

Battle Analysis



**US ARMY SIGNAL SCHOOL
MILITARY HISTORY EDUCATION PROGRAM**

SCCC – ADVANCED BATTLE ANALYSIS PRACTICAL EXERCISE



**PREPARED BY THE US ARMY SIGNAL HISTORY OFFICE
July 2024**

US ARMY SIGNAL SCHOOL MILITARY HISTORY EDUCATION PROGRAM

BATTLE ANALYSIS OVERVIEW

1. In accordance with TRADOC Regulation 350-13 and the Signal School Commandant's guidance, each student in the Signal Captain's Career Course is required to learn and apply the TRADOC Battle Analysis methodology to an assigned historical military operation. **A Battle Analysis is a method used by the US Army to provide a systematic approach to the study of battles, campaigns, and other operations to *critically think* about military problems.**
2. This PE is designed to serve as the ***Preparatory Phase*** for the staff ride.
3. Sources for student use are provided in the **Cyber Research Center (CRC)** inside the Woodworth Library, which has made special efforts to obtain information for particular battles. In addition, some sources are available through Microsoft Teams in folders designated in the appropriate course. Use of Internet sources is allowed; however, care should be used as anyone can post questionable data that is insufficient in depth or accuracy.

REQUIREMENT

1. Task: Students will critically analyze a topic within a historical military operation.
2. Condition: Students are given instructions, the methodology, and access to reference materials.
3. Standard: Analysis must critically evaluate a topic within a military operation in both written and briefing formats.
4. Goal: Students must demonstrate accurate knowledge about the topic through application of exacting research methods and critical analysis of why that topic is important today.

COMPONENTS

1. A 5-7 page written information/analysis paper summarizing research on an assigned topic using the methodology format with critical analysis of each key component. The paper will be the primary means of **feedback** for you to successfully complete your presentation during the staff ride. The paper will be evaluated by the military history facilitator for 75% content and 25% style/correctness.
2. A 6-8 minute presentation of the topic during a staff ride visit to sites of the historical operation/battle. The presentation will be evaluated by an SGL a briefing rubric designated by the course manager.

GENERAL INFORMATION FOR SUCCESS

1. The military history instructor will:
 - A. Be available for consultation through direct visits or through email to answer questions the students may have about the requirements. Mr. Ivan Zasimczuk may be reached at ivan.a.zasimczuk.civ@army.mil or by phone at (706) 791-3920. The branch historian email is steven.j.rauch.civ@army.mil. Phone is (706) 791-5212. Office hours are generally M-F 0800 - 1630. The instructor is located in Bldg. 29717, Room 202 which is near the Connolly Health Clinic.
 - B. Establish standards for the project and ensure they are met, help students identify weaknesses in their research or analysis and answer any questions they may have.
2. This practical exercise generally follows this sequence:
 - A. Students receive instruction and guidance during formal classroom instruction.
 - B. Students in each flow will choose their research topic and write a research paper.
 - C. At designated date, generally at least 3 weeks before the staff ride, students will turn in paper for assessment for a grade.
 - D. Instructor will review, provide feedback NLT 5 working days or earlier before staff ride indicating viability of research to support a briefing during the staff ride. Students will review/follow guidance provided to fine tune presentation on assigned topic. Students must demonstrate sufficient knowledge of the topic, otherwise they will not be allowed to brief on the Staff Ride and risk failing another assessment.
 - E. Conduct 6-8 minute briefing on topic during field study phase of the staff ride, focusing topic on applicable information related to that battle.
3. References/Research:
 - A. Most of the information for your topic will be found in the unique **Staff Ride Reading Book** for that battle and in references at the **Cyber Research Center (CRC)**. Use the following links to search the CRC website's **Staff Ride links**: <https://crc.army.mil/> or their Resources Hub page: <https://auls-cyber.tdnetsdiscover.com/pages/9474/aulscopyber>.
 - B. Visit the Cyber Research Center where you will find many military reference resources on the battles, military leaders, and other topics. Ask a librarian for assistance as they understand your research needs.
 - C. If you use the Internet, be wary of "history buff" sites. Some information is controversial, and many opinions and biases exist. Some reputable websites include:
 - US Army Center of Military History: <http://www.history.army.mil/>
 - US Army Combat Studies Institute: <https://www.armyupress.army.mil/Books/CSI-Press-Publications/revolutionary-war/>
 - US Army Heritage and Education Center (including the Military History Institute): <https://arena.usahec.org/>
 - American Battlefield Trust: <https://www.battlefields.org/>

ADVANCED BATTLE ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY FORMAT

1. DEFINE THE SUBJECT

A. Briefly determine the date, location, and principal opponents. This section is intended to take the audience from the present to the point of time when the event occurred.

- (1) What is the battle?
- (2) Where did it take place?
- (3) When did it take place?
- (4) Who were the combatants?
- (5) Why did it happen?
- (6) How important is it to know about for military profession today?

This should not be more than one paragraph of more than ½ page in length. A sentence or two for each is sufficient. You are not trying to relate the entire battle, just give context for your topic and how it fits in or why it is important.

ADVANCED BATTLE ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY FORMAT (cont.)

2. REVIEW THE STRATEGIC SETTING [THIS IS THE WAR]

A. Determine the causes of the conflict: Usually this is chronological in fashion but may cover more than one type of cause. Consider each of the following areas of causation for each side involved in the war:

- Political/Diplomatic Causes
- Economic Causes
- Religious Causes
- Military Causes
- Social Causes
- Geographic Causes
- Ethnic Causes
- Historic Causes

B. Compare the principal antagonists. Address each of the following:

- (1) Compare the National (strategic) military systems to fight the war.
 - (a) What armed forces did the nations possess at the start of the war?
 - (b) How did the nations raise armies? Draft? Volunteer enlistment? Universal conscription?
 - (c) What was their source of military manpower? Citizens? Allies? Subjects?
 - (d) How well trained, armed, and equipped were the forces?
 - (e) How well did the nation's army perform in recent conflicts?
- (2) Compare National (strategic) objectives for the war.
 - (a) What were the goals or objectives of the opposing nations? Were they clear?
 - (b) How did they intend to achieve those objectives? What was the strategy?
 - (c) How did they organize the national economy, society, information, and political elements of the nation to win the war?
 - (d) What were the commitments (treaties, diplomatic statements, and executive agreements) of the opposing nations?

ADVANCED BATTLE ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY FORMAT (cont.)

3. REVIEW THE OPERATIONAL SITUATION [THIS IS THE CAMPAIGN]

A. Discuss the events of the campaign prior to the battle. ***An operational level map must be used somewhere in this section!*** At a minimum address the following:

- (1) Who were the operational commanders of forces for each side in the campaign?
- (2) What operational forces did they have to accomplish the mission?
- What were the campaign objectives of each commander? How did they intend to achieve them?

B. Describe the operational events that brought the two armies to the time and place where the battle was fought.

- (1) This will usually be a chronological discussion of key events, decisions, or actions at the operational level within the geographic theater of operations.
- (2) This section should conclude at the point where the tactical engagement, which is the subject of the battle analysis, is about to begin.

*****REMEMBER – YOU DO NOT DISCUSS ANY ASPECT OF THE TACTICAL BATTLE THAT IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS ANALYSIS. THAT WILL BE DONE IN PARTS 4 AND 5.

Not applicable for this project

ADVANCED BATTLE ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY FORMAT (cont.)

4. REVIEW THE TACTICAL SITUATION

A. Study the area of operations.

(1) **Climate and weather**

- (a) What was the climate and weather in the battle area? (Consider visibility, clouds, precipitation, temperature, and winds.)
- (b) What were the potential effects of the weather and climate on personnel and their ability to fight effectively?
- (c) What were the effects of weather on natural features, such as the landscape and rivers?
- (d) What were the effects of the weather on equipment and supplies?

(2) **Terrain (OAKOS). NOTE- USE A TERRAIN MAP SHOWING TERRAIN FEATURES** [Analyze the terrain of the area as if you were planning to conduct operations there. Recommend you examine terrain from a neutral perspective as to advantages and disadvantages of a generic attacker or defender.]

(a) **Observation and fields of fire**

- i. How did the terrain influence the ability of the opposing forces to exercise surveillance over critical areas of the battlefield?
- ii. How did the terrain influence both direct and indirect fire weapons?
- iii. What effect did terrain's limiting factors have on the way the battle was fought?

(b) **Avenues of approach**

- i. What were the best avenues of approach for the attacking force?
- ii. Were the avenues of approach selected for the attacking force big enough to accommodate the appropriate units?
- iii. Could the defending force interfere with the use of an avenue of approach?
- iv. What was the relationship between weather and terrain, and what was its impact on the tactical operations?

(c) **Key terrain**

- i. What was the key terrain in the area of operations?
- ii. What potential influence did the key terrain have on the plan of operations of the opposing sides?
- iii. Did the key terrain provide an advantage to one side or the other?
- iv. How did each level of command of the opposing forces view the selection of key terrain?
- v. How did the opposing forces use the key terrain in the assignment of missions?

(d) **Obstacles**

- i. What were the obstacles (man-made and natural) that could impede the movement of military forces?
- ii. How did the presence of obstacles influence the way the battle was fought?
- iii. Which side benefited from the presence of these obstacles?

(e) **Cover and Concealment**

- i. What concealment and cover were available in the battle area for both forces?
- ii. Did the availability of concealment and cover influence the opposing commanders' plans of action?

ADVANCED BATTLE ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY FORMAT (cont.)

- B. Compare the opposing forces to ascertain their combat effectiveness as they existed before the action.

[NOTE: Each section needs to reflect how those systems worked in general for the time and specifically to that battle.]

(1) **Task Organization**

- (a) What were the numerical strengths of the opposing forces?
- (b) What were the strengths in weapons systems, fighting vehicles and other key tactical equipment?
- (c) What were the unit identifications of the forces involved in the fight? (Note: Unit identification consists of the name or number of the unit, type, relative size, and subordination.)
- (d) What were the supporting units? (engineers, special units, etc.)
- (e) What was their experience in warfare up to this point?

(2) **Weapons Technology**

- (a) What was the technological level of the weaponry of the opposing forces?
- (b) Was there a substantial difference? If so, who had the advantage? In what areas?
- (c) Did each side have sufficient technology to support its tactical doctrine?
- (d) Did technology affect the way the battle was fought?

(3) **Sustainment**

- (a) What were the logistical requirements for each side to carry out its course of action to a successful conclusion?
- (b) Were the classes and types of supplies readily available to the forces?
- (c) Was there adequate transportation to support the forces?
- (d) What was the availability of supply installations and terminals?
- (e) What impact did shortages of personnel, equipment, and supplies have on the way the battle was fought and its outcome?
- (f) Were replacements troops or units used during battle? What effect if any did they have on the battle?

(4) **Health Service Support**

- (a) How did the army organize medical treatment on the battlefield?
- (b) What were the accepted medical practices for the time period?
- (c) What impact did disease have on military operations?
- (d) What was the nature of battle wounds at that time?
- (e) What were the methods/policies on medical evacuation?

(5) **Mission Command**

- (a) Who were the key leaders in the battle? What experience did they have?
- (b) Were the leaders technically and tactically proficient?
- (c) What were the personality traits of the commanders and staff officers?
- (d) How flexible were the leaders to the changing nature of the battlefield?
- (e) Were the staffs well organized, trained, and efficient?
- (f) Were operations orders and plans well thought out, coordinated, and implemented to ensure the accomplishment of the mission?

Not applicable for this project

ADVANCED BATTLE ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY FORMAT (cont.)

- (6) Communications/Signal**
- (a) What were the methods of communicating orders and information for that time?
 - (b) Who was responsible for managing communications?
 - (c) What technology was used to enable communications?
 - (d) What were the primary and alternate means of battlefield communications?
- (7) Intelligence.**
- (a) What intelligence assets were available to the opposing forces?
 - (b) What were the major sources of intelligence?
 - (c) How was intelligence collected? How was it disseminated? Was it timely? Was it effective?
 - (d) Did commanders seek and use intelligence information wisely?
 - (e) Was intelligence information integrated into the operational plans? If so, how?
- (8) Information Operations**
- (a) What role did information operations play in the outcome of the operation?
 - (b) What intelligence did it have or not have?
 - (c) How did it affect friendly or enemy C2 or morale?
 - (d) What messages were used against the enemy? Friendly civilians? Uncertain civilians?
- (9) Tactical Doctrine and Training.**
- (a) What were the tactical doctrines of the opposing forces? (Note: This means the accepted principles or employment of forces on the battlefield.)
 - (b) If there were changes in the actual tactics, what were these changes and why?
 - (c) What was the level of training of the forces involved in the fight?
 - (d) Were the forces experienced in battle or were they relatively green troops?
- (10) Condition and Morale.**
- (a) What was the morale of the soldiers before the battle? During the battle?
 - (b) Had they been successful in previous fights?
 - (c) What influence did the weather and terrain have on the morale of the units?
 - (d) What measures had the combat leaders taken to improve morale?
 - (e) What effect did public opinion at home have on the state of morale?
 - (f) Did the soldiers believe in the cause of the fight?
 - (g) What was the state of health of the soldiers?
- (11) Civil Affairs**
- (a) What was the view of the army toward civilians in the battle zone?
 - (b) What were the policies on treatment toward friendly civilians? Unfriendly civilians? Neutral civilians?
 - (c) What were the SOPs to mitigate how the military presence affected the population?
 - (d) What efforts were made to develop friendly native security personnel and forces?
- (12) Law of War / Enemy Prisoners of War**
- (a) What were the established laws of land warfare during that time?
 - (b) Were they written? Unwritten? Accepted?
 - (c) What safeguards were followed regarding POWs?
 - (d) Were prisoners released or detained in a facility? What was the nature of the facilities?
 - (e) How did the conflict affect/change POW operations?

ADVANCED BATTLE ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY FORMAT (cont.)

- C. Consider the feasible courses of action to accomplish the assigned mission.
- (1) What were the tactical courses of action available to the opposing commanders?
 - (2) Did these courses of action lend themselves to the accomplishment of the mission?
 - (3) Did opposing commanders fully understand the situation in their decision-making processes based on the circumstances and time available?
- D. Identify the tactical missions of each antagonist.
- (1) What were the tactical missions of the key subordinate units based on the chosen COA?
 - (2) What were the proposed or planned movements of the units?

5. DESCRIBE THE ACTION [THIS IS THE BATTLE]

- A. Identify the tactical missions of each antagonist.
- (1) What were the tactical missions assigned to subordinate units by the commander?
 - (2) What was considered success for the mission? (I.e., destruction of enemy, seizing terrain, etc.)
- B. Describe the tactical locations of forces at the beginning of the action. **USE A MAP.**
- (1) What were the starting locations of all the forces and how were they deployed on the terrain before the first shot was fired?
 - (2) What were the proposed or planned movements of the units?
- C. Describe the major phases of the battle (usually chronological) along with the key events, decisions, or actions that occurred.
- (1) Describe the opening moves of each side paying attention to the following:
 - (a) How did the attacking forces move their units across the line of departure?
 - (b) How did the defending forces react to the attack?
 - (2) How did the operation unfold after the opening moves?
 - (3) Did the battle have clearly recognizable turning points? If so, what were they? When did they occur? What caused them?
- D. Describe the outcome of the battle. [Review the elements described in Part 4 as a basis of your analysis.]
- (1) Did one side achieve a clear victory? Why or why not?
 - (2) Were the missions stated in 5A accomplished?
 - (3) What were the casualties for each side (both raw numbers and percentage of forces engaged?)
 - (4) Which aspect of Section 4 had the greatest impact for each side? (Strength & Composition; Weapons; Sustainment; Medical; C3; Intelligence; Doctrine & Training; Condition & Morale; Leadership)

ADVANCED BATTLE ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY FORMAT (cont.)

6. ASSESS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ACTION (ANALYSIS)

- A. The first part of your analysis should focus on how your topic relates to some aspect of **CURRENT** US Army doctrine such as found in **ADP 3-0 OPERATIONS** or any **CURRENT** associated ADP, ADRP, ATP, or FM as applicable that is available on the Army Publishing Directorate home page: <http://www.apd.army.mil/>
- (1) You must reference a specific doctrinal publication for your concept and cite the source in both the endnotes and bibliography.
 - (2) You must choose a construct, concept, or process that your topic illustrates, such as War Fighting Functions or Tenets of ULO for example.
 - (3) If you have a topic that is a war fighting function (i.e., sustainment or intelligence) then logic dictates that you compare that function to the historical context and contemporary understanding of that topic as defined in the ADP, ADRP or FM.
- B. The second and **most important part of your analysis** should be your assessment or insights as to why knowing about this topic is applicable for the military professional today.
- (1) What aspects are still relevant to military operations during the 21st Century?
 - (2) What can be learned from this event or topic (the **So What?**) needs to be addressed.

ADVANCED BATTLE ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY FORMAT (cont.)

7. ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A. List all sources of information consulted for your study in alphabetical order. Remember – format should be IAW Turabian. A style sheet is provided in this handout.
- B. Evaluate the sources. This is a crucial step when conducting your analysis. The author of any informational source will invariably inject personal bias into their work. Consider the following:

(1) Did the writer express a point of view or bias?

(2) To what areas of the analysis did the source provide useful information?

(3) Do you recommend this reference for use by others?

- C. Do not copy the comments from the back cover or by other areas of the book used by the publisher to sell their product.
- D. Do not include any biographical information on the author, such as other works they have produced, where they went to school, or where they currently teach. No more than one line about the expertise of the author to establish their credibility. For example, *Lawrence Babits is considered an expert on the Battle of Cowpens, and it is evident in this work.*
- E. An important part of critical analysis is questioning the validity of sources as you learn more details about your topic. Your thoughts about the source may change the more you know about the subject.

EXAMPLE:

Zasimczuk, Ivan. *Topics in Military History*. San Francisco: Golden Gate Books, 2000. This monograph was very useful in my research. Specifically, Chapter 2 discusses the idea of Total War and its characteristics. I used his definitions and principles and applied them to (Sherman's March OR the Cowpens). His point of view is that of a scholar exploring these topics from the outside looking in trying to penetrate and explore each topic. There is a western bias to this work as it is entirely framed from a Eurocentric standpoint and does not include eastern or tribal ways of thought. The best audience for this work would JAG officers and Chaplains because of how rooted it is in law and ethics. Additionally mid-grade officers attending ILE where students are forced out of their comfort zones and forced to consider wider points of view would benefit from reading this work.

Assessing Writing		
STUDENT NAME:	STAFF GROUP:	DATE:
COURSE TITLE: SCCC	ASSIGNMENT:	
INSTRUCTOR:	DEPARTMENT: SIGNAL HISTORY OFFICE	
<p>Requirement: Write effectively as defined by the Army standard as “understandable in a single, rapid reading and generally free of errors in grammar, mechanics, and usage.”</p> <p>Standard: Writing includes—</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Substance; 2. Organization; 3. Style; and, 4. Correctness. 		

OVERALL GRADE:								
97+: A+	96-94: A	93-90: A-	89-87: B+	86-84: B	83-80: B-	79-70: C	<70: U	Total:

INSTRUCTOR COMMENTS
<p>A+/A Papers: EXCEPTIONAL - Sets the standard of excellence and exhibits all of the following characteristics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper has a well-defined central idea and clearly identifies importance of topic with correct information. 2. Organization is entirely logical: the argument is developed step by step from introduction to conclusion with no irrelevant material. 3. Documentation of historical facts is ample and indicates that the writer has examined the most important, current, and available sources. 4. The paper has been written in a clear, literate and scholarly fashion. 5. Paper displays insight and analysis of the subject and sources. Includes appropriate ADP 3.0 constructs and relevance for 21st century leaders. 6. All administrative instructions are followed to the letter (i.e. formats, fonts, etc) and citations (endnotes and bibliography) are in exact Turabian format. <p>A-/B+/B Papers: SATISFACTORY - Papers exhibit most of the following characteristics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a well-defined central idea and topic is clearly stated. 2. The argument is clear and logical, but with little irrelevant material and minor problems in logic or organization. 3. Documentation of historical facts is ample but may have minor errors or use of inadequate sources. 4. The paper is generally well written with few if any distractions to the reader. 5. The subject is thoroughly understood with evidence of original thought. Includes appropriate ADP 3.0 constructs and relevance for 21st century leaders. 6. Most administrative instructions are followed (i.e. formats, fonts, etc) and citations (endnotes and bibliography) may have minor errors in format. <p>B-/C Papers: ADEQUATE - Papers exhibit most of the following characteristics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Topic is not clearly evident to the reader by the second page of the paper. 2. The conclusions may be inadequately developed, based on incorrect facts, or only tangentially related to the information presented. 3. Documentation of historical facts is minimal but adequate and in the correct form, but reflects sources of poor, biased or dated quality. 4. The paper contains errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling though still communicates ideas adequately - but not effectively. 5. Minimal understanding of the subject or its importance. Lacks complete or logical ADP3.0 constructs or relevance for 21st century leaders. 6. Few administrative instructions are followed (i.e. formats, fonts, etc) and citations (endnotes and bibliography) have major errors in format. <p>U Papers: UNSATISFACTORY – Papers exhibit one or more of the following characteristics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discussion is illogical, unclear, contains irrelevant information or consists of a series of facts or direct quotes, with little or no interpretation. 2. Documentation of historical facts is inadequate or the sources are limited in number (i.e. use of only one source). 3. There are major stylistic, grammatical and/or spelling errors that prevent the reader from understanding the writer’s points, facts or analysis. 4. The writer clearly does not understand the subject of the paper. Does not include any analysis of an Army Doctrinal construct or relevance for 21st century leaders. 5. No citations of any sort for information is automatic failure.

Cognitive Level Attained ↓ (Higher levels include characteristics of lower levels)	Elements of Thought	Universal Intellectual Standards Exhibited
<p>EVALUATION (Judging or weighing by building and using criteria and standards)</p> <p>SYNTHESIS (Integrating parts into a new whole)</p> <p>ANALYSIS (Breaking material down into component parts to determine structures and relationships)</p> <p>APPLICATION (Use of knowledge to solve problems)</p> <p>COMPREHENSION (Understanding of the material)</p> <p>KNOWLEDGE (Recall of specific information)</p>		<p>-Clarity</p> <p>-Accuracy</p> <p>-Precision</p> <p>-Relevance</p> <p>-Depth</p> <p>-Breadth</p> <p>-Logic</p> <p>-Significance</p> <p>-Fairness</p>

Instructions: The rubric below integrates the Elements of Thought and Universal Intellectual Standards, IAW Paul and Elder, with the four standards of effective writing: Substance, Organization, Style, and Correctness. Substance is further divided into Content and Analysis/Problem-Solving/Conclusions. The underlined and bolded words directly correspond with Elements of Thought and Universal Intellectual Standards and demonstrate the relationship between effective writing and critical thinking. This rubric provides a means to explicitly assess critical thinking while assessing writing. Faculty should assign points based on the requirements of the assignment. Assess writing based on the descriptions in the Exceptional, Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory blocks.

Student Self-Assessment		Faculty Assessment		
Exceptional		Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	
Substance				
Points	Content (35 Points)		Points	
	<p><u>Topic</u> is clear and concise. <u>Content</u> is fully compliant with the assigned requirement and the needs of the reader; everything is accurate; <u>level of detail</u> is suited to the needs of the assigned requirement and reader. Explanations and descriptions of content are clear and precise. Quantitative <u>information</u> is relevant and accurate, expressed with appropriate examples, and well integrated into the text.</p>	<p><u>Topic</u> is present, but not necessarily clear. Small omissions or inadequacies in <u>content</u>, but adequately covers the written requirement and needs of the reader. Some minor inaccuracies, but primarily accurate. May occasionally include irrelevant details or omit important details. Explanations and descriptions are almost always clear and precise. Quantitative <u>information</u> is accurate, and related to the text.</p>	<p><u>Topic</u> is unclear or confusing. <u>Information</u> content (facts, assumptions, concepts/theories) is inaccurate and/or irrelevant to the topic, missing, misrepresented, and/or insufficient detail. Explanations and descriptions are not clear and precise. Quantitative <u>information</u> is inaccurate, and not related to the text.</p>	
	Analysis/Problem-Solving/Conclusions (40 Points)			
	<p>Attains highest cognitive level that is appropriate to the assignment. Insightful, original <u>analysis</u>; <u>conclusions</u> superbly supported by evidence clearly explained; consideration of a doctrinal construct is logical, effectively related to the topic and relevant; consideration of So What? for 21st century leaders is thoughtful, original and considered in light of evidence presented.</p>	<p>Attains an adequate cognitive level appropriate to the assignment. Thorough <u>analysis</u>, though perhaps not as insightful or original as it could be; <u>conclusions</u> adequately supported by evidence clearly explained; doctrinal constructs may be superficially treated or not fully related to evidence or the topic; So What? conclusion is present but is inadequately developed or related to the topic</p>	<p>Remains at a low cognitive level. <u>Analysis</u> superficial; little or no relation between conclusions and evidence; doctrinal construct is missing or misunderstood in relation to topic; fails to address the So What? in any logical or thoughtful manner; not enough evidence or thought beyond superficial knowledge to support an advanced analysis.</p>	
Points	Organization (10 Points)		Points	
	<p>Points are clear and logically arranged so as to develop the <u>content and analysis</u> most productively for the audience.</p>	<p>Points are clear. In general, points establish a logical line of reasoning.</p>	<p>Points are not clear or the sequence of points is illogical or inadequate to the needs of the task or audience.</p>	
Points	Style (5 Points)		Points	
	<p>Words are precise; language is concise and without wordiness; writer's tone is appropriate to the audience and purpose; sentences track clearly even to the rapid reader; transitions lead smoothly from one idea to the next. Active voice predominates</p>	<p>Some language is imprecise but generally understandable. Style is adequate but lacks polish and directness. Some passive voice or awkward sentence construction is present; Minimally effective in communicating ideas and information to the audience.</p>	<p>The language is awkward, hard to read. The reader must backtrack to understand the writer's meaning, or the reader cannot understand the meaning. Language is excessively wordy; in passive voice, or inappropriate in tone.</p>	
Points	Administration/Correctness (10 Points)		Points	
	<p>Few if any departures from the published standard (grammar, punctuation and usage). Citations are thorough and correctly formatted. Exhibits no more than 5 errors of correctness.</p>	<p>A few departures from the published standard (grammar, punctuation and usage), but not enough to confuse or distract the reader. Citations are adequate but incorrect or incomplete. Exhibits 6-12 errors of correctness.</p>	<p>Significant errors in standards of grammar, punctuation and usage which significantly confuse or distract the reader. Paper is less than 5 pages (5+1) or more than 7 pages. Citations are incorrect, inadequate, lacking or entirely missing. Exhibits more than 12 errors of correctness.</p>	
			Total Points	

Turabian Format Example Endnotes Page

Green: Turabian Orange: History Office

The endnotes page comes after your content and before your bibliography.

Put the Notes title centered at the top, bolded, and with two blank lines beneath.

Indent the first line 1/2" but leave subsequent lines at the regular margin.

Continue the page numbering and 1" margins from your content pages.

Notes

Each note is single-spaced with a blank line between notes.

1. Noah Andre Trudeau, *Southern Storm: Sherman's March to the Sea* (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2008), 33.
2. Lawrence E. Babits, *A Devil of a Whipping: The Battle of Cowpens* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 235.
3. Trudeau, *Southern Storm*, 28-29.
4. Paul K. Davis, "Atlanta/March to the Sea," in *100 Decisive Battles: From Ancient Times to the Present* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 330.
5. Bennett Parten, "'Somewhere Toward Freedom': Sherman's March and Georgia's Refugee Slaves," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 101, no. 2 (June 2017): 132, ProQuest Military Database.
6. Davis, *100 Decisive Battles*, 335.
7. Alan S. Brown, "James Simpson's Reports on the Carolina Loyalists, 1779-1780," *Journal of Southern History* 21 (Nov 1955): 517; <https://doi.org/23.1066/8675309>.
8. John S. Pancake, "Rebels and Bloodybacks," in *This Destructive War: The British Campaign in the Carolinas 1780-1782* (Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1985), 46.
9. Brown, "James Simpson's Reports," 517.
10. Trudeau, *Southern Storm*, 31.
11. Steven E. Woodworth, *Nothing but Victory: The Army of the Tennessee, 1861-1865* (New York: Vintage Press, 2006), chap. 8, Kindle.
12. Department of the Army, *OPERATIONS*, ADP 3-0 (Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 2019), 3-18; https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR_pubs/DR_a/ARN18010-ADP_3-0-000-WEB-2.pdf.
13. "Firearms Used in the Revolutionary War," The Revolutionary War in 4 Minutes, American Battlefield Trust, accessed July 4, 2023, <https://www.battlefields.org/learn/videos/firearms-used-revolutionary-war>.
14. American Battlefield Trust, "Firearms."

Use the full citation the first time you refer to a source. After that you may use the shortened version.

Add the name of the database, DOI, or URL for online resources.

Cite the TAB readings as if from their original sources when possible. Source data for each is found on the orange page.

Cite specific page numbers for notes.

If your electronic book does not provide page numbers from the original, note the chapter or section and the device used.

To number your notes, use regular text with a period and space before the note or use a superscript number with a space but no period.

To format your individual citations, see the Turabian Guide section in your *Advanced Battle Analysis Practical Exercise* document or scan this QR code.



Remember, any formatting directions given by your instructor take precedence. Examples shown reflect formatting according to Kate L. Turabian's *A Manual for Writers*, 9th edition (2018). See more at turabian.org or ask your instructor.

US Army Signal Corps History Office
Turabian Format Example
Bibliography Page
 Green: Turabian Orange: History Office

The bibliography page comes after your content and endnotes page(s).

Put the Bibliography title centered at the top, bolded, and with two blank lines beneath.

Leave the first line at the regular margin, but indent the subsequent lines 1/2".

Bibliography

Continue the page numbering and 1" margins from your content pages.

Each entry is single-spaced with a blank line between notes.

Include an access date for websites without a publication or revision date.

For online resources, add the name of the database, DOI, or URL.

Cite the TAB readings as if from their original sources when possible. Source data for each is found on the orange page.

American Battlefield Trust. "Firearms Used in the Revolutionary War." The Revolutionary War in 4 Minutes. Accessed July 4, 2023. <https://www.battlefields.org/learn/videos/firearms-used-revolutionary-war>.

Babits, Lawrence E. *A Devil of a Whipping: The Battle of Cowpens*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1998.

Brown, Alan S. "James Simpson's Reports on the Carolina Loyalists, 1779-1780." *Journal of Southern History* 21 (Nov 1955): 513-519. <https://doi.org/23.1066/8675309>.

Davis, Paul K. "Atlanta/March to the Sea." In *100 Decisive Battles: From Ancient Times to the Present*, 286-435. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Department of the Army. *OPERATIONS*. ADP 3-0. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 2019. https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR_pubs/DR_a/ARN18010-ADP_3-0-000-WEB-2.pdf.

Pancake, John S. "Rebels and Bloodybacks." In *This Destructive War: The British Campaign in the Carolinas 1780-1782*, 36-55. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1985.

Parten, Bennett. "'Somewhere Toward Freedom': Sherman's March and Georgia's Refugee Slaves." *Georgia Historical Quarterly* 101, no. 2 (June 2017): 115-46. ProQuest Military Database.

Trudeau, Noah Andre. *Southern Storm: Sherman's March to the Sea*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2008.

Woodworth, Steven E. *Nothing but Victory: The Army of the Tennessee, 1861-1865*. New York: Vintage Press, 2006. Kindle.

If using an e-reader, note the type of device.

Put your entries in alphabetical order by authors last name (or organizational name), if needed.

Cite a PDF or electronic version of an article, book, or other document the same way you would the original. Then add the required information for the version/format.

Everything stays the same for an annotated bibliography, with only the addition of your text for each entry. See your *Advanced Battle Analysis Practical Exercise* document for an example annotation.

To format your individual citations, see the Turabian Guide section in your *Advanced Battle Analysis Practical Exercise* document or scan this QR code.



Remember, any formatting directions given by your instructor take precedence. Examples shown reflect formatting according to Kate L. Turabian's *A Manual for Writers*, 9th edition (2018). See more at turabian.org or ask your instructor.

TURABIAN *A Manual for* Writers

CHICAGO STYLE FOR STUDENTS AND RESEARCHERS

CONTENTS CITATION QUICK GUIDE HELP & TOOLS BOOKSTORE ABOUT TIP SHEETS

CITATION QUICK GUIDE

Notes and Bibliography: Sample Citations

The following examples illustrate the notes and bibliography style. Sample notes show full citations followed by shortened forms that would be used after the first citation. Sample bibliography entries follow the notes. For more details and many more examples, see chapters 16 and 17 of Turabian. (For examples of the same citations using the author-date system, go to [Author-Date: Sample Citations](#).)

BOOK

NOTES

1. Katie Kitamura, *A Separation* (New York: Riverhead Books, 2017), 25.
2. Sharon Sassler and Amanda Jayne Miller, *Cohabitation Nation: Gender, Class, and the Remaking of Relationships* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2017), 114.

SHORTENED NOTES

3. Kitamura, *Separation*, 91–92.
4. Sassler and Miller, *Cohabitation Nation*, 205.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRIES (IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

Kitamura, Katie. *A Separation*. New York: Riverhead Books, 2017.

Sassler, Sharon, and Amanda Jayne Miller. *Cohabitation Nation: Gender, Class, and the Remaking of Relationships*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2017.

CHAPTER OR OTHER PART OF AN EDITED BOOK

In a note, cite specific pages. In the bibliography, include the page range for the chapter or part.

NOTE

1. Mary Rowlandson, “The Narrative of My Captivity,” in *The Making of the American Essay*, ed. John D’Agata (Minneapolis: Graywolf Press, 2016), 19–20.

SHORTENED NOTE

2. Rowlandson, “Captivity,” 48.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRY

Rowlandson, Mary. “The Narrative of My Captivity.” In *The Making of the American Essay*, edited by John D’Agata, 19–56. Minneapolis: Graywolf Press, 2016.

To cite an edited book as a whole, list the editor(s) first.

NOTE

1. John D’Agata, ed., *The Making of the American Essay* (Minneapolis: Graywolf Press, 2016), 19–20.

SHORTENED NOTE

2. D’Agata, *American Essay*, 48.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRY

D’Agata, John, ed. *The Making of the American Essay*. Minneapolis: Graywolf Press, 2016.

TRANSLATED BOOK



NOTE

1. Jhumpa Lahiri, *In Other Words*, trans. Ann Goldstein (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2016), 146.

SHORTENED NOTE

2. Lahiri, *In Other Words*, 184.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRY

Lahiri, Jhumpa. *In Other Words*. Translated by Ann Goldstein. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2016.

E-BOOK

For books consulted online, include a URL or the name of the database. For other types of e-books, name the format. If no fixed page numbers are available, cite a section title or a chapter or other number in the notes or, if possible, track down a version with fixed page numbers.

NOTES

1. Fyodor Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, trans. Constance Garnett, ed. William Allan Neilson (New York: P. F. Collier & Son, 1917), 444, <https://archive.org/details/crimepunishment00dostuoft>.
2. Eric Schlosser, *Fast Food Nation: The Dark Side of the American Meal* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2001), 88, ProQuest Ebrary.
3. Jane Austen, *Pride and Prejudice* (New York: Penguin Classics, 2007), chap. 3, Kindle.

SHORTENED NOTES

4. Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, 504–5.
5. Schlosser, *Fast Food Nation*, 100.
6. Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*, chap. 14.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRIES (IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

- Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. New York: Penguin Classics, 2007. Kindle.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor. *Crime and Punishment*. Translated by Constance Garnett, edited by William Allan Neilson. New York: P. F. Collier & Son, 1917. <https://archive.org/details/crimepunishment00dostuoft>.
- Schlosser, Eric. *Fast Food Nation: The Dark Side of the American Meal*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2001. ProQuest Ebrary.

THESIS OR DISSERTATION

NOTE

1. Guadalupe Navarro-Garcia, “Integrating Social Justice Values in Educational Leadership: A Study of African American and Black University Presidents” (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2016), 44, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

SHORTENED NOTE

2. Navarro-Garcia, “Social Justice Values,” 125–26.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRY

Navarro-Garcia, Guadalupe. “Integrating Social Justice Values in Educational Leadership: A Study of African American and Black University Presidents.” PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2016. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

JOURNAL ARTICLE

In a note, cite specific page numbers. In the bibliography, include the page range for the whole article. For articles consulted online, include a URL or the name of the database. Many journal articles list a DOI (Digital Object Identifier). A DOI forms a permanent URL that begins <https://doi.org/>. This URL is preferable to the URL that appears in your browser’s address bar.

NOTES

1. Ashley Hope Pérez, “Material Morality and the Logic of Degrees in Diderot’s *Le neveu de Rameau*,” *Modern Philology* 114, no. 4 (May 2017): 874, <https://doi.org/10.1086/689836>.
2. Shao-Hsun Keng, Chun-Hung Lin, and Peter F. Orazem, “Expanding College Access in Taiwan, 1978–2014: Effects on Graduate Quality and

Income Inequality," *Journal of Human Capital* 11, no. 1 (Spring 2017): 9–10, <https://doi.org/10.1086/690235>.

3. Peter LaSalle, "Conundrum: A Story about Reading," *New England Review* 38, no. 1 (2017): 95, Project MUSE.

SHORTENED NOTES

4. Pérez, "Material Morality," 880–81.
5. Keng, Lin, and Orazem, "Expanding College Access," 23.
6. LaSalle, "Conundrum," 101.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRIES (IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

Keng, Shao-Hsun, Chun-Hung Lin, and Peter F. Orazem. "Expanding College Access in Taiwan, 1978–2014: Effects on Graduate Quality and Income Inequality." *Journal of Human Capital* 11, no. 1 (Spring 2017): 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.1086/690235>.

LaSalle, Peter. "Conundrum: A Story about Reading." *New England Review* 38, no. 1 (2017): 95–109. Project MUSE.

Pérez, Ashley Hope. "Material Morality and the Logic of Degrees in Diderot's *Le neveu de Rameau*." *Modern Philology* 114, no. 4 (May 2017): 872–98. <https://doi.org/10.1086/689836>.

Journal articles often list many authors, especially in the sciences. If there are four or more authors, list up to ten in the bibliography; in a note, list only the first, followed by *et al.* ("and others"). For more than ten authors (not shown here), list the first seven in the bibliography, followed by *et al.*

NOTE

7. Jesse N. Weber et al., "Resist Globally, Infect Locally: A Transcontinental Test of Adaptation by Stickleback and Their Tapeworm Parasite," *American Naturalist* 189, no. 1 (January 2017): 45, <https://doi.org/10.1086/689597>.

SHORTENED NOTE

8. Weber et al., "Resist Globally," 48–49.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRY

Weber, Jesse N., Martin Kalbe, Kum Chuan Shim, Noémie I. Erin, Natalie C. Steinel, Lei Ma, and Daniel I. Bolnick. "Resist Globally, Infect Locally: A Transcontinental Test of Adaptation by Stickleback and Their Tapeworm Parasite." *American Naturalist* 189, no. 1 (January 2017): 43–57. <https://doi.org/10.1086/689597>.

NEWS OR MAGAZINE ARTICLE

Articles from newspapers or news sites, magazines, blogs, and the like are cited similarly. Page numbers, if any, can be cited in a note but are omitted from a bibliography entry. If you consulted the article online, include a URL or the name of the database.

NOTES

1. Farhad Manjoo, "Snap Makes a Bet on the Cultural Supremacy of the Camera," *New York Times*, March 8, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/08/technology/snap-makes-a-bet-on-the-cultural-supremacy-of-the-camera.html>.
2. Erin Anderssen, "Through the Eyes of Generation Z," *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), June 25, 2016, <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/through-the-eyes-of-generation-z/article30571914/>.
3. Rob Pegoraro, "Apple's iPhone Is Sleek, Smart and Simple," *Washington Post*, July 5, 2007, LexisNexis Academic.
4. Vinson Cunningham, "You Don't Understand: John McWhorter Makes His Case for Black English," *New Yorker*, May 15, 2017, 85.
5. Dara Lind, "Moving to Canada, Explained," *Vox*, September 15, 2016, <http://www.vox.com/2016/5/9/11608830/move-to-canada-how>.

SHORTENED NOTES

6. Manjoo, "Snap."
7. Anderssen, "Generation Z."
8. Pegoraro, "Apple's iPhone."
9. Cunningham, "Black English," 86.
10. Lind, "Moving to Canada."

BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRIES (IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

- Anderssen, Erin. "Through the Eyes of Generation Z." *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), June 25, 2016.
<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/through-the-eyes-of-generation-z/article30571914/>.
- Cunningham, Vinson. "You Don't Understand: John McWhorter Makes His Case for Black English." *New Yorker*, May 15, 2017.
- Lind, Dara. "Moving to Canada, Explained." *Vox*, September 15, 2016.
<http://www.vox.com/2016/5/9/11608830/move-to-canada-how>.
- Manjoo, Farhad. "Snap Makes a Bet on the Cultural Supremacy of the Camera." *New York Times*, March 8, 2017.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/08/technology/snap-makes-a-bet-on-the-cultural-supremacy-of-the-camera.html>.
- Pegoraro, Rob. "Apple's iPhone Is Sleek, Smart and Simple." *Washington Post*, July 5, 2007. LexisNexis Academic.

Readers' comments are cited in the text or in a note but omitted from a bibliography.

NOTE

1. Eduardo B (Los Angeles), March 9, 2017, comment on Manjoo, "Snap."

BOOK REVIEW

NOTE

1. Fernanda Eberstadt, "Gone Guy: A Writer Leaves His Wife, Then Disappears in Greece," review of *A Separation*, by Katie Kitamura, *New York Times*, February 15, 2017,
<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/15/books/review/separation-katie-kitamura.html>.

SHORTENED NOTE

2. Eberstadt, "Gone Guy."

BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRY

- Eberstadt, Fernanda. "Gone Guy: A Writer Leaves His Wife, Then Disappears in Greece." Review of *A Separation*, by Katie Kitamura. *New York Times*, February 15, 2017.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/15/books/review/separation-katie-kitamura.html>.

WEBSITE CONTENT

Web pages and other website content can be cited as shown here. For a source that does not list a date of publication, posting, or revision, include an access date (as in the Columbia example).

NOTES

1. "Privacy Policy," Privacy & Terms, Google, last modified April 17, 2017, <https://www.google.com/policies/privacy/>.
2. "History," Columbia University, accessed May 15, 2017, <http://www.columbia.edu/content/history.html>.

SHORTENED NOTES

3. Google, "Privacy Policy."
4. Columbia University, "History."

BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRIES (IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

- Columbia University. "History." Accessed May 15, 2017.
<http://www.columbia.edu/content/history.html>.
- Google. "Privacy Policy." Privacy & Terms. Last modified April 17, 2017.
<https://www.google.com/policies/privacy/>.

AUDIOVISUAL CONTENT

NOTES

1. Kory Stamper, "From 'F-Bomb' to 'Photobomb,' How the Dictionary Keeps Up with English," interview by Terry Gross, *Fresh Air*, NPR, April 19, 2017, audio, 35:25,
<http://www.npr.org/2017/04/19/524618639/from-f-bomb-to-photobomb-how-the-dictionary-keeps-up-with-english>.
2. Beyoncé, "Sorry," directed by Kahlil Joseph and Beyoncé Knowles, June 22, 2016, music video, 4:25, <https://youtu.be/QxsmWxxouIM>.

SHORTENED NOTES

3. Stamper, interview.
4. Beyoncé, “Sorry.”

BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRIES (IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER)

Beyoncé. “Sorry.” Directed by Kahlil Joseph and Beyoncé Knowles. June 22, 2016. Music video, 4:25. <https://youtu.be/QxsmWxxouIM>.

Stamper, Kory. “From ‘F-Bomb’ to ‘Photobomb,’ How the Dictionary Keeps Up with English.” Interview by Terry Gross. *Fresh Air*, NPR, April 19, 2017. Audio, 35:25. <http://www.npr.org/2017/04/19/524618639/from-f-bomb-to-photobomb-how-the-dictionary-keeps-up-with-english>.

SOCIAL MEDIA CONTENT

Citations of content shared through social media can usually be limited to the text (as in the first example below). A note may be added if a more formal citation is needed or to include a link. In rare cases, a bibliography entry may also be appropriate. In place of a title, quote up to the first 160 characters of the post. Comments are cited in reference to the original post.

TEXT

Sloane Crosley offers the following advice: “How to edit: Attack a sentence. Write in the margins. Toss in some arrows. Cross out words. Rewrite them. Circle the whole mess and STET” (@askanyone, Twitter, May 8, 2017).

NOTES

1. Pete Souza (@petesouza), “President Obama bids farewell to President Xi of China at the conclusion of the Nuclear Security Summit,” Instagram photo, April 1, 2016, <https://www.instagram.com/p/BDrmfXTtNct/>.
2. Chicago Manual of Style, “Is the world ready for singular they? We thought so back in 1993,” Facebook, April 17, 2015, <https://www.facebook.com/ChicagoManual/posts/10152906193679151>.

SHORTENED NOTES

3. Souza, “President Obama.”
4. Michele Truty, April 17, 2015, 1:09 p.m., comment on Chicago Manual of Style, “singular they.”

BIBLIOGRAPHY ENTRY

Chicago Manual of Style. “Is the world ready for singular they? We thought so back in 1993.” Facebook, April 17, 2015. <https://www.facebook.com/ChicagoManual/posts/10152906193679151>.

PERSONAL COMMUNICATION

Personal interviews, correspondence, and other types of personal communications—including email and text messages and direct messages sent through social media—are usually cited in the text or in a note only; they are rarely included in a bibliography.

NOTES

1. Sam Gomez, Facebook message to author, August 1, 2017.
2. Interview with home health aide, July 31, 2017.