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

**Title**

* IZ: **Title should be changed** 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** (There maybe further factors to be discovered). Options:
  + “Assessment of a impact of **Human Factors**”:
    - There is more than human factors which is more internal (quality of intellect?).
    - Below factors are not human factors but affects the outcome.
      * 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.
  + “Assessment of Morale and **Conceptual Factors** on the Outcome of Battles”:
    - Conceptual factors includes those leadership and strategy factors as with others.
      * BDD would serve as the **conceptual framework** of the study. In problem definition, Student doesn’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?
    - 2001 British Defense Doctirne (BDD) argues that fighting power is made up of three inter-related components which are conceptual, moral, and physical components and of equal value (2001, pp. 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.
      * 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.

Diagram, venn diagram

Description automatically generated

* Aware of the importance of the non-material factors in warfare, *British Defence Doctrine (BDD)* categorized fighting power into three sections (conceptual, physical, and moral) in 2001 and this approach has been used by UK since then. It asserts that combat power is the product of these three components. *Conceptual component* provides the thought processes to develop the ability to fight and contains principles of the war and the doctrine supported by strategy. *Physical component* is the means to fight and consists of five elements (manpower, equipment collective performance, readiness, and sustainability). And the *moral component* is about persuading the people to fight which requires motivation, leadership, and management (UK Ministry of Defence, 2001, pp. 4-1: 4-5). This doctrine constitutes the linkage between the subject and a military that follows a theoretical foundation from a practitioner perspective.
* IE: Better to read the end of title as “outcome of battles”.
* **War vs Battle:** IZ Outcome of the battles or wars? The term “strategy” used in the title with the unit of analysis as “battles”. The word battle doesn't fit here with the terms strategy, leadership. That's a focus you need to set. 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.
  + Battle is related with a tactical plan which is the operational level of analysis. War is related with strategy. Sun Tzu, Clausewitz and others talks about the war.
    - Dupuy, defines *combat* as violent interactions of armed forces in lethal fighting and designates six levels, namely: war, campaign, battle, engagement, action, and duel (1987, pp. 63–64). While battles are a matter of both tactics and operations, war is a matter of strategy (Foertsch, 1940, as cited in Dupuy, 1987, p. 69).
    - Clausewitz defines tactics as “the use of armed forces in the engagement” while strategy as “the use of engagements for the object of the war” (1989, p. 128). He defines engagement as fighting, it is not a specific level of combat (1989, p. 227). So, strategy deals with using the results of the military fighting (whether it i named as combat or engagement) for the overall objective of the war.
    - Sun Tzu says that winnig a battle is not the Acme of war, to defeat your enemy without fighting is the Acme of war(1971, p. 77). Everyone sees the tactics by which I conquer, no one sees the the the strategy from victory is evolved (1971, p. 100).
    - Moltke the Elder argues that while no plan survives contact, a good *strategy is resilient*, and relevant even when a plan fails.
    - US example of winning every battle and and not winning Vietnam War and not defeating the Taliban.
  + The gap that makes subject attractive: Outcomes of the battles rather than wars are quite covered in existing models (Lancaster and others).
  + It is not the tactics but strategy makes you win wars. Bring those factors in. What makes us superior strategy? How can we quantify the strategic factors?
  + 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.

**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.
* IZ: 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 etc.
  + 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[[1]](#footnote-1) 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**

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. These would include below points.

IZ: Methodology requires below steps;

* Giving the background from where the problem has emerged.
* Defining the problem with a problem statement.
* Expressing aims and objectives within that problem statement.
* Selecting the one of three routes to reach those.
  + Stating the questions that the research will answer.
  + Giving a thesis statement which implies the research will be qualitative. After summarizing the way factors operate in an area of topic researcher is providing initilal estimation of conclusion as a statement one short paragraph. Rest of the dissertation then tries to either support or reject that thesis. Thesis statement would be answered with addressing a set of questions.
  + Stating hypothesis which implies the research will be quantitative. The hypothesis must operationalize the key variables (independent, dependent and control variables) against which data will be gathered. Sometimes main hypothesis can be so complicated that consists too many relationship which cannot be mathematically tested. This time research may have sub-hypothesis. IE will guide the student in this regard, because variables needed to be simplified to have a testable hypothesis. These sub-hypotheses will be tested in Chapter 4.
    - The only one exception to this rule is grounded theory. Grounded theory methodology is a form of qualitative analysis in which hypothesis are tested qualitatively. It is used when there is no theory or theoretical foundation for analysis. So the research builds theory from data with grounded theory approach. This qualitatively tested hypothesis then produces a theory.
* Student might adopt mixed methods methodology with a preceding qualitative research which involves generating theory from data using grounded theory approach. Because the literature indicates no quantitative models for strategy analysis. In this regard Christina Zaidi’s research will be very important for Student as this explains five existing models on decisions making in foreign policy. Those models would go straight into the dissertation.
* Once Student generates his own model through grounded theory, he can then do case study analysis (like Vietnam War, the US involvement in Afghanistan, and etc.). In Chapter 5 of dissertation the qualitative model will be tested quantitatively.

**Concepts and variables**

IE, IZ: These emerge after literature analysis. So better to state these in the research methodology chapter.

IZ: These will be drawn out of theoretical framework. BDD would be used as a loose theoretical framework. Grounded theory will be used to further refine BDD to give it more data and support, and build a a testable version of the BDD. Then that theory will be applied in chapter 5.

Chapter 2 will outline;

* Why any approach that is not comprehensive to cover conceptual and moral factors would be assessed to be incomplete,
* Current models focus is on battles, there is no such model to explain war outcomes from the prism of conceptual, moral and physical factors,
* The linkage between war and battle is not understood.

Application of operational art suggests that fight is not always necessary. Example of tihs is Battle of France[[2]](#footnote-2) in WW2. Hitler’s grand strategy of getting into an alliance with Britain failed since he was challenging the World Economic system the reason why Churchill, Roosevelt and and Stalin gathered against him regardless of the different ideologies. Richard Snell’s The meaning of the Second World War is advised.

**Research ethics**

IZ: The purpose of this is not to break rules. It assures that;

* No people put into danger.
* Data is used in agreed mechanisms in research, all data would be open souırce or related permissions are granted to extract data from organisations (no way of using a leak paper).

**Introductory chapter as a living document**

IZ:

* Keep updating introductory chapter. It is a living chapter. As Student go through research, he will keep coming back and updating research methodology.
* One aspect of the methodology is the plan while another aspect is the reality. And in the reality, in the upcoming phases of the research planned data sets might be understood as insufficient. And therefore you had to collect more data. These needed to be reflected everytime in introductory chapter.
* Get your introductory chapter right to sail safely through thesis.
* In nine month review, you will have to show completed introductory chapter and a part of your literature review.

**Literature review**

* In the introductory chapter there will be initial conceptual framework from which you need to develop what important literature you must look at. For example, in the BDD there are physical, conceptual, and moral components.
* So the literature that you will need to look at in the physical component or weapons systems, armies, numbers, training. The conceptual component might include concepts and doctrines, or in general what is contained in that training is the intellectual component. And then moral component would consist how are they lead, how are they motivated, to what extent?
* All of those factors, this is the kind of literature Student will start looking at and it is Student’s positioning that tells what literature to be looked.
* So Student might have conceptual framework, then go into the the the literature initially filter out all the key literature according to these three big themes that comes from conceptual framework. Each of these components will have subthemes.
* Literature review is not like a book review. So one paragraph on one after another paragraph on the next order, another paragraph on the next author. PhD literature review would pick up a theme (like moral component) and draws on that literature and explaining what people are trying to say on a schematic way (Napoleon argued that the moralist to the physical as 3:1, Montgomery captures this in his statement that man is still the first weapon of war, Sun Tzu argues). So in one paragraph of about one topic about one idea, there will be 6-7 references from literature.

**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. 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-1)
2. The Germans didn't go to destroy the British forces where they were dislocated in Dunkirk. Because under the operational art it is time-wasting error. The French forces in the south was the same. German forces needed to go forward, dealing with these forces will not add value to the ongoing operations. So the Germans showed operational brilliance in not bothering to go after these dislocated forces. They could be dealt with afterwards if necessary. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)