justice" (United States Army, 2009).

Similarly, at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff Headquarters in Fort Leavenworth, KS, which offers an assortment of continuing academic opportunities well beyond the undergraduate level, "all personnel are expected to uphold the highest ethical standards and must undergo periodic refresher training to guarantee widespread awareness of the most current rules and regulations," which include academic policies. A student writing manual, Student Text 22-1, provides information on plagiarism violations, which are "subject to review and may be referred to an academic board" (United States Army Command and General Staff Headquarters, 2005).

But the equation of text with owned property, and its appropriation with theft, is not the sole reason for the pressure of attribution. Like students in almost all educational settings, those in academic military contexts perform in a highly individualized system of rewards for personal achievement; they are constantly measured up against rigorous standards in virtually all areas of their development. In the military academies, their textual performance is no different than their answers on a test or the quality of their regimental marching. If the words are not theirs, they cannot be appropriately and accurately judged; their actions thwart "two of the academy's most basic functions—to teach and to certify intellectual accomplishment" (Howard, 2000, p. 488). In addition to the way it shows respect to those who have produced original text, source attribution allows superiors to know which parts of a text were produced by the student and which parts were not. Such concerns have led to the development of specific strategies, such as continuous assessment of learning, for the "identification, authentication, and monitoring of participants" in online learning environments within military education (Curnow, Freedman, Wisher, & Belanich, 2002).

Against this backdrop of heightened concerns about students' "textual honesty," and in their adherence to honor codes that require meticulous attention to source citation and attribution, we turn to textual practices in the United States Army. Graduates of institutions like West Point or the U.S. Air Force Academy eagerly enter military service as commissioned officers. In the armed services, many of the same rules of conduct, performance, and advancement apply, allowing these officers, with some exceptions, an almost seamless transition from the military academies. But the textual world that officers enter operates with a very dissimilar set of processes and standards concerning the attribution of others' words, partly based on a different relationship of the individual to the collective mission.

Use and Attribution of Text in the United States Army

The Army’s focus on sustaining and improving the collective effort appears to work in contradiction to the academic standards of professional development we have cited. For example, outside of TRADOC and USMA, sharing ideas, formats, tools, and various written products is not only acceptable within the operational social norms of the Army, but disseminating what would ordinarily be considered intellectual property is often encouraged—and attribution beyond the local command level rarely happens.

This seemingly contradictory phenomenon is limited to specific kinds of texts and contexts within the Army, thereby qualifying what might otherwise appear to be rampant institutional plagiarism within an organization that prides itself on strict adherence to principles of integrity. Therefore, we will briefly examine a small sample of Army-specific texts used as "tools," as well

as a few examples of texts prepared in accordance with *Army Regulation (AR) 25-50 - Preparing and Managing Correspondence*. In light of the practices surrounding these texts, we will then discuss a recent controversy concerning attribution in *FM 3-24, Counterinsurgency*--an Army document written to provide soldiers with guidance and procedures on counterinsurgency operations that made its way into a general public context.

AR 25-50 is the Army's regulatory guidance on correspondence that contains formatting specifications for memorandums, letters, enclosures, and official mail. These items of correspondence are integral to the Army's daily operations outside the tactical operating environment and act as the principle means by which commanders disseminate information, establish policies, and otherwise communicate in an official capacity. Because memorandums are the principal means of formal written communication, and the regulatory guidance that dictates much of this communication results in marked textual similarities, continuously creating original correspondence would be difficult and unnecessary. The formatting requirements in accordance with AR 25-50 are so prescriptive that soldiers often create and share accurate templates that strictly adhere to the regulation in order to save time in writing future correspondence of a similar nature. A good example of this is demonstrated by command policy letters. Policy letters are a universal regulatory requirement of command that establish a commander's official guidance concerning subjects such as equal opportunity, sexual harassment, substance abuse, etc., each policy deriving from an applicable regulation (e.g., Equal Opportunity and Sexual Harassment fall under AR 600-20, *Army Command Policy*). In addition to regulations, these policies often cite the next higher commander's corresponding policy letter in the "references" sections, thereby demonstrating compliance and unity throughout the chain of command. Because the core concepts of these policies originate from regulatory guidance, there is rarely a need to rewrite the entire policy after a change of command. Although an incoming commander will review the previous policy letter and perhaps change a few sentences to reflect his or her personal command philosophy, the majority of the original text often remains the same. The new commander's signature block replaces the old commander's, the date is changed, and a "new" policy letter is born. By common definitions found in TRADOC, this is plagiarism, but at the local unit level, it is driven by the need for efficiency and economy of effort.

Attribution in this instance is secondary to the policy letter's intent—informing soldiers of command policies. Whoever formatted the original policy letter is of no significance, and attribution for the new policy letter's author is equally trivial. What is important is that the new commander reviews, edits, and signs it. In fact, the signature block on a memorandum indicates responsibility or approval authority. It does not indicate authorial attribution. By signing the memorandum, the commander is not taking credit for the written words; he or she is taking responsibility for the content. Someone else who may never receive authorial recognition or attribution—nor write with any expectation of recognition—is typically responsible for producing most of the text in the correspondence that the commander signs. Within this framework, who writes the text is immaterial. Some correspondence even includes a point of contact other than the signature authority, but this also does not necessarily indicate the text's author. As in non-competitive or "cooperatively competitive" business contexts (see Anson, in press), text is produced for the benefit of the organization's broader community, not for individual recognition.

Individual recognition for textual production is secondary to the greater good of the unit. During every rating period, a soldier's accomplishments are acknowledged and annotated for purposes of future promotion and professional development. If a soldier produces a text or

textual “tool” (for example, an Excel spreadsheet, a PowerPoint presentation, or a template) that the commander feels is integral to the organization’s success, or something that will contribute to the collective mission, the commander may direct its distribution throughout the command, and the soldier will freely dole out the text or tool without concern for attribution beyond a potential bullet point on his or her next evaluation report. More significantly, the soldiers who receive this text or tool will subsequently integrate it into their operations without concern for citing its original source. This original piece of what would ordinarily be considered intellectual property is seamlessly assimilated into the larger Army community.

Although ethical standards require soldiers to refrain from taking credit for work they did not create, the author is rarely as important as the textual tool itself. How soldiers implement this tool in relation to mission accomplishment becomes the focus. Further complicating authorial attribution, most tools are adopted and immediately adapted to individual unit needs. The original tool mutates and often merges with other similar tools to form a more effective hybrid. When such repurposed and "patchwritten" (Howard, 1999) documents are passed from soldier to soldier, attribution becomes extraneous.

Prior to advances in technology such as Army Knowledge Online (AKO), an electronic portal to a secured, dynamic, institutional Army intranet, and the Center for Army Lessons Learned (CALL), a secured military website where Techniques, Tactics and Procedures (TTPs) and other textual materials are shared electronically throughout the Army, dissemination of useful products was limited by the reach of the local Army community. Great ideas spread slowly throughout the Army, and only as soldiers moved from one post to another through a permanent change of station was cross-pollination of ideas and tools possible. AKO and CALL now expand the dissemination of information from unit level to the entire Army. Ironically, the expansion in the scope of shared information—a by-product of electronic distribution—results in the increased possibility for authorial recognition.

Consider, for example, the 1/21st Infantry, 25th Infantry Division Medical Platoon Battalion Aid Station (BAS) SOP found in the Army Medical Department (AMEDD) Lessons Learned section of CALL. By enabling digital uploads of the unit’s tactical standard operating procedure (TACSOP) that provides a standardized methodology for executing platoon level medical operations in combat environments for the benefit of the entire Army, the electronic format also allows for Army-wide authorial recognition. The posting states the author's name, and also includes the following note: “Our thanks to MAJ Anson Smith, the 25th ID DMOC Chief, and 1LT Matthew Rieder, Platoon Leader of the 1/21st IN, for the use of this excellent SOP” (quoted from a secured document). The TACSOP is available for download (for official use only) by anyone with an AKO account. Authorial recognition gives credit where credit is due to original sources. However, in spite of the credit attached to this textual resource, it is provided for the greater good of the Army with the understanding that soldiers will use it freely without obligation to provide citations of authorial attribution. Although the author is listed as Major Smith and the TACSOP contains a memorandum with First Lieutenant Rieder’s signature block, once downloaded, this TACSOP becomes a tool for the new unit. The signature block will change, the soldiers will integrate the content into their training, and they will claim the TACSOP as their personal unit's standard operating procedures while under no obligation to cite its original architect.

Social norms within the organization, coupled with the necessity for mission accomplishment where soldiers' lives are at stake, create the foundation for this unique environment where ideas, texts, and tools flow freely within the organization for the benefit of the collective effort and

render individual attribution a potential hindrance to institutional development. However, a soldier needs to look no further than an applicable regulation if seeking guidance on the subject of attribution in Army publications. *Department of the Army (DA) Pamphlet (PAM) 25-40* (Army Publishing, Action Officers Guide) and *AR 25-30* (Army Publishing Program) both state that "official publications will not contain credit lines or bylines of Army authors, artists, illustrators, or photographers, or the names of persons who assisted in their preparation" (2-15 a.). Although this guidance applies to Army publications, DA PAM 25-40 states the copyright laws as they apply to all government employees, including soldiers:

> Works of the U.S. Government do not receive copyright protection. Such works are defined as those prepared by an employee of the U.S. Government as part of that person's official duties. Thus, unclassified works of the Government are in the public domain; unless their distribution is restricted, they can be freely reproduced, distributed, or displayed by the public. (2-37 e. (1))

As unique members of the general public, soldiers take full advantage of the rights of public domain and freely use all unclassified text as they see fit—governed by integrity and professional ethics. Where this distinction becomes problematic is with the attribution of non-government texts within official Army publications. DA PAM 25-40 requires sparing use of footnotes, and "the only references to be cited in these footnotes are non-Governmental publications" (2-11). So although a field manual (FM) will contain no authorial attribution recognizing the work of those who created the publication, non-governmental citations used within the publication must be given proper credit. DA PAM 25-40 provides this clear advice: "The first time that a non-Government publication is cited, use a footnote to furnish publishing information" (2-33 c.). Although this guideline appears straightforward, the recent publication of FM 3-24 *Counterinsurgency*, dated December 2006, created a controversy that suggests the clashing of two textual cultures with different norms of attribution and source use.

A Collision of Two Textual Cultures

After serving as head of the Multinational Security Transition Command in Iraq, General David Petraeus returned in 2005 to Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, where he took on the task of rewriting the Army's counterinsurgency manual in light of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. The new manual, FM 3-24, was released at the end of 2006 and, to some, represented "a thoroughly researched and innovative rethinking of counterinsurgency in the post-Sept. 11 world—a reassessment of strategy based on the history of counterinsurgency stretching from ancient Rome to the French debacle in Algeria to America's experience in Vietnam" (Sennott, 2007). In July of 2007, the University of Chicago Press republished FM 3-24 with the original foreword by Petraeus and Lt. General James Amos and a new foreword by Lt. Col. John Nagl, who became its chief spokesperson. After its release, however, it wasn't long before charges of plagiarism were leveled by an academic who recognized in the manual various ideas and text from previous published sources. In many ways, the eventual reception of FM 3-24 by academics and the general public quite dramatically demonstrates what happens when, through an artifact of production, the unique textual values and practices of one context meet with those of another.

In an article in *Counterpunch* titled "Pilfered Scholarship Devastates General Petraeus's *Counterinsurgency Manual,*" St. Martin's University anthropologist David Price charged the Army and General David Petraeus with plagiarism and took issue with FM 3-24. "With a little

searching in Chapter 3 alone," he claimed, "I found about twenty passages showing either direct use of others' passages without quotes, or heavy reliance on unacknowledged source materials" (Price, 2007). In its severe critique, the article even called into question the intelligence of the manual's authors:

> The inability of this chapter's authors to come up with their own basic definitions of such simple sociocultural concepts as "race," "culture," "ritual," or "social structure" not only raises questions about the ethics of the authors but also furnishes a useful measure of the *Manual* and its authors' weak intellectual foundation.

Price also questioned the practices of the University of Chicago Press, chastising them for allowing a piece of "shoddy scholarship" to pass through their "well guarded gates" of academic prestige. He then shifted his focus to what he called "pressganging scholars to fight dirty wars," at which point the article advanced his criticism of anthropological roles in the counterinsurgency campaign.

Reaction to Price's article generally falls into two categories: concern over charges of plagiarism, and debate about using information garnered by anthropologists to aid the commanders on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan. Excellent discussions of these two positions are found at *Small Wars Council* and *Small Wars Journal* (2007) under the discussion threads "Anthropologists and a True Culture War" and “Desperate People with Limited Skills,” to which we will briefly turn.

In response to Price, LTC John Nagl, a spokesman for and contributor to the manual, began a discussion thread in *Small Wars Journal* titled "Desperate People with Limited Skills." In his posting, LTC Nagl addressed the issue of citations in military doctrine, explaining that "citations of previous works were transferred into standard field manual format, with footnotes removed in order to improve readability" (Nagl, 2007). He stressed that the primary audience of the field manual is the soldier, not those who hold Ph.D.s; "thus authors are not named, and those whose scholarship informs the manual are only credited if they are quoted extensively" (Nagl, 2007).

Price's subsequent rejoinder to LTC Nagl's response in *Counterpunch* was equally emphatic, claiming LTC Nagl missed the point of his first article which was meant to question the University of Chicago Press's involvement in printing FM 3-24, and arguing that "some of this scholarship turns out to be fake scholarship . . ." (Price, 2007), referring once again to the lack of citations—a charge readers in the discussion threads at *Small Wars Council* debated vigorously. The crux of the problem appears to be that FM 3-24 was published by a university press for public sale and distribution, complete with a publicity tour, thus thrusting a body of work that would ordinarily remain relevant only within military circles into the academic and public limelight, subject to scrutiny by scholars and misconstrued as text written for scholarly purposes. One of Price's initial charges includes snide comments about the simple language used in this "scholarly text" by its contributors who hold both M.A.s and PhDs. Impugning the authors’ writing skills and scholarship, he writes that

> Most academics know that bad things can happen when marginally skilled writers must produce ambitious amounts of writing in short time periods; sometimes the only resulting calamities are grammatical abominations, but in other instances the pressures to perform lead to shoddy academic practices. (Price, 2007)

Price failed to understand that by regulation, the language of a field manual, designed for soldiers, not scholars, may not exceed a 12th-grade level: "Departmental publications are to be written at an RGL [Reading Grade Level] of no more than 12 (a reading skill level that falls approximately midway between that of college graduates and 12th grade graduates)" (DA PAM 25-40, 2-3). The University of Chicago Press published FM 3-24 as it was written (for soldiers), but its having been "preselected" (Pratt, 1981) and issued by a reputable publisher created false expectations in the minds of some scholars.

Neither LTC Nagl nor the Army responded to Price again. The FM was put into practice and lauded as a great success, and LTG Petraeus was promoted to General. The furor died down concerning the allegations of plagiarism, and Price's article was compared to a Trojan horse designed to advance his political agenda of indignation for using anthropologists in war zones. However, the discussion thread "Desperate People with Limited Skills" raises some important issues concerning citations in field manuals.

It is beyond the scope of this article to analyze this complex thread fully. But one issue particularly relevant here is whether field manuals should have citations, or if all citations should be removed to improve readability. One camp sides with LTC Nagl's argument that citations should be stripped from field manuals to facilitate easier reading for soldiers—for whom, in the highly pragmatic world of the armed forces, citations are not particularly relevant or useful. The other camp believes citations are just as important in field manuals as they are in scholarly publications. The former opinion clings to the social norms of textual assimilation within the Army while the latter appears to stand by regulatory guidance of mandatory citation of non-governmental text (although DA PAM 25-40 was never cited as evidence for this argument). One proposed solution to the conflict was to produce an Army version for soldiers in the field without citations, and to print a separate, scholarly version by a university press with full citations included. Unfortunately, in spite of the attention this controversy attracted, the conflict between the practical exclusion of citations and DA PAM 25-40's requirements to include them remains unresolved.

Academic Attribution and the Rules of Credit

In many ways, the context of academia and its view of authorship and textual production are chiefly responsible for constructing our public conceptions of attribution. Yet as textual practices in the Army demonstrate, authorial ownership is largely a product of particular ideologies of materialism within communities of textual practice. As sociologists of knowledge Bruno Latour and Steven Woolgar (1979) have shown in connection with scientific communities, cycles of credit and credibility often determine the "value" associated with academic products, particularly texts, which are the primary means of disseminating new knowledge in virtually all fields. When a scholar publishes the findings of his or her research, the "work" (a term frequently used in legal documents in the publishing industry) garners a certain degree of material credit. As more work accrues, the credit yields increased pay, promotion and tenure, a stronger likelihood of being commissioned for or invited to participate in various professional activities, and so on. In turn, the credit leads to higher levels of credibility—of standing and notoriety in one's professional field—which leads to more credit-bearing opportunities such as grants, fellowships, publishing contracts, invitations to serve on editorial boards, and the like. As Stuart Green (2002) explains, "recognition of one's work and the development of a reputation as a creative scholar or artist in a given field often do result, even if indirectly, in significant tangible rewards . . . . and individual professors are often ranked by the frequency with which their work is cited. Such rankings, in

turn, may be relevant to important judgments about status and reputation" (p. 220). The great majority of scholarly trajectories can be documented through this cycle of credit and credibility. For this reason, academics and others whose professional identities depend on the accrual of published work strictly adhere to an ideology of textual production that requires precise and unwavering attribution. If the altruistic desire to contribute new knowledge to their areas of specialization were their only motivation, reputation gained through credit would take on far less importance for many scholars, just as it would if their material rewards—such as advancement—were determined not by a documented association with specific texts but by a general *contribution* of texts that are used by others without acknowledgment of authorship but initially judged by their contribution to the collective good (as they are in the Army).

To test this equation beyond the case of FM 3-24, we need only look at other kinds of texts produced in academia that do not earn their authors credit or credibility. As "hybrid" contexts, universities have layers of textual production and consumption, some scholarly, some administrative, some pedagogical. Academics are often called upon to write or help write various administrative documents such as curriculum proposals, outcomes and mission statements, plans and prospectuses, and policies and procedures. Many of these are associated with the required but routine work of committees, councils, and task forces. As in the Army, the documents are produced for the benefit of the community. Some may include the names of those who created them, but often they are attributed only to a committee or group, clearly indicating that their contents matter more than who wrote them. As in the Army, the authors may earn some credit for engaging in the work that led to the document—included as an item on an annual faculty activities report—but the texts themselves take on little importance next to the author's published contributions to his or her field. It is common practice for departments to borrow liberally from other departments' documents when the latter serve the formers' purposes and when it would be a waste of time to reproduce them in different words. And, over time, original documents are altered, repurposed, or borrowed from with no remaining traces of authorship and with no regard for the intellectual and creative energy or the hours of time that went into them for the good of the organization.

The domain of pedagogy includes similar practices in which instructors eagerly share syllabi, classroom policy statements, course descriptions, assignments, and a host of other texts with each other without concern for attribution; cutting and pasting, repurposing, and even adopting material *in toto* is completely acceptable. In most circumstances, very few of these documents are associated with the accrual of credit or credibility *as documents*, only in the ways that they contribute to the common good and earn general praise and a reputation for citizenship.

Just as in the Army, authorship of these kinds of documents, and therefore attribution, become extraneous. As we have seen, it is only when the two sets of textual values come together in a single instance that conflict arises, as in the infamous cases of one university "borrowing" another university's plagiarism policy without attribution (see Morgan and Reynolds, 1997). Practically speaking, it may be a waste of time to recreate a perfectly good plagiarism policy, especially if we assume that educational institutions are unified in their desire to achieve common goals. But the scholarly-academic values associated with text override such cooperation, requiring the borrowing institution to credit the progenitor institution as "author" even though the statement itself provides no authorship. Although it would be a simple matter to credit the authoring institution, the borrowing institution may resist doing so in order to maintain its reputation as a collective that is presumably able to create its own policy statements. Here,

residual competition between the institutions—as "individual collectives"—clashes with their potential cooperation.

The differences between the norms of attribution in the Army and those in military academies (or in higher education more generally) are not unique; it is clear that such differences characterize many general and specific contexts where people produce written text for a variety of purposes. For example, as Chris Anson (in press) and Linda Adler-Kassner, Chris Anson, and Rebecca Moore Howard (2008) have shown, attribution of texts in business settings depends on a process of "selective proprietorship." When an Internet-based travel broker replicates the description of a resort property without attribution or permission, neither business is harmed; the broker fills hotels rooms and earns a small profit along the way, and the resort benefits from the additional clients. The broker will resist citing the source of the text so that it can build trust in its potential Internet customers. However, if a competing resort were to use the PR text verbatim rather than the broker, litigation would almost certainly ensue. The unwritten rules of "cooperative competition" allow for the free borrowing of text across a vast landscape of the business world, in stark contrast to the monolithic edicts and inviolable practices reinforced in higher education.

When we study different textual activity systems, then, we find that the norms of behavior for the production, dissemination, use, attribution, and reward of texts vary considerably based partly on what values inform those texts' functions and purposes. In academia, credit for textual production is sacrosanct because reputation and material reward depend on it, no matter how much weight we place on the advancement of knowledge for the "good" of human progress. Yet even within academia, certain sub-contexts—administrative and pedagogical, for example—operate under different rules that occasionally conflict with dominant academic values. In the Army, individual performance is judged less often through textual production, and advancement does not depend crucially on subsequent association with it. Under these circumstances, lack of permanent association with particular texts does not hinder advancement, and appropriation of many texts without attribution is acceptable practice.

Representations of Textual Use: Toward Transparency in Education

The typical graduate of an academy like West Point enters the military armed with a highly developed code of personal and professional ethics. Similarly, graduates of colleges and universities across the United States—if these institutions have done their job—move into the work force with a particular understanding of citation and attribution practices captured in the ubiquitous language of plagiarism policies, in which the "presentation of ideas from any sources you do not credit" is an offense (University of Iowa, 2006). In these post-educational settings, graduates will dutifully try to transfer their acquired knowledge and practices without understanding the social construction of textual and discursive practices—and they will often fail (Anson & Forsberg, 1990).

Teachers in most areas of scholastic writing usually strive to maintain symmetry between what students learn in their advanced courses and what they will be practicing when they leave the academy. When students learn to write in sophisticated scientific research communities, for example, they are taught that meticulous note taking on projects will be required, even down to initialing specific observations (see Goldbort, 2006, p. 58). It would be a foolish instructor who hid from students the existence of these practices, allowing them to scribble impressionistic thoughts down in their notebooks or suggesting that in professional settings notes can be discarded once a project is complete. Yet when we teach students about source attribution and

plagiarism, we do so from a monolithic perspective, using the language of unbending edicts and conveying the impression that the entire world of discourse behaves in the same way (Anson, 2008).

Describing and analyzing differences in the norms of use and text attribution—differences as stark as, in one context, disciplinary action for not attributing even a few words of an article in a term paper and, in another, freedom to replicate another writer's policy documents without acknowledgment—is worthy study in writing courses at all levels. Such study is sometimes included in advanced courses in professional and technical communication, which have historically taken an interest in complexities of communication that lead to disasters (e.g., Herndl, Fennell, & Miller, 1991), misrepresentations (e.g., Cook, 2000), or ruptures in standards of ethics (e.g., Herrington, 1995); but it needs to be brought more fully into general writing instruction. As Robillard and Fortune (2007) have argued, "composition's disciplinary attachment to the process paradigm together with a deep investment in our collective professional ability to differentiate between the 'authentic' and the 'fraudulent' have rendered the symbolic aspects of plagiarism unavailable for analysis" (199). Focusing courses partly on the cultural politics of writing shifts attention toward the very things we study in our own field, such as understanding writing not simply as a skill, "but, instead, as a complex way of being and relating to the world" (p. 201). As James Porter, et al. (2000) have argued, such changes may seem difficult to bring about in a context as traditional as academia, but further critique, especially at the nexus of the institutional, the disciplinary, and the pedagogical, can expose "zones of ambiguity" (p. 624) that can lead to change in the meaning and value of literacy.

Teachers worried about academic plagiarism may believe that revealing variations in textual practices "sends a message" to students that rules can be bent in school because they don't apply, or apply differently, elsewhere. We would argue, however, that a fuller understanding of how textual practices vary—an understanding not just *that* one must cite sources but *why*, and *for what purposes*—will lead students to take responsibility for their work and produce it according to the norms and conventions of the communities they inhabit. Instead of presenting citation policies as if they were like the laws of physics, teachers need to help students to acquire strategic forms of knowledge that will allow them to quickly "read" a context and begin to understand how discourse works in it (Anson & Forsberg, 1990). Empowering students with this higher-level knowledge will not only serve them more effectively as they move across different activity systems where they will write and circulate texts, but also represents the world of written discourse more accurately, truthfully, and responsibly.

***

References

Academic ethics. (2009) Appendix L. Retrieved 10 February 2009 from https://www.us.army.mil/suite/doc/14185463.

Adler-Kassner, Linda, Anson, Chris M., & Howard, Rebecca Moore. (2008). Framing plagiarism. In Martha Vicinus and Caroline Eisner (Eds.), *Originality, imitation, and plagiarism: Teaching writing in the digital age* (pp. 231-246). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Anson, Chris M. (in press). Fraudulent practices: Academic misrepresentations of plagiarism in the name of good pedagogy. *Plagiary: Cross-Disciplinary Studies in Plagiarism, Fabrication, and Falsification.*

Anson, Chris M. (2008). We never wanted to be cops: Plagiarism, institutional paranoia, and shared responsibility." In Rebecca Moore Howard and Amy Robillard (Eds.), *Sites of plagiarism, sites of pedagogy* (pp. 140-157). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.

Anson, Chris M., & Laurie L. Forsberg. (1990). Moving beyond the academic community: Transitional stages in professional writing. *Written Communication*, *7*, 200-231.

Anthropologists and a true culture war. (2007). Small Wars Council. Retrieved February 25, 2009, from http://council.smallwarsjournal.com/showthread.php?t=4184.

AR 25-50. (2002). Preparing and Managing Correspondence.

AR 25-30. (2006). The Army Publishing Program.

Bazerman, Charles, & David Russell. (2002). *Writing selves/writing societies: Research from activity perspectives*. Fort Collins, Colorado: The WAC Clearinghouse and Mind, Culture, and Activity. Retrieved December 12, 2008, from http://wac.colostate.edu/books/selves_societies/

Citadel. (2009). *Honor manual*. Retrieved December 7, 2009 from http://www.citadel.edu/honor/

Cook, Kelli Cargile. (2000). Writers and their maps: The construction of a GAO report on sexual harassment. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, *9*(1), 53–76

Curnow, Christina K., Freedman, Michael W., Wisher, Robert A., & Belanich, James. (2002). *Training on the web: Identifying and authenticating learners*. Alexandria, VA: United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. Retrieved Aug. 5, 2009 from http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/army/sr2002-07.pdf

DA Pam 25–40. (2006). Army Publishing: Action Officers Guide.

Desperate people with limited skills. *Small Wars Council*. (2007) Retrieved February 25, 2009, from http://council.smallwarsjournal.com/showthread.php?t=4218.

Edwards, Mike. (2007). Plagiarized field manual, part 2. *Vitia* (blog). Retrieved Dec. 6, 2009, from http://www.vitia.org/wordpress/2007/11/07/the-plagiarized-field-manual-part-2/

FM 3-24. (2006) Counterinsurgency.

Goldbort, Robert. (2006). *Writing for science.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Green, Stuart P. (2002). Plagiarism, norms, and the limits of theft law: Some observations on the use of criminal sanctions in enforcing intellectual property rights. *Hastings Law Journal, 54*, 167-242.

Herndl, Carl G., Fennell, Barbara, & Miller, Carolyn R. (1991). Understanding failures in organizational discourse: The accident at Three Mile Island and the shuttle Challenger disaster. In Charles Bazerman and James Paradis (Eds.), *Textual dynamics of the*

professions: Historical and contemporary studies of writing in professional communities (pp. 279-304). Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
Herrington, TyAnna K. (1995). Ethics and graphic design: Rhetorical analysis of the document design in the *Report of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Investigation of Vernon Wayne Howell Also Known as David Koresh*. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, *38*(3), 151-157.
Howard, Rebecca Moore. (1999). *Standing in the shadows of giants: Plagiarists, authors, collaborators*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.
Howard, Rebecca Moore. (2000). Sexuality, textuality: The cultural work of plagiarism. *College English*, 62(4), 473-491.
Latour, Bruno, & Woolgar, Steven. (1979). *Laboratory life: The construction of scientific facts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Miller, Susan. (1991). *Textual carnivals: The politics of composition*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
Morgan, Peter W., & Reynolds, Glenn H. (1997). *The appearance of impropriety: How the ethics wars have undermined American government, business, and society.* New York: Free Press.
Nagl, John. (2007). Desperate people with limited skills. *Small Wars Journal*. Retrieved on February 24, 2009, from http://smallwarsjournal.com/blog/2007/11/desperate-people-with-limited/
Porter, James E., Sullivan, Patricia, Blythe, Stuart, Gabrill, Jeffrey T., & Miles, Libby. (2000). Institutional critique: A rhetorical methodology for change. *College Composition and Communication*, *51*(4), 610-642.
Pratt, Mary Louise. (1981). *Toward a speech-act theory of literary discourse*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
Price, David. (2007). Pilfered scholarship devastates General Petraeus's *Counterinsurgency Manual. Counterpunch*. Retrieved on Feb. 24, 2009, from http://www.counterpunch.org/price10302007.html
Price, David. (2007). Refuting Colonel John Nagl. *Counterpunch*. Retrieved on Feb. 24, 2009 from http://www.counterpunch.com/price11032007.html
Robillard, Amy E., & Fortune, Ron. (2007). Toward a new content for writing courses: Literacy forgery, plagiarism, and the production of belief. *JAC*, *27*(1), 185-210.
Sennott, Charles M. The Petraeus doctrine. *Boston Globe*, Jan. 28, 2007. Retrieved Aug. 5, 2009, from http://www.boston.com/news/education/higher/articles/2007/01/28/the_petraeus_doctrine
Small Wars Council (2007). Discussion thread. Retrieved Feb. 15, 2009 from http://council.smallwarsjournal.com/showthread.php?t=4184
Smith, Anson. (2003) Medical platoon tactical standing operating procedures. *Center for Army Lessons Learned*. Retrieved Feb, 24, 2009, from https://secure-ll.amedd.army.mil/tacsops/25thInfantry/TacticalSOP.pdf
United States Air Force Academy (2009). Honor code. Retrieved Feb. 15, 2009 from http://www.academyadmissions.com/character/honor.php
United States Army. (2009). Uniform code of military justice. Retrieved Feb. 15, 2009 from https://www.us.army.mil/suite/

United States Army Command and General Staff Headquarters. (2005). *Self-Study Report*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: United States Army. Retrieved Feb. 15, 2009 from http://www-cgsc.army.mil/S2006%20Self-Study.pdf

USNA Instruction 1610.3G. (2006). Honor concept of the brigade of midshipmen. Department of the Navy, United States Naval Academy. Retrieved Feb. 15, 2009 from http://www.usna.edu/AdminSupport/Instructions/1000-1999/1610.3G.pdf

University of Iowa. (2006). *Student handbook*. Retrieved Jan. 5, 2009 from http://www.clas.uiowa.edu/students/academic_handbook/ix.shtml

Valley Forge Military Academy and College. (2009). Honor code. Retrieved Feb. 15, 2009 from http://www.vfmac.edu/academicsC_policies.html

Virginia Military Institute. (2009). Honor code. Retrieved Feb. 10, 2009 from http://www.vmi.edu/show.aspx?tid=36579&id=1330&ekmensel=8f9c37c3_38_0_1330_8

This is a pre-publication version of an online article published in Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy. The published version is available at:
http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/14.3/topoi/anson-neely/index.html