

Małgorzata Kuśpit¹

ORCID: 0000-0002-4812-2571

Subjective Aspects of the Functioning of Employees in the Organization²

Podmiotowe aspekty funkcjonowania pracowników w organizacji

Introduction

Creativity is studied by researchers representing various research fields. Creative thinking is manifested in an active approach to life and the search for effective solutions in the implementation of tasks and solving complex problems (Getzels, Csikszentmihalyi, 2017; Mumford, et al., 2000). Shaping a creative attitude as well as a creative and innovative approach to the undertaken professional goals is of particular importance in organizations. Because of increasingly greater needs and related requirements, divergent and multidirectional approach to problem solving begins to play a significant

¹ Małgorzata Kuśpit: PhD, Assistance Professor, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, Faculty of Pedagogy and Psychology, Poland, e-mail: malgorzata.kuspit@mail.umcs.pl

² The article presents some of the study that was carried out as part of a wider project (see Kuśpit M. (2021). Creative attitude of employees of the organization and their hope for success no. 3 (133), pp. 227–243

role among employees. Nowadays, making changes is necessary because the needs of both customers and contractors are now growing (Klijn, Tomic, 2009). Another important factor, considered in this study, to help motivate and achieve goals in the workplace is hope for success. This sustained tendency to manifest positive motivation and beliefs can be important in adopting an attitude of readiness to undertake a brave and creative activity in an organization. Therefore, this study focuses on a creative attitude and hope for success in the context of education and performed (managerial and executive) functions among the employees in organization.

Theoretical basics

Creative attitude and its importance in the organization

Creativity has long been popular among researchers representing various fields. Therefore, it is presented in the literature on the subject in various contexts and is analysed from many perspectives. “Creativity is a continuous trait, that is, it can be of varying intensity, from minimal, even zero, to very large, appropriate to brilliant works and their authors” (Nęcka, 2003, p. 24). Creativity, therefore, is one of the qualities of man. A creative individual can notice the discrepancies between the needs and the possibilities of satisfying them and organize the action by making significant changes in the external environment, as well as their own behaviour (Strzałecki, 1969). The superiority of a creative individual is not only related to intellectual abilities, but also includes the affective sphere, temperamental properties, motivation, and relationships with other people (Eysenck, 1993; Popek, 2001). Therefore, creativity is essential for human functioning in various areas of his activity (Ledzińska, 2004; Popek, 2001). It is also a multidimensional property which can be developed (Mróz, Chudzicka-Czupała, Kuśpit, 2017).

The model of empirical research adopted in this study is based on the interactive understanding of creativity by S. Popek (2001; 2010), who believes that creativity is a phenomenon treated in a holistic way. The author lists the social environment as an important factor in the development of creativity. A creative personality consists of cognitive, emotional, volitional-motivational and creative properties. All these elements are influenced by the socio-ecological environment, which can stimulate or inhibit the development of creativity (Popek, 2001; Popek, 2010, pp. 119–120). By emphasizing the

multidimensionality of the phenomenon of creativity and pointing to the factors important in shaping it, there was introduced the concept of a creative attitude, which is related to self-creation and self-realization in many areas of human activity (cf. Mróz, Chudzicka-Czupała, Kuśpit, 2017). Attitude is defined as "(...) a component of personality that is expressed in a relatively stable attitude towards a given object, concept or dependency, and is also manifested in a permanent tendency to react in specific situations in a specific way" (Tymiakin, 2011, p. 19). The creative attitude is also understood as a creative activity, personal creativity or creative invention (Kielar, 1981). Other researchers argue that "an attitude is most fully manifested in the behaviour of the subject towards a specific object; in the case of creative attitudes, it is about exploratory activity, about initiative, about activities aimed at improving the current state of affairs" (Dobrołowicz, Feder, 2002, p. 39). According to Kaczyńska-Grzywak (1988), a person with a high level of creative attitude is ready and open to accepting new experiences. According to Popek (2000, p. 23), a creative attitude is "an active attitude to the world and life, expressed by the need to know and consciously process the reality as well as one's own self". The creative attitude in this approach consists of the cognitive and characterological sphere.

More and more attention is paid to the use of human potential in the workplace, especially in the organization. Research is being undertaken on the relationship between creativity and the sense of security at work, organizational climate, leadership behaviour and their importance for the employees' creativity (Amabile, Conti, Coon, Lazenby, Heron, 1996; Polzer, Milton, Swann, 2002; Amabile, Schatzel, Moneta, Kramer, 2004; Edmondson, Mogelof, 2006 in: Mróz, Chudzicka- Czupała, Kuśpit, 2017, p. 75). According to Stasiakiewicz (1999), a creative employee can use external resources depending on the type of tasks.

Hope for success – analysis of the phenomenon

Hope for success is viewed from different perspectives. From the point of view of classical psychologists, hope is classified as an emotion and was analysed in the context of physiological activities (Koziellecki, 2006). According to cognitive psychologists, hope is mainly a cognitive structure, although emotions play a significant role in it. According to the representatives of humanistic psychology, hope contributes in a special way to shaping the need for self-realization, and – therefore – has a significant share in human

development. Koziński (2006, p. 37) defines hope as “a multidimensional cognitive structure, the central component of which is the belief that in the future a person will receive the good (achieve an important goal) with a certain degree of certainty, that is, with a certain probability.” The structure of hope is complex and includes thoughts, emotions, motives, affiliate judgments, and causative factors. Koziński, however, assigns a dominant role to cognition (Koziński, 2006, p. 38). The concept of hope is sometimes understood as a positive state relating to the surrounding world or to oneself (Porzak, Sagan, 2013). According to Trzebiński and Zięba (2003, 2004), the basic hope is “general, usually poorly verbalized beliefs of an individual about two characteristics of the world – its meaningfulness and favouritism towards people” (Łaguna, Trzebiński, Zięba, 2005, p. 8). Hope understood in this way is related to the functioning of man in various areas of his activity. Research shows that people with a high level of hope are easier to adopt and can cope effectively in situations of danger and uncertainty (Łaguna, Trzebiński, Zięba, 2005). Hope can be considered a resource that allows you to maintain mental balance even during emerging difficulties, but also to quickly regain it (Matczak, Salata, 2010). C.R. Snyder defines hope as a positive motivational state associated with two types of beliefs (Snyder, Cheavens, & Sympson, 1997; Snyder, Sympson, Michael, & Cheavens, 2000). The first is the belief in the possibility of implementing the planned action, and therefore the belief in the strength of one’s own will. The person, despite the difficulties and obstacles, strives to achieve the intended goal. The second component of hope is related to seeing oneself as a person who can find effective ways to achieve a goal. It concerns “own knowledge and competence, which allows for the effective execution of the will. It is” a belief in the ability to find solutions (Łaguna, Trzebiński, Zięba, 2005, p. 7). In this case, hope is associated with the expectation of positive effects of one’s own actions, that is why it is equated with hope for success. A person who hopes for success feels that he can take actions aimed at the goal and implement them in spite of the emerging difficulties and is convinced that they have the appropriate competences to achieve it. Hope and success refer to the individual’s own beliefs (Matczak, Salata, 2010). In Snyder’s concept, hope is a cognitive process mainly related to motivation and thinking instead of being an emotional process. In his opinion, emotions are processes accompanying hope and are secondary to it. He treats hope for success as a belief that is stable and emerges in concrete action. Hope is shaped

through learning in early childhood and through individual experiences later in life and is related to the perception of oneself (Łaguna, Trzebiński, Zięba, 2005). In cognitive terms, hope may contribute to the reduction of the fear of failure (Jarymowicz, Bar-Tal, 2006, p. 373). In this sense, hope for success is an important factor prompting an individual to take up activity in a threatening situation (Porzak, Sagan, 2013).

Hope for success is associated with human functioning in various areas of his activity. The significant role of emotional intelligence is indicated – as a moderator of the influence of life events and the premise of life successes – in strengthening hope (Maczak, Salata, 2010). Other studies conducted in this area indicate better adaptation and greater flexibility in action and experiencing positive emotions by people with a high level of hope for success, greater sense of life satisfaction, and a higher sense of self-worth (Affleck and Tennen, 1996; Kwon, 2000; Snyder, 2002; Snyder,). A high level of hope for success is associated with high self-esteem, sense of life (Barnum et al., 1998; Snyder, 2002) and emotional intelligence (Maczak & Salata, 2010).

Purpose and method

The aim of the presented research was to determine the relationship between the creative attitude and hope for success, and the education and functions of the employees of the organization.

The main research problem of the presented study took the form of the question: Are there significant differences between the creative attitude and hope for success, and the level of education and functions performed by the employees of the organization?

To solve the problem, the structure of hope for success and a creative attitude were determined, as well as the relationship of these variables with the level of education and the functions performed by the employees of the organization.

The research used the Creative Behaviour Questionnaire KANH III (Bernacka, Popek, Gierczyk, 2016). This is a modified version of the KANH questionnaire. The theoretical basis of the tool can be found in the works of S. Popek (1989-2000). KANH III consists of two scales: conformity-nonconformity, which belongs to the personality sphere, and the scale of heuristic behaviour-algorithmic behaviour, which belongs to the cognitive

sphere. You can also determine the overall level of the creative attitude. Each scale diagnoses 13 continuum dimensions. The questionnaire consists of 26 statements. The reliability of the tool measured by the test-retest method is 0.95. The reliability calculated ($N = 4271$) using Cronbach's *alpha* for the K-N = 0.69 scale, for the A-H scale = 0.65. (Bernacka, Popek, Gierczyk, 2016, p. 33).

The second tool used in the research is the Questionnaire of Hope for Success - KNS (Łaguna, Trzebiński, Zięba, 2005). It consists of 12 statements. It contains four items related to willpower beliefs and four related to finding solutions. The other four items are not diagnostic. Based on the points obtained, you can determine the overall score of hope for success and its individual components, such as willpower and the ability to find solutions. KNS is a reliable and accurate diagnostic tool. The internal consistency index (Cronbach's *alpha*) of the Polish version of the questionnaire was 0.82. The reliability of the willpower belief scale is equal to 0.74, for the scale of beliefs about the ability to find solutions, the reliability factor is 0.72. The scale of hope for success measures the strength of beliefs about one's own abilities to achieve goals and achieve success (Łaguna, Trzebiński, Zięba, 2005, pp. 17-31).

There are 120 people, employees of various service and production profiles, employed in organizations in the south-eastern Poland, who participated in the study. Among the respondents, there were 66 women and 54 men aged 19-60, performing managerial and executive functions. The research was conducted in 2020 (see Kuśpit, 2021).

Research results and discussion

The values of the analysed measurable parameters were presented by means of the average value and standard deviation, while the non-measurable by means of count and percentage. The normality of the distribution of variables in the studied groups was checked using the Shapiro-Wilk normality test. The Student's t-test was used to test the differences between the two groups, and in the case of non-fulfilment of the conditions for its application, it was used the Mann-Whitney test. The database and statistical research were carried out on the basis of the Statistica 9.1 computer software (StatSoft, Poland).

Table 1. *The level of education and functions of the surveyed people in the organization*

The analysed variable		N	%
Education	higher	68	56.67
	secondary	51	42.50
	vocational	1	0.83
Function	managerial	21	17.50
	executive	99	82.50
Overall		120	100.00

Source: own study.

As shown in the above table 1, in the studied group, 56.67% of people have higher education, 42.50 secondary and 0.83% vocational. 82.50% of the respondents perform executive functions, and 17.50% – managerial functions (see Kuśpit, 2021).

Table 2. *Descriptive statistics of the results in individual KANH and KNS scales*

Analysed scale		Mean	Std
KANH	Creative attitude	66.70	10.56
	Conformism-nonconformism	33.41	6.22
	Algorithmic-heuristic behaviours	33.29	5.74
KNS	Overall score	46.93	7.26
	The ability to find solutions	25.00	3.71
	Willpower	21.93	4.50

Source: own study.

As indicated in table 2 above, in the studied group of employees, the average result of creative attitude was 66.70, on the conformism-nonconformism scale – 33.41, and on the algorithmic-heuristic behaviour scale – 33.29. On the other hand, the overall result of hope for success was 46.93, while on the scale of ability to find solutions was 25.00 and willpower was 21.93 (see Kuśpit, 2021).

Table 3. *KANH III score results*

The analysed variable	Result	N	%
Creative attitude	low	38	31.67
	average	54	45.00
	high	28	23.63
Conformism-nonconformism	low	36	30.00
	average	47	39.17
	high	37	30.83
Algorithmic-heuristic behaviours	low	45	37.50
	average	41	34.17
	high	34	28.63
Overall		120	100.00

Source: own study.

Table 4. *KNS results*

The analysed variable	Result	N	%
Overall score	low	37	30.83
	average	52	43.63
	high	31	25.83
The ability to find solutions	low	14	11.67
	average	42	35.00
	high	64	53.63
Willpower	low	71	59.17
	average	34	28.63
	high	15	12.50
Overall		120	100.00

Source: own study.

The data in Table 3 show that, in the studied group of employees, 45% are characterized by an average level of creative attitude, high results were obtained by 31% of the respondents, while the least (23%) were characterized by a high level of creative attitude. On the conformity-nonconformity scale, 39.17% of employees are characterized by average results, high results were obtained by 30.83% of the respondents, and low by 30%. Algorithmic-heuristic behaviours

on a low level occur among 37.40% of employees, average in 34.17%, high is represented by 28% of respondents (see Kušpít, 2021).

The results obtained in Table 4 show that 43.63% of the respondents have an average level of hope for success, low results were obtained by 30.83% of the respondents, and high results by 25.83%. In terms of the ability to find solutions, high scores were obtained by more than half of the respondents (53.63%), average ones by 35% and low by only 11.67%. 59.17% of the respondents have a low level of willpower, average level – 28.63% and high – 12.50% (Kušpít, 2021).

The analyses concerned the comparison of people holding managerial and executive functions in terms of creative attitude and hope for success.

First, it was checked whether there were significant differences between the general indicators of the creative attitude as well as their individual subscales and functions in the organization. The results are presented in the table below.

Table 5. Differences in KANH results due to the function performed

Creative attitude	Function held				Group comparison	
	Managerial		Executive		Z	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
Creative attitude	72.00	10.91	65.58	10.19	2.371	0.018
Conformism-nonconformism	36.48	5.67	32.76	6.16	2.432	0.015
Algorithmic-heuristic behaviours	35.52	6.20	32.82	5.56	1.796	0.073

Source: own study.

Table 6. Differences in the results of KNS due to the function performed

Hope for success	Function held				Group comparison	
	Managerial		Executive		Z	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
Overall score	50.62	8.67	46.15	6.72	2.500	0.012
The ability to find solutions	26.62	4.59	24.66	3.42	2.408	0.016
Willpower	24.00	5.01	21.49	4.29	2.005	0.045

Source: own study.

As shown by the data in table 5, there are significant differences in the creative attitude and conformism-nonconformism among employees

performing managerial and executive functions in the organization. People in managerial positions are characterized by a higher level of creative attitude and non-conformism compared to those holding executive functions. There were no significant differences between the groups in terms of algorithmic-heuristic behaviours.

The results presented in table 6 above indicate the existence of statistically significant differences in the hope of success among employees holding managerial and executive functions in the organization. It turns out that employees in managerial positions show greater hope for success, willpower and have a greater ability to find solutions compared to people holding executive functions.

Table 7. *Differences in KANH results due to education*

Creative attitude	Education				Group comparison	
	Higher		Secondary		t	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
Creative attitude	67.82	10.81	65.23	10.13	1.337	0.184
Conformism-nonconformism	34.18	6.53	32.40	5.70	1.556	0.122
Algorithmic-heuristic behaviours	33.65	5.65	32.83	5.88	0.774	0.440

Source: own study.

There were no statistically significant differences in the creative attitude and its individual dimensions of conformity-nonconformity, algorithmic-heuristic behaviours in the groups of people with secondary and higher education. Thus, education does not differentiate the creative attitude and its individual dimensions (Table 7).

Table 8. *Differences in KNS results due to education*

Hope for success	Education				Group comparison	
	Higher		Secondary		t	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
Overall score	49.31	6.27	43.83	7.35	4.405	<0.001
The ability to find solutions	25.88	3.29	23.85	3.93	3.086	0.003
Willpower	23.43	3.82	19.98	4.61	4.475	<0.001

Source: own study.

Based on the obtained results presented in Table 8, there are statistically significant differences in the hope of success in two groups of people with secondary and higher education in the organization. Employees with higher education are characterized by greater hope for success, willpower, and a higher degree of ability to find solutions compared to people with secondary education.

The presented results support the existence of the expected relationship between the creative attitude and hope for success, and the education and the functions performed by the employees of organization. However, not all assumptions regarding the analysed variables were confirmed in the study. It turns out that in the studied group, people in managerial positions are characterized by a higher level of creative attitude and non-conformism compared to people holding executive functions. Thus, the management staff compared to the executive staff is more open and unconventional as well as manifests divergent thinking and independence, self-organization, responsibility, courage, and consistency in achieving professional goals. Perhaps it is related to the need to solve problems on their own and make decisions. It is an important aspect for functioning in the organization. People in managerial positions, displaying a creative attitude, have a high level of self-regulation and internal motivation, which promotes perseverance, self-acceptance of resistance to social pressure and adopting a constructive attitude in action (Domachowski, 1984; Kofta, 1979). Persons in managerial positions also have a higher level of hope for success, willpower, and the ability to find solutions. As indicated by other authors, hope for success correlates with entrepreneurial orientation (Porzak, Sagan, 2013). People in managerial positions may be more enterprising and thus act more on the belief that they have willpower and demonstrate a greater ability to find solutions.

Based on the obtained research results, it can be concluded that education significantly differentiates the level of hope for success. People with higher education are characterized by a higher overall hope for success, greater willpower, and the ability to find solutions compared to people with secondary education. Perhaps a greater amount of experience gained in the process of education and development and a sense of self-efficacy in pursuing professional goals contribute to strengthening hope for success, willpower and shaping the ability to find solutions. However, no significant differences were found in terms of the creative attitude and its individual dimensions of conformism-

nonconformism, algorithmic-heuristic behaviours in groups of people with secondary and higher education. Thus, education does not differentiate the level of the creative attitude and its individual dimensions.

Conclusions

The results obtained from the conducted study may be significant for the functioning of employees in the organization. Knowledge about the individual resources of employees may contribute to increasing the effectiveness of actions taken in the workplace. There are significant differences in terms of creativity and nonconformity and hope for success among employees in various functions within the organization. Moreover, employees with secondary and higher education differ significantly in terms of hope for success. Therefore, it is worth shaping a creative attitude and hope for success among employees at various levels. Both the creative attitude and the hope for success may foster motivation to undertake new tasks and strengthen the belief in one's own competences and effectiveness in achieving goals.

Abstract: The article deals with the subjective aspects of the functioning of employees in the organization. The subject of the study was to check whether there are significant differences between the creative attitude, hope for success, and the education and functions of the employees of the organization. 120 people performing managerial and executive functions in organizations with a service and production profile in the south-eastern Poland participated in the study. There were 66 women and 54 men among the respondents. The research used the Creative Behaviour Questionnaire – KANH (Bernacka, Popek, Gierczyk, 2016) and the Questionnaire of Hope – KNS (Łaguna, Trzebiński, Zięba, 2005). The analyses were focused on comparing people holding managerial and executive functions as well as their education with regards to a creative attitude and hope for success. Based on the obtained results, it was found that people in managerial positions are characterized by a higher level of creative attitude and non-conformism compared to people holding executive functions. People with higher education are characterized by a higher level of hope for success, willpower, and a higher degree of ability to find solutions compared to people with secondary education. The obtained research results may be significant for increasing the effectiveness of activities in the organization.

Keywords: employees of the organization, managerial and executive functions, level of education, creative attitude, hope for success, nonconformity, heuristic behaviour.

Streszczenie: Artykuł traktuje o podmiotowych aspektach funkcjonowania pracowników w organizacji. Przedmiotem badań było sprawdzenie, czy istnieją istotne różnice pomiędzy postawą twórczą oraz nadzieją na sukces a wykształceniem i pełnionymi funkcjami pracowników organizacji. W badaniach uczestniczyło 120 osób pełniących funkcje kierownicze i wykonawcze w organizacjach o profilu działalności usługowej i produkcyjnej w Polsce południowo-wschodniej. Wśród badanych było 66 kobiet i 54 mężczyzn. W badaniach posłużono się Kwestionariuszem Twórczego Zachowania – KANH (Bernacka, Popek, Gierczyk, 2016) oraz Kwestionariuszem Nadziei na Sukces – KNS (Łaguna, Trzebiński, Zięba, 2005). Analizy dotyczyły porównań osób pełniących funkcje kierownicze i wykonawcze oraz wykształcenia w zakresie postawy twórczej i nadziei na sukces. Na podstawie uzyskanych wyników badań stwierdzono, że osoby na stanowiskach kierowniczych charakteryzują się wyższym poziomem postawy twórczej i nonkonformizmu w porównaniu do osób pełniących funkcje wykonawcze. Osoby z wykształceniem wyższym odznaczają się większą nadzieją na sukces, siłą woli oraz wyższym stopniem umiejętności znajdowania rozwiązań w porównaniu do osób z wykształceniem średnim. Uzyskane wyniki badań mogą mieć istotne znaczenie dla zwiększenia efektywności działań w organizacji.

Słowa kluczowe: pracownicy organizacji, funkcje kierownicze i wykonawcze, poziom wykształcenia, postawa twórcza, nadzieja na sukces, nonkonformizm, zachowania heurystyczne

References

- Amabile, T.M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J., Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5), pp. 1154–1184.
- Amabile, T.M., Schatzel, E., Moneta, G.B., Kramer, S.J. (2004). Leader behaviors and the work environment for creativity: Perceived leader support. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), pp. 5–32.
- Affleck, G., Tennen, H. (1996). Construing benefits from adversity: adaptational significance and dispositional underpinnings. *Journal of Personality*, 64(4), pp. 899–923.

- Barnum, D.D., Snyder, C.R., Rapoff, M.A., Mani M.M., Thompson R. (1998). Hope and social support in the psychological adjustment of children who have survived burn injuries and their matched controls, *Children's Health Care*, 27(1), pp. 15–30.
- Bernacka, E.R., Popek, S. L., Gierczyk, M. (2016). Kwestionariusz Twórczego Zachowania KANH III- prezentacja właściwości psychometrycznych. *Annales Universitatis Mariae Curie-Skłodowska Lublin-Polonia*, Vol. XXIX, pp. 33–57.
- Dobrołowicz, D., Feder B. (2002). Twórcze postawy nauczycieli i menadżerów. In: W. Dobrołowicz, M. Karwowski (eds.), *W stronę kreatywności*, (pp. 36–58). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademii Pedagogiki Specjalnej.
- Domachowski, W. (1984). Poczucie umiejscowienia kontroli jako wymiar osobowości. In: W. Domachowski, S. Kowalik, J. Miluska (eds.), *Z zagadnień psychologii społecznej*, (pp. 40–54). Warszawa: PWN.
- Edmondson, A.C., Mogelof J.P. (2006). Explaining psychological safety in innovation teams: Organizational culture, team dynamics, or personality? In: L. Thompson, H.S. Choi (eds.), *Creativity and Innovation in Organizational Teams*, (pp. 109–136). New York: Psychology Press.
- Eysenck, H.J. (1993). Creativity and personality: Suggestions for a theory. *Psychological Inquiry*, 4(3), pp. 147–178.
- Getzels, J.W., Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2017). From problem solving to problem finding. In: I.A. Taylor, J.W. Getzels (eds.). *Perspectives in creativity*, (pp. 90–116). New York: Routledge.
- Jarymowicz, M., Bar-Tal D., (2006), The dominance of fear over hope in the life of individuals and collectives. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36(3), pp. 367–392.
- Kaczyńska Grzywak, M. (1988). *Trud rozwoju*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX.
- Kielar, M. (1981). O potrzebie sztuki w rozwoju. In: M. Tyszkowa (ed.), *Sztuka a dorastanie dziecka*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Klijn, M., Tomic W. (2010). A review of creativity within organizations from a psychological perspective. *Journal of Management Development*, 29, pp. 322–343.
- Kofta, M. (1979). *Samokontrola a emocje*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Kozielecki, J. (2006). *Psychologia nadziei*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”.
- Kuśpit, M. (2021). Postawa twórcza pracowników organizacji a ich nadzieja na sukces. *Kultura i Edukacja*, 3(133), pp. 227–243. doi:10.15804/kie.2021.03.13.
- Kwon, P. (2000). Hope and dysphoria: the moderating role of defense mechanisms. *Journal of Personality*, 68(2), pp. 199–214.
- Ledzińska, M. (2004). Technologia informacyjna a twórczość naukowa. In: S. Popek, S. Bernacka, C.W. Domański, B. Gawda, D. Turska (eds.), *Twórczość w teorii i praktyce*, (pp. 29–37). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Łaguna, M., Trzebiński, J., Zięba, M. (2005). *Kwestionariusz nadziei na sukces KNS podręcznik. Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych PTP*. Lublin: Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski.

- Matczak, A., Salata, E. (2010). Inteligencja emocjonalna a nadzieja. *Kwartalnik Naukowy Fideset Ratio*, 2(2), pp. 19–23.
- Mróz, B., Chudzicka-Czupała A., Kuśpit M. (2017). *Kompetencje osobowościowe i twórcze. Psychologiczne uwarunkowania kreatywności pracowników*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Mumford, M.D., Marks, M.A., Connelly, M.S., Zaccaro, S.J., Reiter-Palmon, R. (2000). Development of leadership skills: Experience and timing. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 11(1), pp. 87–114.
- Nęcka, E. (2003). *Psychologia twórczości*. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- Polzer, J., Milton L.P., Swann, B. (2002). Capitalizing on diversity: Interpersonal congruence in small work groups. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47, pp. 296–324.
- Popek, S. (2000). *Kwestionariusz Twórczego Zachowania KANH*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Popek, S. (2001). *Człowiek jako jednostka twórcza*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Popek, S. (2010). *Psychologia twórczości plastycznej*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.
- Porzak, R., Sagan, M. (2013). Nadzieja i przedsiębiorczość. *Zeszyty Naukowe WSEI Seria: EKONOMIA*, 6(1/2013), pp. 179–193.
- Snyder, C.R., Cheavens J., Sympson S.C. (1997). Hope: An individual motive for social commerce. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 1(2), pp. 107–118.
- Snyder, C.R., Sympson S.C., Michael S.T., Cheavens J. (2000). Optimism and hope construct: variations on a positive expectancy theme. In: E.C. Chang (ed.). *Optimism and pessimism: Implications for theory, research and practice*, (pp.101–123). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Snyder, C.R. (2002). Hope theory: rainbows in the mind. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13(4), pp. 249–275.
- Strzałecki, A. (1969). *Wybrane zagadnienia psychologii twórczości*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Trzebiński, J., Zięba M. (2004). Basic hope as a world-view: an outline of a concept. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 2, pp. 171–182.
- Tymiakin, L. (2011). Twórczość jako działanie służące autokreacji. In: B. Myrdzik, M. Karwatowska (eds.), *Twórczość w szkole. Rzeczywiste i możliwe aspekty zagadnienia*, (pp. 15–28). Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Date of the submission of article to the Editor: 07.09.2021

Date of acceptance of the article: 26.11.2021