American University Kyiv

A Capstone Project

THE IMPACT OF RELATIONAL MANAGEMENT PRACTICES ON EMPLOYEE WELL-BEING AND BURNOUT IN AN IT DEPARTMENT UNDER PROLONGED EXOGENOUS STRESS
ВПЛИВ МЕТОДІВ УПРАВЛІННЯ ВІДНОСИНАМИ НА САМОПОЧУТТЯ СПІВРОБІТНИКІВ ТА ВИГОРАННЯ В ІТ-ВІДДІЛІ В УМОВАХ ТРИВАЛОГО ЗОВНІШНЬОГО СТРЕСУ

by Tetiana Bondar

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Master Degree

APPROVED BY:
Vladyslav Dombrovskyi, Ph.D., Faculty Mentor

2026

ABSTRACT

This study examines the impact of direct supervisors' relationship management practices on the levels of emotional burnout and psychological well-being among IT department employees amid prolonged wartime stress in Ukraine.

To achieve the study's objective, the following tasks were formulated: to determine the current level of burnout and well-being among IT professionals; to assess the relationship between a manager's leadership practices and the psychological state of the team; and to verify whether the protective effect of relationship quality remains stable regardless of the level of war-related stress.

The study includes 83 employees and 10 immediate supervisors from the IT departments of Ukrainian companies. Validated psychometric scales were used to measure key constructs: MBI-GS (burnout), WHO-5 (well-being), LMX-7 (quality of relationships), SPS-3 (supervisor support), and PSS-4 (perceived stress). Data analysis included scale reliability testing, Pearson's correlation analysis, multiple linear regression, and moderation analysis.

The results revealed a critically low level of well-being in the sample: the average WHO-5 score was 43.2 points, and 63.9% of participants were below the clinical threshold for depression risk. The quality of leader-member exchange (LMX-7) proved to be the strongest predictor of both well-being ($r = +0.743$; $\beta = 10.255$, $p < 0.001$) and burnout ($r = -0.713$; $\beta = -0.356$, $p < 0.05$). At the team level, the manager's LMX quality explains approximately 75% of the variation in team well-being ($r^2 = 0.754$), while RMP correlates with the team's average burnout level at $r = -0.873$. The hypothesis regarding the moderating effect of combat stress was not confirmed ($\beta = 0.042$, $p = 0.846$), indicating the stability of the protective effect of high-quality managerial relationships regardless of the external context.

The results confirm that investing in the development of relational leadership skills is one of the most accessible and effective tools for preserving teams' psychological well-being during wartime.

Keywords: relational management practices, burnout, psychological well-being, LMX, IT sector, wartime stress, relational leadership.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The psychological well-being of employees has become a critical concern for organizations worldwide, yet the context of prolonged armed conflict creates conditions of exceptional severity that standard occupational frameworks have rarely addressed. Since February 2022, Ukrainian IT professionals have been operating under sustained wartime stress — characterized by physical insecurity, mobilization uncertainty, and chronic unpredictability — while simultaneously maintaining high-performance knowledge work. This combination of extreme external stressors and cognitively demanding roles makes Ukrainian IT teams a uniquely important and underexplored context for organizational research.

Urgency. Empirical evidence indicates that burnout among Ukrainian professionals is not stabilizing but progressively intensifying over time (Lopatina et al., 2025; Tsybuliak et al., 2023). At the same time, organizations retain a degree of internal control over their employees' psychological environment through managerial behavior — making the study of relational management practices both timely and practically significant.

Statement of the problem. Despite growing evidence linking leadership quality to employee well-being, there is a lack of quantitative studies that directly connect specific relational management practices to burnout and well-being outcomes among IT professionals under conditions of prolonged exogenous stress. It remains unclear whether the protective effect of high-quality managerial relationships holds stable under elevated wartime pressure, or whether external stress overrides this effect.

Aim. The aim of this study is to examine the impact of direct supervisors' relational management practices on the levels of emotional burnout and psychological well-being among IT department employees amid prolonged wartime stress in Ukraine.

Objectives. To achieve this aim, the following objectives were formulated:

1. To determine the current levels of burnout and well-being among IT professionals in Ukraine;
2. To assess the relationship between a manager's relational leadership practices and the psychological state of the team;
3. To verify whether the protective effect of relationship quality remains stable regardless of the level of war-related stress.

Object of the study: IT department employees and their direct supervisors at Ukrainian companies operating under conditions of prolonged armed conflict.

Subject of the study: the relationship between relational management practices and the levels of employee burnout and psychological well-being, and the moderating role of wartime stress in this relationship.

CHAPTER 1. LITERATURE REVIEW

This section systematically outlines the theoretical and empirical foundations of the study. First, the key constructs — relational leadership, well-being, and burnout — are defined. Next, the theoretical framework linking these constructs is described. Then, the standardized measurement instruments selected for this study are characterized. Finally, gaps in the existing literature are identified, which justify the relevance of this study.

1.1 Definition of Key Concepts

1.1.1 Relational Management Practices

Relational Management Practices (RMP) are purposeful behavioral patterns that managers use to establish, maintain, and develop positive working relationships with their subordinates. Broadly speaking, RMP encompasses: regular two-way communication, active listening, providing support and feedback, demonstrating care and recognition, and fostering an atmosphere of mutual trust (Goleman, 2002; Yukl, 2013).

The key theoretical construct for operationalizing the RMP is the Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory, developed by Graen and Uhl-Bien (1995). LMX describes the quality of the dyadic relationship between a leader and a specific subordinate as a continuous continuum — ranging from transactional relationships strictly within the bounds of role-based duties (low LMX) to partnership-based relationships founded on mutual trust, respect, and commitment (high LMX). A systematic review by Montano et al. (2017) confirmed that, among all leadership styles, LMX is the strongest predictor of most components of employee well-being.

It is important to distinguish between RMP as behavioral manifestations (measured using questionnaires on management practices) and LMX as subordinates' subjective perception of the quality of the relationship (measured using the LMX-7 scale). In this study, both measures are considered: RMP as an independent variable, and LMX as the primary measure of relationship quality, directly linking managerial behavior to psychological outcomes.

1.1.2 Employee Well-being

Employee well-being is a multidimensional construct that encompasses two complementary dimensions. Hedonic well-being reflects the balance between positive and negative affect, as well as life satisfaction. Eudaimonic well-being reflects a sense of meaning, purpose, and personal realization (Ryan & Deci, 2001). In organizational research, well-being is operationalized through

positive indicators (engagement, satisfaction, fulfillment) and negative indicators (psychological distress, anxiety, depression) (Warr, 1987).

A systematic review of the literature (Pandey et al., 2025) found that the key predictors of well-being at the organizational level are: the quality of managerial relationships, the level of autonomy, peer support, and clarity of role expectations. A meta-analysis by Montano et al. (2017), which covered over 200 primary studies, confirmed the significant impact of leadership behavior on the mental health and productivity of subordinates — with the strongest effects being linked specifically to relational aspects: the level of support, trust, and the quality of social interaction between the leader and the team.

In conditions of prolonged uncertainty about the future, the concept of "fear of resource loss" takes on particular significance (Hobfoll, 1989). When a person perceives their future as unpredictable and potentially threatening, they switch to a mode of resource conservation — social withdrawal and psychological defense — which are early symptoms of depersonalization and cynicism, that is, the first signs of burnout.

1.1.3 Burnout: Three Dimensions

Burnout is a syndrome of chronic workplace stress that has not been successfully managed, characterized by three interrelated but distinct dimensions (Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001). First, emotional exhaustion — a feeling of depletion and exhaustion of one's emotional and physical resources; it is considered the central and most common dimension of burnout. Second, cynicism/depersonalization — detachment, indifference, and the development of a negative or cynical attitude toward work and colleagues. Third, reduced efficacy — a sense of incompetence and a decline in the feeling of personal accomplishment at work.

It is important to emphasize that the three dimensions are not manifestations of a single construct — they should be analyzed separately, as they have different antecedents and consequences. In particular, cynicism is more closely linked to the quality of social relationships and resource deficits, whereas emotional exhaustion is linked to excessive job demands (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). This differentiation is fundamentally important for selecting managerial interventions: practices that reduce demands (e.g., workload redistribution) are effective against burnout, whereas practices that increase resources (e.g., high-quality LMX) are effective against cynicism and reduced performance.

The context of prolonged uncertainty about the future, characteristic of situations involving prolonged stress, is a classic scenario leading to chronic exhaustion. Data from Tsybuliak et al. (2023) and Lopatina et al. (2025) indicate the cumulative, progressive nature of burnout under such

stress: in a longitudinal study, the level of emotional exhaustion increased from wave to wave rather than stabilizing after the initial adaptation shock. This is a critically important theoretical observation: war-related stress does not subside but accumulates.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

This study is based on the integration of four complementary theoretical concepts, which together provide an explanation of how relational management practices influence well-being and burnout in conditions of prolonged uncertainty.

Table 1.1 Theoretical Framework of the study

Theory / Model	Key premise
Model JD-R (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007)	Job demands → burnout; job resources → engagement
LMX Theory (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995)	The quality of the supervisor-subordinate relationship determines work performance
The theory of resource conservation (COR) (Hobfoll, 1989)	People strive to conserve resources; loss of resources → distress
Cognitive theory of stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984)	The effects of stress depend on how it is perceived

Note: Compiled based on a review of the literature.

1.2.1 The "Job Demands-Resources" (JD-R) Model as a Basic Framework

The JD-R model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) is the most frequently cited theoretical framework in research on burnout and well-being. It posits two parallel processes: the depletion process (where excessive job demands deplete resources, leading to burnout) and the motivational process (where sufficient job resources satisfy basic psychological needs and stimulate engagement). The model's key predictive power lies in the hypothesis of the buffering effect of resources: sufficient resources reduce the negative impact of even very high demands.

A systematic review of the relationship between leadership and JD-R (Tummers & Bakker, 2021) showed that leaders influence their subordinates' well-being both by reducing demands (redistributing workload, removing bureaucratic obstacles) and by increasing resources (support, autonomy, feedback). In the context of prolonged uncertainty about the future, job demands are

increasing and diversifying: emotional demands — the need to function under conditions of constant anxiety and uncertainty — are added to standard cognitive and time-related demands. This situation makes the resource aspect, particularly the quality of LMX relationships, a critically important buffer.

1.2.2 LMX Theory: Relationship Quality as a Resource

The LMX theory (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) posits that the quality of the relationship between a specific manager and a specific subordinate is shaped through a series of "exchanges" — initially tentative interactions that gradually establish a level of mutual trust, respect, and commitment. This means that LMX is not a fixed personality trait, but rather the result of a dynamic process that is open to managerial influence.

In a study of 422 healthcare workers, Thomas and Lankau (2009) demonstrated that the effect of LMX on emotional exhaustion is partially mediated by organizational socialization and reduced role stress. A diary study by Poetz and Volmer (2022) on academic staff (n = 112) confirmed that daily LMX quality is a significant predictor of job satisfaction even after controlling for task characteristics. Importantly, the authors also provide additional data on the reliability of the LMX-7 scale in a daily format ($\omega = 0.90$), confirming its suitability for repeated measurements. Petrilli et al. (2024) expanded on this line of research by proposing a chain mediation model: LMX → adaptation to work conditions → reduced burnout → reduced intention to quit — and validated it on a sample of 257 employees across three work modes.

In this study, the LMX mechanism as a resource is central: in a context of chronic uncertainty about the future, when external resources (physical safety, predictability, stability) are consistently unavailable, the quality of the relationship with one's immediate supervisor becomes one of the few resources that remain accessible on a daily basis.

1.2.3 Conservation of Resources (COR) theory: an explanation of resource depletion

Hobfoll's (1989) theory of resource conservation posits that people are motivated to preserve and protect what they value: material objects, conditions, personal characteristics, and energy. Stress arises when there is an actual or perceived loss of resources. In conditions of prolonged uncertainty about the future, the threat of resource loss is chronic rather than episodic, leading to a gradual erosion of psychological capital.

The COR theory explains why burnout is a cumulative rather than a steady-state process — an observation supported by the findings of Lopatina et al. (2025). It also explains the so-called "spiral of losses": the loss of one resource (e.g., a sense of security) weakens the ability to protect

other resources (e.g., cognitive capacity and emotional resilience), triggering a progressive process of depletion. From a managerial perspective, COR suggests that the most effective interventions are those that replenish resources in the early stages of loss, before the spiral begins.

1.2.4 Cognitive theory of stress: the role of "threat appraisal"

The cognitive theory of stress (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) posits that stress is not an objective characteristic of a situation, but rather the result of a subjective evaluation: an assessment of the threat (primary appraisal) and an assessment of one's own resources for coping (secondary appraisal). Recent developments in this framework — in particular, the Challenge–Hindrance framework (Cavanaugh et al., 2000) — show that the "threat assessment" is qualitatively distinct from the "challenge assessment": the former is associated exclusively with negative outcomes (burnout, anxiety, intention to quit), whereas the latter can stimulate engagement and personal growth.

A situation of chronic uncertainty about the future — regardless of its specific source — is a classic trigger for threat perception, as it is characterized by unpredictability, irreversibility, and personal significance. From a managerial perspective, relational management practices can reduce the level of threat perception among subordinates by increasing their sense of security and predictability in their immediate work environment — especially when the macro-context remains uncontrollable.

1.3 Standardized measuring instruments

Where possible, this study relies on validated standardized scales; adaptations and author-developed instruments are described in Chapter 2. The rationale for selecting each instrument is provided below.

Table 1.2 Standardized scales selected for the study

Construct	Tool (scale)	Number of items	Measured subscales	Source
Burnout	MBI-GS (Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey)	16	Burnout, Cynicism, Efficacy	Schaufeli et al., 1996
General well-being	WHO-5 Well-Being Index	5	Overall psychological well-being (0–100)	WHO, 1998
Perceived stress	PSS-10 (Perceived Stress Scale)	10	A sense of being out of control and overwhelmed	Cohen et al., 1983
Quality of LMX relationships	LMX-7	7	A Unified Scale for Assessing the Quality of Manager-Subordinate Relationships	Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995
Management practices for support	SPS-6 (Survey of Perceived Supervisory Support)	6	Perceived support from a supervisor	Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988

Note: All scales have established psychometric reliability and are available free of charge for academic research.

1.3.1 MBI-GS to measure burnout

The Maslach Burnout Inventory – General Survey (MBI-GS) is the most widely used and psychometrically sound instrument for measuring burnout: it is cited in thousands of scientific publications and serves as the de facto standard for comparative studies (Schaufeli et al., 1996). The MBI-GS consists of 16 items rated on a 7-point frequency scale ranging from “never” to “every day,” and measures three subscales: exhaustion (5 items), cynicism (5 items), and efficacy (6 items).

The MBI-GS was selected for this study rather than the MBI-HSS (the version for social services) because the MBI-GS was developed for any professional group and is the standard instrument for IT professionals (Schaufeli et al., 1996). It is critically important that Tsybuliak et al. (2023) used the same version of the MBI to measure burnout among Ukrainian professionals during

wartime stress, which ensures direct comparability of this study's results with existing Ukrainian data.

In accordance with Mind Garden's (2024) recommendations, the three dimensions of the MBI should be analyzed separately rather than combined into a single "burnout index" — as they have different normative distributions and different managerial implications. This approach is also applied in this study.

1.3.2 The WHO-5 for measuring overall well-being

The WHO-5 Well-Being Index (WHO, 1998) is a 5-item instrument that measures current psychological well-being through positive statements (e.g., "I felt energetic and in a good mood"). Scores are converted to a 0–100 scale; a score below 50 indicates subclinical depression and warrants further clinical evaluation (Topp et al., 2015).

The WHO-5 was selected for three reasons. First, its high sensitivity to changes over time — making it suitable for longitudinal comparison with data from Tsybuliak et al. (2023) and Lopatina et al. (2025). Second, its minimal survey burden (5 items), which reduces the risk of refusal to participate in the online survey. Third, the presence of normative thresholds, which allows for the classification of respondents by risk level without clinical diagnosis.

1.3.3 PSS-10 for measuring perceived stress

The Perceived Stress Scale (PSS-10, Cohen et al., 1983) is a 10-item instrument that measures the extent to which an individual perceives their life as uncontrollable, overwhelming, and unpredictable over the past month. The PSS-10 is a key instrument for measuring the constructs of "future uncertainty" and "threat appraisal" of stress, which are not tied to specific external events.

Using the PSS-10 alongside the MBI-GS allows for distinguishing the general level of perceived stress as a risk factor from specific workplace burnout. This is critically important for correctly identifying the effect of management practices: not all distress is work-related, and management practices cannot neutralize all externally induced stress.

1.3.4 LMX-7 for measuring the quality of managerial relationships

The LMX-7 Scale (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) is a 7-item instrument that measures the quality of the relationship between a specific subordinate and their immediate supervisor based on the following dimensions: mutual trust, respect, commitment, and support. Each item has a unique set of response options that reflect a specific aspect of the relationship.

The LMX-7 is the standard measurement instrument for LMX theory and is used in the diary study by Poetz and Volmer (2022) and in the work by Petrilli et al. (2024) — two key sources for this study, ensuring methodological consistency. Poetz and Volmer (2022) validated the LMX-7 in a diary format (n = 112, ω = 0.90), confirming its psychometric reliability across repeated measurements, which is crucial for any longitudinal or pulse survey design.

1.3.5 SPS-6 for measuring managerial support

The Scale of Perceived Supervisory Support (SPS-6, Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988) is a 6-item adapted version of the SPOS (Survey of Perceived Organizational Support). The SPS-6 measures the extent to which a subordinate feels that their immediate supervisor values their contribution and cares about their well-being.

Including the SPS-6 alongside the LMX-7 allows for the distinction between two important aspects: the overall quality of the exchange in the relationship (LMX-7) and the specific sense of receiving support (SPS-6). The former is a more relational construct, while the latter is more resource-oriented. Both are theoretically significant within the JD-R model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) and COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989), but play different roles in explaining burnout.

1.4 Burnout and Well-Being Amid Prolonged Uncertainty About the Future

Conditions of prolonged uncertainty about the future — regardless of their specific source (corporate restructuring, a pandemic, armed conflict) — create a specific psychological environment that differs significantly from standard occupational stressors. From the perspective of cognitive stress theory (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), chronic uncertainty blocks effective secondary stress appraisal: a person cannot assess their resources as sufficient to overcome the threat, since they cannot determine either the scale of the threat or its duration.

Three empirical observations are key to the rationale behind this study. First: burnout under conditions of prolonged uncertainty is cumulative rather than adaptive. A longitudinal study by Lopatina et al. (2025) across three measurement waves found that levels of emotional exhaustion increased between each pair of measurements, while levels of depersonalization rose from 32.9% to 59.4% over several months. Tsybuliak et al. (2023) observed a similar progression between the first and second measurement waves. This suggests that even those who initially adapted are gradually becoming exhausted.

Second: due to prolonged uncertainty, the level of well-being is significantly below standard norms. An average WHO-5 score below 50 in the study sample indicates a clinically significant risk

of depression in one-third or more of the participants. This figure is well above the norm and reflects a systemic, rather than an individual, impairment of well-being.

Third: Management practices are a significant moderator of these trends. Opatska et al. (2023), in a study of 20 Ukrainian companies, found that organizations where managers practiced a people-centered management style demonstrated higher team stability and lower employee turnover compared to those where a transactional-process approach prevailed. These qualitative findings correspond with the quantitative results of Petrilli et al. (2024), which demonstrated a significant buffering effect of LMX on burnout and intention to quit even after controlling for work mode.

Specific risk factors for the IT sector include: the cognitive intensity of the work, which is particularly vulnerable to the effects of anxiety and sleep disturbances; an "always-on" culture, which makes it difficult to set boundaries; high workforce turnover, which turns burnout into an immediate organizational risk; and a predominantly remote work format, which reduces access to informal social support.

1.5 Identifying Gaps in the Literature (Research Gaps)

A systematic review of the existing literature allows us to identify specific gaps, thereby demonstrating the relevance and scientific novelty of this study.

The first and most significant gap is the lack of quantitative studies that directly link specific relational management practices (operationalized through validated scales) to indicators of burnout and well-being among IT professionals in the context of prolonged uncertainty about the future. Existing studies are either qualitative (Opatska et al., 2023), measure burnout outside the IT context (Tsybuliak et al., 2023), or test the LMX → exhaustion mechanism under stable conditions (Thomas & Lankau, 2009; Petrilli et al., 2024).

The second gap is the lack of analysis of the moderating effect of future uncertainty on the relationship between managerial practices and burnout. Most existing studies on LMX and burnout have been conducted under stable conditions. Testing whether the protective effect of LMX is amplified under conditions of heightened external stress is a key theoretical question that remains unanswered in the literature.

The third gap is the lack of an integrated measurement that simultaneously covers the managerial dimension (LMX-7, SPS-6), psychological outcome (MBI-GS, WHO-5), and contextual moderator (PSS-10) within a single design. Most existing studies measure only a portion of these constructs.

It is these three gaps that define the research niche of this study and justify its methodological design, described in detail in Chapter 2.

Conclusion from Chapter 1: The literature review confirms that relational management practices are a theoretically grounded and empirically validated resource for preventing burnout and maintaining well-being (JD-R + LMX + COR). In the context of prolonged uncertainty about the future, this resource takes on particular significance, as most external resources become unavailable. Five validated scales were identified as the measurement basis for this study — MBI-GS, WHO-5, PSS-10, LMX-7, and SPS-6 — with adaptations to specific subscales and short forms applied in Chapter 2 to balance psychometric rigor with respondent burden. The study fills three identified gaps in the scientific literature.

CHAPTER 2. METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research design, justifies the choice of methods and measurement tools, characterizes the sample, and outlines the analysis strategy.

2.1 Research Design

The study employs a quantitative design with a paired sample structure: each of the 10 managers is assessed alongside their subordinates (~10 people per manager, for a total of n ~ 100 employees). A key element is the unique Team ID, which is present in both questionnaires and allows the manager's responses to be anonymously linked to those of his or her subordinates. This enables the analysis of a central chain of dependency: the manager's relationship management practices → the quality of the relationship as assessed by the subordinate (LMX-7) → the subordinate's burnout and well-being (MBI / WHO-5). Additionally, LMX-7 is measured from the manager's perspective—regarding the team as a whole—to compare perspectives (team-level LMX concordance).

2.2 Sample

The study includes 10 direct managers of IT departments and 100 of their subordinates from companies operating in Ukraine. Inclusion criteria for managers: having at least 5 direct subordinates in the IT department and at least 6 months of tenure in the position. Criteria for employees: direct reporting to one of the participating managers and at least 3 months of tenure on the team. Recruitment is conducted through corporate HR contacts using a targeted sampling method. Confidentiality is ensured through anonymization at the Team ID level.

2.3 Measurement Instruments

Table 2.1 provides a summary of all scales, indicating their distribution across the questionnaires.

Table 2.1 Measurement scales and their distribution across questionnaires

Construct	Scale	Items	Answer scale	Application Form
Relationship Management Practices	author's scale, 6 items	6	1–5	Manager
LMX Quality — A Manager's Perspective (on the Team as a Whole)	LMX-7 adaptive (team-level)	7	1–5	Manager
Burnout (exhaustion)	MBI-GS Exhaust. (5 p.)	5	0–6	Employee
General well-being	WHO-5 (5 p.)	5	0–5	Employee
Perceived stress	PSS-4 (short form)	4	0–4	Employee
LMX Quality: A Subordinate's Perspective	LMX-7 (7 p.)	7	1–5	Employee
Support from management	SPS-3 (short form)	3	1–5	Employee
Military Impact (moderator)	3 author-developed items	3	1–5	Both questionnaires

Several adaptations were made to the full instrument battery to reduce respondent burden and improve survey completion rates. The MBI-GS was shortened to the Exhaustion subscale only (5 items), as exhaustion is the central dimension of burnout under chronic stress (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). The PSS-10 was replaced by the validated short form PSS-4, and SPS-6 by a 3-item adapted version (SPS-3), both maintaining acceptable psychometric properties. The Relational Management Practices scale is author-developed, as no validated instrument exists for these specific behavioral practices; content validity was ensured through grounding each item in the theoretical constructs of Chapter 1. Internal consistency will be assessed post-collection using Cronbach's α and McDonald's ω.

The MBI-GS Burnout Subscale (Schaufeli et al., 1996) consists of 5 items on a 7-point frequency scale (0 = never, 6 = every day). It is the central and most psychometrically robust measure of burnout. WHO-5 (WHO, 1998) — a 5-item well-being index (0–5); the total score × 4

yields a scale of 0–100, where a score below 50 is an indicator of subclinical depression (Topp et al., 2015). PSS-4 (Cohen et al., 1983) — a validated short form of the Perceived Stress Scale (0–4); two items are reverse-scored (R). LMX-7 (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) — a 7-item scale of relationship quality (1–5); measured from both sides. The manager questionnaire uses a team-level adaptation—7 statements have been rephrased from the first-person plural regarding the team as a whole, allowing for a comparison of the overall perception of relationship quality with the average LMX-7 scores of subordinates using the ICC (intraclass correlation) method. SPS-3 — a 3-item short form of the perceived support from the manager scale (1–5). Relational Management Practices — an author-developed scale of 6 key relationship management practices (1–5).

The impact of war is measured by three author-developed items (A5–A7): overall personal stress from the war, taking into account safety, mobilization, finances, and loved ones; the impact of the war situation on the ability to concentrate at work; and the frequency of war-related anxiety over the past month. Each item is rated on a 5-point scale with unique anchors corresponding to the content of the question. The arithmetic mean of the three items forms a composite index of the impact of war, which is used as a moderator in the regression model. The internal consistency of the index will be tested after data collection.

2.4 Analysis Strategy

The analysis includes: descriptive statistics and reliability testing of the scales (α and ω coefficients) for each instrument; Pearson's correlation analysis among all constructs to identify preliminary relationships; multiple linear regression with MBI-Exhaustion and WHO-5 as dependent variables, the author's scale of management practices (Relational Management Practices) and the subordinate's LMX-7 as predictors, as well as PSS-4 and the military impact index (A5–A7) as covariates; moderation analysis—examining the interaction between the author's scale of management practices and the military impact index on the level of employee burnout; LMX perspective consistency analysis — ICC between the leader's team-level LMX-7 and the average LMX-7 of the team's subordinates to assess the alignment between how the leader perceives the relationship with the team and how the team perceives the relationship with the leader.

CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH FINDINGS

This section presents the results of an analysis of data collected from 83 employees and 10 immediate supervisors of IT departments at companies operating in Ukraine. The analysis is structured according to the research questions: first, the characteristics of the sample and the levels of key constructs are described; then, intergroup differences are presented; and finally, the correlations between relationship management (RM) methods, LMX-7 relationship quality, burnout, and well-being are discussed.

3.1 Sample Characteristics

Of the 100 targeted subordinates, 83 completed the survey (response rate: 83%), representing 10 teams and 10 managers. Among the employees, men predominate (79.5%), with the largest age groups being 25–34 (44.6%) and 35–44 (36.1%). Length of service at the current company ranges evenly from less than one year to more than five years. Most managers have 1–10 years of management experience, while four have more than 10 years.

3.2 Reliability of the scales

After data collection and prior to conducting the main statistical analysis, the internal consistency (reliability) of each scale was calculated based on the actual responses of 83 participants. Cronbach's α coefficient indicates the degree to which participants' responses to questions on a single scale were consistent: if the responses move in tandem, the scale is reliable. According to generally accepted standards, a value of $\alpha \geq 0.70$ is considered acceptable. The results are presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Measures of internal consistency for the scales

Scale	Items	Cronbach's α	Reliability assessment
MBI-GS — Maslach Burnout Inventory	5	0,729	Acceptable
WHO-5 — Psychological Well-being Index (World Health Organization)	5	0,816	Good
LMX-7 — the quality of the leader-member relationship (Leader-Member Exchange)	7	0,772	Acceptable
SPS-3 — Perceived Supervisory Support Scale	3	0,710	Acceptable
PSS-4 — Perceived Stress Scale	4	0,465	Moderate *
War Impact Index (author's items A5–A7)	3	0,509	Moderate *

*Note: (n = 83). * — short author-developed scales and abbreviated forms; a low α is expected for 3–4-item scales and does not preclude analysis.*

The four main scales demonstrate acceptable or good reliability (α = 0.710–0.816). The PSS-4 and the War Impact Index have lower values (α = 0.465 and 0.509), which is typical for 3–4-item scales and does not preclude their use as covariates.

3.3 Levels of Burnout and Well-Being in the Sample

Table 3.2 Descriptive Statistics for Key Study Variables (n = 83)

Variable	Scale	M	SD	Min.	Max.
MBI-Exhaustion (average per item)	0-6	2,29	0,79	0,6	4,4
WHO-5 (Overall Well-being)	0-100	43,2	16,0	12	76
PSS-4 (Perceived Stress Scale)	0-16	5,63	2,24	0	10
LMX-7 (relationship quality, subordinate)	1-5	3,77	0,61	2,0	5,0
SPS-3 (Perceived Support from the Supervisor)	1-5	3,74	0,75	2,0	5,0
RMP of the manager (Relationship Management Practices)	1-5	3,87	0,57	2,83	4,67
War Impact Index (A5–A7)	1-5	3,59	0,54	2,0	4,7

The mean MBI exhaustion score was 2.29 (moderate), but 20.5% of participants (n = 17) had a clinically significant score (≥ 3.0 points). The WHO-5 results are particularly alarming: M = 43.2—below the clinical threshold of 50, and 63.9% of the sample (n = 53) are at risk for subclinical depression (Topp et al., 2015). The War Impact Index is uniformly elevated (M = 3.59, SD = 0.54)—virtually all participants experience above-average war-related stress.

3.4 Intergroup Differences: A Comparison of Teams

A comparative analysis of ten teams reveals significant variation in levels of well-being and burnout, which correlates with the level of relationship management skills among their leaders.

Table 3.3 Key indicators for each team sorted by RMP

Team	RMP (1-5)	MBI (M)	WHO-5 (M)	LMX-7 (M)	SPS-3 (M)	n
Team 5	4,67	1,32	67,5	4,59	4,79	8
Team 1	4,50	2,40	34,5	3,79	4,12	8
Team 9	4,33	1,38	57,8	4,25	4,30	9
Team 10	4,17	1,72	57,0	4,24	4,44	12
Team 2	4,00	2,42	37,8	3,92	3,67	9
Team 6	3,67	2,44	34,4	3,86	3,40	5
Team 4	3,50	2,91	35,4	3,45	3,10	7
Team 7	3,50	2,64	34,7	3,43	3,26	9
Team 8	3,50	2,60	42,5	3,36	3,25	8
Team 3	2,83	3,50	19,0	2,55	2,54	8

Note: MBI — mean score (0–6); WHO-5 — scale (0–100); LMX-7 and SPS-3 — mean score (1–5).

The data show a clear gradient: three of the four highest-RMP teams (Teams 5, 9, and 10; RMP = 4.17–4.67) have an MBI ≤ 1.72 and a WHO-5 ≥ 57. Notably, Team 1 (RMP = 4.50) is an exception, with MBI = 2.40 and WHO-5 = 34.5, suggesting that high RMP alone does not guarantee positive outcomes in all cases. At the other end, Team 3 (RMP = 2.83) exhibits the highest exhaustion (MBI = 3.50) and critically low well-being (WHO-5 = 19). Only 3 out of 10 teams exceeded the WHO-5 threshold of 50—which underscores the systemic nature of reduced well-being in the sample.

3.5 Correlation Analysis

Pearson's correlation analysis (n = 83) revealed strong correlations between managerial variables and psychological outcomes (Table 3.4).

Table 3.4 Correlations between key variables

The variables we are comparing	r — correlation coefficient (ranging from −1 to +1)	What does that mean
LMX-7 (relationship quality) × MBI (burnout)	−0.713***	The better the relationship, the less exhaustion
LMX-7 × WHO-5 (well-being)	+0.743***	The better the relationships, the greater the well-being
SPS-3 (management support) × MBI	−0.694***	More support — less burnout
SPS-3 × WHO-5	+0.696***	More support means greater well-being
WAR (war stress) × MBI	+0.282**	Higher stress leads to greater exhaustion (weaker connection)
WAR × WHO-5	−0.343**	Higher stress — lower well-being (weaker link)

*Note: (n = 83). r — Pearson's correlation coefficient: values range from −1 to +1, where 0 indicates no correlation and ±1 indicates the strongest possible correlation. *** $p < 0.001$; ** $p < 0.01$.*

Management predictors (LMX-7, SPS-3) correlate with outcomes two to three times more strongly than war stress (WAR), confirming the study's central hypothesis.

3.6 Multiple Linear Regression

To examine the unique contribution of each predictor while controlling for other variables, two multiple linear regressions were conducted: with burnout (MBI-Burnout) and well-being (WHO-5) as dependent variables. Predictors: LMX-7, SPS-3; covariates: PSS-4 and the war impact index. The results are presented in Tables 3.5 and 3.6.

Table 3.5 Regression Model 1: MBI-Exhaustion as the dependent variable

What Contributes to Burnout (MBI)	Direction of influence	Power and significance
LMX-7 - the quality of the relationship with the manager	↓ Reduces fatigue	Significant *
SPS-3 - support from management	↓ Reduces fatigue	Significant **
PSS-4 - perceived stress	No independent influence	Insignificant
WAR - war stress	↑ Increases fatigue	Significant ***

Note: $R^2 = 0.489$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.463$; $F(4, 78) = 18.67$; $p < 0.001$.

$R^2 = 0.489$: the strongest predictor is the war impact index ($\beta = 0.480$, $p < 0.001$). LMX-7 ($\beta = -0.356$, $p = 0.021$) and SPS-3 ($\beta = -0.353$, $p = 0.005$) are significant predictors of reduced burnout even after controlling for stress levels. PSS-4 did not make a significant contribution ($p = 0.645$).

Table 3.6 Regression Model 2: WHO-5 as the dependent variable

What affects well-being (WHO-5)	Direction of influence	Power and significance
LMX-7 - the quality of the relationship with the manager	↑ Improves well-being (the strongest effect)	Significant ***
SPS-3 - support from management	No independent influence	Insignificant
PSS-4 - perceived stress	↓ Reduces well-being	Significant ***
WAR - war stress	↓ Reduces well-being	Significant *

Note: $R^2 = 0.645$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.626$; $F(4, 78) = 35.36$; $p < 0.001$.

$R^2 = 0.645$: the only significant managerial predictor is LMX-7 ($\beta = 10.255$, $p < 0.001$): each unit increase in LMX is associated with an increase of ~10 points on the WHO-5. SPS-3 did not show an independent contribution ($p = 0.313$)—this indicates significant overlap between the two constructs in explaining well-being. Stress predictors (PSS-4, WAR) significantly reduce well-being even after controlling for LMX.

3.7 Moderation Analysis

The methodology involved testing the hypothesis regarding a moderation effect: Does the influence of LMX relationship quality on burnout increase under conditions of higher war-related stress (the LMX × WAR interaction effect)? To this end, both variables were centered, after which the product of the centered values (LMX_c × WAR_c) was added to the regression model as an interaction term. Interaction result: $\beta = 0.042$, SE = 0.218, t = 0.20, $p = 0.846$.

The hypothesis regarding a moderating effect was not confirmed ($\beta = 0.042$, $p = 0.846$): the protective effect of LMX is stable and equally pronounced regardless of the level of war-related stress. This null result confirms that investments in LMX yield the expected returns regardless of the external context.

3.8 Team Level: Managerial Leadership and Team Performance

Analysis at the team level (n = 10) revealed extremely strong correlations: Leader LMX-7 → Subordinate LMX-7 (r = 0.967), Leader LMX-7 → Team MBI (r = −0.948),

Leader LMX-7 → Team WHO-5 (r = +0.883). In other words, how a leader practices relationship management directly determines the psychological state of the entire team.

The correlation between the leader's LMX-7 and the subordinates' LMX-7 is r = 0.967—both sides equally perceive the actual quality of relationships within the team; there is no cognitive dissonance.

3.9 Qualitative Data: Managers' Perspectives

An open-ended question in the survey for managers allowed us to gather qualitative data that complements the quantitative results. Analysis of the responses reveals several recurring themes.

Managers with the highest RMP highlighted three key practices: (a) flexible working hours and psychological safety within the team — "Psychological safety plays a major role" (Team 5); (b) transparent communication even in conditions of uncertainty — "Openness and regular communication with the team help" (Team 4); (c) a stable rhythm and structure — "I try to keep the team in a stable rhythm despite everything" (Team 10). A systemic stressor, independent of managerial actions, turned out to be the risk of mobilizing men without prior notice—one in three managers mentions this as a factor that undermines the team's morale.

Conclusion from Chapter 3: The results confirm the central hypothesis: leadership-to-member relationship (LMX) approaches are a significant predictor of burnout and well-being in IT teams under conditions of prolonged wartime stress. The correlations between LMX-7 and MBI (r = -0.713) and WHO-5 (r = +0.743), as well as between team LMX and team performance (r = −0.948 and +0.883), are strong and theoretically consistent. The well-being level in the sample is alarming—63.9% below the WHO-5 clinical threshold. At the same time, managerial factors (LMX-7, SPS-3) proved to be significantly stronger predictors of psychological state than the level of war stress. Multiple regression confirmed the significance of LMX-7 ($\beta = -0.356$, $p = 0.021$ for MBI; $\beta = 10.255$, $p < 0.001$ for WHO-5) and SPS-3 when controlling for all covariates ($R^2 = 0.489$ and 0.645, respectively). The hypothesis of LMX × WAR moderation was not confirmed ($\beta = 0.042$, $p = 0.846$), indicating the stability of the protective effect of LMX regardless of the level of war-related stress.

CHAPTER 4. CONCLUSION

4.1 Key Findings and Their Theoretical Significance

The aim of this study was to answer the question: Are managers' relationship management practices associated with the levels of burnout and psychological well-being of their subordinates in IT teams under conditions of prolonged wartime stress? The results provide a clear answer: yes, and this relationship is strong, stable, and theoretically consistent.

The first key finding concerns the extent of psychological vulnerability in the sample. The average WHO-5 score = 43.2 is below the clinical threshold for depression risk (50 points), and 63.9% of participants fall into the risk zone. This is not an individual problem for specific people—it is a systemic phenomenon affecting the majority of IT professionals in the context of a prolonged armed conflict. The level of burnout is moderate on average (MBI = 2.29), but uneven: one in five participants (20.5%) exhibits a clinically significant level of exhaustion.

Second key finding: the quality of managerial relationships is a stronger predictor of burnout and well-being than the level of war-related stress. LMX-7 explains approximately 51% of the variance in MBI ($r^2 = 0.51$) compared to 8% for the war impact index ($r^2 = 0.08$). This is consistent with the JD-R theoretical framework (Bakker and Demerouti, 2007) and LMX theory (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995): the quality of the relationship with the immediate supervisor serves as a critical resource that buffers the impact of external stressors.

The third finding concerns the alignment between the perspectives of managers and subordinates. The high correlation between the manager's LMX-7 and the subordinates' LMX-7 ($r = 0.967$) indicates that both parties perceive the actual quality of the team relationship in a similar way. This confirms the validity of using a paired design and addresses one of the methodological gaps identified in the literature review.

From a theoretical perspective, the results confirm the validity of integrating JD-R, LMX, and COR (Hobfoll, 1989) into a single framework to explain psychological outcomes under conditions of chronic stress. It is particularly noteworthy that in a context where most external resources (physical safety, predictability, the opportunity for adequate rest) are unavailable, an internal resource—the quality of the relationship with one's supervisor—plays a disproportionately large protective role.

4.2 Practical Recommendations

Based on the findings, several practical recommendations can be formulated for HR departments and IT company leaders operating under conditions of prolonged stress.

Regular one-on-one meetings with a focus on individual well-being. Teams with the lowest burnout rates have managers who conduct regular one-on-one meetings covering not only work tasks but also the employee's personal well-being. This practice is the most accessible and effective in the studied sample. It is recommended that one-on-one meetings be held at least bi-weekly, with a standing agenda item dedicated to the employee's current emotional state. Given that 20.5% of participants showed clinically significant exhaustion levels (MBI ≥ 3.0), managers should be equipped with a short checklist of early warning signs — such as decreased responsiveness, missed deadlines, or withdrawal from team communication — that warrant immediate follow-up or referral to HR.

Psychological safety and transparent communication. Leaders with the highest RMP scores are characterized by openness regarding the state of the organization even in times of uncertainty, and a willingness to acknowledge that emotional tension is a normal reaction. This attitude reduces the subjective sense of isolation and unpredictability — key triggers of cognitive threat appraisal (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). In practical terms, this can be implemented through weekly team updates of 10–15 minutes, where the manager shares available information about the organization's situation and explicitly normalizes stress as a collective experience rather than an individual weakness.

Team-level psychological well-being monitoring. 63.9% of the sample falls below the WHO-5 clinical threshold of 50 points, indicating systemic rather than individual impairment. HR departments are recommended to implement quarterly WHO-5 screening at the team level — the instrument consists of only 5 questions and takes under two minutes to complete. A team average score below 50 points should trigger a structured HR response: a confidential conversation with the manager, a review of workload distribution, and, where necessary, referral to psychological support services. A score below 35 points — as seen in Teams 1, 2, 3, 6, and 7 in this study — should be treated as a critical signal requiring immediate intervention.

Developing relational leadership skills. Since a manager's RMP score correlates with team burnout at $r = -0.873$, investment in relational leadership training represents one of the highest-return interventions available to HR departments. It is recommended to implement quarterly 4-hour workshops focused on three core competency areas directly supported by the study's findings: (1) active listening and emotional validation — the ability to recognize and

name emotional states without minimizing them, which is foundational to psychological safety; (2) proactive workload monitoring and redistribution — identifying overload signals before crisis point, as measured by RMP item 6 in this study; and (3) transparent communication under uncertainty — structuring team updates in a way that reduces ambiguity without overpromising. Workshops should include role-play scenarios based on real wartime stressors — mobilization risk, remote work isolation, and task continuity under disruption — to ensure relevance to the operational context.

4.3 Study Limitations

The study results should be interpreted with several limitations in mind. First, the relatively small number of teams (n = 10) limits the statistical power of the team analysis: although the correlations identified are strong, they need to be confirmed in larger samples. Second, the cross-sectional design does not allow for the establishment of causal relationships—in particular, it cannot be ruled out that team leaders with a priori lower burnout have more resources to practice RMP. Third, the gender imbalance in the sample (79.5% men) limits generalizability to more balanced teams. Finally, the author's RMP scale requires further psychometric validation on independent samples.

Promising areas for further research include: a longitudinal design to examine the causal relationships between RMP and burnout over time; expanding the sample to include teams from different industries and regions; analyzing the moderating effect of mobilization on burnout; and a comparative study of remote and in-office teams regarding the availability of managerial support.

4.4 General Conclusion

The study confirmed that relationship management techniques are a significant, practically applicable factor in psychological well-being and burnout prevention within IT teams operating in the context of a protracted armed conflict. In a situation where external resources are limited or unavailable, the quality of the relationship with the immediate supervisor remains one of the few resources within the organization's control—and upon which the mental health of entire teams directly depends.

It is particularly important that the effect of management practices proved to be significantly stronger than the effect of combat stress. This means that even under conditions that cannot be changed—shelling, mobilization uncertainty, and the inability to plan for the future—a competent and attentive manager is capable of significantly reducing their team's

burnout and supporting their well-being. This is both an encouraging and a responsible conclusion for Ukrainian IT management in wartime conditions.

REFERENCES

1. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115
2. Cavanaugh, M. A., Boswell, W. R., Roehling, M. V., & Boudreau, J. W. (2000). An empirical examination of self-reported work stress among U.S. managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(1), 65–74. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.1.65
3. Pandey, A., Maheshwari, M., & Malik, N. (2025). A systematic literature review on employee well-being. Acta Psychologica, 258, 105080. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105080
4. Mind Garden. (2024). MBI manual (4th ed.). Mind Garden, Inc. Retrieved from https://www.mindgarden.com/117-maslach-burnout-inventory
5. Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 24(4), 385–396. https://doi.org/10.2307/2136404
6. Goleman, D. (2002). Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence. Harvard Business School Press.
7. Graen, G. B., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of LMX theory. The Leadership Quarterly, 6(2), 219–247.
8. Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. American Psychologist, 44(3), 513–524.
9. Kottke, J. L., & Sharafinski, C. E. (1988). Measuring perceived supervisory and organizational support. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 48(4), 1075–1079.
10. Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. Springer.
11. Lopatina, H., Tsybuliak, N., Popova, A., Suchikova, Y., & Shevchenko, L. (2025). Progressive intensification of burnout among academic staff during the war. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 12, article 219. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-06322-5
12. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (1997). The truth about burnout. Jossey-Bass.
13. Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. Annual Review of Psychology, 52(1), 397–422.

14. Montano, D., Reeske, A., Franke, F., & Hüffmeier, J. (2017). Leadership, followers' mental health and job performance: A comprehensive meta-analytic investigation. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 38(3), 327–350. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2124
15. Opatska, V., Dolan, S., & Connelly, S. (2023). Business crisis management in wartime: Insights from Ukraine. Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, 31(4), 712–726. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12513
16. Petrilli, S., Giunchi, M., & Vonthron, A.-M. (2024). Leader–member exchange (LMX) and adjustment to the work mode as protective factors to counteract exhaustion and turnover intention. Sustainability, 16(23), 10254. https://doi.org/10.3390/su162310254
17. Poetz, L., & Volmer, J. (2022). A diary study on the moderating role of LMX on the relationship between job characteristics, job satisfaction, and emotional exhaustion. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 812103. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.812103
18. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. Annual Review of Psychology, 52(1), 141–166.
19. Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1996). MBI-General Survey. In C. Maslach, S. E. Jackson, & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), MBI manual (3rd ed.). Consulting Psychologists Press.
20. Thomas, C. H., & Lankau, M. J. (2009). Preventing burnout: The effects of LMX and mentoring on socialization, role stress, and burnout. Human Resource Management, 48(3), 417–432.
21. Topp, C. W., Østergaard, S. D., Søndergaard, S., & Bech, P. (2015). The WHO-5 Well-Being Index: A systematic review of the literature. Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, 84(3), 167–176.
22. Tsybuliak, N., Suchikova, Y., Shevchenko, L., Popova, A., Kovachev, S., & Hurenko, O. (2023). Burnout dynamic among Ukrainian academic staff during the war. Scientific Reports, 13, 17975. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-023-45229-6
23. Tummers, L. G., & Bakker, A. B. (2021). Leadership and job demands-resources theory: A systematic review. Frontiers in Psychology, 12, 722080. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.722080
24. Warr, P. (1987). Work, unemployment, and mental health. Oxford University Press.
25. Yukl, G. (2013). Leadership in organizations (8th ed.). Pearson.

APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE MANAGER

Дослідження управлінських практик та добробуту в IT-командах

21 питання · ~12–15 хвилин

Шановний/-а керівнику, ця анкета є частиною магістерського дослідження American University Kyiv. Участь добровільна та анонімна. Натискаючи «Далі», ви підтверджуєте інформовану згоду на участь.

БЛОК А. Загальна інформація

Будь ласка, заповніть поля нижче.

A1. Team ID: _____ (ідентифікатор команди, наданий HR)

A2. Ваш вік: ○ До 25 років ○ 25–34 роки ○ 35–44 роки ○ 45–54 роки ○ 55 і старше

A3. Ваша стать: ○ Жіноча ○ Чоловіча ○ Не бажаю вказувати

A4. Ваш стаж на керівній посаді (у будь-яких компаніях): ○ До 1 року ○ 1–3 роки ○ 3–5 років ○ 5–10 років ○ Понад 10 років

A5-A7. Вплив воєнної ситуації

Оцініть загальний вплив воєнної ситуації на ваше особисте та робоче життя.

Питання	**1** Зовсім не відчуваю тиску	**2** Відчуваю незначний тиск	**3** Помірний тиск	**4** Значний тиск	**5** Відчуваю дуже сильний постійний тиск
A5. Наскільки сильно ви особисто відчуваєте тиск від війни прямо зараз? *(Враховуйте всі аспекти: безпеку, мобілізацію, фінанси, близьких)*	○	○	○	○	○
Питання	**1** Зовсім не ускладнює	**2** Мало впливає	**3** Помірно	**4** Суттєво	**5** Дуже сильно
A6. Наскільки воєнна ситуація ускладнює вашу здатність зосередитися на роботі?	○	○	○	○	○
Питання	**1** Ніколи	**2** Мало	**3** Помірно	**4** Суттєво	**5** Постійно
A7. Як часто протягом останнього місяця ви відчували тривогу через воєнну ситуацію?	○	○	○	○	○

БЛОК Б. Ваші практики управління командою

Оцініть, як часто ви застосовуєте кожну з практик у роботі з командою. Шкала: 1 = Ніколи, 2 = Рідко, 3 = Іноді, 4 = Часто, 5 = Завжди / Майже завжди.

Практика	**1** Ніколи	**2** Рідко	**3** Іноді	**4** Часто	**5** Завжди
1. Я регулярно проводжу індивідуальні зустрічі (one-on-one) хоча б один раз на два тижні з кожним членом команди.	○	○	○	○	○
2. Під час зустрічей я приділяю час не лише робочим завданням, але й особистому стану співробітника.	○	○	○	○	○
3. Я відкрито визнаю, що емоційна напруга є природною реакцією на надзвичайні обставини.	○	○	○	○	○
4. Я надаю членам команди гнучкість у розпорядку дня в разі особистих або безпекових обставин.	○	○	○	○	○
5. Я регулярно та відкрито інформую команду про стан організації, навіть коли ситуація невизначена.	○	○	○	○	○
6. Я проактивно моніторю ознаки перевантаження і перерозподіляю завдання до виникнення кризи.	○	○	○	○	○

БЛОК В. Якість відносин із вашою командою (LMX-7)

Оцініть, наскільки ви погоджуєтесь із кожним твердженням щодо вашої команди В ЦІЛОМУ. Шкала: 1 = Зовсім не згоден/на, 2 = Скоріше не згоден/на, 3 = Нейтрально, 4 = Скоріше згоден/на, 5 = Повністю згоден/на.

Важливо: оцінюйте команду загалом, а не окремих співробітників.

Твердження	**1** Зовсім не згоден/на	**2** Скоріше не згоден/на	**3** Нейтрально	**4** Скоріше згоден/на	**5** Повністю згоден/на
1. Я знаю, наскільки мої підлеглі задоволені своєю роботою в команді.	○	○	○	○	○
2. Я розумію робочі проблеми та потреби кожного члена своєї команди.	○	○	○	○	○
3. Я усвідомлюю потенціал кожного члена своєї команди.	○	○	○	○	○

4. Я готовий/а підтримати кожного підлеглого в разі труднощів, навіть за власний рахунок.	○	○	○	○	○
5. Я довіряю своїй команді настільки, що члени команди можуть представляти її в моїй відсутності.	○	○	○	○	○
6. Я готовий/а використати свій вплив, щоб допомогти членам команди вирішити робочі проблеми.	○	○	○	○	○
7. Загалом я оцінюю відносини зі своєю командою як дуже ефективні.	○	○	○	○	○

БЛОК Г. Відкрите питання (необов'язково)

Г1. Що, на вашу думку, найбільше допомагає або заважає підтримувати добробут вашої команди в нинішніх умовах?

APPENDIX B. EMPLOYEE SURVEY

Дослідження психологічного добробуту та управлінських практик в IT-командах

31 питання · ~15 хвилин

Шановний/-а колего, ця анкета є частиною магістерського дослідження American University Kyiv. Участь добровільна та анонімна. Натискаючи «Далі», ви підтверджуєте інформовану згоду на участь.

БЛОК А. Загальна інформація

Будь ласка, заповніть поля нижче.

A1. Team ID: _____ (ідентифікатор, наданий вашим керівником або HR)

A2. Ваш вік: ○ До 25 років ○ 25–34 роки ○ 35–44 роки ○ 45–54 роки ○ 55 і старше

A3. Ваша стать: ○ Жіноча ○ Чоловіча ○ Не бажаю вказувати

A4. Ваш стаж роботи в поточній компанії: ○ До 6 місяців ○ 6 міс. – 1 рік ○ 1–3 роки ○ 3–5 років ○ Понад 5 років

A5-A7. Вплив воєнної ситуації

Оцініть загальний вплив воєнної ситуації на ваше особисте та робоче життя.

Питання	**1** Зовсім не відчуваю тиску	**2** Відчуваю незначний тиск	**3** Помірний тиск	**4** Значний тиск	**5** Відчуваю дуже сильний постійний тиск
A5. Наскільки сильно ви особисто відчуваєте тиск від війни прямо зараз? (Враховуйте всі аспекти: безпеку, мобілізацію, фінанси, близьких)	○	○	○	○	○
Питання	**1** Зовсім не ускладнює	**2** Мало впливає	**3** Помірно	**4** Суттєво	**5** Дуже сильно
A6. Наскільки воєнна ситуація ускладнює вашу здатність зосередитися на роботі?	○	○	○	○	○
Питання	**1** Ніколи	**2** Мало	**3** Помірно	**4** Суттєво	**5** Постійно
A7. Як часто протягом останнього місяця ви відчували тривогу через воєнну ситуацію?	○	○	○	○	○

БЛОК Б. Відчуття виснаження (MBI-GS)

Оцініть, як часто ви переживаєте кожен із наведених станів. Шкала: 0 = Ніколи, 1 = Дуже рідко, 2 = Рідко, 3 = Іноді, 4 = Часто, 5 = Дуже часто, 6 = Щодня.

Твердження	**0** Ніколи	1 Дуже рідко	**2** Рідко	**3** Іноді	**4** Часто	**5** Дуже часто	**6** Щодня
1. Я відчуваю себе емоційно виснаженим/ою від своєї роботи.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
2. В кінці робочого дня я відчуваю себе спустошеним/ою.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
3. Я відчуваю втому, коли прокидаюся вранці й думаю про черговий робочий день.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
4. Щоденна робота стомлює мене.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
5. Я відчуваю, що вигораю від своєї роботи.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

БЛОК В. Загальний добробут (WHO-5)

Оцініть, як часто ПРОТЯГОМ ОСТАННІХ 2 ТИЖНІВ ви переживали кожен зі станів. Шкала: 0 = Жодного разу, 1 = Рідко, 2 = Менше половини часу, 3 = Більше половини часу, 4 = Майже весь час, 5 = Весь час.

Твердження	**0** Жодного разу	**1** Рідко	**2** Менше пол. часу	**3** Більше пол. часу	**4** Майже завжди	**5** Весь час
1. Я відчував/ла себе бадьорим/ою та у гарному настрої.	○	○	○	○	○	○
2. Я відчував/ла себе спокійним/ою та розслабленим/ою.	○	○	○	○	○	○
3. Я відчував/ла себе активним/ою та енергійним/ою.	○	○	○	○	○	○
4. Я прокидався/лась відпочившим/ою та свіжим/ою.	○	○	○	○	○	○
5. Моє повсякденне життя наповнене цікавими подіями.	○	○	○	○	○	○

БЛОК Г. Сприйнятий стрес (PSS-4)

Оцініть, як часто ПРОТЯГОМ МИНУЛОГО МІСЯЦЯ ви переживали відповідне. Шкала: 0 = Ніколи, 1 = Майже ніколи, 2 = Іноді, 3 = Часто, 4 = Дуже часто. Пункти (R) зараховуються у зворотному порядку.

Запитання	**0** Ніколи	**1** Майже ніколи	**2** Іноді	**3** Часто	**4** Дуже часто
1. Як часто ви відчували, що не контролюєте важливі речі у своєму житті?	○	○	○	○	○
2. Як часто ви відчували труднощі й думали, що не зможете з ними впоратися?	○	○	○	○	○
3. Як часто ви відчували впевненість у своїй здатності вирішувати проблеми?	○	○	○	○	○
4. Як часто ви відчували, що справи йдуть так, як ви хочете?	○	○	○	○	○

БЛОК Д. Якість відносин із вашим керівником (LMX-7)

Оцініть, наскільки ви погоджуєтесь із кожним твердженням щодо ВАШОГО БЕЗПОСЕРЕДНЬОГО КЕРІВНИКА. Шкала: 1 = Зовсім не згоден/на, 2 = Скоріше не згоден/на, 3 = Нейтрально, 4 = Скоріше згоден/на, 5 = Повністю згоден/на.

Твердження	**1** Зовсім не згоден/на	**2** Скоріше не згоден/на	**3** Нейтрально	**4** Скоріше згоден/на	**5** Повністю згоден/на
1. Я знаю, наскільки мій/моя керівник/ця задоволений/а моєю роботою — він/вона дає мені це зрозуміти.	○	○	○	○	○
2. Мій/Моя керівник/ця розуміє мої робочі проблеми та потреби.	○	○	○	○	○
3. Мій/Моя керівник/ця усвідомлює мій потенціал.	○	○	○	○	○
4. Незалежно від формальних повноважень, мій/моя керівник/ця використав/ла б свій вплив, щоб мені допомогти.	○	○	○	○	○
5. Мій/Моя керівник/ця підтримав/ла б мене в разі труднощів, навіть за власний рахунок.	○	○	○	○	○

6. Я маю достатньо довіри до свого/своєї керівника/ці, щоб захищати його/її рішення за його/її відсутності.	○	○	○	○	○
7. Відносини з моїм/моєю керівником/цею є дуже ефективними.	○	○	○	○	○

БЛОК Е. Підтримка від вашого керівника (SPS-3)

Оцініть, наскільки ви погоджуєтесь із кожним твердженням. Шкала: 1 = Зовсім не згоден/на, 2 = Скоріше не згоден/на, 3 = Нейтрально, 4 = Скоріше згоден/на, 5 = Повністю згоден/на.

Твердження	**1** Зовсім не згоден/на	**2** Скоріше не згоден/на	**3** Нейтрально	**4** Скоріше згоден/на	**5** Повністю згоден/на
1. Мій/Моя керівник/ця цінує мій внесок у роботу команди.	○	○	○	○	○
2. Мій/Моя керівник/ця виявляє щиру турботу про моє благополуччя.	○	○	○	○	○
3. Якщо у мене виникнуть труднощі, мій/моя керівник/ця допоможе їх вирішити.	○	○	○	○	○

Дякуємо за участь!

Ваші відповіді зберігаються анонімно та використовуватимуться виключно в наукових цілях.