
Mental Resilience in Business – A Case Study Using TOP360 Kaminsky Academy Tool

Submitted 12/01/25, 1st revision 03/02/25, 2nd revision 23/02/25, accepted 10/03/25

Ewa Olszak-Dyk¹, Teresa Kupczyk², Joanna Kalisz³,
Agnieszka Mateja⁴, Agnieszka Raczek⁵

Abstract:

Purpose: The main objective of the article was to identify and analyse the scientific output over 25 years in the study of mental resilience, which has become firmly established not only in the field of psychology or medicine, but also in management science. The specific objective of the paper was to analyse a case study of the study of psychological resilience of employees in three companies using Kaminsky Academy's TOP360 tool.

Design/Methodology/Approach: The research used the method of literature analysis and critique, as well as the TOP360 Kaminsky Academy psychometric tool to identify and analyse the psychological resilience of 140 business people employed at company A (87 people), company B (25 people) and company C (28 people).

Findings: The results of the survey indicate that the employees surveyed have a fairly high level of mental resilience and have the resources to cope with difficult situations and recover. This may indicate that the companies employing them have the right organisational culture and have created a suitable working environment for them to ensure healthy functioning while performing their professional duties.

Practical implication: The practical business implications relate primarily to the possibility for managers to use the results of the research in effective human resource management, but also to the validity of using the TOP360 tool to test the mental toughness of business people.

Originality/value: Research has shown that the TOP360 tool has great potential to explore the mental resilience of business employees.

Keywords: Mental toughness, Resilience, TOP360 tool.

JEL codes: M10, M14, D91, I31, L26.

Paper type: Research article.

¹Business Practitioner, Owner of Tallento Training Company, Business Trainer, HR Advisor, Poland, ORCID: 0009-0001-5068-0695, e-mail: ewa@tallento.pl;

²Associate Prof., Institute of Management and Quality Sciences, Humanitas University, Poland, ORCID: 0000-0003-0361-2128, e-mail: teresa.kupczyk@humanitas.edu.pl;

³Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Academy of Silesia, Poland, ORCID: 0009-0005-9568-025X, e-mail: joanna.kalisz@akademiaslaska.pl;

⁴Institute of Psychology, Humanitas University, Poland, ORCID: 0000-0002-7279-2823, e-mail: agnieszka.mateja@humanitas.edu.pl;

⁵Ph.D, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Academy of Silesia, Poland, ORCID: 0000-0002-1023-9723, e-mail: agnieszka.raczek@akademiaslaska.pl;

1. Introduction

Half of the world's workers experience work-related stress. In contrast, about 15 per cent experience high levels of stress at work every day, 17.1 per cent in Poland (ADP Research Institute, 2024). By 2030, depression could be the most prevalent illness in the world. At the same time, according to the Safe at Work Coalition's report titled "Worker Wellbeing. "Employee wellbeing, or wellbeing at work", nearly 40 % of employees and employers experience frequent or daily stress at work. This can impact on employee health problems and absenteeism at work, resulting in substantial costs for both the employee and the employer (Koalicja bezpieczni w pracy, 2023).

Stress is strongly associated with poorer mental health and performance at work. Employees with high levels of stress are significantly more likely to say that they are unable to do their job to the best of their ability (33 per cent). Up to a third of workers (34 per cent) under moderate stress say they have trouble concentrating and need more breaks. Stress can also reduce employee satisfaction, as employees with high stress levels are significantly more likely to consider changing jobs (ADP Research Institute, 2024). The effectiveness and stability of an organisation largely depends on how stress and challenges are handled by employees, particularly managers.

It is important to emphasise that today's economic environment is increasingly challenging. Progress is taking place at an extremely fast pace. Contemporary business management must take into account the technological, social, legal and sustainability changes taking place. These have a key impact on the creation and implementation of personnel strategy in companies. The role of the human factor in organisations is steadily increasing, requiring an even greater alignment of HR strategy with corporate strategy. The personnel function is the most changing function of the enterprise (Wiernek, 2006), as has been evident over the past decades.

The amount of information and stimuli that the world sends out means that employees are often unable to keep up and react to what is happening around them. Changes are taking place on both a social and individual level. Patterns of behaviour, patterns, values, social roles are changing. Modern existence is taking place under objectively more difficult conditions, as change is more revolutionary than evolutionary (Kolar, 2011). It is believed that only the mentally strongest individuals are able to stay afloat in the ocean of incoming stimuli (Beightol *et al.*, 2012).

Mental resilience is a fundamental protective factor against an excess of destructive stimuli and allows libidinal energy to be redirected also to the development of the individual, without being limited to merely coping with the difficulties of modern existence (Winslow, Handler, and Wolchik, 2006; Neill and Dias, 2001).

The genetic studies that have been conducted (including studies on twins), indicate that psychological resilience is not just a theoretical construct, but 50% depends on genetic conditions and to some extent can also be shaped by environmental conditions (Lin *et al.*, 2017), including the parenting style of the parents (Sağkal, 2019).

Mental resilience is a resource that allows an individual to survive and thrive. Mental resilience research originated in developmental psychology and counselling to understand how people overcome adverse life experiences, including work experiences (Fonagy *et al.*, 1993; Masten, 2001).

Today, psychological resilience is being studied in many broader contexts (Hmieleski and Carr, 2007; Seery, Holman, and Silver, 2010; Van der Vegt, Essens, and Wahlstrom, 2015). It has been shown to be central to personal and professional success (Gerber *et al.*, 2012; Gucciardi *et al.*, 2014; Dewhurst *et al.*, 2019), sport (Connaughton *et al.*, 2008; Powell and Myers, 2017; Kristjánsdóttir *et al.*, 2019), or education (McGeown *et al.*, 2016; Przybylski, 2017; Sağkal, 2019).

It is a person's personal resources of psychological resilience that are a key factor for success in achieving corporate goals and coping with challenges at work (Clough and Strycharczyk, 2017). Also, an employee's effectiveness largely depends on his or her personal mental resilience resources and translates into his or her level of commitment, concentration, ability to cope with challenges and difficult situations.

Employees, including managers, with high psychological resilience cope better with stress and pressure, which translates into their effectiveness and ability to make decisions in difficult situations.

The authors' research shows that people with high psychological resilience have lower levels of job burnout and higher job satisfaction (Clough and Strycharczyk, 2017). Similar conclusions were reached by Lucja Chmielewska and colleagues (2017), who, conducting a study on IT employees, showed that people with a high sense of self-efficacy and engagement at work have lower levels of job burnout (Łopatkiewicz and Sypniewska, 2019). This study confirmed that positive work-related attitudes, such as mental toughness, correlate with higher job satisfaction.

A study by Aleksandra Lopatkiewicz and Barbara Sypniewska found that people with higher psychological resilience have lower levels of occupational burnout and better psychosomatic health. These findings suggest that mental resilience is a key factor in preventing occupational burnout (Chmielewska *et al.*, 2017). Mental resilience among entrepreneurs appears to be very important. Difficulty in coping with the demands of business takes a toll on their health and well-being, resulting in a lower chance of business success (Cocker *et al.*, 2012; Kariv, 2008; Schonfeld and Mazzola, 2015).

In contrast, high psychological resilience, according to entrepreneurship researchers, allows for greater success (Davidsson and Gordon, 2016; Delmar and Shane, 2004; Jenkins, Wiklund, and Brundin, 2014), particularly in Start-ups (Davidsson and Gordon, 2016; Politis, 2005; Shepherd *et al.*, 2000). Mentally resilient people also engage in more forward-looking and adaptive behaviour in the face of stressors (Folkman, 1997; Masten, 2001). It has also been established that an entrepreneur's psychological resilience significantly influences the survival of the business, but also his or her well-being (Chadwick and Raver, 2018).

The literature indicates that the execution of advances in mental resilience research requires a strong correspondence between the nature of things and the research method (Gucciardi, 2017; Kaminski Academy, 2020). In this context, the use of more advanced, diagnostic tools for measuring mental resilience becomes more important. Therefore, the main objective of this article was to identify and analyse the scientific output over 25 years on the study of psychological resilience, which has become a permanent feature not only in the field of psychology or medicine, but also in management science.

The paper reviews the literature on the subject and identifies diagnostic tools for psychological resilience, arguing that there is room for the use of new, more advanced, diagnostic tools such as Kaminsky Academy's TOP 360. It emerged from the work of the Kaminsky Academy's psychometrics research group, where innovative insights into the concept of mental toughness and its impact on people's actions in companies were used. Another equally important aim of the research was to analyse the psychological resilience of employees in three companies using Kaminsky Academy's TOP360 tool. An attempt was also made to determine the usefulness of this new psychometric tool.

2. Definition of Mental Toughness in the Light of the Literature Review and its Components

Mental resilience is defined in multiple ways. It is a complex and multidimensional concept. It can be understood as a dispositional property or relatively fixed resource of an individual to cope with unfavourable life events (Block and Block, 1980; Block and Kremen, 1996; Fredrickson, 2001).

Mental resilience can also be conceptualised as a process of successfully overcoming negative life events (Luthar, Cichetti, and Becker, 2000) and as a developmental outcome (Sikorska, 2016). In general terms, psychological resilience can be defined as a trait, mechanism or process of self-regulation that is associated with a sense of control. Entrepreneurship researchers have assumed that psychological resilience is 'the capacity to bounce back from negative emotional experiences and flexibly adapt to the changing demands of stressful experiences (Block and Block, 1980; Block and Kremen, 1996).

Clough defined mental resilience as a trait of mentally strong people who tend to be sociable and open-minded because they can remain calm and relaxed, are competitive in many situations and have lower levels of anxiety than others. With a high sense of self-confidence and unwavering optimism, they control their own destiny. These individuals may remain relatively insensitive to competition, challenge or adversity (Clough, Earle, and Sewell, 2002).

According to Masten, psychological resilience is “the ability of a system to maintain or recover from the experience of difficulty” (Masten, 2001). This definition emphasises adaptability and the ability to recover from difficult experiences. Other authors consider psychological resilience to be “the ability to maintain an orientation towards existential goals, to overcome difficulties with perseverance and with self-awareness and internal coherence” (Sisto *et al.*, 2019). This framing emphasises the importance of personal development and internal coherence.

A much broader definition of the concept is provided by a team of authors led by Denckla *et al.* (2020). Their definition focuses on a multi-level approach to resilience, from the biological to the socio-structural level. According to Daniel Gucciardi (2020), psychological resilience is the personal ability to consistently achieve high subjective achievements for example personal goals or aspirations or objective outcomes e.g., sales, race time, grade point average at school despite daily challenges and stressors as well as significant adversity. This definition emphasises consistency in performance despite difficulties. Mental resilience as a construct is defined unidimensionally (as a unidimensional trait), but also two-dimensionally (Perry *et al.*, 2021) or multidimensionally (Denovan *et al.*, 2022).

3. Tools to Measure Resilience, Psychological Resilience and Similar Constructs

Nowadays, more attention is being paid to measuring mental resilience at work. Due to the multidimensionality of understanding the resource of mental toughness, many models of it have been developed. These have become predictors of many measurement scales and questionnaires. The following list presents them in alphabetical order (Table 1). These are models exploring the concept of both mental resilience as well as resilience (resilience) and similar constructs in learning.

Table 1. Tools for measuring resilience, psychological resilience and related constructs in light of the literature.

No.	Measuring tools
1	Adolescent Resilience Scale [Oshio <i>i in.</i> , 2003)
2	Adult Resilience Measure [ARM] (Resilience Research Centre 2018)
3	Bief Resilience Scale [BRS] (Smith <i>i in.</i> , 2008)
4	Brief Resilient Coping Scale [BRCS] (Sinclair, Wallston, 2004)
5	Child and Youth Resilience Measure [CYRM-28] (Liebenberg <i>i in.</i> , 2012)
6	Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale [CD-RISC] (Connor, Davidson, 2003)

7	Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale [CD-RISC10] (Campbell-Sills, Stein, 2007)
8	Ego Resiliency (Bromley, Johnson, Cohen, 2006)
9	Ego Resiliency (Klohn, 1996)
10	Ego Resiliency Scale [ER89] (Block, Kremen, 1996)
11	Krótką Skala Prężności Zaradczej (Basińska i in., 2017)
12	Kwestionariusz Oceny Prężności [KOP-26] (Gašior i in., 2016)
13	Kwestionariusz Poczucia Bezpieczeństwa i Prężności Osobowej [KPB-PO] (Uchnast, 1998)
14	Multidimensional Trauma Recovery and Resilience Scale [MTRR] (Harvey i in., 2003)
15	Perceived resilience (Van der Kleij i in., 2011)
16	Psychological resilience (Windle i in., 2008)
17	Psychological Resilience Scale (Rutter i in., 2008)
18	Resilience and Reintegration (Waite, Richardson, 2004)
19	Resilience Appraisal Scale [RAS] (Johnson i in., 2010)
20	Resilience at WorkScale (Winwood i in., 2013)
21	Resilience scale (Bekki i in., 2013)
22	Resilience Scale [RS] (Wagnild, Young, 1993)
23	Resilience Scale [RS14] (Wagnild, 2010)
24	Resilience Scale for Adults [RA45] (Hjemdal i in., 2001)
25	Resilience Scale for Adults [RSA] (Friborg i in., 2005)
26	Resilience Scale for Adults [RSA37] (Friborg i in., 2003)
27	Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile [RASP] (Hurtes, Allen, 2001)
28	Revised Ego Resiliency 89 Scale [ER89-R] (Alessandri i in., 2007)
29	Skala Pomiaru Prężności [SPP-25] (Ogińska-Bulik, Juczyński, 2008)*
30	Skala Sprężystości Psychicznej [polish adaptation Ego Resiliency Scale] (Kaczmarek, 2011)
31	Trauma Resilience Scale [TRS37] (Madsen, Abell, 2010)
32	Trauma Resilience Scale [TRS48] (Madsen, Abell, 2010)
33	Workplace Resilience Inventory [WRI] (McLarnon, Rothstein, 2013)

Source: Own elaboration based on Helmreich 2017, 31-34.

In this field of measuring mental toughness, an important development was the development of the MTQ (Mental Toughness Questionnaire) diagnostic tool (Clough, Earle, and Sewell, 2002), which was later modified (Kawabata *et al.*, 2020). It became the inspiration for work on a new measurement tool. Due to advances in scientific knowledge, changes in social, economic and technological life, there was a need for a new more advanced test of mental toughness, i.e., the Kaminsky Academy's TOP360 tool.

It is a normative psychometric tool, which is the result of a detailed review of scientific literature and systematic research by a team of psychometricians established at the Kaminsky Academy in 2022-2023. In 2024, after multiple tests, revisions, pilot studies, the distribution of the tool to organisations began, in order to collect data and all the time to improve the IT system supporting TOP360.

The term normative refers to a way of interpreting the results of a questionnaire in the context of a norm or standard, which is established on the basis of comparison with the results of others in a reference population (Kaminski, 2022). In the course of the study, the coefficient of convergent reliability and relevance was estimated as a key step in scientific research. Statistically, a confirmatory analysis was also carried out so that the measurement tool is reliable and relevant. This study meets all requirements and standards for creating and conducting psychometric research and was approved for publication (Kaminski, 2022).

In the TOP360 Kaminsky Academy tool, Marek Kaminski distinguishes between definitions of psychological resilience and resilience (resilience). This perspective was adopted in the course of the literature and pilot research during the methodological work on the TOP360 tool. The literature and numerous scientific sources treat these concepts identically, which is why the definitions of resilience and resilience have been used interchangeably in the above overview. Below is the nomenclature used in the TOP360 tool, where these concepts are understood differently.

The 2 terms 'resilience' and 'resiliency' are often used in the literature. Resilience refers to effectively counteracting negative life events, while resiliency describes an individual's enduring characteristic or relative resources (Ogińska-Bulik and Juczyński, 2010). Looking at this in more detail, it can be seen that resilience refers to the dynamic and beneficial adaptation to life's challenges and difficulties in both everyday, current situations and those that are watershed moments in a person's life.

In turn, the term resilience is sometimes translated as: “psychological resilience”, “resilience”, “ego resilience”, “personal resilience”, “resilience” (Sikorska, 2017). It is also defined as a set of skills to effectively cope with high intensity stress, involving flexible, creative coping with adversity. Central to this is the ability to detach from negative experiences and the ability to evoke positive emotions. The construct also includes the ability to form and maintain satisfying social bonds (Heszen-Celińska and Sęk, 2020).

It would be risky to explicitly state that resilience is superior to resiliency or vice versa. It is therefore safer to state that both constructs are desirable and developable human qualities/resources that enable a person to cope effectively with negative experiences. Both concepts fall into the category of an individual's potential, i.e., the resources that improve coping with stress, with negative emotions and effective adaptation to new circumstances (Kaminski, 2022).

The reports using the Kaminsky Academy's TOP360 tool provide a source of information on the basis of which HR departments, in cooperation with management, can take informed and targeted development measures to strengthen mental resilience resources among their employees. In companies, this brings numerous benefits for employees, managers and the organisation itself.

Based on an article in People Magazine in 2024 and the CIPD 2021 report, the most important of these are:

- Increased adaptability - employees with high mental resilience are more flexible and better able to adapt to changes in the working environment. This helps companies cope better with unforeseen challenges and market changes.
- Improved stress management - employees cope more effectively with stress and change, leading to reduced burnout and improved overall mental health.
- Higher productivity, as a result of employees being better able to manage their emotions and stay focused on tasks, even in difficult situations.
- Improved interpersonal relationships in the workplace, as employees are more empathetic and better able to manage conflict.
- Increased innovation - employees with high psychological resilience are more willing to take risks and experiment, which can lead to greater innovation in the company.

3. Materials and Methods

3.1 Sample and Data Collection

The described study used the method of literature analysis and critique, as well as the TOP360 Kaminsky Academy psychometric tool to identify and analyse the psychological resilience of 140 business people employed at company A (87 people), company B (25 people) and company C (28 people). Individual and summary reports were analysed as a result of the TOP360 Kaminsky Cedets online diagnostic test.

The research group whose results were analysed were the employees of 3 companies. Two of them (company A and company B) are large companies with several thousand employees nationwide. A selected number of employees, i.e. professionals and managers, purposively selected, took part in the survey. The structure of the respondents was as follows.

Among the 87 respondents from Company A, men made up 54% and women 46%. From the point of view of the criterion of position held, professionals in this group accounted for 67% and managers for 33%. From Company B, 25 people took part in the survey, of whom 52% were men and 48% women. Of this group, 60% were employed as specialists and 40% as managers. In Company C, 28 people were surveyed, 28% of whom were male and 72% female. 61% of those surveyed from this company were specialists and 39% were managers. Company C has a training business that the TOP360 test surveyed business trainers, coaches, psychologists and professionals who support clients on a daily basis to strengthen their resources in terms of mental resilience.

3.2 Measures and Variables Definitions

The starting point for measuring mental toughness in the TOP360 Kaminsky Academy psychometric tool was a paper by Clough, P.J., Earle, K., and Sewell, D. (2002) entitled 'Mental Toughness: The Concept and Its Measurement', describing the MTQ (Mental Toughness Questionnaire) tool, which was subsequently modified (Kawabata *et al.*, 2020).

The TOP360 Kaminsky Academy psychometric tool consists of 247 questions. Each person who completes this test gets access to it via an individualised code via email. The test takes an average of 30 minutes to complete, and there are no time limits for completion.

The tool used uses a nine-point stanine scale (standard nine), normalised so that the mean in the population is 5 and the standard deviation is 2. Thanks to the extensive IT system in the TOP360 Kaminsky Academy tool, we have access to and the possibility of compiling the characteristics of individuals in the population in any way we wish, we can, for example, compare the report results of individuals in an organisation or a breakdown into given subscales.

This represents an innovation, compared to the MTQ survey. It should also be emphasised that the resulting test report is very comprehensive and comes in 2 versions - one for the client and one for the diagnostician who carries out the test.

The version for the diagnostician contains additional guidelines and recommendations concerning recommended exercises for the employee, in order to strengthen his/her mental toughness.

For the purposes of the TOP360 survey, at Kaminski Academy mental toughness was understood as the ability to cope with stress, pressure and challenges regardless of the circumstances. It allowed for consistent and long-lasting high achievement despite daily difficulties and adversity.

By effectively self-regulating one's own emotional states, thoughts and behaviours, as well as by maintaining satisfying relationships with other people, and by effortlessly adapting to different circumstances, such resilience results in a high degree of efficiency in achieving plan.

A pilot study allowed the 12 dimensions of psychological resilience to be tested for measurement accuracy and differential validity. Subsequently, standardisation studies conducted on a large sample of individuals allowed the structure of the 12 resilience factors to be ascertained and their relationships with other psychological aspects to be assessed. The 12 subscales that related to the TOP360 tool are presented below.

Table 2. The twelve subscales of psychological resilience in the TOP360 Kaminsky Academy study

Resiliency					Resilience	
Emotional regulation	self-	Proactive meaning	sense of		Bounce back	Self-talk
Control management		Spiritual aspect/Optimism			Self-efficacy	Grit
Insight		Stress/Challenges			Attention control	Visualization

Source: Own elaboration based on the script (Kamiński, 2022).

The detailed definition of each subscale in the TOP360 Kaminsky Academy study is as follows (Kaminsky, 2022):

1. Emotional self-regulation is the ability to modulate emotions in such a way as to keep positive emotionality at an optimal level (allowing adaptive action), and to reduce negative emotionality in difficult circumstances. It is also the use of humour, the reinterpretation of events and various forms of behaviour oriented towards reducing the acute impact of negative events and maintaining a positive perspective in assessing oneself, others and the world.

2. Control management is the ability to adjust one's sense of control, understood as the ability to influence/choose on the basis of a realistic assessment of the situation. It implies a high level of sense of control over oneself and one's environment, but with consideration/awareness of the limits of that control. A high sense of control is maintained/supported by, for example, maintaining a daily routine despite experiencing difficulties, practising self-discipline.

3. Insight is the understanding of oneself and others manifested in recognising one's own needs and capabilities, but also the social perceptiveness to see what others may need and have to offer. It involves maintaining a balance between what is offered and what is received, ensuring the establishment of mutually satisfying and supportive relationships with peers, family members, authority figures. Being able to read a social situation ensures that you can adapt to it by choosing the behaviour that is most appropriate in the context.

4. Proactive sense of meaning reflects the ability to actively seek meaning, make meaning, draw lessons/conclusions from challenging events (difficult situations, change, setbacks). It strictly refers to making an effort to see new value in a negative experience and to treat it as an opportunity for self-development, to "move on" and thus prevent the negative affect from lingering and the sense of helplessness from persisting.

5. Spiritual aspect/Optimism is the unfounded belief that fate is on our side, that we have good fortune, that some unspecified higher power is watching over us.

6. Stress/Challenges is to treat difficult circumstances as a challenge/opportunity for self-development. Reinforcing the effects of stress through mobilisation, but kept at a level that is optimal to current capabilities.

7. Bounce back is the ability to rise quickly emotionally and cognitively after setbacks and return to optimal performance. This speed is dictated by a lack of preoccupation with failure, low anxiety, non-remembering of failure (ruminative milling of thoughts), i.e. emotional-cognitive detachment from failure and possible worries associated with it.

8. Self-efficacy is the strength of one's belief in one's own effectiveness, that one is able to carry out a certain action in the face of the problems encountered and the goal set.

9. Attention control is the ability to stay focused on the task at hand. Being able to 'tune in' to what is important and detach from internal distractors (emotions and thoughts) and external distractors (other people, environmental stimuli). A person who controls his or her attention while acting, thus allows oneself to devote oneself entirely to one's current goal (is in a state of flow - flow).

10. Self-talk is an inner dialogue directed at oneself with the aim of reducing negative states or strengthening positive states. Talking to oneself allows one to exchange information with one's experiences, attitudes, learning history and abilities, which consequently helps to guide one's emotions, thinking and behaviour from the outside.

11. Grit is a long-term goal-oriented attitude and a corresponding ability to grasp actions from reality that are consistent with achieving the goal and help to motivate oneself on the long road to achieving it.

12. Visualization is the ability to create imagined vivid images of reality in the mind, which help to improve skills, performance and strategies to achieve a goal, change thinking and regulate arousal. A person with a high level of visualisation is able to freely change something in these images according to their life. Something like a mental chalkboard with a chalk and sponge.

3.3 Data Analysis

Data sources were Reports from psychometric tests conducted using the TOP360 Kaminsky Academy tool. A factor model of the psychological resilience measures was developed using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). Structural equation modelling was carried out in R and using the lavaan package to verify the model estimates. The unweighted least squares mean- and variance adjusted test statistic (ULSMV) algorithm was used in the calculations.

This method allows the calculation of robust estimates and standard error corrections due to the nominal/order nature of the observable variables.

4. Results - Case study Using Kaminsky Academy's TOP360

As the charts above show, although the overall mental toughness score of respondents (team) in each of companies A, B and C was 7, the pie charts show the differences between each company. The detailed results from the 12 dimensions of mental resilience of the surveyed employees measured by Kaminsky Academy's TOP360 tool are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Psychological resilience level of employees from companies A, B and C (12 subscales according to the TOP360 Kaminsky Academy tool).

Dimensions of mental toughness	Company A	Company B	Company C
Resilience	7	7	7
Emotional self-regulation	7	6	6
Control management	8	8	8
Insight	6	6	7
Proactive sense of meaning	7	6	7
Spiritual aspect/optimism	7	7	7
Stress/challenges	7	6	7
Bounce back	6	5	5
Attention control	6	6	6
Grit	7	6	6
Visualization	6	6	6
Self-talk	6	6	6
Self-efficacy	6	6	6
Social approval	7	6	6

Source: Own compilation based on TOP360 Kaminsky Academy summary reports received.

The group reports, were created by averaging the values that were generated from the individual reports of the employees of the companies concerned. The reports carefully analysed the distribution of each characteristic in order to be able to assess on this basis whether this is a desirable result and, if not, how to initiate development activities to strengthen those team resources that are important from the point of view of the company's strategic objectives. Interestingly, Company C, which is professionally involved in mental resilience training and education in this comparison, presents a comparable level of mental resilience.

Values in statin 4-6, according to the statin scale adopted by Kaminski and used in the study (Grochowska *et al.*, 2024), are considered as the middle values, the most frequent in this population, i.e., colloquially speaking, they represent the norm in society. Values in statin 7-9 indicate a high level of psychological resilience resources, but at the same time the description for the report recommends considering what it costs a person to be at that high level and whether it is healthy and natural for them.

It may be that having high, unnatural scores is just as damaging and difficult as staying in the low statnins, i.e., in the 0-3 range. At the same time, staying in the low 0-3 statnins may have some benefits, so both extremes should be considered in terms of gains and losses. Generalising, all the results presented above should be said to be high and indicate that the companies surveyed, and consequently their employees, are mentally resilient, have the resources to cope with difficult situations and recover. This speaks well of these companies as good employers, a safe working environment and an organisational culture that supports healthy human functioning in the organisation.

In the three companies surveyed, the results are similar, staying within the accepted norm (statnins 4-6) or even higher in some subscales. The attribute 'Return to well-being' will be analysed first. Employees in score group 4-6 are able, like the majority of the population, to cope with setbacks and return to optimal performance. Those who maintain this score are moderately anxious about setbacks and may feel slightly anxious about them, which may manifest itself alternately as passivity and activity.

Teams maintaining in this performance range are characterised by a mediocre ability to emotionally and cognitively disengage from failure, which can, on the one hand, hinder the search for effective solutions, a proactive approach to work challenges and a focus on action, and, on the other hand, manifest itself in, for example, downplaying relevant information. In many cases, it is advisable to introduce strategic communication related to specific tools to support the implementation of change in organisations, dealing with sudden difficulties and working individually on self-awareness to develop this trait especially in dynamic business environments.

Analysis of the results of the 'Insight' subscale indicates that groups of employees in statnin 4-6 are characterised by an average level of ability to understand themselves and others and to see their own and team needs and opportunities. Individuals with this level of social perceptiveness are able, like most people, to see what others may need and what they have to offer, indicating their developed ability to maintain a balance between what is offered and what is received.

Teams achieving such results have an average ability to establish mutually satisfying and supportive relationships with colleagues, family members, friends or authority figures. Possessing the ability to read social situations, in this case at a professional level, is combined with the art of choosing the appropriate behaviour to suit the circumstances, a very useful trait in a business environment especially among those in leadership positions.

There is also one more parament in the above presented overview, namely the social approval scale, understood as 'the tendency to create an image of oneself in such a favourable light as to maximise the acquisition of social approval in interactions. It is assumed that an elevated score on this scale may indicate an attempt to achieve a higher score than is actually the case.

This may happen in situations where the person completing the test has a vested interest in obtaining favourable results, e.g., in a situation of promotion, getting a job, self-promotion, etc.', as detailed in the script for diagnosticians (Grochowska *et al.*, 2024). The outcome of social approval is known only to the diagnostician. The respondent/participant himself/herself never knows this score, so the result of this scale can be a guide for the diagnostician and a direction to take into account during the feedback meeting. Each person completing TOP360 has a feedback meeting with the diagnostician.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

In summary, issues of mental resilience in the economic world are becoming increasingly important. The last 25 years have indicated that it is an interdisciplinary area that is developing very rapidly. The effectiveness and stability of an organisation largely depends on how stress and challenges are handled by employees, including managers.

In addition to this, educating and promoting the development of mental resilience has a positive impact on innovation and adaptability to change, which is repeatedly mentioned here. Mental resilience can also be seen as an element of organisational culture. This fosters an open space for dialogue and the creation of a working environment that supports the personal and professional development of employees.

Currently, companies focused on growth and looking to maintain a competitive edge need to maintain high performance and motivation among staff. Mental resilience is therefore fundamental in building strong and stable teams that can consciously pursue the organisation's goals.

The expectations placed on employees, resulting from the dynamic technological development, with the use of artificial intelligence, a number of new legal conditions, resulting from the need to report on Sustainability according to ESG guidelines will certainly make the working environment even more demanding, so it seems necessary to introduce wider interventions in organisations, aimed at strengthening the mental resilience of employees.

References:

- ADP Research Institute. 2024. People at Work 2024: A Global Workforce View WF1972984-GLB-UK |04/2024.
- Alessandri, G., Vecchio, G.M., Steca, P., Caprara, M.G., Caprara, G.V. 2007. A revised version of Kremen and Block's Ego Resiliency Scale in an Italian sample. *Testing, Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, 14(3-4), 165-183.
- Basińska, M., Janicka, M., Piórowska, A., Piórowski, K. 2017. The Brief Resilience Coping Scale-polska adaptacja Krótkiej Skali Prężności Zaradczej. *Przegląd Psychologiczny*, 1, 215-227.

- Beightol, J., et al. 2012. Adventure education and resilience enhancement. *J. Experiential Education*, 35(2), 307-325.
- Bekki, J.M., Smith, M.L., Bernstein, B.L., Harrison, C. 2013. Effects of an online personal resilience training program for women in STEM doctoral programs. *Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering*, 19(1), 17-35.
- Block, J.H., Block, J. 1980. The role of ego-control and ego-resiliency in the organization of behavior. *Minnesota symposia on child psychology*, 13, 39-101.
- Block, J., Kremen, A.M. 1996. IQ and ego-resiliency: Conceptual and empirical connections and separateness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(2), 349-361.
- Bromley, E., Johnson, J.G., Cohen, P. 2006. Personality strengths in adolescence and decreased risk of developing mental health problems in early adulthood. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 47(4), 315-324.
- Campbell-Sills, L., Stein, M.B. 2007. Psychometric analysis and refinement of the Connor-Davidson resilience scale (CD-RISC): Validation of a 10-item measure of resilience. *Journal of Traumatic Stress: Official Publication of The International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies*, 20(6), 1019-1028.
- Chadwick, I.C., Raver, J.L. 2018. Psychological Resilience and Its Downstream Effects for Business Survival in Nascent Entrepreneurship Article in *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, September. DOI: 10.1177/1042258718801597.
- Clough, P.J., Earle, K., Sewell, D. 2002. Mental Toughness: The Concept and Its Measurement. In: I. Cockerill (Ed.), *Solutions in Sport Psychology* (pp. 32-43). London: Thomson.
- Cocker, F., Martin, A., Scott, J., Venn, A., Sanderson, K. 2012. Psychological distress and related work attendance among small-to-medium enterprise owner/managers: literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*, 14(4), 219-236.
- Connaughton, D., Wadey, R., Hanton, S., Jones, G. 2008. The development and maintenance of mental toughness: Perceptions of elite performers. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 26(1), 8395. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410701310958>.
- Connor, K.M., Davidson, J.R. 2003. Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson resilience scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and Anxiety*, 18(2), 76-82.
- Chmielewska, Ł., Gruszka, J., Ilkowska, Z., Kopec, D., Tadorowski, M. 2017. Związek między poczuciem własnej skuteczności, zaangażowaniem w pracę, motywacją a wypaleniem zawodowym wśród pracowników branży IT. Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu.
- CIPD, EMPLOYEE RESILIENCE, Scientific summary March 2021.
- Clough, P., Strycharczyk, D. 2017. *Odporność psychiczna. Strategie i narzędzia rozwoju*. Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne (GWP).
- Davidsson, P., Honig, B. 2003. The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(3), 301-331.
- Delmar, F., Shane, S. 2004. Legitimizing first: Organizing activities and the survival of new ventures. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(3), 385-410.
- Dewhurst, S.A., Anderson, R.J., Howe, D., Clough, P.J. 2019. The relationship between mental toughness and cognitive control: Evidence from the item-method directed forgetting task. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 33(5), 943951.
- Denovan, A., Dagnall, N., Drinkwater, K. 2022. Examining what mental toughness, ego resiliency, self-efficacy, and grit measure: An exploratory structural equation modelling bifactor approach. *Current Psychology*.

- <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03314-5>.
- Folkman, S. 1997. Positive psychological states and coping with severe stress. *Social Science and Medicine*, 45(8), 1207-1221.
- Fonagy, P., Steele, M., Steele, H., Higgitt, A., Target, M. 1993. The Emanuel Miller Memorial Lecture 1992: The theory and practice of resilience. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 35, 231-237.
- Friborg, O., Barlaug, D., Martinussen, M., Rosenvinge, J.H., Hjemdal, O. 2005. Resilience in relation to personality and intelligence. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 14(1), 29-42.
- Friborg, O., Hjemdal, O., Rosenvinge, J.H., Martinussen, M. 2003. A new rating scale for adult resilience: what are the central protective resources behind healthy adjustment? *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 12(2), 65-76.
- Fisk, G.M., Dionisi, A.M. 2010. Building and sustaining resilience in organizational settings: The critical role of emotion regulation. *Research on Emotion in Organizations*, 6, 167-188.
- Gerber, M., Kalak, N., Lemola, S., Clough, P.J., Perry, J.L., Pühse, U., Elliot, C., Holsboer-Trachsler, E., Brand, S. 2012. Are adolescents with high mental toughness levels more resilient against stress? *Stress and Health*, 29(2), 164-171.
- Hamel, G., Valikangas, L. 2003. The quest for Resilience. *Harvard Business Review*.
- Harvey M.R., Liang B., Harney P.A., Koenen K., Tummala-Narra P., Lebowitz L. 2003. A multidimensional approach to the assessment of trauma impact, recovery and resiliency: Initial psychometric findings. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma*, 6(2), 87-109.
- Hjemdal, O., Friborg, O., Martinussen, M., Rosenvinge, J.H. 2001. Mestring og psykologisk motstandsdyktighet hos voksne: Utvikling og foreløpig validering av et nytt instrument (Preliminary results from the development and validation of a Norwegian scale for measuring adult resilience). *Tidsskrift for Norsk Psykologforening*, 38(4), 310-317.
- Hurtes, K.P., Allen, L.R. 2001. Measuring resiliency in youth: The resiliency attitudes and skills profile. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, 35(4), 333-347.
- Denckla, C.A., Cicchetti, D., Kubzansky, L.D., Seedat, S., Teicher, M.H., Williams, D.R., Koenen, K.C. 2020. Psychological resilience: An update on definitions, a critical appraisal, and research recommendations. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 11(1), Article 1822064.
- Fredrickson, B.L. 2001. The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218.
- Gąsior, K., Chodkiewicz, J., Cechowski, W. 2016. Kwestionariusz Oceny Prężności (KOP-26): Konstrukcja i właściwości psychometryczne narzędzia. *Polskie Forum Psychologiczne*, 21(1), 76-92.
- Good, V., Greiner Fehl, A., LaBrecque, A.C., Voorhees, C.M. 2023. Cultivating Resilience in Organizational Frontline Employees. *Journal of Service Research*.
- Gucciardi, D.F. 2020. *Mental toughness*, Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119568124.ch6>.
- Gucciardi, D.F., Hanton, S., Gordon, S., Mallett, C.J., Temby, P. 2014. The concept of mental toughness: Tests of dimensionality, nomological network, and traitness. *Journal of Personality*, 83(1), 2644. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12079>.
- Gucciardi, D.F. 2017. Mental toughness: Progress and prospects. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 16, 1723. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.03.010>.
- Grochowska, M. i inni, Skrypt dla diagnostów, Kurs certyfikujący diagnostów, materiały wewnętrzne Kaminsky Academy 2024.

- Helmreich, I., Kunzler, A., Chmitorz, A., König, J., Binder, H., Wessa, M., Lieb, K. 2017. Psychological interventions for resilience enhancement in adults. *The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, 2017(2), CD012527.
- Heszen-Celińska, I., Sęk, H. 2020. *Psychologia zdrowia*. Wydawnictwo PWN.
- Hmieleski, K.M., Carr, J.C. 2007. The relationship between entrepreneur psychological capital and well-being. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, 27, 3.
- Kolar, K. 2011. Resilience: revisiting the concept and its utility for social research. *Int. J. Ment. Health Addict*, 9, 421-433.
- Jenkins, A.S., Wiklund, J., Brundin, E. 2014. Individual responses to firm failure: Appraisals, grief, and the influence of prior failure experience. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(1), 17-33.
- Johnson, J., Gooding, P.A., Wood, A.M., Tarrier, N. 2010. Resilience as positive coping appraisals: Testing the schematic appraisals model of suicide (SAMS). *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 48(3), 179-186.
- Kaczmarek, Ł. 2011. Kwestionariusz Sprężystości Psychiczej – polska adaptacja Ego Resiliency Scale. *Czasopismo Psychologiczne*, 17, 263-265.
- Lin, Y., Mutz, J., Clough, P.J., Papageorgiou, K.A. 2017. Mental toughness and individual differences in learning, educational and work performance, psychological well-being, and personality: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8.
- Madsen, M.D., Abell, N. 2010. Trauma resilience scale: Validation of protective factors associated with adaptation following violence. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 20(2), 223-233.
- Luthar, S.S., Cicchetti, D., Becker, B. 2000. The Construct of Resilience: A Critical Evaluation and Guidelines for Future Work. *Child Development*, 71(3), 543-562.
- Łopatkiewicz, A., Sypniewska, B. 2019. Zespół wypalenia zawodowego i satysfakcja z pracy wśród pielęgniarek psychiatrycznych. *Psychologia Rozwojowa*.
- Masten, A.S. 2001. Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist*, 56, 227-238.
- McGeown, S., Clair-Thompson, H.St., Putwain, D.W. 2016. The development and validation of a mental toughness scale for adolescents. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 36(2).
- Neill, J.T., Dias, K.L. 2001. Adventure education and resilience: the double-edged sword. *J. Adventure Education and Outdoor Learning*, 1(2), 35-42.
- Kaminski Academy, Skrypt dla diagnostów narzędzia TOP 360, Kurs certyfikacyjny online, 2022.
- Kariv, D. 2008. The relationship between stress and business performance among men and women entrepreneurs. *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, 21, 449-476.
- Kawabata, M., Pavey, T.G., Coulter, T.J. 2020. Evolving the validity of a mental toughness measure: Refined versions of the mental toughness questionnaire-48. *Stress and Health*, 37(2), 378391. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.3004>.
- Klohnen, E.C. 1996. Conceptual analysis and measurement of the construct of ego-resiliency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(5), 1067-1079.
- Koalicja bezpieczni w pracy. 2023. *Bezpieczeństwo pracy w Polsce 2023. Dobrostan pracownika, czyli wellbeing w pracy*.
- Kolar, K. 2011. Resilience: revisiting the concept and its utility for social research. *Int. J. Ment. Health Addict*, 9, 421-433.
- Kristjánsdóttir, H., Jóhannsdóttir, K.R., Pic, M., Saavedra, J.M. 2019. Psychological characteristics in women football players: Skills, mental toughness, and anxiety. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 60(6), 609615.

- Liebenberg, L., Ungar, M., Van de Vijver, F. 2012. Validation of the child and youth resilience measure-28 (CYRM-28) among Canadian youth. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 22(2), 219-226.
- McLarnon, M.J., Rothstein, M.G. 2013. Development and initial validation of the workplace resilience inventory. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 12(2), 63-73.
- Ogińska-Bulik, N., Juczyński, Z. 2008. Skala Pomiaru Prężności (SPP-25). *Nowiny Psychologiczne*, 3, 39-56.
- Ogińska-Bulik, N., Juczyński, Z. 2010. *Osobowość, stres a zdrowie*. Wydawnictwo Defini S.A.
- Oshio, A., Kaneko, H., Nagamine, S., Nayaka, M. 2003. Construct validity of the Adolescent Resilience Scale. *Psychological Report*, 93(3 Pt 2), 1217-1222.
- Perry, J.L., Strycharczyk, D., Dagnall, N., Denovan, A., Papageorgiou, K.A., Clough, P.J. 2021. Dimensionality of the mental toughness questionnaire (MTQ48). *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12.
- Politis, D. 2005. The process of entrepreneurial learning: A conceptual framework. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(4), 399-424.
- Powell, A.J., Myers, T.D. 2017. Developing mental toughness: Lessons from paralympians. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01270>.
- Przybylski, J. 2017. Mental toughness in sport questionnaire MTSQ. *Current Issues in Personality Psychology*, 6(1), 6778. <https://doi.org/10.5114/cipp.2018.72199>.
- Resilience Research Centre. 2018. CYRM and ARM user manual. Halifax, NS: Resilience Research Centre. Dalhousie University, <http://www.resilienceresearch.org/>.
- Sağkal, A.S. 2019. Direct and indirect effects of strength-based parenting on adolescents school outcomes: Exploring the role of mental toughness. *Journal of Adolescence*, 76(1). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2019.08.001>.
- Seery, M.D., Holman, E.A., Silver, R.C. 2010. Whatever does not kill us: Cumulative lifetime adversity, vulnerability, and resilience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 99, 1025-2041.
- Shepherd, D.A., Douglas, E.J., Shanley, M. 2000. New venture survival: Ignorance, external shocks, and risk reduction strategies. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15(5-6), 393-410.
- Schonfeld, I.S., Mazzola, J.J. 2015. A qualitative study of stress in individuals self-employed in solo businesses. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20(4), 501-513.
- Sikorska, I. 2017. Resilience in the light of positive psychology adventure education and adventure therapy. *Psychoterapia*, 2(181), 75-86.
- Sinclair V.G., Wallston K.A. 2004. The development and psychometric evaluation of the Brief Resilient Coping Scale. *Assessment*, 11(1), 94-101.
- Sisto, A., Vicinanza, F., Campanozzi, L.L., Ricci, G., Tartaglini, D., Tambone, V. 2019. Towards a Transversal Definition of Psychological Resilience: A Literature Review. *Medicina*, 55(11), 745.
- Smith, B.W., Dalen, J., Wiggins, K., Tooley, E., Christopher, P., Bernard, J. 2008. The brief resilience scale: assessing the ability to bounce back. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 15(3), 194-200.
- Uchnast, Z. 1998. Prężność osobowa a egzystencjalne wymiary wartościowania. *Roczniki Psychologiczne*, 1(1), 7-27.
- Van der Kleij, R., Molenaar, D., Schraagen, J.M. 2011. Making teams more resilient: Effects of shared transformational leadership training on resilience. *Proceedings of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society Annual Meeting*, 55(1), 2158-2162.

-
- Van der Veegt, G.S., Essens, P., Wahlstrom, M. 2015. From the editors: Managing risk and resilience. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58, 971-980.
- Youssef-Morgan, C.M., Stratman, J.L. 2017. *Psychological Capital: Developing Resilience by Leveraging the HERO Within Leaders*. Routledge.
- Wald, J., Taylor, S., Asmundson, G.J., Jang, K.L., Stapleton, J. 2006. *Literature Review of Concepts: Psychological Resiliency (No. DRDC-CR-2006-073)*. Vancouver: British Columbia University.
- Wagnild, G.M. 2010. *The Resilience Scale user's guide for the US English version of the Resilience Scale and the 14-Item Resilience Scale (RS-14)*. Worden, MT: The Resilience Center.
- Wagnild, G.M., Young, H.M. 1993. Development and psychometric. *Journal of Nursing Measurement*, 1(2), 165-178.
- Waite, P.J., Richardson, G.E. 2004. Determining the efficacy of resiliency training in the work site. *Journal of Allied Health*, 33(3), 178-183.
- Wiernek, B. 2026. *Personel firmy jako zasób strategiczny*. In: L. Zbiegień-Maciąg, *Nowe tendencje i wyzwania w zarządzaniu*, Kraków: Wolters Kluwer Polska, s. 77-99.
- Windle, G., Markland, D.A., Woods, R.T. 2008. Examination of a theoretical model of psychological resilience in older age. *Aging and Mental Health*, 12(3), 285-292.
- Winwood, P.C., Colon, R., McEwen, K. 2013. A practical measure of workplace resilience: Developing the resilience at work scale. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 55(10), 1205-1212.
- Winslow, E.B., Handler, J.N., Wolchik, S.A. 2006. Building resilience in all children. A public health approach. In: S. Goldstein, R.B. Brooks (red.), *Handbook of resilience in children*, New York: Springer.