

The value of ach

Science, Social Science



The Value of ACH The Value of ACH Analysis of competing hypotheses (sometimes abbreviated ACH), is an instrument to support judgment on essential issues requiring watchful thorough weighing of alternative clarifications or conclusions. It helps an analyst succeed, or in any event minimize, a portion of the cognitive restrictions that make prescient intelligence analysis so hard to accomplish. It is a basic model of how to think about complex problem. It is an analytic process which recognizes a complete set of alternative theories and hypothesis systematically assesses data that is consistent and inconsistent with every hypothesis and rejects hypothesis which contain a lot of inconsistent data. ACH allows analysts to disapprove a hypothesis rather than jumping into mere conclusions. 1

ACH is an essential tool to all analysts. It is so because of the various strengths that it displays. Audit trial and overcoming cognitive biases are among the strengths of this tool. In audit trial, by listing of the evidence, weighing its importance and relevance illustrates the importance of ACH. Also by applying it to the available hypothesis in the matrix clearly illustrates the ACH analytic process and this creates a clear and apparent evidence trial. This helps us to explain all our findings to the decision makers and conduct some after- action reviews of our analysis to discover what went wrong or right. In overcoming the cognitive biases, ACH helps us face the alternative hypothesis in a more systematic way. Disapproving hypothesis offers more effective ways of avoiding the established roadblocks and showing how dependent analysts may be on a single piece of available evidence which may eventually lead to ongbad and weak decision making. 2

However, it has some unavoidable weaknesses and limitations. ACH tends to

be solely dependent on the validity of the evidence available and also it is sometimes time-consuming. On its dependence on the evidence validity, ACH analytic process is only as good as the type of evidence that is incorporated into the process. The most thoughtful process execution can sometimes be undermined in cases of disinformation and unreliable evidence. While this is an issue with all systematic strategies and is, subsequently, a feeble feedback of the strategy, it frequently calls into inquiry the apparently "investigative" after-effects of the ACH technique. Performing ACH manually tends to be arduous and long especially in cases of several hypothesis or a broad source of evidence. Analysts tend to argue that they lack enough time to follow this more formal process. 3

In conclusion, because of the above benefits I am planning to use ACH in my future analysis.

Bibliography

Kam Ephraim (2008). Surprise attack. United States of America: Harvard University Press.

Kristan J. Wheaton. Mercyhurst College. Diane E. Chido. McManis. Monsalve Associates. (2006). Structured Analysis of Completing Hypothesis: Improving a Tested Intelligence Methodology.