THE EMPLOYMENT OF DOCTRINE WITHIN THE ACADEMIC EDUCATION OF SWEDISH OFFICERS

ABSTRACT:

Doctrines are by nature dogmatic and academic education is by nature skeptic. As the two perspectives are opposites to each other it would be plausible to assume that the nature of their contradiction would exist between doctrines and military academic education. Though no research has been made on how or to what extent these contradictions exist.

This thesis aims therefore to investigate the relation between Swedish doctrines and military academic education from dogmatic and skeptical perspectives. Consequently, explaining to what extent they correspond to one another and how they can be compared.

The result reveals that Swedish doctrines generally correspond to military academic education to a low degree, where deviations may range from very low to moderate. The analysis further displays strong multifaceted dissonance in their correspondence to one another, but also within Swedish doctrines and military academic education separately.
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1. Introduction

Doctrines do not always explicitly display a clear aim and purpose, mainly because of their guiding nature, which would be hindered by precise and exact instructions (Widen & Ångström 2016:209f). Therefore, to incorporate doctrine within a military organisation is not only a question of interpretation, but it may also mean that it could be used in a way it is not intended to be used. The implicit and explicit purpose can therefore create a reality which does not correlate with the desired one (Høiback 2013:11ff). Furthermore, a doctrine may still, even if executed in an optimal way, be wrong (Howard 1974:6f). Yet, the absence of doctrine might be an even worse alternative than the probability that it may create undesired results (Høiback 2016:195).

It may then seem that military doctrine is a necessary evil. An evil where there is a necessity to use something that may never be right, only to fill the gaps of uncertainty, that would otherwise be filled with something unknown (Widen & Ångström 2016:206ff). This thesis will thus investigate how doctrines can be understood within military academic education, with a theoretical framework that consists of two philosophical perspectives, dogmatism and skepticism.

1.1. Problem

Military doctrine is of an epistemological dogmatic nature, where the receiver of the doctrine is supposed to accept its premises without question and accept the knowledge as true (Høiback 2011:890). But the academic relation to knowledge is more skeptical: its existence is questioned, and the premises of knowledge are not accepted without proof (Morral 2015:305). This creates a contradiction, where military personnel should accept and obey the doctrine and its premises without question, but at the same time they are also supposed to be skeptical and question its content.

Employment of military doctrine within academic education would then seem to contradict itself. The two perspectives, dogmatism and skepticism, cannot coexist in harmony without undermining each other, since they are somewhat opposites (McGrath 2012:534ff). This may not only create friction as to how military doctrines should be perceived, but also to how it should be taught (Høiback 2011:888f). Consequently, if a more dogmatic approach would be adopted in academic education, it would also mean that a less skeptical approach could be included. It would therefore erode the essence of academic education; skepticism towards knowledge.
In the higher levels of academic education, it is expected of the student to incorporate a higher level of scientific skepticism in comparison to the more basic levels (Eriksson & Hultman 2014:9). This can also be assumed to be true for military academic education, which can imply that how officers learn to use and relate to military doctrines also depends on which level the education is conducted. It would be plausible to assume that basic education is concentrated towards understanding the context of doctrine, whereas higher education would have a greater focus on the phenomena. The problem is therefore twofold: (1) The officers are supposed to learn and follow the doctrines dogmatically but are also supposed to perceive them skeptically, (2) employment of doctrines may differ depending on which level the academic education is conducted. Thus, the question then arises of how doctrine as a concept is incorporated and employed within military academic education and how it relates to the set doctrines?

1.2. Previous Research

Current research displays that doctrine as a concept is if not mutually defined at least well-debated (Posen 1984:220; Sloan 2012:223f; Høiback 2013:25ff). The theorisation historically can be attributed to researchers originating from western countries with relatively large armed forces, which implies that the debate has not only been one-sided, but that it also has been adapted to fit certain types of armed forces (Bjerga & Haaland 2010:505f). More modern researchers contribute not only with a differentiated description of doctrine, but problematise it depending on the context it is set to work within (Høiback 2013:10ff). As such, doctrines can be understood to fill several functions. Høiback (2011:888ff) argues that there are three alignments with different purposes; to either command, educate or change the military organisation. Widen and Ångström (2016:202) develop Høiback’s (2011:895f) perspective by defining his fourth-generation doctrine as a tool of signalling. They also argue that doctrine should be perceived as a belief rather than a force multiplier (Widen & Ångström 2016:210). Perceiving doctrine as a belief would not per se rule out its contrasting functions, but it does indeed strengthen the argument that doctrine is generally of a dogmatic nature (Høiback 2011:897f; Widen & Ångström 2016:205f). The awareness of the doctrines’ dogmatic nature might influence doctrine-makers to strive for a conceptual frame instead of dogma thus indicating a change of perspective of the doctrine as a concept (Sloan 2012:244).

The inherent conflict of doctrine may not only create confusion within the military ranks, but it can also affect the legitimacy of its very existence (Høiback 2011:898f). Yet still, the existence of doctrines is viewed as a necessity, as the alternative would be worse (Høiback 2016:195f).
Doctrine, if not established and maintained, will evolve into an unofficial state, created and maintained by the officers’ own emerged culture. To avoid this unofficial state, and to establish a formal doctrine, the officers must be influenced (Kier 1997:143ff; Shamir 2010:666ff; Høiback 2016:195f). However, the process of implementation is generally characterised by resistance from higher ranking officers, which often ends in an organisational rejection, and although the doctrine may still be allowed to exist, it will do so without any legitimacy (Shamir 2010:666f; Pilalis & Ploumis 2018:104ff). A most prominent solution to this problem would then be to influence the lower ranking officers instead, who are generally more malleable (Shamir 2017:223; Pilalis & Ploumis 2018:106ff). No research has been made with the approach, to explain how doctrines are incorporated and employed within academic education on various levels, nor has any research been made as to how the academic approach complies with doctrines. This thesis strives to partly fill this gap and explain from dogmatic and skeptical perspectives to what extent the contradictions between doctrines and academic education exist and how they affect each other.

1.3. Aim and research questions

The main purpose of this thesis is to investigate and compare how the employment of Swedish doctrines complies with academic education of officers. Further, the thesis also aims to investigate to what degree and in which way the education of Swedish officers incorporate doctrine, at both basic and advanced levels. To reach this aim the following research questions have been produced.

*How and to what extent can Swedish Doctrines be compared and related to each other?*

*How and to what extent can academic education of Swedish officers at various levels be compared and related to each other?*

*How and to what extent do Swedish Doctrines correspond to academic education of Swedish officers at various levels?*

To illuminate the contradiction that exists between military academic education and doctrine, the research question will be answered from two theoretical perspectives, which are closely related as to how academic education and doctrines are generally perceived. These theoretical perspectives are skepticism and dogmatism, where the nature of doctrine is closely related to
dogmatism and the nature of academic education is closely related to skepticism (McGrath 2012:536f).

The research question can then appear relevant to continuous doctrinal development and understanding, not only in the Swedish Armed Forces (SAF), but also as part of a wider spectrum of understanding doctrine and its usage. The scientific relevance can therefore be motivated both inwards, as the understanding of how doctrines are used, and outwards, as the understanding of doctrinal employment within the education of Swedish officers.

1.4. Disposition

In Chapter Two the thesis’ design, method, source material and research ethics are described and critically reviewed.

In Chapter Three the theoretical framework is described and operationalised into an analytical model. This model is used as a frame for the empirical material.

In Chapter Four the result of the analysis of the doctrines is presented. The chapter concludes with a summary, discussion and an answer to the first research question.

In Chapter Five the result of the analysis of military academic education is presented. The chapter concludes with a summary, discussion and an answer to the second research question.

In Chapter Six the synopsis of the two previous analyses is compiled, compared, analysed, and discussed. The chapter concludes with an answer to the third research question.

In Chapter Seven the answers to the research questions are aggregated, which is followed by a discussion of how the thesis has been conducted. In conclusion proposals for further research and a discussion of the implications for the military profession are presented.
2. Method

This chapter explains the research design and how the research question is answered, from a validity and reliability perspective. It also describes the material used and discusses its validity and reliability. The largest part of this thesis’ delimitations is covered here.

2.1. Research Design

To answer the research questions and to be able to distinguish the nuances of how doctrine and the empirical material are employed, a method and theoretical approach that enables this is desirable, which a qualitative approach would plausibly grant (Bryman 2018:454ff). Otherwise the nuances in the text itself could be lost. The quantitative method often covers a larger spectrum and together with its methodology has a risk of overlooking details in the context (Holme & Solvang 1997:156f). Thus, to be able to capture the nuances of the empirical material the qualitative method contents purpose will be used. This qualitative approach will then be applied to the empirical material – which consists of doctrines, educational plans and syllabuses – that will reveal the contrasts of the research aim, and where these contrasts then will be put together appropriately. It can therefore also be concluded that this thesis has a general empirical and inductive approach.

2.1.1. Validity and Reliability

The qualitative method still has its flaws, especially because it mainly relies on the author’s ability to objectively interpret the empirical material, but random errors may also occur. Furthermore the number of factors or indicators used to measure the phenomena might be a limiting factor, as it may turn out that some of the factors or indicators did not measure that which was intended (Esaisson 2007:63f, 70f).

To limit these error factors and to reach a higher degree of what can be called a validity of the result, certain approaches can be used. In the case of the operationalisation of factors and indicators, a transparent, continuous and critical reasoning about why factors and indicators are chosen, would create a validity of the concept, a validity of how the theory is used and perceived within the thesis. This reduces the probability of systematic errors made by the author. To further strengthen the validity, multiple factors and indicators will be extrapolated from the theoretic perspectives, because it will minimise the risk that some factors or indicators prove unable to measure the empirical material effectively. This also enables, if most factors and indicators
have proven to be useful, the analytical instrument to identify more nuances within the empirical material (Esaiasson 2007:63ff).

Even if the validity of the thesis may seem high, it would not matter if the reliability is not adequate, as it would diminish the *validity of the result*. The essence of reliability can be explained as the possibility to reproduce the analysis and get the same result. Then to strengthen reliability, the analytical instrument will be clearly explained. But as it also must be made clear *how* it is supposed to be used, a transparency in the usage of the analytical instrument will be required. It can therefore be argued that with the use of these approaches and clarifications, the thesis’ *validity of the result* is adequate (Essaisson 2007:70f).

### 2.1.2. Contents Purpose Analysis

*Contents purpose* analysis aims to capture the purpose of the text. To do this, the text is analysed with indicators produced by either deductive or inductive approaches and then categorised and organised. In this thesis the indicators will be extrapolated with an inductive approach. Lastly the empirical material is analysed with the *contents purpose* approach, which, together with the analytic instrument, reveals the purpose of the text. The method creates conditions for distinguishing the meaning of the text, which makes it a decisive analytic method. Not only as it gives the text transparency and reliability, but because it creates a clear structure and framework. The analytical method *contents purpose* will therefore be used to extract to what extent the perspectives dogmatism and skepticism are present within the empirical material (Johannessen & Tufte 2003:109f).

The extraction of the *contents purpose* from the empirical material will need a structured analytical instrument that enables nuances from the theoretical perspectives, but also enough flexibility to let the empirical material categorise itself within the theoretical framework. It will also need to include a possibility to compare the different empirical material with each other framed by the theoretical perspectives (Esaiasson 2007:237ff). It is therefore necessary to create an adequate tool where the theories incorporate different degrees of their perspective, but that also makes it possible for them to be combined with the empirical material in diverse ways. This would enable the analytical instrument to reveal diversities within the empirical material, both through inductive and deductive comparison. To accomplish this, skepticism and dogmatism
will be used as the theoretical frame in the analysis, mainly since doctrines and academic education incorporate these perspectives that are oppositional to each other (McGrath 2012:536ff, 558ff).

The composition of the analytical tool will consist of extrapolated factors from the theoretical perspectives, which will include several indicators. These indicators will then be used as a screen with the *contents purpose* method, first against the doctrines and then against the empirical material. This will reveal to what degree and in which way they correlate with dogmatism and skepticism. Lastly, the results of each separate analysis will be compiled into two comparative matrices and thus answer what cohesion exists within academic education, first separately by each educational level, and thereafter combined. The answers of each research question will then be aggregated into conclusions that relate to the research problem. Through this methodology, an internal validity is created, but also a reliability and reproducibility (Essaisson 2017:63f, 70f).

2.2. Material

The theoretical and empirical material is discussed both from its relevance and credibility within this thesis.

2.2.1. Theoretical Material

 Both dogmatism and skepticism are two forms of epistemological perspectives, and the interpretation of them becomes the theoretical framework. To limit a deviant tendency in the creation of the framework, the definitional claim of the perspectives must be made clear. This can also be done by using several authors. A diversity of authors would also eliminate intermittently occurring descriptions of the perspectives and further reduce the author’s and the thesis’ possible biases (Essaisson 2017:63ff)

Material on dogmatism

To define dogmatism four authors have been used. Though even if the definition’s origin can be traced back several thousand years this thesis’ will only make a claim to describe it as it is used within research today. Consequently only articles that in some way analyse modern dogmatism or use it as an analytical perspective have been used.
All authors summarise dogmatism with a foundation made of the reasoning of relatively modern philosophers. They also enlighten different perspectives of how the term dogmatism can be understood, but foremost what characterises it. Audi (1988) and Levine and Sherman (2006) describe four characteristics of how knowledge is perceived by a dogmatic, and Lasonen-Arnio (2014) and Ye (2016) problematise how knowledge is entitled within dogmatism. All authors contribute to a general definition of dogmatism.

Material on skepticism

To define skepticism eight authors have been used, mainly because it can be divided into several subcategories, but also because the perspective is not made explicitly clear in most descriptions of scientific skepticism. This thesis only makes a claim to describe how skepticism is perceived within research. Hence, Leach (1981), Eriksson and Hultman (2014), Morral (2015) and Matysin (2016) have been used to identify and problematise the critical perspective of how skepticism perceives knowledge. Pollock (1975), Dutton (2016) and Matysin’s (2016) reasoning about objective and true knowledge have been used to define how skepticism relates to this characteristic. Furthermore José (1997), Sohlberg and Sohlberg (2013) and Matysin (2016) have been used to define the perspective on a broader plane.

2.2.2. Empirical material

Formal doctrines exist in various extents and it is these that are used to deliberately influence military organisations. Therefore, since this thesis aims to investigate the formal influences, only doctrines formally declared as such by the SAF will be included. These doctrines explicitly state that they are supposed to be partly used in education, which strengthens the validity of their inclusion further, though the same can be argued for other documents like tactical regulations. Yet, they are still not referred to as doctrines, and have, as Swedish doctrines describe it, lower influence within the doctrinal hierarchy. The Swedish Military Strategic Doctrine (MSD) and Operational Doctrine (OPD) will therefore be used as the doctrinal piece of the empirical material (SAF; 2014, 2016).

Doctrines may still exist to accomplish different purposes, which can affect its actual use and legitimacy deepening on what type of command philosophy the armed forces use. Whereas the Swedish command philosophy rests on mission-command tactics, it would be counter productive to use a doctrine which strives to deceive an opponent, as it would also deceive its own
personnel. Swedish doctrines are therefore needed to express their true intentions, and their content can thus be regarded as true. This variable will consequently not affect the result of this thesis (SAF; 2014, 2016; Höiback 2011:895f).

The empirical material also consists of educational plans and syllabuses from the two levels of officer education conducted at the Swedish Defence University (SEDU): The Officer Program (OP) and the Higher Staff Education (HSU). The syllabuses and educational plans are from the courses conducted in 2017 and are thus the latest available from the two echelons. Even though some of the syllabuses were composed as early as in 2012 it will not affect the thesis as they were still used in 2017.

The syllabuses and educational plans from four different program starts are included as empirical material, mainly because the OP is three years long. Yet, since SEDU transformed the education of the OP in 2015 it could impact the coherence of the education, mainly affecting the education commenced in 2014. However, the transformation was partly aimed to create educational coherence for future education, which weakens this argument. Anomalies may still occur and are kept in mind in the analysis.

The educational plans and syllabuses are formal and legal binding guidelines for how academic education should be conducted and what it should include. It can therefore be viewed as an essential part of examining how doctrines are employed within academic education. The interpretation of these syllabuses is presented through course descriptions, which include a more detailed perspective of how the courses will be conducted. These may vary depending on subjective interpretations of the syllabuses, thus affecting the formal approach of this thesis, therefore the course descriptions will not be included.

Military academic education is conducted both at SEDU and at service academies. In some of these cases by external universities, such as Linnaeus University (LNU). The incorporation of external universities within this thesis, would create conflict to what extent the conclusions can be related to SEDU. The analysis of the empirical material will therefore not include syllabuses from LNU or The Royal Institute of Technology.

---

1 These are OP14-17, OP15-18, OP16-19 and OP17-20.
2 In OP two semesters at service academies are included, where the cadets are supposed to combine their knowledge from SEDU with field studies. The service academies apply various methods of how to educate, but they are nonetheless obliged to follow the syllabuses and directives issued by SEDU.
The empirical material consists only of primary sources, which include all current Swedish doctrines and all current educational plans and syllabuses from SEDU. The syllabuses that have been disregarded are motivated for, as are the delimitation of not using other types of empirical material. This strengthens the validity of the thesis even though it can be argued that other empirical material should be included.

The educational plans and syllabuses will in the analyses be referred to by collective names (OP or HSU), by branch (e.g. “Leadership” or “Amphibious”) or by course code (e.g. 1OP401 or 2HSU209). The processed syllabuses and educational plans, along with an index, are filed by the author and can be received upon request.

2.3. Ethics

This thesis uses public documents as empirical material. In these documents authors, contributors, teachers and students can be identified. Since these are public documents, it is per se not ethically wrong to use them, even though single individuals can be identified. This thesis is also in line with all the requirements of the four ethical guidelines (Johannessen & Tufte 2003:61f). Consequently, it has a profound ethical approach.
3. Theory

In the Theory chapter, the perspectives of dogmatism and skepticism are described, and are operationalised into factors and indicators, these are then used to create the analytical instrument.

3.1. Dogmatism

As an epistemological and philosophical theory, dogmatism can be explained as beliefs about knowledge. The belief, whose status is often perceived with an unjustified positive attitude, is held without the consideration of the accuracy of the belief, even though arguments support that it should. The underlying reasoning is that if the belief was introduced and accepted, evidence against it would then be false and misleading. The belief can also be perceived as an obvious truth and would therefore be unquestionable from a dogmatic perspective (Audi 1988:434f; Lasonen-Aarnio 2014:420f).

To determine if something has a dogmatic approach rests partly on how knowledge is perceived. This can be identified through four indicators: (1) either explicitly or implicitly encourages premises to be accepted with greater confidence than the evidence supports, (2) reveals unjustified resistance towards plausible arguments, (3) shows a tendency to assert something even though reasons to question it may be present, and (4) as a result from the previous indicators (second-order), or by the mere acceptance of knowledge, generates a belief that something is certainly true. These indicators of dogmatism may seem straightforward, but to grasp their actual occurrence some contradicting factors need to be considered: (i) confidence can emerge from temerity, (ii) resistance may come from intellectual laziness, (iii) personality characteristics can affect apprehension, (iv) the unquestioned belief could be a result from a mistake or conceit. Most of these error factors are applicable to people and are unusable in the context of written documents, but conceit can be regarded as pertinent, mainly because the military hierarchy might suffer legitimacy otherwise. The value of these indicators should not only be related in partition towards the considered factors, but also as to what degree the indicators are fulfilled, or to what extent they are presented (Audi 1988:434f; Levine & Sherman 2006:282f).

A second factor to define dogmatism can be identified through the dogmatical puzzle, which is a contradiction between the dogmatic approach and the entitlement of a perspective. The puzzle
implies that entitlement cannot coexist without a dogmatical approach, where a refusal of dogmatism also requires a refusal of entitlement (Lasonen-Aarnio 2014:432). Even if the puzzle can be regarded as solved under certain circumstances, it still provides an insight into how dogmatism can be identified within the contradiction, where the characteristics of entitlement primarily consist of a certain form of reasoning (Ye 2016:575). This can partly be indicated through close-mindedness, but also by a tendency to avoid information that would support other perspectives (Audi 1988:433; Lasonen-Aarino 2014:275ff). Furthermore, when the entitlement is confronted, the text would not only counter with consistent reasoning, but it would also be persuasive. Entitlement can also be indicated through how it chooses to perceive arguments, whereas the status of the messenger determines if the presented perspective is plausible or not, and where the argument itself comes second. This often takes its form in the unreasonably high trust and confidence the entitlement factor would lay on authorities (Lasonen-Aarino 2014:276f).

Dogmatic influence may differ depending on the context, where unique conditions might only allow some of the indicators to appear, but also because their importance may vary depending on how they appear. It is thus possible for a single indicator to weigh up for the loss of the other three (Audi 1988:434f). This requires the analytical approach and framework to enable the empirical material to be extrapolated in this way, which strengthens the argument to use a qualitative research method.

### 3.2. Skepticism

The idea of skepticism, which originates from the ancient Greek philosophers, was revived with new interest during the Renaissance, where its definition separated into several phalanges (José 1997:199ff, Matysin 2016:1). The separation drove the idea into development of a more modern definition, which we today see the residues of within the terms, critical thinking and critical approach (Eriksson & Hultman 2014:21). Despite its development, the perspective of skepticism is perceived in diverse ways still today, where some can be argued to have an absurd philosophical reasoning (Dutton 2016:3). The definition of the perspective within this thesis will therefore strive to be more plausible and modern, where the scientific and academic forms of skepticism will be the primary defining phalanges of the perspective.
Skepticism in similarity to dogmatism, rests primary on how knowledge is perceived and understood (Sohlberg & Sohlberg 2013:71f). Where skepticism is close to the ideal type of *absolute doubt* contra the opposite, *absolute certainty* (Matysin 2016:3) Absolute doubt would imply that no knowledge can be conquered, no matter what the process of obtaining it might be. Although modern scientific skepticism argues that it can be placed somewhere in between the ideal types, which makes the use and implication of the perspective a bit more plausible (Morral 2015:305, Matysin 2016:3). This critical perspective and approach to knowledge can be regarded as a primary characteristic of modern skepticism, where knowledge is being questioned critically, to what degree it may exist, and what importance the evidence may have (Eriksson & Hultman 2014:18f; Morral 2015:305). Scientists must also relate their critical perspective to their research in a plausible way, where the approached hypothesis may often never be completely confirmed and never fully rejected. This requires researchers to do assessments, as to what degree it is plausible to assume that the knowledge is correct, and what effects these assumptions would give (Leach 1981:406). The purpose of thinking critically is also to use this perspective as a developing force within the current research area, thereby disputing the knowledge and searching for shortcomings in it, with the aim of procuring new knowledge (Eriksson & Hultman 2014:22ff).

Another characteristic that influences the skeptical perspective is the importance of objectiveness, that knowledge is not only presented in this way, but that it has been conquered with this approach (Matysin 2016:1f). This can partially be done by categorising knowledge into different forms, and by clearly displaying what is a belief and what is not, as the belief, from a skeptical point of view, can be understood as a subjective opinion and is thus not knowledge per se. The skeptics often argue that most knowledge is in fact not knowledge at all, but rather subjective beliefs (Dutton 2016:1ff). A less strict interpretation would rather stress that, to reach objectiveness, the arguments of knowledge must be presented in a pertinent manner with evidence that supports the objective lens (Pollock 1975:23ff).

The context, in which the evidence is brought forward, is crucial for the objectiveness to be upheld (Matysin 2016:25ff). A skeptic would argue that it cannot, mainly since they would claim that the context is created out of intuition, which originates from the subjective senses and therefore cannot be trusted (Pollock 1975:23f). Though, as claimed by Pollock (1975:11ff), this argument can be countered by ruling out intuition and instead replacing it with the justified
conditions upon which the argument relies, thus creating a possibility to reach the premises of objectiveness that would otherwise be impossible to reach.

### 3.3. Operationalisation

Operationalisation aims to create a researchable framework from the theoretical discussion (Johannessen & Tuft 2003:44f). This is done by extrapolating factors and indicators from the two theoretical perspectives, dogmatism and skepticism.

#### 3.3.1. Analytical instrument

The analytical instrument is the tool which is used on the empirical material. Factors and indicators, which are found within the theories, provide answers to what degree the empirical material employs the different perspectives. The transparency that this instrument offers together with the contents purpose method creates a reliability that is created through reproducibility. The research questions are answered from the premises of this frame, the result must therefore be related to the instruments’ delimitations (Essaisson 2017:63ff).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism</td>
<td>Acceptance of knowledge</td>
<td>1:1 Premises accepted without enough support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:2 Unjustified resistance towards plausible arguments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:3 Asserting something even though it is being questioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:4 A belief that something is certainly true.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entitlement of knowledge</td>
<td>2:1 Close-mindedness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:2 Unreasonably high trust of authority or the status of the messenger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:3 Consistent reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skepticism</td>
<td>Critical towards knowledge</td>
<td>3:1 Provides evidence for arguments and knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:2 Questions the plausibility of presented knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:3 Strives to develop knowledge, by disputing it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Striving for objective knowledge</td>
<td>4:1 Categorises knowledge depending on its form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:2 Pertinent and objective approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:3 Justifies the context of the argument.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Compiled analytical instrument.*

The measurement scale that is used in the thesis ranges from “no” to “very high”, indicating the amount of influence that can be identified within the empirical material. To define the degree of influence it will consist of two parts, its occurrence and the, implicit or explicit, extent of projected influence. The interaction between them may also either contribute to or undermine the perspectives’ influence, were they both share an equal worth. The final analysis compares the coherency of Swedish doctrines and academic education, where their value is a result of
how similar their factors are to one another. The values will range from “no” to “very high”, where a very high coherence indicates that they have the same degree of influence from a perspective, and vice versa for no coherence.
4. Analysis of Swedish Doctrines

This chapter presents the result of the analysis of Swedish doctrines, where each doctrine is described separately. These are then compiled into a comparative chart where their relation to each other is discussed.

4.1. Military Strategic Doctrine

The analysis of MSD shows that it has a dogmatic influence which extends to all the analytical instruments dogmatic factors and indicators, where factor one is predominant throughout the doctrine, and indicator 1:4 has a high occurrence compared to the other indicators. Factor two has a high degree of influence within the doctrine, mainly through indicator 2:2 and 2:3, even if it does not occur in the same degree as factor one. Even if the indicators 1:2, 1:3 and 2:1 only occur intermittently and to a small extent, the very high occurrences and influence that the other indicators contribute still create enough support to conclude that both of the dogmatic factors occur to a high degree and have a high influence within the doctrine (SAF 2016).

The skeptical approach exists within the doctrine and is for the most part intertwined within the dogmatic perspective. The text holds a reasoning which gives arguments and support for how SAF should act, but the arguments are not perceived skeptically per se, they are on the contrary rather perceived as an absolute truth. Although, in some paragraphs it gives, if not an objective approach, a more open-minded approach as to how knowledge should be perceived. The skeptical and critical mindset should be incorporated not only within education, but also throughout the organisation on all levels. The doctrine still shows a high dogmatical approach towards knowledge, which may seem contradictory, as it in the next paragraph undermines the skeptical approach by stressing the importance of the status of the messenger. These contradictions, which occur intermittently throughout the doctrine, might be a result of the processes of production, where SEDU initially held the responsibility to create a script for a Military Strategic Doctrine and where SAF then rewrote and finalised it. Regardless, the mixed influences imply a mixed approach towards knowledge, where it explicitly supports skepticism even if it often implicitly, undermines it (SAF 2016).

3 Here referred to as all military education, not only the academic.
4 Where the messenger can be an officer who is entitled to know “true knowledge” by status her or his rank or experience.
The extent to which skepticism occurs and how much influence it holds, are not at level with each other. As argued the undermining of the perspective creates a lesser worth than the perspective otherwise would hold. So even if factor “critical towards knowledge” has a high occurrence and “striving for objective knowledge” a moderate one, with the predominant indicators 3:1 and 4:3, their actual influence only weighs as moderate and low (SAF 2016).

### 4.2. Operational Doctrine

The analysis of OPD shows that it has a very high occurrence and strong influences of dogmatism, where factor “acceptance of knowledge” and “entitlement of knowledge” are equally current, with their most salient indicators 1:1, 1:4, 2:2 and 2:3. Indicator 1:3 and 2:1 still have a high occurrence, but do not project as much influence as the most salient ones. Furthermore, indicator 1:2 only occurs and project influence at a moderate degree (SAF 2014).

The dogmatical influence within the doctrine is mostly an effect of *how* it is presented. It presents frictions and considerations as an absolute truth by arguing that they *must* be considered and further explains in which way it *must* be done, even though it does not define actions or circumstances as definitive. It can also be argued that the doctrine tries to persuade the reader to succumb to its perspective of *how* and *what* knowledge about war is. Furthermore, also ascribing the knowledge presented as a universal true belief, where the beliefs are supposed to act as guidelines within the operational frame (SAF 2014).

The skeptical perspective shines through to a small extent within the doctrine, though only implicitly in a feeble way, which consequently enhances the dogmatic influence. This contradiction can mainly be attributed indicators 4:1 and 4:3, which also are the only occurring skeptical indicators within the doctrine. Yet, as the doctrine does not make any explicit claims to include a skeptical or scientific approach in either its reasoning or its creational basis, it can be argued that the doctrine, on its own, is cohesive. It does rather, on the contrary, make an active claim not to include a skeptical or scientific approach by stating that the organisation is only to be developed by their own evaluations and reflections, with a foundation on proven experience (SAF 2014).

Proven experience may be perceived as a part of a scientific and skeptical approach, yet without a scientific foundation, it projects less credibility and legitimacy, as both dogmatical influences and individual tendencies may affect the use and outcome of these proven experiences. Which,
in the case of this doctrine, would be undermined by at the least the dogmatical influences. Thus, even though some skeptical occurrences exist within the doctrine, and almost exclusively in an implicit way where it also reinforces the dogmatical influences, it can be stated that the doctrines have no skeptical influences (SAF 2014).

As the doctrines were created with the aim to correspond with international doctrines, mainly from the European Union (EU) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), some of their influences might probably have affected the doctrine. Even if it cannot be made clear to what extent their influences have affected the doctrine, it is still plausible to assume that they have (SAF 2014).

4.3. Compilation and Comparison

The matrix presents to what influential extent the different perspectives are present in the Swedish doctrines. The perspectives’ influence is divided into a six-grade scale from no to very high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Swedish Doctrines</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dogmatism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptance of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Strategic Doctrine</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Doctrine</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Compiled analysis of Swedish Doctrines.

The matrix shows that MSD and OPD have a high correlation within the dogmatical perspective but diverge within the skeptical. It can be stated that OPD has a higher dogmatical approach than MSD, not only because the analysis shows it, but because the indicators that can be identified within the doctrine occur to a higher extent and project stronger influence. Thus, also reaching out to a larger spectrum of the dogmatical perspective.

5 Except when unique Swedish conditions create a need for another approach.
The doctrines deviate to a higher degree within the skeptical perspective in comparison to dogmatism. Whereas both have skeptical influences there is a distinct difference between them, where OPD undermines its skeptical influence to a level where it has no influence. This is shown not only by the deviations within the matrix, but as to how they are presented, where one reason might be the extent of involvement from SEDU within the creation of MSD and OPD. \(^6\) It may also be because the creation of the OPD emanates from an older version of MSD created in 2011, thus explaining, not only the deviations within the doctrinal coherence, but also their different approaches to how they influence the SAF. Even though one may assume there should be no deviation since they aim to direct different military levels

The deviations in perspective and approach may also be a result of their difference in level. But it would be unreasonable to purposely strive for these deviations, as it may create confusion of how doctrines in general should be perceived by SAF. Another reason may be the origin of their creation, where OPD is explicitly aimed to correlate with international doctrines from EU and NATO while MSD is not. As international doctrines have a different approach it would be possible that some of the deviations between MSD and OPD could be traced to influences from EU and NATO. Nonetheless MSD and OPD still are in some extent contradictory to each other, which also increases the probability of confusion within the military ranks, at least when used together.

\textit{How and to what extent can Swedish Doctrines be compared and related to each other?}

Swedish doctrines have a high coherence of dogmatic influence, but a lesser one to how they choose to incorporate the perspectives. The doctrines differ even further within the skeptical perspective, where MSD shows a tendency to actually incorporate this which OPD does not, even if they both undermine the perspective. This indicates that there is a lack of cohesion between them and that OPD would be in greater harmony than MSD, since it mainly incorporates dogmatism. Even so it can still be concluded that they correlate to a high to very high degree with dogmatism, but only to a moderate degree with skepticism.

As the doctrines are supposed to accomplish different purposes, they should not transgress each other’s areas, which would make this a lesser problem. A deviant formal approach will still

\(^6\) SEDU created a script for MSD which was revised by SAF, whereas only five authors from SEDU participated in the creation of OPD.
create a contradiction when it comes to how Swedish doctrines should be perceived. This contradiction will not only increase the probability of confusion, but it could also mean that their legitimacy may decrease. Especially as they explicitly show different approaches to knowledge and how it is created within a military organisation. Since MSD is higher within the doctrinal hierarchy it would, at least formally, override OPD. Therefore, it would also be plausible to assume that the skeptical perspective would be incorporated within SAF, at least to the extent which MSD proscribes.
5. Analysis of academic education

In this chapter, the result of the analysis of academic education are presented separately by each academic level. These levels are then compiled into a comparative chart and their relation to each other is discussed.

5.1. Officer Program

Educational Plans

The educational plans steer the academic part of OP, and define the alignment of the education, what it will include and how it will be included. The Analysis shows that the Educational plans overall have a skeptical approach to how the education should be conducted. The difference that exists between them shows that the skeptical approach is present to a higher degree in the more recent educational plans. Which would imply that, during the four programs, there is a developing tendency towards a more skeptical approach. However, an underlying dogmatic approach can also be identified, mainly attributed the occurrence of indicator 2:3, but it has little influence in the documents overall.

Syllabuses

The analysis shows that most of the syllabuses have a variety of both dogmatic and skeptic influences. But some alignments stand out, as they have almost no dogmatic influence. These are, as one may have expected, syllabuses which aim to develop the critical perspective to knowledge and how it is obtained. But it also includes the leadership syllabuses for the courses that are conducted at SEDU. On the contrary, the syllabuses for the courses that have been conducted at the service academies have a much higher dogmatic influence and almost no skeptical influence. Which implies that there is a different approach depending on if the education is being conducted externally (service academies) or internally (SEDU), where the service academies plausibly would educate with a more dogmatic approach, or at least intend to do so. This argument can be strengthened further by the military technology syllabuses, where the main part of those intended for the service academies, have almost no skeptical influence.

---

7 1OP410 & 1OP450.
8 1OP455 & 1OP454.
9 Except for 1OP421.
The external war studies syllabuses all employ a rather high skeptical approach, especially indicated by “critical towards knowledge”, and have a low occurrence of dogmatism. It would be plausible to assume the same for the internal war studies syllabuses, but the analysis shows a small difference that these syllabuses employ a more dogmatic approach. The greatest difference between the internal and external war studies syllabuses is the divergence of their most prominent skeptical factor, where “strives for objective knowledge” is predominant internally and “critical towards knowledge” is predominant externally. This might be unexpected, partly as the service academies have a closer connection with the military branches and their specialities, where it would be plausible to assume that they do not enforce an equally high degree of skepticism as SEDU. But mainly because the service academies are intended to educate in an environment and with methods, that might be more dogmatic.

A plausible explanation for the differences in dogmatic and skeptical influences might be that the education has an increasing and changing skeptical approach as the education progresses. It would be plausible to assume that the argument could be strengthened by the programs concluding syllabuses, though this is not the case. These syllabuses show on the contrary a lesser skeptical influence when compared to the collective skeptical influence of previous courses. The most notable anomaly are the war studies syllabuses of OP14-17, which show a significant smaller occurrence and influence of the skeptical perspective than the war studies syllabuses of OP15-18, OP16-19 and OP17-20. This would seem to break the tendency of skeptical progression within the program.

The changed skeptical tendency might be a result of the educational change which took place in 2015 and might therefore not have affected OP14-17 as much as the other programs. Even so, the syllabuses for the courses in 2017 were composed not earlier than at the end of 2015, which implies that they have been revised with the new educational approach in mind. This may seem puzzling, because it can be argued that the syllabuses of OP14-17 should be viewed with the same premises as the other programs, which then would degrade the skeptical influence overall. It can also be argued that this is partly an error factor, since the changes in the program occurred after OP14-17 began their education.

10 OP297, OP298, OP303 & OP305.
11 OP297, OP298 & OP305.
It can be argued that the latest argument is the more plausible one, since the changing tendency towards the skeptical perspective can be identified within the educational plans. One could also argue that OP has a progressively changing approach from a dogmatical towards a more skeptical perspective, which occurs both within the progression of courses within a program and between programs.

Throughout the syllabuses, almost all syllabuses had either indicators 1:1 or 1:4 included, and often both, which makes up the bulk part of the dogmatical influences within them. It shows that the syllabuses have a dogmatic approach which, either deliberately or unintentionally, presents knowledge as true. This might be a result of the educational level of OP, where knowledge initially should be accepted as true. It is also notable that the indicators 3:1 and 3:2 occur almost as often as 1:1 and 1:4, which creates more favourable conditions for stimulating the critical approach to knowledge, but also creates a contradiction within the syllabuses themselves. Moreover, indicator 1:2 did not occur at all, and indicator 1:3 and 2:1 only occurred rarely. Even though dogmatism is present within the syllabuses to some degree, some indicators are not. This implies that even if the education has a moderate dogmatic approach, it only includes a part of the dogmatic spectrum.

5.2. Higher Staff Education

Educational Plans

The educational plans show a high influence of skepticism, with a focus on developing the profession from a critical and scientific mindset. The plans also show several dogmatic influences, mainly through the occurrence of indicators 1:1 and 1:4. These indicators are characterised by their emphasis on doing things a certain way without a critical approach. Paradoxically, they also show a great skeptical approach in these regards. They are thus, in a way contradictory, though only to a moderate extent.

Syllabuses

The syllabuses show a very high skeptical influence and a low dogmatic influence overall. Yet, some traces of dogmatism can be identified, mainly in the war studies syllabuses, where almost half of the syllabuses had some dogmatic influence. The most dogmatic deviant syllabus was

12 2HU047, 2HU069, 2HU070, 2HU071, 2HU072, 2HU073 & 2HU074.
This might be because of the nature of operations, where its effect can be perceived as the result of intuition and creativity, where the parameters which must be taken into considerations might be hard to learn and relate to through academic education. However, the dogmatic influence within the syllabus is still only moderate, and together with a high skeptical influence the *operational art* syllabus can be stated to be fairly in line with the general approach of the war studies syllabuses.

The military technology syllabuses showed almost no dogmatic influence, and had a clear skeptical approach throughout all syllabuses, not only by the occurrence of almost every skeptical indicator, but as they occurred to a great extent with strong skeptical influence. This implies that there is a difference between branches perhaps due to the difference in scientific fields, where military technology can be regarded as being closer to natural science, and war studies can be regarded as being closer to social science. However, the leadership syllabuses, which also have an approach closer to social science, show no dogmatic influences, which might erode the argument that the variations emerge from the differences of the scientific fields. Nonetheless, it can be concluded that there is a difference between branches, even though its source cannot be identified.

One syllabus explicitly describes how doctrines should be approached. This *military strategy* syllabus, which is a part of the war studies branch, stresses the importance of a critical perspective. Even if the approach to doctrines is not explicitly made clear in the other syllabuses, the perspectives’ influence indicates how they are supposed to be used. Those syllabuses which includes doctrines would therefore use them in a way that correlates with the extent of the dogmatic and skeptical influences.

The syllabuses range from 2012 to 2017, which might imply that there could be a difference, or at least a changing tendency over the years. However, there are no variations of this kind, either within branches or the programs. This straight approach combined with the relatively low occurrence of dogmatism, makes it possible to conclude that the programs, spreading over all the various specialisations, have a very high skeptical influence, but also that they generally are without any significant deviances.

---

13 2HU069.
14 Except 2HU045.
15 2HU066.
16 Except the deviation of syllabus 2HU069.
5.3. Compilation and Comparison

The matrix presents to which influential extent the different perspectives are present in the academic education. The perspectives’ influence is divided into a six-grade scale from no to very high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empirical Material</th>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Dogmatism</th>
<th>Skepticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptance of knowledge</td>
<td>Entitlement of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Program</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Staff Education</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deviations

| OP: Thesis, method and leadership syllabuses$^{17}$ | Very low | Very low | Very high | Very high |
| OP: Leadership and military technology syllabuses$^{18}$ | High     | Moderate | Very low  | Very low  |
| HSU Educational plans | Moderate  | Low      | High      | Very high |

*Figure 3. Compiled analysis of academic education.*

The matrix shows that OP and HSU mainly have skeptical influences, where the difference between them can be attributed to the academic level to which their education strives. As such, the difference in the dogmatic influences can also be attributed to the disparity in the academic levels. Even though a difference would be expected between OP and HSU, the extent of the differences in the dogmatic perspective implies that there could be more factors which affect the education than just the academic level. These eventual factors are outside the scope of this thesis, but they will still need to be considered when evaluating the result.

$^{17}$ 1OP455, 1OP454, 1OP455 & 1OP454.
$^{18}$ 1OP418, 1OP422, 1OP456, 1OP457, 1OP468 and 1OP469.
The most prominent factors within both OP and HSU are “critical towards knowledge” and “striving for objective knowledge”, were the most occurrent indicators are 1:1, 3:1 and 4:3. The most prominent indicators exclusively within HSU are 3:3, 4:1 and 4:2. In comparison, the most prominent indicators exclusively within OP are 1:4 and 2:2. Furthermore, neither OP nor HSU have a significant occurrence of indicators 1:2, 1:3 or 2:1. HSU also has no significant occurrences of “entitlement of knowledge” whatsoever. This implies that the similarities are mainly focused within the skeptical perspective, and that the indicators’ presence extends with the advancement of the academic level. It also implies that they both disregard certain indicators within the dogmatic perspective and that some indicators have lesser or no influence within HSU. Thus, leading to a change of perspective between them, not only by the extent and occurrence of certain factors and indicators, but by the change of factors and indicators, thereby also reinforcing the dissonance between the educational levels.

The deviations show that some branches and courses diverge from the general direction. The military technology and leadership\(^1\) syllabuses from OP and HSU diverge in different direction depending on which academic level they strive towards. The syllabuses intended for OP have a greater dogmatic influence than OP in general, and the syllabuses intended for HSU has a lesser dogmatic influence than HSU in general. This creates a greater gap between the specific branches at the different academic levels than the ones that already exist. It can therefore be argued that the dissonance between the academic levels exists in a diversity of ways.

\(\textbf{How and to what extent can academic education of Swedish officers at various levels be compared and related to each other?}\)

Military academic education systems differ in how they perceive knowledge. It would be plausible to assume that this phenomenon would exist to some extent. However, the divergencies in education supports that they, even though they have similar approaches at a general level, are inconsistent in several branches, programs and courses. The main reason for this are the deviations within OP. Even so it can still be concluded that they generally correlate to a high degree within the skeptical perspective and to a moderate-high degree within the dogmatic perspective. Yet, there are still deviances as in how they incorporate the two perspectives, which

\(^1\) Except 1OP454 and 1OP455.
further indicates that they have different approaches to how knowledge should be perceived. It can thus also be concluded that the dissonance is multifaceted.

This multifaceted dissonance is also an indicator that the two perspectives, dogmatism and skepticism, indeed contradict each other. The contradiction seems to create a higher friction within academic education depending on the extent of the perspectives’ incorporation, thus hampering a harmony within the educational scope in general, and OP in particular.
6. Analytical Compilation

In this chapter the comparison of Swedish doctrines and academic education is presented.

6.1. Doctrines and the Officer Program

The matrix below compares the results of the analysis of Swedish doctrines and OP. They are presented by to which extent they are coherent, which ranges from no to very high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Coherency of Swedish Doctrines and Officer Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Military Strategic Doctrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of knowledge</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitlement of knowledge</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skepticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical towards knowledge</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striving for objective knowledge</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Comparison of Swedish Doctrines and OP.

MSD correlates with OP in a moderate-high degree in both perspectives, which is a result of their own incoherence to a single perspective. Even if MSD and OP are somewhat coherent, it can be argued that they are so in dissonance. The lack of certain dogmatic indicators within OP which have a high influence within MSD, strengthens this argument further. The most prominent indicators within the skeptical perspective from MSD are the same as those of OP. Which diminishes the dissonance between them and makes the skeptical perspective their most common frame, if only to a small extent.

OPD correlates with OP to a low degree when looking at both perspectives together. This is a result of OPD’s lack of skeptical influences, which also creates contradictions to a degree that might make them incompatible to each other. It can also be argued, as they still correlate to a high enough extent within the dogmatical perspective, that they are if not coherent, at least compatible to a reasonable level. Yet the dissonance between OPD and OP is still blatant.
It can be concluded that there are several differences between Swedish doctrines and OP, where OPD deviates to a higher degree compared to MSD. It can also be argued that, if the doctrines were to be used together within OP, the contradictions between the doctrines and OP could create a greater dissonance than they would by themselves. The doctrines’ cohesion within the dogmatical perspective can still create conditions where they could be used in a more harmonious way, though only when the skeptical perspective is disregarded from. This may still not be enough though, since the skeptical perspective is intertwined within the dogmatical perspective in the doctrines.

6.2. Doctrines and the Higher Staff Education

The matrix below compares the results of the analysis of Swedish doctrines and HSU. They are presented by to what extent they are coherent, which ranges from no to very high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perspective</th>
<th>Coherency of Swedish Doctrines and Higher Staff Educations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Military Strategic Doctrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogmatism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of knowledge</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitlement of knowledge</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skepticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical towards knowledge</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striving for objective knowledge</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Comparison of Swedish Doctrines and HSU.

MSD correlates with HSU to a low degree overall. Even so they share a common prominent indicator within the dogmatical perspective, indicator 1:1, which implies that, there is some harmony within this perspective. Furthermore the most prominent skeptical indicators from MSD match those of HSU. Though, as almost every skeptical indicator within HSU is prominent it could be argued that this has no relevance. It can be suggested that this does, in combination with the most prominent dogmatic indicator, create a lesser dissonance between MSD and HSU then the matrix explicitly shows.
OPD correlate with HSU to a very low degree, where the similarities between them can be attributed to HSU’s low dogmatic influence. This creates a contradiction between the doctrine and the education that enforces the dissonance between them and makes them incompatible. It can be argued that the small dogmatic approach they share could be enforced by HSU’s aims to incorporate an operational perspective within the education. It can also be argued that the possibility to assimilate this knowledge would decrease since they have different approaches to how knowledge is obtained. Either way they are still opposites to a high degree, thus also increasing the probability of friction and dissonance.

### 6.3. Employment of Doctrine Within Academic Education

The employment of doctrine within academic education is explained from the two perspectives, dogmatism and skepticism, where the correspondence between the empirical materials are related to each other through the theoretical framework.

*How and to what extent do Swedish Doctrines correspond to academic education of Swedish officers at various levels?*

Swedish Doctrines correspond to the academic education of Swedish Officers to a low degree, where the correspondence is characterised by dissonance and contradictions. The perspectives overall deviate between the doctrines and the academic education. Yet, the doctrines and the academic education can still be compared to one another in numerous ways, where some comparisons show a much higher cohesion than in general. The highest correspondence on a general level is between MSD and OP, which is moderate-high. The lowest correspondence on a general level is between OPD and HSU, which is very low. It can thus be concluded that OP corresponds more with the doctrines than HSU does, and that the range of the correspondence deviates to a moderate degree. Deviances within OP and HSU may still expand this range of correspondence, which would not only create a larger multifaceted dissonance generally, but it could specifically also create a harmony to these branches and courses.

The employment of doctrine within academic education may then, from the two perspectives, seem inadequate in a general context. Even if specific branches or courses may correspond with the doctrines to a higher degree. This implies that the incorporation and comprehension of doctrine within military academic education is filled with friction.
7. Result

In this chapter the conclusions of the analysis are presented and related to the problem and previous research. It is followed by a discussion which focuses on how the thesis has been arranged. Lastly the thesis’ implications to the profession and further research are discussed.

7.1. Conclusions

The contradictions that exist in the doctrines, academic education and within their comparison to one another, imply that the employment of doctrine within military academic education is not only puzzling but also somewhat paradoxical. They still differ in the ways assumed, but the multifaceted dissonance also adds another dimension complicating the comprehension and incorporation of doctrines within the education systems. It can thus be argued that the concept of doctrine is not incorporated efficiently, but that it also undermines the academic education when the concept is enforced within the education systems. The doctrines would affect OP to a higher degree than HSU.

The doctrines generally relate to the academic educations to a low degree. Even so, it can still be argued that the differences between OP and HSU are a result of a deliberate approach, where OP is supposed to incorporate an understanding of the context of doctrine, whereas HSU is supposed to incorporate an understanding of the phenomena. However, the conflict of dogmatism and skepticism would still undermine the contextual education, thus increasing the probability for friction within both approaches. Even so Høiback (2011) argues that doctrine could be used for education. The thesis’ result would argue against this, at least with the current contradictions.

Shamir (2010), amongst others, argues that the lower ranking officers should be the ones to affect when deliberately wanting to affect an organisation. The result of the thesis can support this, mainly as OP has a dogmatic approach to a moderate extent, thus enabling moderate influences to be employed. Yet, as Høiback (2016) argues, the effect of employment also rests on its legitimacy. It can be argued that this dogmatic legitimacy is hard to attain when confronted by the skeptical perspective of knowledge, where the result implies that HSU would show a greater resistance to dogmatic legitimacy than OP. Therefore, also hampering the influence projected to the lower-ranking officers, as it generally is the higher-ranking officers who define the doctrines. However, this might be changing, as indicated by the different procedures.
when MSD and OPD were created. This also implies that there is a changing tendency to diverge from the doctrinal influences that larger nations or organisations may have projected, which can be supported by the results indication that nations’ and organisations’ influence is changing in MSD and OPD. This would correlate with Bjerga and Haaland’s (2010) understanding of how larger armed forces have projected doctrinal influence, but also with how Sloan (2012) describes the modern doctrinal change, mainly as another possible tendency of MSD and OPD is the decrease of dogma and the increase of conceptualisation. Thus, also fostering Widen’s and Ångström’s (2016) argument that doctrine should be perceived as a belief.

7.2. Discussion

The discussion aims at evaluating the thesis, which is discussed from three perspectives: Result, Method and Theory.

Result

The result shows that there are many contradictions between the Swedish Doctrine and Swedish military academic education. These vary to a high extent depending on several factors, but in general the doctrines and education do not correspond. The primary aim of this thesis – to investigate and compare how doctrine corresponds with academic education of officers – can therefore be regarded as achieved. Furthermore, the result reveals to what degree inconsistencies exist in the incorporation of doctrine within the different academic education systems. The secondary aim – to investigate to what degree and in which way the education of Swedish officers incorporates doctrine, at both basic and advanced levels – can therefore be regarded as achieved.

The previous research has been related to the result, which puts the implication of the thesis’ conclusions in context. This enlightens not only the relevance of the result but reinforces or weakens the arguments of the previous research. Even so, it should be kept in mind that this thesis only claims to contextualise the result from the parameters of the theoretical framework. Moreover, the previous research has contributed to identifying a research gap, which the result of this thesis has filled to a small extent from two theoretical perspectives. The claim was to partly fill this research gap, it can thus be concluded that this thesis has achieved this.

The possibility to create general conclusions from the result is limited since only SAF and their doctrines were researched. To create general conclusions more armed forces would need to be
researched with the same theoretical framework. However, this thesis contributes with a first step to a general understanding of how doctrines are employed within academic education.

**Method**

*Contents purpose* analysis and the research design have contributed to this thesis by revealing nuances of the theoretical perspectives within the empirical material. It has further illuminated the deviances that exist and made it possible to compose the empirical material in numerous ways to problematise the empirical materials’ relation to each other. It can therefore be concluded that this thesis has used an adequate method to answer the research questions.

It is important to state that the answers within this thesis are made from the framework of the method, and it is probable that another method would have given another result. Furthermore it is possible that some errors may have occurred. To identify these eventual errors and validate the result, reproductions of the analysis must be made. The result therefore contributes to the knowledge of doctrine, but it must be viewed critically and be tested further to reach definite conclusions.

The empirical material included in the thesis was utilised to assess the formal approach of how doctrine was employed within academic education conducted by SEDU. Even though all available empirical material was included in the thesis, it can still be argued that the inclusion of the course descriptions in the syllabuses would have created more nuances in the result. Reproductions of the method should include these to compare and relate those results to this thesis, which may further identify the occurrence of errors within my thesis.

**Theory**

The use of dogmatism and skepticism as a theoretical framework has contributed to this thesis by enabling a comparison of opposite perspectives. The perspectives’ relevance to empirical material has further enabled an understanding of the correlation between doctrine and education and how they can affect each other. Still, the theoretical perspectives are a delimited framework, and as such do not include nuances of doctrine or academic education that are outside of the perspectives’ epistemological frame. Thus, implying that there might be factors not taken into consideration, though this thesis does not make any claim to explain the circumstances of factors that deviate from the two theoretical perspectives.
7.3. Professional Implications

This thesis has brought knowledge to how Swedish military academic education corresponds and relates to Swedish doctrines. Awareness of the contradictions may diminish dissonance in the education systems as methods to avoid these might be developed. It can also provide insights into how to develop doctrines and military academic education that correspond to a higher degree. OP has been modified as late as 2015 and HSU will be transformed in 2018. The insights the perspectives have given on the different approaches of academic education may also be used as a basis for education that is subject to change. The insights may also illuminate the need for change for some branches and courses.

7.4. Further Research

This thesis is a first step in understanding the employment of doctrine within academic education. To strengthen the validity of the arguments presented reproduction of the analysis must be made. But to enlighten more perspectives of the relation between doctrine and academic education, another empirical approach can be made, where documents such as course descriptions are researched instead or where teachers who have influence over academic education are interviewed. Another approach may be to research how doctrines are employed within non-academic education, which would enable a comparison to this thesis. Summing up, further research is needed not only about how doctrine formally corresponds to academic education, but also about how doctrine is interpreted and projected by those who can be argued to have influential power within academic education.
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