**Follow on meeting on Introductory Chapter, 5 April 2022**

**Title**

* IZ: **Title should be change** to better reflect the core issues in the study. Instead of counting factors one by one in the title like strategy, leadership and morale, combining those factors with a generic term will be better. Because there maybe a third or a fourth factor will be discovered.
  + It should be assessment of a impact of human factors. But actually is a there is more than human factors involved. Human factors are more internal. There are other factors like training, quality of doctrine, the quality of intellect which is not human factor.
    - Training: Institutional thing.
    - Doctrine: You can be well trained with poor doctrine. And you can be poorly trained on an excellent doctrine. This is not human and correlational factor. US have always had great training, but their doctrines are usually not good. They do everything well according to what they what they've been trained. But they get that basic training wrong and that's why they don't win wars.
  + It should be better to have Assessment of Morale and Conceptual Factors on the Outcome of Battles. Because conceptual factors includes those leadership and strategy factors as with other. And that will justify Student’s title. Furthermore BDD would serve as the **conceptual framework** of the study. Because that's a comment that I bring in later on that when you define problem, you don't seem to latch onto any framework for analysis at the outset. One critique of the BDD is that it's not an academic & peer reviewed model. It is an in organizational model belonging to the British Defence. So you have to say that it is a theory in use, not a formal theory. How to justify?
* IE: Better to read the end of title as “outcome of battles”.
* **War vs Battle:**
  + IZ: Outcome of the battles or wars. Because strategy used want to put in your title but strategy doesn't deal with battle. Battle is related with a tactical plan which is the operational level of analysis. The word battle doesn't fit here with the terms strategy, leadership. That's a focus you need to set. Sun Tzu doesn't talk about battle war. Clausewitz about battle and war, but he says that the the battle is there for the purpose of the end of war.
  + IZ: People like Moltke Elder and Sun Tzu argues that, unless you have a strategy, it doesn't matter whether you win battles or not. So you got you got the US example of winning every battle and and not winning Vietnam War and not defeating the Taliban. So what are you analyzing? You need to sort that out. And I think you've got to nail what you what goes in your objective? Is it the war which was fundamentally change your thinking.
  + GY: My concern was about current databases, which are mainly battle focus.
  + IZ: This should attract the Student. Because that's a gap. Just think about it. If this approach is adopted, a subquestion needed to be answered. This is like IE was saying that you will have another follow-up objective which would be to what extent does battle influence the outcome of war. And you can then narrative that out that analysis of battle outcomes are quite comprehensive, covered in existing models. Outcome of the battles are quite explained by Lancaster and others. But outcome of the wars has not been explained by the current models. Comments of Moltke[[1]](#footnote-1) the Elder and Sun Tzu[[2]](#footnote-2) might be utilized to explain that it is not the tactics but strategy makes you win wars. So Student needs to bring those factors in. What makes us superior strategy? How can we quantify the strategic factors?

**Glossary of terms**

* IZ: Student will start to populate it and show the source of the term in this part. It would be;
  + Self-creation of the term.
  + Borrowed from other academicians,
  + Or the terminology from a particular source, but that has been variously used by other sources.

**Introduction**

IE: Explain why Rummel’s analysis of the conflict is comprehensive. And put a reference accordingly.

GY: He treats the subject a from a from psychology, sociology and from other perspectives as well. He conceptualizes all conflicts in four levels, even personal one. He then steps up and defines the group and interstate conflicts. He argues that these features constitutes a new framework into which all the all kinds of conflicts are fits in.

**Thoughts on effects of physical factors on the outcome of battles**

* IE: Clarification needed on the phrase of “while much has been said about the physical elements of factors like force ratios”. Force ratios added in terms of what?
* IZ: Whenever comment like that “much has been said”, it needs to add typically 3/4 references. Two types of force ratios should be reflected.
  + There is the Russian approach which is which is the “comparison of forces” and the Western approach, which is the “correlation of forces”, the Russian go on the numerical strength. The concept of correlation of forces was that force times capability. It is to do with training, motivation and all of those things.
  + Prior to the 60s and 70s, correlation of forces was being done manually. But as the Americans transition to to mathematical models, they couldn't really quantify correlations, so they've actually over the years become more like the Russians, a comparison of forces.
  + Correlation of forces is a numeric analysis followed by their capability analysis. When comparing US battalion versus a Russian battalion, certain numerical strength would be 1:1. But if US battalion has better weapons system, in correlation the American battalion has more combat power. But if the US Battalion is better led and better trained than it has a force multiplier and that is motivation, morale, training and others.
  + So the way to do that in Student’s initial analysis would be to call it an ***f*** function. That overall combat strength is a function of the factors to be identified. Rest of Student’s thesis would be identifying the components of ***f*** function. You can replace the ***f*** with a constant first and then convert the constant into those multipliers.

IE: Last paragraph of introduction is an aim sentence and it should be either relocated or deleted.

IZ: This is a good connecting sentence for the next one. But it shouldn't be stated like an aim. Clauswitz’s argument on war as a social phenomena[[3]](#footnote-3) would be a good connector to background part.

**Background**

IE: First sentence was a bit incomplete.

IZ: Opening sentence of first paragraph has no connection with the second sentence. Rest of this paragraph is all pieces of snippets which are not connected together. There is no flow to them. After first sentence there should be four or five sentences around the same theme from different academic approaches (For example war is vital importance to state, that theme is in line with the opening sentence). Then get on to the factors (Clausewitz, Sun Tzu, Russians etc.). You can then combine in the second paragraph things about the taxonomy of war.

IE: Add reference for Lancaster’s original contributions. Insert summary about acceptance of his linear and N- square law.

IZ: Either insert a footnote to explain the N-square law for general audience to easily get into discussion or populate annexes which explains the prominent methods (like Lancaster and Dupuy’s) to borrow from that own work when needed (not to be included in the final text). This will prevent coming back to that research multiple times. Main parts of these annexes (quantitavie methods) will be in the literature review.

**National doctrines on the researched subject**

IE, IZ: All related doctrines with the same subject would be summarized. Picking up one particular country is inappropriate.

IZ: If there is few example that captures the importance of non-material factors, this would be reflected like. The exception being the British defence doctrine. And these examples should be cited accordingly. They don't seem to indicate or emphasize human factors in measurement of combat power, whereas British Defence Doctrine captures it as material, intellectual and the moral component. And moral component is purely embedded in it and this gives a taxonomy of factors.

**Aim and objectives**

IZ: Before problem analysis, aim and objectives needed to be formally stated. Problem statement and hypothesis or the thesis should follow. What is the research problem? What are the questions or hypothesis that research is answering? Or what is your thesis? And after that you will do problem analysis (Student has problem statement but he wrote it at the end of problem analysis). Problem analysis as a heading implies that there is already a stated problem.

**Problem Analysis-Considerations:**

İA: Clausewitz’s approach on quantifiable and non-quantifiable factors should be reflected.

IA: Outcomes of the battles of which the major models fail to explain (USA withdrawal, Battle of France) should be added. So what exactly about the withdrawal from Afghanistan or other events? Is it the victory or the loss or whatever? So little bit of more explanation here too for the reader to understand.

**Combining problem definition and problem statement**

IE, IZ: You don't need to have both.

IZ: It can be structured under the heading “problem statement” and under this title analysis might come. This way assertation would have fewer headings. In a PhD normally it is not advised to go beyond third level.

IE: Use of italics in problem statement is inappropriate.

IZ: General rule is not to use bold, italics or underline. Exceptions are below;

* Use italics when it's a foreign language. English translation is written normal while original term would be in italics.
* Title of a book in the text.
* On a very rare occasion, if it's something that you need to emphasize (not much more than ten on one page). It would be something fundamental and crucial.
* The more use it the more they lose value. That is one of the biggest criticisms of examiners.

**Objectives**

IE: There are two objectives. Another objective about critical review of literature might be added.

Instead of the word vary, impact would be appropriate. Because the word vary has associations with cross-sectional research design, which would be too early to use since the research design not decided yet.

**Research value**

İZ: This section explains who’s it valuable for? (for people interested in war, analyzing war, for historians, for military practitioners, for government). Just keep an idea on who it's valuable for and it's obviously valuable for future students because you will provide rich data and literature. This is the only place you don't need references, by the way, but if you've got them, there's no problem.

**Positioning**

* IZ: Student is advised to keep doing this, but it doesn’t have to be in the final text.
* Positioning helps to clarify mind for the literature review chapter as it points which bodies of literature must be looked.
* Object of positioning is where amongst this huge body of literature on war, which includes legal approaches which use humanitarian approaches, which includes the strategy which includes international relations, which includes economy, where in that body of massive body of literature are you positioning yourself so that you pick up the key literature that is relevant to your problem statement.
* So in relation to your problem statement, you narrow down the bodies of literature and I always ask students to put that in a Venn diagram.
* Yeah, just put it in a diagram so you can put that diagram in front of you and and when you do your literature review, you open that there's so.

**Research questions**

IE, IZ: They needed to be moved up. They should come before the aim.

**Methodology**

IZ:

* Methodology requires you to to define your problem.
* It requires you to give the background from where the problem has emerged.
* Once you've given that background from where the problem has emerged, then you give your very specific problem statement.
* Once you've given the problem statement, you then say within that problem statement, what are your aims and objectives?
* Once you've stated your aim objectives, you have now three choices.
  + One choice is to go down the question routes. In that route you state questions that your research will answer.
  + The other route is you give a thesis statement. You say that this is how things are and that is your estimation. You're actually trying to write your conclusion there. What you think you will find at the end of your research. So you write it out as a statement one short paragraph where you will state that this is what will happen. And the rest of the thesis then tries to either support or reject that thesis. When you use the thesis statement, it implies your research will be qualitative. Now some people write a thesis statement and then say in order to answer this thesis following questions need to be addressed.
  + The other route to go down is a hypothesis. A hypothesis applies in a classical methodology, quantitative approach. The hypothesis must operationalize the key variables. So the key variables (independent, dependent and control variables) are against which you will gather data. It must indicate those once. Then you can have sub hypothesis. Because sometimes main hypothesis can be so complicated that you got too many relationship which cannot be mathematically tested. And IE will guide you in this regard, because you've got to simplify your variable so you have testable hypothesis. So you need to break your big problem statement into maybe 3-4 hypotheses and then each of those hypotheses will be tested in Chapter 4.
* There is only one exception to this rule, and that exception is when you're doing grounded theory. But when you're doing grounded theory methodology, it is a form of qualitative analysis. But you can put in a hypothesis to be tested qualitatively. And that is done when you find that there is no theory, there is no theoretical foundation for your analysis. So if you find that there is no theoretical foundation for your analysis and you have to build the theory from data, you then use grounded theory. And grounded theory approach very much allows you to have a hypothesis that is qualitatively tested. And that qualitatively tested hypothesis then produces a theory. And that theory becomes the this way forward.
* I think you will have to do mixed methods. You will have a qualitative portion first which will involve you generating theory from data using grounded theory. Because once you do your literature review, you will find that there are no quantitative models for strategy analysis. That is why the Christina Zaidi’s research will be very important for you as this explains five existing models on decisions making in foreign policy. Those models will go straight into your thesis.
* Then you’ll generate your own model. Once you have generated your own model through grounded theory, you can then do case study analysis and I would suggest things like the Vietnam War, the American involvement in Afghanistan. Open source literature on strategy and analysis so that will become your chapter 5 probably. And what you will do in your Chapter 5 is quantitatively you will test your qualitative model. And then you will come up with a if they conclusion.

**Concepts and variables**

IE: It is too to state these. These emerge after literature analysis. Possibly in the research method methodology chapter.

IZ: After literature review you in methodology chapter these can be drawn. You will draw them out of your theoretical framework. So you will use a loose theoretical framework which is the British defence doctrine. You’ll use grounded theory to further refine the British defence doctrine to give it more data and support behind it, and build a a testable version of the BDD. Then you apply that theory in your chapter 5. In chapter 2, you're going to rubbish everything that's out there.

Alright, you will talk about that. There is so much about battle, not normal enough about war. The linkage between war and battle is not understood and and so on. The lack of understanding of or application of operational art, where where it suggests that you don't always have to fight. You know, the British forces were marginalized in Dunkirk. The Germans didn't go to destroy the British forces because under the operational art it is timewasting error. The French forces in the south was the same. Engaging with these marginilized forces was waste of effort and German forces needed to go forward. In dealing with things that are not going to impact you at all. So the Germans showed operational brilliance in not bothering to go after the the British force. From the point of view of the war, they are dislocated. So once they are dislocated you don't need to go any further deal with them. We just go over the head and if necessary we can come back and deal with them afterwards. And if they are stupid enough to try and interfere with you, you can destroy them anyway. Which is the mistake that the Russians made. So once they got dislocated, the Russians turned back and started fighting. And what resulted was total destruction. Hitler’s grand strategy was to get into an alliance with Britain and his grand strategy failed. And as a result, his strategy failed. His grand strategy bolts to share the world with Britain. He didn't realize that if he was challenging the World Economic system. Then the rest of the world, particularly Churchill, Roosevelt and and Stalin, will gather against him. Regardless of the different ideologies they will gather against him because this is one thing they are common about, the control of money. Richard Snell’s The meaning of the Second World War is advised.

**Methodology, Research Methods**

IE: All these section should move to methodology chapter.

IZ: Student only need research design here. Very brief chapter to show people how this research will go ahead. So you can call it methodology or or or better to just call research design. And just give an overview of a in the introduction of what your methodology is likely to be and it just needs to be maybe at best two paragraphs. And the rest will go to your methodology chapter.

**Research ethics**

IZ: The purpose is that you are not breaking rules. You're not putting people in danger, you're not putting yourself in harm's way. Research ethics is about making sure that research does not hurt or harm any person. It does not. You are not stealing data from organisations. You know you're not using your position to extract data from organisations which they don't want to share that data, so you're not a journalist, you researcher, a journalist, will get away with stealing data. We we we. Got hold of a leak paper. You can't put a leak paper in in your research. OK, you can only put something that's open source. And when that leak paper becomes open source and other academics authenticate, it's a it's a, you know, pedigree. You can then utilize it, but you you you will have to rely on or and that's all you need in your return. Research ethics. If there isn't too much, try to write here. Research ethics can actually go in your methodology chapter. OK, but a brief mention here. Useful. OK. A brief mention of research ethics is useful in the introduction. But not what you've written here.

IZ: And later on you will keep amending this. The introductory chapter is what we say or living chapter as you go through your research, you keep coming back and updating your your your research methodology.

IZ: OK, you're it. Sorry, your introductory chapter and the other chapter you keep updating is your methodology chapter, because one aspect of the methodology is the plan. Another portion of the methodology is the reality. And in the reality, so for example, you were planning to look at a particular data set and you discard, you put that in your introduction when you went to look at that data set, you found that it was insufficient. And therefore you had to collect more data. Now this is another. This is a story. That story goes in your methodology chapter. OK, it shows that your plan is being put into practice, but it it is confronting real life problems which you are addressing.

IZ: I just have one advice for you gurkan you get your introductory chapter right, you will sail through your thesis. If you are confused about your introductory chapter, you will never know what you're doing.

IZ: You got time to do this, but in your nine month review, you will have to show a completed literature. So sorry introductory chapter and you will have to show a part of your literature review. So what you have to do is you first from your introductory chapter from your conceptual framework, which you can introduce in your introductory chapter. Alright, that's something you need to do in your internal you know in your positioning. So once you've used that conceptual framework from that conceptual framework, you need to develop what important literature you must look at. OK. So and then look at. So for example, in the British different the the you've got the physical component. You've got the conceptual component and you've got the moral component. Right. So the literature that you will need to look at in the physical component or a, you know, weapons systems, armies, numbers, training. All of that is the the physical component, the conceptual proponent. So training is a physical component, but the conceptual query is the software. What are you trading your soldiers with? Are you training them with very good concepts and doctrines? Or are you training them with rubbish so training is a physical component, but what is contained in that training is the intellectual component. Alright. And then comes the moral component. How are they lead? How are they motivated? To what extent are they so? All of those factors, this is the kind of literature you will start looking at and it is your your positioning that tells you what literature you want. So what you might do is have your your conceptual framework, then go into the the the literature initially filter out all the key literature. So you have three big things, OK, the three big sections of your literature review are defined by your conceptual framework. They are the the physical component. The second one is the conceptual component and the last one is the moral component. Each of these components will have subteams. And I don't want you to do a literature review, read which reads like a book review. So one paragraph on one after another paragraph on the next order, another paragraph on the next author. No, that is not a PhD literature review. What you do is you pick up your theme, you say on the moral component. On the moral component, Napoleon argued that the moralist to the physical as three is to 1. Montgomery captures this in his statement that man is still the first weapon of war. Sons who argues this this this so you then are drawing on that literature and explaining what people are trying to say on a schematic way. So in one paragraph of about one topic about one idea, you've got 6-7 references from literature. That is a literature review.

**General comments**

**Paragraph Structure**

IZ: **One paragraph** should convey **one idea.** And that idea can be done, amplified through a number of sentences collecting. The trick to do it is that ask yourself, what am I trying to say in this paragraph? Convey this meaning with one sentence and support this idea with different approaches.

IE:Using sentences rather than bullets. Makes it look a bit disjointed.

IE: Where ever there is quotation reference might come in.

IZ: Citation should be used in a manner that ideas exactly reflects the contributors. Using citation at the end of paragrah is improper.

**Referencing**

IZ, İA: Reference needs to go where it belongs. You can always repeat it over and over again.

IZ: When a reference is put at the end of the paragraph, it means that everything in this paragraph relates to this reference. Researcher firstly ascribing things for challenging and raising issues also in relation to that reference. These needed to be well reflected.

1. While no plan survives contact, a good *strategy is resilient*, and relevant even when a plan fails. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Winnig a battle is not the Acme of war, to defeat your enemy without fighting is the Acme of war (Sun Tzu, 77). Everyone sees the tactics by which I conquer, no one sees the the the strategy from victory is evolved (Sun Tzu, 100). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. War does not belong in the realm of arts and sciences; rather it is part of man's social existence. War is a clash between major interests, which is resolved by bloodshed - that is the only way in which it differs from other conflicts, (Clausewitz, 149) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)