# Research & Preparation Workflow for Presentations

## Step 1. Receive the research question and sub-questions

Clarify scope, boundaries, and assessment criteria. Identify which sub-questions connect directly to course learning outcomes.

## Step 2. Use AI to sketch out a presentation format

Ask for an outline: introduction, thematic sections, case studies, conclusion. Ensure each section maps to Claim → Evidence → However (limit) → Implication.

## Step 3. Verify format with at least three other AI systems

Compare outlines to check consistency, missing angles, and alternative framings. Note divergences to refine scope.

## Step 4. Use AI to identify the first key prolific author

Search by keywords linked to your topic. Select an author with repeated citations across the field.

## Step 5. Build a bibliography

Combine library databases, collected papers, and AI-assisted discovery. Check against Maynooth Harvard referencing requirements. Use connected-papers, inciteful.xyz and research rabbit.

## Step 6. Download the papers

Store in a structured folder system. Maintain a reference management database for citations.

## Step 7. Use AI to analyse each paper in DIMER format

For each source: Describe, Interpret, Methodology, Evaluate, (Autho)R. End with Limit → Implication.

## Step 8. Extract into presentation format + DIMER

For each finding, log where it fits in the presentation. Keep an Evidence & Implication Log.

## Step 9. Extract quotations and citations

Collect direct quotes with page numbers. Tag each quote to the slide/section it supports.

## Step 10. Maintain a single consolidated file

File contains all extracted info structured in DIMER format. This becomes the master dataset to draft slides and notes.

Ensure that AI is constantly reviewing for a critical perspective. Analytical and not descriptive.

**Distinction Levers (68% → 72%+)**

**1. Frame the Argument Early and Clearly**

* Open with a precise research question and your answer in one line.
* Example: *“This essay argues that small states can influence outcomes conditionally, when niche expertise aligns with institutional demand.”*
* Examiners reward clarity of stance more than density of sources.

**2. Prioritise Critical Synthesis over Description**

* Don’t just say “Bachmann argues X, Bennett argues Y.”
* Say: *“Bachmann overstates disinformation’s impact; Bennett shows institutional decline is deeper. For the Defence Forces, Bennett’s reading is more persuasive because…”*
* That *weighing* is what examiners scan for.

**3. Limit → Implication Discipline**

* Every section should end with:
  + *Limit*: one clear boundary (“Bachmann’s data is Ukraine-focused only”).
  + *Implication*: one DF consequence (“Implication: Ireland must adapt cautiously, given neutrality constraints”).
* This is examiner catnip: it proves you are reflective, not just descriptive.

**4. Anchor Every Claim in the Defence Forces**

* Even when discussing Clausewitz or RMA theory, always land on DF application.
* Example: *“Metz’s claim that revolutions are social as well as technical matters. Limit: US-centric. Implication: DF must consider cultural resistance as much as drones themselves.”*
* Examiners want Ireland made relevant in every paragraph.

**5. Balance Optimist vs Sceptic Voices**

* Always show at least two sides, then position yourself.
* E.g. *“Krepinevich’s optimism clashes with Betts’ caution. By contrast, Alach bridges both. Taken together, this suggests…”*
* Critical contrasts signal higher-level analysis.

**6. Deliver Novel Synthesis**

* Push one fresh link beyond what sources say.
* E.g. *“Mission command and strategic communication both hinge on candour under uncertainty. This parallel suggests a common doctrinal challenge for the DF.”*
* Even one or two such insights can push an essay into the 70s.

**7. Slide/Essay Economy**

* In presentations: one big claim per slide.
* In essays: one claim per paragraph. Avoid stacking.
* Dense work reads as descriptive; lean, prioritised work reads as analytical.

✅ **Rule of Thumb:** *Every time you add evidence, ask: Am I weighing it, limiting it, and tying it back to DF?* If not, cut or reframe.