

УДК 65.011.8

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30970/PPS.2025.63.29>

## **PRAXEOLOGICAL AND BEHAVIORAL MODELS OF CORPORATE CULTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF SECURITY CHALLENGES IN UKRAINE**

**Tetiana Chubina**

*National University of Civil Defense of Ukraine,  
Faculty of Civil Protection, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences  
Onoprienko Str. 8, 18034, Cherkasy, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9383-3604>*

**Maria Dmytrenko**

*National University of Civil Defense of Ukraine,  
Faculty of Civil Protection, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences  
Onoprienko Str. 8, 18034, Cherkasy, Ukraine  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8338-4032>*

The article conducts a systematic analysis of the dynamic behavioral and praxeological models that underpin the remarkable resilience of contemporary Ukrainian corporate culture during pervasive security challenges. The research moves beyond traditional, descriptive cultural frameworks – such as Edgar Schein’s three-level model (Artifacts, Values, Core Beliefs) and S. Robbins’ ten criteria by integrating the crucial praxeological dimension: the theory of effective, rational action under conditions of extreme duress and radical uncertainty. The core argument is that in a crisis environment, organizational survival is dictated not merely by shared values, but by the culture’s critical ability to rapidly institutionalize and execute efficient, survival-focused actions.

The study focuses on the critical interplay between deep-seated cultural assumptions about risk, trust, and continuity, and their swift manifestation in observable behavioral patterns. It highlights how the necessity of resilience forces a fundamental praxeological shift, moving corporate priorities from routine practices and profit maximization to adaptive action, employee safety, and business continuity. The paper examines specific cultural techniques – including evolving rituals of solidarity, crisis-focused communication (myths and sagas), and flexible formal/informal systems that efficiently transfer vital information and maintain psychological cohesion.

Furthermore, the analysis redefines rationality within the context of war, where an action is considered rational if it effectively secures the organization’s existence and its employees, even if it entails significant short-term financial losses. The efficiency of resilience itself is analyzed as a core cultural trait, focusing on the speed and resourcefulness with which a company restores operations after a shock. By defining the shift from standard operational norms to institutionalized praxeological norms, this article offers a novel paradigm for understanding and cultivating organizational robustness, providing essential insights for corporate security and crisis management globally, particularly for businesses operating in highly volatile or conflicted territories.

*Key words:* corporate culture, praxeology, organizational resilience, security challenges, behavioral models, crisis management, business continuity.

The study of corporate culture, particularly its manifestation in behavioral and praxeological models, has moved from an abstract academic concern to a critical requirement for organizational survival and national resilience, making this topic profoundly relevant. Interest in this subject is driven by the observed, almost unprecedented, adaptability of Ukrainian enterprises,

which have sustained operations despite ongoing military aggression, infrastructure loss, and massive uncertainty. This context presents a living laboratory for understanding how deep-seated organizational values (culture) translate into swift, rational, and effective action (praxeology) – a gap in traditional management literature focused on stable environments. The need for this research is urgent: for Ukrainian businesses, analyzing these successful behavioral models provides a blueprint for continuity and recovery, essential for preserving the national economic fabric. Furthermore, global security – ranging from geopolitical crises to climate disasters – demands new models of organizational resilience, and Ukraine’s experience offers invaluable, empirical data on creating cultures that prioritize efficiency of survival over routine efficiency. By integrating the established, descriptive criteria of behavioral psychology with the action-oriented framework of praxeology, this study provides a powerful, actionable paradigm for corporate security and crisis management that extends far beyond the Ukrainian context.

The purpose of this article is to systematically analyze and define the dynamic behavioral and praxeological models of contemporary corporate culture that enable Ukrainian organizations to maintain operational resilience, efficiency, and continuity amidst pervasive security challenges. Specifically, this study aims to integrate established descriptive cultural frameworks (artifacts, values, beliefs) with the praxeological dimension – the logic of effective, rational action under duress – to reveal how deep-seated cultural assumptions are swiftly transformed into observable, survival-focused behaviors and institutionalized cultural techniques in a crisis environment.

The study of corporate culture requires a multi-layered approach to understand how deep-seated assumptions translate into observable behavior, a crucial link for addressing security challenges. In publications devoted to the study of corporate culture, one can find various attempts to classify the levels or aspects of the manifestation of a company’s culture. A large number of approaches to identifying various attributes characterize and identify the culture of a particular organization both at the macro and micro levels.

Thus, S. Robbins suggests considering the culture of an organization based on ten criteria. Among them are personal initiative, i.e. the degree of responsibility, freedom and independence that a person has in the organization; the degree of risk, i.e. the employee’s willingness to take risks; the direction of action, i.e. the organization’s establishment of clear goals and expectations of the results of implementation; the consistency of actions, i.e. the situation in which units and people within the organization interact in a coordinated manner; management support, i.e. ensuring free interaction, assistance and support to subordinates from management services; control, i.e. a list of rules and instructions that are used to control and monitor the behavior of employees; identity, i.e. the degree of identification of each employee with the organization; reward system, i.e. the degree of accounting for work performance, the organization of the incentive system; conflict, i.e. the employee’s willingness to openly express his opinion and go into conflict; interaction models, i.e. the degree of interaction within the organization, when interaction is expressed in a formal hierarchy and subordination [1].

If we evaluate any organization according to these criteria, we can draw up a complete picture of corporate culture, against the background of which employees’ general idea about the organization is formed.

Thus, corporate culture, through the content of its elements, expresses a sense of the general style of the organization and ensures its flexibility, prosperity and stability.

In general, perhaps the most famous is the three-level model of the American psychologist E. Shane, which is built on the concept of cultural scientists F. Kluckhohn and F. Strobeck [2].

The study of corporate culture begins with the first, “superficial” or “symbolic” level, which includes such external manifestations as technology and architecture, the use of space and

time, language, slogans, patterns of behavior, methods of verbal and non-verbal communication, planning and decoration of premises. This is the “visible” part of corporate culture. However, external manifestations can remain incomprehensible if the basic ideas behind the external manifestations are unknown. The second level represents the values and beliefs that are shared by all members of the organization according to the extent to which these values are reflected in symbols and language. E. Schein called this “organizational ideology”, which in many companies is directly formulated in the program documents of the organization. The set values, which can be visible or hidden, in turn determine the social norms that regulate the behavior of members of the organization. According to E. Schein, corporate culture is based on certain basic ideas about the nature of the surrounding world, reality, time, space, etc. These ideas determine people’s behavior, helping them perceive the attributes that characterize corporate culture [2]. So, E. Schein identifies three levels: artifacts, values, and core beliefs.

Artifacts are the visible level of the physical and social environment created in the organization.

Values are an intermediate level of corporate culture, which consists of values, norms adopted in a certain physical and social environment. These are strategies, goals, and philosophy of the organization.

Core beliefs are an invisible, subconscious level of corporate culture, which combines: attitude to the world around us, perception of reality, time, space, human nature, human activity, and relationships.

The model is quite universal, since it is invariant with respect to the industry affiliation of the organization, the stage of its development life cycle, form of ownership, etc. Despite this, this model, with all its advantages, is quite theoretical. That is, values and other elements located at the first level determine a person’s personality, motivate their activities, and in particular determine work behavior. First, certain suprapersonal categories, structures of general social activity are assimilated by the human psyche, turning into internal structures, and then they generate external actions (rituals, behavioral style, etc.)

Scientists F. Harris and R. Moran offer the following ten characteristics:

1. Awareness of oneself and one’s place in the organization (some cultures value the employee’s concealment of their inner feelings, others encourage their external manifestation, in some cases independence and creativity are manifested through cooperation, and in others – through individualism).

2. Communication system and language of communication (the use of oral, written, non-verbal communication of “telephone law” and open communication differ in different groups and organizations; jargon, abbreviations, gestures vary depending on the industry, functional and territorial affiliation of the organization).

3. Appearance, clothing (the variety of uniforms and work clothes, business style, cosmetics, hairstyles, etc. confirm the presence of many microcultures).

4. Habits and traditions in the field of nutrition (organization of employee nutrition, food subsidies, periodicity, etc.).

5. Awareness of time, attitude to it and its use (degree of accuracy and time compliance among employees, adherence to the time regime and encouragement, monochronic or polychronic use of time).

6. Relationships between people (by age and gender, status and power, experience and knowledge, rank and protocol, religion and citizenship, etc.), the degree of formalization of relationships.

7. Values and norms (as a set of guidelines).

8. Belief in something or support for something (belief in leadership, success, one's own strength, in mutual assistance, in justice, attitude to colleagues, clients and competitors, the influence of religion and morality).

9. The process of employee development and training (mindless or conscious performance of work; procedures for informing employees).

10. Work ethics and motivation (attitude to work and responsibility for it, quality of work, habits, work evaluation and reward, individual or group work) [3].

The contemporary corporate culture of Ukrainian organizations, particularly when facing ongoing security challenges (such as the full-scale war, internal displacement, and economic instability), demonstrates a critical interplay between shared values and observable behavioral patterns. Corporate culture is not merely a conglomeration of values, norms, and traditions; it is the space for the corporation's existence, shaping its collective habitus and manifesting in the actions and relationships of its employees.

Corporate culture actively and passively shapes the individual according to its defined scale. This process of formation highlights the profound link between the organization and the employee's behavior and practical actions. In terms of active formation (integration), corporate culture acts as an integrating factor that aligns the interests of the employee and the employer. This is achieved by establishing rules of the game, i.e. expected behavioral guidelines for specific situations, behavioral stereotypes tied to job performance, and compliance with organizational norms. In the perspective of passive formation, contemporary corporate culture is a practical realization of a theoretical superstructure: the corporate philosophy of shared destiny. This philosophy outlines principles, obligations to various social strata (including employees), and desired practices. An anthropologically oriented corporate philosophy serves as the ideological foundation, asserting a team approach, a unified corporate creative spirit, and a humanistic attitude toward every employee.

Ethical, legal, and social commitments, while enhancing external attractiveness, fundamentally affirm the principles of internal alignment and solidify the organization's cohesive style, ensuring its flexibility, prosperity, and stability under duress.

The most recognized model, the three-level structure proposed by Edgar Schein (based on F. Kluckhohn and F. Strodtbeck), identifies three key layers:

1. Artifacts (Visible Level): This surface level includes the visible physical and social environment: technology, architecture, space utilization, language, slogans, patterns of behavior, communication styles, and office layout. These are the immediate behavioral manifestations.

2. Values and Beliefs (Intermediate Level): These are the shared values and beliefs that guide organizational behavior. Schein refers to this as "organizational ideology", often formalized in mission statements and programmatic documents. These values determine the social norms that regulate employee behavior.

3. Basic Assumptions (Invisible/Subconscious Level): This is the core of the culture, encompassing unconscious, fundamental beliefs about the surrounding world, reality, time, space, human nature, and relationships. These core assumptions ultimately dictate behavior and the perception of cultural attributes.

In the context of security challenges, the basic assumptions about risk, trust, and resilience determine how quickly the artifacts (e.g. communication rituals, work arrangement) and values (e.g. prioritizing employee safety over profit) adapt.

The behavioral aspects of corporate culture can be systematically analyzed using established criteria and cultural techniques that directly influence how employees act. S. Robbins' framework provides a set of criteria highly relevant to assessing the operational readiness and behavioral profile of a corporation facing external threats (Table 1).

Table 1

**Description of S. Robbin's Criteria in Crisis/Security Context**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Description in Crisis / Security Context</b>
Individual Initiative	Degree of responsibility, freedom, and independence employees have to act quickly in non-standard situations (e.g., during shelling).
Risk Tolerance	Willingness to assume controlled risks; e.g., continuing operations despite proximity to risk zones.
Direction of Actions	Setting clear, achievable goals and expected outcomes even with disrupted plans.
Integration/Coordination	The degree to which departments and individuals coordinate and synchronize actions under stress.
Management Support	Provision of help, resources, and psychological support by management to subordinates.
Control	Formal rules and instructions used to monitor and ensure essential compliance when traditional oversight is difficult.
Identity	The degree of employee identification with the organization's survival and its mission (elevated during conflict).
Reward System	System for accounting for work and providing incentives (often shifting towards recognition of loyalty and crisis contribution).
Conflict Tolerance	Willingness to openly express opinions or engage in necessary conflict for optimal crisis solutions.
Interaction Patterns	The degree to which internal interaction relies on formal hierarchy versus swift, informal communication.

In times of stress, organizational culture utilizes specific cultural techniques to foster cohesion:

- **Rituals and Ceremonies:** Symbolic actions that mark important events. In Ukraine, these have evolved to include rituals of solidarity (e.g., collective volunteering, commemorating losses) and celebrating resilience (e.g., successful re-opening after destruction).
- **Organizational Communication (Myths and Sagas):** Stories and legends, often based on real events, which form corporate folklore. These serve to heroize adaptive behaviors and reinforce core values like mutual assistance and perseverance.
- **Formal vs. Informal Systems:** The culture operates through formal systems (policy, strategy, clear instructions) and informal systems (myths, traditions, non-verbal code for crisis exit). The balance between these systems determines the organization's adaptive speed and flexibility.

The praxeological aspect focuses on the logic of efficient action and rational choice within the organization, which is crucial for understanding how Ukrainian businesses strive for optimal performance and survival during security challenges.

To fully incorporate praxeology (the theory of effective human action) into the analysis, we need to focus on how crisis conditions force a re-evaluation of organizational efficiency, goal-setting, and risk management.

In stable conditions, corporate culture often seeks predictable, routine actions. However, security challenges compel a fundamental praxeological shift:

- from routine to adaptive action, i.e. the culture must prioritize adaptive, non-routine actions based on immediate context rather than rigid procedures. Praxeology examines whether the choices made by managers and employees (e.g., relocating an office, switching supply chains) are the most rational and efficient given the existential constraints and incomplete information.

- re-evaluating rationality i.e. traditional business rationality often centers on profit maximization. Crisis praxeology redefines rationality to prioritize survival, continuity, and employee safety. An action is deemed “rational” if it effectively secures the organization’s existence, even if it incurs short-term financial losses.

- efficiency of resilience, i.e. praxeology analyzes the efficiency of the resilience process itself. How quickly (temporally) and with how few resources (economically) can a company restore operations after a shock? This efficiency becomes a core, observable cultural trait.

The praxeological dimension directly shapes the behavioral stereotypes (the expected rules of the game).

Communicative patterns of behavior can serve as an example. Under security challenges in Ukraine they undergo a radical praxeological transformation. They quickly evolve from hierarchical, efficiency-oriented to networked, survival-and-trust-oriented. This shift fundamentally redefines the traditional academic understanding that communication models are merely verbal (used predominantly for information transfer) or non-verbal (used primarily for expressing interpersonal relationships) [4]. In the high-stakes, highly volatile Ukrainian context, both categories merge into an urgent, action-oriented system where all communication is evaluated based on its efficacy in securing organizational existence and employee safety, a truly praxeological measure.

Praxeology determines the optimal level of risk-taking. A purely behavioral description notes the willingness to take risks, but praxeology evaluates which risks are rational to take (and which are not) to achieve the goal of continuity. Crisis praxeology dictates that organizational goals must be clear, measurable, and above all, actionable under duress. The cultural emphasis shifts to action-oriented metrics over purely financial ones. The rituals and communication models (artifacts) are not just symbols; they are efficient techniques for transferring vital information and maintaining psychological cohesion. For instance, a regular crisis communication ritual is a praxeologically sound method to reduce uncertainty and coordinate action.

In summary, the behavioral models of contemporary Ukrainian corporate culture are defined by their shift from standard practices to a resilience-focused mode. This involves the rapid institutionalization of new praxeological norms – prioritizing safety and continuity – and the behavioral manifestation of heightened identity and solidarity in the face of external security threats. The successful behavioral models of contemporary Ukrainian corporate culture are defined by their ability to internalize and execute praxeologically sound actions, swiftly turning the necessity of resilience into an observable, efficient, and sustained organizational practice.

### References

1. S. Robbins, T Judge (2024) Organizational Behaviour. URL: [http://121.121.140.173:8887/files/organizational%20Behavior,%20Global%20Edition%20\(Stephen%20Robbins,%20Timothy%20Judge\)%20\(2024\).pdf](http://121.121.140.173:8887/files/organizational%20Behavior,%20Global%20Edition%20(Stephen%20Robbins,%20Timothy%20Judge)%20(2024).pdf)
2. E. Schein (2004) Organizational Culture and Leadership. URL: [https://agustinazubair.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/13-organizational\\_culture\\_and\\_leadership\\_3rd\\_edition-p-4581.pdf](https://agustinazubair.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/13-organizational_culture_and_leadership_3rd_edition-p-4581.pdf)
3. F. Harris and R. Moran (2004) Managing Cultural Differences. URL: [http://mimccomwinter2017.pbworks.com/w/file/attach/114649891/\\_Robert\\_T.\\_Moran\\_Philip\\_R.\\_Harris\\_Sarah\\_V.\\_Moran\\_Bookos.org\\_.pdf](http://mimccomwinter2017.pbworks.com/w/file/attach/114649891/_Robert_T._Moran_Philip_R._Harris_Sarah_V._Moran_Bookos.org_.pdf)
4. Іванова І. Засвоєння комунікативних моделей поведінки у процесі співвивчення мов і культур як основа розвитку полікультурної особистості. *Наукові записки Ніжинського державного університету ім. М. Гоголя. Психолого-педагогічні науки*. 2013. № 3. С. 107–110.

## **ПРАКСЕОЛОГІЧНІ ТА ПОВЕДІНКОВІ МОДЕЛІ КОРПОРАТИВНОЇ КУЛЬТУРИ В КОНТЕКСТІ БЕЗПЕКОВИХ ВИКЛИКІВ В УКРАЇНІ**

**Тетяна Чубіна**

*Національний університет цивільного захисту України,  
навчально-науковий інститут цивільного захисту,  
кафедра соціальних і гуманітарних дисциплін  
вул. Онопрієнка, 8, 18034, м. Черкаси, Україна  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9383-3604>*

**Марія Дмитренко**

*Національний університет цивільного захисту України,  
навчально-науковий інститут цивільного захисту,  
кафедра соціальних і гуманітарних дисциплін  
вул. Онопрієнка, 8, 18034, м. Черкаси, Україна  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8338-4032>*

У статті представлено системний аналіз динамічних поведінкових та праксеологічних моделей, які лежать в основі надзвичайної стійкості сучасної української корпоративної культури в умовах всеосяжних безпекових викликів. Дослідження виходить за межі традиційних, описових культурних структур, як-от трирівнева модель Едгара Шайна (артефакти, цінності, базові переконання) та десять критеріїв Стівена Роббінса, інтегруючи ключовий праксеологічний вимір: теорію ефективної, раціональної дії в умовах крайнього тиску та радикальної невизначеності. Ключова теза полягає в тому, що в кризовому середовищі виживання організації диктується не лише декларованими чи спільними цінностями, а й критичною здатністю культури швидко інституціоналізувати та здійснювати ефективні, цілеспрямовані дії, спрямовані на виживання. Дослідження зосереджується на критичній взаємодії між глибоко вкоріненими культурними припущеннями щодо ризику, довіри й безперервності та їх швидким проявом у спостережуваних моделях поведінки. Воно підкреслює, як необхідність стійкості викликає фундаментальний праксеологічний зсув, переміщуючи корпоративні пріоритети від рутинних практик і максимізації прибутку до адаптивних дій, безпеки співробітників і безперервності бізнесу. У статті розглядаються конкретні культурні механізми (техніки), включно з еволюційними ритуалами солідарності, кризово орієнтованими комунікаціями (міфи та саги) і гнучкими формальними / неформальними системами, які ефективно передають життєво важливу інформацію та підтримують психологічну згуртованість. Крім того, аналіз переосмислює поняття «раціональності» в контексті війни, де дія вважається раціональною, якщо вона ефективно забезпечує існування організації та її співробітників, навіть якщо це спричиняє значні короткострокові фінансові втрати. Ефективність самої стійкості аналізується як ключова культурна риса, зосереджуючись на швидкості та винахідливості, з якою компанія відновлює діяльність після шоку.

*Ключові слова:* корпоративна культура, праксеологія, організаційна стійкість, безпекові виклики, поведінкові моделі, кризове управління, безперервність бізнесу.

Дата першого надходження рукопису до видання: 18.11.2025

Дата прийнятого до друку рукопису після рецензування: 22.12.2025

Дата публікації: 30.12.2025