# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

*Form Approved*
*OMB No. 0704-0188*

| 1. AGENCY USE ONLY *(Leave blank)* | 2. REPORT DATE | 3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED |
|---|---|---|
| | 21.Jun.04 | THESIS |

**4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE**
INTERPRETING THE EMBEDDED MEDIA EXPERIENCE: A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF MILITARY-MEDIA RELATIONS DURING THE WAR IN IRAQ

**5. FUNDING NUMBERS**

**6. AUTHOR(S)**
CAPT WESTOVER DAVID S JR

**7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)**
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

**8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER**

CI04-390

**9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)**
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AFIT/CIA, BLDG 125
2950 P STREET
WPAFB OH 45433

**10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER**

**11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES**

**12a. DISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**
Unlimited distribution
In Accordance With AFI 35-205/AFIT Sup 1

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

**12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE**

20040820 045

**13. ABSTRACT** *(Maximum 200 words)*

**14. SUBJECT TERMS**

**15. NUMBER OF PAGES**
89

**16. PRICE CODE**

| 17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT | 18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE | 19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT | 20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract of Thesis Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Mass Communication

INTERPRETING THE EMBEDDED MEDIA EXPERIENCE: A QUALITATIVE
STUDY OF MILITARY-MEDIA RELATIONS DURING THE WAR IN IRAQ

By

David S. Westover, Jr.

May 2004

Chair: Margot Opdycke Lamme, Ph.D., APR
Major Department: Public Relations

The purpose of this qualitative study was to examine how the U.S. Department of

Defense's embedded media policy affected relations between the U.S. military and the

American media during the War in Iraq. Based on 13 in-depth interviews, four main

themes of trust, understanding, access, and exchange emerged from the data, drawing

several theoretical connections to the relationship theory of public relations. Additionally,

the media representatives in this study collectively identified and labeled some of the

same key elements that public relations scholars have been using to define, measure, and

maintain organization-public relationships over the past several years.

# CHAPTER 1
## INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Department of Defense's "embedded media policy" was one of the most intriguing issues regarding news coverage of the War in Iraq. The following quote may have best characterized the situation:

> Welcome to the second Gulf War, which oddly enough began with a truce between very old enemies . . . the military and the media.

-- Kim Hume, *The Daily Standard,* March 28, 2003

Prior research has shown that military-media relations during the 1991 Persian Gulf War were largely characterized by the negative residual effects of the Vietnam War (Smith, 1992; Taylor, 1992; DeFrank, 1996). Journalists claimed that the U.S. government restricted access to information and censored and monopolized media coverage of the war through media pools, security and review procedures and military press briefings (Zorthian, 1992; Gettler, 1992; Kellner, 1993).

However, several months prior to the 2003 War in Iraq, the U.S. government re-enacted a policy to "embed" media representatives with its military combat units[1]. According to the Department of Defense, "embedded media" was defined as a media representative remaining with a unit on an extended basis – lasting weeks or even months (see Appendix B). This included living, traveling, eating, sleeping, and performing all everyday activities as a member of the military unit.

---

[1] Although media embedding had been used to cover military training and other routine operations, it had not been adopted during a large-scale combat operation of this magnitude.

In return, military commanders provided billeting (lodging), rations (food), and medical attention, as well as access to military transportation and assistance with filing or transmitting media products, if required. As a result of this policy, nearly 700 journalists, reporters, photographers, videographers and other media representatives "embedded" with U.S. military units during the War in Iraq.

The purpose of this qualitative study is to examine how the U.S. Department of Defense's embedded media policy affected relations between the U.S military and the American media. The primary objective of the study is to closely examine and interpret the perspectives of a purposive sample of media representatives who were embedded with the U.S. military, as well as military public affairs officers who worked closely with embedded media during the War in Iraq.

# CHAPTER 2
## OVERVIEW OF MILITARY-MEDIA RELATIONS

In the wake of the War in Iraq, the relationship between the United States military

and the American media continues to be a ripe topic of discussion and debate among

communications scholars, professionals and students, and might have long-term

implications for media relations practices among other industries in the United States as

well as in other countries. And the relationship continues to evolve as the U.S. Armed

Forces are called upon in crisis situations at home and around the globe.

To better understand the existing relationship between the military and the media

today, it is helpful to review the academic research that examined this relationship during

the 1991 Persian Gulf War, the last formal military engagement of the United States

before the War in Iraq and one in which lessons from Vietnam continued to resonate—

twenty years later.

The U.S. Armed Forces and the American media have historically teetered between

trust and mistrust of one other. In World War II, journalists such as Ernie Pyle were

"supportive of their comrades in arms when, indeed, treated like comrades" (Davidson,

2003, p. 3). However, during the Vietnam War, when media coverage turned critical of

the war effort, the White House and the Defense Department restricted reporters' access

to commanders and the front lines "in an attempt to stem the tide of negative reporting"

(p. 3). This change in military-media relations policy spawned suspicion and mistrust that

eventually developed into a highly contentious relationship.

DeFrank (1996) characterized the interplay between the military and the media, especially in times of conflict:

> 'War is an aberration' (Taylor, 1992, p.8) in the normal state of civilized affairs that by its nature is both violent and horrific. This means that there is a fundamental need for the populace of a democracy, those who institutionally are the ultimate decision makers, to be kept informed on a sufficient level to make rational decisions. Providing the information necessary to do this is a function that is performed by an independent and often adversarial media. Herein is the heart of an institutional conundrum, for that very process of keeping the citizenry informed unquestionably has the potential to increase the costs in lives if it compromises military operations. Yet the very cloak of secrecy so crucial to military operations also had the potential to lend itself to poor decision making, and worse, abuse of official power and other institutional misconduct. (p.2)

At the core of the contention between these two institutions is information, an "organic factor," fundamental to the nature of both the military and the media (Dugan, 1992). On one hand, the American media rely upon the First Amendment to keep the people informed of what their government is doing. On the other hand, the military dogmatically claims "in the interest of national security" and the protection of its men, women, resources and strategic advantage, that sensitive and classified information should be carefully guarded.

### The Vietnam Effect

In the aftermath of the Gulf War, Zorthian alluded to Vietnam when he observed in 1992 that "the military has established the current restrictions on the movement and coverage by [media] correspondents to prevent the undisciplined media excesses of the past and wants to project instead a picture of the war which will be controlled and based largely on official sources" (p. 103).

Additionally, DeFrank (1996) found the tension between the media and the military reached a crescendo during and immediately following the Vietnam War, concluding that this had a lasting effect, up to and including the Gulf War. And although Venable (2002) found that the military and the media had made significant strides in reducing the tension between one another, he conceded that the military's "'post-Vietnam blame the media attitude' . . . fostered mistrust, which unfortunately many Army leaders still harbor" (p. 70).

## The Sidle Commission

In August 1984, following an ill-fated Defense Department policy to exclude media from covering the initial phases of Operation Urgent Fury in Grenada (Calloway, 1994), the Secretary of Defense appointed Major General Winant Sidle, U.S. Army (retired) and former military spokesperson during the Vietnam War, to head up a joint panel of military officers and retired journalists to examine the state of military-media relations and to provide workable solutions (Stebenne, 1991, p. 16).

The Sidle Commission offered two key recommendations: 1) the "endorsement of media pooling in combat zones when that was the only feasible means of furnishing reporters with early access to an operation; and 2) that the basic tenet governing media access to military operations should be voluntary media compliance with security guidelines or ground rules established and issued by the military, and that the penalty for violating such restrictions would be exclusion from further coverage of the operation" (p. 16).

The first test of the Sidle panel recommendations came in 1989 during the U.S. military operation in Panama. While the media did gain some access to the war zone with the new pool system, the Defense Department's efforts were largely disorganized and too

slow (Stebenne, 1991). Additionally, because the conflict was very brief, it did not provide a real test of the panel recommendations, although the Department of Defense (DOD) "promised to handle any future military operations properly" (p. 16).

As the Gulf War neared, Sidle testified before the U.S. Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, explaining that the military and the media don't realize the extent of their mutually beneficial relationship. "The military is funded by taxpayer dollars, [who] have a right to know what the military is doing . . . [and] the only way for the military to both inform the taxpayers and to get credit for doing a good job is through the news media" (Sidle, 1992, p. 106). Additionally, Sidle concluded that this even applies to the handling of sensitive information. While the media must be prudent, the military should provide them "all possible information that will not be of real value to the enemy and/or endanger troop safety" (p. 106).

### Gulf War Observations

Still, as DeFrank observed in 1996, Vietnam was a "formative period for a crop of senior officers who conducted the Gulf War . . . their influence and attitudes to a large extent colored the opinions toward the media of their subordinates" (p.11). Thus it is not surprising that in personal accounts of journalists and public affairs officers (PAOs) during the Gulf War, the relationship between the media and the military reflected the clash between the fundamental ideals of each institution (Smith, 1992; Taylor, 1992; Dugan, 1992). In fact, Zorthian (1992) found that a struggle between the military and the media emerged over three principal points of contention: an escort requirement for all journalists, the media pool system, and the pre-transmission review of copy.

Getler (1992), on the other hand, finding during the Gulf War that "the Pentagon and the U.S. Army Central Command conducted what is probably the most thorough and

sophisticated wartime control of American reporters in modern times" (p. 160), identified the most crucial restriction as "censorship by delay." It is not uncommon for reporters to interpret the military's "security review" standards as censorship; however, Getler found that there were many cases of the military deleting "material that had nothing to do with real security – earthy language or embarrassing scenes" (p. 161). Such an approach not only delayed the transmission of stories, rendering many of them obsolete and no longer newsworthy, but it tarnished the military's credibility and further fueled the tension between the media and the military.

Among Getler's findings was a quote from reporter David Hackworth, a retired Army colonel and highly decorated Vietnam veteran, who said, "I was very unhappy with the military's paranoia and their thought police who control the press. We didn't have the freedom of movement to make an independent assessment of what the military is all about. Everything was spoon-fed. We were like animals in a zoo, and the press officers were the zookeepers who threw us a piece of meat occasionally" (p.166).

Unlike Zorthian and Getler, Taylor (1992) developed a different set of conclusions concerning the relationship between the military and the media during the Gulf War. Finding that dependence on the military coalition for information was "nothing particularly new" and similar to the approach adopted by the British and U.S. governments during World War II, Taylor observed that there was relative uniformity of coverage, "despite the existence of well over a thousand journalists, from a wide variety of news-gathering organizations with differing editorial styles and journalistic practices" (p. 268). Additionally, he suggested that the military's "pre-censorship system, of

controlling what came out of the pool before it was distributed more widely, was functioning quite smoothly and effectively" (p. 269).

Taylor (1992) also concluded that the Gulf War presented a new challenge to journalists, in what seemed to be "the public's apparent desire *not* to know beyond the sketchiest of details," because they felt it was a just war and the benefits of winning were well worth the costs (p. 274, italics in original).

Additionally, Taylor argued that although television provided live footage of the Gulf War, the images were filmed at a distance, keeping the public's perception of the war in check. "The absence of cameras in Kuwait or at the Iraqi front line meant that neither the main reason for war, nor the battlefields where it was mainly won and lost, were being seen" (p. 278). This was in dramatic contrast to the close-up images broadcast during Vietnam, which not only ushered the war into America's living rooms, but which, according to Taylor, prompted liberals and others not so like-minded to reject what they saw as "the futility of human beings killing their fellow men and thereby agitate for an end to all war, let alone specific conflicts" (p. 277).

## Military Perspectives of the Press

Thus, nearly 20 years after the end of the Vietnam War, the military still sought to control media coverage not only by keeping the media at arm's length from the events of the war, but by providing images in which the subjects were far from the eye of the viewer. Such distance, literally and figuratively, enabled the military coalition to control the flow of information, whereas the press had little to no editorial control.

Small (1994) provides an example of this more figurative distancing between the military and the media in the comments of a senior Air Force officer who began a Gulf War press briefing by stating, "Let me say up front that I don't like the press. Your

presence here can't possibly do me any good, and it can hurt me and my people . . . that's just so you'll know where we stand with each other" (p.5).

Another example is provided by Pete Williams, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs during the Gulf War, who, in his remarks to the National Press Club defended the DOD media policies during the conflict. "While the Saudi government studied whether to grant visas to journalists, they agreed to accept a pool of U.S. reporters if the U.S. military would get them in. And we did that: we activated the DOD national media pool because at the time there was no other way to get Western reporters into Saudi Arabia" (Williams, 1992, p. 171). The irony is that while the press bristled at the idea of pooling and perceived it as a tool for controlling them and keeping them from the story, the military in fact was only implementing a key recommendation of the 1984 Sidle Commission in an attempt to provide some mutual benefit between the military and the media.

Alluding to the fact that the very geography of the war required a new kind of media relations strategy, Williams (1992) also observed that "this was not an operation in which reporters could ride around in jeeps [sic] going from one part of the front to another or like Vietnam, where reporters could hop a helicopter to specific points of action" (p.174). Once again, then, the traditional tension between the military and the media arose in the form of access versus security and safety.

## Public Discourse: A Casualty of the Gulf War?

In evaluating the implications of these policies after the Gulf War, Small (1994) concluded that while "the big loser was Saddam Hussein . . . the other loser was traditional American journalism, which . . . while not surrendering its First Amendment function, independent reporting, found that function seriously compromised" (p. 3).

Small (1994) argued that informed public opinion was a casualty of these policies as well, when he cited a Princeton Survey Research Associates poll for the Times-Mirror Company that reported that "more than three-fourths (76%) of Americans knew that Gulf [War] news was being censored by the American military and a larger number (79%) thought that was a good idea." Similar to Taylor's observation of the public's desire to *not* know, Small concluded that Americans "seemed perfectly happy with the news it [sic] got, even if it felt that the media was being spoon-fed by the military" (p. 4).

Kellner (1993) also found the demise of journalism to be a casualty of these policies. Even prior to the war, "mainstream media served as a mouthpiece and amplifier" for the U.S. government, and then during the war, the military punished critical reporters, refusing them "access to top military brass . . . while compliant reporters were rewarded with pool assignments and interviews" (p. 37, 43).

On the other hand, Mortimer Zuckerman, the owner of *U.S. News and World Report*, was one of the few in the media who were satisfied with the military press relations during the Gulf War. According to Small (1994), Zuckerman told advertising firm Ogilvy & Mather that he was "astonished by the availability and the access that we have had both to the Pentagon and to the information we feel we needed to cover and report the war. The press, in my judgment, seems petulant, self-concerned, self-centered and really downright silly, particularly when you compare the rather mature intelligence of some of the military briefers compared to the stupidity of some of the questioners." He concluded that, "we're not just journalists; we're also Americans" (p.7).

Like Zuckerman, *Time Magazine's* Jay Peterzell said (in MacArthur, 1993) that while "the pool concept has received a lot of criticism, and [while] much of it is justified,

it misses an important point . . . the pools did give U.S. journalists a way of getting into Saudi Arabia and seeing at least part of what was going on at a time when there was no other way of doing either of those things" (p. 153).

### The Role of Technology

An equally important variable in the military and the media's dynamic relationship is the technological innovation that drives the flow of this information – between governments and their citizens, their allies, as well as their enemies. The War in Iraq demonstrated how real-time information can be delivered in high-quality, live video feeds that can be transmitted instantaneously, anywhere in the world.

Richard Tauber, the director of CNN Satellites and Circuits and an interviewee in a study by Pavlik and Thalhimer (1991), said, "The widespread availability of CNN in 105 countries spawned tele-diplomacy" during the Gulf War, which both President Bush and Saddam Hussein used in communicating with their citizens and with each other (p. 35).

Furthermore, Calloway (1994) claimed that "a real-time war was made possible, mainly because President George Bush announced U.S. intentions in time to set up and configure those technologies. Following the president's lead, it became possible to ship automated data processing equipment to the Desert Storm Theater within days. As a result, supplies arrived, networks were reconfigured" (p. 56).

But new technologies also exposed the news gathering and news disseminating processes (Pavlik & Thalhimer, 1991). In fact, it led to an unanticipated result of live coverage of the Gulf War: the demystification of the wartime press briefing. While Americans were familiar with presidential briefings, televised since the Kennedy Administration, satellite technology provided the first front row seats into the news gathering process during war time (Small, 1994). He pointed out, for example, that "to a

non-journalist the reporters can seem rude and at times ignorant . . . watching an unedited news conference, an average American is sometimes surprised, if not shocked by the manners of the press" (p.11).

MacArthur (1993) studied this phenomenon through an *NBC "Saturday Night Live"* parody of a Gulf War press briefing, in which reporters repeatedly asked idiotic questions to a military briefer who wouldn't answer to preserve battlefield security. MacArthur concluded that for the most part, the public sided with the military briefer against the press – "At least some of the program's viewers hoped the target would be the Pentagon censors and their disappointment signified a public relations triumph for the White House" (p. 151).

In a roundtable discussion about the Gulf War coverage titled "The first casualty revisited," captured in LeMay et al. (1991), former NBC News and PBS president Larry Grossman claimed that "this was television's first live war, even though most of it occurred out of sight of cameras. We heard a lot about censorship and restrictions, but to me the most interesting aspect of this war was the fact that the screen was filled up by material-briefings, press conferences, videotapes-that were supplied by the government" (p. 65).

Grossman further contended, "The issue was not so much keeping things away, but how much from one perspective dominated the screen . . . this was the ultimate in the cheerleading war" (p. 65).

### After the Gulf War

Thus, as in the post-Vietnam years, the end of the Gulf War found the military defensive about its media relations strategies, and the media, for the most part, discontented. What was different, however, was the reaction of the American public to

the coverage. Whereas public opinion became inflamed against Vietnam, it ranged from complacent to pro-war during the Gulf War. In fact, Small (1994) concluded that "the success of the Pentagon, and the fact that the public at large has lost interest, mitigate against any change in policy. Indeed, an administration, having learned how it could contain the press, is not likely to overlook that lesson either in future international conflicts or domestic political ones. The battle for a free press never ends. The battleground, thanks to the events of early 1991, make [sic] it more difficult than ever for the press to prevail" (p. 17).

Thus, it appears that the U.S. military was successful, not only in containing Saddam Hussein, but also in employing a media relations policy that fulfilled its own objectives, while exhibiting little regard for the needs and desires of the press.

As a result of strong criticisms from news organization leaders about how the military handled the media during the Gulf War, the Department of Defense again made an effort to improve the current situation, as it had done with the Sidle Commission in 1984. The Pentagon convened with news organizations to produce the DOD Principles for News Media Coverage of DOD Operations (Venable, 2002). "While this document highlighted concepts and procedures that had been in other DOD documents for years, it emphasized to military commanders the importance of their personal involvement in planning for news coverage of combat operations" (p. 69).

The DOD Principles established or reinforced three basic concepts: 1) open and independent reporting was the standard for combat coverage for the future; 2) media pools were to be an exception rather than the rule; and 3) voluntary compliance with security guidelines was a condition of access to U.S. military forces.

These guidelines were immediately put to the test in September 1994 when Operation Uphold Democracy commenced in Haiti, and proved that there could be a workable solution between the military and the media covering U.S. combat operations. In fact, this operation re-introduced the "concept of embedding or merging the media into operational units before the invasion began" (Venable, 2002, p. 70).

## Embedded Media and Modern Warfare

After the Gulf War, the DOD continued its "embedded media" policy, which provided the press an inside perspective on U.S. military operations. Not only did this reemerging policy from decades past provide renewed and broader access for the media, it also enhanced the military's ability to tell its story to the American public.

Still in a 1998 qualitative study, Baroody concluded that there exists an adversarial albeit healthy relationship between these two institutions. "There is a historic tension between the media and the military in the United States, a natural outgrowth of what has evolved into a checks-and-balances system within the democratic state compelling the two actors to interact as antagonists" (p.3).

She also characterized such adversarial relationships as "part of the mechanism for maintaining liberty and are thus healthy and necessary, because these tensions prevent any one group from winning too much power and help maintain a broad distribution of authority" (p. 3).

News coverage of the War in Iraq demonstrated the continued evolution of military-media relations, as the American public was flooded with live images from embedded reporters from multiple cable TV news channels, instantaneous reports from front-line journalists and real-time commentary as the war progressed. At first glance, it appears that the military adhered to the fundamentals set forth by the 1994 DOD

principles for media coverage of military operations, which resulted from the harsh

criticisms following the Gulf War. And although the basic principle of embedding media

was first employed during Operation Uphold Democracy nearly a decade before, it was

truly put to the test by the sheer magnitude of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Coupled with the vast and perpetual innovations of information technology that have

become second nature to the citizens of most of the world's advanced nations, media

coverage of the War in Iraq provided unprecedented high-resolution, real-time video

images transmitted via satellite from the battlefields of Iraq to the living rooms in

America and around the world. This phenomenon ushered in a new era of war coverage

and further perpetuated the ever-evolving relationship between the military and the

media.

## A Critical Perspective

In a 2003 study, Louw claims that the Pentagon had been successful at crafting a

new "genre of media-ized and PR-ized warfare." He criticizes the U.S. government by

stating that "each war since Vietnam has seen the [U.S.] military become increasingly

sophisticated as agents of hegemonic coercion; agents skilled not only at killing people,

but as using the media (especially television) as a powerful tool of warfare" (p. 216).

More specifically, Louw argues that "if military PR personnel can supply

appropriate images and information, they will tend to be used, particularly if alternative

sources are denied to them [the media] . . . this has become the basis for the PR-ization of

war – the managing of information flows has become central to the conduct of U.S.-led

wars" (p. 221). In the aftermath of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, Louw

asserts that "the Pentagon must have been well pleased that conducting warfare in 2001

was once again deemed a respectable activity by the U.S. public, with the anti-war sentiments of the Vietnam-era an unpleasant, distant memory" (p. 226).

## Need for Research

Although there has been little scholarly research published on military-media relations during the War in Iraq, an Associated Press story published just a few weeks into the war pointed to the Defense Department's embedded media strategy as a public relations success. It included these quotes from the media and from the Pentagon:[2]

> The Pentagon's scheme of embedding journalists with military units brought the media closer to warfare and to U.S. soldiers than any other since World War II, when reporters were given the honorary rank of captain . . . the access was a big step forward--Andrew Gray, *Reuters*.

> It has been an extraordinary experience for all of us. This really has been, not just a quantitative change, but a qualitative change in war journalism--Andrew Heyward, President of *CBS News*.

> The side benefit is there's now a new generation of journalists who have had a chance to see first-hand [sic] what kind of people volunteer to put their lives at risk . . . and that's a good thing--Donald Rumsfeld, Defense Secretary.

> We had total freedom to cover virtually everything we wanted to cover--Chip Reid, *NBC News* embedded journalist.

> It meant one thing for the Pentagon to deny an Iraqi spokesman's claim that coalition forces weren't in Baghdad; [and] quite another when *Fox News Channel* aired that spokesperson on a split screen with reporter Greg Kelly riding a tank on a city street--Bryan Whitman, Pentagon Media Operations

> It was like expecting to be taken to *McDonald's* and going to the greatest smorgasbord in the world. You could have anything you could ask for--Walter Rodgers, *CNN*.

---

[2] All of these quotes appeared in D. Bauder (2003, April 20). With embeds returning home, the Pentagon's experiment drawing mostly favorable reviews. The Associated Press [Lexis-Nexis]

The question is whether these few accounts accurately represent the broad range of experiences and sentiments of the individual journalists and military officers that were on the front lines of the embedding process.

Thus, keeping in mind the importance that media relations plays in military public affairs and in many public relations efforts, the three research questions that guide this study are:

RQ1: How did embedding affect the journalists' ability to cover the war?

RQ2: How did embedding affect the military units in combat operations?

RQ3: What were the benefits and the drawbacks of embedded media coverage of the war?

# CHAPTER 3
## METHODOLOGY

To thoroughly examine the perspectives of some of the journalists and military

officials who adhered to and executed the embedded media policy, respectively,

qualitative methods were used for this study. Specifically, in-depth interviews afforded

the opportunity for research participants to provide a "thick description" (Geertz, 1973)

of their personal experiences and impressions during the War in Iraq.

According to Lincoln and Guba (1994), the qualitative researcher is a "passionate

participant actively engaged in facilitating the 'multi-voice' reconstruction of his or her

own construction as well as those of all other participants" (p.115). With this study, my

goal was to listen with an open mind and reconstruct the stories of the participants as they

recounted their personal experiences and interpretations of what it was like being an

embedded journalist or a public affairs officer who worked closely with them.

Daymon & Holloway (2002) delineate the effectiveness of qualitative research as

an approach that focuses on words rather than statistics, allowing the researcher to

become closely involved with the people being studied.

Additionally, this approach allows for inductive rather than deductive reasoning, in which

the categories, themes, and patterns emerge from the data, rather than deriving

conclusions from assumptions made prior to collecting the data.

One of the key criticisms of qualitative studies is that the data cannot be

generalized to a larger population. Other criticisms address issues of replicability and

subjectivity (Daymon & Holloway, 2002, p.7). On the other hand, the benefit of a

qualitative approach is that it provides an effective way to explore the "human side" of what it was like to be embedded during the war. Rather than providing survey responses, the participants' in-depth personal accounts, feelings and impressions better characterize their "lived experiences" encountered during an anomaly such as war (Creswell, 1998). Janesick (2000) argues that the qualitative researcher should early on identify his or her biases and articulate the ideology or conceptual frame for the study. Furthermore, other qualitative research scholars suggest that the researcher bracket his or her own preconceived ideas about the topic under examination, to understand it through the voices of the informants (Creswell, 1998).

Additionally, Janesick (2000) claims that "access and entry are sensitive components in qualitative research, and the researcher must establish trust, rapport and authentic communication patterns with participants. By establishing trust and rapport at the beginning of the study, the researcher is better able to capture the nuance and meaning of each participant's life from the participant's point of view. This also ensures that participants will be more willing to share everything, warts and all, with the researcher" (pp. 39-40).

As an active duty military public affairs officer, it is a challenging and delicate balance to keep personal interpretations free from bias. Therefore, in an effort to maintain some objectivity and reduce unnatural feelings or stigmas, I made a conscious decision to avoid the overuse of military jargon and my military rank. In addition, I also chose not to wear a military uniform while conducting the face-to-face interviews. Notwithstanding the subjective nature of my perspective as a researcher, my professional experience as a

military PAO should provide deeper insight and offer a fuller understanding of military-media relations.

In addition, I feel that having worked as a military PAO for approximately eight years (including three years as a media relations officer at the Air Force Press Desk at the Pentagon) provided an added level of credibility with each of the research participants. On the other hand, another interesting dynamic was that being an Air Force PAO provided a degree of insulation between my role as a researcher and the participants because they primarily were either embedded with the Marines, Navy or Army, or served as PAOs in the Army or Marines. I feel this dynamic added to the participants' ability and inclination to fully and candidly describe their experiences to a relative "outsider."

### Participant Selection

With the exception of two face-to-face interviews, the primary method of collecting data was through in-depth telephone interviews. Fourteen research participants were identified using snowball sampling, beginning with professional contacts I maintain in the Department of Defense Office of Public Affairs. There were no direct refusals to participate, however, of the 14 participants identified, one was unable to participate due to scheduling conflicts, leaving a total of 13 participants for this study.

The primary criteria for participation were that each research participant had been embedded or had worked directly with embedded media for at least four weeks in the Persian Gulf region during the War in Iraq. Additionally, at the end of each interview, I asked each participant to identify other individuals (specifically stating either media representatives or military officers) with diverse backgrounds or situations that they thought would enhance the variety of the participants of this study.

This purposive sample of participants included a diverse group, 11 of whom represented broadcast, radio, and print media from several regions of the United States, while the other two represented military public affairs (see Table 3.1). The media representatives included national, mid-size and small-market print journalists; an international TV correspondent; a freelance TV producer who was hired by a major national network; two photographers, one from a major national newspaper and one from a relatively small newspaper, each of whom were embedded with military combat units. Both military public affairs officers were responsible for executing the embedded media policy, however, one of them worked in the Coalition Press Information Center in Kuwait City, while the other worked directly with combat units in the field in Kuwait and Iraq. Additionally, two of the media representatives and one of the military public affairs officers were female. Later in this section, I will briefly identify each of the participants, their job title, organization and unique background or situation during the war (Table 3.1).

## Pilot Study

In October 2003, I conducted a pilot study that consisted of in-depth telephone interviews with one embedded journalist and one military public affairs officer. This allowed me to get familiar with the physical mechanics of interviewing and, more importantly, test and revise the interview topic guide. Additionally, I was able to test the room acoustics, sound recording equipment, as well as the method of transcribing and analyzing the data. The results of the pilot study are not included as part of this study.

## In-Depth Interview Procedures

Between November 26, 2003 and January 23, 2004, I conducted in-depth interviews with each of the 13 research participants. The first two interviews were

---

3. Traditionally, there has been tension between the military and the media regarding access to information vs. security and safety. Describe how your experiences might have supported or refuted this during the War in Iraq.

4. Describe how embedding affected the mutual dependency between the military and the media.

5. How did embedding enhance your work?

6. How did embedding hinder your work?

7. What skills or characteristics did you find you relied on most? How did these differ from your previous experiences with military-media relations?

8. Who else would you recommend I talk to regarding this topic?

Throughout each interview, I offered related follow-up questions that provided the participants an opportunity to further clarify and describe their experiences as they pertained to the topic of study.

## Research Participants

Table 3.1 identifies each of the 13 research participants using a pseudonym, their job title or description, the size and type of organization the participant represented, and a unique identifier that provides a snapshot of the research participants' background and situation. Please refer to this table throughout the results and discussion/conclusion sections of this study.

All pseudonyms are fictitious with the intent of preserving the confidentiality of the research participants. Any individuals possessing these names have nothing to do with this study. The use of their names is strictly unintentional and merely coincidental.

Table 3-1. Brief description of each of the research participants

| Research Participant | Job Title or Description | Size & Type of Organization | Unique Situation/Perspective |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Dave Evanston | Military reporter | Mid-size newspaper and news wire service | Embedded with Army Infantry Division during the war, returned as unilateral after combat operations ceased, 20 yrs experience as reporter, first combat experience |
| Mr. Kevin Harrison | Staff photographer | Small newspaper | Invited by Army to embed with local unit, regularly covers the military; first combat experience; dis-embedded when father died |
| Ms. Patricia Henley | Special Projects coordinator/TV correspondent | International Broadcasting service | Embedded with the Navy aboard aircraft carrier and hospital ship; experienced reporter, regularly covers world events |
| Mr. Bruce Kelly | Entertainment/celebrity news reporter | Major national newspaper | Embedded with the U.S. Navy aboard aircraft carrier; former Army National Guard journalist; covered U.S. military in Afghanistan |
| Mr. George Lamont | Washington correspondent | Small newspaper | Embedded with an Army supply unit; dis-embedded after a week in Iraq due to prior commitments |
| Mr. William McCoy | Staff Photographer | Major national newspaper; major news service | Embedded photojournalist; experienced photographer, regularly covers world events; embedded with Army Infantry |
| Capt. Edith Miller | Public affairs officer | U.S. Marines, Persian Gulf Region | Unit PAO who directly worked in the field with 40+ embedded journalists; responded to media queries, requests; first combat experience |
| Ms. Rachel North | Higher education reporter | Mid-size newspaper | Embedded with Marine Support Battalion; no previous experience covering military |
| Mr. Tommy Rafferty | Special Projects reporter | Small, newspaper | Claimed it literally took an act of Congress to eventually embed with local Army Reserve Unit; first combat experience |
| Lt. Col. Neil Thompson | Public affairs officer, | U.S. Army, Persian Gulf Region | Public affairs officer at the Coalition Press Information Center; responsible for executing the DOD embedded media plan/policy; facilitated, trained, credentialed 100's of journalists as they entered region |

Table 3-1. Continued

| Research Participant | Job Title or Description | Size & Type of Organization | Unique Situation/Perspective |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mr. Jeff Wilson | TV Correspondent | Major network TV affiliate | Worked as freelance TV producer/correspondent for major network; former Marine officer during Vietnam War; covered the Gulf War |
| Mr. Chuck Winslow | Columnist | Mid-size newspaper | Embedded with a Marine Infantry unit; Vietnam veteran, first combat experience |
| Mr. Rich Worthington | Washington correspondent | Small newspaper | Embedded with various Marine Reserve units for 4-5 weeks; was eventually kicked out of Iraq for allegedly reporting military capabilities and positions |

## Data Analysis

Each of the interviews was transcribed verbatim. Rather than hiring out for this tedious process, I consciously chose this option to fully immerse myself in the data.

Using an inductive approach, the transcripts were first analyzed using open coding to examine, compare and categorize the data. I then identified recurring themes and constructed categories that included supporting evidence for each of these main themes. Direct quotations from the research participants were sorted under each category to later provide supporting examples of each of these main themes.

## Authenticity and Trustworthiness

Daymon and Holloway (2002) argue there are two perspectives related to assessing the quality of qualitative research. "Reliability and validity are the concern of the conventional [quantitative] position" . . . however, the "second and perhaps more fashionable position" (p. 92) relies on an "interpretive paradigm," a concept they attribute to Lincoln & Guba (1985), and Guba & Lincoln (1989, 1998). With this perspective the "goodness of research is characterized by trustworthiness and authenticity" and is "shown

by [the] researchers' careful documentation of the process of research and the decisions made along the way" (p. 93).

Daymon and Holloway (2002) argue that "a study is authentic when the strategies used are appropriate for the 'true' reporting of participants' ideas" (p. 93). Moreover, they identify credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability as key criteria for evaluating the trustworthiness of qualitative research, claiming that, "If the findings of your study are to be dependable, they must be consistent and accurate ... this means that readers will be able to evaluate the adequacy of your analysis through following your decision-making process" (p. 94).

In keeping with some of these strategies Daymon and Holloway (2002) offer for ensuring the quality of qualitative research, I have provided a detailed description of each of the steps of the research process, including an audit trail of the decisions made before and during the collection of the data. Furthermore, I attempt to provide a thick description of the context and the people in the study because Daymon and Holloway (2002) suggest that "the reader of your study should be able to feel, hear and see exactly what it is like to be in the setting your are describing" (p. 100).

Lastly, the pilot study adds credibility and dependability to the study as it served as an effective means of honing my interview skills, familiarizing myself with the recording and transcribing equipment, and analyzing the data, which closely mirrored the findings from the present study.

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to report the findings from the analysis of the

transcribed interviews. The interpretation and implications of these findings will be

discussed in Chapter 5.

There were six themes that emerged upon analysis of the transcribed data. These

themes included: 1) unprecedented access; 2) reporter also became the link back home; 3)

understanding what their life was like; 4) trust eased some of the tension; 5) it was a

trade-off, a "give and take," and 6) "it was all about relationships." The first three themes

described the overall essence of being embedded, while the last three specifically

characterized the interaction between the media and the military, the two institutions

under examination.

**Theme 1: Unprecedented Access**

Access was the first emerging theme that described the embedded experience. In

fact, three participants drew a direct comparison to the journalists' lack of access that

resulted in the inability to adequately cover the Persian Gulf War in 1991.

Network TV correspondent Jeff Wilson, who covered both wars, made the

following observation:

> Having covered the Gulf War, the media was totally boxed out of the coverage of
> the Gulf War. With the pool situation and the Joint Information Bureau, we
> virtually didn't cover the war. We couldn't even shoot a picture of the desert, let
> alone a military base or any military operations.

Columnist Chuck Winslow made a supporting observation that:

In the '91 Gulf War, the media was pretty much kept back and kept out. The people back home wound up seeing a whole lot of great shots of jets taking off from runways or aircraft carriers and a lot of footage of Schwartzkopf giving briefings. What they didn't have was coverage of the frontline stuff . . . you know, the Army's famous "left hook" to trap the Republican Guard . . . the Marines pushing up the coast to capture Kuwait City, that sort of stuff.

Special projects reporter Tommy Rafferty directly compared the media coverage of

the two wars:

There's so much stuff that happened in the Gulf War that was just lost . . . there was no one there to record it or photograph it. In this one, all those pictures of the first missiles striking the buildings in Baghdad . . . and the pictures of the tanks going over breaching the border, that's just amazing stuff.

**Being embedded meant unparalleled access**

Other participants contrasted their access as an embedded reporter to their typical

day-to-day means of covering events. William McCoy, a staff photographer with a

national daily newspaper, described it as a "photojournalist party:"

This was like being given a party . . . all you have to do is live and take pictures. You don't have to worry about transportation, food, and in many realities, you don't have to worry about safety. Access is just granted . . . food, everything . . . you're there. So this was a heaven for a photographer.

Kevin Harrison, another photographer but from a small newspaper from the

Southeast United States, made the following observations:

Once we got embedded, you know . . . we're there. There was no public affairs person to filter . . . to observe the interviews or to counsel the soldiers on what not to say. We had access to really anybody in our area. So as far as being an embed vs. working back in the U.S. going through the normal channels with the public affairs folks, I thought this was great because there were no hindrances.

Tommy Rafferty spoke of this access when he recalled:

I was sleeping in tents with the soldiers and riding around in their vehicles with them. What would the alternative be? Walking up to them and asking them, "How's it going?" or "What did you do yesterday?" or "What are you thinking?" the kinds of things you see TV reporters do at a crime scene. There were times that I didn't have to do interviews for a story, because you were right there in the

middle of it and you got your quotes just from hearing people talk. It was an amazing level of access.

Rafferty further explained this phenomenon upon his return from covering the war:

The other thing that's taking me time to get used to . . . now that I'm back here . . . whenever I had a question about something like, 'How's the facility running?' I'd just like to spend a week up there. You just get kind of used to that kind of thing.

International broadcast correspondent Patricia Henley, who was embedded aboard a

Navy aircraft carrier and a hospital ship, made the following observation:

The access was fabulous. We lived with the enlisted, but we ate with the officers, which gave you the breadth of experience on the ship. So you could get some pretty good one-on-one experiences you couldn't get otherwise. This access gave people an understanding of who is in the military, what their life was like.

## Seeing through a "soda-straw"

While this unprecedented access was positively cited throughout many of the

participant interviews, another recurring perspective described one of the limitations of

being embedded. Lt. Col. Neil Thomas, an Army public affairs officer who was "tasked

to come up with a plan to execute the Defense Department's embedding policy," spoke of

this limitation:

Obviously, it gives you the fish-eye view. If you're the Miami Herald or the Columbus Ledger or whatever, and you've got one reporter with one unit, it really hinders your ability to tell the American public about what's going on with the war. You get good human interest stories, but as far as news it was very difficult.

Rachel North, a higher education reporter from a mid-size market newspaper in the

Midwest, described this limited perspective the following way:

The hardest thing about being an embed was you only saw one tiny, tiny piece of the war, just a tiny piece. The phrase that's been used was that it's like looking through a soda straw and it's really true. People back home had a much better sense of what's going on with the war than I did, and I was out there.

George Lamont, a Washington correspondent for a small newspaper in the Northeast U.S., recounts the following event that exemplified this 'soda-straw' perspective:

> One of the most telling moments came when I went into the general's briefing in the morning and heard all about where the water, the ammo and the fuel was . . . and then I go back to my tent and sign on the Internet and see that the biggest battle of the war had just taken place about 10 miles away that night. Not a word of it was mentioned in the briefing.

Tommy Rafferty also described this perspective:

> What's the opposite of a bird's eye view? Your view was from the trenches. All you could really see, was what you could really see . . . what you could hear, smell and touch.

## Pieces of a mosaic

Then again, some of the participants attested that larger news organizations had the assets and thus the ability to see the big picture and tell the entire story. Patricia Henley described it the following way:

> The editors back here [in the U.S.] had to keep putting together the mosaic of what was actually happening out there. There were just so many reporters with such a small picture of what's going on.

William McCoy claimed that:

> If you're a large company like the Associated Press, with many, many assets out there, you had the ability to tell the entire picture. Without the embedding process that wouldn't be possible, because you wouldn't be able to have all these little pieces in the puzzle.

Also recognizing this perspective, Army PAO Lt. Col. Thomas spoke highly of the cable news channels:

> The best story was the major news organizations like CNN and FOX that had numerous reporters on different levels of the battlefield, and somebody coordinating it back in Kuwait. They could see the big picture taken from a bunch of different snapshots to try to synthesize it.

## Theme 2: The Reporter Also Became the Link Back Home

The next common theme to emerge was that media representatives found themselves not only informing their readers or viewers, but they also became the connection or link between the military members in Iraq and the military families and friends back home. Rich Worthington, a Washington correspondent for a small newspaper in the Northeast U.S., described this unexpected role he adopted:

> Never did we expect this kind of reaction. I heard from people, families and everything [saying], I knew my husband, my boyfriend, nephew or whatever, was safe for another day . . . because you would have written about it if something bad had happened. There was a sense of relief. There was a sense of connection. I'd feel guilty if I didn't file [everyday], not for the paper's perspective, just for the people back home.

Rachel North also commented on this phenomenon:

> It was a very interesting experience as a journalist because a lot of people actually started looking for my byline. Because they found out that I was there with their spouse, their husband, or whatever, their unit. So people were tuning into our website from all over the country because I was the person with that particular unit. I got so many e-mails when I got back.

Capt. Edith Miller, a Marine Corps public affairs officer who worked in Kuwait and Iraq with more than 40 embedded journalists at the beginning of the war, made the following observation:

> We definitely had quite of bit of what I call American regional newspapers – not the highest-circulated like the New York or L.A. Times, but [those] that had a big impact in their regional communities. We made a pretty big impression . . . to be able to send news home about the units and to send it back specifically to their family and friends . . . for the local support in their area.

Jeff Wilson also spoke of this role as a conduit of information:

> My family was responsible for keeping an open line of communication between the [Marines'] families and myself, as kind of the only information they were getting during the war. It was through my reports and some e-mails that my family relayed to them.

Chuck Winslow spoke of a similar experience:

The Marines let it be known that I was with the Xth Battalion, Xst Marines, about a thousand guys. So there were a thousand family and countless friends all across the country who knew that. They would log on to the Internet to see our stories. They were just so appreciative of that. I got countless e-mails when I got back who said, 'oh, it was so great' even though I didn't mention their kid's name. If I talked about his unit, they kind of knew where he was and what he was going through. That was really the most gratifying thing.r

Kevin Harrison also recalled:

The response we got back home was immense, especially like military wives and the general public. They didn't care what we sent back, they read it. They loved it! It was great!

Tommy Rafferty also shared this sense of connection:

When I got back here and checked my e-mail for the first time, I had just a flood of things from people around town and from people all over the country who knew someone in that unit. The response was overwhelmingly positive. It's almost embarrassing . . . they think I'm so great. One person actually gave me $50. I tried to give it back and the paper wouldn't let me keep it, so I donated it to charity.

**"Here...use my phone"**

Some of the participants even talked about how they literally provided that

connection with the use of telephones and lap-top computers. Dave Evanston, a military

reporter for a mid-size newspaper from the Southwest U.S., who also filed stories for a

national news service, shared the following anecdote:

There were soldiers who knew the war was coming in a few hours and they saw me on the satellite phone talking to my boss. They came over with those dog-faces and they all had a sob story, and it was one bad story after another. They didn't even have to use those sad stories on me. If they needed it, I'd say, 'get on the phone for 5 minutes, but don't stay on any longer.' I'd let them use my laptop at will ... probably let them use it too much.

Rich Worthington recalled a similar experience:

I'd let them use my sat [satellite] phone from time to time. I'd relay dozens of messages and I would e-mail messages for different Marines and bring information back, things like that. People would ask me sports scores or what's going on in the world.

## Theme 3: Understanding What Their Life Was Like

The third theme that emerged was how the embedded journalists had an

understanding of what the life of a Marine, a soldier, an airman or a sailor was like. Many

of the participants talked of how they went through it all together. Some participants even

acknowledged becoming "one of them."

George Lamont commented on how he successfully described what life was like:

My goals as I discussed them with my editors were to really just bring the story of the war home to the readers back home, to make it as descriptive as possible and to make it seem like the readers were there and to bring them as close to the scene as we could. So that's kind of what we went into hoping to accomplish. A friend of mine who was reading my stories said she could taste the sand between her teeth, which I thought was a pretty good sign that I was accomplishing what I set out to do.

### "We went through it together"

Patricia Henley characterized her experience aboard an aircraft carrier the

following ways:

It gave people an understanding of what their life was like . . . and life as it was characterized, it was always "Ground Hog Day." You didn't know what day it was, you didn't know if it was a.m. or p.m., you didn't know how long you had been on the ship and you didn't know how long it would be until you'd leave. It was just endless that way. So you lived the life that they lived, and if you've never been in the military, this was very informing. Their life was your life. Their bathing facilities and shower facilities were yours. You really had to figure out where the female heads were because, believe me, there weren't that many. And after the first week or two nobody could stand making up all the time. They felt what they felt, they did what they did. They cursed when they cursed. So there was no 'be nice to the visitors' after a while, it was just normal. There was just no hiding anything, because you were just too deep inside the skin.

Chuck Winslow described his experience the following way:

We decided that we were going to go over there and do what the Marines did. They dug a hole and slept in a hole . . . we dug a hole and slept in a hole. We just went along with the program and followed what they did without bitching about it and without asking any special favors. Eventually, they realized that these guys are going through the same stuff we're going through. Of course, you get close to these guys, especially in that kind of a situation.

**"Becoming one of them"**

Some of the research participants even went so far as to claim that they became part

of the military unit, using "we" and possessive pronouns such as "my," "our" and "us."

Dave Evanston described this phenomenon:

> When my bosses were concerned about me getting too close, they would remind
> me that, 'it's not we' when I'd say we took a bridge today. And I know what they
> were saying, but when you're with a group of people like that you become . . . if
> you're any kind of human being, you become closer to the people. I came over
> there to do my job, but in the process, I found a whole new "band of brothers" for
> the rest of my life. Those people are my friends and I don't mind saying that and I
> don't care what other reporters think about it. What matters is that we went through
> something as scary as hell and we survived it.

Jeff Wilson, a former Marine officer in Vietnam, characterized similar feelings

about his experience the following way:

> It's really refreshing being back in the military, having the camaraderie and
> selflessness that really don't exist in the media business, which is very competitive
> and individualistic. It was really kind of refreshing to get back into that team spirit,
> that kind of caring for each other, and the selflessness that was required living out
> in the field under such miserable conditions as long as we did and not really
> complaining about it . . . so it was really infectious.

Tommy Rafferty described his perspective as an embedded reporter:

> I was just there to cover it through their eyes and ears. I was more interested in
> being in the tent where the soldiers were and seeing what their emotions were, what
> they were feeling and what they were going through as the war developed. There
> were people who ended up not liking me and others who I ended up getting really
> close to. It almost became like I was one of the soldiers. So living and being in that
> same situation of fear, and having to eat MRE's [meals ready to eat] and having to
> sleep outdoors with all the people; there's just no substitute for that.

Army public affairs officer Lt. Col. Neil Thomas recalled the following instance of

journalists identifying with their units:

> The embedded people were very jealous of their status with their units. Their
> organizations had done a lot to get them there . . . they paid a lot of money and that
> was their story. They realized that it was a small universe, but that was their turf.
> So if you'd have a unilateral roll in [an independent reporter who was not
> embedded who would try to cover the unit], it wasn't necessarily the military

kicking them out, the embedded guys were kicking them out. They basically had kind of the Stockholm Syndrome, where the reporters felt like their unit was the best unit in the military.

William McCoy described how he was included from the start, when he recalled one of the commander's initial briefings:

> The top commanders said, "Let the reporters and photographers in on your top-secret meetings, in your briefings, anything. They have free will here. They can go anywhere they want, but they're under the premise that they're not going to release any vital information. And until they break those rules, they're part of this team."

Bruce Kelly, an entertainment writer for a large national newspaper who embedded with the Navy, made the following observations:

> Basically, you're living with these people, you're sleeping with them, and you're eating with them. You sort of had to strike a balance of not ticking people off, who were obviously your keepers and basically in charge of protecting you and making sure they'd save your life if they had to. And at the same time, you had to still get the news and remember, this is a job and you weren't in the military.

On the other hand, Rachel North made it clear that she personally abstained from "becoming one of them."

> There may have been some [reporters] in terms of becoming too dependent on the military or too cozy. You know if you're a reporter and you suddenly start thinking you are a Marine, I hope there wasn't any instances of that.

### Theme 4: Trust Eased Some of the Tension

The theme of trust further described the interaction between the media and the military. Some of the research participants spoke of their pre-conceptions regarding the tension between the two institutions. Rachel North claimed that, "I didn't have a relationship with the military beforehand, but there was pretty much the belief that the military and the media just don't get along."

Chuck Winslow offered the following anecdote that described how trust was crucial to ease this tension:

When we first got into Kuwait, the Marines had been briefed that we were coming. They were told, 'you're going to have some journalists with you' and they were advised they were to consider this what they call an adverse condition. In other words, having a journalist along was like bad weather or deep mud, or a bad thing. Something that sucked, but there was nothing you could do about it.

He went on to say:

When we first showed up, there was that tension and there was that suspicion. They looked at us and thought, 'these guys are going to be looking for anything we do wrong, or anything negative, or they're going to put us in a bad light. And it took a while for them to realize, 'hey, that wasn't my intention and for them to trust that wasn't my intention. You don't get to know these guys in a couple of days, especially grunts. These guys . . . well it's an insular kind of existence. You know they look at everyone who isn't a grunt as an outsider. So it takes a while for them to warm up to you. Sure you can jump off a helicopter and run up to some young corporal and ask him a question. Well, what's he going to say? He'll say 'yes, sir or no, sir.' He doesn't know you . . . he's not going to tell you how he really feels.

Winslow concluded that:

Eventually, we got to the point where we were allowed total access to everything. They really started to trust us because they knew we were not there to give away secrets or put their men in danger, or paint them in a bad light.

Jeff Wilson also described how trust was one of the key factors in this war:

I went to a seminar that was hosted by the War College in Pennsylvania. They had the commanding officers and the embedded reporters sitting together, going through these various scenarios and situations. It was quite amazing to see how consistent everyone's point of view was that it was all based on trust and understanding. When it came to a difficult decision, the two worked it out, coming at it from a level of trust and understanding of each other's needs and responsibilities. And they usually came up with the right solution. We were all quite amazed, the media and the military, that the coming of the mind was as complete as it was.

William McCoy spoke at length of how his previous experience, such as covering

military conflicts in Afghanistan and the West Bank, gained the confidence of the

soldiers he was with:

I think that many of the photographers there probably had seen at the start more in the way of devastation and death than a lot of the soldiers they were covering . . . the young guys. That was really interesting the dynamic when you talk to the young soldiers and some of the commanders. When you describe where you have been, I

think that opened up a lot of doors. They understood why you were there and what you were doing, once those barriers were down. In many respects, it just took time. People just watched how you worked and realized what you were doing, as with every assignment, to gain people's 'at ease-ness' to allow you to do your job.

Dave Evanston described the initial pre-conceptions of one of the soldiers he was embedded with:

Before the war, one guy said on the radio to me, "Why should we allow you to be in with the soldiers, you're just going to screw things up, you're just going to give away secrets." At first when we came there he thought that we were just going to write all the bad crud and he didn't want us around. By the end of the war, I think all of us were glad to have known each other . . . it's a learning process for everyone.

Evanston concluded with the following observation regarding trust between the media and the military:

The tensions aren't over, I wish they were, but I don't think they're going to be over as long as you've got a camera in your hand and you're unknown to a soldier. The soldier is going to treat you more like an enemy combatant than a potential friendly. They almost have to do that . . . they're trying to stay alive and they're all nervous.

On the other hand, Rich Worthington saw both perspectives and made the following observations:

Most of the officers were good. I had some problems. I don't know if you knew about the problems [but] I got kicked out.

He went on to elaborate:

My problems for the most part, came down from the battalion commander. All across the battalion staff, they were excellent to me. It was just the battalion commander who didn't want press there to begin with. The 3 or 4 weeks before we went, we were fighting to go, because he didn't want us. But there was a lot of pressure put on him from the Marine headquarters. The sense I got from him was "no coverage is good coverage."

Although Worthington was eventually kicked out after 4 or 5 weeks for allegedly disclosing military capabilities and positions, he concluded that, "The Marines I was

with, by and large, were very cooperative and helpful. It surprised me to some degree

because the military and the media haven't always had that good of a relationship."

## Theme 5: It Was a Trade Off – "A Give and Take"

Another common theme that emerged was how being embedded was a trade-off or

"a give and take." Tommy Rafferty described this phenomenon when he said, "If you

were an embedded reporter you signed ground rules agreements. That was an exchange,

it was a deal. You agree to those things in exchange for 100% access to the troops."

Jeff Wilson also spoke of this trade-off:

As a result of the Gulf War, the media had a very bad feeling from that war. And I think had they not come up with a solution this time the media was not willing to play by the military's rules this time. By the same token, I could see where the military realized they had to do a better job than they did in 1991. So out of those two interests, they came up with the embed plan, which was kind of "keep your enemies close to you."

Wilson continued:

I think that by keeping the media close, giving them this ultimate access by keeping them close, they'd probably have more control. Not editorial control, but logistical control over their activities, which is what they really wanted. I think that they were willing to experiment with the benefit of the doubt, that if the media really got to know the military, they'd have a much better context for what was happening. And I think that had proven to be the case.

Chuck Winslow also made a similar observation addressing the Gulf War and

spoke of the give and take between the two institutions:

I got the impression [after the Gulf War] a lot of ground commanders felt like, "Damn it, my men did a lot of really good stuff and there was nobody out there to report it. So nobody knows about it." I think that the military at that point, really kind of realized, or at least they started to, that they needed the news media. Yes, it can be dangerous to have them around, but they need the media to get that message back as to what these boys and girls are doing. So I think that was the motivating thing for the embedding program in this war.

Kevin Harrison further described this give and take situation:

It took a lot of faith to embed all these folks . . . a lot of faith because there are journalists who would, in an effort to one-up the other guy, try to reveal more than they should. I guess that was the risk that the U.S. [military] took. But in the same right, they also had these guys who were kind of part of the unit. So they're kind of trapped . . . not really trapped, but they're kind of a captive audience. It was kind of a risk for the military to embed all these folks. They had to have an element of trust, but in the same right, they got more accurate and realistic reporting, I think.

Dave Evanston talked about other trade-offs between him and the soldiers he was

embedded with:

They needed us to keep in touch with the folks back home. I needed them to make sure that my blood pressure wasn't going down so low that my heart was going to stop because my blood pressure plummeted once I got out to the desert. Also, while they got us into battle, they could've gotten us killed, [but then] they also protected us. So there is a mutual dependency without question and that's part of what helped everybody get to know each other. That was one of the key things that helped bring down the walls.

George Lamont observed the following trade-offs during his embedded experience:

I think it did very good things for both the military and the media. I know myself, I learned an incredible amount and got a new kind of respect for people in the military and what they do. I really think that you have to see it . . . you have to know these people to understand what a fine machine this is – the U.S. military. I also get the sense that it helped the morale of the troops when they could actually see that they had been written about.

Lt. Col. Neil Thomas talked of the very specific trade-offs that had grave

consequences:

I told the media flat out, "Our intent is to show you the good, the bad and the ugly of war. We're not going to have a public affairs officer standing over your shoulder. We're not going to be censoring you. We trust that you are going to be ethical. And frankly, you have a vested interest in making sure that you do not give away operational security ... because if you do and the artillery starts falling, it may be falling on your head."

Bruce Kelly described this give and take the following way:

I think the military wanted reporters to live just like the soldiers did and give them a firsthand taste of what it was like so they have a better understanding. Especially nowadays there are so few reporters out here that have military backgrounds. On the flipside, reporters got to experience it and provide much better, much clearer stories. So each needed the other, obviously the Pentagon wanted reporters not to

just cover the glory and the battles, so to speak, but also as witnesses making sure that if Saddam or his cronies had come out and said, "U.S. soldiers are slaughtering women and children in the village," the military had witnesses right there. They had reporters who could independently verify that, "no that's not the case."

## Theme 6: "It's All About Relationships"

Several of the participants spoke specifically about the importance of relationships, either in their ability to successfully do their job, or in terms of building relationships with people with whom they withstood certain situations. Many of the participants even described how they became personally involved in the lives of the military members they were embedded with. Jeff Wilson spoke at length about all of these aspects of relationships:

> I was asked to do an embed project based on some previous work I'd done in Afghanistan. They [the TV news network] knew I had good military contacts and they wanted me to try to use those contacts to get even closer than the normal embed would get, and because of my military experience as well. With that, I was able to approach General X [omitting name for confidentiality] of the Xst Marine Division, who I was with in Afghanistan, about doing an embed even though the slots had not been officially given out. He told me that he was very interested in having someone document them all the way from start to finish, through the training and the deployment. We had developed a good level of trust during the Afghanistan conflict, so he knew that I knew how to get around the battlefield, knew the terminology and the protocol and that I could take care of myself while I was out there. So I was embedded into his unit. That was my relationship with them and it went very, very well. It's a relationship that continues today. We just finished exchanging Christmas gifts and cards. We feel pretty much part of the Xst Marine Division family. And not only was I personally involved with them, but my family also got very involved with their families in my absence during the war.

William McCoy also described how relationships were a key factor that allowed him to accomplish his daily duties as an embedded photographer:

> You can tell there's always a fence [between] the media and the military. You develop relationships with people in the public affairs departments and they understand what you're trying to do. They respect you, because they know you. But if you're just walking in there off of the street, there's going to be an arm's length discretion. And it's all in basically developing sources and developing reputations and . . . I don't want to say friendships, but it's business relationships.

Mc Coy went on to describe his specific situation during this war:

> After a week or two, after people realized who you were as a person or a journalist, the respect factor went up tremendously. And once the war started and people saw how you worked and how you were there to cover their story, and you weren't there for personal or political reasons, the respect value and the respect factor went up tremendously. And to this day, because of so many of those instances, there's a working relationship that has been developed that's more valuable that what was there during the war. It's no different than covering any other assignments, where you have one-on-one contacts with people. It's the friendships, it's the professional relationships you build.

Chuck Winslow made the following observation:

> Of course you get close to these guys. I mean I'm still friends with a lot of the Marines I was over there with. I see them every now and then . . . we have beers and that sort of stuff. So yeah, I got close to them, especially in that kind of situation.

Dave Evanston also discussed the value of relationships:

> The thing I can say about Lt. Col. X [the unit commander; omitting name for confidentiality] is that I thought we worked pretty well [together]. He never really interfered with what I was doing. The working relationships that we established . . . it was more collegial than it was adversarial. I think to some degree, the reason for that is because of the closeness of the quarters for all of us and the danger that we all faced.

Evanston also described how he has become personally involved with a few of the

soldiers:

> It's hard to explain to people who haven't been there, but that's what happens . . . those people who at first were merely soldiers and airmen that I was supposed to report on, some of those folks became my friends. And a few of them are like brothers. In fact, Craig Stevenson's grandfather died a couple of days ago and I'm going to meet him tomorrow at the funeral. When he gets married, I'll go to his wedding next summer.

Rich Worthington discussed the importance of relationships as an embedded

reporter:

> It was a completely different perspective. It's hard on any assignment to sort of parachute in some place and cover it with people you don't know. If you've got a relationship with someone, it's much easier to find out what's going on and get the accurate information. And for a story like this, where from my perspective it was

human interest type stories, to see what these guys are going through. You can't build that relationship just parachuting in for a day. One of the platoons sent a postcard to my bosses saying I should get a raise, and stuff like that. And that was built over time you know . . . you scrub their back, they scrub your back.

Bruce Kelly talked of about relationships aboard a Navy aircraft carrier:

Obviously, it needs some fine tuning here and there, but I hope that the military keeps this [embedding] as it is. We had a very good rapport with our officers who were on the ship. We were almost like family when we left. In fact, I recently attended a reunion with the reporters and all the top commanders on the ship. However, that was not the case on other ships. I heard about how restrictive they were . . . some even had to be escorted to the latrines.

Tommy Rafferty described what may have been more of a give and take

relationship:

I think what they [the military] were trying to do this time was to have a better relationship, kind of get back to the way it was in World War II. Of course in WW II, you had guys who were team players, plus they were censored. This time around they had the ground rules agreement[4] and I didn't see any censorship going on, except at the back end. If you violated the ground rules agreement in a report, you were put under field arrest and driven down to Kuwait and dropped off. I think that was what they were trying to do, and I think it worked very well.

Evanston concluded with the following anecdote that described the importance of

the relationships he formed while embedded:

There was a day during the war, after the intense battle at a bridge near Karbala. We were on a road which was about 3 miles long and it ended in a T. There were bunkers across from us about 200 yards that had been held by the Iraqis. That night, the Iraqis came down to counterattack and it was an extraordinary battle. I kept feeding reports back on it to my editors, right as it was going on. I just picked up the phone and called and dictated. [At one point] I looked over at the guys and said, "If we make it home, I'm putting a flag pole up in the front yard." And I'm not a big flag-waving guy, but that's what I did . . . When I look at that flag pole, it reminds me of that morning. It reminds me of all the shit that we all went through, and we all went through it together. I mean I was still doing my job and they were doing their job, but there's another dimension to that relationship and that dimension became important. Some people in the journalism community might say that I had crossed the line, in terms of my emotions, but I don't give a rat's ass of

---

[4] See Appendix A: Release, Indemnification and Hold Harmless Agreement and Agreement Not to Sue, and Appendix B: Public Affairs Guidance (PAG) on Embedded Media

what they say. What matters to me was the feeling of union at that moment. And it's one of the very few times in my life I felt it. I was very relieved to be alive, because we went into that battle on the bridge the day before and we were pretty certain that we weren't going to make it across. We were one of the first vehicles going over the bridge and it was just utter fucking chaos everywhere. We were in the vortex of the damn thing, and mortar blowing up near us and firing going on everywhere. You never knew when you were going to get killed and you never knew how it was going to come. If I sit and really think about it a lot, I'll get all emotional, so I'll leave it at that. But that was what the flagpole thing was about.

CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The findings of this study address the three research questions that guided it.

RQ1: How did embedding affect the journalists' ability to cover the war? The study showed that embedding enhanced the media's ability to cover the war by providing unprecedented access, which in turn resulted in a heightened understanding of what military life was like during wartime.

RQ2: How did embedding affect the military units in combat operations? These findings indicate that it provided far-reaching benefits, including a sense of connection with their loved ones back home, which led to stronger overall troop morale.

RQ3: What are the benefits and the drawbacks of embedded media coverage of the war? The 13 research participants seemed to indicate that embedding strengthened the relationship between the military and the media. However, many thought a major drawback was the media's loss of the "big picture" due to the "soda straw" effect, in which reporters gained a deeper but narrower view of the war. This chapter will explore these ideas in greater detail and discuss a correlation that emerged between these findings and some basic tenets of public relations' relationship theory.

The emergent themes of access, understanding, communication (link back home), trust, give & take (exchange) and the importance of relationships exemplify how both the media and the military benefited from the embedded media policy during the war. Even in the single case where reporter Rich Worthington could not earn the trust of the battalion commander and was eventually "kicked out" of Iraq, he still claimed that,

"overall I had a good experience with these guys and I'm still in touch with a lot of them."

In comparison to the strained military-media relations during and after the Gulf War in 1991, the research participants emphasized the unprecedented access and how it provided an up-close, first hand view of the events as they happened, as well as how this dynamic provided a means for the media to live with, understand, offer assistance to and eventually become personally involved with their military counterparts; all of which led to the building and strengthening of relationships, a striking change from military-media relations during the Gulf War as identified in the literature review.

Additionally, a majority of the research participants also identified how the key variables of trust and a "give & take" [exchange] seemed to, as Reporter Dave Evanston said, "bring down the walls" between the media and the military. Reporter Bruce Kelly summed up the importance of these two key variables:

> I think it was a very successful system. Everyone pretty much got what they wanted under the embedding process. And I think we [the reporters] proved that some of the past campaigns, [and specifically the Department of Defense's media relations policies during] Desert Storm, Grenada, Panama, were just silly because obviously reporters can be trusted to withhold information until the time comes when it can be released.

As pointed out in the findings section, an unexpected phenomenon that resulted from the media embedding was identified as "the reporter became the link back home." Here again the elements of a "give & take" exchange and trust provided a mutual benefit to both parties. The trade-off was while military members could communicate with their loved ones back home, the media continued to earn the trust of the military units, which eventually led to more access and built stronger relationships. To illustrate this point, reporter Chuck Winslow recalled,

You got to know these kids in a way that you couldn't have before. Eventually, we got to the point where we were allowed total access to everything. We stood there while platoon commanders gathered, when they were planning an operation, and [they] would draw lines on the map and that sort of stuff.

## Theoretical Correlations

The findings of this study add credence to the scholarly interest in relationship management theory as a separate public relations paradigm (Ferguson, 1984; Ledingham, 2003; Ledingham & Bruning, 1998; Bruning & Ledingham, 1999; Ehling, 1992; Hon & Grunig, 1999; L. Grunig et al., 1992; Huang, 1998). This substantial body of public relations scholarship is rooted in Ferguson's (1984) call for placing the research focus on the relationship itself, rather than on the organization or the public. She concluded that "a relationship-centric model has the assumption that the relationship is the prime issue of concern, not the parties" (p. 20).

Apart from this study's overarching theme of "it's all about relationships," the fundamental themes of access, understanding, communication, trust and exchange that emerged in this study draw several direct correlations to the body of knowledge in relationship theory.

Ehling (1992) posited that the relationship management perspective shifts the practice of public relations away from the manipulation of public opinion and towards a focus on building, nurturing, and maintaining organization-public relationships. When comparing the two wars, the participants in the present study observed that the military shifted its media relations' strategy of tightly-controlled press briefings, media pools and manipulative "security reviews" during the Gulf War, to media embedding which, they seem to have concluded, clearly resulted in a mutually beneficial relationship built on trust, exchange and understanding during the War in Iraq.

Army PAO Lt. Col. Neil Thomas described it as "a sea-change from the Vietnam,

Gulf War days of 'we don't want to tell the media anything, because we're afraid they'll

give away operational security.'"

**Trust, Understanding, Involvement, Access and Openness**

L. Grunig, J. Grunig and Ehling (1992) suggested that the most important measures

in determining the quality of organization-public relationships are "reciprocity, trust,

credibility, mutual legitimacy, openness, mutual satisfaction and mutual understanding"

(p. 83). Again, the findings of this study show this relationship-based theory in action as

the research participants repeatedly highlighted the parallel elements of exchange

(reciprocity), trust, access (openness) and understanding when describing their individual

successes with media embedding.

The findings of this study also support the research of Ledingham and Bruning

(1998b) who examined the link between the five operational dimensions of openness,

trust, involvement, commitment and investment and the attitudes of consumers toward an

organization. While their quantitative study focused more on the relationship between

organizations and its consumers, they defined openness as "sharing the organization's

plans for the future with public members," trust as "doing what it says it will do" and

involvement as "the organization being involved in the welfare of the community" (p.

62).

TV correspondent Jeff Wilson recounts that element of openness at a micro-level

when he said, "The military guys were just terrific as far as helping us out, getting us in a

better position whenever they could. Or alerting us to when something was going to

happen, before it happened, so we could get it [capture footage of it] in its more natural

state."

Wilson also highlighted the points of trust and, to a lesser degree, involvement

when he recalled an Army War College seminar discussion:

> Both the commanders and the media representatives said, "We just sat down and looked at the situation and said, what is the right thing to do here? And we came up with the right solution most of the time." So I think that's the best indication of how the basic understanding of each other's respective needs and responsibilities helped both parties come up with a very workable protocol.

Other scholars also identified trust and exchange as key elements of their

relationship-based research. For example, Huang (1998) defined organization-public

relationships as "the degree that the organization and its publics trust one another, agree

that one has rightful power to influence, experience satisfaction with each other, and

commit oneself to one another" (p. 12), while Broom, Casey, and Richey (2000) also

advocate that "relationships consist of the transactions that involve the exchange of

resources between organizations" (p. 91).

**Measuring Relationships**

Hon and Grunig (1999), combining information from previous professional and

academic literature and findings from surveys and in-depth interviews, argued that

organization-public relationships can be best measured by the elements of control

mutuality, trust, satisfaction, commitment, exchange relationship and communal

relationship.

They defined control mutuality as "the degree to which parties agree on who has

the rightful power to influence one another," satisfaction as "the extent to which each

party feels favorably toward each other because positive expectations about the

relationship are reinforced," and commitment as "the extent to which each party believes

and feels that the relationship is worth spending energy to maintain and promote" (p. 3).

Additionally, they argued that communal relationships exist when "both parties provide

benefits to the other because they are concerned for the welfare of the other – even when they get nothing in return" (p. 3).

However, to specifically key in on the themes that overlapped in this study, Hon and Grunig (1999) defined trust as "one party's level of confidence in and willingness to open oneself to the other party;" and that exchange relationships exist when, "one party gives benefits to the other only because the other has provided benefits in the past or is expected to do so in the future" (p. 3).

It is evident from the literature review that control mutuality, trust, satisfaction, commitment, and elements of exchange and communal relationships were practically non-existent between the military and the media during the Gulf War. As a result, there was essentially no relationship to measure. However in this study, the research participants repeatedly describe how embedding imparted the elements of trust, understanding and exchange, all of which eased their perceptions of the tension between these two institutions.

Photographer William McCoy specifically described how embedding afforded the opportunity for an exchange relationship:

> Sure you gave up some rights as a journalist. You couldn't report certain things such as troop strength, location and advance details. But the reason that we signed those DOD documents saying you're embedded and you will abide by these rules – it was a give and take. And the give was you won't report this information. But the take was you're going to be given the opportunity to witness and see what's going on first hand.

**Maintaining Relationships**

Hon and Grunig (1999) also suggested that "all the concepts from research on interpersonal relationships can be applied to maintaining symmetrical public relationships or those that benefit both the organization and publics" (p. 15). Thus, they recommended

the following strategies for maintaining relationships: access, positivity, openness, assurances, networking, and sharing of tasks. Specifically, they recognized access as when "senior managers provide representatives of publics access to organizational decision-making processes." They described positivity as "anything the organization or public does to make the relationship more enjoyable for the parties involved," openness as "thoughts and feelings among parties involved" (p. 14) and assurances as "attempts by parties in the relationship to assure the other parties that they and their concerns are legitimate." The last two strategies for maintaining relationships include networking, in which "organizations' building networks or coalitions with the same groups that their publics do," and sharing of tasks where the "organizations and the publics share in solving joint or separate problems" (p. 15).

McCoy further described the "give and take" of being embedded when he addressed access and openness in this context:

> You're going to live there. You're going to be with the people [the military]. You're going to understand what's happening on a 24-hour basis. Instead of just being ferried in on a helicopter for a one-hour 'look-see' to see people all smiley and happy, this was an opportunity for us to be there, to witness history.

Jeff Wilson offered the following observation that hints at Hon and Gruinig's notion of positivity:

> My cameraman, who was very much against the military, said the only thing that kept him going was the basic principles of selflessness, camaraderie, and the good humor that were so prevailing with the military.

However, of the five strategies suggested by Hon and Grunig (1999), this study also illustrates how assurances are not only essential to maintaining relationships, but also to establishing them. Again as indicated in the literature review, during the Gulf War, the military sought to fulfill its own objectives, with little regard to accommodating

the needs and desires of the press. As a result, a large majority of the media felt hampered by the military's highly-restrictive media relations' policies.

Conversely, during the War in Iraq, several of the research participants in this study alluded to how media embedding legitimized a primary concern of having unobscured access to the battlefield.

Furthermore, Ledingham and Bruning (1998b) suggested that, "to be effective and sustaining, relationships need to be seen as mutually beneficial" (p. 27). In this study, most of the participants contend that embedding benefited both the military and the media. For example, reporter Bruce Kelly claimed, "It was good process for the military to give reporters a taste of what military life was like so they have a better understanding, a better first hand knowledge and experience. On the flipside, reporters got to experience it and [as a result] handed out much better, clearer stories." Reporter Rachel North made a similar observation that demonstrated the mutual benefits of the relationship:

> I would say that it [embedding] worked in that it provided a decent framework for the two sides to work together and fulfill separate objectives. I think I did a good job of informing people . . . I don't think I slowed my unit down in any way. They offered a level of protection that I wouldn't have had if I had just gone out there on my own.

**Professional, Personal and Community Relationships**

In a quantitative study based on survey results from customers' views of an organization, Bruning and Ledingham (1999) determined that organization-public relationships fall into three categories: professional, personal and community. They observed that in a professional relationship, "it is important that services be delivered in a businesslike manner, that those services meet the business needs of the customer, and that the organization demonstrate a willingness to invest financially in the relationship" (p.

71). Marine Corps PAO Capt. Edith Miller spoke of her experience that aligned with this description of a professional relationship:

> Because I consider both the media and my command to be my clients, my job is to further the media's ability to cover my command. So the more I was able to meet and talk with them [the media] once they were assigned with me, the better I was able to meet their specific needs.

Also as William McCoy described it earlier in the "relationships" theme, "It's all in basically developing sources and developing reputations and . . . I don't want to say the word friendships, but it's business relationships. They know you, they respect you. It's a respect factor."

Turning now to the level of personal relationships, Bruning and Ledingham (1999) suggested the importance of taking a personal interest and engaging "in actions that build a sense of trust" and a willingness to "demonstrate commitment" to the needs of each other (p. 71). For example, Dave Evanston's claim, "I found a whole new 'band of brothers' for the rest of my life," verified that he and some of the soldiers had obviously developed personal relationships.

Bruning and Ledingham (1999) defined the third type of relationship, community, as an organization's "commitment to and interaction with the communities it serves," (p. 70). Several participants in the current study described what could be categorized as this community-level relationship, which was identified by the theme becoming the "link back home." It was even described by one of the participants as one of the "most gratifying things" about being embedded.

Reporter George Lamont recalled, "Several weeks after I came back...while I was waiting to cross the street, a car's pulling by and this guy looks at me, stops dead in his

tracks and says, 'Are you the reporter who covered the war? I just want to shake your hand.'" Reporter Tommy Rafferty made a similar claim:

> I think my relationship with the people here at home, the people reading the paper – it got a whole lot better. People are just amazed that I would go into a war area like that . . . with no training or no weapon, and just volunteer to be with the soldiers. Since I've been back, I've probably done more than a dozen talks at Rotary Clubs, Kiwanis Clubs and other civic clubs, and things like that. It really improved the newspaper's relationship with the community. Because we hadn't done anything like that [embedding] ever, that I know of.

The findings of this study demonstrate that embedding not only provided an opportunity for the research participants to establish and strengthen relationships, but the diversity of their personal accounts and anecdotes indicate that these relationships spanned the complete range from professional to personal to community in nature, as described by Bruning and Ledingham (1999).

**Interpersonal Communication in Relationships**

Toth (2000) argued that "the goal of interpersonal communication is to establish and maintain successful relationships" (p. 217) and "rather than interpersonal communication as merely a context, such as between people, typically face to face in a private setting, the focus is on interpersonal communication that develops a relationship between individuals" (p. 215).

As indicated by the participants in this study, embedding brought individual reporters up-close and personal into military units, where the relationships that formed were based on interpersonal communication between individuals. And as most of the participants attested, there was "no filter" or "interference" from public affairs officers attempting to monitor or control coverage of the events.

Toth (2000) identified the elements of mutuality of understanding, trust, credibility, emotion, intimacy and similarity, immediacy and dominance-submission as "some

conceptual elements to examine along an individual continuum" (p. 218). Just as Dave Evanston's anecdote of surviving the fierce fire-fight at the bridge near Karbala touched upon the elements of emotion and intimacy, the common overlapping elements of understanding and trust that emerged from this study support relationship theory even at an interpersonal level.

Interestingly, Toth (2000) suggested using qualitative methods in future studies to determine "how much individuals in negotiation situations attribute their success to their own choices and motivations and how much their agency is influenced and distinctly built in the negotiation relationship" (p. 217). This study clearly demonstrates how the success of embedding for the research participants was founded upon the individual, interpersonal relationships that were formed on the "frontlines." This contrasts with the Gulf War, in which the military's media relations policies were not founded on trust or understanding and failed to provide a framework for relationships to form at any subsequent level.

**Summary**

As Ferguson (1984) posited nearly two decades ago, the focus of public relations should be on the relationship, rather than the organization or the public. To further develop this relationship-based theory, L. Grunig, et al. (1992) suggested that the most important measures in determining the quality of relationships are reciprocity, trust, credibility, mutual legitimacy, openness, mutual satisfaction and mutual understanding.

Ledingham and Bruning (1998) found that trust, commitment and openness are strongly related to a consumer's decision to stay with or leave a service provider.

Hon and Grunig, (1999) later identified that relationships can be best measured by the elements of control mutuality, trust, satisfaction, commitment, exchange relationship

and communal relationship. They also recommended the following strategies for maintaining relationships: access, positivity, openness, assurances, networking, and sharing of tasks.

Bruning and Ledingham (1999) then determined that organization-public relationships fall into three relationship types: professional, personal and community. Toth (2000) stressed the importance of interpersonal communication in establishing and maintaining successful relationships.

While the study did not produce all the elements associated with measuring, maintaining and describing various types of relationships, the findings are particularly meaningful because the themes that emerged not only are consistent with much of the scholarly research that has examined dimensions of organization-public relationships – trust, access, exchange and understanding – but they arose in the context of a media relations program, a key organization-public relationship.

## Limitations

Since qualitative methods were used here, the results may be representative only of the 13 individuals who participated in this study. They are not generalizable to the larger population of embedded media representatives and military public affairs officers who directly experienced the War in Iraq. Additionally, the use of snowball sampling also has limitations associated with participant selection. While this method allows for easier recruitment, it may have also resulted in identifying like-minded individuals regarding the topic under examination. Thus other perspectives not identified by the participants of this study may certainly exist.

## Conclusion

This exploratory, qualitative approach to examining the ubiquitous spectacle of media embedding during the U.S. military's largest combat operation since the Gulf War afforded an opportunity to establish grounded theory. Instead, what emerged were four of the elements identified in the scholarly literature as central to organization-public relationships.

More importantly, these themes emerged from the field by way of open-ended interviews with research participants who were, in all likelihood, not familiar with the academic theory of relationship management. Furthermore, these findings add even more stability to relationship theory because 11 of the 13 participants were representatives of the media who identified some of the same key elements and terminology that public relations scholars have been using to define, measure and maintain organization-public relationships over the past several years.

Further reflecting on the methodology of this study, a comparison to quantitative approaches comes to mind:

> The research interview is an interpersonal situation, a conversation between two partners about a theme of mutual interest. It is a specific form of human interaction in which knowledge evolves through dialogue. The interaction is neither as anonymous and [sic] neutral as when a subject responds to a survey questionnaire, nor as personal and emotional as a therapeutic interview. (Kvale, 1996, p. 125)

The inductive methodology of this study in which words, experiences, expressions and feelings were candidly revealed by the research participants and which developed into subsequent emergent themes, offers a measure of triangulation to the relational theory and perspective of public relations.

Moreover, this study is unique in that it qualitatively examined media relations from the relational perspective. Apart from Esposito and Koch (2000), who conducted a

content analysis of network news stories to determine community involvement and commitment, and Lee's (2003) study of media relations in Korea that examined human relationships from a cultural perspective, this study uniquely contributes to the public relations body of knowledge, by examining media relations from the relational perspective and finding relationship theory at work.

## Future Research

Given that four key elements of relationship theory were evident in this study, the military and the media could collaboratively revisit those elements that did not emerge—control mutuality, satisfaction and commitment (Hon & Grunig, 1999)—and test for their presence by either directly eliciting participants' views on these elements, or by conducting a quantitative study using Hon and Grunig's (1999) questionnaire to more fully explore the effectiveness of the relationship. Better yet, through triangulation, which would combine these research approaches with more focused attention on these specific dimensions, we could further build upon the positive strides already made by the embedded media policy, as indicated by the participants of this study.

Other research could examine the difference between male and female research participants, the differences in the length of time as an embed, or the different experiences associated with being embedded depending on the various branches of the military.

Another possibility would be to use the findings of this study to help develop and distribute a questionnaire to each of the more than 700 media representatives that were embedded during the War in Iraq. This type of study would aim to quantitatively examine the organization-public relationships that were established, strengthened or weakened as a result of media embedding.

However, as Ferguson (1984) argued two decades ago, the biggest research challenge that remains in this relational perspective of public relations is to design a study in which the relationship is the unit of analysis, rather than the perceptions of relationships as identified by research participants.

## APPENDIX A
### RELEASE, INDEMNIFICATION, AND HOLD HARMLESS AGREEMENT AND AGREEMENT NOT TO SUE

1. The United States of America (the "Government"), acting by and through the Department of Defense, believes it to be mutually beneficial to both the Government and news media organizations ("media organizations") to place selected news media organization employees ("media employees") with selected military units ("military units") for the purpose of providing news media coverage before, during, and after military operations. The placement of media employees with military units is referred to in this Agreement as "embedding" or the "embedding process" and will require media employees to live, travel, eat, sleep, and conduct all professional and personal activities with the military unit to which the media employees are "embedded."

2. Definitions.

a. The term "Government" means the United States Government, including its departments, subdivisions, agencies, instrumentalities, officers, employees (including military and civilian personnel), servants, contractors, volunteers, and agents.

b. The term "media organization" means the "media employee's" employer, a registered U.S. or foreign profit or not-for-profit organization, its successors, and assigns.

c. The term "media employee" means an employee or agent of a "media organization", his or her guardians, executors, administrators, heirs, and assigns.

3. Media organizations and media employees understand and agree that the embedding process will expose media employees to the same risks and hazards as those

to which the military members of military units are exposed, including the extreme and unpredictable risks of war, combat operations, and combat support operations, as well as common and uncommon hazards of military living. Media organizations and media employees fully understand and appreciate the following:

a. The embedding process will expose media employees to all hazards of a military environment, including but not limited to the extreme and unpredictable hazards of war, combat operations, and combat support operations. The military environment is inherently dangerous and may result in death or personal injury of media employees or damage to personal property.

b. The embedding process may include strenuous and inherently dangerous activities, including transportation in, and close proximity to, military tactical vehicles, aircraft, watercraft, and other Government (and Government contracted) vehicles and may involve substantial risk of serious injury or death as the result of the media employee's own actions or inaction, the actions or inactions of others including agents, contractors, officers, service members, and employees of the Government, the conditions of the Government facility and the natural environment, the known or unknown condition of any government-furnished equipment, and the inherent dangers of war, combat operations, and combat support operations.

c. The embedding process requires media employees to be in overall good physical health and condition. Persons who are not in overall good physical health and condition should not participate in the embedding process. Media employees should consult their physicians prior to embedding to be certain they are qualified to do so. Persons with a history of heart or lung disease or conditions, or coronary disease, or other chronic or

pervasive diseases or conditions may not participate. Likewise, those women currently

pregnant may not participate. Anyone suffering from any injuries, conditions, ailments or

pre-existing conditions that could be affected by the embedding process may not

participate.

d. As part of the embedding process, the Government will make available anthrax

and smallpox vaccinations to media employees, provided it is done at no cost to the

Government (full reimbursement of all Government costs) and provided that the media

employees sign an additional agreement regarding the risks involved. These vaccinations

are voluntary and are not a prerequisite for participating in the embedding process. Media

organizations and media employees agree, for those media employees choosing to receive

the anthrax and smallpox vaccinations, that this Release, Indemnification, and Hold

Harmless Agreement and Agreement Not to Sue specifically includes all risks and

hazards associated with the smallpox and anthrax vaccinations, including any negative

reactions, adverse effects, including the media employee's illness, infirmity, or death.

4. The media employee agrees to:

a. Participate in the embedding process and to follow the direction and orders of the

Government related to such participation. The media employee further agrees to follow

Government regulations. The media employee acknowledges that failure to follow any

direction, order, regulation, or ground rule may result in the termination of the media

employee's participation in the embedding process.

b. Voluntarily, willingly, and knowingly ASSUME ANY AND ALL RISKS,

known and unknown, in any way associated with the embedding process, war, combat

operations, and combat support operations.

c. RELEASE, INDEMNIFY, AND HOLD HARMLESS the Government from and against any claims, demands, actions, liens, rights, subrogated or contribution interests, debts, liabilities, judgments, costs, and attorney's fees, arising out of, claimed on account of, or in any manner predicated upon the media employee's participation in the embedding process, including any loss or damage to property or the personal injury or death of any person which may occur as a result of the media employee's participation in the embedding process, even where that loss, damage, personal injury, or death is caused or contributed to, in any manner, by the Government.

5. The media organization agrees to permit its media employees to participate in the embedding process. As a condition of being permitted to participate in the embedding process, the media organization agrees to RELEASE, INDEMNIFY, AND HOLD HARMLESS the Government from and against any claims, demands, actions, liens, rights, subrogated or contribution interests, debts, liabilities, judgments, costs, and attorney's fess arising out of, claimed on account of, or in any manner predicated upon the media employee's participation in the embedding process, including any loss or damage to property or the personal injury or death of any person, even where that loss, damage, personal injury, or death is caused or contributed to, in any manner, by the Government.

6. The media organization and media employee hereby covenant and agree they will never institute, prosecute or in any way aid in the institution or prosecution of any demand, claim or suit against the Government for any destruction, loss, or damage to the media organization's property or the media employee's property, or the personal injury or

death of media employees which may occur as a result of the media employee's participation in the embedding process.

7. The media organization and media employee grant express, voluntary, and knowing consent to the rendering of all emergency medical or dental treatment that may, in the professional judgment of a Government medical or dental officer, become necessary while participating in the embedding process. Transportation to a definitive Government or commercial care facility may be required as an adjunct to authorized emergency medical or dental care. Persons receiving Government medical or dental care who are not otherwise eligible to receive such care shall be obligated to reimburse the Government.

8. The media organization and the media employee understand and agree that the Government may terminate the embedding process at *any time* and for *any reason*, as the Government determines appropriate in its sole discretion.

9. This Release, Indemnification, Hold Harmless Agreement and Agreement Not to Sue shall be interpreted according to federal law. It is to be construed as broadly and inclusively as is permitted by relevant federal law. If any portion of this document is held invalid, the balance shall continue in full force and effect.

_____

Media Employee's Signature Date

_____

Media Organization Date

By: _____

# APPENDIX B
## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PUBLIC AFFAIRS GUIDANCE ON EMBEDDING MEDIA

101900Z FEB 03
FM SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//OASD-PA//
TO SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//CHAIRS//
AIG 8777
HQ USEUCOM VAIHINGEN GE//PA//
USCINCEUR VAIHINGEN GE//ECPA//
JOINT STAFF WASHINGTON DC//PA//
SECSTATE WASHINGTON DC//PA//
CJCS WASHINGTON DC//PA//
NSC WASHINGTON DC
WHITE HOUSE SITUATION ROOM
INFO SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//OASD-PA/DPO//

UNCLAS

SUBJECT: PUBLIC AFFAIRS GUIDANCE (PAG) ON EMBEDDING MEDIA
DURING POSSIBLE FUTURE OPERATIONS/DEPLOYMENTS IN THE U.S.
CENTRAL COMMANDS (CENTCOM) AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY (AOR).

REFERENCES: REF. A. SECDEF MSG, DTG 172200Z JAN 03, SUBJ:
PUBLIC AFFAIRS GUIDANCE (PAG) FOR MOVEMENT OF FORCES INTO THE
CENTCOM AOR FOR POSSIBLE FUTURE OPERATIONS.

1. PURPOSE. THIS MESSAGE PROVIDES GUIDANCE, POLICIES AND
PROCEDURES ON EMBEDDING NEWS MEDIA DURING POSSIBLE FUTURE
OPERATIONS/DEPLOYMENTS IN THE CENTCOM AOR. IT CAN BE ADAPTED
FOR USE IN OTHER UNIFIED COMMAND AORS AS NECESSARY.

2. POLICY.

2.A. THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) POLICY ON MEDIA COVERAGE
OF FUTURE MILITARY OPERATIONS IS THAT MEDIA WILL HAVE LONG-
TERM, MINIMALLY RESTRICTIVE ACCESS TO U.S. AIR, GROUND AND
NAVAL FORCES THROUGH EMBEDDING. MEDIA COVERAGE OF ANY
FUTURE OPERATION WILL, TO A LARGE EXTENT, SHAPE PUBLIC
PERCEPTION OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT NOW AND IN
THE YEARS AHEAD. THIS HOLDS TRUE FOR THE U.S. PUBLIC; THE PUBLIC
IN ALLIED COUNTRIES WHOSE OPINION CAN AFFECT THE DURABILITY OF

OUR COALITION; AND PUBLICS IN COUNTRIES WHERE WE CONDUCT OPERATIONS, WHOSE PERCEPTIONS OF US CAN AFFECT THE COST AND DURATION OF OUR INVOLVEMENT. OUR ULTIMATE STRATEGIC SUCCESS IN BRINGING PEACE AND SECURITY TO THIS REGION WILL COME IN OUR LONG-TERM COMMITMENT TO SUPPORTING OUR DEMOCRATIC IDEALS. WE NEED TO TELL THE FACTUAL STORY - GOOD OR BAD - BEFORE OTHERS SEED THE MEDIA WITH DISINFORMATION AND DISTORTIONS, AS THEY MOST CERTAINLY WILL CONTINUE TO DO. OUR PEOPLE IN THE FIELD NEED TO TELL OUR STORY – ONLY COMMANDERS CAN ENSURE THE MEDIA GET TO THE STORY ALONGSIDE THE TROOPS. WE MUST ORGANIZE FOR AND FACILITATE ACCESS OF NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL MEDIA TO OUR FORCES, INCLUDING THOSE FORCES ENGAGED IN GROUND OPERATIONS, WITH THE GOAL OF DOING SO RIGHT FROM THE START. TO ACCOMPLISH THIS, WE WILL EMBED MEDIA WITH OUR UNITS. THESE EMBEDDED MEDIA WILL LIVE, WORK AND TRAVEL AS PART OF THE UNITS WITH WHICH THEY ARE EMBEDDED TO FACILITATE MAXIMUM, IN-DEPTH COVERAGE OF U.S. FORCES IN COMBAT AND RELATED OPERATIONS. COMMANDERS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICERS MUST WORK TOGETHER TO BALANCE THE NEED FOR MEDIA ACCESS WITH THE NEED FOR OPERATIONAL SECURITY.

2.B. MEDIA WILL BE EMBEDDED WITH UNIT PERSONNEL AT AIR AND GROUND FORCES BASES AND AFLOAT TO ENSURE A FULL UNDERSTANDING OF ALL OPERATIONS. MEDIA WILL BE GIVEN ACCESS TO OPERATIONAL COMBAT MISSIONS, INCLUDING MISSION PREPARATION AND DEBRIEFING, WHENEVER POSSIBLE.

2.C. A MEDIA EMBED IS DEFINED AS A MEDIA REPRESENTATIVE REMAINING WITH A UNIT ON AN EXTENDED BASIS - PERHAPS A PERIOD OF WEEKS OR EVEN MONTHS. COMMANDERS WILL PROVIDE BILLETING, RATIONS AND MEDICAL ATTENTION, IF NEEDED, TO THE EMBEDDED MEDIA COMMENSURATE WITH THAT PROVIDED TO MEMBERS OF THE UNIT, AS WELL AS ACCESS TO MILITARY TRANSPORTATION AND ASSISTANCE WITH COMMUNICATIONS FILING/TRANSMITTING MEDIA PRODUCTS, IF REQUIRED.

2.C.1. EMBEDDED MEDIA ARE NOT AUTHORIZED USE OF THEIR OWN VEHICLES WHILE TRAVELING IN AN EMBEDDED STATUS.

2.C.2. TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE, SPACE ON MILITARY TRANSPORTATION WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR MEDIA EQUIPMENT NECESSARY TO COVER A PARTICULAR OPERATION. THE MEDIA IS RESPONSIBLE FOR LOADING AND CARRYING THEIR OWN EQUIPMENT AT ALL TIMES. USE OF PRIORITY INTER-THEATER AIRLIFT FOR EMBEDDED MEDIA TO COVER STORIES, AS WELL AS TO FILE STORIES, IS HIGHLY ENCOURAGED. SEATS ABOARD VEHICLES, AIRCRAFT AND NAVAL SHIPS WILL BE MADE

AVAILABLE TO ALLOW MAXIMUM COVERAGE OF U.S. TROOPS IN THE FIELD.

2.C.3. UNITS SHOULD PLAN LIFT AND LOGISTICAL SUPPORT TO ASSIST IN MOVING MEDIA PRODUCTS TO AND FROM THE BATTLEFIELD SO AS TO TELL OUR STORY IN A TIMELY MANNER. IN THE EVENT OF COMMERCIAL COMMUNICATIONS DIFFICULTIES, MEDIA ARE AUTHORIZED TO FILE STORIES VIA EXPEDITIOUS MILITARY SIGNAL/COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES.

2.C.4. NO COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT FOR USE BY MEDIA IN THE CONDUCT OF THEIR DUTIES WILL BE SPECIFICALLY PROHIBITED. HOWEVER, UNIT COMMANDERS MAY IMPOSE TEMPORARY RESTRICTIONS ON ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSIONS FOR OPERATIONAL SECURITY REASONS. MEDIA WILL SEEK APPROVAL TO USE ELECTRONIC DEVICES IN A COMBAT/HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT, UNLESS OTHERWISE DIRECTED BY THE UNIT COMMANDER OR HIS/HER DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE. THE USE OF COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT WILL BE DISCUSSED IN FULL WHEN THE MEDIA ARRIVE AT THEIR ASSIGNED UNIT.

3. PROCEDURES.

3.A. THE OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS (OASD(PA) IS THE CENTRAL AGENCY FOR MANAGING AND VETTING MEDIA EMBEDS TO INCLUDE ALLOCATING EMBED SLOTS TO MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS. EMBED AUTHORITY MAY BE DELEGATED TO SUBORDINATE ELEMENTS AFTER THE COMMENCEMENT OF HOSTILITIES AND AT THE DISCRETION OF OASD(PA). EMBED OPPORTUNITIES WILL BE ASSIGNED TO MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS, NOT TO INDIVIDUAL REPORTERS. THE DECISION AS TO WHICH MEDIA REPRESENTATIVE WILL FILL ASSIGNED EMBED SLOTS WILL BE MADE BY THE DESIGNATED POC FOR EACH NEWS ORGANIZATION.

3.A.1. IAW REF. A, COMMANDERS OF UNITS IN RECEIPT OF A DEPLOYMENT ORDER MAY EMBED REGIONAL/LOCAL MEDIA DURING PREPARATIONS FOR DEPLOYMENT, DEPLOYMENT AND ARRIVAL IN THEATER UPON RECEIPT OF THEATER CLEARANCE FROM CENTCOM AND APPROVAL OF THE COMPONENT COMMAND. COMMANDERS WILL INFORM THESE MEDIA, PRIOR TO THE DEPLOYING EMBED, THAT OASD(PA) IS THE APPROVAL AUTHORITY FOR ALL COMBAT EMBEDS AND THAT THEIR PARTICULAR EMBED MAY END AFTER THE UNIT'S ARRIVAL IN THEATER. THE MEDIA ORGANIZATION MAY APPLY TO OASD(PA) FOR CONTINUED EMBEDDING, BUT THERE IS NO GUARANTEE AND THE MEDIA ORGANIZATION WILL HAVE TO MAKE ARRANGEMENTS FOR AND PAY FOR THE JOURNALISTS' RETURN TRIP.

3.B. WITHOUT MAKING COMMITMENTS TO MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS, DEPLOYING UNITS WILL IDENTIFY LOCAL MEDIA FOR POTENTIAL EMBEDS AND NOMINATE THEM THROUGH PA CHANNELS TO OASD(PA) (POC: MAJ TIM BLAIR, DSN 227-1253; COMM. 703-697-1253; EMAIL TIMOTHY.BLAIR@OSD.MIL). INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE FORWARDED INCLUDES MEDIA ORGANIZATION, TYPE OF MEDIA AND CONTACT INFORMATION INCLUDING BUREAU CHIEF/MANAGING EDITOR/NEWS DIRECTOR'S NAME; OFFICE, HOME AND CELL PHONE NUMBERS; PAGER NUMBERS AND EMAIL ADDRESSES. SUBMISSIONS FOR EMBEDS WITH SPECIFIC UNITS SHOULD INCLUDE AN UNIT'S RECOMMENDATION AS TO WHETHER THE REQUEST SHOULD BE HONORED.

3.C. UNIT COMMANDERS SHOULD ALSO EXPRESS, THROUGH THEIR CHAIN OF COMMAND AND PA CHANNELS TO OASD(PA), THEIR DESIRE AND CAPABILITY TO SUPPORT ADDITIONAL MEDIA EMBEDS BEYOND THOSE ASSIGNED.

3.D. FREELANCE MEDIA WILL BE AUTHORIZED TO EMBED IF THEY ARE SELECTED BY A NEWS ORGANIZATION AS THEIR EMBED REPRESENTATIVE.

3.E. UNITS WILL BE AUTHORIZED DIRECT COORDINATION WITH MEDIA AFTER ASSIGNMENT AND APPROVAL BY OASD(PA).

3.E.1.UNITS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING THAT ALL EMBEDDED MEDIA AND THEIR NEWS ORGANIZATIONS HAVE SIGNED THE "RELEASE, INDEMNIFICATION, AND HOLD HARMLESS AGREEMENT AND AGREEMENT NOT TO SUE", FOUND AT HTTP://WWW.DEFENSELINK.MIL/NEWS/FEB2003/D20030210EMBED.PDF. UNITS MUST MAINTAIN A COPY OF THIS AGREEMENT FOR ALL MEDIA EMBEDDED WITH THEIR UNIT.

3.F. EMBEDDED MEDIA OPERATE AS PART OF THEIR ASSIGNED UNIT. AN ESCORT MAY BE ASSIGNED AT THE DISCRETION OF THE UNIT COMMANDER. THE ABSENCE OF A PA ESCORT IS NOT A REASON TO PRECLUDE MEDIA ACCESS TO OPERATIONS.

3.G. COMMANDERS WILL ENSURE THE MEDIA ARE PROVIDED WITH EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO OBSERVE ACTUAL COMBAT OPERATIONS. THE PERSONAL SAFETY OF CORRESPONDENTS IS NOT A REASON TO EXCLUDE THEM FROM COMBAT AREAS.

3.H. IF, IN THE OPINION OF THE UNIT COMMANDER, A MEDIA REPRESENTATIVE IS UNABLE TO WITHSTAND THE RIGOROUS CONDITIONS REQUIRED TO OPERATE WITH THE FORWARD DEPLOYED FORCES, THE COMMANDER OR HIS/HER REPRESENTATIVE MAY LIMIT THE

REPRESENTATIVES PARTICIPATION WITH OPERATIONAL FORCES TO ENSURE UNIT SAFETY AND INFORM OASD(PA) THROUGH PA CHANNELS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. GENDER WILL NOT BE AN EXCLUDING FACTOR UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCE.

3.I. IF FOR ANY REASON A MEDIA REPRESENTATIVE CANNOT PARTICIPATE IN AN OPERATION, THEY WILL BE TRANSPORTED TO THE NEXT HIGHER HEADQUARTERS FOR THE DURATION OF THE OPERATION.
3.J. COMMANDERS WILL OBTAIN THEATER CLEARANCE FROM CENTCOM/PA FOR MEDIA EMBARKING ON MILITARY CONVEYANCE FOR PURPOSES OF EMBEDDING.

3.K. UNITS HOSTING EMBEDDED MEDIA WILL ISSUE INVITATIONAL TRAVEL ORDERS, AND NUCLEAR, BIOLOGICAL AND CHEMICAL (NBC) GEAR. SEE PARA. 5. FOR DETAILS ON WHICH ITEMS ARE ISSUED AND WHICH ITEMS THE MEDIA ARE RESPONSIBLE TO PROVIDE FOR THEMSELVES.

3.L. MEDIA ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING THEIR OWN PASSPORTS AND VISAS.

3.M. MEDIA WILL AGREE TO ABIDE BY THE CENTCOM/OASD(PA) GROUND RULES STATED IN PARA. 4 OF THIS MESSAGE IN EXCHANGE FOR COMMAND/UNIT-PROVIDED SUPPORT AND ACCESS TO SERVICE MEMBERS, INFORMATION AND OTHER PREVIOUSLY-STATED PRIVILEGES. ANY VIOLATION OF THE GROUND RULES COULD RESULT IN TERMINATION OF THAT MEDIA'S EMBED OPPORTUNITY.

3.N. DISPUTES/DIFFICULTIES. ISSUES, QUESTIONS, DIFFICULTIES OR DISPUTES ASSOCIATED WITH GROUND RULES OR OTHER ASPECTS OF EMBEDDING MEDIA THAT CANNOT BE RESOLVED AT THE UNIT LEVEL, OR THROUGH THE CHAIN OF COMMAND, WILL BE FORWARDED THROUGH PA CHANNELS FOR RESOLUTION. COMMANDERS WHO WISH TO TERMINATE AN EMBED FOR CAUSE MUST NOTIFY CENTCOM/PA PRIOR TO TERMINATION. IF A DISPUTE CANNOT BE RESOLVED AT A LOWER LEVEL, OASD(PA) WILL BE THE FINAL RESOLUTION AUTHORITY. IN ALL CASES, THIS SHOULD BE DONE AS EXPEDITIOUSLY AS POSSIBLE TO PRESERVE THE NEWS VALUE OF THE SITUATION.

3.O. MEDIA WILL PAY THEIR OWN BILLETING EXPENSES IF BILLETED IN A COMMERCIAL FACILITY.

3.P. MEDIA WILL DEPLOY WITH THE NECESSARY EQUIPMENT TO COLLECT AND TRANSMIT THEIR STORIES.

3.Q. THE STANDARD FOR RELEASE OF INFORMATION SHOULD BE TO ASK

"WHY NOT RELEASE" VICE "WHY RELEASE." DECISIONS SHOULD BE MADE ASAP, PREFERABLY IN MINUTES, NOT HOURS.

3.R. THERE IS NO GENERAL REVIEW PROCESS FOR MEDIA PRODUCTS. SEE PARA 6.A. FOR FURTHER DETAIL CONCERNING SECURITY AT THE SOURCE.

3.S. MEDIA WILL ONLY BE GRANTED ACCESS TO DETAINEES OR EPWS WITHIN THE PROVISIONS OF THE GENEVA CONVENTIONS OF 1949. SEE PARA. 4.G.17. FOR THE GROUND RULE.

3.T. HAVING EMBEDDED MEDIA DOES NOT PRECLUDE CONTACT WITH OTHER MEDIA. EMBEDDED MEDIA, AS A RESULT OF TIME INVESTED WITH THE UNIT AND GROUND RULES AGREEMENT, MAY HAVE A DIFFERENT LEVEL OF ACCESS.

3.U. CENTCOM/PA WILL ACCOUNT FOR EMBEDDED MEDIA DURING THE TIME THE MEDIA IS EMBEDDED IN THEATER. CENTCOM/PA WILL REPORT CHANGES IN EMBED STATUS TO OASD(PA) AS THEY OCCUR.

3.V. IF A MEDIA REPRESENTATIVE IS KILLED OR INJURED IN THE COURSE OF MILITARY OPERATIONS, THE UNIT WILL IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY OASD(PA), THROUGH PA CHANNELS. OASD(PA) WILL CONTACT THE RESPECTIVE MEDIA ORGANIZATION(S), WHICH WILL MAKE NEXT OF KIN NOTIFICATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE INDIVIDUAL'S WISHES.

3.W. MEDIA MAY TERMINATE THEIR EMBED OPPORTUNITY AT ANY TIME. UNIT COMMANDERS WILL PROVIDE, AS THE TACTICAL SITUATION PERMITS AND BASED ON THE AVAILABILITY OF TRANSPORTATION, MOVEMENT BACK TO THE NEAREST LOCATION WITH COMMERCIAL TRANSPORTATION.

3.W.1. DEPARTING MEDIA WILL BE DEBRIEFED ON OPERATIONAL SECURITY CONSIDERATIONS AS APPLICABLE TO ONGOING AND FUTURE OPERATIONS WHICH THEY MAY NOW HAVE INFORMATION CONCERNING.

4. GROUND RULES. FOR THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF U.S. FORCES AND EMBEDDED MEDIA, MEDIA WILL ADHERE TO ESTABLISHED GROUND RULES. GROUND RULES WILL BE AGREED TO IN ADVANCE AND SIGNED BY MEDIA PRIOR TO EMBEDDING. VIOLATION OF THE GROUND RULES MAY RESULT IN THE IMMEDIATE TERMINATION OF THE EMBED AND REMOVAL FROM THE AOR. THESE GROUND RULES RECOGNIZE THE RIGHT OF THE MEDIA TO COVER MILITARY OPERATIONS AND ARE IN NO WAY INTENDED TO PREVENT RELEASE OF DEROGATORY, EMBARRASSING, NEGATIVE OR UNCOMPLIMENTARY INFORMATION. ANY MODIFICATION TO THE STANDARD GROUND RULES WILL BE FORWARDED THROUGH THE PA

CHANNELS TO CENTCOM/PA FOR APPROVAL. STANDARD GROUND RULES
ARE:

4.A. ALL INTERVIEWS WITH SERVICE MEMBERS WILL BE ON THE RECORD.
SECURITY AT THE SOURCE IS THE POLICY. INTERVIEWS WITH PILOTS
AND AIRCREW MEMBERS ARE AUTHORIZED UPON COMPLETION OF
MISSIONS; HOWEVER, RELEASE OF INFORMATION MUST CONFORM TO
THESE MEDIA GROUND RULES.
4.B. PRINT OR BROADCAST STORIES WILL BE DATELINED ACCORDING TO
LOCAL GROUND RULES. LOCAL GROUND RULES WILL BE COORDINATED
THROUGH COMMAND CHANNELS WITH CENTCOM.

4.C. MEDIA EMBEDDED WITH U.S. FORCES ARE NOT PERMITTED TO CARRY
PERSONAL FIREARMS.

4.D. LIGHT DISCIPLINE RESTRICTIONS WILL BE FOLLOWED. VISIBLE
LIGHT SOURCES, INCLUDING FLASH OR TELEVISION LIGHTS, FLASH
CAMERAS WILL NOT BE USED WHEN OPERATING WITH FORCES AT NIGHT
UNLESS SPECIFICALLY APPROVED IN ADVANCE BY THE ON-SCENE
COMMANDER.

4.E. EMBARGOES MAY BE IMPOSED TO PROTECT OPERATIONAL SECURITY.
EMBARGOES WILL ONLY BE USED FOR OPERATIONAL SECURITY AND
WILL BE LIFTED AS SOON AS THE OPERATIONAL SECURITY ISSUE HAS
PASSED.

4.F. THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES OF INFORMATION ARE RELEASABLE.

4.F.1. APPROXIMATE FRIENDLY FORCE STRENGTH FIGURES.

4.F.2. APPROXIMATE FRIENDLY CASUALTY FIGURES BY SERVICE.
EMBEDDED MEDIA MAY, WITHIN OPSEC LIMITS, CONFIRM UNIT
CASUALTIES THEY HAVE WITNESSED.

4.F.3. CONFIRMED FIGURES OF ENEMY PERSONNEL DETAINED OR
CAPTURED.

4.F.4. SIZE OF FRIENDLY FORCE PARTICIPATING IN AN ACTION OR
OPERATION CAN BE DISCLOSED USING APPROXIMATE TERMS. SPECIFIC
FORCE OR UNIT IDENTIFICATION MAY BE RELEASED WHEN IT NO LONGER
WARRANTS SECURITY PROTECTION.

4.F.5. INFORMATION AND LOCATION OF MILITARY TARGETS AND
OBJECTIVES PREVIOUSLY UNDER ATTACK.

4.F.6. GENERIC DESCRIPTION OF ORIGIN OF AIR OPERATIONS, SUCH AS
"LAND-BASED."

4.F.7. DATE, TIME OR LOCATION OF PREVIOUS CONVENTIONAL MILITARY MISSIONS AND ACTIONS, AS WELL AS MISSION RESULTS ARE RELEASABLE ONLY IF DESCRIBED IN GENERAL TERMS.

4.F.8. TYPES OF ORDNANCE EXPENDED IN GENERAL TERMS.

4.F.9. NUMBER OF AERIAL COMBAT OR RECONNAISSANCE MISSIONS OR SORTIES FLOWN IN CENTCOM'S AREA OF OPERATION.

4.F.10. TYPE OF FORCES INVOLVED (E.G., AIR DEFENSE, INFANTRY, ARMOR, MARINES).

4.F.11. ALLIED PARTICIPATION BY TYPE OF OPERATION (SHIPS, AIRCRAFT, GROUND UNITS, ETC.) AFTER APPROVAL OF THE ALLIED UNIT COMMANDER.

4.F.12. OPERATION CODE NAMES.

4.F.13. NAMES AND HOMETOWNS OF U.S. MILITARY UNITS.

4.F.14. SERVICE MEMBERS' NAMES AND HOME TOWNS WITH THE INDIVIDUALS' CONSENT.

4.G. THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES OF INFORMATION ARE NOT RELEASABLE SINCE THEIR PUBLICATION OR BROADCAST COULD JEOPARDIZE OPERATIONS AND ENDANGER LIVES.

4.G.1. SPECIFIC NUMBER OF TROOPS IN UNITS BELOW CORPS/MEF LEVEL.

4.G.2. SPECIFIC NUMBER OF AIRCRAFT IN UNITS AT OR BELOW THE AIR EXPEDITIONARY WING LEVEL.

4.G.3. SPECIFIC NUMBERS REGARDING OTHER EQUIPMENT OR CRITICAL SUPPLIES (E.G. ARTILLERY, TANKS, LANDING CRAFT, RADARS, TRUCKS, WATER, ETC.).

4.G.4. SPECIFIC NUMBERS OF SHIPS IN UNITS BELOW THE CARRIER BATTLE GROUP LEVEL.

4.G.5. NAMES OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS OR SPECIFIC GEOGRAPHIC LOCATIONS OF MILITARY UNITS IN THE CENTCOM AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY, UNLESS SPECIFICALLY RELEASED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OR AUTHORIZED BY THE CENTCOM COMMANDER. NEWS AND IMAGERY PRODUCTS THAT IDENTIFY OR INCLUDE IDENTIFIABLE FEATURES OF THESE LOCATIONS ARE NOT AUTHORIZED FOR RELEASE.

4.G.6. INFORMATION REGARDING FUTURE OPERATIONS.

4.G.7. INFORMATION REGARDING FORCE PROTECTION MEASURES AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS OR ENCAMPMENTS (EXCEPT THOSE WHICH ARE VISIBLE OR READILY APPARENT).

4.G.8. PHOTOGRAPHY SHOWING LEVEL OF SECURITY AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS OR ENCAMPMENTS.

4.G.9. RULES OF ENGAGEMENT.

4.G.10. INFORMATION ON INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES COMPROMISING TACTICS, TECHNIQUES OR PROCEDURES.

4.G.11. EXTRA PRECAUTIONS IN REPORTING WILL BE REQUIRED AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF HOSTILITIES TO MAXIMIZE OPERATIONAL SURPRISE. LIVE BROADCASTS FROM AIRFIELDS, ON THE GROUND OR AFLOAT, BY EMBEDDED MEDIA ARE PROHIBITED UNTIL THE SAFE RETURN OF THE INITIAL STRIKE PACKAGE OR UNTIL AUTHORIZED BY THE UNIT COMMANDER.

4.G.12. DURING AN OPERATION, SPECIFIC INFORMATION ON FRIENDLY FORCE TROOP MOVEMENTS, TACTICAL DEPLOYMENTS, AND DISPOSITIONS THAT WOULD JEOPARDIZE OPERATIONAL SECURITY OR LIVES. INFORMATION ON ON-GOING ENGAGEMENTS WILL NOT BE RELEASED UNLESS AUTHORIZED FOR RELEASE BY ON-SCENE COMMANDER.

4.G.13. INFORMATION ON SPECIAL OPERATIONS UNITS, UNIQUE OPERATIONS METHODOLOGY OR TACTICS, FOR EXAMPLE, AIR OPERATIONS, ANGLES OF ATTACK, AND SPEEDS; NAVAL TACTICAL OR EVASIVE MANEUVERS, ETC. GENERAL TERMS SUCH AS "LOW" OR "FAST" MAY BE USED.

4.G.14. INFORMATION ON EFFECTIVENESS OF ENEMY ELECTRONIC WARFARE.

4.G.15. INFORMATION IDENTIFYING POSTPONED OR CANCELED OPERATIONS.

4.G.16. INFORMATION ON MISSING OR DOWNED AIRCRAFT OR MISSING VESSELS WHILE SEARCH AND RESCUE AND RECOVERY OPERATIONS ARE BEING PLANNED OR UNDERWAY.

4.G.17. INFORMATION ON EFFECTIVENESS OF ENEMY CAMOUFLAGE,

COVER, DECEPTION, TARGETING, DIRECT AND INDIRECT FIRE, INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION, OR SECURITY MEASURES.

4.G.18. NO PHOTOGRAPHS OR OTHER VISUAL MEDIA SHOWING AN ENEMY PRISONER OF WAR OR DETAINEE'S RECOGNIZABLE FACE, NAMETAG OR OTHER IDENTIFYING FEATURE OR ITEM MAY BE TAKEN.

4.G.19. STILL OR VIDEO IMAGERY OF CUSTODY OPERATIONS OR INTERVIEWS WITH PERSONS UNDER CUSTODY.

4.H. THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES AND POLICIES APPLY TO COVERAGE OF WOUNDED, INJURED, AND ILL PERSONNEL:

4.H.1. MEDIA REPRESENTATIVES WILL BE REMINDED OF THE SENSITIVITY OF USING NAMES OF INDIVIDUAL CASUALTIES OR PHOTOGRAPHS THEY MAY HAVE TAKEN WHICH CLEARLY IDENTIFY CASUALTIES UNTIL AFTER NOTIFICATION OF THE NOK AND RELEASE BY OASD(PA).

4.H.2. BATTLEFIELD CASUALTIES MAY BE COVERED BY EMBEDDED MEDIA AS LONG AS THE SERVICE MEMBER'S IDENTITY IS PROTECTED FROM DISCLOSURE FOR 72 HOURS OR UPON VERIFICATION OF NOK NOTIFICATION, WHICHEVER IS FIRST.

4.H.3. MEDIA VISITS TO MEDICAL FACILITIES WILL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPLICABLE REGULATIONS, STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES, OPERATIONS ORDERS AND INSTRUCTIONS BY ATTENDING PHYSICIANS. IF APPROVED, SERVICE OR MEDICAL FACILITY PERSONNEL MUST ESCORT MEDIA AT ALL TIMES.

4.H.4. PATIENT WELFARE, PATIENT PRIVACY, AND NEXT OF KIN/FAMILY CONSIDERATIONS ARE THE GOVERNING CONCERNS ABOUT NEWS MEDIA COVERAGE OF WOUNDED, INJURED, AND ILL PERSONNEL IN MEDICAL TREATMENT FACILITIES OR OTHER CASUALTY COLLECTION AND TREATMENT LOCATIONS.

4.H.5. MEDIA VISITS ARE AUTHORIZED TO MEDICAL CARE FACILITIES, BUT MUST BE APPROVED BY THE MEDICAL FACILITY COMMANDER AND ATTENDING PHYSICIAN AND MUST NOT INTERFERE WITH MEDICAL TREATMENT. REQUESTS TO VISIT MEDICAL CARE FACILITIES OUTSIDE THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES WILL BE COORDINATED BY THE UNIFIED COMMAND PA.

4.H.6. REPORTERS MAY VISIT THOSE AREAS DESIGNATED BY THE FACILITY COMMANDER, BUT WILL NOT BE ALLOWED IN OPERATING ROOMS DURING OPERATING PROCEDURES.

4.H.7. PERMISSION TO INTERVIEW OR PHOTOGRAPH A PATIENT WILL BE GRANTED ONLY WITH THE CONSENT OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN OR FACILITY COMMANDER AND WITH THE PATIENT'S INFORMED CONSENT, WITNESSED BY THE ESCORT.

4.H.8. "INFORMED CONSENT" MEANS THE PATIENT UNDERSTANDS HIS OR HER PICTURE AND COMMENTS ARE BEING COLLECTED FOR NEWS MEDIA PURPOSES AND THEY MAY APPEAR NATIONWIDE IN NEWS MEDIA REPORTS.

4.H.9. THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN OR ESCORT SHOULD ADVISE THE SERVICE MEMBER IF NOK HAVE BEEN NOTIFIED.

5. IMMUNIZATIONS AND PERSONAL PROTECTIVE GEAR.

5.A. MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS SHOULD ENSURE THAT MEDIA ARE PROPERLY IMMUNIZED BEFORE EMBEDDING WITH UNITS. THE CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL (CDC)-RECOMMENDED IMMUNIZATIONS FOR DEPLOYMENT TO THE MIDDLE EAST INCLUDE HEPATITIS A; HEPATITIS B; RABIES; TETANUSDIPHTHERIA; AND TYPHOID. THE CDC RECOMMENDS MENINGOCOCCAL IMMUNIZATIONS FOR VISITORS TO MECCA. IF TRAVELING TO CERTAIN AREAS IN THE CENTCOM AOR, THE CDC RECOMMENDS TAKING PRESCRIPTION ANTIMALARIAL DRUGS. ANTHRAX AND SMALLPOX VACCINES WILL BE PROVIDED TO THE MEDIA AT NO EXPENSE TO THE GOVERNMENT (THE MEDIA OUTLET WILL BEAR THE EXPENSE). FOR MORE HEALTH INFORMATION FOR TRAVELERS TO THE MIDDLE EAST, GO TO THE CDC WEB SITE AT HTTP://WWW.CDC.GOV/TRAVEL/MIDEAST.HTM.

5.B. BECAUSE THE USE OF PERSONAL PROTECTIVE GEAR, SUCH AS HELMETS OR FLAK VESTS, IS BOTH A PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL CHOICE, MEDIA WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PROCURING/USING SUCH EQUIPMENT. PERSONAL PROTECTIVE GEAR, AS WELL AS CLOTHING, WILL BE SUBDUED IN COLOR AND APPEARANCE.

5.C. EMBEDDED MEDIA ARE AUTHORIZED AND REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED WITH, ON A TEMPORARY LOAN BASIS, NUCLEAR, BIOLOGICAL, CHEMICAL (NBC) PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT BY THE UNIT WITH WHICH THEY ARE EMBEDDED. UNIT PERSONNEL WILL PROVIDE BASIC INSTRUCTION IN THE PROPER WEAR, USE, AND MAINTENANCE OF THE EQUIPMENT. UPON TERMINATION OF THE EMBED, INITIATED BY EITHER PARTY, THE NBC EQUIPMENT SHALL BE RETURNED TO THE EMBEDDING UNIT. IF SUFFICIENT NBC PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT IS NOT AVAILABLE FOR EMBEDDED MEDIA, COMMANDERS MAY PURCHASE ADDITIONAL EQUIPMENT, WITH FUNDS NORMALLY AVAILABLE FOR THAT PURPOSE,

AND LOAN IT TO EMBEDDED MEDIA IN ACCORDANCE WITH THIS
PARAGRAPH.

6. SECURITY

6.A. MEDIA PRODUCTS WILL NOT BE SUBJECT TO SECURITY REVIEW OR
CENSORSHIP EXCEPT AS INDICATED IN PARA. 6.A.1. SECURITY AT THE
SOURCE WILL BE THE RULE. U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL SHALL PROTECT
CLASSIFIED INFORMATION FROM UNAUTHORIZED OR INADVERTENT
DISCLOSURE. MEDIA PROVIDED ACCESS TO SENSITIVE INFORMATION,
INFORMATION WHICH IS NOT CLASSIFIED BUT WHICH MAY BE OF
OPERATIONAL VALUE TO AN ADVERSARY OR WHEN COMBINED WITH
OTHER UNCLASSIFIED INFORMATION MAY REVEAL CLASSIFIED
INFORMATION, WILL BE INFORMED IN ADVANCE BY THE UNIT
COMMANDER OR HIS/HER DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
RESTRICTIONS ON THE USE OR DISCLOSURE OF SUCH INFORMATION.
WHEN IN DOUBT, MEDIA WILL CONSULT WITH THE UNIT COMMANDER OR
HIS/HER DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE.

6.A.1. THE NATURE OF THE EMBEDDING PROCESS MAY INVOLVE
OBSERVATION OF SENSITIVE INFORMATION, INCLUDING TROOP
MOVEMENTS, BATTLE PREPARATIONS, MATERIEL CAPABILITIES AND
VULNERABILITIES AND OTHER INFORMATION AS LISTED IN PARA. 4.G.
WHEN A COMMANDER OR HIS/HER DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE HAS
REASON TO BELIEVE THAT A MEDIA MEMBER WILL HAVE ACCESS TO THIS
TYPE OF SENSITIVE INFORMATION, PRIOR TO ALLOWING SUCH ACCESS,
HE/SHE WILL TAKE PRUDENT PRECAUTIONS TO ENSURE THE SECURITY OF
THAT INFORMATION. THE PRIMARY SAFEGUARD WILL BE TO BRIEF MEDIA
IN ADVANCE ABOUT WHAT INFORMATION IS SENSITIVE AND WHAT THE
PARAMETERS ARE FOR COVERING THIS TYPE OF INFORMATION. IF MEDIA
ARE INADVERTENTLY EXPOSED TO SENSITIVE INFORMATION THEY
SHOULD BE BRIEFED AFTER EXPOSURE ON WHAT INFORMATION THEY
SHOULD AVOID COVERING. IN INSTANCES WHERE A UNIT COMMANDER
OR THE DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE DETERMINES THAT COVERAGE OF
A STORY WILL INVOLVE EXPOSURE TO SENSITIVE INFORMATION BEYOND
THE SCOPE OF WHAT MAY BE PROTECTED BY PREBRIEFING OR
DEBRIEFING, BUT COVERAGE OF WHICH IS IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE
DOD, THE COMMANDER MAY OFFER ACCESS IF THE REPORTER AGREES TO
A SECURITY REVIEW OF THEIR COVERAGE. AGREEMENT TO SECURITY
REVIEW IN EXCHANGE FOR THIS TYPE OF ACCESS MUST BE STRICTLY
VOLUNTARY AND IF THE REPORTER DOES NOT AGREE, THEN ACCESS MAY
NOT BE GRANTED. IF A SECURITY REVIEW IS AGREED TO, IT WILL NOT
INVOLVE ANY EDITORIAL CHANGES; IT WILL BE CONDUCTED SOLELY TO
ENSURE THAT NO SENSITIVE OR CLASSIFIED INFORMATION IS INCLUDED
IN THE PRODUCT. IF SUCH INFORMATION IS FOUND, THE MEDIA WILL BE
ASKED TO REMOVE THAT INFORMATION FROM THE PRODUCT AND/OR

EMBARGO THE PRODUCT UNTIL SUCH INFORMATION IS NO LONGER CLASSIFIED OR SENSITIVE. REVIEWS ARE TO BE DONE AS SOON AS PRACTICAL SO AS NOT TO INTERRUPT COMBAT OPERATIONS NOR DELAY REPORTING. IF THERE ARE DISPUTES RESULTING FROM THE SECURITY REVIEW PROCESS THEY MAY BE APPEALED THROUGH THE CHAIN OF COMMAND, OR THROUGH PA CHANNELS TO OASD/PA. THIS PARAGRAPH DOES NOT AUTHORIZE COMMANDERS TO ALLOW MEDIA ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

6.A.2. MEDIA PRODUCTS WILL NOT BE CONFISCATED OR OTHERWISE IMPOUNDED. IF IT IS BELIEVED THAT CLASSIFIED INFORMATION HAS BEEN COMPROMISED AND THE MEDIA REPRESENTATIVE REFUSES TO REMOVE THAT INFORMATION NOTIFY THE CPIC AND/OR OASD/PA AS SOON AS POSSIBLE SO THE ISSUE MAY BE ADDRESSED WITH THE MEDIA ORGANIZATION'S MANAGEMENT.

7. MISCELLANEOUS/COORDINATING INSTRUCTIONS:

7.A. OASD(PA) IS THE INITIAL EMBED AUTHORITY. EMBEDDING PROCEDURES AND ASSIGNMENT AUTHORITY MAY BE TRANSFERRED TO CENTCOM PA AT A LATER DATE. THIS AUTHORITY MAY BE FURTHER DELEGATED AT CENTCOM'S DISCRETION.

7.B. THIS GUIDANCE AUTHORIZES BLANKET APPROVAL FOR NON-LOCAL AND LOCAL MEDIA TRAVEL ABOARD DOD AIRLIFT FOR ALL EMBEDDED MEDIA ON A NO-COST, SPACE AVAILABLE BASIS. NO ADDITIONAL COSTS SHALL BE INCURRED BY THE GOVERNMENT TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE IAW DODI 5410.15, PARA 3.4.

7.C. USE OF LIPSTICK AND HELMET-MOUNTED CAMERAS ON COMBAT SORTIES IS APPROVED AND ENCOURAGED TO THE GREATEST EXTENT POSSIBLE.

8. OASD(PA) POC FOR EMBEDDING MEDIA IS MAJ TIM BLAIR, DSN 227-1253, CMCL 703-697-1253, EMAIL TIMOTHY.BLAIR@OSD.MIL.

## APPENDIX C
## RESEARCHER'S MILITARY BIOGRAPHY

**Captain David Westover**

Capt. Westover is an active duty U.S. Air Force public affairs officer, currently assigned to the University of Florida. He is in his second-year of the master's degree program in public relations and will be completing his thesis in the Spring of 2004.

Prior to his current assignment, Capt. Westover served as a media relations officer at the Air Force Press Desk, Pentagon, Washington, DC from July 1999 to July 2002. He was responsible for coordinating all media relations activities for senior Air Force leaders including the Under Secretary of the Air Force, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel and the Deputy Chief of Staff for Installations and Logistics. His daily responsibilities included responding to national media queries, providing guidance to senior Air Force leaders on media issues, facilitating media interview requests, and designing and executing communication strategies to reach both internal and external audiences.

Prior to his assignment in Washington, Capt. Westover served as the Deputy Chief of Public Affairs at Dover Air Force Base, Delaware from March 1997-July 1999. During this assignment, he managed Dover AFB's weekly, 28-page newspaper, established Dover's first electronic news website and operated Dover Team TV, the commander's access channel. While assigned at Dover AFB, he deployed to Incirlik Air Base, Turkey, in support of Operation Northern Watch. He served as a media relations officer working with national and international media including CBS Evening News, Reuters and

Aviation Week, to help shape the news coverage of the U.S. Air Force's patrol of the no-fly zone in Northern Iraq.

Capt Westover's first enlisted in the Air Force in October 1984 and served 3 ½ years active duty as a graphic arts specialist at Blytheville AFB, Arkansas. During this assignment, he earned as Associates of Arts degree in audio-visual production from the Community College of the Air Force. After an honorable discharge, he worked in the graphic arts and printing industry, while performing part-time as a musician.

In May of 1996, Capt. Westover earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in radio/television at Penn State University and was commissioned a second lieutenant upon completion of the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps program. His first assignment upon re-entering active duty was is the recruiting capacity as the AFROTC Regional Director of Admissions at the Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, NY. In May 1997, Capt. Westover graduated from the Defense Information School's Public Affairs Officer Course at Fort Meade, Maryland. He also completed Squadron Officer School at Maxwell AFB, Alabama in December 2001.

# LIST OF REFERENCES

Baroody, J. (1998). *Media access and the military: The case of the Gulf War*. Lantham, MD: University Press of America, Inc.

Broom, G., Casey, S., & Ritchey, J. (2000). Toward a concept and theory of organization-public relationships: An update. In J. Ledingham & S. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to public relations* (pp. 3-22). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Bruning, S., & Ledingham, J. (1999). Relationship between organizations and publics: Development of a multi-dimensional organization-public relationship scale. *Public Relations Review 25*(2), 157-170.

Calloway, L. (1994). High tech comes to war coverage: Uses of information and communications technology for television coverage in the Gulf War. In T. McCain & L. Shyles (Eds.), *The 1,000 hour war: Communication in the Gulf* (pp. 55-72). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Creswell, J. (1988). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Daymon, C., & Holloway, I. (2002). *Qualitative research methods in public relations and marketing communications*. London: Routledge.

Davidson, T. (2003). The power of "we"–How embedding reporters strengthens U.S. military strategy. National Defense University--National War College paper received via e-mail correspondence, Sept. 30.

DeFrank, J. (1996). *News from Hell before breakfast: The clash of military and media cultures during the Persian Gulf War*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Anaheim, CA.

Dennis, E., Stebenne, D., Pavik, J., Thalhimer, M., LaMay, C., Smillie, D., FitzSimon, M., Gazsi, S., & Rachin, S. (1991) *The media at war: The press and the Persian Gulf conflict*. New York, NY: Gannett Foundation.

Dugan, M. (1992). Generals versus journalists. In H. Smith (Ed.) *The Media and the Gulf War: The Press and Democracy in Wartime* (pp. 60-62). Foreign Policy Institute of the School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University. Washington, DC: Seven Locks Press.

Ehling, W. (1992). Estimating the value of public relations and communication to an organization. In J. Grunig, D. Dozier, W. Ehling, L. Grunig, F. Repper, & J. White (Eds.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Esposito S., & Koch, S. (2000) "Relationship and the evolution of network news" in J. Ledingham & S. Bruning (Eds.) *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to public relations* (pp. 221-238). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Ferguson, M. (1984). *Building theory in public relations: interorganizational relationships as a public relations paradigm.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Gainesville, FL.

Getler, M. (1992). Do Americans really want to censor war coverage this way? In H. Smith (Ed.) *The Media and the Gulf War: The Press and Democracy in Wartime* (pp. 160-167). Foreign Policy Institute of the School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University. Washington, D.C.: Seven Locks Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Grunig, L., Grunig, J., & Ehling, W. (1992). What is an effective organization? In J. Grunig, D. Dozier, W. Ehling, L. Grunig, F. Repper, & J. White (Eds.) *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 65-90). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Hon, L., & Grunig, J. (1999). *Measuring relationships in public relations.* Paper presented to the Institute for Public Relations, Gainesville, FL.

Huang. Y. (1998). *Public relations strategies and organization-public relationships.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Baltimore, MD.

Janesick. V. (2000). The dance of qualitative research design: Metaphor, methodolatry, and meaning. In M. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 379-399). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kellner, D. (1993). The crisis in the Gulf and the lack of critical media discourse. In B. Greenberg & W. Gantz (Eds.), *Desert Storm and the mass media* (pp. 37-43). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.

Kvale, S. (1996) *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviews.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ledingham, J. (2003). Explicating relationship management as a general theory of public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 15*(2), 181-198.

Ledingham, J., & Bruning, S. (1998). Relationship management in public relations: Dimensions of an organizational-public relationship. *Public Relations Review, 24*(1), 55-65.

Lee, J. (2003). *Media relations in Korea: Cheong between journalist and PR practitioner.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication. Kansas City, MO.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In M. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Louw, E. (2003). The war against terrorism: A public relations challenge for the Pentagon. *Gazette: The International Journal for Communication Studies, 65*(3), 211-230.

MacArthur, J. (1993). *Second front: Censorship and propaganda in the Gulf War.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Pavlik, J., & Thalhimer, M. (1991). The charge of the e-mail brigade: News technology comes of age. In C. LaMay, M. FitzSimon & J. Sahadi (Eds.) *The media at war: The press and the Persian Gulf conflict.* New York, NY: Gannett Foundation.

Sidle, W. (1992). Testimony before the U.S. Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs. In H. Smith (Ed.), *The media and the Gulf War: The press and democracy in wartime* (pp. 105-110). Foreign Policy Institute of the School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University. Washington, DC: Seven Locks Press.

Small, W. (1994). The Gulf War: Mass media coverage and restraints. In T. McCain & L. Shyles (Eds.), *The 1,000 hour war: Communication in the Gulf* (pp. 3-17). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Smith, H. (1992). *The media and the Gulf War: The press and democracy in wartime.* Foreign Policy Institute of the School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University. Washington, DC: Seven Locks Press.

Stebenne, D. (1991). The military and the media: The Gulf conflict in historical perspective. In C. LaMay, M. FitzSimon & J. Sahadi (Eds.), *The media at war: The press and the Persian Gulf conflict* (pp. 8-25). New York, NY: Gannett Foundation.

Taylor, P. (1992). *War and the media.* Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Toth, E. (2000). From personal influence to interpersonal influence: A model for relationship management. In J. Ledingham & S. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to public relations* (pp. 205-219). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Venable, B. (2002, January-February). The Army and the media. *Military Review,* pp. 66-71.

Williams, P. (1992). Excerpts from remarks to the National Press Club. In H. Smith (Ed.), *The media and the Gulf War: The press and democracy in wartime* (pp. 168-191). Foreign Policy Institute of the School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University. Washington, DC: Seven Locks Press.

Zorthian, B. (1992). Statement before the U.S. Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs. In H. Smith (Ed.), *The media and the Gulf War: The press and democracy in wartime* (pp. 101-104). Washington, DC: Seven Locks Press.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

David S. Westover, Jr. earned a Master of Arts in Mass Communication degree

specializing in public relations at the University of Florida in 2004. He completed his

Bachelor of Arts degree in broadcast/cable-telecommunications at Pennsylvania State

University in 1996. He is an active duty Air Force public affairs officer currently serving

at the rank of Captain.