Marching toward “heart work”: Connecting in new ways to thrive amidst COVID-19 crisis
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Abstract

With one of the greatest turmoil in the world of work that has wreaked havoc on companies small and large, the global pandemic COVID-19 is penning a new normative. Amidst such disruptions, employees are found to be floundering with tears, boredom, annoyance, and helplessness. With unparalleled challenges and uncertain prognosis, employees are unable to rebuild their power and thrive in alternative circumstances. This calls for an active effort on the part of organizations to embrace openness and discuss vividly what needs to be preserved, created, eliminated, or accepted. Deeper ties and inclusive approach of firms can amp up an employee’s self-worth. The current study reflected the essence of connectedness and oneness at times of crisis. Organizations can play a pivotal role in helping employees rise above the feeling of despair. Connecting with heart can sweep off the feeling of instability, bringing in a stream of positive emotions and experiences. The study draws a cross-sectional data (n = 418) from employees working in various manufacturing and service companies of India to test the hypothesized framework. We have carried out SEM analysis through AMOS to understand the combined measurement model with mediation effects. The analytical results demonstrate that positive mindset fully and partially mediates between the drivers of heart work and resilience. The study reveals that the contributing factors of heart work significantly influences positive mindset of employees, which in turn has a positive association.
with resilience at work. One of the triggers of heart work—“Face the fear, fix fast” is found to be a strong and consistent predictor of positive mindset. Again, “Generate energy moments” another element of heart work stands to be a sharp predictor of resilience at work. The study also discusses varied implications that can enrich managerial effectuality in this crisis condition.
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1 | INTRODUCTION

The path went like this:

**January 2020:** Corona virus is taking a toll on lives in distant countries [Facts & figures]
**February 2020:** But it'll not affect us [Denial]
**March 2020:** “The Lockdown” Okay I need to stay home for 2 weeks...that's it? [Deal]
**April–May 2020:** Cannot stay home for so long...I have a job and other responsibilities [Anger]
**June 2020:** “Unlocked” with constraints. My friend lost a job, there's a 25% cut in my pay [Sad]
**July 2020:** God when it'll end? [Grief]
**Later July 2020:** We have to go on with it. I have to work out things [Acceptance]

This is how we are heading in this harrowing time of pandemic COVID-19. Faces are hidden behind little screens and we are hidden behind anxiety and uncertainty. By now, we have become painfully aware that recovery and growth in this crisis is far off. Amidst such stoking fears of the pandemic, the business and work environment is becoming unpredictable. With the lack of social support system, employees are facing psychological and emotional distress; making it difficult for them to cope up with this disruption (Shigemura et al., 2020). Thus, lack of resilience has become one of the critical concerns as companies march to adapt the changes and survive in the downturn. Articulating a purpose is essential to keep the employees embedded that can be achieved through consolidation and sincere compassion (Chakraborty & Biswas, 2019; Rees et al., 2015). Then again, empathetic emotional response of the organizations is not all; an all-inclusive approach with optimism shall sustain the workforce (Boldor et al., 2012). A better care, mending relationships, consistent cadence of communication, clarity in expectations, embracing healthy thoughts, maintaining a hopeful outlook, letting employees experience strong emotions, building perseverance, and trust in their abilities will be helpful in dealing with strains and stretches (Chakraborty & Biswas, 2020a; Chakraborty & Biswas, 2020b). The groundwork needs to be meaningful to let the workforce thrive. The heart work is the new exigency. It would have a strongest influence on their strength and virtues to rebound.
It is a time not to ensure performance but to integrate and reintegrate so that resilience can be set up as a trajectory, as a process and as a system to recuperate and revive. Such a heart work is all about vitalizing future performance (Biswas & Chakraborty, 2019). This is how we can frame, accept, interpret, and overcome the crisis together.

The studies on resilience, employee engagement, empathy, and gratitude have been covered by research studies all through the world (Dimitriou et al., 2020; Fehr et al., 2016; Love, 2021; Schoofs et al., 2019). However, exploring the essence of heart work in organizations under unpredictable circumstances is scarcely investigated in emerging economies like India. Several studies have revealed—how can an employee be engaged at work, how an organization can focus on employee well-being (Shuck & Reio, 2013), how can employees remain committed at work, what special does gratitude bring at workplace, effects of organization citizenship behavior, workplace happiness (Fisher, 2010), empowerment, positive practices in workplace, and coping with stress (Cameron et al., 2011). However, there are limited numbers of empirical studies that have observed relationship between heart work on the part of organizations and resilience at times of uncertainty and anxiety. The research is not all about empathy; it is about being compassionate, flexible, realistic, optimistic, gentle, and caring. It is about enlivening employees with renewed self-esteem, self-efficacy, and self-worth. It is about being stable amidst wretched surroundings. The study is not about pacifying employees in this harrowing time. It is lending a hand to help employees step up and not jump up. The study sincerely unfolds the ways that how an organization can fortify its people and in due process make them adaptive, prudent, and embedded. In this unforeseeable situation, how can employees be taken care of, how can we bring their whole self at work, how can a firm help to relieve employee concerns, how can they be made to respond meaningfully, how can employees be helped to bounce back, how can a firm stand as a social support system for its people, what path can be followed to make employees adapt the new normal need to be addressed essentially. Our research has made an endeavor to find out what are the crucial drivers of heart work that a company can adopt to strengthen its people; how does essential elements of heart work instill a positive mindset in employees; how can positive emotions help them to rebound and revive in this trying time and how can a firm help employees manage their re-entry angst.

To contextualize our studies' contribution, we have tried to build on the propositions based on few earlier studies of Positive Organizational Scholarship. The concept of positive organizational scholarship evolved in 2003 that focused on creating a positive work life emphasizing on self-efficacy, hope, optimism, resiliency, and positive human potential; thereby bringing out the virtuousness of an organization essentially needed for its survival and success (Cameron et al., 2003). In overcoming weaknesses and uncertainties, an organization must make an attempt toward wholesome growth and development of employees through personal integration, compassion, inspiration, and elevation to unleash their positive energy (Cameron & Spreitzer, 2012). The theorists who have tried to explore the aspect of positive organizational scholarship have identified that it inculcates a sense of self-worth making them embedded toward positive goals (Cameron et al., 2004; Cameron & Winn, 2012). At times of crisis, it brings about a collaborative spirit of tolerance, openness, critical reflection, flexibility, and respect (Nilsson, 2015). The practice of cultivating compassion, goodness, and the strength of employees often lead them to open up (Roberts, 2006). Positive organizational scholarship has thereby helped to unlock the capacities of relationship transformation and positive emotion cultivation have resulted toward an onward march for heart work; thereby helping organization to thrive (Cameron, 2008; Caza & Caza, 2008). Positive organizational scholarship—the foundation upon which our research on heart work is compiled is strongly associated with human flourishing.
and positive dynamics in organization at times of crisis. The approach of heart work in organizations helps employees to gather a set of adaptive capacities to function in times of challenges and disturbances. Their collective level of actions thus makes up for resilient response (Hillmann & Guenther, 2021).

2 | REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

2.1 | “Be happy not perfect” and positive mindset of employees

As people remain happy at work, it brings in them few unpleasant feelings and reinforces the quality of their emotional health (Seligman, 2002). It leads to a deeper interaction at work that stimulates a sense of achieving their potential where the five Cs come into operation—contribution, confidence, conviction, commitment, and culture (Pryce-Jones & Lindsay, 2014). Under such crucial circumstances, forcing toward perfectionism would make employees vulnerable to emotional distress (Dunkley et al., 2016) where they would measure their self-worth in terms of unattainable goals at work. It would lead employees to overemphasize the crisis and gradually turn them to self-blame (Chai et al., 2020). Thus, instilling a spirit of self-esteem and optimistic belief in them of being capable of coping with the crisis would make them happy to take a step forward with positive thoughts. Thus, we postulate that:

H1: “Be happy not perfect” significantly affects positive mindset of employees.

2.2 | Effect of “open doors, open minds” on positive mindset of employees

When employers listen to the perspectives of their people, they set an environment of meaningful relationship and contribution. It is one of the positive virtuous practices that make employees feel that their inputs are being valued and their abilities are trusted (Geue, 2017). Thus, it enriches their work process by bringing in ideas that can help identify possible solutions during uncertainties. Clarity of expectation occurs as employers encourage their people to participate in the process of getting things better. They no more remain isolated or alienated (Shenhar, 1993). Caring gestures on the part of organization proves them open, genuine and transparent. Through such openness and attention, employees maintain their expertise even at hard times (Louis & Murphy, 2017). Thus, we hypothesize that:

H2: “Open doors, open minds” significantly affects positive mindset of employees.

2.3 | “Face the fear, fix fast” and positive mindset of employees

Providing strategic information to the employees about the change-related uncertainties and helping them to see through it actually prepares them to remain open to the change and its challenges (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999). Thus employees resort to an open expression of their emotional feeling that leads to a positive reinterpretation of the situation and making them
understand “this isn’t forever” (Robinson & Griffiths, 2005). A timely, accurate, and trustworthy communication about the crisis would clarify their role expectations and lessen their psychological discomfort, compelling them to stay positive (Terry & Jimmieson, 1999). Facing the fear of uncertainties can generate a spur among employees to share innovative ideas and suggestions to help improve organizational functioning, willingness to protect each other, and finding out the problems to alleviate potential harm (Liang et al., 2012). It dampens their pessimistic emotions and gradually finds a path to deal or cope up with the crisis. Thus, we propose:

H3: “Face the fear, fix fast” significantly affects positive mindset of employees.

2.4 | “Generate energy moments” and positive mindset of employees

Boosting employees amidst bleak and uncertain circumstances reinforces their spirit of initiative to contribute significantly. Equipping employees with expertise to face the challenges of crisis help rebuild their potentials. Bridging connections across the firm by pouring enthusiasm and confidence in their abilities make them set new goals (Hunter & Wu, 2016). This positive mindset reshapes the culture at work and drives the innovation process (Baker, 2019). Energizing people at work by instilling in them the courage leads to a psychological growth with a positive reflection on the process or outcome. This develops positive emotions of gratitude and respect in them to improve the odds and survive the hostile conditions (Fredrickson, 2013). Thus, we propose:

H4: “Generate energy moments” significantly affects positive mindset of employees.

2.5 | “Be happy not perfect” and resilience at work

Providing a happy platform to employees at work amidst complexities and uncertainty regulates their behavior and develops a potential to surmount barriers (Williams et al., 2018). Happiness at work instills in them a readiness to give more and manage the challenges and threats in a judicious manner (Bataineh, 2019). They work together in a constructive manner to face the perplexities and withstand stressful events. Employees then exhibit conscientious behaviors to attain the best outcome. They further intend to resolve conflicts and bounce back through a healthy coordination; rather than avoidance (Higashide, 2016). This happiness helps them in committing kind acts. Thus, we hypothesize that:

H5: “Be happy not perfect” significantly influences Resilience at work.

2.6 | “Open doors, open minds” and resilience at work

Connecting employees with compassion and opening up about the crisis by sharing relevant information help them to prepare and generate greater credibility to handle the situation (Murty & Subramanian, 2014). By allowing employees to come up with their ideas and concerns would harness each other’s competencies that would improve decision-making at trying times. This would stimulate cohesiveness and creativity to accomplish goals (Helms & Haynes, 1992)
and lessen their anxiety and depression while facing uncertain work climate. As firms remove the barriers to stand with its people to genuinely share and perceive their ideas, they learn the crucial competencies of self-management, interpersonal relation, creative problem-solving, and strategic action to achieve their objectives (Daft & Marcic, 2014). Thus, we propose:

**H6**: “Open doors, open minds” significantly influences Resilience at work.

### 2.7 “Face the fear, fix fast” and resilience at work

Facing the uncertainty at workplace and not hiding from it helps employees to deal and overcome the unwanted situation effectually (Paul & Garg, 2012). The experiences of the difficult times build in them perseverance in spite of adversity and discouragement. By being transparent about the turbulence, enable them to have a clear understanding of their capabilities and limitations (Wagnild & Young, 1990). This makes them emotionally stable, explore new experiences, build social relationships, and engage more in work processes (Tugade & Fredrickson, 2004). Thus, looking through the challenges and setbacks, an employee develops self-awareness capabilities to manage the risk factors rather than avoidance (Luthans et al., 2006). It helps them to contribute toward developmental persistency. Consequently, we hypothesize that:

**H7**: “Face the fear, fix fast” significantly influences Resilience at work.

### 2.8 “Generate energy moments” and resilience at work

Boosting employee competence through empowerment and inspiration during stressful circumstances help them to respond actively and improve continuously (Nilakant et al., 2014). Reinforcing employees by appreciating their worth, strength, and past contribution would make them willing to stand strong to overcome challenges amidst crisis (Owens et al., 2013). By stimulating employees to perceive the crisis as a developmental challenge helps them facilitate adaptive coping strategies. As a firm strengthens employees to have faith in their inherent cognitive resources, it leads them to fight back. We put forward the following hypothesis:

**H8**: “Generate energy moments” positively affects Resilience at work.

### 2.9 Positive mindset of employees and resilience at work

Positive mindset leads to resilient adaptation, a pro-social behavior and promotes problem-solving skills. Positive mentalities among employees are likely to adopt active coping strategies that are functional and problem focused (Sagone & De Caroli, 2015). It brings among them hope, self-esteem, and constructive thinking. They never tend to use denial and behavioral disengagement coping strategies in trying times (Brissette et al., 2002). A positive mindset builds their level of perseverance. This helps employees to “bounce back” from stressful circumstances with increased responsibility; maintaining their psychological health. Employees remain flexible in response to the changing demand and open to new experiences; finding opportunities in it (Kašpářková et al., 2018). Thus, we propose that:
2.10 | The mediating role of positive mindset

When firms help employees to remain happy and not perfect during turbulent times, it infuses satisfied emotions and moods that build a constructive attitude in them (Mohammed & Abdul, 2019). Such employees start describing their job more positively and their organizational behavior and activities entail acts of courtesy, conscientiousness and cooperation (Borman et al., 2001). Accordingly, the cultivation of positive emotions and outlook paves a path of growing resilience that leads one to capitalize even the adverse situations. A positive mind ushers in courage, wisdom, and gratitude that provide a sense of purpose during a detrimental situation (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Hence, the following hypothesis is formulated:

H10(a): Positive mindset mediates the association between “Be happy, not perfect” and Resilience at work.

Open communication with employees at trying times and acknowledging their views not only encourages them to open up but leads to a better deliverance (Adu-Oppong & Agyin-Birikorang, 2014). Listening to their ideas, concern, and question has a significant impact on their attitudinal behavior. A sense of trust emerges. A positive outlook evolves that infuses a prosocial behavior among people thereby increasing positive emotions and engagement (Seligman, 2011). It enhances their ability to engage in adaptive behaviors and lessen their level of anxiety, growing insecurity, and lack of confidence (Froman, 2010). Accordingly, the workforce comes back with new and creative ways of coordination and productivity. Thus, we hypothesize that:

H10(b): Positive mindset mediates the association between “Open doors, open minds” and Resilience at work.

COVID-19 has engulfed our world with complexities, risk, and fear; escalating it quickly across social boundaries. When employees are strengthened to look through such uncertainties in the business operations and understand the risk to prepare themselves; even the resilient intervention needs some time for reflection. Facing the fear of uncertainty triggers a positive mindset. It leads to a positive evaluation and mental adjustment (McCreadie et al., 2010); bringing with it optimism, self-esteem, and enthusiasm to overcome the fear and challenges better (Lauriola & Iani, 2017). A positive outlook significantly influences one’s behavior; they add positive value to their self, have a realistic observation, and expect that the future outcomes are likely to be better 1 day (Schou et al., 2005). Thus, we hypothesize that:

H10(c): Positive mindset mediates the relation between “Face the fear, fix fast” and Resilience at work.

Creating energy moments at work by empowering employees provide them with a purpose that enhances their level of adaptability to the challenging and unfavorable environment (Dahou & Hacini, 2018). The energy moments generate a positive mindset that helps in optimal human functioning (Luthans, 2002). This positivity helps them to remain oriented toward their strengths and abilities; thereby instilling confidence and hope to sustain and bounce back. As
organization inspires and boosts employees to find possibilities from among the unforeseeable, they gain an emotional stability, a relevant aspect of a positive mindset (Luthans & Youssef-Morgan, 2017), and render their effort despite encountering crisis. Thus, we hypothesize that:

**H10(d):** Positive mindset mediates the association between “Generate energy moments” and Resilience at work.

### 2.11 The proposed conceptual model

Based on the related review of literature and the corresponding hypothesized relationships, a proposed conceptual model has been formulated as shown in Figure 1.

### 3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study is following the descriptive research design and used the cross-sectional design to further analyze it. Cross-sectional design was chosen due to its numerous benefits (Creswell & Creswell, 2003). Firstly, it saves time and money. Secondly, assumptions can be verified with it. Thirdly, the timeline can be captured with multiple variables at any given point. Finally, it provides insights into new theories or in-depth research. Even though it has these benefits, it is not free from limitations. Cause and effect are not well-explained with this method. The representativeness of the timeline is not mistake-proof. Ample care must be taken. Although it has some limitations, its benefits outweigh the risks involved. The concept of “heart work” is pretty new and how the organizations are marching toward “heart work” during this pandemic has been elaborated in this study. The structured questionnaire has been adopted to find the responses from different respondents of various organizations. Five point Likert scale has been
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adapted to record the responses from the respondents with two extreme ends with strongly agree to strongly disagree.

3.1 Sample and management of survey

Responses have been collected from various manufacturing and service organizations of India. The questionnaire was spread through online modes due to the pandemic. The convenience sampling technique has been used and 1,567 emails have been sent to different respondents. Out of the 1,567 emails, only 418 properly filled up responses has been gathered from the online surveys and the same size has also been used for analysis. The questionnaire has been sent to various places of India including most of the major cities namely Kolkata, Mumbai, Chennai, Delhi, Pune, Ahmedabad, Bengaluru, Hyderabad, Noida & Gurgaon. Researchers have spread the questionnaire throughout the country because they want to see the variability and representativeness across all the areas of India. Data collection has happened from May third to June 17th 2020.

3.2 Measures and developments of instrument

The various items used in the questionnaire have been taken from prior validated scales which have been published by various researchers. We have also modified the question according to the need of the study. The questionnaire was having two parts one was related to the demographic information (Table 1) and second part contains the items related to the various constructs (Table 2). There constructs are namely “Be happy not perfect (BHN P)”, “Open doors open Minds (ODOM)”, “Face the fear, Fix fast (FFFF)”, “Generate 'energy' moments (GEM)”, “Positive Mindset (PM)”, and “Resilience at Work (RW)” has been obtained from various studies.

4 ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.1 Common method bias

The responses were self-reported by the respondents and therefore, we performed stages of assessment to assess the possible influence of common method bias in the data. Initially, Harmon’s one
factor test as suggested by Podsakoff et al. (2003)) was conducted on all factors and the variance extracted by all the factors was at 37.95% still less than the recommended value 50%, indicating that the data are free from the common method bias issues. The data can be considered free from common method bias (CMB) due to the variety of reasons. Firstly, as a normal practice, a different variable (completely unrelated to the factors used in this study) was used and its correlation was found to be very low. It proved the absence of CMB in the data. Secondly, the factor analysis clearly showed a lack of a dominating factor explaining most of the variance. Finally, our study used a difficult mediation approach with a lot of factors that had many variables that made it difficult for the respondents to create a mind map of the connections.

4.2 Measurement model

Before evaluating the structural model, we assessed the reliability and validity of the data. A pilot survey was conducted to confirm face validity and seeking expert opinion confirmed content validity. Reliability of all the variables was assessed at item as well as construct level. Table 3 reflects the values of Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for all the constructs with values higher than 0.7 that guarantees its adequacy (Hair et al., 2010). The next scale reliability was assessed using composite reliability (CR) as shown in Table 4. Authors preferred CR above Cronbach's Alpha, for it being more reliable. The CR values were above the recommended level of 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978).

Thereafter, validity of the data was tested by using convergent and discriminant validity. Convergent validity is tested by using the Fornell and Larcker (1981) criteria. Accordingly, we tested (1) standardized factor loading for individual items (2) CR values for all the constructs and (3) average variation extracted (AVE) value. Following Fornell & Larcker criteria, the standardized loadings for all the items have values more than 0.5 as suggested. For CR values, the suggested threshold is 0.8. The result shown in Table 4 meets the criteria reflecting that an internal consistency exists indicating the reliability of these values. Constructs must have AVE value of at least 0.5. Table 4 further shows that AVE values were estimated above 0.5 showing the explanatory power of the constructs. Variables of all the six constructs share a high proportion of variance among them. Moreover, it is also observed that CR values are higher than the values of AVE. Altogether a strong convergent validity among the constructs is observed.

Discriminant validity was verified using few approaches. First, the correlation matrix was examined as shown in Table 4 that reflected the square roots of the AVEs diagonally. The table showed that all the square roots of the AVEs are higher than the off diagonal correlation values (Fornell & Larcker criterion) suggesting that there is no multicollinearity of items while representing their hypothesized latent factors. Moreover, all of the constructs has accounted for a greater proportion of variance of the variables that are assigned to them. Second, a measure of fit is needed to determine whether the overall model is accepted. Model fit indices with AMOS version 23 reflected acceptable model fit (Table 5). This confirms the unidimensionality of the measurement model.

4.3 Structural model

After ensuring that the reliability and validity of the data is satisfactory, we tested the proposed structural model. The standardized path coefficients are presented in Figure 2. SEM was
| Constructs          | Items                                                                                      | Key references                                    |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Be happy not perfect| My work gives me a scope to make best use of resources to overcome challenges rather than obsessive striving for perfection. |
|                     | There is a peace of mind as my firm enhances the spirit of initiative to focus on what I can and make the best of this situation. |
|                     | Company find ways of expressing patience and gratitude for my smallest efforts giving purpose to my role. |
|                     | Kanten and Yesultas (2015)                                                               |
|                     | Sharifzadeh and Almaraz (2014)                                                           |
|                     | Grant and Gino (2010)                                                                    |
| Open doors open minds| I no longer feel isolated as I can share my thoughts and ideas that are actively listened with an intent to make a difference. |
|                     | Small day-to-day caring gestures at work helps to sort out problems enhancing my keenness to work. |
|                     | Firm chooses “we” instead of “I” that gives me confidence to manage the unknown by being more innovative. |
|                     | Company shares crucial information and willingly interact to discuss that makes me oriented to learn & contribute. |
|                     | Wheeler (2020)                                                                           |
|                     | Kar (2019)                                                                               |
|                     | Wheeler (2020)                                                                           |
|                     | Jones (2002)                                                                             |
| Face the fear, fix fast| I am made aware that I need to go out of my comfort zone to embrace vital changes and reorganize myself. |
|                     | I am made to experience the discomfort of uncertainty at work, so that I remain focused to start once again with greater capacity. |
|                     | I no longer suppress or deny my emotions while facing this crisis that help me to respond quick to changing opportunities. |
|                     | Selvaraj (2020)                                                                          |
|                     | Mikušová and Horváthová (2019)                                                           |
|                     | Roemer and Borkovec (1994)                                                               |
| Generate “energy” moments| I am energized by interactions in which we discuss on possibilities, opportunities and generate a vision where hope follows. |
|                     | I get inspired by the dose of applause at work while reflecting on critical past events where we worked hard together. |
|                     | I feel empowered the moment my employer puts an extra effort to prepare me for handling projects amidst crisis. |
|                     | Cross et al. (2003)                                                                     |
|                     | Yperen and Orehek (2013)                                                                 |
|                     | Paderna et al. (2019)                                                                    |
| Positive mindset    | I feel emotionally stable and work on my strengths as my company boosts me to remain determined. |
|                     | I get strength to seize opportunities & tackle challenges as my firm tells to reflect on what I have learned and adapted during crisis. |
|                     | Now I look for solutions instead of dwelling on problems as the firm helped me to gain faith on my abilities. |
|                     | Luthans and Youssef-Morgan (2017)                                                         |
|                     | Parmar (2015)                                                                            |
|                     | Tugade and Fredrickson (2004)                                                            |
| Resilience at work  | My positive adaptive capacities has enhanced in crisis work situations that inspires me to contribute more and expect less. |
|                     | I respond calmly with positive emotions as I am made to realize the meaningfulness and purpose of my work. |
|                     | Zautra et al. (2010)                                                                     |
|                     | Paul et al. (2016)                                                                       |
employed to test the research hypothesis. The outcome of the path analysis was ascertained from model fit indices (Table 5). The values in Table 6 indicated acceptable model fit. The standardized estimates were examined to determine support for the hypotheses (Table 6). Hypotheses were tested at two stages: (1) testing direct effects \([H1–H9]\) and (2) mediation effects \([H10(a)–H10(d)]\). AMOS version 23 was used to test both direct effects and indirect effects. The VIF values for the variables were below 3 specifying absence of multi-collinearity in the model. The structural model explained 78.4% of the variance in leading to resilience at work.

After the measured model was tested, the hypotheses were tested with the structural model. As shown in Table 7, BHNP \((\beta = 0.04, p = .073)\), and ODOM \((\beta = 0.04, p = .086)\) has no significant influence on resilience at work. Hence H5 and H6 were rejected. However,

| Factors | Scale items | Factor loading | No. of items retained | Cronbach's alpha |
|---------|-------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| BHNP    | 1 b1        | 0.893          | 3                     | 0.826            |
|         | 2 b2        | 0.873          |                       |                  |
|         | 3 b3        | 0.870          |                       |                  |
| ODOM    | 1 o1        | 0.650          | 4                     | 0.743            |
|         | 2 o2        | 0.831          |                       |                  |
|         | 3 o3        | 0.841          |                       |                  |
|         | 4 o4        | 0.874          |                       |                  |
| FFFF    | 1 f1        | 0.928          | 3                     | 0.892            |
|         | 2 f2        | 0.899          |                       |                  |
|         | 3 f3        | 0.860          |                       |                  |
| GEM     | 1 g1        | 0.873          | 3                     | 0.868            |
|         | 2 g2        | 0.876          |                       |                  |
|         | 3 g3        | 0.862          |                       |                  |
| PM      | 1 p1        | 0.769          | 3                     | 0.801            |
|         | 2 p2        | 0.864          |                       |                  |
|         | 3 p3        | 0.771          |                       |                  |
| RW      | 1 r1        | 0.859          | 2                     | 0.866            |
|         | 2 r2        | 0.881          |                       |                  |

| CR     | AVE   | MSV  | PM   | BHNP | ODOM | FFFF | GEM | RW |
|--------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| PM     | 0.845 | 0.647| 0.209| **0.804** |      |      |     |     |
| BHNP   | 0.877 | 0.704| 0.156| 0.395| **0.839** |      |     |     |
| ODOM   | 0.831 | 0.558| 0.130| 0.360| 0.021| **0.747** |     |     |
| FFFF   | 0.921 | 0.796| 0.209| 0.457| 0.281| −0.014| **0.892**|     |
| GEM    | 0.855 | 0.662| 0.129| 0.151|−0.020|−0.042| 0.050| **0.814** |
| RW     | 0.775 | 0.633| 0.138| 0.371| 0.167| 0.105| 0.270| 0.359| **0.796** |

**TABLE 3** Reliability estimates and factor loadings

**TABLE 4** Evaluation of the measurement model (Fornell & Larcker)
FFF (β = 0.14, p = .012) and GEM (β = 0.32, p = .000) had significant positive influence on resilience at work. Hence, H7 and H8 were accepted. PM has a significant positive effect on resilience at work (β = 0.23, p = .016). Hence H9 was supported.

Thereafter, the mediation effects were assessed. In order to examine the significance of indirect effects, bootstrapping technique was applied that fixes no importance on normality of data distribution and is used to determine mediation effects (Byrne, 2010). The direct effect between BHNAP and RW in presence of mediator is 0.04 (p > .05) and the indirect effect between BHNAP and RW is significant (indirect effect = 0.07). This suggests that positive mindset fully mediates the relationship between “Be happy not perfect” (BHNAP) and Resilience at Work (RW). The direct effect between ODOM and RW was 0.04 in the presence of “Positive Mindset (PM)” as a

TABLE 5 Amos goodness-of-fit measures for CFA

| Absolute fit measures                  | CMIN/DF |
|----------------------------------------|---------|
| CMIN/DF                                | 2.812   |
| Goodness-of-fit index (GFI)             | 0.943   |
| Adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI)  | 0.912   |
| Root mean square residual (RMSR)       | 0.042   |
| Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) | 0.053   |

| Incremental fit measures               |         |
|----------------------------------------|---------|
| Relative fit index (RFI)               | 0.908   |
| Tucker-Lewis index (TLI)               | 0.914   |
| Normed fit index (NFI)                 | 0.923   |
| Comparative fit index (CFI)            | 0.899   |

Note: Recommended values: CMIN/DF <3.0; GFI >0.9; AGFI >0.9; RMSR <0.05; RMSEA <0.06; RFI >0.9; TLI >0.9; NFI >0.9; CFI >0.9.
mediator ($\beta = 0.04$; $p > .05$) whereas the indirect effect between ODOM and RW is significant (indirect effect = 0.9; $p < .05$). This shows that positive mindset fully mediates the relationship between Open doors, open minds (ODOM) and Resilience at Work (RW). As we see in Table 8, standardized beta of the direct path between FFFF and RW in presence of “PM” as a mediator was 0.14 ($p < .05$) and the indirect effect between them is 0.09 ($p < .05$). When both direct and indirect effects are significant then partial mediation is anticipated (Cheung & Lau, 2008). In this case, positive mindset partially mediates the relationship between Face the fear, fix fast (FFFF), and Resilience at Work (RW) as both direct and indirect effect are significant. Addition of positive mindset as a mediator shows the direct effect between GEM and RW was 0.32 ($p < .05$), whereas the indirect effect between both of them is 0.04 ($p < .05$). This also shows that positive mindset partially mediates the relationship between Generate energy moments (GEM) and Resilience at Work (RW) reflecting the significance of both direct and indirect effects. The summary of the mediation effects is found at Table 8.

**TABLE 6** Amos goodness-of-fit measures for SEM

| Absolute fit measures                  | CMIN/DF |          |
|---------------------------------------|---------|----------|
| Goodness-of-fit index (GFI)           | 0.931   |          |
| Adjusted goodness-of-fit index (AGFI) | 0.891   |          |
| Root mean square residual (RMSR)      | 0.029   |          |
| Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) | 0.068 |          |

| Incremental fit measures              |          |          |
|---------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Relative fit index (RFI)              | 0.922    |          |
| Tucker-Lewis index (TLI)              | 0.911    |          |
| Normed fit index (NFI)                | 0.923    |          |
| Comparative fit index (CFI)           | 0.911    |          |

| Parsimonious fit measures             |          |          |
|---------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Parsimonious goodness of fit index (PGFI) | 0.622 |          |
| Parsimonious normed fit index (PNFI)   | 0.756    |          |
| Parsimonious comparative fit index (PCFI) | 0.777 |          |

**TABLE 7** Standardized regression weights

| Hypothesis | Hypothesized relationship | Estimate | Significant/insignificant | Accepted/rejected |
|------------|---------------------------|----------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| H1         | BHNP $\rightarrow$ PM     | $0.28^{**}$ | Significant               | Accepted          |
| H2         | ODOM $\rightarrow$ PM     | $0.37^{**}$ | Significant               | Accepted          |
| H3         | FFFF $\rightarrow$ PM     | $0.37^{**}$ | Significant               | Accepted          |
| H4         | GEM $\rightarrow$ PM      | $0.15^{*}$  | Significant               | Accepted          |
| H5         | BHNP $\rightarrow$ RW     | 0.04      | Insignificant             | Rejected          |
| H6         | ODOM $\rightarrow$ RW     | 0.04      | Insignificant             | Rejected          |
| H7         | FFFF $\rightarrow$ RW     | $0.14^{*}$  | Significant               | Accepted          |
| H8         | GEM $\rightarrow$ RW      | $0.32^{**}$ | Significant               | Accepted          |
| H9         | PM $\rightarrow$ RW       | $0.23^{*}$  | Significant               | Accepted          |

Note: **$p < .01$; *$p < .05$.**
This segment discusses the results of the two sets of hypotheses. The findings of our study support our hypothesis that the triggers of heart work (i.e., Face the fear, fix fast & Generate energy moments) significantly affects resilience at work except “Be happy not perfect” and “Open doors, open minds”. In other words, the two factors of heart work enhance resilience of employees at work. This is in line with the findings of the earlier studies (Fredrickson, 2004; Seligman, 2002, 2011). The study provides a new approach for endorsing resilience at work and a significant direction for its continuance. The findings of the study “Face the fear, fix fast” showed clearly that when firms help their people to face the crisis and remains transparent showing them the actual scenario, employees get active to work toward exploring opportunities for a new beginning. Employees start accepting the vital changes soon and start to reorganize themselves with a prominent capacity. A positive and meaningful relationship is evident between Generate energy moments and resilience at work. It highlighted that when organizations boosted and empowered their employees at times of uncertainties, it generated a hope for employees to put on their best efforts and overcome the setbacks. Employees then collectively thrive on all the possibilities to fulfill their new vision.

However, we would like to highlight two surprising findings which have been contrary to our expectation. First, in contrast to our theorizing, “Be happy not perfect” does not significantly enhance resilience at work. Perhaps it might be owing to the fact that when employees are inspired and boosted to look through the crisis circumstances honestly, understand it wisely and pull themselves up; it fills them with vigor and zeal to overcome barriers. This eventually keeps them in high spirits and ingrains in them a sense of contentment as they can foresee something propitious down the line. Organization might not need to put that extra effort to make them happy (Chakraborty & Biswas, 2021). Second, “Open doors, open minds” do not have a statistically significant effect on resilience at work. This might be due to the reason that an organization energizes a firm with vibrant and frequent interaction at times of crisis. The company helps them reflect on the critical past circumstances where its people fought together with constant brainstorming, discussion on possibilities and analysis of critical issues. Thus, at times of setbacks and upheaval there is no need for an employee to enter the door of a boss to communicate their concern and ideas. Rather the entire firms set the floor on for quick and spontaneous interactions and interactivity.

The second set of hypothesis shows the mediation effects of positive mindset. The findings reflect that positive mindset fully mediates the effects of “Be happy not perfect” on resilience at work. When an organization strengthens the emotional health of an employee by asking them to give more at work and appreciating their worth at times of disruption, infuses in them a reassuring belief that has a positive effect on the minds. This reinforces them to bounce back.

| Hypothesis | Direct effect | Indirect effect | Result | A/R |
|------------|--------------|----------------|--------|-----|
| BHNP → PM → RW | 0.04 | 0.07* | Full | Accepted |
| ODOM → PM → RW | 0.04 | 0.09* | Full | Accepted |
| FFFF → PM → RW | 0.14* | 0.09* | Partial | Accepted |
| GEM → PM → RW | 0.32* | 0.04* | Partial | Accepted |

Note: **p < .01; *p < .05.

5 | DISCUSSION
This finding is consistent with the earlier studies (Borman et al., 2001). The findings also showed that positive mindset fully mediates the association between “Open doors, open minds” and resilience at work. This indicates that connecting and interacting people at work lessens their level of fear and anxiety. This pro social behavior implants a positive feeling and makes them stable to respond quickly to the challenges. The process triggers their creative ideas and decision making abilities. This is also in line with the findings explored in the previous studies (Froman, 2010; Rogers, 1987). As from the findings we also perceive that positive mindset partially mediates the effects of Face the fear, fix fast on resilience at work. Equipping employees with relevant information of the crisis, making them experience and understand the reality of the work floor and the external environment make them clear about their respective roles. It builds in them a sense of control that helps them to prepare for the unknown challenges. This keeps them positive and not helpless. Employees then find courage to fight back. This finding is unvarying with the earlier studies (van Galen & Bellamy, 2015). We also discern that positive mindset partially mediates the effects of “Generate energy moments” on resilience at work. By infusing enthusiasm and confidence on the competence of employees at times of upheaval, making them believe in themselves and prepare them gradually enhances their positive emotion. They regain their courage credibility to stand still and perform. The findings too are uniform with the earlier investigations (Luthans et al., 2007).

6 | MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

As the spread and far reaching effect of COVID-19 is engulfing the world, a parallel spread of worry, fear and instability is overtaking the minds of people at work. Amidst the threat of pandemic, employees are trapped into negative thinking. A series of changes in employee policies, regulations, guidelines, targets, expectations together with remote working process has distracted the working minds. They are now hooked by compulsive thinking and a feeling of helplessness. Yet there is no one to show them the positive possibilities. Thus, it is crucial for firms to connect with employees through compassion. Nourishing an organization with heart work and bounded optimism would never disrupt the equilibrium amidst existential crisis. Varied collaborative pattern would collectively help employees perceive potential risks and emerge from it together with new opportunities. Sincere expressions of gratitude when employees are afflicted by anxiety and stress shall renew their energy and hope to overcome barriers and initiate a thought process. The essence of heart work cultivates a feeling of inclusivity and gesture of unity amidst this COVID-19 turbulence. Engaging in an open dialogue with employees would help them adapt the required level of variance. It is the time for a company to generate value that drives transparency and mutual respect to make its people endure this stretching situation.

Thus, it is essential for a firm to generate a purpose driven and a positive goal for its employees by restoring a deep emotional connection. It would then be possible to accomplish the steps of Resolve, Resilience, Return and Reimagine as rightfully highlighted by Faridun Dotiwala of McKinsey & Co., Asia (Dotiwala, n.d.). This pandemic has a taken a toll on psychological health of employees as they witness terminations, pay cuts, layoffs, closure of firms, ambiguous virtual meetings and growing sense of isolation. It is a time to reconnect with employees and reignite their creative energy.

While we have embarked on the “unlock” session, it is crucial for firms to ensure that employees bring their whole self at work. Thus marching toward heart work has become the “platinum rule” that would trigger a revolution to achieve sustained coordinated initiatives.
The current COVID-19 turbulence comes as a wakeup call to hold on to what we have and grow it with generosity and compassion. It can curb passivity and depression in them and infuse enthusiasm and confidence. Amidst frustration, fear and anxiety, happiness would reside in their hearts and shall bring in stable world of work. Employees would emerge once again with a vision; a new hope as it says, “fall down seven times, stand up eight”.

7 | LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Although the study has been resourceful and provides implications for practitioners as well as academicians, it has some limitations that can be addressed for further research. The mediated model can be expanded as we have considered only one mediator. Researchers in future can examine the moderating effect of demographic variables such as age, gender and income on the relation between the stimulators and positive mindset. Researchers can also conduct the study in the other parts of the world using the same model. In this study the data used is cross sectional in nature. Thus, for further research the scholars can use longitudinal data to make the study more certain. Moreover, the impact of work patterns in organizations during this pandemic phase would also help us to explore the study better.

8 | CONCLUSION

Our study tried to understand the subtle aspects of the conscience of an employee who are trapped, burdened, perturbed, and dispirited by the unfavorable impacts of this global pandemic. In such an adverse situation, when employees are spiraled into hopelessness how can an organization help find an employee the silver linings is delved deep into our study. By being a little flexible, gentler, kind, by acknowledging efforts of its people, willing to take on board new ideas a firm can change the bad narrative. Expressions of gratitude and compassion can be a total heart opener and can go a long way. This would help employees deliver insights and actions and can keep them away from wallowing in agony. It is a high time that an organization must keep positive words for all. Therefore, it is time to choose your celebration for...Record breaking sales versus thoughtful and helpful employees.
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