



Transformation of military organisational culture under the influence of war: An empirical study using the OCAI methodology

Oleh Rybchuk*

PhD

National Defence University of Ukraine
03049, 28 Povitroflotskyi Ave., Kyiv, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3966-8326>

Vitalii Shevchuk

PhD in Military Sciences, Senior Researcher
National Defence University of Ukraine
03049, 28 Povitroflotskyi Ave., Kyiv, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8532-739X>

Oleksii Voroshchuk

PhD, Professor
National Defence University of Ukraine
03049, 28 Povitroflotskyi Ave., Kyiv, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5091-4722>

Yuliia Khachaturian

Senior Lecturer
National Defence University of Ukraine
03049, 28 Povitroflotskyi Ave., Kyiv, Ukraine
<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-5182-6322>

◆ **Abstract.** The relevance of the study is conditioned by the fact that a full-scale war radically changes the conditions of functioning of the Armed Forces of Ukraine, putting forward new requirements for leadership, communication, and preservation of institutional values. In such circumstances, the transformation of organisational culture becomes a key factor in the cohesion, sustainability, and effectiveness of command, and its empirical measurement allows understanding the mechanisms of internal adaptation of military units to external pressure. The purpose of the study was to empirically assess the dominant types of organisational culture among Ukrainian servicemen during the war (2022-2025) using the OCAI method. The OCAI (Organisational Culture Assessment Instrument) methodology adapted to the military context, questionnaires of military personnel, open interviews, and document analysis were applied, and descriptive statistics, paired t-test and one-factor variance analysis (ANOVA) were used for data processing. A survey of 83 military personnel showed that the dominant type of culture remains hierarchical (34.25 points), but in the desired state its value is significantly reduced (20.26 points) in favour of adhocratic (an increase from 12.1 to 26.97 points) and clan (from 27.22 to 27.77). The most pronounced changes were recorded in the success criteria, where the adhocratic culture rose from 20.34 to 35.64 points, and the hierarchical culture decreased from 32.98 to 14.08 points. There was also an increase in innovation (from 6.36 to 7.64), initiative (from 6.96 to 7.68 points), and result orientation (from 7.16 to 8.24 points), which showed the active adaptation of troops to the conditions of modern warfare based on trust, mutual support networks, and value-oriented leadership practices. This study was one of the first empirical applications of the OCAI model in the military context of Ukraine during the war, its originality lies in the adaptation of the tool for highly structured and stressful

Suggested Citation:

Rybchuk, O., Shevchuk, V., Voroshchuk O., & Khachaturian, Yu. (2025). Transformation of military organisational culture under the influence of war: An empirical study using the OCAI methodology. *The Bulletin of National Defence University of Ukraine*, 20(6), 93-101. doi: 10.33099/2617-6858-25-20-6-93-101.

Article's History: Received: 23.05.2025; Revised: 22.10.2025; Accepted: 27.11.2025



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

*Corresponding author

institutions, which allowed diagnosing changes from a rigid hierarchy to more flexible models. The results obtained enrich the international discourse on military leadership and organisational development, and are also of practical value for reforming the system of training military leaders, forming a sustainable organisational culture in the defence sector

◆ **Keywords:** organisational changes; Armed Forces of Ukraine; leadership; cultural adaptation; transformation; combat effectiveness

◆ Introduction

In modern warfare, organisational culture is becoming crucial to ensuring combat effectiveness. Even under equal conditions of the combat situation, resource support and level of training of personnel, the results of actions can vary significantly depending on the internal climate, values, and leadership style in a particular unit. The effectiveness of military organisations largely depends on the quality of leadership, and the development of the leadership potential of cadets should combine thorough theoretical training with practical experience in exercises, tactical, and simulation games. The existing Ukrainian system is characterised by insufficient individualisation of approaches, so improvement is possible through the introduction of interactive teaching methods, mentoring, cases, project work, etc., which will contribute to the development of strategic thinking, communication skills, and the ability to make decisions in extreme conditions (Melnychenko *et al.*, 2024). In this regard, organisational culture is a decisive factor in combat readiness, rather than a background factor. War creates an extreme environment that accelerates the transformation of cultural mechanisms, activates adaptation, innovation, and cohesion, revealing not only positive potentials, but also critical points of vulnerability of organisations. The study of the dynamics of cultural changes in Ukrainian military units is of great scientific and practical significance for the development of strategic approaches in the Armed Forces of Ukraine. E.D. Lonergan & J. Snyder (2025) emphasised that the military organisational culture shapes the professional identity, values, and standards of conduct of the army, defining its internal norms and approaches to conducting combat operations, while the strategic culture reflects a broader understanding of the goals and methods of using force at the state security level, and both of these components are undergoing profound transformations in modern warfare conditions, in particular in cyberspace, which introduces new technological opportunities and challenges.

Analysis of organisational culture in the South Carolina National Guard (USA) showed that leadership styles are crucial for shaping organisational culture, while transformational and transactional leadership were significantly more effective than liberal style in achieving the desired cultural results (Elliott *et al.*, 2025). Other studies have highlighted the importance of cultural factors in military adaptation. Thus, in the SCEEUS report M. Mannerfeld (2023) noted that the organisational culture of the Armed Forces of Ukraine stimulated innovation – for example, the mass use of civilian drones was made possible by a decentralised, proactive approach to command. The study

by J. Soeters (2021) showed that military organisational culture was established under the influence of national traditions, historical experience, and features of military service, depends on the specifics of a particular country and integrates elements of global culture within the framework of international unions and joint operations. A.T. Bogale & K.L. Debela (2024) identified organisational culture as a key factor in overcoming crises and improving efficiency, which affects interpersonal interaction, management and dynamics of the work environment, which creates the basis for its effective integration into military affairs. The paper devoted to the study of the lessons of the war in Ukraine, B.A.M. Langum (2024) also emphasised the importance of mental flexibility and adaptive leadership in the military during war. M.T. Hackett & J.A. Nagl (2024) in its analysis of military experience emphasised the need for a culture of command to achieve the ultimate goal (mission command), which implies trust and decentralisation of responsibility. Similar findings were obtained in the analytical research by CSIS (2025), which pointed to the critical role of the human domain (psychological state, continuity of command, and moral stability) in conflict situations. M. Hvizda *et al.* (2025) further reviewed Ukraine's lessons for future wars, with a focus on innovation, efficiency, and structural adaptation. Summarising, the scientific community agrees that it is culture, trust, initiative, and the rejection of excessive hierarchy that determine the current effectiveness of the Armed Forces. Despite this, direct, systematic empirical research into cultural changes in the Ukrainian military environment in conditions of active warfare remains underrepresented in the literature. The purpose of the study was to identify the impact of war on the transformation of military organisational culture and factors that determine the success or inefficiency of units in combat conditions.

◆ Materials and Methods

The methodological basis of the research was contemporary scientific approaches to the investigation of organisational culture and its role in management and leadership. The central concept was the model by E.H. Schein (2004), which explained the development and consolidation of culture through three levels: artefacts, proclaimed values, and basic ideas. In the military environment, these elements are reflected in leadership styles, decision-making mechanisms, communications, and interpersonal interaction. In order to determine the influence of cultural context on organisational behaviour, the cultural dimension model by G. Hofstede (2001) was considered, which allowed assessing the specifics of management strategies in a

cross-cultural context. Additionally, the “cultural web” model by G. Johnson & K. Scholes (2002) was also used, which covered informal elements of culture – symbols, rituals, dominant paradigms. Of particular importance was the Organisational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI), which allowed identifying the current and desired organisational culture within the model of competing values: clan, adhocratic, market, and hierarchical (Cameron & Quinn, 2005; Wang *et al.*, 2021). It was this tool that was adapted to the military context in this study. In addition to generally accepted theories, the development of the research approach considered the results of a previous empirical study by V. Osodlo *et al.* (2021), who focused on the role of organisational culture in ensuring the sustainable development of organisations. It proved that it is cultural architectonics that largely determines the effectiveness of communication, motivational mechanisms, and leadership influence, which has become the basis for the current analysis.

In this study, organisational culture is interpreted as “a pattern of collective basic ideas adopted by a group when solving problems of adaptation to the external environment and internal integration” (Schein, 2004). To determine the specific characteristics of the organisational culture of military units, the OCAI methodology adapted for the military environment was used. The organisational culture diagnostic questionnaire consisted of 24 diagnostic statements, which were divided into 6 blocks of 4 statements each. In each of the 6 blocks, respondents had to distribute 100 points between four statements according to how much each of them reflects the real state (present) and the desired state (what they would like to see the division in the future). For the purposes of this study, the author adapted the OCAI methodology to the military context. In particular, the wording of the statements was clarified considering the military terminology, the organisational structure of the Armed Forces of Ukraine, and the specifics of the units. The concept of “manager” was

replaced by “commander”, “organisation” – by “division”. Aerobic testing of the adapted version of the questionnaire was conducted on 10 military personnel of different levels, as a result of which minor editorial changes were made. The reliability of the instrument was checked by internal consistency: the Cronbach’s α for the scales ranged from 0.72 to 0.81, which indicates sufficient reliability. In order to assess changes in organisational culture under the influence of war, respondents were asked to evaluate 8 components of organisational culture and their transformation during a large-scale war. The Likert scale from 1 to 10 points was used to evaluate responses, where 1 – the lowest score (no manifestation) and 10 – the highest score (maximum level of manifestation).

The following methods were also used to collect empirical data: open interviews, questionnaires of military personnel – primarily officers of operational and strategic levels of military education, analysis of documents and internal communications, indirect observation of behaviour. The presented empirical study was conducted in 2025. In total, the study covered 83 respondents and was conducted considering the ethical foundations of psychological research in accordance with the requirements of the Helsinki Declaration of the World Medical Association (WMA, 2024). Statistical analysis involved calculating mean values and standard deviations to identify trends in change and the level of consensus in estimates. The received data was processed using the SPSS software suite (version XX). Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation) were used to evaluate the basic characteristics of the sample and the parameters of the organisational culture. A paired t-test for dependent samples was used to test the statistical significance of differences between the existing and desired culture state. Individual intergroup comparisons were performed using univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA). Statistical significance was considered acceptable at $p < 0.05$. Table 1 provides information describing the sample of subjects.

Table 1. Characteristics of the study sample

Category	Number of people	Percentage
Total number of respondents	83	100
Duration of military service		
under 10 years	42	50.6
11-20 years	19	22.9
more than 20 years	22	26.5
Affiliation with the type (branch, forces) of the Armed Forces of Ukraine		
Ground Forces	50	60.2
Air Forces	2	2.4
Naval Forces	2	2.4
Special Operations Forces	3	3.6
Forces of Unmanned Systems	1	1.2
Territorial Defence Forces	5	6.0
Logistics Forces	5	6.0
General Staff	3	3.6
Ministry of Defence of Ukraine, HMEI	12	14.5
Category of military personnel		
soldiers	20	24.1
sergeants	15	18.1

Table 1. Continued

Category	Number of people	Percentage
junior officers	10	12.0
senior officers	36	43.4
generals	2	2.4

Source: developed by the authors

These data allowed considering the findings representative, since the study covered all categories of military personnel representing the majority of the components of the Armed Forces of Ukraine. Despite the representativeness of the study for key categories of military personnel, there was an uneven distribution in some indicators. In particular, the sample mainly included representatives of the Ground Forces (60.2%) and senior officers (43.4%), which may partially affect the generalisation of results for other categories and types of forces of the Armed Forces of Ukraine. This should be considered as a methodological limitation that requires further study with an extended or stratified sample.

◆ Results and Discussion

Interpretation of the results of the assessment of the organisational culture of military units. The study allowed identifying key changes in the military organisational culture that occurred as a result of the war for the period from February 2022 to May 2025. The result of

using the OCAI methodology is a rating assessment of four alternatives, which helped to identify the type and state of the division's culture by constructing a framework structure of competing values. The types of culture in this case include clan (alternative A), adhocratic (alternative B), market (alternative C), and hierarchical (alternative D). Clan culture implies the establishment of a "family" within the organisation, where all military personnel share common values, all are united and empathetic. Adhocratic is a corporate culture characterised by flexibility and adaptability to circumstances. Hierarchical – mainly aimed at a clear distribution of responsibilities in the division, standardisation of rules and procedures for functioning. Market culture means that the division primarily focuses on external circumstances, and not on the internal situation. The data presented in Table 2 provide an in-depth comparative analysis of the current and desired state of organisational culture of military units in six key dimensions that reflect the structural, managerial, value, and strategic aspects of the team's functioning.

Table 2. Assessment of organisational culture parameters

		Current status		Desired state	
Dimensions of organisational culture		Mean value	Standard deviation	Mean value	Standard deviation
The most important characteristics of the division	A	27.22	0.449	27.77	0.429
	B	12.1	0.380	26.97	0.352
	C	26.42	0.599	25	0.456
	D	34.25	0.484	20.26	0.387
General leadership and command style	A	26.96	0.681	32.02	0.568
	B	19.85	0.630	29.88	0.386
	C	24.42	0.662	22.97	0.688
	D	28.77	0.730	15.13	0.542
Personnel management	A	27.42	0.691	32.21	0.424
	B	20.89	0.704	26.01	0.389
	C	21.51	0.626	24.18	0.546
	D	30.18	0.692	17.6	0.564
Unifying features of the division	A	29.44	0.686	32.91	0.432
	B	17.26	0.576	27.12	0.324
	C	27.43	0.352	23.17	0.576
	D	25.86	0.386	16.81	0.346
Strategic guidelines of the division	A	25.34	0.380	28.32	0.566
	B	23.19	0.448	31.55	0.624
	C	25.8	0.449	27.71	0.431
	D	25.66	0.420	12.42	0.386
Criteria of division success	A	24.01	0.599	27.64	0.348
	B	20.34	0.662	35.64	0.367
	C	22.68	0.393	22.64	0.431
	D	32.98	0.484	14.08	0.564

Source: developed by the authors

According to Table 2, the current state is dominated by a hierarchical culture (34.25), which indicates the presence of structure, regulation, and orientation to control and subordination. However, the desired state demonstrates a clear desire to reduce this dominant (to 20.26) and a significant increase in the importance of adhocratic culture (from 12.1 to 26.97), and a moderate increase in the clan component. This dynamic is interpreted as a request to increase flexibility, innovation, strengthening internal cohesion, emotional mutual support, and identity of the division. The current leadership model tends towards a hierarchical style (28.77), which is typical for traditional military structures with a high level of formalisation and vertical management. However, the expected changes indicate a clear desire for a more humane, open and transformational style: the importance of clan leadership style increases (up to 32.02) and adhocratic (up to 29.88). This may indicate the need for more trusting interpersonal relationships, developing initiative among subordinates, and maintaining a mentoring culture. In the field of personnel management, there is also a desire to abandon strictly formalised procedures (the hierarchical model decreases from 30.18 to 17.6) in favour of the clan (growth to 32.21) and adhocratic model (to 26.01). This trend reflects the growing importance of an individualised approach to military personnel, orientation to the development of human capital, considering psychological comfort and social support in difficult and dynamic circumstances. The current situation is characterised by a somewhat unbalanced cultural profile, with approximately equal positions of clan, market, and hierarchical cultures. In the desired state, preference is clearly given to clan (up to 32.91) and adhocratic (up to 27.12) traits. This indicates a demand for the development of a culture of unity, shared values, interpersonal trust, and openness to change and flexibility in responding to challenges. A decrease in the importance of market culture may indicate the priority of internal cohesion over external competition. The transition of strategic guidelines was most striking: hierarchical culture decreased to a minimum level (12.42), and adhocratic

culture increased to 31.55, which indicates a transformation of the strategic vision of the organisation. The focus is gradually shifting from stability and predictability to innovative development, adaptive planning, and finding new approaches to task completion. In conclusion, the analysis of success criteria showed the most pronounced change in cultural emphasis: if the hierarchical model currently dominates (32.98), then in the desired version preference is given to the adhocratic type (35.64). This means that the idea of efficiency and effectiveness shifts from monitoring and following formal procedures to achieving innovative results, a high degree of autonomy, initiative, and creativity in work. In general, the results of the study revealed a significant transformation of value orientations within military units. From a clearly dominant hierarchical culture, there is a transition to a more flexible, innovative, and human-centred model of organisational culture that combines the features of clan and adhocratic cultures. This indicates changes in the expectations of personnel regarding management styles, ways of interaction, and determining the effectiveness of the unit in the modern security environment. In addition, a high standard deviation in current state assessments (especially in measuring leadership style) indicates cultural heterogeneity or even hidden tensions between different behaviours, which can complicate the process of change. But the low level of deviation in the desired state of culture demonstrates the consensus of the study participants on the priority areas of development of the organisational environment.

Interpretation of changes in the components of the organisational culture of military units under the influence of war. Table 3 provides a comparative analysis of key components of organisational culture before and after the deployment of full-scale military operations. The analysis is based on scores on a scale from 0 to 10, where higher values indicate a greater degree of the corresponding characteristic. Changes in the mean values and dynamics of the standard deviation presented in Table 3 allow assessing both qualitative transformations and the level of uniformity of perception of changes among respondents.

Table 3. Assessment of changes in organisational culture components under the influence of war

Culture component	Before		After	
	Mean value (score 0-10)	Standard deviation	Mean value (score 0-10)	Standard deviation
Cohesion level	7.60	0.346	7.50	0.437
Initiative of personnel	6.96	0.422	7.68	0.348
Compliance with procedures	6.80	0.368	7.56	0.495
Result orientation	7.16	0.354	8.24	0.367
Support from commanders	7.00	0.420	7.31	0.438
Innovation in approaches	6.36	0.566	7.64	0.433
Readiness for change	6.43	0.622	7.54	0.452
Atmosphere of trust	6.95	0.426	7.01	0.387

Source: developed by the author

The cohesion index remained almost unchanged (from 7.60 to 7.50), showing a slight decrease that does not go beyond the statistical error. This demonstrates the

stability of horizontal ties and collective solidarity in the military environment, even in conditions of extreme stress and high dynamics. A slight increase in the standard

deviation may reflect the variability of the cohesion experience in different units or at different stages of combat operations. Initiative increased from 6.96 to 7.68, which indicates an increase in the subjectivity of military personnel, an increase in autonomy in decision-making and a willingness to act proactively. A decrease in the standard deviation indicates greater consistency in the perception of this shift, which can be interpreted as a sign of an adaptive increase in individual responsibility in the face of combat challenges. The formal compliance rate increased from 6.80 to 7.56. This indicates the strengthening of the role of regulatory guidelines and disciplinary structure, which remain the basis for the functioning of divisions even in conditions of uncertainty. This is probably conditioned by the need to maintain order and predictability in extreme situations. The growing deviation indicates differences in the experience of implementing procedures in different contexts. The largest increase among all components was recorded for this parameter – from 7.16 to 8.24. This demonstrates that war has activated instrumental orientations when evaluating the effectiveness of actions has become a priority. A stable low deviation confirms a high level of consensus on improving performance as a defining criterion for behaviour and management. The support rate increased from 7.00 to 7.31, which indicates a positive trend in interpersonal vertical relationships, in particular, an increase in attention from commanders to the needs of subordinates. While growth is moderate, it shows a desire for a more ethical, humane, and supportive leadership style that is consistent with modern ideas about effective command in the face of uncertainty. A sharp increase in innovation (from 6.36 to 7.64) indicates that the war has become a catalyst for the search for new solutions, tactics, and ways to organise processes. Increasing innovation activity can be associated both with the need to adapt to changes, and with expanding the space for initiatives at the tactical level. A decrease in the standard deviation indicates a unified perception of this trend. Readiness for changes also shows positive dynamics – from 6.43 to 7.54. This trend reflects psychological mobilisation and increased tolerance for uncertainty among personnel. Increasing flexibility of thinking and adaptability is a key factor in survival and success in war. A slight increase in the atmosphere of trust indicator (from 6.95 to 7.01) with a consistently low deviation indicates a relative constancy in the level of interpersonal trust, despite the challenges associated with extreme conditions. This may indicate already established trusting relationships, which remain an important resource in crisis situations, although they do not show significant strengthening. Analysis of changes in the components of the organisational culture of military units under the influence of war demonstrates a general tendency to strengthen adaptive, innovative and performance-oriented characteristics, while maintaining (or slightly reducing) the level of cohesion and trust. War, as an extreme external factor, on the one hand, mobilised initiative, innovation and readiness for change, and on the other,

contributed to increasing the role of clear procedures and monitoring of results. This paradox of combining formalisation and flexibility is typical for complex organisations in conditions of high uncertainty and risk. The changes were accompanied by a general decrease in the variability of perception in most parameters, which indicates an increase in the consistency of collective experience. This can be seen as a sign of consolidation of the organisational culture around new challenges, when a common goal forms new rules for interaction and collective survival.

A variety of approaches to interpreting organisational culture models. Organisational culture, formed under the influence of historical heritage, values and behaviour of leaders, is a key factor in the effectiveness of organisations, determines the opportunities and limitations of their development, and its purposeful management contributes to the achievement of strategic goals, improving work ethics, communications, and the implementation of innovative strategies (Osodlo *et al.*, 2021). The results of the study confirmed that the organisational culture of the Armed Forces of Ukraine is in the process of active transformation. M.R. Bowers *et al.* (2017) argued that successful crisis management requires a combination of organisational culture and individual leadership styles, implemented through crisis leadership principles that allow the choice of the most effective leader for a particular situation. Accordingly, the conditions of war are just such crisis situations, so OCAI in a reformed form has the potential to identify the dominant types and trends of transformation of military organisational culture, and to outline the tension between hierarchical models and orientation towards clan and adhocratic values (Cameron & Quinn, 2005; Wang *et al.*, 2021). Despite the preservation of a significant share of hierarchical characteristics, the personnel declare a desire to shift the emphasis towards clan and adhocratic culture. The study by A. Pollman (2015) demonstrated that the organisational culture of the U.S. Marine Corps is characterised by a preference for market and hierarchical attributes with a tendency towards greater flexibility and adhocracy, while reflecting a desire to strengthen clan elements in leadership. But the results of this study showed a focus on trust, team interaction, initiative and flexibility in decision-making among the Ukrainian military. Such results show that war is becoming a catalyst for cultural change, stimulating a reorientation from rigid and formalised practices to more adaptive and humanitarian-coloured models of interaction. Similar trends can be traced in other Ukrainian studies. Analysis of the positive organisational culture in the Armed Forces of Ukraine showed that the key factor of sustainability is the development of informal practices of mutual support, horizontal communication and trust between military personnel, which strengthen readiness to perform tasks under stressful conditions (Shynkaruk *et al.*, 2024). Similar processes were recorded in the civilian sector, in particular in the university environment, where during the war there was a shift from a rigid hierarchical culture to a more

flexible, innovative and creative organisational model (Falko & Zhukov, 2023). This indicates that the transformation of culture under the pressure of war is a common characteristic for different types of organisations in Ukraine.

The relationship between organisational culture and leadership styles deserves special attention. The results of this study show that military personnel's focus on clan and adhocratic culture is accompanied by an expectation of leadership based on support, trust, and shared responsibility. A similar connection has been confirmed in different contexts from the Ukrainian military. Thus, a study of the US National Guard showed a close correlation between the dominance of clan culture and the predominance of a democratic, supportive leadership style (Langum, 2024). In the Ukrainian context, this is reflected in the expectation of the military to see commanders who combine professional competence with a willingness to serve as an example, provide team cohesion and moral support. Similar characteristics were described in the study by N. Batryn (2023) on military leadership, which highlighted the role of empathy, quick decision-making, and maintaining trust in crisis situations. The results of this study also revealed a systemic conflict between new cultural landmarks and the inertia of old hierarchical models. Contemporary publications repeatedly emphasised that the new generation of Ukrainian commanders strives to implement more decentralised and proactive approaches to management, but faces resistance from the traditional bureaucratic system (Kirichenko, 2025). Analytical reviews confirm that excessive regulation and rigid hierarchical practices often limit the initiative and flexibility of military units, reducing their effectiveness in combat conditions (Zaluzhny, 2025; Walker et al., 2025). In this context, the data obtained can be interpreted as an empirical confirmation of cultural tension: on the one hand, the dominant hierarchy; on the other, the clear desire of personnel for new models based on mutual trust and partnership. Ultimately, the results obtained are consistent with the strategic conclusions of military science regarding the lessons of war. The ability of the Ukrainian military to act effectively is determined not only by the level of technical support, but also by the development of flexible, creative, and collegial forms of command that allow them to quickly adapt to changes in the environment (Sukman, 2024). This further emphasised that the transformation of organisational culture is not only an internal management process, but also a determining factor in operational and strategic effectiveness. Thus, the conducted research fits into the broader scientific discourse and demonstrates that culture in military organisations is not a secondary, but a key factor of combat capability. It simultaneously reflects the legacy of the past and the landmarks

of the future, determining the readiness of personnel for adaptation, innovation, and sustainability.

◆ Conclusions

The war has become a powerful transformative factor for the organisational culture of military units of the Armed Forces of Ukraine. The results of a survey of 83 military personnel showed that the dominant type of culture remains hierarchical (34.25 points), but in the desired state its value decreases to 20.26 points in favour of adhocratic (an increase from 12.1 to 26.97 points) and clan (from 27.22 to 27.77 points). The greatest changes were recorded in the success criteria, where the adhocratic culture increased from 20.34 to 35.64 points, and the hierarchical culture decreased from 32.98 to 14.08 points. There is also an increase in innovation (from 6.36 to 7.64 points), initiative (from 6.96 to 7.68 points), and result orientation (from 7.16 to 8.24 points), which indicates an active adaptation of the army to modern warfare. These results confirmed the gradual transition from a strictly hierarchical to a more flexible and human-centred culture, where trust, cooperation, flexibility, innovation, efficiency, and initiative become the leading characteristics. As a result, the distance of power decreases, the formal boundaries between levels and roles lose rigidity, horizontal communications and combat brotherhood are strengthened, which forms an open and goal-oriented military culture. High scores of cohesion and trust showed that there is a stable moral core that supports combat capability despite extreme conditions. The results obtained are of applied importance for the reform of military administration, the development of leadership training programmes, and new personnel policies. Moreover, they highlight the need for further institutional consolidation of these positive changes, so that the latest military organisational culture moves from a natural phenomenon to a conscious system practice and becomes the basis for the next stage of development of the Defence Forces of Ukraine. Further research should focus on a more in-depth study of the dynamics of change in units of different types and levels of combat interaction, considering the specifics of their organisational structure, professional composition, intensity of combat missions, and external conditions.

◆ Acknowledgements

None.

◆ Funding

None.

◆ Conflict of Interest

None.

◆ References

- [1] Batryn, N. (2023). Wartime leadership in the context of organizational change theories. *International Science Journal of Management, Economics & Finance*, 2(1), 96-103. [doi: 10.46299/j.isjmef.20230201.10](https://doi.org/10.46299/j.isjmef.20230201.10).
- [2] Bogale, A.T., & Debela, K.L. (2024). Organizational culture: A systematic review. *Cogent Business & Management*, 11(1), article number 2340129. [doi: 10.1080/23311975.2024.2340129](https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2024.2340129).

- [3] Bowers, M.R., Hall, J.R., & Srinivasan, M.M. (2017). Organizational culture and leadership style: The missing combination for selecting the right leader for effective crisis management. *Business Horizons*, 60(4), 551-563. doi: [10.1016/j.bushor.2017.04.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2017.04.001).
- [4] Cameron, K.S., & Quinn, R.E. (2005). *Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- [5] Center for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS). (2025). *Human domain lessons from the Russia-Ukraine conflict*. Retrieved from <https://www.csis.org/analysis/human-domain-lessons-russia-ukraine-conflict-focus>.
- [6] Elliott, Z.U., Bourne, P.A., Chambers, T.M., McNeil, T.H., Moses, D.N.C., & Nelson, R. (2025). A quantitative analysis of leadership styles and organisational culture: A data-driven study of the South Carolina Army National Guard. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability & Ethics*, 22(1), 78-117. doi: [10.33423/jlae.v22i1.7537](https://doi.org/10.33423/jlae.v22i1.7537).
- [7] Falko, N., & Zhukov, O. (2023). Transition from hierarchy to adhocratic organizational culture in a Ukrainian university: From survival to successful development in the conditions of war. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 21(2), 15-22. doi: [10.21511/ppm.21\(2-si\).2023.03](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.21(2-si).2023.03).
- [8] Hackett, M.T., & Nagl, J.A. (2024). A long, hard year: Russia-Ukraine war lessons learned 2023. *The US Army War College Quarterly Parameters*, 54(3), article number 6. doi: [10.55540/0031-1723.3302](https://doi.org/10.55540/0031-1723.3302).
- [9] Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- [10] Hvizda, M., Frederick, B., Laufer, A., Evans, A.T., Gunness, K., & Ochmanek, D.A. (2025). *Dispersed, disguised, and degradable: The implications of the fighting in Ukraine for future U.S.-involved conflicts*. Retrieved from https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA3141-2.html.
- [11] Johnson, G., & Scholes, K. (2002). *Exploring corporate strategy: Text and cases* (6th ed.). Harlow: Financial Times Prentice Hall.
- [12] Kirichenko, D. (2025). *Ukraine's new generals battle the old system*. Retrieved from <https://cepa.org/article/ukraines-new-generals-battle-the-old-system/>.
- [13] Langum, B.A.M. (2024). *Adapt, lead, win: NCO lessons from Ukraine*. Retrieved from <https://www.armyupress.army.mil/portals/7/nco-journal/images/2024/October/NCO-Lessons-from-Ukraine/NCO-Lessons-from-Ukraine.pdf>.
- [14] Loneragan, E.D., & Snyder, J. (2025). Cultural change in military organizations: Hackers and warriors in the US Army. *Texas National Security Review*, 8(3), 74-95. doi: [10.1353/tns.00006](https://doi.org/10.1353/tns.00006).
- [15] Mannerfelt, M. (2023). *The positive organizational culture of the Ukrainian Armed Forces and the use of civilian drones in the war against Russia*. Retrieved from <https://sceus.se/en/publications/the-positive-organizational-culture-of-the-ukrainian-armed-forces-and-the-use-of-civilian-drones-in-the-war-against-russia/>.
- [16] Melnychenko, S., Ovchynnyk, V., Hudal, S., & Kulyk, M. (2024). Pedagogical aspects of the development of leadership qualities in cadets of higher military educational institutions. *Scientific Bulletin of Mukachevo State University. Series "Pedagogy and Psychology"*, 10(1), 87-97. doi: [10.52534/msu-pp1.2024.87](https://doi.org/10.52534/msu-pp1.2024.87).
- [17] Osodlo, V., Rybchuk, O., & Krykun, V. (2021). Organizational culture as a basis for efficient development of organization. *European Journal of Studies in Management and Business*, 17, 18-30. doi: [10.32038/mbrq.2021.17.02](https://doi.org/10.32038/mbrq.2021.17.02).
- [18] Pollman, A. (2015). *Diagnosis and analysis of marine corps organizational culture*. (Master's thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, USA).
- [19] Schein, E.H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [20] Shynkaruk, O., Byshyvets, N., Dutchak, M., Andrieieva, O., & Iakovenko, O. (2024). Mental health and post-traumatic stress disorder in military personnel depending on participation in active combat operations. *Physical Education, Sport and Health Culture in Modern Society*, 2(66), 39-51. doi: [10.29038/2220-7481-2024-02-39-51](https://doi.org/10.29038/2220-7481-2024-02-39-51).
- [21] Soeters, J. (2021). *Militaries' organizational cultures in a globalizing world*. Retrieved from <https://oxfordre.com/politics/display/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-1937/version/0>.
- [22] Sukman, D. (2024). *Something old and something new: Lessons from the Ukraine-Russia war*. Retrieved from <https://www.armyupress.army.mil/Journals/Military-Review/Online-Exclusive/2024-OLE/Lessons-Ukraine-Russia-War/>.
- [23] Walker, M., Lovett, I., & Sivorka, I. (2025). *Ukraine's once nimble army is mired in Soviet decision-making*. Retrieved from <https://www.wsj.com/world/ukraine-russia-army-soviet-5fa8e1c9>.
- [24] Wang, Y., Zhu, G., Shi, J., Huang, Y., & Guo, X. (2021). OSAI: A component-based open software architecture for modern industrial control systems. *Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering*, 47(4), 3805-3819. doi: [10.1007/s13369-021-06123-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13369-021-06123-3).
- [25] WMA. (2024). *WMA Declaration of Helsinki – ethical principles for medical research involving human participants*. Retrieved from <https://www.wma.net/policies-post/wma-declaration-of-helsinki/>.
- [26] Zaluzhny, V. (2025). *The art of command and control on the battlefields of Ukraine*. Retrieved from <https://www.thetimes.com/world/russia-ukraine-war/article/the-art-of-command-and-control-on-the-battlefields-of-ukraine-lml8m5qgx>.

Трансформація військової організаційної культури під впливом війни: емпіричне дослідження за методикою OCAI

Олег Рибчук

Доктор філософії
Національний університет оборони України
03049, просп. Повітрофлотський, 28, м. Київ, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3966-8326>

Віталій Шевчук

Кандидат військових наук, старший дослідник
Національний університет оборони України
03049, просп. Повітрофлотський, 28, м. Київ, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8532-739X>

Олексій Ворошук

Доктор філософії, професор
Національний університет оборони України
03049, просп. Повітрофлотський, 28, м. Київ, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5091-4722>

Юлія Хачатурян

Старший викладач
Національний університет оборони України
03049, просп. Повітрофлотський, 28, м. Київ, Україна
<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-5182-6322>

◆ **Анотація.** Актуальність дослідження зумовлена тим, що повномасштабна війна радикально змінює умови функціонування Збройних Сил України, висувуючи нові вимоги до лідерства, комунікації та збереження інституційних цінностей. У таких умовах трансформація організаційної культури стає ключовим чинником згуртованості, стійкості та ефективності командування, а її емпіричне вимірювання дозволяє зрозуміти механізми внутрішньої адаптації військових підрозділів до зовнішнього тиску. Метою дослідження була емпірична оцінка домінуючих типів організаційної культури серед українських військовослужбовців у період війни (2022-2025 рр.) за методикою OCAI. Застосовано адаптовану до військового контексту методику OCAI (Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument), анкетування військовослужбовців, відкриті інтерв'ю та аналіз документів, а для обробки даних використано описову статистику, парний t-тест і однофакторний дисперсійний аналіз (ANOVA). Опитування 83 військовослужбовців показало, що домінуючим типом культури залишається ієрархічна (34,25 бала), однак у бажаному стані її значення суттєво знижується (20,26 бала) на користь адхократичної (зростання з 12,1 до 26,97 бала) та кланової (з 27,22 до 27,77). Найбільш виражені зміни зафіксовано у критеріях успіху, де адхократична культура піднялася з 20,34 до 35,64 бала, а ієрархічна знизилася з 32,98 до 14,08 бала. Також спостерігалось зростання інноваційності (з 6,36 до 7,64), ініціативності (з 6,96 до 7,68 бала) та орієнтації на результат (з 7,16 до 8,24 бала), що засвідчило про активне пристосування військ до умов сучасного бою завдяки довірі, мережам взаємопідтримки та ціннісно орієнтованим практикам лідерства. Це дослідження стало одним із перших емпіричних застосувань моделі OCAI у військовому контексті України під час війни, його новизна полягає в адаптації інструменту для високоструктурованих і стресових інституцій, що дало змогу діагностувати зміни від жорсткої ієрархії до більш гнучких моделей. Отримані результати збагачують міжнародний дискурс про військове лідерство й організаційний розвиток, а також мають практичну цінність для реформування системи підготовки військових керівників, формування стійкої організаційної культури в оборонному секторі

◆ **Ключові слова:** організаційні зміни; Збройні Сили України; лідерство; культурна адаптація; трансформація; бойова ефективність