**Initial Review Meeting on Introductory Chapter of the Dissertation**

* I.Z: Opening paragraps:
  + Declaratory statements should not be presented as truth. Foundations for the knowledge in the field should be reflected. Notion of the conflict needed to be mentioned in first paragraphs. Different forms of conflicts is needed to be included. 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. Nature of this kind of case needs to be in opening paragraph to indicate the complexity of what we're dealing with.
* I.Z: Background Part: Relationship between this research and other main studies in the field needed to be clearly expressed.
  + The literature 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 (Lancaster, 1916, 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, p. 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. This research will add the effects of the superior strategy, leadership and morale to better understand the real causes of the outcome. So it is not challenging these studies but it be complementary to these work and it will further explore other these 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, 1970 , 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, 1970, 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.
* I.Z: Subject needed to be linked 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. BDD does not attempt to quantify these components. This may be used 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 (BDD, 2001, 4-1).
  + Combat power is the product of these three components (BDD, 2001, 4-1/5).
    - Conceptual component provides the thought processes to develop the ability to fight. 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 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: Elements of fighting power needed to be included. At the operational level these are; man, machine, materials and time. But the Americans ignore leadership.
* I.Z: Elements 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 national culture does not promote ability to fight, then no amount of of economic power would help to win the battle.
* **İ.Z: Problem Statement considerations:** 
  + Problem statement is not defined clearly. It must identify the problem. It must make it obvious that there is a problem. 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.
  + 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 below ideas.
    - 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 (Clausewitz, 1989, 75-80).
      * 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 (Clausewitz, 1989, 194). This constitutes his mechanical way of predicting the outcome of the battle. 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. 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 (Clausewitz, 1989, 194-195).
  + This conceptualization and model of war is adopted by the Americans. They attribute the victory in the WWII 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.
  + The problem is literature presents very mechanical approach to to understanding the outcomes of combat. There is highly subjective Dupuy method of bringing in the non-material factors in the QJM.
  + 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.
* Problem statement could be; “Current models which explains the reasons of the outcome of the battle is basically using material factors as predictor of the winner and this is not reflecting reality and remain simple”. That is why they cannot explain outcomes like the Taliban defeating a superpower or numerically inferior forces defeat their opponents like Germany in Battle of France. Germans would never attacked to France if they were to use Lancaster’s and Dupuy’s models. Current models including Biddle (because his main argument was force employment, the one Americans is excellent at) would have said Taliban can never triumph in Afghanistan. So clearly there's a clear problem in those tools that we are applying. Afghanistan case would be the test of this research’s predictive model (How does this predictive model explain the success of the Taliban?).
* Problem analysis will be done once the problem definition is agreed. These problem statement and historical examples constitutes the logic to reach research question of the thesis.
* 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.
* I.A: How leadership and morale will be measured against the outcome of the battle?
  + G.Y: 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?
  + G.Y: 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?
  + G.Y: 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?
  + G.Y: 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 applying that model, the thinking needed to be justified that it 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. First literature has to be scanned, then model can be constructed.
  + An associate supervisor will be searched from Center for Simulations and Analytics (Ken MacNaught or Jeremy Smith) to assess better the credibility of this method. We need to be sure that student’s knowledge of the science of modeling is accurate.
* I.Z: General feedbacks on the Introductory Chapter
  + Title change: Title needed to be changed. 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.
  + Use of superlatives in dissertation: 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. APA 7 rules needed to be checked again.
  + Use of quotes: Forms of the text (bold, italic, markings etc.) is needed to be used correctly. 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.
  + Practices to make reading easy:
    - Interconnected short paragraphs may be combined.
    - Seperate paragraphs with different references with the same subject may be combined.
    - Subsequent referencing should be paraphrased.
    - Quotes may be break up with use of paraphrasing.
  + Unnecessary detail of background is not to be mentioned in Introductory chapter.
  + 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.
* 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. Current research positioning is to look at war from strategy, leadership and combat prediction.
  + Three things needed to be specified; where the data (secondary and primary) and literature sits.
* Research questions: They're broadly right but simplistic, and needed to rethought.
  + These two questions should be used;
    - 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?
* Hypothesis/Thesis: 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.
* Methodology: With one or two paragraphs the type of research is needed to be expressed. This should be followed by the general approach to the problem. This can be at the end of problem statement or in the research design. Details should be put on the Methodology Chapter. Correct language should be used to name the research (sequential mixed method).
  + The nature of the research (explanatory or exploratory) will be decided after problem definition.
  + If qualitative method is answering the problem, then it will be qualitative research. Then research will be QUAL + quan.
  + If quantitative method is answering the problem, then it will be quantitavie research. Then research will be QUAN+qual.
  + If both required to answer research question then both will be capital (QUAL + QUAN).
  + The next thing to be decided is how is the sequence (regardless of their relative weightage).
    - If one is followed by another then the research becomes sequential,
    - If both two are conducted at the same time to produce the results, then the research becames triangulation.
* Theoretical Framework (refered also as a conceptual framework or an analytical framework):
  + Theoretical framework is drawn from theory. This is a predictive model. Current proposal is more like a conceptual framework.
  + Conceptual framework can be produced after having read all the relevant literature. You understood the methodology and you have looked at the existing theoretical frameworks which found as incomplete.
  + If unsure about this framework, it should be mentioned in general trerms at this stage. It may be a statement rather than a picture.
* Need of bibliography: A comprehensive bibliography is needed. It's also useful to have a a full bibliography at the end.
* Conclusion:
  + Concentrate needed to be given to the problem statement and justifying it from historical perspective not on the model or analytical framework.
  + It is advised to consider a set of research questions with sub questions instead of expressing a thesis or a hypothesis.
  + These sub questions can then be converted into hypothesis for the quantitative part, and thesis for the qualitative part in the potentially two part.
    - In the methodology chapter
    - In the literature review chapter. 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.