**Initial Review Meeting**

* **Problem Statement considerations:** 
  + İ.Z: Problem statement is not defined clearly. This is needed to be stated and other parts of the introductory chapter needed to be regulated accordingly. Defining it is so crucial that it cannot be changed afterwards. Because all other parts like aim, objectives depends on this definition.
  + İ.Z:Clausewitz’s conceptualization of the war needs to be reflected comprehensively in order to understand the basics of the problem. His way of thinking resembles Isaac Newton’s approach who argues that in order to understand a phenomenon we need to understand the perfect world. His conceptualization of the war consists:
    - Absolute and real war distinction: In order to understand real war, first we need to conceptualize absolute war where human factors, politics and elite interests are taken away. In this absolute portion of the war each sides pushes toward the extremes (extreme use of force, disarming the opponent, maximum exertion of strength). Then he describes the modifications to this absolutism with introducing below factors to identify real war.
      * Human nature reduces the power of resistance,
      * Realities and prospects of future events prevents sides from employing all available forces.
      * Politics and the possibility of the peace.
    - In this real war or in the clash of forces physical and moral forces employed. If we take away all of the human factors, leadership, morale, will, determination, then the side which has greater superiority in numbers will succeed. This constitutes his mechanical way of predicting the outcome of the battle (p.194).
    - Then he qualifies it by saying that if you have overwhelming numbers, strategy, morale doesn't matter. Because overwhelming numbers would counterbalance all other contributing circumstances (p.194).
    - That’s why he suggests that bringing as many troops as possible in to the engagement at the decisive point as the first principle of strategy (p.195).
* I.Z:This model of war is adopted by the Americans. They attribute the victory in the Second World War to overwhelming numbers. Americans continue to think succeed will come when the combat force of 10 times strength is used against opponent even with the flawed strategy. So they thought that morale factors should be taken away from considerations. Vietnam, Korea, Afghanistan, Libya, and Iraq cases have demonstrated flaws in this way of thinking. The reasons of these flaws of the models constitute the problem statement of the research.
* I.Z: Research needs to link the subject with a military that follows a particular theory in use in the contemporary times. And **2001 British Defence Doctrine (BDD)** should be used for this purpose. It will be useful to include in the analysis because it's the only sort of theoretical foundation that may be get from a practitioner perspective. British Defence Doctrine does not attempt to quantify these components. Student should use this as a foundation to support the thesis with an effort to quantify it.
  + 2001 BDD reflects the considerations about fighting power. In this approach fighting power is made up of three inter-related components, conceptual, moral, and physical of of equal value (p.4-1).
  + Combat power is the product of these three components.
    - Conceptual component provides the thought processes to develop the ability to fight (p.4-1). This comprises two elements; principles of the war and the body of the doctrine supported by an appropriate strategy. It is basically the intellectual component which provides knowing how to fight.
    - Physical component is the means to fight (p.4-5) and consists five elements namely manpower, equipment collective performance, readiness and sustainability. These are four says equipment, logistics. Although those physical things that make up a military.
    - And the moral component is about persuading the people to fight. To draw this motivation, leadership and management is required. It is better to have a sodier who has “will to fight” than having a soldier with a perfect equipment and best training but lacks this quality.
* I.Z: Student needs to include also the **elements of fighting power.** The elements of fighting power in the operational level are; man, machine, materials and time. But the Americans ignore leadership.
* I.Z: Similarly, the elements of of national power includes diplomacy, information, military, and the economic instruments. This is qualified with adding the national culture. Culture should be in research. 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 would help to win the battle.
* I.Z: Student need to rephrase how his research relates with other main studies in the field.
  + The literature that has been developed on the quantifiable impacts of on war outcome.
  + Lancester produced mathematical formula to predict winner of the battle with a differential explanation of the casualties. He analyzes winner based on the casualties of the sides with taking into consideration of number of troops and the weapon effectiveness. As a conclusion of this understanding he defines fighting strength as “the fighting strength of a force is proportional to the square of its numerical strength multiplied by the fighting value of individual units” with his famous n-square law. However he excludes training, morale, leadership and other qualitative factors of fighting strength from his analysis since these cannot be put into the equations (p.47). So he takes for granted these factors are equal on both sides.
  + Nearly 70 years after Dupuy expanded his mathematical model to include all material and nonmaterial factors into his formulas. Lancester’s weapon effectiveness find thier place as Operational Lethality Indexes (OLI) and his troop numbers find their places in Dupuy’s operational variables (mobility and vulnerability effects) in his famous Quntified Judgement Model. He groups the non-materials factors of leadership, training/experiene, morale and logistics as “combat effectiveness value (CEV)” (Dupuy, 1979, p.33-36). And gives total values for opponents (for example he gives a value of 1.2 points of CEV as opposed to 1 to Allies for the Second World War) and takes this value to the calculation of the Combat Power Potentials of the sides to predict the winner. If any of these factors is detected different from other side, evaluaters are taking account of it. For example if one side’s training or commander leadership qualities is better than other side, model takes this as a value to increase or decrease the Power Potential value. He himself admits that this represent an oversimplified statement of a complex relationship (Dupuy, 1979, p.39).
  + Biddle, tried to fix this overstatement by adding “force employment” to the analysis. He argued that material factors alone cannot explain capability and added force employment, which is a nonmaterial variable to his analysis. He defines modern system of force employment as “the doctrine and tactics by which armies use their materiel in the field” (Biddle, 2006, p. 2). His key finding might be summarized as the effects of preponderance in the numbers and technology is mediated by “modern system of force employment”. He concludes that technology and preponderance’s effects are radically different as a function of force employment, it can be decisive or almost immaterial as a function of the implementation of the modern system force employment. The one who implements “force employment” better, will exploit advantageous of numerical superiority in numbers and technology (Biddle, 2006, pp. 60–77).
  + Lancester and Dupuy’s models have identified the factors that are quantifiable. They identified force ratios based on the mathematical formulas to predict the winner. Lancester’s work shed light to importance of the numbers of the troops and effectiveness of the weapons with taking all other factors in equal. Dupuy’s QJM tried to quantify all factors (weapon, terrain, weather, season, air superiority, posture, mobitiy, vulnerability, and intangible factors) affecting the outcome to predict the winner while non-material part is not reflecting the reality, by his terms oversimplistic. Biddle, by contrast expanded the topic with adding one non-material factor to the analysis.
  + These studies treat non-material factors either non-existent or highly subjective to predict the outcome of the battle. Superior strategy, leadership and morale needed to be included to the models to better understand the real causes of the outcome.
  + This research will attempt to do that. So it is not challenging these studies but it be complementary to these work and it will further explore other two qualitative factors to “add” new information to the literature. It will first explain the affects of the material factors on the outcome of the battle to detect the gray areas which are not yet analyzed acedemically. Further that point it will explore affects of leadership and morale factors on the outcome of the battle.
* I.Z: Effects of superior strategy needed to be included to the research with historical examples.
  + Battle of France in WW II
    - Relatively small army of Germans defeated the French and the British. Heinz Guderian, attacking corps commander of the German Army didn't managed it through superiority in numbers.
    - With very small forces (3 Panzer Divisions and Motorized Infantry Regiment), he break the front of France (of 10 Divisions) from Ardennes and dislocated BEF forces to Dunkirk and French forces to south of the country where they were ineffective throughout the war.
    - Inferior by all predictions or force ratios (Hart, Second World War, p.66; Battlefield, Series I), Guderian would not have attempt to this manouvre if he is to use current models of Lancester or Dupuy. Superior tactic of strategic penetration by independent armoured force combined with effective leadership enabled these victory (Hart, Second World War, p. 66).
  + North Africa Campaign in WWII
    - Erwin Rommel in North Africa was fighting with literally a armored division with a few additional elements. But that armoured division attracted and stopped 5 Allied corps, a force seven times the strength with which he named as 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.
* Against these considerations problem statement could be “Current models which explains the reasons of the outcome of the battle do not reflect reality and remain simple”.
* These problem statement and historical examples constitutes the logic to reach research question of the thesis.
  + How much leadership and morale affect the variation on the outcome of the battle?
  + To what extent do leadership and morale mediate the effects of material factors?
* The the purpose of the scope is to draw the lines of what you will not be doing. Scope part of the introductory chapter is to be used by the student himself.
* Problem analysis will be done once the problem definition is agreed.
* I.A: How leadership and morale will be measured against the outcome of the battle?
  + Student: Qualitative research methodology will be adopted and they will be measured with content analysis method. This method allows to extract a which factors affect the dependent variable 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.
* I.A: What will be the reseach data?
  + Student: Content analysis is going to be based on secondary data. United States Army's database which consists 660 battles will be used. This database while sufficient in material factors lack information on non-material factors.
  + With content analysis I will analyze leadership and morale factors. I will use texts of military history as input of analysis to conduct content analysis.
* IA: What will be the sample for content analysis?
  + Student: From 660 battles, which I have quantified data, I will select my sample. For example Battle of Somme in WWI will be one example and Liddle Hart’s World War One book will be used as input. The tool for content analysis will be Natural Language Processing (NLP). NLP is a word representation model which uses the text as input to analyze terms importance against analyzed variable, in my case outcome of the battle.
* İA: How do you intend to measure morale?
  + Student: I will annotate named entities of morale. Literature will provide the key terms which reflects the state of the morale in battle. For example Clausewitz says “spirit of an army” is key indicator of Army’s morale (On War, p.188). I will manually annotate these terms as Named Entities. These Named Entities will be used to extract relations between these entities and the outcome of the battle with the Machine Learning Model.
* IZ: Two points to note:
  + All of these considerations belong in methodology. Justification for all of these belong in introduction.
  + This resembles highly subjective model. Before appling that model, Student need to justify that his thinking is on the right lines. An model cannot be constructed in this way because it is just logic. To justify a position language processing cannot be used. This can be done through literature. Student will first get what literature says, then he will construct the model.
  + Student will be contacted with Center for Simulations and Analytics (Ken MacNaught or Jeremy Smith) to have a associate supervisor for this method. We need to be sure that Student know the science of modeling is accurate.
* İA: Defining the problem is key. Once we get that sorted, we can develop.
* I.Z: Feedbacks on the Introductory Chapter
  + Title change: Student need to change his title. It is neither indicative nor catchy, nor does it suggest what might be the content. It depends on problem definition. Words like predicting, measuring of forecasting should be used. Key terms of research nature (qualitatively or quantitatively) and factors (material or non-material) could be used to construct title. It should be long title, but it can be revised right up to the point of submission. Title is just the best language to express the problem statement.
  + Opening paragraps: Declaratory statements presented as truth. Student needs to reflect foundations for the knowledge in the field and needs to mention the notion of conflict in his first paragraphs and look at different forms of conflicts. Relying on literature is critical. Below mainstream academic sources should be consulted.
    - Karl Marx’s social construct of conflict theory.
    - RJ Rummel’s theory of war and conflict and the linkage between war and conflict.
    - National Defense University of Islamabad work on the nature of conflict.
  + Academicians generally refer to conflict of which war is merely a form. War is becoming more and more a obsolete term. And academicians are looking for the right label for the war (hybrid, kinetic, non-kinetic). These are all the labels to identify the war. Because war as we define and understand doesn't happen anymore.
  + Taliban case may be used as an example because they, by all predictive analysis, were unknown entity with non military appearance and very simplistic weapons. But they managed to seize the power and USA has left the country. This case would be the test of Student’s predictive model (How does Student’s predictive model explain the success of the Taliban?). Nature of this kind of case needs to be in opening paragraph to indicate the complexity of what we're dealing with.
  + Use of superlatives in dissertation: Student needs to be careful about the choice of words. These kind of comments has to be supported by evidence.
  + Use of n.d. (no date) in reference: It is used when original reference is used. Whenever translation is used, the date of translation needed to be inserted as year. Student needs to check new APA 7 rules are for referencing translated text.
  + Use of quotes: Student needs to be careful on forms of the text (bold, italic, markings etc.). Wherever quotes are used reference should be given. In order to make reading easy on the text it is suggested not to put things in bold or with exclamation marks. Quotes may be embedded in a way that flow with the reading.
  + Subsequent referencing should be paraphrased.
  + Practices to make reading easy:
    - Interconnected short paragraphs may be combined.
    - Seperate paragraphs with different references with the same subject may be combined.
  + Use of paraphrasing: Quotes may be break up in order to allow the flow to be nicer.
  + Unnecessary detail of background is not to be mentioned in Introductory chapter. Key literature may shortly rephrased.
  + Convention to write the name of a book is use of italics.
  + Suppressing the author name is used in referencing when we use the name of author in the paragraph.
* Before aim and objectives problem statement will be put.
  + The problem is we have a mechanical approach to to understanding the outcomes of combat. We have a highly subjective Dupuy method of a of of bringing in the moral factors in the QJM. But there is solid model that can account 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, 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 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 models of 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.
* Separate meeting is needed to understand what should be the aim and objectives, what would be your problem. And then and then the problem analysis, this is of these are sort of pedantic chapters.
* The concept of positioning: It relates with the used bodies of literature to conduct research. Student positioning is to look at war from strategy, leadership and combat prediction.

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

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.