***ENG 3505: Concepts of Authorship (CRN 43641)***



Meeting Days/ Times/ Place: Tuesdays and Thursdays, 12:15-2:45, in JSSB 200

Instructor Contact Information: Elizabeth Kleinfeld, Ph.D. - she/her/hers

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ekleinfe@msudenver.edu | Office hours[[1]](#footnote-1): T and R 11:15-12:15 / by appointment / by chance Check my availability here: <https://calendly.com/elizabethkleinfeld>.  |
| Twitter: @lizkleinfeld |
| Cell: 303-915-5895 (texts preferred) |
| Office: KC 454 /303-615-1316  |

Welcome to ENG 3505!

Authorship studies is tough to define, a fact scholar Rebecca Moore Howard acknowledges when she says that it’s taken her decades to come up with a good way to explain it when people ask her what her scholarship is on. In 2016 she offered this definition: “authorship studies is all about who is and is not positioned to claim the status of ‘author’; whose voice is and isn’t heard; and what circumstances enable or prevent that claim.”[[2]](#footnote-2) In this course, we’ll explore different ways western cultures have understood the concept of *author*, paying particular attention to challenges to the notion of the solitary author and what prospective authors need to know to protect their intellectual property.

Topics include copyright and intellectual property law, collaborative authorship, theories of invention, and contemporary challenges to the idea of solitary authorship, including the Internet, the writing workshop, writing centers, and workplace writing practices.

A key assumption of the course is that *author* is a rhetorically-constructed term, which means that it is socially-constructed, which means that our understandings of who is or is not an author are impacted by implicit bias.

This course will help you:

1. Describe different historical and legal conceptions of “the author.”
2. Discuss trends in how plagiarism is understood in different contexts (e.g. academia, the workplace, the Internet).
3. Analyze challenges to traditional notions of solitary authorship (e.g. the Sciences, the workplace, the Writing Center, the writing workshop).
4. Perform rhetorical analysis of the authorship of a particular published piece of writing.
5. Draft, revise, and edit original critical material that demonstrates an understanding of issues related to conceptions of authorship and originality;
6. Demonstrate mastery of critical skills and good workshop citizenship by exercising the rights and responsibilities of both the reviewer and the writer.

This class supports MSU Denver’s mission to “provide a high-quality, accessible, enriching education that prepares students for successful careers, post-graduate education, and lifelong learning in a multicultural, global, and technological society. To fulfill its mission, MSU Denver’s diverse university community engages the community at large in scholarly inquiry, creative activity and the application of knowledge.” In addition to supporting the University’s mission, this class supports the MSU Denver English Department’s stance on diversity: “MSU Denver English Department embraces the University's mission of inclusive excellence and strives to offer courses that value diversity in all its forms: race and ethnicity, gender, gender identities and expressions, sexual orientations, religion, socioeconomic class, national origin and nationality, linguistic diversity, age, disabilities, individual differences, and cultural affiliations.” This means that no matter what your previous schooling experiences, linguistic background, documentation status, (dis)ability, religion, race, sexual identity or orientation, body type, and history are, you belong here, and so do your colleagues. WELCOME. I’m glad you’re here.

To ensure that this classroom is humane, inclusive, and just, I ask us all to practice the following behaviors in class:

* Arrange your chairs in a circle and face the person speaking.
* Make room for others to share their perspectives by inviting them to comment.
* Listen to understand and ask clarifying questions before determining whether or not you agree with someone else.
* Disagree respectfully.
* Acknowledge that we are all works in progress.
* Dare to fail.

Texts:

Aufderheide, P., & Jaszi, P. (2018). *Reclaiming Fair Use: How to Put Balance Back in Copyright*. University of Chicago Press. First reading due 7/25.

Lauer, J. M. (2004). *Invention in Rhetoric and Composition*. Parlor Press LLC. First reading due 6/18. Link to free download on Blackboard.

Laquintano, T. (2016). *Mass Authorship and the Rise of Self-publishing*. University of Iowa Press. First reading due 7/9. Available for free download from Auraria Library website.

Micciche, L. R. (2017). *Acknowledging Writing Partners*. WAC Clearinghouse. First reading due 7/16. Link to free download on Blackboard.

Robillard, A. E., & Fortune, R. (Eds.). (2015). *Authorship Contested: Cultural Challenges to the Authentic, Autonomous Author*. Routledge. First reading due 6/24. On reserve at the Auraria Library (you can only check the book out for 2 hours).

Schur, R. L. (2009). *Parodies of Ownership: Hip-Hop Aesthetics and Intellectual Property Law*. University of Michigan Press. First reading due 7/23. Link to free download on Blackboard.

Woodmansee, M., & Jaszi, P. (1994). *The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature*. Duke University Press. First reading due 6/18.

HIGHLY Recommended: *Getting Things Done* by David Allen, *Time Management from the Inside Out* by Julie Morgenstern, or another book on time/action management. Time management and the discipline to revise laboriously are two of the most overlooked and sorely lacking skills in writers. Do not underestimate the importance of these things. YOU WILL NOT MAKE IT ON SHEER TALENT AND INSPIRATION. Trust me.

Blackboard. Class handouts, answers to frequently asked questions, and online class readings will be on Blackboard. Please commit to checking Blackboard regularly.

Evaluation:

Grade Contract. Instead of grading the traditional way, I use a grading contract[[3]](#footnote-3). This means that instead of getting a percentage of points possible on each assignment, you will simply get credit for doing it or no credit for not doing it. Contract grading allows you to make mistakes and learn from them without being penalized, and making mistakes is a very important part of learning. The premise of the contract is simple: *If you turn in every single assignment on time (or use late tickets) and miss no more than two classes, you will earn at least a B in the class.* Turning in incomplete assignments, skipping assignments, and missing more than two classes will result in grades of less than B, as the chart below shows. In other words, grades of B or lower are wholly dependent upon the quantity of work done.

If you turn in work that is complete and on time (or with late tickets) but is not of passing quality, you will receive a revise and resubmit request (R&R). This means you have one calendar week from the time of the R&R to revise and resubmit the work for credit. If the resubmitted work is of passing quality, you will get full credit for the assignment; if the resubmitted work is not of passing quality, you will receive another R&R and have another week to revise. If you choose not to resubmit the work, you will get no credit for the assignment. You can (and should) consult me and/or a Writing Center consultant during your revision process.

The grade of “A” is the only grade dependent upon the quality of work. An A grade in the course is earned by doing everything required for the B—turning in every single assignment on time and missing no more than three classes—and completing a final research project that is of exceptional in quality, as judged by colleagues in class.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **# of absences** | **# of late assignments (not including use of late tickets)** | **# of skipped assignments (never turned in)** | **# of incomplete assignments (missing a required component)** | **additional criteria** |
| A | ≤ 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | quality of final project |
| B | ≤ 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| C | ≤ 2 | 1+ | 1  | 1 |  |
| D | 3+ | 1+ | 2 | 2 |  |
| F | 3+ | 1+ | 3+ | 3+ |  |

Assignments. Many of the assignments have flexible parameters that allow you to choose how you want to demonstrate to me that you have met the assignment outcomes. In terms of credit for assignments in fulfilling the contract, every assignment carries equal weight. For something to be considered complete, it must meet length and source requirements, follow basic instructions, and include all components.

Each assignment is described in more detail on Blackboard.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * Reading responses
* Participation in class co-gens
* Source Use in Your Writing analysis
* Authorship case study
 | * Project prospectus & annotated bib
* Research Project
* Scores and comments
 |

Class Policies, Three Habits of Highly Successful Students, and Frequently Asked Questions are on Blackboard and considered part of the syllabus.

Schedule:

| week | Activities & Assignments. During a summer term, one class meeting is roughly equivalent to one week during a regular term and the reading load reflects this. \*\*For each class meeting, do ONE reading response, alone or collaboratively, that touches on all of the readings assigned for that day. Reading responses must be shared with me (liz.kleinfeld@gmail.com) by 11:59 p.m. the day before class.\*\* |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Tuesday** | **Thursday** |
| 1 | 6/11: Introductions. What is an Author and Why Does It Matter? Read and discuss in class: * Barthes, “The Death of the Author”
* Foucault, “What Is an Author?”
* Mann, “Who Will Own Your Next Good Idea?”
* Wikipedia, “Intellectual Property”
* Lauer chapter 2, “Definitions”
 | 6/13: What Are the Stakes? Syllabus quiz (covers this document as well as the documents on BlackBoard). Watch *The Wife* in class.  Read & respond to before class: * Lunsford, Andrea Abernethy. “Rhetoric, Feminism, and the Politics of Textual Ownership” (on Blackboard)
 |
| 2 | 6/18: How have authors historically been defined? Read & respond to before class: * Lauer chapter 3, “Historical Review: Issues in Rhetorical Invention”
* From Woodmansee & Jaszi – Woodmansee, “On the Author Effect: Recovering Collectivity”; Jaszi, “On the Author Effect: Contemporary Copyright and Collective Creativity”; Swan, “Touching Words: Helen Keller, Plagiarism, Authorship”
 | 6/20: How have authors historically been defined? Read & respond to before class: * Lauer chapter 4, “Issues over the Nature, Purpose, and Epistemology of Rhetorical Invention in the 20th Century”
* From Woodmansee & Jaszi – skim from Feather, “From Rights in Copies to Copyright” to Streeter, “Broadcast Copyright and the Bureaucratization of Property“
 |
| 3 | 6/25: Is student writing IP? and Is Intertextuality Collaboration? Read & respond to before class: * Lauer chapter 5, “Issues over Invention Pedagogies”
* Lunsford, Fishman, & Liew, “College Writing, Identification, and the Production of Intellectual Property: Voices from the Stanford Study of Writing Intertextuality” (on Blackboard)
* DeVoss, "Intellectual Property in College English--and English Studies" (on Blackboard)
* Maruca, “The Plagiarism Panic” (on Blackboard)

Begin the Analysis of Your Own Sources  | 6/27: Why Does Intertextuality Matter? And How is authorship contested? Read & respond to before class: * Shirley K. Rose, “The Role of Scholarly Citations in Disciplinary Economies”
* From Robillard & Fortune (on reserve): Introduction; Smith, “A Gay Girl in Damascus”; Hollrah, “Student Authorship in the Age of Permissions”

Bring your original piece of writing coded |
| 4 | 7/2: How is authorship contested? Bring SFD of your analysis to class. Read & respond to before class: * From Robillard & Fortune (on reserve): Frost & Sharp-Hoskins, “Authorial Ethos as Location”; Butler, “The Sound of Silence”
 | 7/4: NO CLASSAnalysis due Friday  |
| 5 | 7/9: What are the realities of becoming an author today? Read & respond to before class: Laquintano, introduction; chapter 1, “The Decline of Vanity and the Rise of Self-Publishing”; chapter 2, “Becoming an Author without a Publisher”; chapter 3, The Birth of Independent Authorship” Begin case studies.  | 7/11: What are the realities of becoming an author today? Read & respond to before class: * Laquintano, chapter 4, “Amazon As a New Intermediary”; chapter 5, Microclimates of Intellectual Property”; chapter 6, “Book Reviews and Credibility in a Nonfiction Niche Market”

Guest speaker Alma Katsu from 1-2.  |
| 6 | 7/16: How to authors actually work? Read & respond to before class: * Micciche, Introduction; chapter 1, “Acknowledging Communal Composing”; chapter 2, “Acknowledging Good Feelings”
* Biagioli, “Rights or Rewards? Changing Frameworks of Scientific Authorship”
 | 7/18: How to authors actually work? Read & respond to before class: * Micciche, chapter 3, “Acknowledging Time”; chapter 4, “Acknowledging Animal Companions; Conclusion; Postcript

Case study presentations. Begin research project.  |
| 7 | 7/23: Is IP Law Neutral?Read and respond to before class: * Schur, chapter 1, “From Chattel to Intellectual Property”; chapter 2, “Critical Race Theory, Signifyin’, and Cultural Ownership”; chapter 3, “Defining Hip Hop Aesthetics”

Prospectus and annotated bib due.  | 7/25: Is IP Law Neutral?Read and respond to before class: * Schur, chapter 4, “Claiming Ownership in the Post-Civil War Era”; chapter 5, “’Fair Use’ and the Circulation of Racialized Texts”; chapter 6, “’Transformative Uses’”; chapter 7, “From Invisibility to Erasure?”
 |
| 8 | 7/30: What do authors and others need to know about copyright and fair use?Read and respond to before class: * Aufderheide & Jaszi, chapter 1, “The Culture of Fear and Doubt”; chapter 2, “Long and Strong Copyright”; chapter 3, “The Decline and Rise of Fair Use: The Back-Room Story”; chapter 4, “The Decline and Rise of Fair Use: The Public Campaigns”; chapter 5, “Fair Use Resurgent”; chapter 6, “Fair Use in the Courtroom”
 | 8/1: What do authors and others need to know about copyright and fair use?Read and respond to before class: * Aufderheide & Jaszi, chapter 7, “Documentary Filmmakers”; chapter 8, “Codes of Best Practices Catch On”; chapter 9, “Fair Use Expands Its Reach”; chapter 10, “How to Fair Use”; chapter 11, “The International Environment”

Final projects due on Friday.  |

1. You should come by during my office hours to ask questions about class readings or content; explore writing and/or writing center ideas or theories that interest you; bounce ideas around related to writing and/or writing centers; get advising related to courses, degree plans, graduation, and beyond; to get feedback on assignments and drafts; get moral support when you have hit an obstacle in your education; or you want my input on something for any reason. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. From her foreword to *Authorship Contested: Cultural Challenges to the Authentic, Autonomous Author*, edited by Amy E. Robillard and Ronald Fortune (Routledge, 2016). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Asao Inoue is a writing assessment scholar who has researched the effectiveness of grade contracts versus conventional grading. He observes that,

Most courses that have writing in them ask us to write something, turn it in to the professor, and get back a grade . . . We are writing for grades, not for feedback, not for developing the ideas we find most valuable, not for expressing those ideas in ways that we see as important. If we get comments from our teacher on our writing, typically, we are likely to read those comments so that we can figure out what the teacher wants, what will get a better grade. If we get comments or feedback from our colleagues in class, we may feel conflicted about listening to them or taking their advice. If they suggest something, would the teacher agree? What if we took their advice but the teacher did not agree with that advice? Furthermore, using conventional grading systems to compute course grades often leads us to think more about our grade than about our writing, to worry more about pleasing a teacher or fooling one than about figuring out what we really want to learn, or how we want to communicate something to someone for some purpose. Additionally, conventional grading may cause us to be reluctant to take risks with our writing or ideas. It doesn’t allow writers to fail at writing, which many suggest is a primary way in which people learn from their practices. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)