Beyond your Textbook: Research Skills for First Year Students

Find what you need

Evaluate what you find
Your Library

Come in to study, read, connect or relax
Fines and Fees

How to avoid them
- Check your MyLibrary account regularly
- Read library email notifications
- Return items to the Library prior to travelling

Interesting things to know
- Unpaid fines and overdue items can block you from enrolling in classes and graduating
Expectations from Academics

• Academic Writing Style
• Use authoritative sources beyond your textbook
• Critical evaluation of information resources
How to find the Academic Language & Learning (ALL) Unit

Go to the UNSW Canberra website
select ‘STUDENTS’
login with your zPass

Click on the ALL Unit link
Build a Search Strategy in three steps

Identify the key concepts in your topic

Find alternate terms

Combine your terms using Boolean logic
Discuss the relationship between the military and the media

Identify the key concepts in this topic

- Relationship
- Military
- Media
Find Alternate Terms

**Relationship**

- Symbiotic
- Symbiosis
- Symbio*

**Military**

- Army
- Navy
- Air Force
- RAAF
- RAN
- Defence
- Defense

**Media**

- Journalism
- Journalist
- Journalists
- Journalis*
- “Embedded journalism”
- Conflict reporting
- War correspondence
7. Facilitated news as controlled information flows: The origins, rationale and dilemmas of ‘embedded’ journalism.

The article traces the origins, rationale and some of the dilemmas that have emerged in the practice of ‘embedded’ journalism. It argues that the practice emerged as a post-Vietnam response by the US military to the ‘problem’ of independent news coverage of conflicts in which the US was involved. For the post-Vietnam US military, independent news coverage was problematic because it often contradicts the official war narrative and, if left unhindered, undermines public support for the war effort. Since public support is crucial for success in a foreign war, particularly during lengthy engagements, independent news coverage is seen as a threat to the unity of the home front and therefore a threat to the war effort itself. The lesson learned from Vietnam was to restrict independent media access to battle zones, first by denying all access and withdrawing security guarantees to journalists operating in conflict theatres, and then by providing privileged but controlled access to front line units via the practice of facilitated news-gathering known as ‘embedded journalism’. As it turns out, even that practice has a downside, and there is more to the story than the military desire to control the narrative.

Keywords: conflict reporting, embedded journalism, facilitated news, independent news, objectivity, propaganda, war correspondence

PAUL G. BUCHANAN
Security analyst, Auckland
THE RESPONSE to the ‘problem’ of independent news gathering in conflict zones in which the US military was engaged was first elaborated during the Reagan administration. It was honed and perfected in different ways during subsequent decades of fighting by Democratic and Republican governments, but the overall trend was towards increased control of information flows. What they have in common is the break with past journalistic practice. Historically, military correspondents are soldiers, representatives of major news outlets or independent stringers. Although the specifics have varied, the first are uniformed personnel who report in the military press or who act as ‘in house’ correspondents for commercial media, the second are accredited reporters with access to military briefings and movements, and the third are unaffiliated individuals who follow and sometimes accompany troops into battle but are not permanently attached to any particular unit or news agency.

Embedded journalists are something else. They are media figures that have received an explicit invitation to join troops on a cohabitating basis for relatively extended periods of time. They live, patrol and often come under fire with the units that they are assigned to, so that, the argument goes, they may better understand the totality of the soldiering experience in a foreign combat zone (Pfau et. al., 2004, pp. 74-76).

That privileged access comes at a price, and that price is not written in any press guidance issued by the US Department of Defense or other militaries that have adopted the practice. Embedded journalists are often selected based upon the relationship their media employer has with the inviting government or the military as well as their individual propensity to support ‘the troops’ whom they depend on for their care and welfare while in combat zones. The relationship is symbiotic. Embedded media get access to front and back line action while the military gets a sympathetic public depiction of its endeavours. Current media industry practices facilitate the use of controlled news sourcing by focusing on the embedded reporter’s story and those of the troops with which the reporter is embedded rather than the military context in which they operate. The reporter becomes both protagonist and narrator in the ultimate reality show. The terms and conditions to which the embedded reporters agree preclude critical scrutiny of potentially negative impact of the combat experience on innocents and ensure that the journalistic narrative conforms to the military’s preferred interpretation of events. In effect, there are both push and
From 2001 to 2011, Osama bin Laden was the major target of the so-called War on Terror. On 2 May 2011, he was shot dead inside a walled compound in Abbottabad, Pakistan, by US Navy SEALs on a secret mission.

References
Some handy tricks to remember

Use truncation to search variations of a word
journalis*

Phrase searching
“embedded journalism”

ACRONYMS
RAAF
RAN

Different spelling
defence
defense
Welcome to the World of Boolean Operators

AND
OR
NOT
AND

connects different meaning words

OR connects similar meaning words

(Enclose similar meaning words in brackets)
Citation chaining

Finding articles that have been cited in the bibliography of your article

Identifying resources that have cited your starting resource

Source: http://www.library.usyd.edu.au/elearning/print/iResearch_Print_CitationChaining.pdf
CAARP
How to tell if information smells fishy

Currency
Authority
Accuracy
Relevance
Purpose

## CAARP - Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Poor... 0 points</th>
<th>Fair... 1 point</th>
<th>Good..... 3 points</th>
<th>Excellent.... 5 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Currency: The timeliness of the information.</strong></td>
<td>No date indicated, no updates shown, information out of date.</td>
<td>Published date is shown, but not updated in a long time.</td>
<td>Update is shown but is slightly out of date.</td>
<td>Updates are shown, regular and current.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- When was the information published or posted?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has the information been revised or updated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does your topic require current information, or will older sources work as well?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are the links in websites functional?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authority: The source of the information.</strong></td>
<td>No author is identified</td>
<td>Author is identified, but no credentials are given, no contact details given. The publisher is not reputable.</td>
<td>Author is identified, contact details given, credentials are valid. The publisher is identified and reputable.</td>
<td>Author and publisher are clearly identified, respected and reliable. Able to confirm legitimacy of the author and content Where relevant the item has been peer reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Who is the author/publisher/source/sponsor?</td>
<td>No publisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are the author's credentials or organizational affiliations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is the author qualified to write on the topic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is there contact information, such as a publisher or email address?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does the URL reveal anything about the author or source? examples: .com, .edu, .gov, .org, .net</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is the source credible enough to cite in an Academic paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accuracy: The reliability, truthfulness and correctness of the content.</strong></td>
<td>Poorly written source or content Presence of grammatical and spelling errors May include errors, with incomplete or inaccurate information No citations Clearly biased</td>
<td>Consistent line of thought but information is superficial. May have grammatical and spelling errors Some citations</td>
<td>Has some spelling and grammar errors Well written, logical free from bias Bibliography and author source is identifiable</td>
<td>No errors, clear concise, well written, information is current, accurate and relevant. An in-depth understanding of the related issues shows the authors familiarity with the subject. Links to or from is also reliable. Has a bibliography. Information can be verified from other sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Where does the information come from?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is the information supported by evidence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Has the information been reviewed or refereed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Can you verify any of the information in another source or from personal knowledge?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does the language or tone seem unbiased and free of emotion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Are there spelling, grammar or typographical errors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance: The importance of the information for your needs.</strong></td>
<td>The information has no relevancy for what I need to find out.</td>
<td>There is a little bit of information I can use.</td>
<td>I will be able to use some of the information to answer my question.</td>
<td>Most of the information I will be able to use to answer my question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does the information relate to your topic or answer your question?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Who is the intended audience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is the information at an appropriate level (i.e. not too basic or advanced for your needs)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Have you looked at a variety of sources before determining this is one you will use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose: The reason the information exists.</strong></td>
<td>Information is presented with emotive words, unbalanced views or questionable facts.</td>
<td>Contains some questionable content with a few emotive words. The content is the opinion of the author with little support of facts.</td>
<td>Facts are presented free form bias, information is thorough.</td>
<td>Facts are presented free from bias, information is thorough, and multiple viewpoints are given. Purpose is clearly identifiable as educational with intended audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What is the purpose of the information? Is it to inform, teach, sell, entertain or persuade?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do the authors/sponsors make their intentions or purpose clear?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Is the information fact, opinion or propaganda?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does the point of view appear objective, unbiased and impartial?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Academic v Popular

Recognise the difference between Academic and Popular articles – more examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic (Scholarly etc)</th>
<th>Popular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original research</td>
<td>Summarises research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors name and affiliation clearly stated</td>
<td>Written by a journalist or a contributing author, or no author stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>No bibliography or references links to internet sources only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or no advertisements</td>
<td>Advertisements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluate these websites
Thank you

For further assistance:

Contact us via [Ask Us]

Visit us at the library service desk

Phone 02 6268 8116