

Голубев Станіслав¹, к.е.н.,
доцент кафедри психології і соціології

Holubiev Stanislav¹, Candidate of Economics, Associate Professor of
the Department of Psychology and Sociology,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4642-8876>

Білоконенко Ганна¹, к.е.н.,
доцент кафедри психології і соціології

Bilokonenko Hanna¹, Candidate of Economics, Associate Professor of
the Department of Psychology and Sociology,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7858-1461>

¹Харківський національний економічний
університет імені Семена Кузнеця, Україна

¹Simon Kuznets Kharkiv National University of Economics,
Ukraine

РОЗВИТОК СОЦІАЛЬНО-ПСИХОЛОГІЧНОГО КЛІМАТУ КОЛЕКТИВУ В КРИЗОВИХ УМОВАХ ТА ПІД ЧАС ВОЄННОГО СТАНУ

BUILDING SOCIAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL (WORKPLACE) CLIMATE DURING WAR-INDUCED CRISIS

Голубев С., Білоконенко Г. Розвиток соціально-психологічного клімату колективу в умовах кризи та під час воєнного стану. *Український журнал прикладної економіки та техніки*. 2026. Том 11. № 3. С. 112 – 119.

Holubiev S., Bilokonenko H. Building social and psychological (workplace) climate during war-induced crisis. *Ukrainian Journal of Applied Economics and Technology*. 2026. Volume 11. № 3, pp. 112 – 119.

The relationship between the socio-psychological climate and organizational effectiveness and team cohesion has been extensively studied for numerous years. However, during times of crisis and armed conflict, the role of the socio-psychological climate changes. It transforms from being a tool for motivating and strengthening team loyalty into a guarantee of the team's (or organization's) survival. The purpose of this study is to identify approaches to transforming the role of the socio-psychological climate under martial law. The research materials include works by domestic and foreign scholars on the patterns of building and developing the socio-psychological climate within organizations, collectives, and teams, as well as the transformation of its role in management practice. The main methods used in the work are analysis and synthesis, generalization and categorization, and comparison. This research paper explores the essence of socio-psychological climate and summarizes and analyzes approaches to understanding it. It identifies the key factors influencing the socio-psychological climate and the characteristics of its various dimensions. Researchers have investigated the transformation of the socio-psychological climate role (considering the key consequences and challenges of martial law), establishing key indicators of a supportive socio-psychological climate in wartime. Future studies should focus on developing diagnostic tools and refining and further developing methodological and practical guidance for establishing psychosocial safety and an innovative behavioral environment during wartime and the post-war period. Preferably, this will be based on the principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion, and will use effective psychological support tools and ecological management practices.

Keywords: workplace climate, wartime, supportive workplace climate, toxic workplace climate, cohesion.

Зв'язок між соціально-психологічним кліматом та організаційною ефективністю і згуртованістю колективу досліджується вже давно. Однак у кризові часи та під час війни змінюється роль соціально-психологічного клімату. Він перетворюється з інструменту мотивації та зміцнення лояльності колективу на запоруку його виживання (або організації). Метою дослідження є розкриття концептуальних підходів до трансформації ролі соціально-психологічного клімату колективів в кризових умовах та під час воєнного стану. Матеріали і методи. Матеріалами дослідження є праці вітчизняних та зарубіжних авторів щодо формування і розвитку соціально-психологічного клімату колективів/команд, а також трансформації його ролі в практиці менеджменту. Основними методами, що використовувалися в роботі, є методи аналізу та синтезу, узагальнення та категоризації, а також метод порівняння. Результати. У науковій статті розкрито сутність соціально-психологічного клімату, узагальнено та проаналізовано підходи до його розуміння. Визначено ключові фактори, що впливають на соціально-психологічний клімат, та ознаки різних рівнів його розвитку. Проаналізовано ключові наслідки та проблеми воєнного стану й визначено вплив цих явищ на функціонування підприємства, персонал і соціально-психологічний клімат колективу. Проаналізовано трансформацію ролі соціально-психологічного клімату в колективі під час воєнних дій та запропоновано окремі заходи щодо його підтримки й поліпшення. Перспективи. У подальших наукових дослідженнях пропонується зосередити увагу на розробці діагностичного інструментарію, а також на вдосконаленні та подальшому розвитку методичного забезпечення й практичних рекомендацій щодо створення сприятливого психосоціального клімату та інноваційної поведінки в умовах воєнного часу на засадах концепції різноманітності, справедливості та інклюзії із застосуванням ефективних засобів психологічного супроводу та екологічних управлінських практик.

Ключові слова: соціально-психологічний клімат (СПК), воєнний стан, сприятливий СПК, токсичний СПК, згуртованість.

Statement of the problem

During times of major crisis – initially such as a pandemic and now war-induced stress – employees' basic psychological sense of security is completely shattered. Under these circumstances, a supportive team climate is no longer merely a bonus or a tool for motivating and enhancing team cohesion and loyalty; it becomes the key factor determining the organization's survival. Organizational resilience under war-induced stress (Sobolieva [39], Morozova, Trimpop, Chernobrovkin [25]) when "Ukrainian companies that not only survived under extremely difficult conditions but also remained competitive and increased their profits" is based on enhancing adaptability and flexibility, fostering innovation, promoting social responsibility, and supporting personnel, and directly determined by the quality of the workplace climate, which transforms an organization from a fragile structure into an adaptive, supportive system. When an organization builds a strategically supportive and psychologically safe workplace climate, it actively mitigates employee burnout and fosters collective adaptive capacity. Crisis conditions (Stepanenko, Zlobina, Golovakha, Dembitskyi, Naidionova [40]) accelerate transformation, as wartime has become a catalyst for profound organizational change, pushing office management toward more flexible, hybrid, and tech-driven models (Liashenko, Plotnichenko [23], Opatska, Johansen, Gordon [28], Mialkovska, Pimenova, Savchuk, Moklytsia, Stasiuk, Shkarlatiuk [24]).

Considering the nature of these crises (Stepanenko, Zlobina, Golovakha, Dembitskyi, Naidionova [40]), we should clearly understand how different social norms, management practices, and the working atmosphere can be. We should be under these circumstances (Barnes, Newton [3]), taking into account the objectives, priorities, and capabilities of specific organizations, collectives, and teams.

Numerous studies in both domestic and international psychological science have been devoted to the topic – the SPC of organizations, collectives, and teams. Studies conducted over the last five years demonstrate:

1) a clear focus among Ukrainian researchers' studies on: socio-psychological peculiarities of establishing SPC within an organization during a crisis (Klychkovskiy [18]); shaping the psychological climate as a guarantee of the team's stress resilience during wartime (Kostyshyn, Yakovets [20]); improving methods of supporting the



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0

© Holubiev Stanislav, Bilokonenko Hanna, 2026

enterprises/organisations activities under martial law (Murovana [26]); socio-psychological aspects of ensuring staff safety during wartime (Turyansky, Svidruk, Hnylianska [41]);

2) meanwhile, foreign researchers are focusing their attention on:

“numerous future research opportunities in organizational climate, which have a lot of potential for resolving conflicting results and reducing the harmful effects of poor climate in organizations. Such as: 1) cross-country and cross-industry study of organizational climate; 2) combining theories related to organizational climate [36]; 3) exploring the unexplored outcomes that earlier have received less attention; 4) exploring the unexplored dimension (via people-oriented climate, rule-oriented climate, result-oriented climate, and innovation-oriented climate); 5) exploring the combined effect of multiple dimension; 6) operationalizing the organizational climate variables (in terms of people, rule, goal, and innovation); 7) role of organizational leaders in developing conducive organizational climate (Hussainy [12]);

role of “Supportive organizational climate: a moderated mediation model of workplace bullying and employee well-being” (Hayat, Afshari [10]), measuring “Effects of supportive work environment on employee retention” (Yusliza, Noor Faezah, Ali, Mohamad Noor, Ramayah, Tanveer, Fawehinmi [49]), and “impact of Organisational Climate on Employee Well-Being and Healthy Relationships at Work” (Janiukštis, Kovaitė, Butvilas, Šumakaris [14]; Ruzungunde, Chinyamurindi, Marange [34]; Viitala, Tanskanen, Sääntti [42]), taking into account “organisational climate component” (Rožman, Štrukelj [32]), the program aiming at improving the workplace climate in corporations (Alan, Corekcioglu, Sutter [1]) taking into account capacity of different social and psychological resources to adaptation (Hobfoll [11];

“antecedents, outcomes, and moderators of diversity climate in the workplace” (Nault, Sabat, He, Zhou, Jaramillo, Liu [27]), “climate motivation explores drivers behind organizational diversity climates”, and “gaps and opportunities in organizational diversity climate research” (because of various forms of bias in measurement) (Hatter, Avery, McKay [9]);

studying “effect of organizational innovation climate on employee innovative behavior” (You, Hu, Li, Wang, Xu [48]) via “role of psychological climate factors in stimulating creativity through workplace innovation in the service sector” (Salim, Khorsheed [35]),

“how psychosocial safety climate influences health, safety and performance of workers” (Amoadu, Ansah Sarfo [2], Dong, Li, Hernan [5]).

Thus, despite the significant volume of studies oriented toward evaluating and improving the workplace climate, they have only partially focused on the dual nature of SPC and on differentiating its various stages of development across multiple dimensions.

The purpose of the research

The purpose of the study is to identify conceptual approaches to transforming the role of the SPC within organizations, collectives, and teams during war-induced crisis. It also aims to develop a model of a supportive workplace climate oriented toward organizational resilience and psychosocial support, taking into account the dual nature of the SPC and considering the objectives, priorities, and capabilities of specific organizations, collectives, and teams.

Presentation of the main research material

First, we need to clarify the concept of the SPC. Despite considerable research and experience in this area [6, 9, 12, 14-22, 27, 33, 38, 41, 43, 44, 48, 50, and more], there is no single universally accepted definition of the SPC. In social sciences, similar terms are frequently used: “socio-psychological climate,” “moral-psychological climate,” “psychological climate,” and “psychological atmosphere of a group.” SPC is the most commonly used term. It depends on how the subject is understood and defined. There are serious disagreements on this, which are reflected, in particular, in the still insufficiently clear distinction between the concepts of “psychological climate” and “socio-psychological climate.” It sometimes happens that the scope of the first concept is extended to encompass that of the second. But sometimes, the first concept replaces the second.

Through the analogy between socio-psychological phenomena and climate, the significance of group effects is first revealed as a condition of interpersonal interaction within a collective, which determines the reciprocal influence of interpersonal relations on people’s joint practical activities.

Secondly, the SPC is characterized as a state of interpersonal relations, implying their capacity for change. The dynamics of change in SPC are determined, first, by external factors (material, technical, organizational, and managerial conditions of people’s practical activities) and, second, by the perception and understanding of interpersonal relationships as a system of interactions.

The structure of the SPC is determined by the system of relationships that have developed within a group among its members and can be characterized by elements that synthesize social and interpersonal relationships.

One of the criteria that can be used as the basis for such a classification – and, consequently, for structuring the psychological climate – is the attitude of team members towards the objects of the surrounding world. According to this criterion, four structural elements of the psychological climate can be identified, reflecting the attitudes of team members: 1) toward the common task; 2) toward one another; 3) toward the world as a whole; and 4) toward themselves. It should be noted, however, that the first two groups are primary – that is, the most revealing and direct manifestations of the psychological climate. The next two groups are secondary and more indirect, as they are determined not only by the activities of a specific team but also by other factors (social and personal).

Consequently, there are several approaches to understanding this concept.

The first approach [15] considers the SPC as a state of collective consciousness (with the climate being defined as employees’ attitudes towards the team). SPC is perceived as a comprehensive appraisal of employees’ dedication to the team, considering loyalty, acceptance of group norms and objectives, interpersonal relationships within the team, working conditions, and motivational strategies. The advantage of this approach is that it simplifies the diagnostic procedure by measuring individual indicators for each employee. However, this provides an indirect assessment of the team’s effectiveness through individual employee evaluations.

The second approach [43] focuses on the emotional and psychological atmosphere within the group, which can be task-oriented (the mind’s focus on the activity itself) and emotional or tonal (a sense of satisfaction with the activity and its outcomes). The substantive characterization of the psychological climate is generally linked to an individual’s sense of well-being within the group (mood, satisfaction, psychological comfort). It is extended to attitudes towards work and other members of the group, to interpersonal relationships, and to general relationships. This approach complicated the diagnostic process by requiring accounting for a variable factor such as “mood,” but it expanded the range of tools available for developing SPC.

In accordance with the third approach [16], there is a feature of relationships among individuals who are in close contact with one another. Here, SPC is the result of people’s joint activities and their interpersonal relationships. These are

reflected in group effects such as mood and collective opinion, as well as in the individual well-being of group members. These effects are reflected in work-related relationships and in the team's efforts to accomplish shared tasks. This methodology allows for the evaluation of SPC based on interpersonal relationships and performance outcomes. This approach is more effective in work collectives that focus on specific, measurable outcomes. However, the multifaceted nature of SPC and the uncertainty about the impact of individual components hindered the development of effective methods to improve SPC.

The fourth approach [21] evaluates the degree of team cohesion, as demonstrated by the social and psychological compatibility of group members, their solidarity and moral-psychological unity, and the existence of common beliefs, goals, and traditions (i.e., the team climate, a synonym for team cohesion). This approach enables the assessment of the SPC's development status based on the team's level of development. Various indicators of cohesion, goal unity, and norms, among others, are used for this purpose. Still, the key drawback is that such a team may be focused not on achieving results, but on destructive activities. Thus, for work teams, this approach should be used in conjunction with an assessment of the team's performance.

The main structural elements of the psychological climate can also be identified based on another criterion: the extent to which psychological, social, and sociopsychological manifestations are represented within it.

The psychological aspect is reflected in the intellectual, emotional, and volitional states and characteristics of the collectives within organizational institutions. Thus, it can be said that some collectives are characterized by an atmosphere of intellectual activity and creative exploration, purposefulness and optimism, whilst others are characterized by intellectual and creative inertia, a lack of new approaches to organizing a particular activity, and a lack of volitional actions and the desire to overcome the difficulties that arise when achieving the goals set for the team.

The social aspect reflects the extent to which social demands are manifested, which are the demands that society makes at a certain stage of its development. Accordingly, the social climate can be divided into political, moral, business, aesthetic, and other categories. Within each of these, the psychological aspect may have its own specific meaning.

The socio-psychological aspect is reflected in the integrative indicators of group psychology, which are significant for maintaining the group's integrity and functioning as a relatively autonomous association. These include such characteristics of the collective as unity, cohesion, the degree of mutual support, the closeness of its members, the similarity of their opinions, assessments, and attitudes, and their level of coordination.

When discussing the nature and content of the SPC, we will always keep in mind that it is a subjective construct—that which is reflected—and that it is one of the psychological phenomena that emerges in collectives and groups.

The objective reality reflected in the psychological climate of a collective is its actual life activity – the specific types of activity carried out by its members, how they interact with one another, and the organizational culture.

Scientists note the dual nature of the collective SPC. The dual nature of the SPC is a combination of the objective conditions of the collective's life and the subjective perception of these conditions by each of its members. This phenomenon is shaped by both the real environment and people's emotional state. On the one hand, it is a kind of subjective reflection in the group consciousness of the entire set of elements of the social situation and the entire environment. On the other hand, arising from the direct and indirect influence of objective and subjective factors on group consciousness, the SPC acquires relative independence, becomes an objective characteristic of the collective, and begins to influence collective activity and individuals in reverse [15, 16, 43]. These two aspects are closely intertwined: comfortable objective conditions help to build a positive subjective perception, and conversely, a supportive psychological atmosphere makes it easier to cope with objective difficulties. Thus, the SPC is an integral characteristic of relationships, comfort within the collective, and acceptance of group norms, values, and goals.

Within different groups, SPC may vary in both content and orientation; accordingly, three main types are distinguished: those with positive, negative, and neutral orientations. Each of the above types of climate has characteristic features – both subjective (internal) and objective (external) in nature. Even neutral SPC is influenced by both objective factors (such as the type of organization) and subjective factors (such as the assessment of others' behavior). But it doesn't take into account the priorities for development (of the organization, collective, or the team) implemented in organizational climate (via relevant social norms, management/leadership practices, working atmosphere) (Hussainy [12]): people-oriented organizational climate, rule-oriented organizational climate, goal-oriented organizational climate, innovation-oriented organizational climate, as well as some dimensions of organisational climate [4]: with strong evidence (safety climate, innovation climate, learning climate, ethical climate, inclusion climate), with emerging evidence (empowerment climate, leadership climate, risk climate, service climate), with weak evidence (trust climate, team incivility climate, autonomy-organisational health climate, implementation climate, hospitality climate, affective team climate, agency climate, motivational climate, competitive work climate).

A people-oriented workplace climate “with the primary goal of appreciating and respecting people” (Skvarciany, Iljins, Gaile-Sarkane [38]). Prioritizes employees' well-being and development, fostering a supportive and collaborative work environment. It emphasizes open communication, teamwork, trust, recognition, and a strong sense of belonging, where individuals' needs and contributions are valued (Shahzad, Luqman, Khan, Shabbir [37]). It serves as a social norm that translates empathetic leadership into tangible, everyday organizational practices. “To develop this superior subordinate connection is critical and helps to develop a feeling among employees that they are an important part of the team. Employees should be rewarded at the workplace for their contributions, which are essential to the growth of innovative ideas. Likewise, establishing a work-life balance culture will help to create a positive atmosphere at the workplace. Today's employees prefer a flexible work schedule. To build a people-oriented organizational atmosphere, it is also necessary to invest in employees' growth and success” (Hussainy [12]).

A rule-oriented organizational climate (which is based on “the organization's defined rules, regulations, and processes” (Rudd & Mills [33]), prioritizes structure, strict policy adherence, and established norms (Roswag, Häusser, Hubert, Etgen, Mojzisch [31]) to ensure predictability, safety, and operational order. “People will not be permitted to perform anything unless clear guidelines have been established. This attempts to ensure that all members of the organization are safe. The rule-oriented climate of an organization is based on tradition and a robust set of norms that cannot be readily modified, and employees are expected to follow procedures, rules, and regulations. And pre-determined scenarios are frequently planned to use established processes and procedures” (Hussainy [12]).

A goal-oriented organizational climate (in which “it is expected from the employees to reach the specific organizational goals (that can be set on daily, weekly or monthly bases) in the specific time period to satisfy the organizational standards and rules” (Komenić, Bazdan, Agušaj [19]) prioritizes the pursuit of specific objectives, continuous improvement, and high performance. This requires a results-driven culture, performance-based norms, and catalytic leadership practices that transform broad objectives into actionable, day-to-day behaviors. “This approach is valuable because it provides insight into how to enhance individual-level performance:

1) leaders who prioritize employee development implement various management practices to convey their commitment to learning;

2) leaders who prioritize the demonstration of ability conform to a tournament model of career progression in which employees are encouraged to engage in ongoing implicit competitions with one another to “win” extrinsic rewards;

3) leaders who prioritize the avoidance of failure focus on events that challenge their appearance of competence, such as group member mistakes, errors, and subpar performance. (Dragoni [6])

An innovation-oriented organizational climate is a safe, supportive environment with a shared workplace atmosphere where policies, practices, and leadership actively encourage employees to generate, develop, promote, and implement new ideas (Kim, Wang, Schuh, Liu [17]) based on “psychological safety, intrinsic motivation, and innovative work behavior” (Xu, Wang Suntrayuth [47]). Organizations should develop an entrepreneurial mindset to foster an environment of innovation and creativity. Isaksen and Ekvall [13] found that “the organizational environmental characteristics play a critical influence in stimulating the workforce to think creatively and augment organizational performance by having radical product innovations”.

Achieving the goal of fostering a positive, supportive SPC within the workforce is a long-term process of mutual understanding that employees strive for and management seeks to cultivate among staff. The process of achieving the ultimate goal consists of distinct stages, i.e., goals and tasks at each sub-stage. The main parameters of a supportive SPC are [16]:

1) duration (characterized by the stability of professional and psychological motives, their consistency throughout the entire period of professional training, and chronological sequence);

2) realism (the individual's constant assessment of their perceptions of the profession in terms of the fulfillment of expectations regarding it; the individual's ability to distinguish between reality and fantasy in their perceptions of professional activity; to realistically assess themselves as a person and their professional knowledge and capabilities);

3) differentiation (the ability to extract from traditional general psychological training the information necessary to solve specific tasks);

4) comprehensiveness (a synthesized approach to integrated structures, encompassing the full range of accumulated knowledge: methodological, procedural and technological, as well as professional and psychological, which ensures the effective resolution of operational, educational and developmental tasks);

5) activity (persistent work moving from what has been acquired towards what has not yet been achieved);

6) coherence (the degree to which all the employee's motives for activity are interconnected);

7) dynamism (a characteristic feature is the process of formation and development from a hypothetical initial level (interest in psychology) to a hypothetical state of maturity (professional maturity);

8) optimism (the degree of confidence in achieving professional goals and in oneself).

Thus, a supportive SPC would be characterized by certain subjective features that reveal its inner essence: presence of a positive outlook for the group and each of its members; mutual trust and high mutual accountability within the group; constructive criticism; freedom to express one's own opinion; absence of pressure from managers on subordinates; sufficient awareness among employees of the organisation's goals and objectives; satisfaction with work and belonging to the group; taking responsibility for the state of affairs within the group (Orban-Lembrich); sense of pride in the team's honour and a desire to make a meaningful contribution to its further development; absence of pressure from managers on subordinates and granting them the right to make decisions important to the team; a manager's attentiveness and, at the same time, high standards in their approach towards each member of the team; a team environment that fosters active professional and creative engagement, self-fulfilment, self-assertion and self-development for every employee.

Building a supportive SPC depends primarily on five key factors. For example, observing shows that employee dissatisfaction is often caused by performance-related factors (standard of teaching, managers' understanding of staff, etc.), functional factors (uneven workload distribution among group members, lack of clarity regarding criteria and indicators for assessing learning outcomes, etc.), managerial factors (ambiguity in the manager's approach towards employees, bias and unfairness in managers' assessments, managers forcing employees to perform functions that are not their responsibility, etc.), and psychological factors (contradictions and conflicts, socio-psychological incompatibility among employees, deviations from group norms, views and traditions, etc.). If, when working with a group of employees, one attempts to eliminate these negative factors, this will undoubtedly contribute to the development of a supportive SPC, a positive working atmosphere among employees, and satisfaction with being part of this group.

A supportive workplace climate transforms fundamentally depending on whether an organization operates in a stable, growth-oriented environment or an existential crisis driven by geopolitical conflict, severe market collapse, or war, accompanied by primarily with psychosocial safety climate in workplace (manifesting organization's commitment to protecting the mental health and well-being of its workers when extreme external danger and trauma surround them, employees' perception of the extent to which the organisation prioritises their psychological wellbeing over operational requirements). Maintaining a positive and supportive workplace climate during wartime requires shifting from standard HR practices to a trauma-informed, deeply empathetic leadership approach. When employees face existential stress, the workplace must serve as a psychological anchor of stability, safety, and purpose.

To expand on the idea of Turyanskyy, Svydruk, & Hnylianska [41], we attempt to systematize characteristics of supportive SPC in wartime. A supportive SPC amid war transforms ordinary workplace comfort into a sense of basic psychological safety, giving people the strength to remain resilient, effective, and mentally healthy in extreme conditions. It must become an emotionally safe environment where trust, mutual support, awareness of shared goals, and adaptability prevail. This does not mean the absence of stress; rather, it indicates the group's ability to interact effectively whilst maintaining morale despite the danger.

Key indicators of supportive SPC in wartime are:

1) level of cohesion and mutual support: trust among team members and the sense of security felt by group members who openly express their emotions and freely voice their opinions without fear of judgment, since there is always the opportunity to receive feedback; mutual support provided by and received from colleagues, the basis of which is the unconditional willingness to come to help (both in work tasks and in personal/domestic matters), where everyone feels part of a single whole; mutual substitutability with willingness to step in for one another if a team member is physically or mentally unable to carry out their duties due to the effects of the war; peer support when colleagues voluntarily share resources, information and essential items, and offer help with day-to-day issues; empathy, which manifests itself through an attentive attitude to the psychological state of colleagues and subordinates, tolerance for fatigue, manifestations of stress, and emotional burnout; emotional integrity by sharing experiences of grief and joy and forging strong bonds (the sense that ‘we are a team that will get through this together’); engagement in volunteer work because groups that come together to support the Armed Forces of Ukraine or those affected by the conflict demonstrate higher levels of morale.

2) setting up of effective communication: clarity and transparency (as all orders, instructions, and goals are clearly stated and communicated, since the absence of uncertainty reduces anxiety levels); presence of constructive professional criticism; constructive conflict resolution (disputed issues are resolved by finding solutions, rather than assigning blame, with an emphasis on maintaining calm in emergencies); awareness (each team member understands the overall situation and their role in achieving the common goal);

3) leadership, adaptive management, and psychological resilience: an authoritative leader is a model of emotional resilience, confidence, and fairness who knows how to listen and understand the needs of their subordinates; a manager's flexibility of thinking (as this will determine how quickly the team adapts to new realities, changes in circumstances or sudden threats, and responds to force majeure situations without panic); clear coordination with understanding how each contribution affects the common goal (business operations, volunteering, or defense); sense of control by focusing on what the team can change and accepting circumstances that cannot be influenced; flexibility in decision-making by abandoning rigid bureaucracy in favor of efficiency and common sense; trust in leadership because the leader is an example of resilience and calm, communicates openly about the situation, and demonstrates respect for people; optimism and belief in success by maintaining faith in victory and a positive outlook on the future, despite objective difficulties;

4) Psychological safety and acceptance: attentiveness to basic needs. Because management and team members understand that physical exhaustion and lack of sleep affect productivity, they focus on safeguarding life and health without judgment, as team members are tolerant of each other's emotional reactions, fatigue, or anxiety. There is no pressure to hide one's vulnerability; no hierarchy or bullying because of social equality and respect for personal boundaries, regardless of position or rank (particularly relevant for military units); workplace as a safe space for expressing opinions where everyone can openly discuss their fears and concerns without fear of criticism or being belittled; avoiding the search for culprits, instead of mutual recriminations, the focus shifts to constructive problem-solving and mutual support.

A supportive SPC is, by its nature, very close to a people-oriented SPC. In wartime, it is crucial to support an organization's social component. Therefore, SPC transforms from a tool for staff motivation into a tool for organizational survival. War has led to the restructuring of all organizational processes and created uncertainty in the workplace. Flexibility and adaptation provided by staff are necessary to eliminate this uncertainty. But staff are also people who find themselves in difficult and stressful circumstances. Therefore, it is crucial to adopt a people-oriented approach to SPC in wartime. However, a purely people-oriented SPC is insufficient; it is important to consider individual elements of a goal-oriented and innovation-oriented SPC. For example, a goal-oriented SPC emphasizes setting goals and focusing efforts on achieving them, but in such circumstances, the goal is the organization's survival. An innovation-oriented SPC emphasizes support for innovation and risk-taking as tools for ensuring adaptability in the current environment. Therefore, the characteristics and indicators of a supportive SPC should be grounded in a human social performance management system and take into account the individual aspects of goal-oriented and innovation-oriented SPC.

An unfriendly or negative SPC is characterized by the exact opposite traits: members of these teams are indifferent towards one another and towards the team as a whole; they do not take an interest in the state of affairs; they work the required hours and show no interest in matters that do not directly concern them. In other words, it can be argued that in an unfriendly SPC, the team and each employee exist as if in isolation from one another; as if separated in time and space, which leads to poor work performance, unsatisfactory discipline, tension in personal relationships, conflict, and a desire to change jobs. To "detox" negative SPC (according to Pfeffer [29] to Toxic Work Climates) Priesemuth and Schminke [30] provide holistic approach build on "Integrative Review and Development of a New Construct and Theoretical Framework Toxic Work Climates" (in particular for specific abusive supervision climate, bullying climate, harassment and discrimination climates, aggression and violence climates, ostracism climate, social undermining climate, social undermining climate, interpersonal deviance climate, interactional justice climate).

A neutral SPC prioritizes objectivity, fairness, and professional boundaries, protecting teams from emotional volatility. Achieving this requires cultural norms that mandate clear communication (with clear boundaries, based on open dialogue, limited to work/business communication) and mutual respect, with objective evaluations, alongside democratic, unbiased, inclusive leadership practices focused on inclusive decision-making, equitable resource distribution, and consistent policy enforcement. Employees exhibit objective & task-focused counterproductive work behavior without initiative, are oriented toward procedural adherence, and demonstrate indifference toward corporate culture. Even neutral SPC is influenced by both objective factors (such as the type of organization) and subjective factors (such as the assessment of others' behavior); organizational atmosphere, it is also necessary to invest in employees' growth and success" (Hussainy [12]).

Managing the SPC involves a variety of methods and approaches aimed at reducing conflict, improving employee interactions, minimizing stressful situations, and, as a result, creating a supportive emotional and psychological environment. Nowadays, companies often assign a specific employee to monitor and manage SPC. Nonetheless, it is frequently challenging for them to consider the unique work requirements of each employee, particularly when there is only one pertinent specialist for the entire organization and numerous teams. Several HR specialists aim to reduce stress levels and increase employee engagement (such as a Chief Happiness Officer, an HR Business Partner (HRBP), a People Partner, and a Well-being Manager). However, in the face of severe budget cuts, managers are forced to take on these responsibilities themselves. Consequently, their role in fostering a positive social and psychological environment is becoming increasingly important. The role of a manager in shaping the SPC is a central aspect of management [22, 50]. Any problems must be resolved with due regard for the social and psychological consequences, taking into account the actual people within the team and their psychology. The manager's activities, as an element of the management system, are based on requirements arising from the objective laws of social development. However, different people implement these requirements and contribute to the creation of the SPC within the team in different ways. Three key variables form the basis of a manager's psychological profile in terms of their influence on the moral and psychological climate: authority, personality, and leadership style. Engaging psychologists in the process of fostering a positive SPC and enhancing the effectiveness of professional interactions involves specialists working in the following key areas: 1) assessing the SPC as a key indicator of professional group interaction; 2) the psychologist's advisory work on optimizing interpersonal interactions among team members and enhancing their cohesion; 3) harmonizing professional and personal relationships; 4) preventing and resolving conflict situations; 5) psychoprophylactic, psychotherapeutic, and psychocorrectional work with individual staff members.

Conclusions and prospects for further research

This research article explores the nature of SPC, summarizes and analyzes approaches to understanding it, and identifies key factors influencing SPC and the characteristics of its various dimensions. Using a psychological approach, the authors studied the transformation of the SPC role during martial law. Authors plan to continue their further research by

creating new diagnostic tools for measuring and managing workplace climate, improving it, and providing more practical advice on how to establish a supportive social and psychological environment (Amoadu, Ansah, Sarfo [2]; Dong, Li, Hernan [5]; Weziak-Bialowolska, Lee, Cowden, Bialowolski, Chen, VanderWeele, McNeely [45]) based on the DEI concept [7] during wartime and the post-war period by applying effective tools for psychological support (Amoadu, Ansah, Sarfo [2]; Dong, Li, Hernan [5]) and ecological managerial practices [12, 46] to build change-oriented behavior (Gil, Mataveli, Garcia-Alcaraz, Ibanez-Somovilla [8]).

Література

1. Alan S., Corekcioglu G., Sutter M. Improving Workplace Climate in Large Corporations: A Clustered Randomized Intervention. *MPI Collective Goods Discussion Paper*. 2021. No.17. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3923565>.
2. Amoadu M., Ansah E. W., Sarfo J. O. Influence of psychosocial safety climate on occupational health and safety: a scoping review. *BMC Public Health*. 2023. 23(1), 1344. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-16246-x>
3. Barnes V., Newton L. War and peace in organizational memory. *Management and Organizational History*. 2018. No.13, pp. 303–308. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449359.2018.1549798>.
4. CIPD. Organisational culture and climate: an evidence review. URL: <https://www.cipd.org/globalassets/media/knowledge/knowledge-hub/evidence-reviews/2023-pdfs/8263-organisational-culture-and-climate-practice-summary.pdf>.
5. Dong R., Li X., Hernan B. Psychological safety and psychosocial safety climate in workplace: A bibliometric analysis and systematic review towards a research agenda. *Journal of Safety Research*. 2024. No. 91, pp. 1–19, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2024.08.001>.
6. Dragoni L. Understanding the Emergence of State Goal Orientation in Organizational Work Groups: The Role of Leadership and Multilevel Climate Perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2005. Vol. 90(6), pp. 1084–1095. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1084>.
7. Findler L., Wind L. H., Barak M. E. M. The Challenge of Workforce Management in a Global Society: Modeling the Relationship Between Diversity, Inclusion, Organizational Culture, and Employee Well-Being, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment. *Administration in Social Work*. 2007. Vol. 31(3), pp. 63–94. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1300/J147v31n03_05.
8. Gil, A.J., Mataveli, M., Garcia-Alcaraz, J.L., Ibanez-Somovilla, L. (2024). Organisational climate and change-orientated behaviour: The mediating effects of employee learning culture and perceptions of performance appraisal. *European Management Review*, No. 21(3). Pp. 618–630. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12601>.
9. Hatter K., Avery D. R., McKay P. F. Organizational diversity climate: Recent scholarship and What's missing. *Current opinion in psychology*. 2024. No.60, 101926. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2024.101926>.
10. Hayat A., Afshari L. Supportive organizational climate: a moderated mediation model of workplace bullying and employee well-being. *Personnel Review*. 2021. Vol. 50(7-8), pp. 1685–1704. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-06-2020-0407>.
11. Hobfoll S. E. Social and Psychological Resources and Adaptation. *Review of General Psychology*. 2002. No. 6(4), pp. 307–324. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.6.4.307>.
12. Hussain S.S. Organizational Climate: From Literature Review to Agenda Ahead. *International Journal of Engineering Technologies and Management Research*. 2022. No. 9(1), pp. 44–62. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29121/ijetmr.v9.i1.2022.1107>.
13. Isaksen S. G., Ekvall G. Managing for innovation: The two faces of tension in creative climates. *Creativity and Innovation Management*. 2010. No. 19(2), pp. 73–88. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00558.x>.
14. Janiukštis A., Kovaitė K., Butvilas T., Šumakaris P. Impact of Organisational Climate on Employee Well-Being and Healthy Relationships at Work: A Case of Social Service Centres. *Administrative Sciences*, 2024. Vol. 14(10), 237. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14100237>.
15. Карамушка Л. М. Психологія управління : навч. посіб. Київ : Міленіум, 2003. 344 с. URL: [https://www.scribd.com/document/918550374/Хараджи-М.-В.,-Саріна-К.-Г.-Особливості-соціально-психологічного-клімату-в-організації.-Перспективи-та-інновації-науки.-Серія-«Педагогіка,-психологія,-медицина».-2022.-№-9\(14\).-С.-655-664.-DOI:-https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-4952-2022-9\(14\)-655-664](https://www.scribd.com/document/918550374/Хараджи-М.-В.,-Саріна-К.-Г.-Особливості-соціально-психологічного-клімату-в-організації.-Перспективи-та-інновації-науки.-Серія-«Педагогіка,-психологія,-медицина».-2022.-№-9(14).-С.-655-664.-DOI:-https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-4952-2022-9(14)-655-664).
16. Kim T. Y., Wang X., Schuh S. C., Liu Z. Effects of organizational innovative climate within organizations: The roles of Managers' proactive goal regulation and external environments. *Research Policy*, 2024. Vol. 53(5), 104993. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2024.104993>.
17. Кличковський С. О. Соціально-психологічні особливості формування психологічного клімату на підприємстві у кризовий період. Дис. ... канд. психолог. наук: 19.00.05. КНУ ім.Т.Шевченка. Київ, 2020. 241 с. URL: <https://uacademic.info/ua/document/0420U010445>
18. Komenić P., Bazdan V., Agušaj B. The Organizational Climate and Employee Turnover Intention in Dubrovnik Hotels. *Rithink*, 2016. 5(1), 7–14. http://www.rithink.hr/brochure/pdf/vol5_2016/7-14.pdf.
19. Костишин Н., Яковець Т. Стресостійкість колективу під час війни: налаштування психологічного клімату. *Grail of Science*. 2022. No. 14–15. 565–570. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36074/grail-of-science.27.05.2022.102>.
20. Кравець І. М., Совира Н. Р. Соціально-психологічний клімат в трудовому колективі та шляхи його поліпшення. *Modernization of socio-economic systems: the new economic conditions* : International scientific conference, Sept. 28th, 2016, Kielce, Poland : proceedings of the conference. Kielce: Baltija Publ., 2016. Pt. II. P. 73–76.
21. Levecque K., Roose H., Vanroelen C., Van Rossem R. Affective team climate: a multi-level analysis of psychosocial working conditions and psychological distress in team workers. *Acta Sociologica*. 2014. Vol. 57(2), pp. 153–166. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001699313498262>.
22. Liashenko O., Plotnichenko S. Office management and crisis practices during wartime: organizational, communicative, and digital aspects. *Economics and organization of management*. 2025. Vol. 2(58), pp. 68–76. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31558/2307-2318.2025.2.7>.
23. Mialkovska L., Pimenova O., Savchuk N., Moklytsia H., Stasiuk L., Shkarlatiuk K. Crisis communication in human capital management during war: Addressing social and psychological challenges. *Amazonia Investiga*. 2024. Vol. 13(84), pp. 183–196. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2024.84.12.11>.
24. Morozova O., Trimpop R., Chernobrovkin V. Stress and resilience of Ukrainian employees during the Russian-Ukrainian war. Workshop "Psychologie, der Arbeitssicherheit und Gesundheit". Kröning : Asanger Verlag. 2024. Pp. 435–438.
25. Мурована, Т. Вітчизняне підприємництво в умовах воєнного стану: основні тенденції та методи підтримки *Економіка та суспільство*. 2023. Вип. 47. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2023-47-49>.
26. Nault E., Sabat I., He Y., Zhou Y., Jaramillo K., Liu S. The antecedents, outcomes, and moderators of diversity climate in the workplace: A meta-analytic review. *Human Resource Management Review*, 2026. Vol. 36(2), 101134. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2026.101134>.
27. Opatska S., Johansen W., Gordon A. Business crisis management in wartime: Insights from Ukraine. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*. 2024. No.32, e12513. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12513>.
28. Pfeffer J. Dying for a Paycheck: How Modern Management Harms Employee Health and Company Performance and What We Can Do About It. NY: Harper Business. 2018.
29. Priesemuth M., Schminke M. Toxic work climates: An integrative review and development of a new construct and theoretical framework. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 2024. Vol. 109(9), pp. 1355–1376. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001188>.
30. Roswag M., Häusser J.A., Hubert P., Etgen S., Mojzisch A. Organizational Climate Shapes Employee Behavior Through Social Norms. *Journal of Business and Psychology (Early access)*. 2026. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-026-10132-0>.
31. Rožman M., Štrukelj T. Organisational climate components and their impact on work engagement of employees in medium-sized organisations. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 2021. Vol. 34(1), pp. 775–806. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2020.1804967>
32. Rudd D., Mills J. R. Climate Applications. *Journal of Applied Business and Economics*. 2020. Vol. 22(9), pp. 30–36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33423/jabe.v22i9.3665>.

34. Ruzungunde V., Chinyamurindi W. T., Marange C. S. Determinants of mental health: Role of organisational climate and decent work amongst employees. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management/SA Tydskrif vir Menslikehulpbronbestuur*. 2023. Vol. 21(0), a2105. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v21i0.2105>.
35. Salim B., Khorsheed K. A. The role of psychological climate factors in stimulating creativity through workplace innovation in the service sector of a transitional economy. *Discover Psychology*, 2025. No. 5, 154. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44202-025-00482-w>.
36. Schneider B., Ehrhart M., Macey W. Organizational Climate and Culture: History, Current Status, Integration, and Change. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*. 2026. No.13, pp. 309-335. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-020924-070545>.
37. Shahzad F., Luqman R. A., Khan A. R., Shabbir L. Impact of organizational culture on organizational performance: An overview. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*. 2012. Vol. 3(9), pp. 975-985.
38. Skvarciany V., Iljins J., Gaile-Sarkane E. Impact of Organizational Culture on Organizational Climate During the Process of Change. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 2015. No. 213. Pp. 944-950. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.509>.
39. Sobolieva T., Danko T., Trąpczyński P., Steger T. Management and Organization in Times of War: Challenges and Responses. *Journal of East European Management Studies*. 2026. Vol. 31(1), 51208. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31083/JEEMS51208>.
40. Степаненко В., Злобіна О., Головаха Є., Дембіцький С., Найдьонова Л. Стрес, спричинений війною, та ресурси соціально-психологічної стійкості: огляд теоретичних концептуалізацій. Соціологія: теорія, методи, маркетинг 2023. №4, 22–39 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15407/sociology2023.04.022>.
41. Турянський Ю. І., Свидрук І. І., Гнилянська О. В. Соціально-психологічні аспекти гарантування безпеки діяльності персоналу в умовах війни. Вісник Львівського торговельно-економічного університету. Економічні науки. 2024. № 75. С. 37-43. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2522-1205-2024-75-05>.
42. Viitala R., Tanskanen J., Säänti R. The connection between organizational climate and well-being at work. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*. 2015. Vol. 23(4), pp. 606–620. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-10-2013-0716>.
43. Воднік В. І. Структура соціально-психологічного клімату колективу, шляхи його регуляції та формування. *Бюлетень*. 2009. № 5. С. 36-37.
44. Вонберг Т. В., Головок А. А. Формування соціально-психологічного клімату в умовах пандемії. Науковий вісник Ужгородського університету. Серія : Економіка. 2022. Вип. 1. С. 79-84. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.24144/2409-6857.2022.1\(59\).79-84](https://doi.org/10.24144/2409-6857.2022.1(59).79-84).
45. Weziak-Bialowolska D., Lee M., Cowden R., Bialowolski P., Chen Y., VanderWeele T., McNeely E. Psychological caring climate at work, mental health, well-being, and work-related outcomes: Evidence from a longitudinal study and health insurance data. *Social Science & Medicine*, 2023. No. 323, 115841. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2023.115841>.
46. Wu J., Elliott O'Dare C., Greene J. Ageism and Intergenerational Dynamics in the Workplace: A Scoping Review with Implications for Gender and Sustainable Human Resource Management (HRM). *Gender and Sustainability in the Global South*. 2025. No.2(1), pp. 281-308. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/gsgs-2024-0010>.
47. Xu Z., Wang H., Suntrayuth S. Organizational Climate, Innovation Orientation, and Innovative Work Behavior: The Mediating Role of Psychological Safety and Intrinsic Motivation. *Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society*. 2022, 9067136, 10 pages. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/9067136>.
48. You Y., Hu Z., Li J., Wang Y., Xu M. The Effect of Organizational Innovation Climate on Employee Innovative Behavior: The Role of Psychological Ownership and Task Interdependence. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2022. No. 13, 856407. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.856407>.
49. Yusliza M. Y., Noor Faezah J., Ali N., Mohamad Noor N.M., Ramayah T., Tanveer M.I., Fawehinmi O. Effects of supportive work environment on employee retention: the mediating role of person-organisation fit. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 2021. Vol. 53(3), pp. 201–216, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-12-2019-0111>.
50. Жигайло Н. В. Роль керівника у формуванні соціально-психологічного клімату в колективі. Науковий вісник Львівського державного університету внутрішніх справ. 2020. №2(1). С. 374–383. <https://journals.lvduvs.lviv.ua/index.php/psychology/article/view/481>.

References

1. Alan, S., Corekcioglu, G. & Sutter, M. (2021) *Improving Workplace Climate in Large Corporations: A Clustered Randomized Intervention*. MPI Collective Goods Discussion Paper, No. 17. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3923565>.
2. Amoadu, M., Ansah, E. W. & Sarfo, J. O. (2023) Influence of psychosocial safety climate on occupational health and safety: A scoping review, *BMC Public Health*, vol. 23, no. 1, art. 1344. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-16246-x>.
3. Barnes, V. & Newton, L. (2018) War and peace in organizational memory, *Management & Organizational History*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 303–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449359.2018.1549798>.
4. CIPD (2023) *Organisational culture and climate: An evidence review*. Practice Summary. London: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. Available at: <https://www.cipd.org/globalassets/media/knowledge/knowledge-hub/evidence-reviews/2023-pdfs/8263-organisational-culture-and-climate-practice-summary.pdf>.
5. Dong, R., Li, X. & Hernan, B. (2024) Psychological safety and psychosocial safety climate in workplace: A bibliometric analysis and systematic review towards a research agenda, *Journal of Safety Research*, vol. 91, pp. 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2024.08.001>.
6. Dragoni, L. (2005) Understanding the Emergence of State Goal Orientation in Organizational Work Groups: The Role of Leadership and Multilevel Climate Perceptions, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 90, no. 6, pp. 1084–1095. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1084>.
7. Findler, L., Wind, L. H. & Mor Barak, M. E. (2007) The Challenge of Workforce Management in a Global Society: Modeling the Relationship Between Diversity, Inclusion, Organizational Culture, and Employee Well-Being, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment, *Administration in Social Work*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 63–94. <https://doi.org/10.1300/J147v31n03.05>.
8. Gil, A. J., Mataveli, M., Garcia-Alcaraz, J. L. & Ibanez-Somovilla, L. (2024) Organisational climate and change-orientated behaviour: The mediating effects of employee learning culture and perceptions of performance appraisal, *European Management Review*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 618–630. <https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12601>.
9. Hatter, K., Avery, D. R. & McKay, P. F. (2024) Organizational diversity climate: Recent scholarship and What's missing, *Current Opinion in Psychology*, vol. 60, art. 101926. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2024.101926>.
10. Hayat, A. & Afshari, L. (2021) Supportive organizational climate: A moderated mediation model of workplace bullying and employee well-being, *Personnel Review*, vol. 50, no. 7/8, pp. 1685–1704. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-06-2020-0407>.
11. Hobfoll, S. E. (2002) Social and Psychological Resources and Adaptation, *Review of General Psychology*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 307–324. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.6.4.307>.
12. Hussainy, S. S. (2022) Organizational Climate: From Literature Review to Agenda Ahead, *International Journal of Engineering Technologies and Management Research*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 44–62. <https://doi.org/10.29121/ijetmr.v9.i1.2022.1107>.
13. Isaksen, S. G. & Ekvall, G. (2010) Managing for Innovation: The Two Faces of Tension in Creative Climates, *Creativity and Innovation Management*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 73–88. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00558.x>.
14. Janiukštis, A., Kovaitė, K., Butvilas, T. & Šumakaris, P. (2024) Impact of Organisational Climate on Employee Well-Being and Healthy Relationships at Work: A Case of Social Service Centres, *Administrative Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 10, art. 237. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14100237>.
15. Karamushka, L. M. (2003) *Psycholohiia upravlinnia* [Psychology of Management]. Educational manual. Kyiv: Milenium. Available at: <https://www.scribd.com/document/918550374/>.
16. Kharadzhy, M. V. & Sahina, K. H. (2022) Osoblyvosti sotsialno-psykholohichnoho klimatu v mekhanizmi [Peculiarities of the socio-psychological climate in the organization], *Perspektyvy ta innovatsii nauky. Seriya Pedagogika, Psykholohiia, Medytsyna*, no. 9 (14), pp. 655–664. [https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-4952-2022-9\(14\)-655-664](https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-4952-2022-9(14)-655-664).

17. Kim, T. Y., Wang, X., Schuh, S. C. & Liu, Z. (2024) Effects of organizational innovative climate within organizations: The roles of Managers' proactive goal regulation and external environments, *Research Policy*, vol. 53, no. 5, art. 104993. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2024.104993>.
18. Klychkovskiy, S. O. (2020) *Sotsialno-psykholohichni osoblyvosti formuvannya psykholohichnoho klimatu na pidpriemstvi u kryzovyi mezhuvannia* [Socio-psychological characteristics of the formation of the psychological climate at the enterprise in the crisis period]. PhD thesis. Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Kyiv. Available at: <https://uacademic.info/ua/document/0420U101445>.
19. Komenić, P., Bazdan, V. & Agušaj, B. (2016) The Organizational Climate and Employee Turnover Intention in Dubrovnik Hotels, *Rithink*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 7–14. Available at: http://www.rithink.hr/brochure/pdf/vol5_2016/7-14.pdf.
20. Kostyshyn, N. & Yakovets, T. (2022) Stresostii kolektyvu pid chas viiny: nalashtuvannya psykholohichnoho klimatu [Team stress resistance during the war: Setting up the psychological climate], *Grail of Science*, no. 14–15, pp. 565–570. <https://doi.org/10.36074/grail-of-science.27.05.2022.102>.
21. Kravets, I. M. & Sovyra, N. R. (2016) Sotsialno-psykholohichniy klimat v trudovomu kolektyvi ta shliakhy yoho polipshennia [Socio-psychological climate in the working team and ways to improve it], in *Modernization of socio-economic systems: the new economic conditions*. International Scientific Conference, September 28, 2016, Kielce. Kielce: Baltija Publishing, pt. 2, pp. 73–76.
22. Levecque, K., Roose, H., Vanroelen, C. & Van Rossem, R. (2014) Affective team climate: A multi-level analysis of psychosocial working conditions and psychological distress in team workers, *Acta Sociologica*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 153–166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001699313498262>.
23. Liashenko, O. & Plotnichenko, S. (2025) Office management and crisis practices during wartime: Organizational, communicative, and digital aspects, *Economics and Organization of Management*, vol. 2, no. 58, pp. 68–76. <https://doi.org/10.31558/2307-2318.2025.2.7>.
24. Mialkovska, L., Pimenova, O., Savchuk, N., Moklytsia, H., Stasiuk, L. & Shkarlatiuk, K. (2024) Crisis communication in human capital management during war: Addressing social and psychological challenges, *Amazonia Investiga*, vol. 13, no. 84, pp. 183–196. <https://doi.org/10.34069/AI/2024.84.12.11>.
25. Morozova, O., Trimpop, R. & Chernobrovkin, V. (2024) Stress and resilience of Ukrainian employees during the Russian-Ukrainian war, in *Psychologie der Arbeitssicherheit und Gesundheit*. Kröning: Asanger Verlag, pp. 435–438.
26. Murovana, T. (2023) Vitchyzniane pidpriemnytstvo v umovakh voiennoho stanu: osnovni tendentsii ta metody pidtrymky [Domestic entrepreneurship under martial law: Main trends and support methods], *Ekonomika ta suspilstvo*, issue 47. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2524-0072/2023-47-49>.
27. Nault, E., Sabat, I., He, Y., Zhou, Y., Jaramillo, K. & Liu, S. (2026) The antecedents, outcomes, and moderators of diversity climate in the workplace: A meta-analytic review, *Human Resource Management Review*, vol. 36, no. 2, art. 101134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2026.101134>.
28. Opatska, S., Johansen, W. & Gordon, A. (2024) Business crisis management in wartime: Insights from Ukraine, *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, vol. 32, no. 1, e12513. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12513>.
29. Pfeffer, J. (2018) *Dying for a Paycheck: How Modern Management Harms Employee Health and Company Performance and What We Can Do About It*. New York: Harper Business.
30. Priesemuth, M. & Schminke, M. (2024) Toxic work climates: An integrative review and development of a new construct and theoretical framework, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 109, no. 9, pp. 1355–1376. <https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0001188>.
31. Roswag, M., Häusser, J. A., Hubert, P., Etgen, S. & Mojzisch, A. (2026) Organizational Climate Shapes Employee Behavior Through Social Norms, *Journal of Business and Psychology*. Early Access. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-026-10132-0>.
32. Rožman, M. & Štrukelj, T. (2021) Organisational climate components and their impact on work engagement of employees in medium-sized organisations, *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 775–806. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2020.1804967>.
33. Rudd, D. & Mills, J. R. (2020) Climate Applications, *Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, vol. 22, no. 9, pp. 30–36. <https://doi.org/10.33423/jabe.v22i9.3665>.
34. Ruzungunde, V., Chinyamurindi, W. T. & Marange, C. S. (2023) Determinants of mental health: Role of organisational climate and decent work amongst employees, *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 21, art. a2105. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v21i0.2105>.
35. Salim, B. & Khorsheed, K. A. (2025) The role of psychological climate factors in stimulating creativity through workplace innovation in the service sector of a transitional economy, *Discover Psychology*, no. 5, art. 154. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44202-025-00482-w>.
36. Schneider, B., Ehrhart, M. & Macey, W. (2026) Organizational Climate and Culture: History, Current Status, Integration, and Change, *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, vol. 13, pp. 309–335. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-020924-070545>.
37. Shahzad, F., Luqman, R. A., Khan, A. R. & Shabbir, L. (2012) Impact of organizational culture on organizational performance: An overview, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, vol. 3, no. 9, pp. 975–985.
38. Skvarčian, V., Iljins, J. & Gaile-Sarkane, E. (2015) Impact of Organizational Culture on Organizational Climate During the Process of Change, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 213, pp. 944–950. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.509>.
39. Sobolieva, T., Danko, T., Trąpczyński, P. & Steger, T. (2026) Management and Organization in Times of War: Challenges and Responses, *Journal of East European Management Studies*, vol. 31, no. 1, art. 51208. <https://doi.org/10.31083/JEEMS51208>.
40. Stepanenko, V., Zlobina, O., Holovakha, Ye., Dembitskyi, S. & Naidonova, L. (2023) Stres, sprychynenyi viinoiu, ta resursy sotsialno-psykholohichnoi stiikosti: ohliad teoretychnykh kontseptualizatsii [War-induced stress and resources of socio-psychological resilience: A review of theoretical conceptualizations], *Sotsiologia: teoriia, metody, marketynh*, no. 4, pp. 22–39. <https://doi.org/10.15407/sociology2023.04.022>.
41. Turianskyi, Yu. I., Syvdrak, I. I. & Hnylianska, O. V. (2024) Sotsialno-psykholohichni aspekty harantuvannya bezpeky diialnosti personalu v umovakh viiny [Socio-psychological aspects of ensuring personnel activity safety under war conditions], *Visnyk Lvivskoho tohohelno-ekonomichnoho universytetu. Ekonomichni nauky*, no. 75, pp. 37–43. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2522-1205-2024-75-05>.
42. Viitala, R., Tanskanen, J. & Säänti, R. (2015) The connection between organizational climate and well-being at work, *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 606–620. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-10-2013-0716>.
43. Vodnik, V. I. (2009) Struktura sotsialno-psykholohichnoho klimatu kolektyvu, shliakhy yoho rehuliatitsii ta formuvannya [Structure of the socio-psychological climate of the team, ways of its regulation and formation], *Biuletyn*, no. 5, pp. 36–37.
44. Vonberh, T. V. & Holovko, A. A. (2022) Formuvannya sotsialno-psykholohichnoho klimatu v umovakh pandemii [Formation of a socio-psychological climate in conditions of a pandemic], *Naukovyi visnyk Uzhhorodskoho universytetu. Seriya: Ekonomika*, issue 1, pp. 79–84. [https://doi.org/10.24144/2409-6857.2022.1\(59\).79-84](https://doi.org/10.24144/2409-6857.2022.1(59).79-84).
45. Weziak-Bialowolska, D., Lee, M., Cowden, R., Bialowolski, P., Chen, Y., VanderWeele, T. & McNeely, E. (2023) Psychological caring climate at work, mental health, well-being, and work-related outcomes: Evidence from a longitudinal study and health insurance data, *Social Science & Medicine*, vol. 323, art. 115841. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2023.115841>.
46. Wu, J., Elliott O'Dare, C. & Greene, J. (2025) Ageism and Intergenerational Dynamics in the Workplace: A Scoping Review with Implications for Gender and Sustainable Human Resource Management (HRM), *Gender and Sustainability in the Global South*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 281–308. <https://doi.org/10.1515/gsgs-2024-0010>.
47. Xu, Z., Wang, H. & Suntrayuth, S. (2022) Organizational Climate, Innovation Orientation, and Innovative Work Behavior: The Mediating Role of Psychological Safety and Intrinsic Motivation, *Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society*, vol. 2022, art. 9067136. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/9067136>.
48. You, Y., Hu, Z., Li, J., Wang, Y. & Xu, M. (2022) The Effect of Organizational Innovation Climate on Employee Innovative Behavior: The Role of Psychological Ownership and Task Interdependence, *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 13, art. 856407. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.856407>.
49. Yusliza, M. Y., Noor Faedah, J., Ali, N., Mohamad Noor, N. M., Ramayah, T., Tanveer, M. I. & Fawehinmi, O. (2021) Effects of supportive work environment on employee retention: The mediating role of person-organisation fit, *Industrial and Commercial Training*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 201–216. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-12-2019-0111>.
50. Zhyhailo, N. V. (2020) Rol kerivnyka u formuvanni sotsialno-psykholohichnoho klimatu v kolektyvi [The role of the leader in forming the socio-psychological climate in the team], *Naukovyi visnyk Lvivskoho derzhavnoho universytetu vnutrishnikh sprav*, no. 2 (1), pp. 374–383. Available at: <https://journals.lvduvs.lviv.ua/index.php/psychology/article/view/481>.