Initial Review Meeting

* Clausewitz talks about the theory of war, he saying it his his theory of absolute war. He's saying that if we take away all the human factors, If we take away the politics, if we take away vested interests. If we take away elite. Interest, the world that we are left with is absolute war. The perf
* But then he goes on to talk about real war, which is all about politics, elite interests and so on and so forth.
* Chance. That's a separate thing that's got nothing to do with this. Chance comes in later. Chance is linked with the next point. I'm going to try and make. I'm bringing him to the point that you have very, uh. Sort of.
* Literally just brushed over in your introductory chapter without analyzing it, because that almost provides you the foundation of your thesis. It gives you why everyone makes very simplistic predictive models.
* What clause which says is that in the context of a clash of forces.
* There are two things at work. There is the the physical force. And there is the moral force.
* He says that that if we take away all of the human factors, leadership, morale will. Determination. If we take away those, then we are the side which has. Greater superiority in numbers Will succeed. Am I right?
* You mentioned it, but you missed out the point that that is his way of thinking. He's thinking like Isaac Newton. He's thinking like the perfect war because he says that in order to understand real war, you first have to talk about perfect world. So he's talking about the most mechanical way of predicting the outcome of the battle. Then he qualifies it by saying that if you have overwhelming numbers. It doesn't matter what your strategy is. It doesn't matter if you're morale is good enough or not. Because numbers at the end of the day will will succeed, and that is the American model of war.
* What the Americans do is, well, let's take away the morale factors because we didn't do too well in Vietnam. We didn't do too well in Korea. You know, we one of Second World War because we had overwhelming numbers.
* We went 10 to one against our enemy and we succeeded. So the Americans continue to think in that line that you put 10 times the firepower. 10 times the combat force off your opponent, you're likely to succeed even with the rubbish strategy.
* No outcomes of places like Afghanistan of places like Libya, places like Iraq have demonstrated a flaw in this way of thinking.
* This western model of war has been flawed by people in slippers with nothing more than knives and and machine guns. Right. Why has it been flawed?
* At that, I think is where your problem statement sets. You skim over it and you miss this point.
* So you will have to do obviously correct me as we go forward.
* The other thing I think you might want to put in here is because all of this is dated, you see, but if you look at the 2003 British Defence doctrine BDD one, yeah, there's a new one that version out, but it was introduced in in the first branch defence doctrine where it talks about combat power. And and that is a really important.
* Component for your research to to link it to the contemporary times and with with a military that follows a particular philosophy theory in use, if you will, so they argue.
* The in the British defence doctrine. They argue that combat power is the product of Physical component. These are four says equipment, logistics. Although those physical things that make up a military.
* Uh, it is then a component of the the next component in there is the intellectual component of fighting power. The intellectual component is knowing how to fight.
* Having good doctrines, having good tactics, having good procedures.Supported by a propane. These are the ad supported by an appropriate strategy.
* Right. And then you have the moral component of fighting power.
* And the model component is is good leadership.
* At the will to fight.
* OK, but it does not quantify it. So you have now got one more foundation to support your thesis that while we quantify using other means.
* The BDD identifies the moral component as a significant. Element of fighting power.
* OK. And my argument is that if I was given a soldier. Who had the best training and the best equipment? Knew exactly how to use it, but had no will to fight. I would not take that soldier in battle with me. But if I was given a soldier. That Was ill disciplined. Did not have the proper equipment and had limited or no training. What was crazy enough to go and launch himself in battle? I would take that.
* I would take that soldier because no amount of equipment and no amount of training compensates for a lack of will to fight.
* Yeah. So so I think that is the British defence doctrine. Also, you need to include in your in your in your analysis because it's the only Sort of theoretical foundation that you get from a practitioner perspective because everybody else is a theorist. You know Lancaster boy clothes with sunsu. They're all as far as we know, they're all theorists. Yeah, none of them were successful commanders.
* Yeah. So you've got one example. The other one you need to consider is the elements of fighting power.
* The elements of fighting power in the in in at an operational level or man machine materials and time.
* OK, but the Americans ignore leadership. Similarly, if you look at the elements of of national power, they are diplomacy, information, military instruments, and and the economic instruments. Yeah, I think they they have qualified it with with the with something else. These days I've got. I've got to have a look at it, but also the, the, the national culture. If a in my view.
* Culture should be in there. If you don't have the cultural will or you haven't demonstrated the ability to to fight, then no amount of of economic power and so on will help you.
* Scope: So what you're essentially doing is the opposite of what Lancaster did.
* What you're saying is that you will assume that the the you take for granted or you you, you, the, the, the literature that has been developed on the quantifiable impacts of on war outcome.
* OK, so you're not going to discuss those, you are going to look at the, the qualitative opponents of so rephrase it in that manner?
* So what you're trying to say is that you're not challenging Lancaster. You were saying that his work is complete. You depois work, is incomplete. They talk about things that we can reduce the numbers.
* And and then they they they are, or rather things that that are quantifiable have been identified. In other words force ratios and and and you know even in Dubois case he does go a little bit qualitative as well you've got to to recognize his QJM is built on on, on a more uh it is still quantified but it try he tries to quantify.
* Training. He does have a if I remember from my staff college days when we used to do the QJM model and and feed numbers in you fed in the quality of training as a ratio comparing VR that much better than the other side, yes.
* G: Did he gives some values
* But you said that it so he does take that into account, but it's highly subjective. That's where his numbers make no sense.
* Because I can always be, I can always say that, you know, in, in, in the in the context of my country and my enemy, our training is better and there we are, two to one in terms of training standards.
* But what about the superior strategy? So if you look at the example, you can use here is that of the Battle of France. So in the Battle of France are very small army defeated the French and the British? Guderian's pincer. He didn't do it through superiority in numbers. By all predictions or force ratios, Guderian should not have even managed to move 10 feet into frogs. Yeah, it was the fastest population capitulation of a country that we know of. So what had actually happened was through superior tactics. Guderian managed to get the British Expeditionary Force up in Dunkirk. They voluntarily went there. And they put themselves in a position where they had no influence on the rest of the war. He managed to pull the French central reserve into the South. Into an area where he wasn't planning to do anything. And that force never played any role in the rest of the war. And with the empty center, he drove through. And then all he did was with very small forces, make sure that these forces that have been in strategy language dislocated on either side of the of the of the actual theater. On the flags of the theater cannot come back. So this is a combination of superior strategy and morale. So all of these examples you see it belong in your introduction.
* They belong in your introduction with some reference of numbers that you know the the French total forces and the British combined. This was the strength, this was the number of weapons and so on. This is how much force Guderian brought, but the outcome was Guderian won, if you had put this into Lancaster equation, you would discover that the the Guderian. If he had used the model of Lancaster, he would never have attempted that war.
* Similarly, Rommel in North Africa was fighting with literally a armored division plus. His Africa corps was not a core, it was, it was the German definition of corps, which is a body of troops. So it was essentially an armored division with a few additional elements. But that armoured division attracted 5 allied corps, a force seven times the strength. At that forced the several times the strength kept running around like idiots all over North Africa. And that's what got Rommel, the name of Desert Fox. It had nothing to do with numbers. It had to do with the moral of his soldiers. Be real leadership. And at element of cunning.
* These are the logics that really provide your thesis the sort of strength it needs in arriving at your research question.
* Problem statement needs a lot of work. It is too thin. It is a two, I think. The simplistic at the moment. And for me it's too descriptive.
* The scope is essentially for you. It is not to be included in the thesis when you finally submit it. So what I would ask you to do is to take the scope out and put it as a piece of paper in front of you. The the purpose of the scope is to draw the lines of what you will not be doing. So would pull out the scope, but it's a very important body of text that you must have and leave it inside as a box for now in your thesis and pull it out when you submit it for your your next review.
* Problem analysis: I read your problem analysis and again. There isn't a problem statement on which it is built. So we will not waste time on the problem analysis today. Alright, because if you can't analyze something that we don't know what we are analyzing. So I don't have your explicit problem statements. We need to rework the research questions and the thesis.
* Only then are we going to be in a position to analyze the problem. The problem analysis has a purpose. The purpose of the problem analysis is to help you shape your literature and your methodology.
* OK, that's the purpose of the problem analysis. But it cannot occur without a problem statement to begin with.

Irfan Ansari

* Quite a number of important points. I mean we're without this problem. They have finish and your aim would not be focused either because if you don't know what your problem that you're going to be looking at, we cannot be a as a sure that the aim is actually applicable says it's very important to understand that the aim also has to be very focused.
* And as part of you objectives, you didn't mention about leadership and. Morale and the outcome of the battle. Do you have an idea at the moment as to how you will be measuring that leadership and morale?
  + Gurkan: In my methodology part I will talk it more in more detail.
  + With qualitative research methodology I will measure these factors with content analysis method. This method will allow me to extract a which nonmaterial factors affect the outcome of the battle and to what degree.
  + I will analyze the relationship between these nonmaterial factors and the outcome of the battle. I will try to extract all this core themes of nonmaterial factors based on leadership and morale.
  + I will use natural language processing tools to achieve this. It is like N vivo.
* İA: OK, so you so you don't, so all your sources of data, the first part of your day, sorry, the first objective is to do with. Number crunching. So that was going to be secondary data. The content analysis is also going to be based on secondary data is I believe, is that right?
  + Right. There is a in place database which is, uh, the United States Army's database and it consists 660 battles, Irfan 660 battles, all quantified the numbers, the weapons. But yeah, as I said in my background part in it, do not material factors lack information, lack data. For example it has like I I made.
  + Play the song battle for example, I gave in the same battle they give all the values of the weapons, numbers, all things, but in the leadership and morale and training part that there is no material factors on the database. But there is no information up to 60 battle has related information on non material factors 90 off 690 barrels. So it it lacks the.
  + The majority it it will not representing it is not representing all the all the battles because it's so less. That's why it is being criticized on the non material part. OK. The model has place in nonmaterial factors but there is no data to support a the any any idea on the non material factors that's why the the Stephen Biddle.
  + For example, use qualitative methods. Basically, he measured the doctrine how much doctrine effects to outcome of the battle. What I will do and which lacks in the literature now, it is basically my problem definition, but I I'd I I I'm not, I couldn't the explicitly right in my introductory chapter. The literature now lacks and doesn't say anything about.
  + Leadership and morale varize outcome of the battle to this degree.
  + This information is not is, is is not included in any study now and this content analysis I will mainly use.
  + And maybe, yeah, I I'm not certain yet. The number of the texts I will use in the model as so I will use some official reports or historical writings of the experts.
  + As a input and I will, I will analyze this input this text with the content analysis.
  + And this analysis will. Also give me all the factors, not only nonmaterial factors. It will also give the importance of two numbers importance of the other factors because I will make a teams core teams and I will make a relationship with the outcome of the battle. But mainly I will I will, I will Uh, analyse leadership and morale factors with this qualitative analysis.
* IA: OK, so your content analysis will be focused. So yes, so your sample for your content analysis will be those 90 bear handles for which you have nonmaterial factors information in that US database.
  + Yeah, absolutely. From 660 battles, which I have quantified data.
  + World War book includes all battles that already includes that database, so I will. For example, I will use that text if 11 text will be that one. The Little Hearts World War One and my my model natural language processing model. Will it take this as input and it will analyze these terms. For example, leader for the leadership terms for example, I will.
  + I will make annotations when you find OK motivation or charismatic leadership or device of better strategy. These are all the the teams that my program will search and we'll make relationship with the outcome of the battle. So the battles that I will use in my qualitative work, we'll be in the will come from the battles which are already. Them analyzed in the quantitative database.
* İA: And and uh, how do you intend to measure morale?
  + Move these are these are Irfan. I'm notating named entities of leadership.
  + I will make you from this point I will explain your question. For example, in my content analysis I will I will I will read, I will search these terms. I will annotate for example, strategy devising of strategy, as if this ad and this will be one named entities own leadership.
  + Other will be calculation of time, space, effect of timing and others. These factors Irfan are are the things that I will annotate and I will I will seek relationship with the outcome of the battle, the these natural language processing is.
  + Jim, letting me to, uh, calculate the effects of these terms with the the dependent variable, how they related with the the this dependent variable. So for the morale I will live it. It will be certain in the literature review part which which factors of morale, for example the spirit of the army is a one can be.
  + It took what will be one term or boldness as closer which says in the from the morale factors, the most important thing is, he says in in his books. The boldness, for example, I I will make this turn boldness. I will take that and I will annotate.
  + And as named entities off morale and like that, there will be maybe 10 to 15 terms, which is related with the morale and my program will detect the relationship of all these terms with the outcome of the battle. And I may say from here.
  + These named entities are coming to hear Irfan.
  + Uh, excuse me from the from the reportes in the first part. I, as I said I will use as input and then we come to 2nd a second step.
  + My old named entities, as I explained you will be grouped in. This process will be grouped.
  + And then when I when I group all these named entities I will I will make a relation extraction. This is the relation extraction is is made with the again natural language processing and machine learning.
  + And it is at it's a mixed a tool, I may say I will make named entity recognition with natural language processing and then.
  + Our two analyze the relationship. I will use machine learning. It's a mathematical model actually actually and and I will. I will uh, extract relationships and then in the final step I will I will build a model. In this model you refund mainly it will say me OK if you detect the Sprint of Army is high. I I'm uh I'm giving you a very simplistic example of that.
  + If you if you detect in the text of input, if you detect the spirit of army was high and the morale was good and the and the soldiers are fat very well or excellent are very well and the something like that, the things if you detect all these terms and make your relationship with the with the outcome of the battle for example the the site who's more more morale is is good.
  + According to the named entities and it will. It will analyze the relationship status with with this terms with the detected terms and it is calculating how many times how many times this term is past, for example. Otherwise of strategy was exemplary. Oh, he detected that term and he detected that that term 2 \* 4 times and he calculates which side he is used.
  + Better than that, better than other side and the model makes it makes this relationship with the outcome of the battle. So my model.
  + We'll give the values do measures of how how much.
  + Yeah, the outcome varies with the inclusion of the named entities I already defined in the beginning of the analysis. So it will, it will be something like that.
* IZ: One is that all of this discussion doesn't belong in introduction. OK, all of this belongs in methodology. But the justification for all of this belongs in the literature. So one is that this is a highly subjective. Model that you're built. It needs Providence. You need to justify that your thinking is on the right lines. Before you can apply this model, you can't just construct inventor model, no matter how convincing it looks, right. Because it's just logic. It's language processing to justify a position, so you can't do that. You got to do it through literature 'cause. You got to have the literature, then you've got to construct the model because you can't do anything beyond that without this sort of initial. Uh, I think the other thing I would strongly recommend is that we have a center called the Center for Simulations and Analytics. OK, you have to remind me I will try and get you in touch with somebody there. It might be maybe Ken MC naught or or or or Jeremy Hilton. I probably think Ken MC naught would be more. appropriate and and have a conversation with him and we might actually ask him to be a associate supervisor.
* On your to make sure that you know the science of modeling is accurate. We can't. We can't fundamentally go wrong in this. It's not my field of expertise. It's not irfan's field of expertise. Alright, so we might need to draw somebody to get you that initial foundation. Right? And then we can continue. Uh, onwards. OK. So please make a make a note of that.
* IZ: I don't think it's needed, you know, because as I said, everything else you're doing after this is you will have a I'm sure you have a well prepared presentation, but it isn't relevant because we still need to define the problem.
* IZ: Did you get my point? It's so I I know you well prepared on this. On your presentation and and so on. But for me it is irrelevant because we might end up, you know, rubbishing all of this once we understand what the problem is. So there's no point in, in, in the discussing that further.
* İA: But it all goes back to Ifti's point of defining the problem. That's the that's the key here. Once we get that sorted, we can develop. We can make sure that the aim is focused and the methodology or however you are going to uh, collect the data and do the justification is also there.
* OK. And and I will go through that document. Uh, more or less, there will be some repetition, but obviously the amount of detail that Irfan and I have given to you orally. Uh, we can't put it down in the in in the hero will write more than your thesis so far. Here to put it on on papers, we will only get pointers in the in the written contents, and I'll share it with you. I will add to it whatever it fan has observed. OK, so let me just show you that.
* OK, so the first thing I notice you change your title. So I'm not sure if I agree with the title. Because this title means nothing to me, effects of leadership and morale on outcome of the battle. OK, it is neither indicative nor catchy, nor does it suggest what might be the content. Yeah. So you've got to ask yourself the again. I go back to the the understanding the problem statement. So once you've got the problem statement, I think, uh, a short title like this is good, but it has to be something. Using words like predicting, measuring of forecasting. Right. And what are you doing? You are working effects of of leadership and morale on combat outcome? On outcome of battle? Yeah, but it's about predicting, measuring and forecasting. It is also about doing it qualitatively as well as quantitatively. Looking at the tangible factors and the intangible factors, so you've got to work with these key terms and construct a title. Don't be scared to have a long title at the start. Because the title you can revise right up to the point of submission. What you can't revise once you get into your half a year into your research is your problem statement. You know the title is just the best language to express the problem statement. And and your answer. But achieving so. OK, so if on what do you think?
* The main body. So just to let you know that I haven't bothered to read your literature review because that's jumping the gun, we are not concerned with the literature review at this stage. We are concerned with introductory chapter.
* **Openning up statements:**
  + Declaratory statements presented as truth. How do you know this? I'm interested the foundations for the knowledge that he is presenting. We need to go something more concrete. And again, relying on literature is critical.
    - Look at the work of RJ Rummel. He's a bit of an eccentric, but but he talks about the theory of war and conflict, and he talks about the linkage between war and conflict. In my PhD in there, there is a a whole chapter on this right.
    - Look: Great piece of grey literature I can share with you which is from the National Defense University in Islamabad where the the nature of conflict is discussed. OK, so that's something you can also have a have a look at, but there are also more mainstream academic sources that you need to consult. And I've given you an example of those here in the in the text box.
    - We generally refer to conflict of which war is merely a form. So what you're really talking about and your first sentence is conflict.
    - Look at different forms of conflict. Remember, war is becoming more and more a obsolete term.
    - And we're looking for the right label for it. We call it hybrid war, a grave. What is it? Non kinetic warfare and we call it all these funny names. Now we're calling it the Fusion Wars and so on. So these are all labels people are trying to identify because war, as we define it and understand it doesn't happen anymore. Yeah. Look at the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Yes, it is military force coming in, but it's not coming in through war. It's coming in through a more hybrid Model.
    - So you need to get that right first. What are you talking about?
    - Uh, uh, and somewhere I think you might want to use the Taliban as an example because the Taliban, by all predictive analysis, were unknown entity. Yet they managed to get rid of. The US from Afghanistan. No, that will be the test of your predictive model. How does your predictive model in the end explain? Or the success of the Taliban.
    - You know, even if you go by the conspiracy theory that the Taliban were backed by Pakistan and China, the fact is at the end of the day, it was the Taliban fighting. With the same slippers. And and and you know those flabby should close that they wore. Non military appearance and very simplistic weapons.
    - Yet It's not the Taliban that have success succumbed. It's the Americans that have left after 20 years of trying everything from surges, putting their top generals in, you know, portrayals and and crystal and and you name it. They brought him.
    - So that will be your acid test and and something of that nature needs to come in your opening paragraph, something to indicate the complexity of what we're dealing with.
    - OK and not so declaratory, something that you can evidence in in bodies of literature?
    - I'd like to see a lot of references right from the outset.
  + So same thing applies here. I mean, you know you've this is what you've written. How do you know this? And and you need to frame it because this is your shop window. This is your opening opening paragraph.
  + First written: So this is a very dangerous thing to write. Specially as a in the pH D's you make one mistake and your external examiner will go after you and they will rubbish the rest of your work based based on one. Casual mistake. OK, there are older texts because the oldest tax is is car dash for example. Kardashians. Expiry dates, which predates it's written on stone. All right, we've got. We've got a war memoirs and and illustrative guidelines on the conduct of war in the nature of war from Egypt.
  + That predates that predates uh. You know, so you have to be very careful about the choice of words and and every time you make a superfluous superlative comment.
  + Please question yourself that how do I know this? Is this actually correct?
  + Because at this level we are not interested in the flowery Ness of your language.
  + Or because this is journalism for me?
  + You don't want to be a journalist. You want to be an academic, you know, journalists say, oh, it was big. It was powerful. These words have no meaning for me. Big powerful is meaningless. You've got to to support it through evidence, alright.
  + It can't be n.d. because obviously you're not really reading ancient Chinese. So you're reading a translation of his work. So you need to use the date for when the the interpretation or translation that was published.
  + So it it would probably say sunsu, uh, right and and and the date would be from the translated text. But please check what the new API 7 rules are for foresighting translated text. It used to be in a PS6. So you wrote sunsout 19 strive 79 P for 63 to 65 and when we went down to look at the reference you will say sunsu.
  + Griffiths translator, 1917. Sunsu 19. You know, translation by so and so. And that's where you realize that there's a translated text that you're referring to. So you need to work that out.
  + I think this was just a small typo here. It should be on an engagement outcome, not only engagements outcomes so.
  + The other problem is you've got power of resistance in courts here. Now you've got to be very careful when using. Bold text, italics text or any form of. Marking on your body text. I don't know what your quotes mean here. Because I can't read your mind to me, it reads as if this is somebody else is sentence or statement power of resistance that you have borrowed?
  + OK. And you've plugged in here if that is the case, then you need to give the the, the, the put it in quote Marks and and uh and then give reference and location page number or whatever or website point or whatever to indicate what it is if it is not I would suggest please don't put things in bold or with exclamation marks. You know because it it makes no sense all right. It should be running text. You've got three of them here, right? I would suggest paraphrasing would be a better way to take it forward. What was here? I think that was an engagement.
  + Yeah, close with a you've given 1832, so I'm sure you have not read the German original and you've read the translation, so please use the the the the correct reference. OK the text. Because now I will go to page 127 of the original 1918 thirty two document. Which is that what you're trying to refer to? Am I right? Yeah, because I I read German, so I have the German text as well and this is not what is on page 127. So that's the problem. Yeah. Which one are you using? Can I have a look? So that has to be sorted. Now. What you've got here is lots of short paragraphs which are really interconnected. So think about combining them, yeah. So again, here you've got a a sentence that doesn't read very well. It is what we say. Awkward. So it is you. You you can embed the quotes, but they must flow with the reading. You must construct a sentence to make sure the text flow. You can also break up the the the quote in order to allow that flow to be nicer. Alright so you you can paraphrase as we say it in in academia.
  + You've got again, you see you you start off by saying we know that this paragraph is all about clauswitz, but you've got clauswitz repeated three times.
  + Yeah. So, but you say close, which is approach so and so you don't need to write clauswitz again. You can just write down 1832 page 77.
  + Or you can say close Vets 1832 page 77 approach to subject is comprehensive.
  + Yeah, so you need to use a variety of ways to to site.
  + And have a look at what APS 7 allows you to do and use that to do this. Again, you got a fact here with no reference.
  + In the 1900s, I don't know how you got this. Yeah. And what does 1900s mean now? It's one century you're referring to? Yeah, you're you're talking about the 20th century. So that's a long period of time. So I don't know what what that means. And these are things that you know you can't have a a.
  + So these are three paragraphs. I think it could easily combine them.
  + At at in terms of the construction for me, you're already running at a tangent. Now you're going into unnecessary detail without having drawn the audience into the problem that you're trying to. We will shortly rephrase, OK.
  + So you're you're going at a tangent first, yet you haven't defined you haven't. You are not defining the problem here, you are setting the background.
  + And just remember what detail you need in there. So some of this is relevant, it would stay.

Uh, and then the and the rest will will be. So I've put her DOB battle. So is it a particular battle you're talking about or or battle, I'm sure.

No, general. It is wrong.

But again, again, you've got these quote marks, which don't mean anything to me.

If you treat, take them away, it still reads the same, but when you put them in, I get confused. Why is this in courts?

So you've got a lot of these these quotes, so understanding war, history of war. I'm not sure if it's a book. The Convention is, you know, you could just simply say in in the book.

Uh, totally in why? Don't know what totally means here.

You know what this totally mean, right?

Yeah, it's a bug bite.

Yeah. At the Convention for Writing Books is very simple. It is this.

Italics indicates it's the title of a book.

OK, that's all you need to do.

Alright. And and just refine the language a little bit and who is the book by we don't know.

You will have a easy.

Can you imagine us doing this level of detail once we get to once you have 80,000 words, right? So we need to get it right now.

So that doesn't cause with low numbers. Again, I don't know what you mean. Why is it in in and where is the reference? Where is the law of numbers stated? And so on. So again you need to get all of these these sorted OK.

Your boy uh in 19th 8 deploy. 1987 reformulated his combat power of 1979. You see? It reads much nicer, so if you instead of doing this if you wrote.

And if I pick this up?

And I move it here.

Yeah. And if you go here.

You're using mendeley. OK, So what you need to do is you need to suppress author name.

So once you suppress alternating alright uh, there is an option for that. What you will end up with is.

So you will write it like this. Do point 1987, page 30.

He formulated his his combat power. Uh.

Off 1971 nineteen 79.

Yeah. So that is. Can you notice how many words have disappeared?

And it's it reads nicer as well.

OK, so just have a I have a think about how you use references.

You you sent to you. You have one approach. You tend to plant a reference right at the end of a paragraph.

Could justify the entire paragraph and and very soon you know, the examiners will start getting worried. What is he referring to actually?

This whole paragraph.

OK. And it just when you see something like this with each paragraph supported by one reference, one things off, someone who's thinking in silos. So you read one piece of text, you pick it up and paste it with a reference. You read another piece of text, you write a paragraph and paste it with the reference. How about combining the two?

Using both references and making more sense out of it.

Yeah. So it's not about Biddle. It's not about Keanu. It's about Biddle and piano.

I got the point.

Combined with a a sense drawn out of it. So we've got a bit of coke and in there as well now.

In the analysis, OK, so you've got to get get rid of this habit. You do this all the way through. So use Biddle. Biddle. It's a Biddle. And then it's UK Ministry of Defence. And then it's again something you know. And I come to the aim and objective. No one has told me what is the problem statement.

So what I need here is. Problem statement.

GY: It is basically the lack of analysis on leadership and morale. Uh, it is the problem problem to that time it.

IZ: No, no, that is not the problem gurkan the problem you stated very well when you were giving your presentation. The problem is we have a mechanical approach to to understanding the outcomes of combat. We have a highly subjective dupee method of a of of bringing in the model factors in the QJM. But there is no no. US solid model that can account for for the outcome of combat and explain outcomes like the Taliban defeating a superpower.

Or if you bring these examples in your background, you know the historical examples I gave you, you are lacking historical examples in your introduction. So or Guderian defeating an army three times its size and better equipped.

In and and capturing France with all French forces intact.

If you look at the casualties of the Battle of France, they are minimal.

So you need these historical examples in your introduction, I expect to see a very big introductory chapter. To begin with, which we can then trim and shape later on, it must have its foundations in history.

Military history. It must identify the problem. It must make it obvious that here is a problem. Look, Lancaster would have said do pay would have said that the British and French would win in if Germany attacked France. Yeah. Do pay at Lancaster would have said, and so would little that Afghanistan, the the, the, the, the. The Taliban can never triumph.

Yeah. So clearly there's a problem in those those tools that we are applying.

And there is a price for those tools that the Americans walked into Afghanistan based on, on on on models of prediction, predictive models that suggested that Afghanistan, Libya, Iraq or all going to be cakewalks.

They're going to be absolute total victory without any problem.

In each of these cases they have been unsuccessful in achieving the initial war aims.

I want something like this in the beginning.

Yeah. So once you get there, I think we need to have a separate meeting to understand what should be your aim, what should be your objectives, what would be your problem, uh. And then and then the problem analysis, this is of these are sort of pedantic chapters. Your research value I can understand.

Uh, we can talk about those later on, so I'll this portion. I really cannot comment on till I know what the problem is.

The concept of positioning is. Which bodies of literature are you going to look at? So for example, if I look at positioning from a legal perspective. I expect the literature review to produce a lot of legal documents on the war and conflict. I would look at juris production per perspective. Now your positioning is it is so the other way to look at war is IR International because it's a subject in political science within political science. Science is international relations.

Right. So that's another set of positioning, but that's not what you're doing. That's not what you're doing either your positioning is strategy.

Leadership.

Add combat prediction.

Yeah. So these are the bodies of literature. But, you know, predictive models. So you're looking at game theory.

You're looking at A at a, you know.Good.

Outcomes of battle, so you'll need to specify.

Where your datasets.

Board secondary data.

I'm sorry, I should say three areas, your literature, your secondary data, and your primary data. Where do they sit at? That's what positioning does. It tells the reader. And whenever I read somebody's positioning, I go straight away to the bibliography.

And I look at all their titles to justify that positioning.

Are you looking at? I've just marked and M SC dissertation and it's a student. I want her about this ages ago and I asked her to to make sure she never got back to me for supervision. So if you don't come to me, we won't help you. OK, so uh and and in her final thesis, you know, she's talking about looking at the, the, the the problem from a particular lens. But when you look at the literature that the literature of that lens is missing.

So for me, that's a fail. Why? Because you say that you're going to look at it through the the political lens. There is nothing on political science and your literature. So your legs is blind.

So so that is what needs to be done. So get the positioning correct.

Rethink your **research questions**. They're broadly right, but please, Rob, they're very simplistic, very vague and unclear to me.

If you are going to do a quantitative analysis to answer your your research problem or your big research question, then you will have a hypothesis.

The reason I put in the template hypothesis or thesis is you pick one you don't normally have both, OK.

No, I I I I thought on that, Sir. MBTI, have since I have two portion in my research. I thought that OK with the database.

I I'm coming. I'm going to come to that. That's my next point in the in here. OK, that is uh.

This is my point here that is this a wanted qualitative quantitative or mixed. So what you are suggesting to me is a mixed research, right mixed methods now if it is a mixed methods research then right at the in the at the end of your your problem statement.

Uh, you should give a little bit of an indicator of how you're going to approach the problem, so you can you can simply say that this is or you can do it in later on in your research design that this will be a a sequential mixed methods.

So is it sequential? Is it parallel? You remember all those models we discussed in mixed methods?

But that is that is where they belong. You need in your research design you don't need so much on methodology. Here you see all of this stuff that you've got here.

Port steps and variables methodology. All of this stuff is not required here. None of this is of value. Research ethics, yes, but all of this portion here. You don't belong. After literature review.

Alright, so this as well, right? They all belong after literature review, so methodology. I only want one or two paragraphs stating what type of research is it.

You know, uh, so you're using the exploratory sequential mixed method design. You see you're not using the word mixed methods at all?

I know what you're trying to say.

But you're not using the correct language.

OK, so this is, uh, I I'd I'd need to see whether it is actually explanatory or exploratory. I will only understand that when I know your problem statement, because I think you've mixed them up here as well.

Right at the question, remember in the research methods I paused you the question that ask yourself.

Which method is answering a my research problem? If it is the qualitative?

Then you're you have a big wall and a small cone.1.11

If it is a quantitative that answers your problem, then it's a big corn and a small call.

But if you need to rely on both to answer your question that both are capital quote UN quote are both big right? Because both of them answered the question. The next thing you have to answer is how are they sequence is called first followed by quote.

It squad first followed by QUAL, regardless of their relative weightage.

Or are they parallel? In other words, is it triangulation? Is it sequential?

So this is something that you can say in one paragraph very, very clearly without the need for any of these things that you put underneath. OK. So that's something we need to work on and we can have a separate session or on that when you come to it in our in our thesis committee meeting. Alright. So I'm assuming this is your model.

Right. So none of this belongs here.

The reason for that is that this does not qualify as a theoretical framework.

OK, a theoretical framework is drawn from theory.

And and this is a predictive model or what we sometimes refer to as a conceptual framework or an analytical framework, this is more like a conceptual framework.

And the only way you can produce a conceptual framework is first having demonstrated you've read all the relevant literature.

You understood the methodology and you have a uh, you have looked at the existing theoretical frameworks which you find our in incomplete. So what you might produce here as a theoretical framework is are you more inclined towards challenging do P or are you inclined towards challenging Lancaster?

Or little you have to ask yourself this question so your your initial theoretical framework is which draws your data in.

Would either be Dupee would either be little or would either be like caster, so their model goes here if you need.

If you are unsure, just make a mention of it that you theoretically draws on the work off so and so and so and so OK.

As a statement, you don't always have to put a picture in.

So as I said, all these research steps go they don't belong in in here. This is something we will we will discuss and debate after. I know that you have read the relevant literature, OK.

Add and then in the research ethics this is fine, leads work, limitations needs work, but it's fine. Layout of the research at the moment. You've got a five chapter structure. I'm alright with that for the time being, but once we go forward we can think about.

Don't whether you need more chapters or not, but I'm happy at the moment to have it as five chapters so. Anything beyond this I have not read.

Yeah. So what we also have to do here is is to give a verdict on the outcome of this form. The point of view of your progression, alright. So I've already had a conversation with the Irfan prior to our meeting today and I am convinced that you know what you want to do.

I am convinced that you are capable of doing what you say you want to do.

But the document that you have produced is not up to the mark.

And I've we've shown that so.

Uh it for me, it's on the border of unsatisfactory.And reservations.

Now if I give you unsatisfactory here, or rather I should say we give you unsatisfactory it, it triggers an additional review.

Which simply means you will lose more time and we will be still discussing chapter one from beginning to end.

So I am going to recommend you before the award of of reservations.

We have three awards of a review, which is unsatisfactory reservations or satisfactory.

OK, so reservations because there is a lot of fundamental work required to be done.

I had, uh, but as I said, because I think, uh, and we've talked about this before and I because we think you can do it. We are prepared to give you that benefit of doubt and give you the reservation. But my my honest advice to you is you really need to to seriously think about this that concentrate on getting your introductory chapter right.

What I want you to please do. Is think like clauswitz. What clause which had the ability to do was recognized what needs to be done and he could forget about everything else.

So please don't confuse what model I'm going to use and what my my analytical framework will be at this stage. Think about what is my problem.

How can I justify the problem from a historical perspective?

What has happened in recent times that allows me to make a point score a point with the reader, to make sure that they understand that this is something of importance and value that I'm discussing?

Right. So so focus on that, get that bit right. Once you've got that bit right, then phrase your question out of that your research problem.

Once you've got the right research problem, you can then project uh, refine the aim and objectives of your research. You see, that problem will give you 3000 approaches. Maybe you're more of solving it. You gotta focus on what will I do?

Yeah. So that becomes your, your, your, your, your research.Question.

Then from the research question, if you are producing.

A mixed methods approach. I would suggest you neither state or thesis here, nor a hypothesis. Here you leave a set of research questions. With sub questions.

When you get into your methodology chapter after your literature review, these sub questions can then be converted into hypothesis for the quantitative part.

And thesis for the qualitative part.

Alright, so you wait till you. You'll stick with questions only for now. You wait till you get to methodology and in your methodology you construct them. In along these lines.

Alright, you can potentially do that in literature review as well. One of the outcomes of a literature review is coping the nature of the problem.

Identifying the gap obviously is the big one and justifying the gap, but you can also use the literature review to refine your research problem.

Further and then refine your questions and even producer a hypothesis or thesis statement.

Or sub questions, but you can equally do that in the methodology chapter.

Because the methodology chapter comes after the problem statement after the literature review, then you're thinking about how that's, you know, why is the is the.

Uh, uh, introductory chapter? What is the literature review and how is the methodology?

So if you think in terms of strategy, why is answered in the introductory chapter? What is our said in the literature review? Because that focuses you on where the problem sets.

* Right. And how is in the methodology chapter? So why what how? In each of these you can refine your problem as you go down.
* **Need of bibliography:** Comprehensive bibliography, which you can obviously generate using, you know, using. But you know when you use Mandalay it produces only a reference list. In other words, it it only produces documents that you've cited in your work.
* But what about all the other bodies of literature which you haven't cited but have been reading? So it a PhD. It's also useful to have a a full bibliography at the end. We may not keep it in your final submission because it consumes word count. But you need to have a a bibliography of all the documents that you've consulted. So for example, you may have 10 constructed consulted a piece of grey literature from Turkish military again. You know, a basic book on strategy or something. So you can always hide that in the list that in your bibliography, but it will not appear in your list of references. Alright, so I would suggest to keep a bibliography document prepared as well.