Spring semester, 2016

Using Evidence & Referencing Effectively

Dr Jeannette Stirling, Senior lecturer, Learning Development

Further developed by Dr Carol Priestley, Learning Development

UOW Learning Development
EVIDENCE

Why do we use EVIDENCE?
To SUPPORT OUR ARGUMENTS.

Where do we use EVIDENCE?
In the BODY OF THE ESSAY
(after the introduction, before the conclusion)
In the CORE OF THE BODY PARAGRAPHS

Each Body paragraph has:
→ a topic sentence with one main point
→ other sentences that give evidence
→ a synthesis that links to the main discussion
Structure of the academic essay

**Introduction**
- Introduce topic/discussion focus
- Provide brief background
- Outline key points
- State thesis

**Body**
- Point 1 & evidence
- Point 2 & evidence
- Point 3 & evidence
- etc.,

**Conclusion**
- Draw together the points & restate your claim
And how much is enough?

For 2000 words, something like........

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Word Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>~10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para/main idea 1</td>
<td>120-150 wds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para/main idea 2</td>
<td>120-150 wds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para/main idea 3</td>
<td>120-150 wds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para/main idea 4</td>
<td>120-150 wds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para/main idea 5</td>
<td>120-150 wds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Para/main idea 6</td>
<td>120-150 wds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>~10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The function of paragraphs in academic writing is to extend and justify the argument of the essay...

1. Identify the main idea/point → TOPIC SENTENCE.

2. Provide some EVIDENCE to support your point.

3. SYNTHESIS/RELEVANCE: connect the point to your wider discussion (analysis)
Parts of Paragraphs:

1. **Topic Sentence:**
   What the essay is about/the claim in your argument

2. **The core - evidence:**
   - General reason to justify the claim
   - Specific reasons to justify the claim
     - Evidence / examples / data with in-text referencing (Who & When)
   - Critical comments about significance of evidence, explain, analyse, give insights...

3. **Synthesis / relevance** to your main claim
Migrant women are frequently unaware of their rights in the workplace. They are commonly put in negative situations involving illegal pay rates; excessive working hours; sub-standard workplace conditions; racism and harassment (Singerman 1992). Gender, language and cultural factors can all play a part in keeping them from knowledge about their rights. For example, migrant women make up the majority of outworkers in the fashion industry and are often subjected to sub-standard working and pay conditions (Keane 1996). As Dyson has argued, these workers are ‘deprived of the most basic rights enjoyed by Australian factory workers’ (2003, p. 137). These women can be expected to work twelve and eighteen hour days, seven days a week and be paid as little as a third of the award rate (Fares 1994; Keane 1996; Pender 2005).
Migrant women are frequently unaware of their rights in the workplace. They are commonly put in negative situations involving illegal pay rates; excessive working hours; sub-standard workplace conditions; racism and harassment (Singerman 1992). Gender, language and cultural factors can all play a part in keeping them from knowledge about their rights. For example, migrant women make up the majority of outworkers in the fashion industry and are often subjected to sub-standard working and pay conditions (Keane 1996). As Dyson has argued, these workers are ‘deprived of the most basic rights enjoyed by Australian factory workers’ (2003, p. 137). These women can be expected to work twelve and eighteen hour days, seven days a week and be paid as little as a third of the award rate (Fares 1994; Keane 1996; Pender 2005).
How & why do we use REFERENCING?

- **The ‘mechanics’**: use recommended style conventions.

- **The ‘courtesy’/respect**: ‘Thanks, mate.’ Respectfully acknowledge other people’s intellectual contributions to your own thinking & writing.

- **The ‘art’**: strategically weave research evidence into your discussion for maximum effect.
Consistent use of placement & formatting conventions of a particular referencing style.
The ‘mechanics’ of Harvard Referencing

• Go to the **Library website**

• Scroll down to **Referencing and citing**
  – Click on **UOW Style Guides**

    • Look under **UOW Harvard**
      – Choose from

        » **Books, Journal Articles, Government Publications, Web Resources, Other Sources**...

        » Find details of what to do

          • For **in-text citations**

          • For **Reference Lists**
The ‘mechanics’ of Harvard: referencing web sites
According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), the occurrence of diabetes is three times higher for Indigenous Australians than non-Indigenous Australians (Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Survey 2012-13). However, health disparities between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians are not limited to diabetes, with higher statistical occurrence of other chronic diseases including cardiovascular, renal, retinopathy and mental health, accounting for the majority of the Indigenous health gap (ABS 2009; Browne et al. 2009). These diseases are all largely preventable and have similar risk factors, therefore efforts to ‘close the gap’ in the social determinants of health for Australian Indigenous populations should be addressed holistically and not isolated to a particular disease type (Vos et al. 2009). This analysis examines the correlatives between being an Indigenous Australian and the risk factors associated with developing Type 2 diabetes. The World Health Organisation (WHO 2013) indicates that Type 2 diabetes comprises approximately 90% of all diabetes diagnoses and is strongly linked to lifestyle factors and hence considered preventable in most cases. The following discussion will therefore focus on Type 2 diabetes because this disease is where the greatest discrepancy between Indigenous and non-Indigenous health is notable. It should be noted, however, that according to the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW 2012) not all studies differentiate diabetes types despite the marked difference in aetiology.
References:


The ‘mechanics’ of a Harvard style reference list …


Broome, R 2010, Aboriginal Australians, Allen and Unwin, Sydney,


NB: Note that the list is organised in alphabetical order.
Migrant women are frequently unaware of their rights in the workplace. They are commonly put in negative situations involving illegal pay rates; excessive working hours; sub-standard workplace conditions; racism and harassment. Gender, language and cultural factors can all play a part in keeping them from knowledge about their rights. For example, migrant women make up the majority of outworkers in the fashion industry and are often subjected to sub-standard working and pay conditions. As Dyson has argued, these workers are ‘deprived of the most basic rights enjoyed by Australian factory workers’. These women can be expected to work twelve and eighteen hour days, seven days a week and be paid as little as a third of the award rate.
Migrant women are frequently unaware of their rights in the workplace. They are commonly put in negative situations involving illegal pay rates; excessive working hours; sub-standard workplace conditions; racism and harassment (Singerman 1992). Gender, language and cultural factors can all play a part in keeping them from knowledge about their rights. For example, migrant women make up the majority of outworkers in the fashion industry and are often subjected to sub-standard working and pay conditions (Keane 1996). As Dyson has argued, these workers are ‘deprived of the most basic rights enjoyed by Australian factory workers’ (2003, p. 137). These women can be expected to work twelve and eighteen hour days, seven days a week and be paid as little as a third of the award rate (Fares 1994; Keane 1996; Pender 2005).

Used with permission
The ‘art’ of referencing

To:
--demonstrate your understanding of what you’ve read.

To:
--reference at strategic points to support your argument.
The ‘art’ involves ensuring that your evidence …

✓ Is **relevant** to the topic.

✓ Is **clearly connected** to the line of argument you are developing.

✓ Is **critically evaluated** in relation to your discussion topic / point. Ask yourself:

  - **What** is the source of the opinion?
  - **Who** is writing it? **When**?
  - **Why** is it significant?
The lifesaver’s athletic, tanned and self-disciplined body came to personify the beach. National images in Australia were heavily dominated by the surf lifesaver between the World Wars. The representations were not only of the new ideals of masculine perfection but also the civic duty of protector of others. The changing attitude of the lifesaver can be seen in an example of the advertisements depicting the image of Australian masculinity; heroic sacrifice and racial purity were found to feature in the foreground of the poster celebrating the opening of the Sydney Harbour Bridge, in March 1932. The lifesaver is pictured as fit and powerful; the deliberate position of his body displays a dependable, strong and heroic image that compares to the massive Harbour Bridge in the background. This is thought to have elevated the lifesaver as an Australian icon not dissimilar from the bushman and the Anzac soldier (Booth 2001).

What is wrong with it? Note: you can select more than one answer.

a. Many of the ideas are clearly not the student’s but remain unreferenced

b. The reference for the direct quotation does not include a page number or quotation marks

c. It uses evidence from only one source
This is a sophisticated use of evidence because?

Alperovitz asserts that Byrnes, Truman, and Stimpson believed that the dropping of atomic bombs on Japan would advance America’s political position in the Far East and their ability to partake in negotiations concerning the fate of Europe, and in particular, Eastern Europe.\(^1\) In a direct response to Alperovitz, Bernstein emphasizes the atomic bomb itself as being its own imperative in the decimation of Japan.\(^2\) Bernstein challenges the theory that the atomic bombs were dropped on Japan as an anti-Soviet strategy, seeing this as a relevant but not essential element in explaining the event.\(^3\) President Roosevelt allowed the secret production of the atomic bomb with the intention of using it to end war quickly when the time came.\(^4\) Operating under this premise, Bernstein asserts that Germany was the initial target for the attack but surrendered before the bomb was able to be tested, shifting the attention directly onto Japan; this would explain America’s lack of interest in finding alternatives to the use of the atomic bomb.\(^5\) Miles also comments on this theory, asserting that for America it was not a case of whether to use the bomb, it was a case of when.\(^6\) Although this argument has merit, Bernstein does not place enough emphasis on the strong anti-Soviet sentiment that was rife within the American government at this time. While this facet of the argument should not be considered the primary reason for the bombing of Japan its relevance, in combination with America’s relationship to Russia, is of great significance to this debate.

Select the reasons why it is sophisticated. Note: you may select more than one answer.

a. The evidence is derived from a variety of sources
b. All the evidence is appropriately referenced
c. The multiple author reference indicates a sophisticated level of analysis and synthesis
Alperovitz asserts that Byrnes, Truman, and Stimpson believed that the dropping of atomic bombs on Japan would advance America’s political position in the Far East and their ability to partake in negotiations concerning the fate of Europe, and in particular, Eastern Europe. In a direct response to Alperovitz, Bernstein emphasizes the atomic bomb itself as being its own imperative in the decimation of Japan. Bernstein challenges the theory that the atomic bombs were dropped on Japan as an anti-Soviet strategy, seeing this as a relevant but not essential element in explaining the event. President Roosevelt allowed the secret production of the atomic bomb with the intention of using it to end war quickly when the time came. Operating under this premise, Bernstein asserts that Germany was the initial target for the attack but surrendered before the bomb was able to be tested, shifting the attention directly onto Japan; this would explain America’s lack of interest in finding alternatives to the use of the atomic bomb. Miles also comments on this theory, asserting that for America it was not a case of whether to use the bomb, it was a case of when. Although this argument has merit, Bernstein does not place enough emphasis on the strong anti-Soviet sentiment that was rife within the American government at this time. While this facet of the argument should not be considered the primary reason for the bombing of Japan its relevance, in combination with America’s relationship to Russia, is of great significance to this debate.
Evaluating resources / moving the discussion along…

*** argues that…
*** asserts that…
*** points out that…
*** takes the view that…
*** concludes that…

*** claims that…
*** suggests that…
*** observes that…
*** proposes …
However, *** insists that…
The evidence suggests that…
Weaving the evidence into your argument: quoting directly.

“A democracy needs to be informed and have a right to information” (Barr 1994, p.102).

- Use **exact** wording from another text.

- You **must** include quote marks, reference & page number(s).

- **Indent** quotes of 3 lines or more
Indirect citation …

Barr (1994, p. 102) argues that ‘democracy needs to be informed’ and include information rights.

- Present another’s ideas by *summarising* or *paraphrasing*.

- You *must* give a reference to the source text even when re-writing – it *is still* someone else’s idea you’re presenting.
Paraphrasing means...

✓ rewording another text....

SO...

✓ Do not use quote marks.

HOWEVER...

✓ Give the source reference immediately.
“Infants differ in their emotional expressiveness and their emotional responses to events. Some infants are shy and fearful of new situations. Others are sociable, eager to begin a social interaction with people they meet. Some infants seem always on the move, involved in constant and intense activity. Others seem less active and more calm. These differences illustrate the variations in the infants’ temperament.”

Berndt (1992) argues that different children react in different ways to given situations. For example, in an unfamiliar situation, one might react with fear while another is more open. This, he states, is directly related to the child’s general disposition.
How is the paraphrase different?

Original:

“Infants differ in their emotional expressiveness and their emotional responses to events”.

Paraphrase:

Different children react in different ways to given situations.
Currently, Australian health policies reflect the colonial paternalistic nature of non-Aboriginal practices by sending Indigenous women away from their families and culture to manage their pregnancies and give birth without the consideration of a family-centred care strategies (Cass et al. 2002; Watson et al. 2002).

**Useful when discussing research in a general area.**

*This is important when leading up to the specific studies most relevant to the focus of your report or essay.*
Archell et al. (2007) identify the issues around retention and attraction of medical officers to remote and regional areas of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health services.

This emphasis is useful when introducing research more closely related to a specific point because at this stage you want to discuss or emphasise a particular aspect of your findings.
Alperovitz asserts that Byrnes, Truman, and Stimpson believed that the dropping of atomic bombs on Japan would advance America’s political position in the Far East and their ability to partake in negotiations concerning the fate of Europe, and in particular, Eastern Europe. In a direct response to Alperovitz, Bernstein emphasizes the atomic bomb itself as being its own imperative in the decimation of Japan. Bernstein challenges the theory that the atomic bombs were dropped on Japan as an anti-Soviet strategy, seeing this as a relevant but not essential element in explaining the event. President Roosevelt allowed the secret production of the atomic bomb with the intention of using it to end war quickly when the time came. Operating under this premise, Bernstein asserts that Germany was the initial target for the attack but surrendered before the bomb was able to be tested, shifting the attention directly onto Japan; this would explain America’s lack of interest in finding alternatives to the use of the atomic bomb. Miles also comments on this theory, asserting that for America it was not a case of whether to use the bomb, it was a case of when. This argument has merit, however, Bernstein does not place enough emphasis on the strong anti-Soviet sentiment that was rife within the American government at this time. While this facet of the argument should not be considered the primary reason for the bombing of Japan its relevance, in combination with America’s relationship to Russia, is of great significance to this debate.
Alperovitz asserts that Byrnes, Truman, and Stimpson believed that the dropping of atomic bombs on Japan would advance America’s political position in the Far East and their ability to partake in negotiations concerning the fate of Europe, and in particular, Eastern Europe. In a direct response to Alperovitz, Bernstein emphasizes the atomic bomb itself as being its own imperative in the decimation of Japan. Bernstein challenges the theory that the atomic bombs were dropped on Japan as an anti-Soviet strategy, seeing this as a relevant but not essential element in explaining the event. President Roosevelt allowed the secret production of the atomic bomb with the intention of using it to end war quickly when the time came. Operating under this premise, Bernstein asserts that Germany was the initial target for the attack but surrendered before the bomb was able to be tested, shifting the attention directly onto Japan; this would explain America’s lack of interest in finding alternatives to the use of the atomic bomb. Miles also comments on this theory, asserting that for America it was not a case of whether to use the bomb, it was a case of when. While this argument has merit, Bernstein does not place enough emphasis on the strong anti-Soviet sentiment that was rife within the American government at this time. While this facet of the argument should not be considered the primary reason for the bombing of Japan its relevance, in combination with America’s relationship to Russia, is of great significance to this debate.
Alperovitz asserts that Byrnes, Truman, and Stimpson believed that the dropping of atomic bombs on Japan would advance America’s political position in the Far East and their ability to partake in negotiations concerning the fate of Europe, and in particular, Eastern Europe.¹ In a direct response to Alperovitz, Bernstein emphasizes the atomic bomb itself as being its own imperative in the decimation of Japan.² Bernstein challenges the theory that the atomic bombs were dropped on Japan as an anti-Soviet strategy, seeing this as a relevant but not essential element in explaining the event.³ President Roosevelt allowed the secret production of the atomic bomb with the intention of using it to end war quickly when the time came.⁴ Operating under this premise, Bernstein asserts that Germany was the initial target for the attack but surrendered before the bomb was able to be tested, shifting the attention directly onto Japan; this would explain America’s lack of interest in finding alternatives to the use of the atomic bomb.⁵ Miles also comments on this theory, asserting that for America it was not a case of whether to use the bomb, it was a case of when.⁶ This argument has merit, however, Bernstein does not place enough emphasis on the strong anti-Soviet sentiment that was rife within the American government at this time. While this facet of the argument should not be considered the primary reason for the bombing of Japan its relevance, in combination with America’s relationship to Russia, is of great significance to this debate.

Can you see how the student acknowledges the relevant sources here?
Alperovitz asserts that Byrnes, Truman, and Stimpson believed that the dropping of atomic bombs on Japan would advance America’s political position in the Far East and their ability to partake in negotiations concerning the fate of Europe, and in particular, Eastern Europe. In a direct response to Alperovitz, Bernstein emphasizes the atomic bomb itself as being its own imperative in the decimation of Japan. Bernstein challenges the theory that the atomic bombs were dropped on Japan as an anti-Soviet strategy, seeing this as a relevant but not essential element in explaining the event. President Roosevelt allowed the secret production of the atomic bomb with the intention of using it to end war quickly when the time came. Operating under this premise, Bernstein asserts that Germany was the initial target for the attack but surrendered before the bomb was able to be tested, shifting the attention directly onto Japan; this would explain America’s lack of interest in finding alternatives to the use of the atomic bomb. Miles also comments on this theory, asserting that for America it was not a case of whether to use the bomb, it was a case of when. This argument has merit, however, Bernstein does not place enough emphasis on the strong anti-Soviet sentiment that was rife within the American government at this time. While this facet of the argument should not be considered the primary reason for the bombing of Japan its relevance, in combination with America’s relationship to Russia, is of great significance to this debate.
The long tradition of segmenting the workforce by gender and the resultant wage disparity is scrutinised by Frances (2000) who documents a century of arbitration that has been used by powerful unions, male politicians and employers to enable unequal pay to remain fixed through legislation. Frances (2000, p. 85) clearly demonstrates the legacy of the 1907 Harvester Judgement through historical examples of arbitration decisions and argues that its articulation enabled the establishing of the notion of the male breadwinner in the discourse of valued work. The legislation that stemmed from the Judgement, Frances argues, is commensurate with the centring of men and men’s work in the culture of workplace organisation (2000, p. 85). An important consideration for the centralising of men in the discourse of work is the construction of the female caregiver role that is the regular dichotomous partner to the male breadwinner. Together these form a gendered separation that continues to have a huge impact in the current debate over the conflict between work and family (see in particular Pocock 2003).
It’s cool to acknowledge the contributions of others to your scholarly development.