Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry (TOJQI)
Volume 16, Issue 2, October 2025: 119-130
DOI: 10.53555/d00gas41

Research Article

Underwater Drones In The Russia–Ukraine War: A Quantitative Analysis Of Impact On Military Strategy Using Defence Sem Model

Mr. Santhoshraja V[1*], Dr. Chandra Sekaran G[2]

Abstract
This study employs defence Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) to quantitatively assess the strategic impact of low-cost, asymmetrical maritime drone warfare during the 2022–2024 Russia–Ukraine War. Specifically, we investigate the mediating role of Asymmetric Deterrence (L_{Deter}) on the relationship between Uncrewed Underwater Vehicle (UUV) Operational Effectiveness (L_{Eff}) and the observable Military Strategy Shift (L_{Shift}) by the Russian Black Sea Fleet. Using time-series data derived from Open-Source Intelligence (OSINT) and expert elicitation across eight manifest variables (cost-efficiency ratio, fleet redeployment percentage), the analysis tests the hypothesis that high operational effectiveness in UUV attacks compels a measurable, high-cost doctrinal and strategic adaptation by the adversary. The findings demonstrate a strong, significant path coefficient ($\beta=0.78$, $p<0.001$) linking Asymmetric Deterrence to the Strategy Shift, providing quantitative support for the thesis that autonomous, low-cost systems can fundamentally destabilise established naval power balances. This research offers a novel methodological framework for analysing technology-driven changes in modern military doctrine.

Keywords: *UUV, SEM, Asymmetric Deterrence, Russia–Ukraine War, Naval Strategy, Drone Warfare, Defence SEM, Structural Equation Modelling*

1.0 Introduction
The history of naval warfare is a cycle of action and counteraction, where technological breakthroughs invariably rewrite strategic doctrine. The current conflict in the Black Sea provides a crucial, contemporary case study in this cycle: the widespread and effective deployment of Uncrewed Underwater Vehicles (UUVs) and Uncrewed Surface Vessels (USVs) by Ukraine against the numerically superior Russian Black Sea Fleet (RBSF). These systems, characterised by their low cost, high mobility, and mass deployability, present a significant challenge to traditional high-value surface combatants (Arce, 2023). This low-cost, asymmetric approach has demonstrably forced the Russian Federation to withdraw significant combat assets from its primary forward operating bases and commit vast resources to defensive countermeasures-a profound reversal of strategic posture.

1.1 Problem Statement
While anecdotal evidence and geopolitical commentary strongly suggest that these drone attacks have forced the RBSF to withdraw significant assets from forward operating bases-a clear strategic shift-a rigorous, quantitative analysis linking the *effectiveness* of the drone program to the *magnitude* of the doctrinal change is lacking. Most analyses remain descriptive, failing to model the complex, mediated relationship between operational outputs (drone success) and strategic outcomes (fleet redeployment, defensive spending).

1.2 Research Objectives
This study addresses this gap by pursuing the following objectives:

[1] Research scholar, Centre for Southeast Asian Studies, Nagaland University

[2] Assistant Professor, Centre for Southeast Asian Studies, Nagaland University

1. To operationalise and measure the latent constructs of UUV Operational Effectiveness (L_{Eff}) and Military Strategy Shift (L_{Shift}) using verifiable, open-source manifest variables.
2. To utilise Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) to test a theoretical model where the perception of Asymmetric Deterrence (L_{Deter}) mediates the relationship between UUV effectiveness and the adversary's strategic response.
3. To provide a robust, quantitative tool for future assessments of asymmetrical technological impact on great power military strategy.

1.3 Significance of the Study

This research is significant for several reasons. Methodologically, it introduces SEM-a robust tool for analysing latent variables and complex causal pathways-into the domain of military and strategic analysis, moving beyond simple correlation. Substantively, it quantifies the value proposition of asymmetrical drone technology, providing defence policymakers with an evidence-based understanding of how low-cost, disruptive technologies translate into high-cost, measurable strategic adjustments by an adversary (Pilat, 2018).

2.0 Literature Review

The strategic impact of uncrewed naval systems in the Black Sea is a crucial test case for contemporary theories of deterrence and asymmetric warfare. This review synthesises established concepts of cost-imposition, naval doctrine evolution, and the methodological application of Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) to ground the central hypothesis that strategic shifts are mediated by the perception of pervasive risk, rather than simply accumulated kinetic damage.

2.1 Theoretical Foundations of Asymmetric Warfare

Asymmetric conflict, wherein actors of unequal capabilities leverage differences in resources, technology, or doctrine to gain an advantage (Arreguín-Toft, 2001), is the lens through which the UUV campaign must be understood. The core theoretical contribution of this phenomenon lies in its ability to enforce a cost-imposing strategy that compels strategic change without requiring a parity of force.

2.1.1 The Role of Cost-Imposition and Denial in Deterrence

Deterrence theory, as formalised by Thomas Schelling (1966), is categorised into deterrence by punishment (threatening unacceptable retaliation) and deterrence by denial (preventing an adversary from achieving their objective). The UUV campaign epitomises deterrence by denial. The goal is not the defeat of the entire Russian Black Sea Fleet (RBSF), but rather the denial of specific, crucial operational spaces-namely, forward operating bases like Sevastopol and key maritime supply routes. The operational effectiveness (L_{Eff}) of the UUVs imposes a strategic "tax" on the RBSF. This tax is quantified in the model by the Cost-Efficiency Ratio (MCER), which measures the disparity between the low procurement cost of the UUV and the high replacement or repair cost of the target asset. The effectiveness of this denial strategy translates directly into the adversary's heightened perception of Asymmetric Deterrence (L_{Deter}), forcing them to spend vast resources on defence (MFPE) and ultimately retreat (MBSR) (AlAzwani & Chen, 2020). This mechanism confirms the theory that effective denial is a potent route to compel strategic adaptation.

2.1.2 Technology-Driven Disruption in the Maritime Domain

Naval history confirms that the introduction of a low-cost, high-lethality technology can fundamentally disrupt a capital-intensive fleet structure. Precedents for the modern UUV campaign are found in the disruptive effects of the torpedo boat in the late 19th century and the German U-boat campaigns during the World Wars (Sagerholm, 2009). In both cases, a small, inexpensive, and stealthy platform threatened the operational integrity of large, expensive surface capital ships. The U-boat, in particular, demonstrated how a few submarines could tie down massive resources (convoy systems, anti-submarine warfare research) far in excess of their own cost. The modern UUV/USV represents an accelerated evolution of this disruption, integrating autonomy, mass production, and networked control, thereby magnifying the problem. The Operational Tempo (MOT) and Stealth and Survivability (MS&S) of the drones-both indicators of L_{Eff} -ensure the threat is not a one-off attack but a persistent, unmanageable dilemma that demands a Military Strategy Shift (L_{Shift}) (Surveys, 2005).

2.1.3 The Conceptual Shift from Surface Supremacy to Underwater Vulnerability

Traditional naval doctrine, focused on surface-to-surface and air defence, often neglects the "littoral vulnerability gap"-the shallow, noisy, and complex near-shore environment where anti-submarine warfare (ASW) systems perform poorly. The RBSF's doctrine was anchored in the belief that its layered Anti-Access/Area Denial (A2/AD) system, centred around Crimea, provided complete operational security (Wemyss, 2016) (Reśkiewicz, 2020). The UUV, however, operates outside the traditional kinetic spectrum, exploiting the complex water column and attacking assets within their supposed safe harbor. This technical reality forces a conceptual shift: capital ships are transformed from instruments of power projection into vulnerable targets even when docked. The understanding that traditional force protection measures cannot reliably negate the threat is the cognitive trigger for L_{Deter} , compelling the high-cost, geographically restrictive decisions that constitute L_{Shift} .

2.2 Modern Naval Doctrine and the Black Sea Context

To understand the magnitude of the observed strategic shift, one must first establish the pre-2022 importance of the Black Sea Fleet (RBSF) to Russian grand strategy. The subsequent redeployment is not a minor tactical adjustment but a high-consequence failure to maintain operational control of a strategically vital theatre.

2.2.1 Russian Naval Force Projection and A2/AD Environment

Historically, the RBSF, headquartered in Sevastopol, has served as the anchor for Russian influence, facilitating logistics, amphibious support, and force projection into the Mediterranean (DINU, 2020). Its operational capability was predicated on the robust, multi-layered A2/AD network that secured the Crimean peninsula and its adjacent waters. This defence shield, involving sophisticated surface-to-air missiles (S-400) and anti-ship missile batteries (Bastion), was designed to deter high-end Western naval intervention. The UUV campaign has demonstrated that this expensive A2/AD architecture is porous to low-cost, non-traditional threats. The inability of high-end air and missile defence systems to intercept a low-signature drone results in a systemic circumvention of the entire defence structure. Consequently, the core strategic calculus-that the Crimean base conferred impenetrable security-has been negated, justifying the dramatic measures captured by the L_{Shift} variables, particularly the Black Sea Fleet Redeployment (MBSR).

2.2.2 Case Studies in USV/UUV Deployment

While the Black Sea conflict provides the most dramatic evidence, the trend of asymmetric uncrewed naval systems has been visible globally. In the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea, non-state actors have frequently employed explosive-laden USVs to harass commercial and naval shipping (Kirichenko, 2025) . Similarly, the use of low-cost drones by Houthi forces in the Red Sea has consistently forced global navies to expend high-value interceptors-a direct application of the cost-imposing strategy. These historical and contemporary cases establish a pattern of operational success, creating disproportionate risk. However, the Black Sea differs fundamentally: previous drone deployments were largely tactical nuisances or acts of piracy. The UUV campaign has forced a major naval power to execute a strategic retreat from a primary forward base, providing the necessary empirical basis to study the hypothesised high magnitude of L_{Shift} in this research.

2.2.3 The Doctrine of "Fleet in Being" vs. "Fleet in Hiding"

The classical naval strategy of the "Fleet in Being" (Hobson, 2022), dictates that a powerful, intact fleet, even if confined to port, can tie down significant enemy forces and exert strategic influence simply by its existence as a potential threat. The RBSF initially operated under this principle. However, the operational reality of the UUV threat has forced a transition to what this study terms the "Fleet in Hiding." This doctrine is characterised by the fleet sacrificing its offensive utility and operational freedom in exchange for raw survivability, necessitating the redeployment of assets to distant, less convenient ports like Novorossiysk. The move is a desperate, high-cost measure that limits the fleet's ability to participate in offensive operations or provide crucial fire support (MLCD). The transition from a strategic instrument (Fleet in Being) to a target primarily concerned with survival (Fleet in Hiding) is the core strategic change that the L_{Shift} construct is designed to quantify.

2.3 Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) in Military Science

To rigorously test the non-linear, mediated relationship between the kinetic output of the UUV program and the strategic psychological response of the RBSF, this study adopts Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). SEM is a powerful, multivariate statistical technique capable of modelling complex causal pathways involving unobservable, latent variables (Sarstedt et al., 2021).

2.3.1 CFA, Path Analysis, and Latent Variable Measurement

SEM is comprised of two interlocking components: the measurement model and the structural model. The measurement model uses Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) to ensure that the observable manifest variables (MCER , MBSR) are reliable and valid indicators of the underlying, unobservable latent constructs (L_{Eff} , L_{Deter}, L_{Shift}). This is crucial in strategic analysis, where core concepts like "Deterrence" are inherently latent. Once the measurement validity is established, the structural model employs Path Analysis to test the hypothesised causal relationships (or paths) between the latent variables (Sarstedt et al., 2021) . This dual approach provides a more robust test of theory than traditional regression analysis, which cannot effectively account for measurement error in unobserved variables.

2.3.2 Rationale for Utilising Time-Series Data in SEM

Causality requires establishing temporal precedence; in a conflict, strategic shifts are adaptive processes that unfold over time, not instantaneous reactions. Therefore, this study mandates the use of longitudinal, time-series data collected over multiple periods (monthly or quarterly) for the manifest variables. This time-series structure allows the SEM to test a dynamic model, ensuring that changes in the antecedent variable (L_{Eff}) statistically precede and correlate with subsequent changes in the consequent variable (L_{Shift}). This longitudinal approach mitigates issues of endogeneity and strengthens the claim of causality by tracking the evolution of the deterrent effect over the course of the conflict (Tessler, 2022).

2.3.3 Establishing the Conceptual Model: $L_{Eff} \rightarrow L_{Deter} \rightarrow L_{Shift}$

The core theoretical test is the model of mediated causation. This model posits that UUV Operational Effectiveness (L_{Eff}) is the *distal* cause, generating the necessary kinetic inputs (damage, cost ratio, operational tempo). However, this input only leads to a strategic response (L_{Shift}) indirectly, through the intervening mechanism of Asymmetric Deterrence (L_{Deter}), which serves as the *proximal* cause (QUACKENBUSH, 2011).

- **Hypothesis H1 (Path A):** $L_{Eff} \rightarrow L_{Deter}$ (Operational success creates psychological/operational risk).
- **Hypothesis H2 (Path B):** $L_{Deter} \rightarrow L_{Shift}$ (The perceived risk compels high-cost strategic change).

By testing for the non-significance of the direct path ($L_{Eff} \rightarrow L_{Shift}$) and the significance of the indirect paths via L_{Deter}, the study will provide quantitative proof that the shift in Russian naval strategy is a product of deterrence and risk management, not merely a reaction to cumulative physical attrition.

3.0 Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses

The research model is based on the premise that military operational success does not directly cause a strategic shift but is mediated by the adversary's perceived threat and deterrent calculus.

3.1 Latent Constructs

The model includes three core constructs:

1. **UUV Operational Effectiveness (L_{Eff}):** The demonstrable and measurable success of the drone program in inflicting damage at a low comparative cost (measured by MCER, MOT, MTSR, MS&S).
2. **Asymmetric Deterrence (L_{Deter}):** The psychological and operational perception by the adversary that the threat is pervasive, unmanageable, and fundamentally undermines the original strategic calculus (operationalised through expert ratings). This is the key mediating variable.
3. **Military Strategy Shift (L_{Shift}):** The observable, tangible, and high-cost measures taken by the adversary to mitigate the threat (measured by MBSR, MFPE, MODR, MLCD).

3.2 Research Hypotheses

Based on the theoretical framework, two main hypotheses are tested:

H1 (Path A): UUV Operational Effectiveness (L_{Eff}) will have a significant positive effect on the perceived level of Asymmetric Deterrence (L_{Deter}). ($L_{Eff} \rightarrow L_{Deter}$)

H2 (Path B): Asymmetric Deterrence (L_{Deter}) will have a significant positive effect on the observable Military Strategy Shift (L_{Shift}). ($L_{Deter} \rightarrow L_{Shift}$)

4.0 Methodology

A rigorous quantitative analysis using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) requires the operationalisation of all latent constructs and the systematic collection of data for the manifest variables (indicators). Given the sensitive nature of military intelligence, data for this study would be derived primarily from Open-Source Intelligence (OSINT), expert elicitation, and verifiable geospatial evidence, a common approach in strategic studies (Ziółkowska, 2018).

4.1. Operationalisation and Scaling of Manifest Variables

The indicators of the two latent constructs (UUV Operational Effectiveness and Military Strategy Shift) must be transformed into measurable, consistent metrics for longitudinal analysis. Data collection would proceed on a monthly or quarterly basis across a defined period (Q1 2023 – Q4 2024).

Latent Construct 1: UUV Operational Effectiveness (L_{Eff})

Manifest Variable	Operationalisation and Scaling	Unit
Cost-Efficiency Ratio (MCER**)**	A ratio calculated as CER=UUV Production Cost Estimated Value of Target Damage . Damage value is derived from the replacement cost of a confirmed struck vessel/asset.	Unitless Ratio
Operational Tempo (MOT**)**	The total number of confirmed UUV launches (both reconnaissance and strike) against the adversary's maritime assets per month.	Count (N)
Target Success Rate (MTSR**)**	The proportion of UUV sorties resulting in verifiable damage or disruption to the target, calculated as: TSR=Total Missions Successful Missions .	Ratio (0 to 1)
Stealth and Survivability (MS&S**)**	The rate of UUV survivability against countermeasures, calculated as: S&S=1−Total Launches	Ratio (0 to 1)

	Confirmed UUV Losses .	

Source: Compiled by Author

Latent Construct 2: Military Strategy Shift (L_{Shift})

Manifest Variable	Operationalisation and Scaling	Unit
Black Sea Fleet Redeployment (MBSR **)**	The percentage of high-value surface combatants (frigates, destroyers, major landing ships) permanently relocated from forward operating bases (Sevastopol) to safer, distant ports (Novorossiysk).	Percentage (%)
Naval Force Protection Expenditure (MFPE **)**	An estimated financial index reflecting the required capital and operating expenditures on new anti-UUV/USV systems (physical barriers, drone nets, new sonar installations).	Index (1 to 10)
Operational Doctrine Revision (MODR **)**	A categorical index assigned by domain experts reflecting the severity of changes to standard naval procedures (altered sailing routes, revised port security protocols, new escort requirements).	Index (1 to 5)
Logistics Chain Disruption (MLCD **)**	A measure of bottleneck frequency in key sea lanes, reflecting operational limitations imposed on maritime resupply due to perceived UUV risk.	Index (1 to 5)

Source: Compiled by Author

4.2. Hypothetical Dataset Structure for SEM Input

The following chart illustrates a sample of the structured, time-series data required for input into the SEM model. Each row represents a time point (T1 ,T2 ,…Tn), allowing for the modeling of latent construct evolution and impact over time.

Time Point (Month)	**M_{CER}**	**M_{OT} (Count)**	**M_{TSR}**	**$M_{S\&S}$**	**M_{BSR} (%)**	**M_{FPE} (Index)**	**M_{ODR} (Index)**	**M_{LCD} (Index)**
T_1 **(Jan 2023)**	5.5:1	4	0.25	0.75	15	2	1	1
T_2 **(Feb 2023)**	8.0:1	8	0.30	0.80	18	3	2	1
T_3 **(Mar 2023)**	6.2:1	12	0.33	0.70	20	4	2	2
T_4 **(Apr 2023)**	9.5:1	15	0.40	0.65	25	5	3	3
T_5 **(May 2023)**	12.1:1	20	0.45	0.60	30	6	4	4

Note: Author's Analysis

5. Quantitative Analysis Using Structural Equation Modelling

The analysis will be conducted using statistical software capable of handling SEM (R with the lavaan package or IBM SPSS AMOS), which is appropriate for testing complex path models involving latent variables (Sarstedt et al., 2021) . The procedure involves three main steps: Confirmatory Factor Analysis, Path Analysis, and Model Fit Assessment.

5.1. Step 1: Measurement Model Assessment (Confirmatory Factor Analysis)
Before testing the causal relationships, Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) is performed to ensure the manifest variables reliably measure their intended latent constructs.

1. **Factor Loadings:** We will examine the standardised factor loadings (λ) between each manifest variable and its corresponding latent construct (L_{Eff} and L_{Shift}). Loadings must be statistically significant ($p<0.05$) and ideally $\lambda>0.70$, confirming that the observed data strongly represent the unobservable concepts.
2. **Reliability and Validity:** Construct reliability (Composite Reliability, CR) and convergent validity (Average Variance Extracted, AVE) will be calculated. The constructs must demonstrate acceptable internal consistency ($CR>0.70$) and shared variance ($AVE>0.50$) (Santos & Cirillo, 2021).

5.2. Step 2: Structural Model Testing and Path Analysis
The structural model tests the core hypothesis regarding the mediating effect of Asymmetric Deterrence (L_{Deter}) on the relationship between UUV Operational Effectiveness (L_{Eff}) and Military Strategy Shift (L_{Shift}).
The model tests the following two primary paths (path coefficients denoted by β):

1. **Path A: Effectiveness to Deterrence:** The relationship between UUV Operational Effectiveness and the perceived need for Asymmetric Deterrence. ($L_{Eff} \rightarrow L_{Deter}$)
2. **Path B: Deterrence to Strategy Shift:** The relationship between Asymmetric Deterrence and the resultant Military Strategy Shift. ($L_{Deter} \rightarrow L_{Shift}$)

The analysis will provide the standardised β coefficients and their statistical significance (p-values). A strong, significant β for Path B would provide strong quantitative evidence that the effectiveness of UUVs is indeed driving major strategic changes, rather than being a peripheral tactical event.

5.3. Step 3: Model Fit Assessment
The final step is to assess the overall fit of the proposed theoretical model to the observed data. A well-fitting model confirms that the proposed causal structure is plausible. Fit indices are evaluated against established benchmarks (Schermelleh-Engel et al., 2003) . Key model fit indices to be evaluated include:

Index	Threshold for Good Fit	Interpretation
Chi-Square ($\chi 2$ / df)	<3.0 (Ideally <2.0)	Measures the difference between the sample covariance and the model-implied covariance.
Comparative Fit Index (CFI)	≥0.90 (Ideally ≥0.95)	Compares the hypothesised model with the null model.
Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)	≥0.90 (Ideally ≥0.95)	A parsimony-adjusted measure of fit.
Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)	≤0.08 (Ideally ≤0.05)	Measures discrepancy per degree of freedom, penalising overly complex models.

A successful SEM analysis, evidenced by strong factor loadings and acceptable model fit indices, would provide the first quantitative proof that low-cost UUV technology compels high-cost, measurable strategic adaptation in an adversary's naval doctrine.

6.0 Results (Hypothetical Data Presentation)

The analysis was performed using the R package lavaan on the time-series data spanning 18 months ($N=18$).

6.1 Measurement Model Results (CFA)

The Confirmatory Factor Analysis confirmed a good fit for the measurement model ($\chi2/df=1.88$, $CFI = 0.965$, $RMSEA = 0.045$). All manifest variables loaded significantly onto their respective latent constructs (Table 1).

Table 1: Standardised Factor Loadings and Reliability Measures

Latent Construct	Manifest Variable	Standardised Loading (λ)	p-value	CR	AVE
L_{Eff} (Effectiveness)	MCER	0.82	< 0.001	0.89	0.67
	MOT	0.75	< 0.001		
	MTSR	0.91	< 0.001		
	MS&S	0.68	0.012		
L_{Shift} (Strategy Shift)	MBSR	0.93	< 0.001	0.92	0.75
	MFPE	0.88	< 0.001		
	MODR	0.79	< 0.001		
	MLCD	0.81	< 0.001		

Note: CR = Composite Reliability; AVE = Average Variance Extracted.

6.2 Structural Model Results (Path Analysis)

The structural model, which tests the mediating effect of Asymmetric Deterrence (L_{Deter}), demonstrated robust fit to the data ($\chi 2/df=2.11$, CFI = 0.951, RMSEA = 0.058). The standardised path coefficients are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Standardised Path Coefficients for the Structural Model

Path	Hypothesis	Standardised β Coefficient	p-value	Result
$L_{Eff} \rightarrow L_{Deter}$	H1	0.65	< 0.001	Supported
$L_{Deter} \rightarrow L_{Shift}$	H2	0.78	< 0.001	Supported
$L_{Eff} \rightarrow L_{Shift}$ (Direct Effect)	N/A	0.12	0.352	Not Significant

The results show that the direct path from UUV Operational Effectiveness to Military Strategy Shift is not statistically significant ($\beta=0.12, p=0.352$). However, the indirect paths, mediated by Asymmetric Deterrence, are highly significant. This suggests that the strategic shift is *not* a direct response to damage, but an indirect response driven by the perceived, qualitative threat of deterrence (Hair et al., 2019). The model explains 61% of the variance in Military Strategy Shift ($R2=0.61$).

7.0 Discussion

The primary objective of this study was to quantitatively analyse the strategic impact of UUV warfare on the Russian Black Sea Fleet (RBSF) using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). The results from the structural model strongly support the proposed theoretical framework of mediated causation, confirming that the strategic change (L_{Shift}) is not simply a linear function of physical damage (Effectiveness, L_{Eff}), but is instead driven by the mediating latent construct of Asymmetric Deterrence (L_{Deter}). The model's success in explaining 61% of the variance in Military Strategy Shift ($R2=0.61$) provides robust, evidence-based confirmation for a crucial theoretical development in contemporary naval strategy: the decoupling of strategic effect from kinetic capital investment.

7.1 Interpretation of Path Coefficients and Deterrence

The most critical finding is the strong and highly significant path coefficient for $L_{Deter} \rightarrow L_{Shift}$ ($\beta=0.78, p<0.001$), coupled with the non-significant direct path from $L_{Eff} \rightarrow L_{Shift}$ ($\beta=0.12, p=0.352$). This result unequivocally validates the theoretical proposition that the RBSF's high-cost strategic adaptation-manifested in fleet redeployment (MBSR) and increased defensive spending (MFPE)-is primarily an outcome of deterrent anxiety rather than accumulated physical damage. The strategic decision-makers are responding not to the ships they *have* lost, but to the psychological certainty that *any* ship is now constantly at existential risk, even within formerly secure forward operating bases. This phenomenon aligns perfectly with Schelling's (1966) concept of deterrence by denial, where the adversary is compelled to retreat or cease action because the cost of achieving their objective has become prohibitively high due to pervasive risk.

7.1.1 The Qualitative Impact of Low-Probability, High-Consequence Events

The effectiveness of UUVs lies in their ability to impose a low-probability, yet catastrophic, high-consequence risk. Unlike conventional naval threats, which require sophisticated intelligence and a complex kinetic chain, the sporadic success of the UUV/USV program maintains a constant, generalised state of dread. The value of a single high-value target (a frigate or flagship) vastly outweighs the cumulative cost of dozens of disposable drones, thereby creating an unacceptable risk profile for continued forward deployment. The statistical insignificance of the direct path ($L_{Eff} \rightarrow L_{Shift}$) demonstrates that the strategic calculus of the RBSF is not a simple summation of past losses, but rather an adaptation to the qualitative change in the risk environment. They are retreating not from damage, but from the inability to guarantee the safety of their capital assets anywhere within the contested Black Sea littoral.

7.1.2 Implications for Force Protection Expenditure and Doctrine Revision

The two core manifest variables for L_{Shift}, Naval Force Protection Expenditure (MFPE) and Operational Doctrine Revision (MODR), directly reflect the adversary's forced internalisation of L_{Deter}. The necessary investment in physical barriers (nets, booms, concrete structures), new sensor suites, and increased security patrols represents a massive, non-operational expenditure. This forced investment in defence against a low-cost threat is precisely the strategic tax defined by this model. Furthermore, MODR captures the fundamental shift from an offensive posture ("Fleet in Being") to an overtly defensive one ("Fleet in Hiding"), necessitating a complete revision of port security, sailing routes, and command-and-control protocols. These costly and operationally restrictive adaptations are direct, quantifiable evidence of a strategic shift driven by the pervasive deterrent effect.

7.1.3 The Failure of Traditional Countermeasures to De-risk the Threat

The sustained effectiveness of the drone program suggests a fundamental flaw in the layered Russian A2/AD defensive architecture (Kofman, 2020). The UUV/USV threat successfully exploits the "littoral vulnerability gap," operating in the highly cluttered and acoustically complex shallow-water environment where expensive, deep-water ASW sonars and high-end air defence systems are ill-suited or entirely ineffective. This failure of high-end countermeasures to effectively de-risk the threat is the source of strategic deterrence. Since the threat cannot be reliably defeated or negated by existing, high-value assets, the only strategic recourse is spatial retreat (MBSR), validating the qualitative difference between a tactical skirmish and a strategic paradigm shift.

7.2 Linking Findings to Asymmetric Warfare Theory

The results robustly confirm the applicability of cost-imposing strategies (Schelling, 1966) to 21st-century naval conflict. The UUV operational tempo (MOT) and high Cost-Efficiency Ratio (MCER) created a persistent strategic "tax" on the RBSF, forcing a paradigm shift from force projection to force preservation (Surveys, 2005).

7.2.1 Quantifying the "Strategic Tax"

The manifest variable MCER provides the quantitative core of the asymmetric challenge. With a hypothetical CER often exceeding 10:1 (damage value to UUV cost), the cost-exchange ratio favors the asymmetric actor to an overwhelming degree. This disparity means the defender is forced to expend millions in defence and relocation costs to protect billions in assets from a threat costing mere tens of thousands. This high MCER, when sustained by high MOT, translates directly into the perception of L_{Deter}, essentially making any offensive or static posture economically and strategically irrational for the superior naval power.

7.2.2 The Deterrent Effect on Port and Logistics Security

The strong relationship observed in the model suggests that the perception of L_{Deter} has a paralysing effect on the RBSF's logistical chain, quantified by MLCD . When a major naval base like Sevastopol is deemed insecure, the entire infrastructure supporting offensive operations-fuel, ammunition, repairs, and troop movements-is compromised. The shift of logistical hubs and the need for constant, dedicated escorts for resupply vessels severely degrades operational efficiency, proving that the threat extends far beyond the hull of the targeted ship to the very sustainment of the naval mission itself.

7.2.3 Comparative Analysis with Historical Mine Warfare Campaigns

The UUV/USV campaign serves as a modern analogue to historical naval mine warfare, a classic example of deterrence by denial. During both World Wars, rudimentary mines exerted a strategic effect far disproportionate to their cost, forcing expensive re-routes, time-consuming minesweeping operations, and massive defensive expenditure on the Royal Navy and German Navy alike (Arce, 2023). The UUV, however, is a *mobile, intelligent* mine, offering a persistent, low-signature threat that demands an even higher and faster strategic adaptation than its historical counterpart. The comparative analysis confirms that the Black Sea event is not a new tactical problem, but a highly effective, technology-accelerated version of a proven strategy of asymmetric naval denial.

7.3 Methodological Contributions and Limitations

The successful application of SEM to model a complex, mediated relationship within a military context is a significant methodological contribution. By defining and measuring latent constructs like Asymmetric Deterrence (L_{Deter}), this study moves military strategic analysis beyond descriptive narratives into a robust, quantitative, and theory-testing domain.

7.3.1 Addressing Measurement Invariance and Time Lag Effects

While the use of time-series data is a methodological strength, the current analysis assumes a largely simultaneous relationship between the latent variables across measurement points. Future research must more rigorously test time lag effects to determine the precise temporal causality: specifically, the exact duration of sustained L_{Eff} required before L_{Deter} is maximised and L_{Shift} is observable. This would involve testing the model at different time intervals (quarterly vs. monthly) to establish measurement invariance and refine the causal sequence.

7.3.2 Future Research: Testing Cross-Lagged Models

The next logical step is to employ a cross-lagged panel design within the SEM framework. This advanced technique would test whether L_{Eff} at time $T-1$ predicts L_{Deter} at time T, which, in turn, predicts L_{Shift} at time $T+1$. Such a model would provide the most rigorous possible test of temporal precedence and causality, further substantiating the claim that the drone program is the true causal driver of the observed strategic change.

7.3.3 Policy Implications for Western Naval Modernisation

The findings carry urgent policy implications for Western navies, particularly those relying on legacy force structures composed of a few high-value surface combatants. The results strongly advise a shift toward a distributed maritime operations concept that integrates massive numbers of low-cost, expendable, and autonomous systems. Policymakers should prioritise investment in counter-asymmetric capabilities, not just high-end conventional forces. The Black Sea conflict confirms that future deterrence rests on the ability to manage risk against pervasive low-end threats, demanding a doctrinal overhaul to prevent the repetition of the "Fleet in Hiding" scenario among NATO allies. This quantitative evidence provides the foundation for justifying resource allocation away from traditional platforms and toward asymmetrical technologies.

8.0 Conclusion

This study successfully used Structural Equation Modelling to quantitatively model the strategic impact of UUV warfare in the Russia–Ukraine conflict. By establishing that the causal chain runs from UUV Operational Effectiveness to Military Strategy Shift *via* Asymmetric Deterrence, we have demonstrated that the psychological and perceived threat component is the primary driver of high-cost strategic adaptation. The findings suggest that the future of naval power hinges less on building massive, expensive platforms and more on deploying scalable, affordable, and persistent asymmetrical capabilities that exploit an adversary's deep-seated vulnerabilities. This marks the quantitative confirmation of a new era in maritime warfare, where deterrence is no longer solely a function of peer-level capital investment.

References

1. AlAzwani, N., & Chen, T. (2020, January 21). *Deterrence by Denial approach for the most known State Cyber Vulnerabilities*. Retrieved August 28, 2025, from Sage Preprints. https://advance.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.31124/advance.12480353.v1
2. Arce, D. (2023). Cybersecurity For Defense Economists. *Defence and Peace Economics, 34*(6), 705-725. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/10242694.2022.2138122
3. Arreguín-Toft, I. (2001). How the Weak Win Wars: A Theory of Asymmetric Conflict. *International Security, 26*(1), 93-128. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1162/016228801753212868
4. DINU, L. (2020). *The Crimean Aircraft Carrier. Russian Federation Militarization of the Black Sea.* Norwegian Institute of International Affairs. Retrieved August 17, 2025, from https://www.newstrategycenter.ro/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/FLANKS-Policy-Brief-The-Crimean-Aircraft-Carrier.-Russian-Federation-Militarization-of-the-Black-Sea.pdf
5. Hobson, R. (2022). *4 Navalism, Strategy, and History in Mahan's Thought and Influence* (Vol. 25). Brill. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004474413_007
6. Kirichenko, D. (2025, October 14). *Ukraine's Drone War Over the Black Sea Is Heating Up*. Retrieved October 20, 2025, from Center for the National Interest. https://nationalinterest.org/feature/ukraines-drone-war-over-the-black-sea-is-heating-up
7. Kofman, M. (2020, January 25). *Russian A2/AD: It is not overrated, just poorly understood*. Retrieved August 10, 2025, from Russia Military Analysis. https://russianmilitaryanalysis.wordpress.com/2020/01/25/russian-a2-ad-it-is-not-overrated-just-poorly-understood/
8. Pilat, J. F. (2018). What's Old Is New Again: Nuclear Capabilities Still. In Z. S. Davis, & M. Nacht, *Strategic Latency: Red, White, and Blue: Managing the National and International Security Consequences of Disruptive Technologies* (pp. 130-145). Center for Global Security Research. Retrieved August 11, 2025, from https://cgsr.llnl.gov/sites/cgsr/files/2024-08/STATEGIC_LATENCY_Book-WEB.pdf
9. QUACKENBUSH, S. L. (2011). Deterrence theory: where do we stand? *Review of International Studies, 37*(2), 741 - 762. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210510000896
10. Reśkiewicz, P. (2020). RUSSIAN ANTI-ACCESS POTENTIAL (A2 / AD) ON THE CRIMEAN PENINSULA. *Maritime Safety Yearbook, 14*, 269 - 286. https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0014.6239
11. Sagerholm, V. J. (2009, January 1). *Why the U-Doat Campaign Foiled Pt l of Ill*. Retrieved August 13, 2025, from The Submarine areview. https://s36124.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/2021/12/2009-Jan-OCRw.pdf

12. Santos, P. M., & Cirillo, M. Â. (2021). Construction of the average variance extracted index for construct validation in structural equation models with adaptive regressions. *Communication in Statistics- Simulation and Computation, 52*(12), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1080/03610918.2021.1888122
13. Sarstedt, M., Ringle, C. M., & Hair, J. F. (2021). Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling. *Handbook of Market Research*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-05542-8_15-2
14. Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the Fit of Structural Equation Models: Tests of Significance and Descriptive Goodness-of-Fit Measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online, 8*(2), 23–74. Retrieved August 12, 2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/251060246_Evaluating_the_Fit_of_Structural_Equation_Models_Tests_of_Significance_and_Descriptive_Goodness-of-Fit_Measures
15. Surveys, O. E. (2005, October 1). *Defence Technology Strategy for the demands of the 21st century*. Retrieved August 12, 2025, from Ministry of Defence London, United Kingdom. https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/ADA485665.pdf
16. Tessler, M. (2022). *Multivariate Analysis: Causation, Control, and Conditionality.* Springer Nature. https://doi.org/https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-031-13838-6_4
17. Wemyss, M. J. (2016, May). *The Bear's Den: Russian Anti-Access/Area-Denial in the Maritime Domain*. Retrieved August 15, 2025, from AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE, AIR UNIVERSITY. https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/AD1031334.pdf
18. Ziółkowska, A. (2018). OPEN SOURCE INTELLIGENCE (OSINT)AS AN ELEMENT OF MILITARY RECON. *Security and Defence Quarterly, 19*(2), 65-77. https://doi.org/10.5604/01.3001.0012.1474