



CHAPTER 1



“Kids These Days”... May Know More About Copyright Than You

Nancy Sims

Congress passed the Higher Education Opportunity Act in 2008 (HEOA), creating new obligations for colleges and universities that receive federal financial aid to take steps to curb unauthorized file sharing on campuses.¹ The act required colleges to inform students annually about copyright law and relevant campus policies to “effectively combat the unauthorized distribution of copyrighted materials” on campus via “technology-based deterrents” and to “offer alternatives to illegal downloading.” Although many institutions already had programs in place to address this type of network use,² the legislation imposed additional burdens and created some uncertainty for institutions.³ In 2009, one report on campus IT issues noted that institutions were confused about how to “offer alternatives,” given that many of the few commercial music services offering educational institutional licenses had ceased that year.⁴ Implementing regulations issued in 2009 clarified that HEOA did not actually require institutions to provide content alternatives for students but required schools to regularly review options and inform students about them.⁵ The regulations also required schools to write down and regularly review their plan to “effectively combat” file-sharing and expanded on the meaning of “technology-based deterrents.”

At the time of this bill’s passage, the idea that campuses were hotbeds of file-sharing was already outdated. Commercial ISPs far outstripped

educational institutions as the recipients of Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) takedown actions by at least 2005.⁶ The era of file-sharing without legal repercussions was already past its peak: *Grokster* had been decided by the Supreme Court three years earlier.⁷ And although the criminal prosecution of several individuals responsible for torrent site The Pirate Bay would not finally conclude until 2012, the original raid on their offices took place in 2006 and charges had already been filed in early 2008.⁸

Despite this, the HEOA provisions presume that students lack information about copyright and that steps beyond education are needed to curb the behaviors of these copyright scofflaws. Like many moral panics, these presumptions are fairly widespread—as is their focus on youth.⁹ I once had an audience member at a talk repeatedly press me to agree with her that students have no respect for the law. Librarians, educators, and members of the public often commiserate with me over the presumed difficulty of my job policing copyright infringement on campus (despite the fact that my work has no compliance or policing components).

I suggest another framing of this situation: laws reflect moral and ethical values of certain groups—primarily those with the most power to shape and interpret the law. Most students are no more ignorant or disrespectful of copyright law than other individuals and, in many cases, their behaviors and beliefs that diverge from legal norms also reflect divergent values around complex related issues. Many communities of creation and use that are *not* perceived as willful legal violators also possess beliefs or engage in behaviors that do not comport with realities of the law, and their community norms also reflect important ethical and moral values. Due to the moral weight often given to copyright and related issues, and the very practical impacts the law can have for almost any individual, education and training around these topics is useful for many different populations. However, information outreach is more effective when we engage with and validate complex values and norms around copying, sharing, permission, and attribution.

Presumptions Embedded in the Law

It is perhaps easiest to illustrate the various ways in which copyright law embeds moral and ethical values by considering the international arena. International copyright law today is largely a reflection of the values of

dominant populations of Europe and North America, but many other countries and cultures have their own divergent values around copying, permission, and attribution. China is often offered as a comparison to “Western” nations on these points: people there are said to de-emphasize individual authorship and “lone genius” creators and to emphasize copying as itself an act of respect for preexisting works and as a way of acknowledging the tradition in which one is working.¹⁰

Abrahamic religious legal traditions also offer different perspectives on these values. Miriam Altman shows that both Jewish and Islamic legal traditions initially considered knowledge as a public good and/or common property or owned by god.¹¹ However, Jewish traditions were concerned from fairly early on with attribution to individual thinkers¹² and have, over time, modulated to the point where they align fairly well with secular international legal approaches.¹³ By contrast, Islamic traditions of attribution were historically more concerned with attesting the source of information for preservation and authentication, rather than individual credit.¹⁴ And while today many Islamic jurists agree that secular intellectual property laws should generally be obeyed and upheld, there is still dissent among Islamic legal scholars as to whether “Western” intellectual property laws are compatible with Islam.¹⁵

But one need not reach to deeply embedded cultural philosophies to see how different countries may have different values around intellectual property law. Developing nations frequently disagree with more developed countries about the appropriate extent of ownership and control of intellectual property in policy and enforcement arenas. While this is true on the world stage today, it is also very true historically. When the United States was young, our cultural economy included a great deal of content imported without authorization from England and Europe, and we strategically refused to recognize protection under US law for foreign authors.¹⁶ Then in the late 1800s, as US authors and publishers grew in prominence, we began to recognize the advantages of international recognition of ownership and control over creative works.¹⁷ A similar pattern of growing literary export leading to recognition of multidirectional international copyright enforcement can be seen in Sweden around the same time period.¹⁸

Despite the fact that copyright laws, and the values and norms underlying them, quite obviously vary across geographies, cultures, and time periods,

there is still a widespread perception that many of these legal provisions represent universally shared mores. For example, in the US, libraries do not pay any copyright fees to lend books; the right to lend is generally considered to attach to the ownership of the physical copy of the book.¹⁹ By contrast, in many European countries, statutes set out a “public lending right” in which libraries pay a pre-set fee each time they lend certain items; these fees and their distributions are often administered by central collecting societies.²⁰ The experience of checking out books is fairly similar in these places; users generally do not see the fees (though they may come out of taxes, directly or indirectly.) In my experience, European librarians are often shocked to contemplate that we lend books without compensating authors, while people in the United States (librarians and layfolk alike) are often appalled to think that libraries would pay fees to lend books for free.

Copyright rhetoric also often assumes that norms reflected in dominant laws are the “correct” or superior perspective. Martin Fredriksson notes that the rhetoric around international copyright law in particular tends to assume that nations with less recognition for individual creators or owners are less “progressed” and that it is inevitable that a “civilized” nation will come to embrace copyright concepts as they are currently promulgated by dominant groups.²¹ He also shows how the contrasts between “developed” and “developing” countries’ perspectives on copyright are paralleled by those between younger and older people even in “developed” countries and by conflicts between powerful groups and those who resist them on the international stage.²²

Creative Communities Often Have Norms of Sharing and Attribution that Diverge from the Values Embedded in the Law

Several years ago, I had the pleasure of accepting an invitation to talk copyright with a large local organization of quilters. I was pretty sure about some gaps that might exist in their legal knowledge; for example, my experience is that most people are unaware that copyright attaches automatically to new creative works. I had some guesses as to some misunderstandings they might have, due to some limited experience

with textile-based crafts in general. For example, I had encountered a widespread misconception in the crafting world that things like patterns and instructions are always copyrightable. I also had a few guesses as to questions they might have, such as whether one can print out images onto fabric and use them in a quilt, and whether quilting for personal use might be different than quilting for sales or commercial use.

I ended up learning at least as much from this group as they did from me. While there was some vague interest in printing images onto fabric, there was much livelier questioning about acceptable use of fabric pre-printed with licensed characters or logos. The group also drew distinctions on personal and commercial use in places that surprised me: most of them saw little difference between personal use and work for hire, but there was fairly widespread confidence that you could never enter a quilt containing copied images or licensed designs into a competition. (A few people thought competitions might be okay if there were no monetary prizes.) My suggestion that sewing a quilt for pay is perhaps a profit-making activity with tighter legal limitations, but that entering a personal or gift quilt in a contest with a minimal monetary prize (especially one far lower than the value of the time and material invested in the quilt) is probably still personal non-commercial use, was met with some suspicion.

Most notably, we ended up having an extensive discussion around both the inability to copyright factual patterns and instructions and the public domain nature of traditional graphic elements in quilting. I had seen a few legal information resources aimed at the crafting community and a lot of claims from independent craft entrepreneurs that actively misstated the law on these points, so I was fairly sure quilters would appreciate corrections that reinforced how many things belong collectively to all of us. They did not. With more discussion, I began to comprehend that the group's resistance to my legal analysis was intimately connected to issues of attribution and credit. They were perceiving my assertion that these things were not owned as an assertion that they were not valuable, and that one need not provide credit for influences on one's own work. Our disconnect was compounded by my ignorance of the contributions the community considers worthy of recognition: the person who designs a pattern of fabric pieces, the person who “pieces” the quilt (cuts it out and sews it together), and the person who “quilt” it (sews the layers together,

often in a decorative pattern), may all be different, and are all often credited. The quilters were eventually willing to concede to my assertion that what the community values and wants to provide credit for is up to the community to decide, but I think many of them remained skeptical of my enthusiasm for the public domain.

I met with this group twice, at separate daytime and evening sessions. After the revelations unveiled to me in the first session, I thought I was more prepared for the second but found that the group had even more gnarly questions for me, underlaid with other community norms and values that I did not understand. I regret that I have not had much opportunity to continue to interact with quilting groups. I do feel certain there are some persistent misconceptions among crafters that may be imposing some unnecessary limits on their creativity, but also that I do not yet understand the culture (or cultures?) well enough to provide better information in ways that will easily integrate with existing values and practices.

Are Students Actually Ignorant? No More so than Most

The limited empirical research I have been able to find suggests that yes, students' knowledge about copyright is generally lacking. Undergraduates at a Spanish university almost overwhelmingly answered incorrectly to questions assessing knowledge of basic copyright concepts in their national laws in 2015.²³ A researcher in 2011 interviewed an undergraduate student who was unable to contemplate herself as an author or rightsholder without significant prompting, despite the student reporting that she had received a few hours of class instruction in copyright issues.²⁴ Earlier surveys of students in Taiwan also showed confusion about relevant laws, although the straightforward survey design conflated ethics and legality.²⁵ A survey of graduate student populations in the UK in 2011 suggested a bit more robust knowledge in this group—they tended to answer questions correctly more often than not, but only by a slim margin.²⁶ I was unable to locate quantitative research specifically on the copyright knowledge of students in the United States, whether graduate or undergraduate.

Though thin, this evidence aligns with many experiences I have had with both graduate and undergraduate groups. I often poll groups on their copyright knowledge before a training or information session. One of

the polling questions is a self-assessment of copyright knowledge: “How much do you know about copyright?” Students’ self-ratings usually spread fairly evenly from 0–4 on a scale of 0–5. Graduate student groups in technical or engineering fields tend to rate their knowledge slightly higher (often with multiple 3s and 4s), while undergraduate groups and groups in the social sciences or humanities tend to rate themselves a bit lower (more 0s and 1s.) Despite the varied self-perception of copyright knowledge among groups, almost all groups answer the follow-up question “Do you own any copyrights?” similarly—60 to 80 percent incorrectly answer “no.” Very roughly speaking, undergraduate groups tend to get this one correct more often than graduate students but it is by no means certain that this reflects better knowledge; it may be that graduate student groups are more likely to be confused about their own ownership status because they are aware that they have “signed away” copyrights in academic publications at some point (or may be called upon to do so in the future).

However, the confusions that seem to be present in student populations are by no means unique to their age group. I pose the same warm-up questions frequently to campus groups of faculty and administrators and to professionals and academics outside of my own campus and they, too, claim not to own any copyrights at similar, if not higher, rates. I was surprised enough by this that I did some slightly more rigorous research into the knowledge of faculty members. Polled on basic factual questions about copyright, faculty members performed very poorly—only 28 percent of respondents recognized the correct term for copyright in newly-created works, and only 50 percent of them recognized that copyrights came into existence as soon as new work was created.²⁷ On more nuanced questions attempting to assess respondents’ ability to correctly recognize legally relevant considerations for fair use of third-party materials, faculty respondents often managed to identify well less than half of relevant considerations.²⁸ In general, faculty respondents showed weaker knowledge of copyright basics than library workers responding to the same survey.

My 2011 research also showed a strong over-identification by faculty respondents of attribution or credit as a legal consideration for re-use of third-party materials—particularly surprising because the research did not ask about attribution or credit in most situations.²⁹ (United States law rarely considers attribution or credit relevant to the legality of a use.) In a

question about textual quotation, ten out of fifty-one respondents spontaneously raised credit as a consideration in a write-in field. In a question about image use on conference slides or posters, six out of forty-eight respondents did the same.

I am not alone in finding this a notable misconception in academia. Martine Courant Rife describes “the academic institution’s emphasis, bordering on obsessive fixation, with attribution and documentation of ‘authors,’” in her background discussion of a survey of professional writers that found that 49 percent incorrectly identified attribution/credit as “[t]he single most important thing U.S. courts look at when deciding whether or not a particular use is a fair use....”³⁰ Steve Westbrook documents a number of writing textbooks for college and university use that ignore all other considerations of legal use and emphasize only citation and attribution.³¹

It makes sense that academics strongly value credit and attribution, as these are fundamental elements of the economy of academia. It even makes sense that they conflate these extra-legal considerations with legal ones since credit is a big part of the moral rhetoric of copyright generally. But understanding the origins and persistence of these misconceptions among academics—and how they represent valid moral considerations within this particular culture of creators and users—should also help us recognize that other divergences from dominant expectations may also represent valid moral considerations among their own relevant communities of creation and use.

Are Students Willfully Disrespectful?

Other educators and researchers relate experiences with students who are deeply thoughtful about copyright. One of two writing students Nguyen interviewed demonstrated “curiosity and awareness of copyright and intellectual property issues” well beyond what was put forth in course materials.³² Lisa Dush recaps extensive discussion with her writing students of their spontaneous concerns around payment for artists in the face of file-sharing.³³ She also highlights how her students often thought carefully about including third-party materials in multi-modal texts they were producing, and nonetheless chose to use material on the edges of established fair use with full knowledge that this might mean their own work would

be subject to removal from public forums. For her students, the messages they wanted to convey through their new works were more compelling than ensuring the preservation and distribution of those works. Dush suggests, “Limiting students to composing with texts that will allow for the full circulation of the finished product may, in fact, lead them to produce texts that they are not all that interested in circulating.”³⁴

For the last several years, I have met with a select group of undergraduates, often from backgrounds underrepresented in higher education, who participate in a summer seminar to produce short biographical videos.³⁵ I have also returned several times (at the instructor’s invitation) to talk with students in a writing course section specifically for those who are not native speakers of English. Each session has been about an hour (and it is a different group of students each time I return), but the majority of the group are more engaged, and we cover more ground than in almost any other sessions I have led of similar length.

Although in a single short session they obviously cannot take away detailed and robust knowledge of copyright and related issues, these groups usually ask much broader-ranging questions than is typical in my experience. They have questions and observations about music listening and movie watching, Instagram and Snapchat, how brands communicate on social media, music performance and production, clothing design, books they are writing, small businesses their siblings are starting, and always, always how they can help artists get paid and whether media pricing is fair to consumers and artists. It is clear that they regularly think about issues of copying, sharing, permissions, and credit across many aspects of their lives.

Another training warm-up question I pose is, “How many copyrights have you infringed within the last twenty-four hours?” This question breaks the ice to address two important realities: first, that we all make use of third-party materials frequently in twenty-first-century life, and second, that it is well-nigh impossible to be certain that every single one of those uses is 100 percent legal, given the conflicting signals about legal use we all regularly experience. These groups of undergraduates often engage easily with these thorny realities, when getting to such discussion can be quite difficult with older session participants.

YouTube is my favorite embodiment of the prevalence of conflicting signals around legal use, not just because it contains many materials that appear to have been uploaded without the authorization of rightsholders. For users, it appears almost arbitrary whether apparently-unauthorized files are taken down or left alone, and users may conclude that rightsholders who do not take any action against apparently-unauthorized uses are tacitly permitting them. (This perception may, in fact, be right in some cases or it may arise from the misconception, leaking over from trademark law, that failing to police copyrights results in their expiration.) Users are also aware that potentially legitimate materials are sometimes removed, although in my experience, few (except perhaps active YouTube content producers) are fully cognizant of the frequent overreach in YouTube takedown notices and other rights claim practices.

In my experience, younger groups (both graduate and undergraduate students) rapidly grasp the complexity of the signals about legitimate and illegitimate use for YouTube users. They quickly understand the difference between “legal videos” and “videos tolerated by rightsholders”—or raise the distinction on their own. They also easily grasp the difference between “infringing videos” and “videos rightsholders try to take down.” However, more senior groups often find these distinctions difficult to understand. To some extent, that is likely due to the fact that they simply have less experience as users of YouTube. But lack of experience is not a complete explanation; while more senior groups do seem to easily grasp the concept of overreach, they tend to have more trouble grasping the distinction I try to make between “authorized” and “tolerated” content.

It may seem that older academics’ failure to recognize the difference between “authorized” and “tolerated” content on YouTube has few real implications for their work, but a parallel issue frequently arises in my one-on-one consultations with university instructors. An instructor finds a free online copy of a book they want to assign as student reading for a course and asks if they can use that copy. Since my role is not to approve or deny instructors’ course material choices, I can only offer general information about assessing the legitimacy of free online copies of books: something that appears to be authorized by the publisher or one of the authors may possibly be a legitimate copy, but copies with no connection to publisher or author are more questionable. Many instructors are confused by this response. How would they know whether a copy

is associated with the publisher or author? In some cases, this befuddlement is disingenuous: they recognize they have found a questionable copy of the materials but want someone else to tell them it is okay to use it anyway. Other times, it is truly a matter of the instructor lacking a basic skill, such as the ability to note the URL of a PDF link (i.e., they may not recognize that search results usually list the source of a file or that hovering over a link to the file usually displays similar information somewhere in a browser window.) In this case, my usual advice is to ask a minimally tech-competent fourteen-year-old: they may not make the same decisions a college instructor would about whether to *use* questionable copies, but already by that age they will often be able to assess whether a given copy is questionable.

While I think most tech-competent fourteen-year-olds are capable of recognizing copies of questionable provenance, they usually have not truly considered their own ethics around using third-party materials. But even though often only a few years older, many undergraduates have considered these issues in the same ways that quilters worry that prize money renders the use of third-party content illegitimate, or that academics focus on attribution and credit to the exclusion of other relevant legal considerations.

Suggestions

I have expended a lot of words above trying to normalize the idea that assorted groups validly think differently about copying, permissions, sharing, and credit. But given the possible repercussions for creators if they misstep on related legal issues, it also remains quite important to provide real-world copyright education and training. Here are some practical suggestions:

Don't assume younger people are necessarily coming from an information deficit, even when they admit to practices that diverge from expectations about legal compliance.

Don't assume that behavior or practices that diverge from yours (or those of a dominant group), do so because of a moral failure. In many cases, the behavior or practices may be tied to mores or ethics with which you

are unfamiliar or may be a considered choice to depart from dominant expectations.

When working with creator/user communities with which you are unfamiliar or of which you are not a part, avoid assumptions about the current extent of their knowledge or about their information needs. You may not be able to answer all or even the majority of their questions; you may not even be able to understand all of their questions!

Be clear on your goals when engaging with a particular group. Are you trying to get session participants to buy into a set of norms of particular types of use? Or are you trying to ensure participants have enough knowledge to avoid legal pitfalls regardless of their acceptance of the norms and mores embedded in the laws? Both can be useful approaches, but many participants will appreciate when you make these motives more explicit.

Inculcating a specific set of norms is often the intent of copyright education sessions for undergraduates; the more so if the instructor is trying to relate information on both copyright and plagiarism in a single session. Try to avoid presenting about the two issues together, except to pick apart the unnecessary entanglement and conflation of the issues.

You may encounter resistance to information that does not fit with participants' own established expectations; this is particularly common for outreach to members of established communities of creation and use, such as senior faculty members—or quilters. With such established communities:

- Get to know the field or creative community. In a faculty setting, this might involve learning more about the communication structures of particular disciplines. For example, a discussion-starter about journal articles functioning as course readings will be ineffective with a group of instructors in a field that uses only textbooks.
- Demonstrate your competence with their established norms—or ask them to explain those norms to you. In a faculty setting, again, specific practices of a discipline may be relevant. For example, mathematicians and high-energy physicists often primarily share their research publications online, chemists tend to focus more on American Chemical Society publications, and many

humanities fields emphasize monographs. In a field where I am unfamiliar with common research dissemination practices, I may ask faculty members to explain their important research-distribution venues to me. Such an explanation can still help build to the next step.

- Once you have demonstrated that you are at least aware of their established norms and expectations, demonstrate how their established norms break down in alternative scenarios. This can help to drive home pieces of information that fit poorly with—or actively contradict—participants’ established norms and expectations. For example, academics can often be pushed to rethink the universality of their hyper-focus on citation by asking them if they have ever seen a visual collage artwork with footnotes and a bibliography.
- Acknowledge the conflict. My interactions with the quilters’ group helped me to understand why academics sometimes find my assertion of the lack of copyright in facts or ideas upsetting—attribution for ideas is a central part of academic values. I now emphasize that attribution is a separate issue from ownership and, more important, that the inability to copyright a work does not mean it is not valuable; instead, it means we think it is so valuable that everyone should get to use it.

Regardless of your goals, demonstrate respect for participants’ existing knowledge of and values around related topics. Ask them about their own creative work and how others’ creative work is important in their lives. Make connections from their existing experiences and knowledge to the information and/or norms you wish to share. Be explicit that new information and norms may conflict with participants’ existing understandings, and, above all, engage with them on the complexity of the issues.

Endnotes

1. Higher Education Opportunity Act, Pub. L. No. 110–315, 20 U.S.C. ch. 28 § 1001 et seq. (2008).
2. Nate Anderson, “RIAA v. U: The State of P2P File Sharing on Campus,” *Ars Technica*, August 27, 2008, <https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2008/08/raa-v-u-on-campus/>.
3. Steve Worona, “On Making Sausage,” *Educause Review* 43, no. 6 (December 2008): 118–19, <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2008/10/on-making-sausage>.

4. Kenneth C. Green, "The 2009 Campus Computing Survey," The Campus Computing Project, November 5, 2009, <https://www.campuscomputing.net/content/2009/11/5/the-2009-campus-computing-survey>.
5. Final Regulations, 34 C.F.R. 600, 668, 675, et al. (October 29, 2009), available at <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2009-10-29/html/E9-25373.htm>.
6. Kenneth C. Green, "Swiftboating Higher Education on P2P | Inside Higher Ed," *Inside Higher Ed* (November 15, 2007), <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2007/11/15/green>.
7. MGM Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd., 545 US 913 (2005).
8. "The Pirate Bay," Wikipedia, April 22, 2018, https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=The_Pirate_Bay&oldid=837733475. The Pirate Bay allows visitors to search, download, and contribute magnet links and torrent files, which facilitate peer-to-peer file sharing among users of the BitTorrent protocol.
9. William F. Patry, *Moral Panics and the Copyright Wars* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 135.
10. Martin Fredriksson, "Copyright Culture and Pirate Politics," *Cultural Studies* 28, no. 5/6 (September 2014): 1030–31, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2014.886483> (noting, however, that such descriptions of "Chinese understanding of artistic labour" are often invoked in order to make or imply claims about the superiority of European understandings).
11. Miriam B. Altman, "IP Rights Outside of Secular Law: Copyright in Judaism and Islam Intellectual Property Advances," *Maryland Bar Journal* 43 (2010): 56.
12. Altman, "IP Rights," 54.
13. *Ibid.*, 55.
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Ibid.*, 56.
16. Fredriksson, "Copyright Culture and Pirate Politics," 1028.
17. Siva Vaidhyanathan, *Copyrights and Copywrongs: The Rise of Intellectual Property and How It Threatens Creativity* (New York: New York University Press, 2001), 43–55.
18. Fredriksson, "Copyright Culture and Pirate Politics," 1027.
19. 17 U.S.C. § 109 (2012).
20. "The IFLA Position on Public Lending Right (2016)," The International Federation of Library Associations, April 29, 2016, <https://www.ifla.org/publications/the-ifla-position-on-public-lending-right--2016->.
21. Fredriksson, "Copyright Culture and Pirate Politics," 1029–32.
22. *Ibid.*, 1039.
23. Enrique Muriel-Torrado and Juan-Carlos Fernández-Molina, "Creation and Use of Intellectual Works in the Academic Environment: Students' Knowledge About Copyright and Copyleft," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 41, no. 4 (July 2015): 443–46, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2015.05.001>.
24. Nicole Nguyen, "Intellectual Property Teaching Practices in Introductory Writing Courses," in *Copy(Write): Intellectual Property in the Writing Classroom*, ed. Martine Courant Rife, Shaun Slattery, and Danielle Nicole DeVoss (Fort Collins, CO; Anderson, SC: WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press, 2011), 302–3.
25. Chien Chou, Pei-Shan Chan, and Huan-Chueh Wu, "Using a Two-Tier Test to Assess Students' Understanding and Alternative Conceptions of Cyber Copyright Laws," *British Journal of Educational Technology* 38, no. 6 (November 2007): 1076–77, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2006.00695.x>.

26. “Researchers of Tomorrow: The Research Behaviour of Generation Y Doctoral Students,” *Jisc Reports*, June 28, 2012, 47, <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/reports/researchers-of-tomorrow>.
27. Nancy Sims, “Lies, Damned Lies, and Copyright (Mis) Information: Empowering Faculty by Addressing Key Points of Confusion,” *ACRL 2011* (2011): 293.
28. Sims, “Lies, Damned Lies,” 288–92.
29. *Ibid.*, 293–94.
30. Martine Courant Rife, “Copyright Law as Mediatonal Means: Report on a Mixed Methods Study of U.S. Professional Writers,” *Technical Communication* 57, no. 1 (February 2010): 58.
31. Steve Westbrook, “What We Talk about When We Talk about Fair Use: Conversations on Writing Pedagogy, New Media, and Copyright Law,” in *Copy(Write): Intellectual Property in the Writing Classroom*, ed. Martine Courant Rife, Shaun Slattery, and Danielle Nicole DeVoss, Perspectives on Writing (Fort Collins, CO: Anderson, SC: WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press, 2011), 164–65.
32. Nguyen, “Intellectual Property Teaching Practices,” 304.
33. Lisa Dush, “Beyond the Wake-up Call: Learning What Students Know about Copyright,” in *Composition & Copyright: Perspectives on Teaching, Text-Making, and Fair Use*, ed. Steve Westbrook (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2009), 118.
34. Dush, “Beyond the Wake-up Call,” 123.
35. “President’s Emerging Scholars Program,” text, President’s Emerging Scholars Program, accessed April 29, 2018, <https://prezscholars.umn.edu/>.

Bibliography

- Altman, Miriam B. “IP Rights Outside of Secular Law: Copyright in Judaism and Islam Intellectual Property Advances.” *Maryland Bar Journal* 43 (2010): 56.
- Anderson, Nate. “RIAA v. U: The State of P2P File Sharing on Campus.” *Ars Technica*. August 27, 2008. <https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2008/08/raa-v-u-on-campus/>.
- Chou, Chien, Pei-Shan Chan, and Huan-Chueh Wu. “Using a Two-Tier Test to Assess Students’ Understanding and Alternative Conceptions of Cyber Copyright Laws.” *British Journal of Educational Technology* 38, no. 6 (November 2007): 1072–84. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2006.00695.x>.
- Dush, Lisa. “Beyond the Wake-up Call: Learning What Students Know about Copyright.” In *Composition & Copyright: Perspectives on Teaching, Text-Making, and Fair Use*, edited by Steve Westbrook, 114–32. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2009.
- Copyright Act of 1976, The. 17 U.S.C. § 109 (2012).
- Final Regulations. 34 C.F.R. 600, 668, 675, et al. (October 29, 2009). Available at <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2009-10-29/html/E9-25373.htm>.
- Fredriksson, Martin. “Copyright Culture and Pirate Politics.” *Cultural Studies* 28, no. 5/6 (September 2014): 1022–47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2014.886483>.
- Green, Kenneth C. “The 2009 Campus Computing Survey.” The Campus Computing Project. November 5, 2009. <https://www.campuscomputing.net/content/2009/11/5/the-2009-campus-computing-survey>.
- Green, Kenneth C. “Swiftboating Higher Education on P2P | Inside Higher Ed.” *Inside Higher Ed* (November 15, 2007). <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2007/11/15/green>.

- Higher Education Opportunity Act. Pub. L. No. 110–315, 20 U.S.C. ch. 28 § 1001 et seq. (2008).
- International Federation of Library Associations, The. “The IFLA Position on Public Lending Right.” April 29, 2016. Available at <https://www.ifla.org/publications/the-ifla-position-on-public-lending-right--2016->.
- Jisc Reports. “Researchers of Tomorrow: The Research Behaviour of Generation Y Doctoral Students.” June 28, 2012. Available at <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/reports/researchers-of-tomorrow>.
- Muriel-Torrado, Enrique, and Juan-Carlos Fernández-Molina. “Creation and Use of Intellectual Works in the Academic Environment: Students’ Knowledge About Copyright and Copyleft.” *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 41, no. 4 (July 2015): 441–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacalib.2015.05.001>.
- Nguyen, Nicole. “Intellectual Property Teaching Practices in Introductory Writing Courses.” In *Copy(Write): Intellectual Property in the Writing Classroom*, edited by Martine Courant Rife, Shaun Slattery, and Danielle Nicole DeVoss, 295–307. Fort Collins, CO; Anderson, SC: WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press, 2011.
- Patry, William F. *Moral Panics and the Copyright Wars*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- President’s Emerging Scholars Program. “President’s Emerging Scholars Program.” Text. Accessed April 29, 2018. <https://prezscholars.umn.edu/>.
- Rife, Martine Courant. “Copyright Law as Mediatonal Means: Report on a Mixed Methods Study of U.S. Professional Writers.” *Technical Communication* 57, no. 1 (February 2010): 44–67.
- Sims, Nancy. “Lies, Damned Lies, and Copyright (Mis) Information: Empowering Faculty by Addressing Key Points of Confusion.” *ACRL 2011* (2011): 282–97.
- Vaidhyanathan, Siva. *Copyrights and Copywrongs: The Rise of Intellectual Property and How It Threatens Creativity*. New York: New York University Press, 2001.
- Westbrook, Steve. “What We Talk about When We Talk about Fair Use: Conversations on Writing Pedagogy, New Media, and Copyright Law.” In *Copy(Write): Intellectual Property in the Writing Classroom*, edited by Martine Courant Rife, Shaun Slattery, and Danielle Nicole DeVoss, 159–77. Fort Collins, CO; Anderson, SC: WAC Clearinghouse; Parlor Press, 2011.
- Wikipedia. “The Pirate Bay.” April 22, 2018. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=The_Pirate_Bay&oldid=837733475. The Pirate Bay allows visitors to search, download, and contribute magnet links and torrent files, which facilitate peer-to-peer file sharing among users of the BitTorrent protocol.
- Worona, Steve. “On Making Sausage.” *Educause Review* 43, no. 6 (December 2008): 118–19. <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2008/10/on-making-sausage>.