Eastern Michigan University

DigitalCommons@EMU

2022

Murder, Mayhem, and Plagiarism: Using Nonfiction Podcasts to Teach Academic Integrity

Allison Rand

Murder, Mayhem, and Plagiarism: Using Nonfiction Podcasts to Teach Academic Integrity

Allison Rand

Introduction

Among one of the biggest struggles in library instruction and academia is addressing citation and plagiarism. As Ashworth et al. (1997) point out in their study, "cheating seems to be a low-key issue for the university; the regulations are sometimes vague, with responsibility for understanding them placed on the student. It is assumed that students instinctively know what does and does not constitute acceptable practice" (p. 187). While students recognize the moral implications of cheating, they are often able to convince themselves that they are an exception, or that they aren't cheating at all. In other cases, students may not know what constitutes cheating, especially if they have never been explicitly told, and especially when it comes to citation and plagiarism (Ashworth et al., 1997). These notions held true for students at Park University as well. When concepts of academic integrity and plagiarism were discussed in library instruction sessions, students were often unfamiliar with University policies and had never been taught what plagiarism is or how to avoid it.

This paper and corresponding presentation describe a pilot program of library instruction performed in 2019 at Park University which engaged with nonfiction audio podcasts as learning objects to teach first year students about academic integrity.

Background

Park University's course catalog, the primary source for information on academic integrity, notes:

Academic integrity is the foundation of the academic community… each student has the primary responsibility for being academically honest," and states that "Academic dishonesty includes committing or attempting to commit cheating, plagiarism, falsifying academic records, unauthorized possession or distribution of academic materials, and other acts intentionally designed to provide unfair advantage to the student. (Park University, 2019)

The catalog goes on to define the various aspects of academic dishonesty, and defines plagiarism as:

the use of quotations without quotation marks, the use of quotations without indication of the source, the use of another's idea without acknowledging the source, the submission of a paper, laboratory report, project, or class assignment (any portion of such) prepared by another person, or paraphrasing another's work without acknowledging and documenting the source. (Park University, 2019)

While this is a relatively straightforward definition of plagiarism, few students had read the Academic Regulations and Policies section of the course catalog. When it comes to consequences for academic integrity violations, "the primary responsibility for the initial handling of Academic Dishonesty rests with the instructor" and penalties range from a "verbal or written reprimand" to "University-wide sanctions," and are generally unclear (Park University, 2019).

In early 2019, faculty were regularly engaging in conversations with librarians about recurring issues with plagiarism in their classes, and a number of instructors asked specifically for guidance on how to move forward with students after knowing they

plagiarized. There was a general confusion among both instructors and students with University policies, how violations are handled, and what constitutes plagiarism.

LE 100

During the same time period, the University saw a new opportunity in the redevelopment of its First Year Seminar class, Liberal Education 100 or LE 100. The purpose of LE 100 is as an "introduction to university life and enhancement of skills for success" and is required for all incoming first time freshmen, and highly encouraged for transfer students (Park University, 2019).

The summer of 2019 saw a complete redevelopment of LE 100, including its library components. This redevelopment was conducted primarily by the LE Subcommittee with the help of other campus units, including the library. Prior to Summer 2019, only students at the Parkville campus taking the face-to-face class were required to take LE 100, but the redevelopment expanded the class to online students and students taking classes at satellite campus centers. Library components of LE 100, which had previously taken the form of one-shot library instruction, were moved entirely online. New videos and guides introduced students to the Instruction and Outreach Librarian, helped students navigate to the library website, and guided them to useful tools such as the library's chat reference service. Despite these changes, some LE 100 instructors still expressed an interest to bring students to the library and engage with a librarian in-person, although most sections of LE 100 did not have a research assignment or require substantial research.

In the midst of these changes on campus, stories about plagiarism in podcasting were hitting the headlines. In August of 2019, news broke that popular true crime podcast *Crime Junkie* had removed several episodes due to allegations of plagiarism (Taylor & Hauser, 2019). Journalist Cathy Frye of the *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette* accused the hosts of *Crime Junkie*, Ashley Flowers and Britt Prawat, of using her words verbatim, as well as details and reporting from her four-part investigative series "Caught in the Web" for the *Democrat-Gazette*. Frye's allegations initially began in a comment on Flowers' Facebook page, but were soon picked up by reporters across the country. In addition to the allegations by Frye, at least two other podcasts, *The Trail Went Cold* and *Trace Evidence*, also accused *Crime Junkie* of plagiarizing their work (Taylor & Hauser, 2019).

Shortly after the accusations about *Crime Junkie* were revealed, similar accusations were made against the history/comedy podcast *The Dollop* by author Josh Levin. In a Twitter thread, Levin asserts that Dave Anthony, the host of *The Dollop,* used material Levin had previously published in Slate during a 2017 live show without credit or attribution (Levin, 2019). Levin notes that "Tickets cost $25. According to this guy on Reddit, there were 'over 900 people in the audience'... It was, according to those in the know, one of the best *Dollop* episodes ever" (Levin, 2019). Levin goes on to compare *The Dollop*'s script to his own work, and points out only two instances which are not pulled directly from his reporting. He notes that while *The Dollop* does have a list of sources for the episode, they're difficult to find and do not adequately convey how much information the hosts used verbatim from Levin (Levin, 2019).

While none of these allegations are unique, they were high profile and each instance points to specific verbiage and information that was clearly lifted from their original content. The timing and high profile nature of these plagiarism allegations led to a major opportunity to use podcasts as learning objects in conjunction with the redevelopment of LE 100. These podcasts and their corresponding plagiarism allegations were well positioned to introduce the concepts of citation and plagiarism to first year students in a way that contextualizes plagiarism on a scale larger than the ivory tower of academia.

IN PRACTICE

Since only a limited number of sections of LE 100 were still interested in face-to-face library instruction after the redevelopment, the instruction session needed to be purely supplemental. Thus, in developing library instruction centered around plagiarism for LE 100, the session needed to be substantial enough to teach students something worthwhile, but not so critical that missing it would put a class at a disadvantage. Recently developed learning outcomes for LE 100 included three points that would be addressed with the session:

- Students will be able to locate the library and the librarians in person
- Students will be able to locate and navigate the library's website
- Students will be introduced to citation and plagiarism

These outcomes were foundational concepts that were also addressed in the online content created for LE 100. Face-to-face instruction sessions would focus heavily on introducing students to citation and plagiarism, as well as acquainting them with a librarian. These outcomes were also mapped to the ACRL *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*. For these face-to-face sessions, particular focus was placed on "Authority is Constructed and Contextual" and "Scholarship as Conversation."

The choice to use podcasts as learning objects in these sessions was intentional, and meant to help students contextualize plagiarism and citation into a space beyond academia. Students were given the definitions of academic integrity and plagiarism as found in the Park University course catalog, and introduced in class to the concept of plagiarism using a game which gave examples of various forms of citation. Students were asked to give a thumbs up if the example was considered a violation of academic integrity, or a thumbs down if it wasn't. This game gave the librarian a gauge on how familiar students were with the details of what constituted plagiarism. In most cases, students knew to cite direct quotes, but didn't know what other content should be cited. The notion that students were unfamiliar with what constituted plagiarism is supported by Ashworth et al. (1997), wherein the authors state that "an important feature of the student viewpoint is that, although the existence of an activity termed plagiarism was acknowledged, students are unsure about precisely what should and should not be assigned to this category" (p. 201).

At this point in the class, students were introduced to the concept of "the scholarly conversation," tied to the *Framework*'s Scholarship as Conversation frame. The knowledge practices for Scholarship as Conversation state that novice learners will "cite the contributing work of others in their own information production" and "critically evaluate contributions made by others in participatory information environments." The dispositions for the frame state that novice learners will "recognize that scholarly conversations take place in various venues," "suspend judgment on the value of a particular piece of scholarship until the larger context for the scholarly conversation is better understood," and "understand the responsibility that comes with entering the conversation through participatory channels" (ACRL, 2015). Using these knowledge practices and dispositions as a guide, the librarian uses a few simple questions for students to self-assess their place in the scholarly conversation and whether citation is necessary:

Figure 1: Infographics Used to Prompt Scholarly Conversation Discussion
<Placeholder; Editors will place Figure here in final doc>

This concept of scholarly conversations provides a transition to discussing what this looks like outside of traditional scholarship in the form of podcasting. Since podcasts are often framed as a literal conversation, the metaphor provides a clear route to students when discussing non-traditional citation and plagiarism.

Students are first asked their familiarity with podcasts as a medium. Anecdotally, most students were familiar with podcasts and had listened at least once, or knew someone who listened. Students were then asked to list what they listened to, which included a broad range of answers. While some students listed fiction or interview-style podcasts, the majority of students listed narrative nonfiction podcasts in which a host or hosts relay a story or concept to the listener in a linear traditional narrative. The emphasis on narrative nonfiction podcasts ended up being critical: narrative nonfiction podcasts are more likely to use outside sources to support or create their narrative, have a wide variance in quality, and have a metatextual structure comparable to a college-level research assignment:

- Genre: in a research paper, this is likely the subject or course a student is writing for. In a podcast, it is the genre or category such as true crime, history, popular science, pop culture, etc.
- Topic: like a research paper, each podcast episode or series of episodes provides a look at a particular topic.
- Research: many or most nonfiction narrative podcasts rely on outside sources to craft a narrative, and have an obligation to cite or acknowledge these sources in the same way a student would use scholarly research to support their writing.
- Presentation: while a student's presentation of a paper will likely be in a formal essay style, podcasts may present a narrative in an informal conversational manner.

The close structural relationship between nonfiction narrative podcasts and research papers provides an easy point of class discussion: how does someone cite a source if not in a formal bibliography or works cited? This discussion is used to introduce students to the incidents of plagiarism previously described, including *Crime Junkie* and *The Dollop*. These incidents are used to prompt further discussion, including relating concepts of citation and plagiarism to students' futures. Students are asked what citation might look like their chosen career path, and what their responsibility for citation is beyond the setting of the classroom. Students are also provided with an example of citation within a podcast using a clip from *My Favorite Murder*, in which the hosts list their sources prior to discussion of their episode topic. The biggest point of conversation typically relates to consequences. As Ashworth et al. (1997) note when it comes to citation, "[Students] were very aware of the need to reference the source of the material cited, the positive reasons for adopting this practice--other than to avoid punishment--were not universally apparent" (p. 200). Discussing the consequences of plagiarism outside a university context may help students understand the role of citation in their own school work. In this case, monetary loss on the part of those who had been plagiarized seems to hold water with students, but discussions of loss of advertisers or listeners for the podcasters who did the plagiarizing is also common. This relationship to clear loss or gain from one party or another seeks to clarify the otherwise often murky purpose of formal citation. Similarly, students may better understand their role in the scholarly conversation when it is conveyed as actual conversation.

IMPLICATIONS

Podcasts, but particularly narrative nonfiction podcasts, can be used as learning objects to teach citation and plagiarism to undergraduate students, and may have uses beyond academic integrity instruction as mirror images of traditional scholarship. Librarians can engage students by using podcasts as learning objects in class, but should be aware of some technical and accessibility concerns.

Like with any outside media, librarians should evaluate the podcast content they are bringing into the classroom for credibility. The spectrum of podcasts is broad and the range in quality is equally so. It is also advisable to evaluate for content; in the classes taught at Park University, content warnings about language were given to students before certain examples which used profanity. If possible, print or digital transcripts of audio clips should also be provided for accessibility purposes.

While this pilot program was performed in one-shot library instruction, these concepts may also be adaptable for a credit bearing information literacy course. Anecdotally, student engagement with these activities tends to be higher than traditional plagiarism or citation instruction, but qualitative assessment has not yet been performed. However, instructor feedback on these sessions was mixed, as some instructors were more comfortable with traditional instructional methods.

CONCLUSION

Instances of plagiarism in podcasting can provide ample opportunities for librarians and instructors to discuss concepts of academic integrity and citation practices that can be otherwise confusing to students. Nonfiction podcasts can serve as learning objects used in active learning instruction, both in one-shot and credit bearing information literacy settings, and podcasts are easily tied to both the Scholarship as Conversation and Authority is Constructed and Contextual frames from the ACRL *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education.* As instructors, reaching into current media can help students relate their scholarly activity to a broader context and prepare them for a more nuanced understanding of academic integrity and plagiarism in their studies. While further traditional research instruction will be necessary to supplement their learning, these discussions and exercises provide a foundational context for students.

REFERENCES

ACRL. (2015, February 9). *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education.* Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL). http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework

Ashley Flowers on Facebook. (2019, May 3). Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/flowers.ashley/posts/2225934814166735

Ashworth, P., Bannister, P., & Thorne, P. (1997). Guilty in whose eyes? University students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment. *Studies in Higher Education, 22*(2), 187-203. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079712331381034

Bailey, J. (n.d.). How a Comedy Podcast Sparked a Plagiarism Debate. *Plagiarism Today.* Retrieved May 12, 2020, from https://www.plagiarismtoday.com/2015/07/15/how-a-comedy-podcast-sparked-a-plagiarism-debate/

Bellows, A. (2015, July 9). *A Special Note to the Writers at The Dollop.* Damn Interesting. https://www.damninteresting.com/a-special-note-to-the-writers-at-the-dollop/

Levin, J. (2019, August 25). *Given the reporting about the "attribution issues" with the hit podcast Crime Junkie, I thought the time was right to talk about my experience with the comedy/history podcast @thedollop. A THREAD.* Twitter. https://twitter.com/josh_levin/status/1165614546813427713

Park University. (2019). *Academic Regulations and Policies.* Park University Catalog. Retrieved May 14, 2020, from https://catalog.park.edu/content.php?catoid=5&navoid=492&hl=%22academic+integrity%22&returnto=search

Park University. (2019). *Catalog Search LE 100.* Park University Catalog. https://catalog.park.edu/search_advanced.php?cur_cat_oid=5&search_database=Search&search_db=Search&cpage=1&ecpage=1&ppage=1&spage=1&tpage=1&location=33&filter%5Bkeyword%5D=le+100&filter%5Bexact_match%5D=1

Taylor, D. B., & Hauser, C. (2019, August 22). Popular '*Crime Junkie*' Podcast Removes Episodes After Plagiarism Accusation. *The New York Times.* https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/22/business/media/crime-junkie-podcast-plagiarism.html

Figure 1

01 Scholarly Conversation

Who's talking?

What are they saying?

Are they responding to someone else?

TIP

You are part of the scholarly conversation! Consider your research paper a response to other scholars.

02 Citing the conversation

If the answer to "who is talking" is "I am," and what you're saying is original thought, no need to cite! If you're repeating what someone else said, even in your own words, give them credit. If you're responding to someone else, give that person credit too.