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Organizational resilience and Employee performance in COVID-19 pandemic: The mediating effect of Emotional Intelligence

Abstract

Purpose – Explosion of the deadly coronavirus (COVID-19) has led to an unprecedented crisis lately, which has adversely affected the performance level of professionals in the educational sector worldwide due to a number of constraints, imposition of lockdown being one of those. Organizational Resilience (OReg) and Emotional Intelligence (EI) discretely have been identified as indicators of employee performance (EP) over the years, but during the period of crisis, these have been scarcely analyzed. Therefore, the present study aims to examine the mediating role of emotional intelligence on the relationship between organizational resilience and employee performance during the pandemic.

Design/methodology/data-analysis – 390 responses from the teaching and non-teaching professionals working in the Higher Educational Institutions (HEIs) were collected from different HEIs located in India through online survey questionnaires. The collected data was further analyzed using regression analysis, factor analysis, structural equation modeling along with bootstrapping technique, reliability and validity analysis, mediation analysis, and model fit indices analysis.

Findings – The results of the study confirmed partial mediation effect of EI on OReg-EP relationship, and further results also exhibited that employees with a higher level of EI, contribute more positively to the organizational resilience level, which further enhances the performance level at the workplace.

Research limitations – The samples collected for the current study pertain to the higher educational institutions (HEIs) only, therefore the present study results have limited general applicability. Furthermore, the study doesn’t investigate the influence of time.

Practical implications – This study would assist practitioners of HEIs in improving the resilience capabilities of the organization. Employee performance can be improved by enhancing the levels of organizational resilience and individuals’ emotional intelligence, which is in line with the findings of the current study.
**Originality/value** – The current study examines the mediating effect of emotional intelligence on organizational resilience and employee performance relationship for the first time in the HEIs in India.

**Keywords**: Organizational resilience, Emotional intelligence, Employee performance, Adaptability.

I. BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION

1. Introduction

The outburst of the deadly coronavirus (COVID-19) is an unprecedented crisis which has been declared as a global pandemic by the World Health Organization (WHO). Having its origin in China, the novel coronavirus has led to an increased number of casualties, loss of revenues, employment and disturbance in the everyday activities in more than 180 countries. It was in December 2019 that the people started falling prey to the devastating coronavirus, and approximately a year into the COVID-19 disaster, the impacts of this massive scale pandemic are quite apparent. From the leading economies of the world to the cities regarded as the financial hubs, from the large scale multi-national corporations to the start-ups in infancy, from the people working in the organizations to the ones owning those, coronavirus has catapulted everybody and everything into a state of total dismay.

It is not only the exposure to coronavirus that has put the economic as well as the social activities in jeopardy, but it is owing to the imposed lockdowns and the social distancing measures too that the routine activities are hampered. One such sector that has been widely impacted by the pandemic and the preventive measures is the education sector. With the multiplication of coronavirus cases each day, a major change that has occurred in the educational institutions is the pivot from regular classroom teaching to the use of digital platforms to impart education (remote learning). With the unpredictable changes being forged by the virus, the question is: how will the organizations and the educational institutions withstand the environmental disruptions of such huge scale?

The outbreak of coronavirus is not the only one of its type, the outburst of Ebola, Zika, SARS all serve to give a cue to mankind that the unthinkable may actualise one day. As the Ebola crisis has faded from the world’s attention, the humans have actually missed the opportunity to learn from the crisis (Gates, 2015). Undoubtedly, crises of such huge scale pose a great challenge for the organizations, at times even threatening their survival, but what is more important is to comprehend the challenges and learn from these (Simmons, 2009). The psychosocial implications of the outbreak of Ebola were seen to be intense at the individual, community and international levels (Bortel et al., 2016) but the impacts of COVID-19 pandemic are even more fatal. In the organizations, the realm of crisis management is intimately linked to organizational
learning. Learning helps an organization handle the crisis situation better and also enables an organization to learn from the crisis experience so as to improve the future processes of managing a crisis (Wang, 2008).

Today, the world in which the organizations tend to survive is complex and the speed of unforeseen events turning into a disaster is intensifying rapidly (Weick and Sutcliffe, 2001), as a result of which developing organizational resilience is critically important to navigate through the catastrophe successfully. Moreover, the way in which the individuals and the organizations respond to changes influences the key outcomes. The organizational response is not directed towards combating the present crisis only but, also towards facilitating learning for organizations for the times to come. Hence, the present paper seeks to develop an integrated theory of resilience to help organizations to embrace and handle organizational changes effectively during crises like the prevailing COVID-19. Resilience is the maintenance of positive orientation under disruptive conditions such that the organization becomes more resourceful and strengthens itself (Vogus and Sutcliffe, 2007). While, Garmezy (1987) presented an ecological view of resilience, which discussed the protective factors (at individual, family and external to family) that affect the individual resilience. The present work is based on Rutter’s (2012) principles of resilience theory, which states that resilience is not only associated with individual psychological attributes, but rather this is a common adaptation towards offered resources. Similarly, description of resilience by Luthar et al. (1991) is also offering theoretical background for the current study, which states that resilience is an active process about positive adaptation in the context of considerable adversity.

Moreover, organizational resilience is a new practice in organizational theory that integrates insights from both usually applicable strategies and contingency theories. Kantur and Say (2015) defined organizational resilience as the capacity of the organizations to resist and combat the unfavourable and taxing conditions, it is the capability of the organization to benefit from the disruptive conditions and sustain its reputation. Additionally, in the times of crisis, resilience is not simply about being adaptive to the situation, it is about finding solutions to the problem proactively and creatively (Weick, 1993). To sustain in the dynamic environments and to prosper, the organizations should be able to handle the unexpected events successfully (Duchek, 2020). For the higher educational institutions to navigate through the ongoing pandemic smoothly, development of resilience capabilities is imperative and emotional intelligence of the faculty members has a part to play in the development of resilience capabilities and further influencing the performance of employees.

According to the figures disclosed by UNESCO, around 70% of the learner’s around the globe have been refrained from attending the educational institutions by nation-wide closures. It is not just the learners that are largely impacted but the employees of these educational institutions as well, with a major impact on the performance of these employees. In a situation as turbulent as this, it becomes very important to study the factors exerting an influence on their performance. In
addition to organizational resilience, emotional intelligence is one important factor that is a
subset of social intelligence and can be defined as the capacity to monitor the feelings and
emotions of oneself and the others, assess the emotions and use the information to solve the
immediate problems as well as steer one’s thinking and actions (Salovey and Mayer, 1990).

Considering the havoc wrecked by the outburst of novel coronavirus, this research endeavours to
investigate the following research questions:

RQ1: What is the role of organizational resilience in building emotional intelligence of the
professionals working in HEIs and the influence of organizational resilience on employee
performance in the times of crisis?

RQ2: What is the effect of emotional intelligence on employee performance and does it mediate
the relationship between organizational resilience and employee performance?

By pursuing the above research questions, an insightful theoretical contribution and a more
practical understanding to deal with the catastrophes is anticipated. The conceptual framework of
this study could be seen as an additional step towards making a novel contribution to the
resilience and organizational theory. Since, the crises of such massive scale are rare, there is a
lack of research on the role of organizational resilience and emotional intelligence in influencing
the performance of employees in the times of crisis. The findings of this paper will help the
future researchers to develop arguments based on the results and extend the extant theories
related to resilience and organizations at large.

The remaining part of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the literature on the
study constructs, discusses the gaps and the proposed hypotheses as well as the proposed model
of the study. Section 3 consists of the research methodology including context, target samples,
sampling and data collection, data analysis etc. Data analysis results such as (reliability and
validity analysis, CFA, Normality analysis, common method bias, correlation and regression,
hypothesis testing, mediation analysis and fit indices etc.) are presented in detail in Section 4,
followed by the study results, discussion from theoretical and practical viewpoints, limitations of
the study along with future directions in the final sections.

2. Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

In this section, the literature regarding the organizational resilience, emotional intelligence, and
employee performance is discussed in detail, followed by research gaps and the proposed
hypotheses:

2.1 Organizational Resilience
At the organizational level, resilience may be defined as the ability to reinvent the business models as well as the strategies in accordance with the changing scenario before the need for the adoption of new models and strategies becomes apparent (Hamel and Valikangas, 2003). The interest of academicians in organizational resilience has multiplied in the recent years but there is a lack of consensus on the conceptualization of the construct and the elements of organizational resilience (Duchek, 2020). According to Lengnick-Hall et al. (2011) it is essential for the organizations to focus on the development of resilience capacities because it capacitates the organization to respond to the unprecedented events and benefit from the events instead of letting such catastrophes affect the organization’s survival. Resilience not only helps the organization in responding to the changes effectively but it also enhances the sense of well-being and stimulates people to make sense of change speedily along with helping them in maintaining their performance levels (Hodges, 2017). Practically, the multidimensional concept of organizational resilience can be critical for the organizations to assess and build the adaptive capacity to bounce back post a crisis (Kim, 2020). In the COVID-19 pandemic, it is critical for the organizations to be resilient to combat the crisis of such massive scale. To navigate through the ongoing pandemic smoothly, the knowledge of resilience capacities is essential and it is equally essential to understand the determinants (discussed below) of organizational resilience:

2.1.1 Organizational Capability and Adaptability

The organizations should possess the adaptive capacities especially in the unfavourable times. The term adaptive capacity may be understood as the ability of an organization to modify its strategies, decision-making capabilities, operations, governance structure and management system to cope with the disruptions (Starr et al., 2004) and use it as an opportunity. More perceptive and more adaptive organizations have the capacity to lead their members towards enhanced creative thinking, eventually leading to a transformational process (Koronis and Ponis, 2018). According to the above-mentioned authors, it is via change, improvisation, transformation and adaptation that resilience is developed as an attempt to step into a new environment and changed organizational reality.

2.1.2 Resilient Organizational Culture

Learning and cultural aspects have a critical role in the development of organizational resilience (Pal et al., 2014). The cultural system of an organization indicates the emotional/belief system of the senior executives largely, and ultimately it is the attitude and beliefs of the senior executives with regard to the organization’s potential to help in preparing and managing the crisis which determines success of the organization in crisis management (Pearson and Mitroff, 1993). Culture is the summation of fundamental, tacit assumptions shared commonly by a group of people about how the things are and how they ought to be (Bowers et al., 2017). For the development of organizational resilience, a healthy, positive and learning culture may be considered as an essential precondition.
2.1.3 Organizational Crises Policy

Crisis events tend to act as turning point in the lifetime of an organization, however there is a lack of a comprehensive model which helps the organizations to prepare themselves to combat crises and why they tend to behave the way they do (Carmeli and Schaubroeck, 2008). The crises management policy of the organization should delineate how the organization envisages and prepares for the crisis as a distinct constituent of the broad resilience framework. As far as the crisis is concerned, consequences of the crisis are more important than the causes of crisis, to combat and manage the crisis strategically. Therefore, it is imperative to focus on the severity of the situation and the potential impacts (Griffin, 2014).

2.1.4 Employee Empowerment Initiatives

Employee empowerment is the phenomena wherein the decision-making authority and responsibility is delegated to the employees working at every level. It is very important for the organizations to respond to the environmental changes quickly, and empowerment of employees is one measure that caters to the realization of such objectives (Baird and Wang, 2010). In today’s turbulent times, employee empowerment initiatives are assumed to be crucial in building organizational resilience however Argyris (1998) argues that employee empowerment is rhetoric and superficial, in the organizations the actual control lies with the managers only.

On the basis of the literature, the following hypotheses are developed:

H1: (a) Organizational Capability and Adaptability, (b) Resilient Organizational Culture, (c) Organizational Crisis Policy and (d) Employee Empowerment Initiatives are positively related to organizational resilience.

2.2 Emotional Intelligence

The conceptualization of EI dates back to 1920’s when Thorndike (1920) classified the concept into three dimensions namely mechanical intelligence, abstract intelligence and social intelligence. Emotional Intelligence was first introduced by Salovey and Mayer (1990), as the ability to (a) gauge and exhibit emotions, (b) handle emotions and (c) utilize emotions to solve problems. Mayer et al. (1999) redefined the notion of emotional intelligence as the competence of an individual to identify and demonstrate emotions for facilitating judgements. The conceptualization of EI encompasses three primary domains of research (Caruso, 2003), the first one considers EI as a set of interconnected intellectual abilities for the use of emotional information (Mayer et al., 1997), in the second domain, similar to the models of dispositional traits and personality, EI is treated as a set of traits for adjusting and enduring (Bar-On, 2000) and the third domain stands on the foundation of behavioural competencies which combines the affective and cognitive abilities (Boyatzis and Boyatzis, 2009; Mahon et al., 2014).
EI has a pivotal role to play in determining competence and success (Goleman 1995, 1998) in various endeavours of life, be it a student, a teacher, a parent, a leader or a manager. With reference to the personality theory, EI has been placed as an umbrella concept which focuses on the non-cognitive capabilities and skills to deal with the environmental demands and constraints (Bar-On, 1997). According to Dulewicz and Higgs (1999), Emotional intelligence has seven components, namely self-awareness, motivation, influence, intuitiveness, emotional resilience, interpersonal sensitivity, conscientiousness and integrity. Whereas, Goleman (2001) has recognized two competencies relating to EI namely- the personal competence consisting of self-awareness and self-management and the social competence which constitutes of social awareness and relationship management. He defined, Self-awareness as the ability to know one’s feelings at a point of time and utilizing it for the process of decision making, while self-management can be regarded as the regulation of distressing and disruptive feelings and moreover it is the ability of being unperturbed even in stressful situations. And social awareness is the process of recognizing the feelings of other people and is especially crucial to the job performance when the interaction with different people is in focus and relationship management is the capability to comprehend and influence the emotions of other people along with managing conflicts in the organization, inspiring and guiding people and focusing on teamwork and collaborations.

EI is a significant psychological variable that exerts an influence on the abilities and performance of employees. In the literature EI has been seen to have an impact on certain work-related outcomes, however there is a dearth of literature on the influence of EI on the positive work related outcomes in the education sector particularly and owing to the direct and frequent interactions between individuals in the services sector, the study of EI becomes significant (Asrar-ul-Haq et al., 2017). Albeit the academic achievements, an individual with high emotional intelligence is considered to be a better worker owing to his ability to be a team player, ability to work under pressure and strengthen the overall organizational productivity (Mohzane et al., 2013). Accordingly, the following hypotheses are developed in the study:

H2: (a) Self-awareness, (b) Self-management, (c) Social-awareness and (d) Relationship management are positively related to Emotional intelligence.

2.3 Employee Performance

Performance is the cognition of the organization’s capacity to attain the pre-determined goals (Miller and Broamiley, 1990) and in today’s business environment individual performance has become critical to the overall organization’s performance. Individual job performance is the sum-total of abilities, skills, knowledge and function that is directed towards the prescribed job behaviour (Campbell, 1999). Strategic management of employee performance, translation of organizational objectives into goals and review of such goals on regular basis ensures greater control over the activities of employees (Forrester, 2011). According to Forrester (2011)
performance management is not limited to monitoring performance only, for it possesses the
capacity to shape and reshape the academic institutions.

The concept of employee performance in the educational institutions in the time of pandemic
goes beyond the fundamental responsibilities of employees, and it includes different aspects such
as adaptability, work-life balance (WLB) in the changing scenario, development through
learning, training and other initiatives due to the accelerated adoption of digitalization which will
lead to the transformation in higher education. WLB does not necessarily mean an equal balance
instead it is a combination of interactions at different levels of an individual’s life, it is about
adjusting the work patterns in such a way that employees are able to meet out their personal
responsibilities sufficiently along with professional responsibilities (Mendis and Weerakkody,
2017). WLB is much more than prioritizing the work life and the personal life, it is a
phenomenon that exerts an influence on the social, psychological, mental and economic well-
being of the employees (Obiageli et al., 2015). In the times when the employees are faced with a
危机 of such huge scale, adaptability of the employees to the situation is equally important.
Individual adaptability is a comparatively stable individual difference that is seen to influence
the way in which the employees interpret and respond to the situation (Ployhart and Bliese,
2006). Adaptable individuals tend to perceive the situation positively and their sensitivity
towards the environment cues is more, and as a result of which the employees tend to notice
more and their ability to appreciate the supportive actions of their organizations is more too
(Cullen et al., 2014). Proactiveness of employees is another factor that is expected to impact the
employee performance in this pandemic era. The proactiveness can be viewed as the summation
of high involvement and commitment, a distinct sense of responsibility and independent
contribution with initiative; to combat the crisis, expansion in the role of employees either
through alterations in job, or increased involvement or through modifications in the processes
and procedures is also critical (Campbell, 2000).

The COVID-19 pandemic has completely changed the economic as well as social scenario
around the world. In such turbulent circumstances it is essential for the employees of the
education sector too to adapt rapidly to the changing situation and adopt new ways of imparting
education like switching to digital mode. Since remote teaching is essential in the prevalent
scenario, it would be interesting to see how well the faculties cope up with the new ways of
education delivery and also manage the work-life interface. Furthermore, the initiatives taken by
the faculty members to make learning more effective and acquiring new skills themselves is
crucial too in such distressing times to help in withstanding the pandemic and turn the
opportunity into an advantage. On the basis of this discussion, the proposed hypotheses are
discussed below:

H3: (a) Initiatives, (b) Adaptability and (c) Work-life Balance are positively related to Employee
performance.
All the measurement variables from the literature are summarized in Table I.

(Insert Table I here)

2.4 Research Gap

In the literature, the relationship between emotional intelligence and employee performance (Kulkarni et al., 2009; Wu, 2011; Lam and Higgins, 2012; Lakshmi and Rao, 2018; Ujagare, 2020), has been of great interest to the researchers. But, there is a dearth of literature on the influence of emotional intelligence and organizational resilience on employee performance in the times of crisis. Only a few researchers have investigated resilience within an organizational context (Parsons, 2010), and the organizational resilience and employee performance relationship during crisis has barely received attention.

Moreover, there is limited empirical research on organizational resilience in the organization theory owing to the unpredictability of emergencies and disasters. The possibilities to pursue the construct of organizational resilience in the future are manifold, the impact of organizational resilience on various individuals and other organizational outcomes being of utmost importance. Similarly, the literature on the role of organizational resilience in developing emotional intelligence is scant. Especially, in the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the study of these constructs becomes even more significant.

Based on the above discussion and the identified research gaps, the below-mentioned hypotheses and model have been proposed:

H4: Organizational resilience is positively related to Employee Performance.

H5: Organizational resilience is positively associated with Emotional Intelligence.

H6: Emotional Intelligence is also positively related to Employee Performance.

H7: Emotional Intelligence mediates the relationship between Organizational Resilience and Employee Performance.

(Insert Figure 1 here)

II. METHODOLOGY, RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS

3. Research Methodology

The research framework including all three stages which were followed in the current study is presented in Figure 2.
3.1 Context and Data collection

The Higher Educational Institutes of the country are facing tough times due to the COVID-19 pandemic; this pandemic has disrupted the higher educational sector (ET Government News, April 16, 2020) to a great extent. The teaching as well as the non-teaching staffs are significantly affected in this sector due to the imposed lockdown and many other reasons (UNESCO’s Report, 2020). The challenges ahead for the HEIs are multi-fold as they have to not only adopt new ways of education delivery through online mode but also ensure that the quality of education is better than that in the pre-COVID era, as in the post-COVID era there will be accelerated adoption of digitalization making it perhaps the primary medium of education for many. The present study was conducted on various higher educational institutions in India by collecting data from employees (including teaching and non-teaching professionals). With the consent of the top management and the support of senior professionals of the higher educational institutes, the questionnaire was shared online through Google Survey forms with teaching and non-teaching employees. The purpose and context of the study was clearly mentioned and discussed with the assurance of data confidentiality in the instructions of the questionnaire. The convenience sampling (non-probability method) method was used for data collection from the target population.

3.2 Sample and Procedure

Online questionnaire was shared with 500 teaching and non-teaching employees working with various higher educational institutions in India. 390 samples which were complete and valid were received back, at a response rate of 78%. The gender distribution was 71.1% male and 28.4% female, in the age group of 30-52 years. The profile of respondents was as follows: Assistant professors-62.8%, Associate professors and Professors-16.4%, and non-teaching employees-20.8% respectively.

(Insert Figure 2 here)

3.3 Measures

3.3.1 Organisational Resilience (OReg)

To measure organizational resilience, a 16 items self-designed scale was developed, which was first pilot tested for reliability and validity assessment with 120 samples. Principal component analysis (PCA) and Varimax factor rotation methods were employed to explore and confirm important and highly loaded indicators of all the three constructs. The study measures Organizational resilience in a holistic manner. Based on the pilot study results, organizational
resilience (OReg) was finalized as a latent variable with its four indicators (i.e. organizational capability and adaptability (OCA), resilient organizational culture (ROC), organizational crisis policy (OCP), and employee empowerment initiatives (EEI). The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was found to be 0.963, which has exceeded the conventional cut-off threshold of 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978), thus fully supporting the internal reliability of the OReg scale. Each indicator of OReg was measured by using four items on the 5-point Likert scale with anchors of 1 (strongly Disagree) and 5 (Strongly Agree) for all 16 items.

Sample items (of OCA) included, “The organization does sufficient planning to establish maps and roadmaps to manage risks”, “The organization has a set of plans with diverse focus to deal with emergencies”, and “The organization has the capability to restructure itself when confronting crisis”. Similarly, few sample items of ROC were: “I like the way my company is handling internal communications during this crisis”, “In a crisis, the company gets support from other parts of the organization, resources, and plans”, and “Personnel can take time out of their working day to practice how to respond in a crisis”. For OCP indicator, the sample items were: “My manager has effectively responded to my needs in the current environment”, “My organization has flexible policies to handle crisis and offers financial assistance too”, and “The organization has identified and prepared for necessary resources during crisis period”. And the sample items (of EEI) included, “Management listens and encourage to my suggestions for the improvement in operations”, “Employees are involved and consulted in problem solving and decisions affecting their work”, and “My organization provides training opportunities to develop skills necessary to perform the job effectively”.

### 3.3.2 Emotional Intelligence (EI)

To measure emotional intelligence, a 16 items self-designed scale was developed, which was first pilot tested for reliability and validity assessment with 120 samples. Based on the pilot study results, and from the Goleman and Boyatzis (2017)’s elements of EI, emotional intelligence (EI) was finalized as a latent variable with its four indicators namely: self-awareness (SSA), self-management (SM), social-awareness (SA), and relationship-management (RM). The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was found to be 0.918, which met the conventional cut-off threshold of 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978), hence fully supporting the internal reliability of the emotional intelligence scale. Each indicator of EI was measured by using four items on the 5-point Likert scale, where participants indicated their level of agreement for all 16 items on the scale (1 = strongly Disagree, and 5 = Strongly Agree).

Sample items (of SSA) included, “I always know when I’m being unreasonable”, “I always know which emotions I am feeling and why”, and “I realize the links between my feelings and what I think, do, and say”. Similarly for SA, sample items were: “I am attentive to emotional cues and am a good listener”, “I show sensitivity and understand others’ perspectives”, and “I help out based on understanding other people’s needs and feelings”. For SM, sample items included, “I
manage my impulsive feelings and distressing emotions well”, “I stay composed, positive, and unflappable even in trying moments”, and “I think clearly and stay focused under pressure”. And sample items of RM were, “I cultivate and maintain extensive informal networks”, “I build rapport and keep others in the loop”, and “I make and maintain personal friendships among work associates”.

3.3.3 Employee Performance (EP)

To measure employee performance during COVID-19 crisis, a 12 items self-designed scale was developed following existing literature. Based on the pilot study results, employee performance (EP) was finalized as a latent variable with its three indicators.

The three indicators of EP (latent variable) found from the existing literature were: Initiatives/taking the lead (EPI), Adaptability (EPA), and Work life balance (EPWLB) (Harrington and Ladge, 2009; Parkes and Langford, 2008) while working remotely during this pandemic. The Cronbach’s alpha for this scale came out to be 0.844, which fully satisfied the conventional cut-off threshold of 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978), thereby confirming the internal reliability of employee performance scale. Each indicator of EP was measured by using four items on the 5-point Likert scale with anchors of 1 (Strongly Disagree) and 5 (Strongly Agree) for all 12 items.

Sample items (of EPI) included, “I am always ready to seize opportunities”, “I pursue goals beyond what’s required or expected of me”, and “I cut through red tape and bend the rules when necessary to get the job done”. For EPA, sample items were: “I smoothly handle multiple demands, shifting priorities, and rapid change”, “I adapt my responses and tactics to fit fluid circumstances”, and “I am flexible in how I see events”. And sample items for EPWLB included, “I feel that I never have chance to catch my breath before I move onto the next projects during this crisis time”, “I am able to manage family and work efficiently while working from home”, and “I feel supported to adjust my work schedule to accommodate my caregiving needs”.

The key indicators for Organizational Resilience, Emotional Intelligence and Employee Performance were chosen owing to their high relevance during the times of crisis. The existing literature on organizational resilience dominantly conceptualizes organizational resilience in terms of resilient employees (Van der Vegt et al., 2015; Kim, 2020) but there is an absolute lack of consensus on how the construct of organizational resilience is to be measured (Kantur and Say, 2015). In the current study, the measurement of organizational resilience is not limited to considering the employees as a resilient system, the other key elements such as the resilient organizational culture, adaptive capabilities, the organizational crisis policy, which are crucial in crisis-specific context have been adapted. Similarly, employee performance has also been calibrated as an amalgamation of initiatives from employees’ end, adaptability and the work life balance. The three indicators are highly relevant in today’s times when the organizations are going through a period of transformation. Moreover, the importance of adaptability and work life
balance as indicators of employee performance can be attributed to the monumental disbalance in the conventional work patterns and the lives of the employees (Anwer, 2020; Kumar and Mokashi, 2020). As indicated by Pradhan and Jena (2017) in their findings, there are different aspects of employee performance for example, job performance and contextual performance (Johnson, 2003), Conscientious initiative and Personal and Organizational Support (Borman et al., 2001), Proactive Work Behavior, Problem Solving and Idea Implementation (Parker, Williams and Turner, 2006), Creativity, Reactivity to the difficulties, Training efforts, Dealing with work related stress, Interpersonal adaptableness (Audrey and Patrice, 2012). But, the factors adapted in the current study are of supreme importance during such disruptive times.

3.4 Procedure

The data collection was done in the months of April and May, 2020 during the COVID-19 pandemic. Online questionnaire (Google forms) was mailed to all the target participants in the third week of April 2020. 390 completed responses of questionnaire at a response rate of 78% were collected from target population over a time period of a month.

3.5 Analysis

A path analysis approach was applied to understand the significance of key predictors of employee performance and to determine the empirical associations between the constructs of study and their indicators during the COVID-19 pandemic. The aim of the proposed model in the current study is to examine both direct and indirect relationships among the constructs pertaining to the crisis period and establish the relative importance of these constructs in ascertaining the factors impacting employees performance level in higher educational sector. To the best of our knowledge, this aspect for crisis period has not been formerly analyzed which motivated us to conduct the study.

The Pilot testing was performed on 120 samples for reliability and validity assessment of the self-designed questionnaire (OReg, EI and EP). Skewness and kurtosis tests were performed to check normality of the data with the help of IBM SPSS Statistics 20 software. Reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha and composite reliability), validity assessments (convergent and discriminant validity) were performed to test the reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity of each construct. Furthermore, the common method bias in data was tested by Harman’s Single factor test (HSFT). Hypotheses of study were tested by deploying path analysis through structural equation modelling (SEM) with bootstrapping technique using IBM AMOS 20 software (Arbuckle, 2006).

A mediation model was established to examine/assess the hypothesized direct and indirect effects. All goodness-of-fit indices, chi square (χ2), chi-square to df (χ2/df), the comparative fit index (CFI), the root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA), and the test of close fit
(PCLOSE) etc. were also estimated and analysed to explore the fitness of model with the key predictors of employee performance during this COVID-19 pandemic using SPSS and AMOS software.

4. Results

The proposed path model was tested with the latent variables: organizational resilience, emotional intelligence and employee performance to examine the relationships among these variables. The maximum likelihood method was used to calculate the path coefficients with the assumption of normal multivariate distribution. The normal distribution of data was verified with skewness and kurtosis analysis, in which the skewness values (organizational resilience: 0.828; emotional intelligence: 0.875; and employee performance: 0.424) were below 3.00 (Kline, 2011) and in acceptable range (-1 to +1). Similarly the kurtosis values (organizational resilience: 0.381; emotional intelligence: 1.139; and employee performance: 1.616) were also in acceptable range (-2 to +2) (George and Mallery, 2010; Gravetter and Wallnau, 2014), thus satisfying the criteria for normal distribution of data.

4.1 CFA Results

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was done to explore highly loaded and key items of each indicator, and also to determine the convergent and discriminant validity for all constructs of the study. The proposed hypothesized model comprises of three constructs which were: organizational resilience (OReg), emotional intelligence (EI), and employee performance (EP). A good fit model was found for the collected data with Chi-square $\chi^2 = 113.982$, $p = .110$, CMIN/DF = 3.562, normed fit index (NFI) = 0.955, comparative fit index (CFI) = 0.967, root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA) = 0.046. Moreover, all the indicators of the proposed hypothesized model were found to be loaded significantly with their corresponding latent variables (as shown in Table V).

4.2 Reliability and Validity Results

Reliability analysis was carried out to examine the internal consistency/reliability based on the Cronbach Alpha ($\alpha$) scores, which should be more than 0.70 (Nunnally, 1978). It was found that the Cronbach Alpha scores for the instruments of organizational resilience, emotional intelligence and employee performance were 0.963, 0.918, and 0.844 respectively which is far more than the criteria specified by Nunnally (1978). These results confirm that the study instruments have good internal consistency or reliability for measurement of the corresponding construct. In addition to this, composite reliability values on a reflective scale were also estimated for the internal consistency.
The composite reliability values of each latent variable were greater than 0.8, and also the AVE values of each construct were more than 0.5 (Table II). All the three constructs (i.e. organizational resilience, emotional intelligence, and employee performance) of the study have exceeded Cronbach Alpha values of 0.7, composite reliability values of 0.8, and the AVE values of 0.5 (Hair Jr. et al., 2016; Kline, 2015). It confirms the internal reliability of each study construct.

Additionally, the construct validity was assessed using both convergent and discriminant validities. It was found that the condition for the convergent validity (i.e. AVE value > 0.5, Gaskin, 2012a, 2016) of each study construct was fully achieved on the basis of the AVE values of each construct (organizational resilience: 0.856; emotional intelligence: 0.707, and employee performance: 0.647).

(Discard Table II)

Discriminant validity is defined as “the degree to which the constructs are empirically different from other constructs” (Ab Hamid et al., 2017), it was also determined for each study construct. The discriminant validity can be measured by using Fornell and Lacker (1981)’s criterion in which the AVE score of square-root of every construct must be more than 0.50.

The values of AVE and squared correlation for all the factors of OReg, EI, and EP are shown in Table II. All the diagonal elements’ values (Square root of AVE/DV values) are more than the respective values of off-diagonal elements (inter construct correlation values). Therefore, the discriminant validity of each construct (OReg, EI and EP) has been confirmed as the constructs and items (in bold) have duly satisfied the threshold requirements of the criteria (Table II).

4.3 Common Method Variance Considerations

Harman’s Single factor test (HSFT) was conducted in the present study with the help of SPSS software to examine the common method bias (CMB). This test in general is used to examine whether all the study variables in the data set can be explained by any single factor or not. This test exhibits common method bias when any single factor of the data set explains more than 50% of the variable. The result of HSFT in this study was 39% (i.e. < 50%), which showed that one single factor of data set did not explain most of the variance for the research objective, therefore the assumption of common method bias was withdrawn (Podsakoff and Organ, 1986; Podsakoff et al., 2003). Moreover, common latent factor (CLF) test was also performed to observe the presence of CMB, by adding a common latent factor in the study model using AMOS-SPSS. The differences among “the standardized regression weights of the models with CLF” and “the standardized regression weights of the models without CLF” were observed and compared (Podsakoff et al., 2003). As per the criteria, a large difference (larger than 0.2) indicates the presence of biases in the response (Podsakoff et al., 2003; Gaskin, 2012b). The CLF results
showed that the data set was free from the prejudiced/biased responses (because the differences among “the standardized regression weights of the models with CLF and without CLF” were found to be less than 0.2; Refer Table III) and consequently further data analyses were performed.

(Insert Table III)

4.4 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

Descriptive statistics and correlations for all the study constructs are presented in Table IV. Good internal consistency/reliability (i.e. $\alpha>0.70$), with low-to-moderate correlations among variables is shown by all the constructs of this study. Organizational resilience with its indicators demonstrated significant and positive relationships with emotional intelligence ($r = 0.59$, $p < 0.01$). It explained that both constructs were positively and significantly related with each other. Similarly, OReg was also found to be significantly and positively correlated with EP ($r = 0.713$, $p < 0.01$), and EI also exhibited strong, positive and significant contribution towards EP ($r = 0.8159$, $p < 0.01$).

(Insert Table IV)

4.5 Test of Hypotheses and Mediation analysis

Structural equation modelling (SEM) along with bootstrapping was performed to test mediation in the proposed model (Figure 1) using AMOS software. The path coefficients’ confidence intervals were identified by SEM with bootstrapping method. The Bootstrapping method utilizes repetitive random sampling with replacements from the original sample for creating bootstrap sample which ultimately attains standard errors for the hypothesis testing. The Direct relationships and mediation analysis results are discussed in the following sections:

4.5.1 Direct Relationships

As discussed earlier, SEM with bootstrapping was conducted for the analysis of the hypothesized relationship in the proposed model (Figure 1). Direct relationship between OReg and EI, EI and EP, OReg and EP were assessed with regression coefficients ($\beta$), and $p$-values (Table V). Regression coefficient ($\beta$) is used to measure the strength and the nature (positive or negative) of the relationship among the constructs. Moreover, $p$-values associated with regression coefficients describe the significance of the hypothesized relationship. The results of hypothesis testing are presented in Table V.

The $\beta$ values were in the range of 0.7 to 0.9 for all the hypothesized direct relationships (Table V) of the proposed model (Figure 1). Consequently, all the relationships were found significant with $\beta > 0.5$ along with their corresponding significant $p$-values (i.e. $p<0.001$).
4.5.2 Mediation Analysis

The mediation analysis for Hypothesis 7 (Table V, Figure 3) by measuring the significance of the path coefficients was carried out using SEM with Bias-corrected bootstrapping. This method is used to test mediation effects, especially in the case where variables/data are not normally distributed (Zhang et al., 2009). Bias-corrected bootstrapping is the correct way to test 3-path mediation effects in a single-level setting (Taylor et al., 2008). Bootstrapping is a transparent non-parametric resampling method that determines variability of a statistic through determination of variability of the sample data instead of the parametric assumptions for estimation (Streukens and Leroi-Werelds, 2016). Moreover, the assumptions on which bootstrapping is based are non-restrictive and offer solutions in situations where the use of conventional methods is difficult (Streukens and Leroi-Werelds, 2016). The results of the mediation test to determine the mediating role of emotional intelligence on the relationship among organizational resilience and employee performance during crisis period are shown in Table V and Figure 3.

The mediation was confirmed (Table V) by following the approach proposed by Preacher and Hayes (2004), which states that the direct and in-direct associations can be measured through bootstrapping technique. The results (Table V) confirmed the partial mediation with the significant standardized direct and indirect effects with a perfect fit model for the collected data having $\chi^2$ (Chi-square) = 113.982 at Probability level = 0.110 and Degrees of freedom = 32 along with other better fit indices (shown in Table VI).

The path among organizational resilience and EI was positive and significant ($\beta = 0.615$, $p < 0.001$), and also the path between EI and employee performance was strong, positive and significant ($\beta = 0.729$, $p < 0.001$). The direct path/relationship among organizational resilience and employee performance was as well positive and significant ($\beta = 0.340$, $p < 0.001$) in the presence of mediating effect of EI. Therefore, Hypothesis H7, which assumed the mediating role of EI in the relationship between OReg and EP was accepted. The lower bounds for the direct effect of organizational resilience on emotional intelligence, organizational resilience on employee performance and emotional intelligence on employee performance were 0.544, 0.264 and 0.654 (Table VII) respectively whereas the upper bounds were 0.686, 0.415 and 0.794 (Table VIII) respectively. The bootstrapped coefficient intervals (for direct effect) exceeded zero, confirming the presence of direct effect. The bootstrapped values with 99% bias-corrected confidence interval for the indirect effect of organizational resilience on employee performance.
through the mediation of emotional intelligence were 0.358 and 0.549 (Table IX and X) respectively with a significant path coefficient ($\beta = 0.449, p < 0.001$). The upper and lower bound standardized indirect effect coefficients were more than zero, indicating the presence of indirect effect of EI on the OReg-EP relationship. Consequently, the SEM with bootstrapping results confirmed the mediation hypothesis (at 99% Confidence Interval) (Preacher and Hayes, 2008).

(Insert Table VII here)

(Insert Table VIII here)

(Insert Table IX here)

(Insert Table X here)

Overall, the results showed that the emotional intelligence level of an individual partially mediates [as the direct as well as indirect paths were found significant (with $p<0.001$, shown in Table V) in the presence of mediator-EI] the relationship between organizational resilience and employees’ level of performance during the crisis period, consequently Hypothesis 7 (the mediation model) was accepted.

Bayesian analysis of mediation effects was also performed as it offers a simpler mediation analysis in multilevel models and is widely accepted (Gelman and Hill, 2007). The estimation of the posterior of quantities which are resulting from the model parameters, like an indirect effect was further analyzed. The results for indirect effect (of OReg on EP through the mediation of EI) were analyzed by the marginal posterior distribution of the additional estimands, which shows the posterior distribution of the indirect effect. The results of Bayesian estimates showed that the distribution of the indirect effect was normal (Figure 4). And it is observed that the posterior distribution of the indirect effect lied entirely to the right side of 0 (Figure 4), which confirmed the indirect effect or mediation as the curve starts with a value more than 0 (Arbuckle, 2010).

The use of Bayesian analysis is advantageous owing to its ability to establish credible intervals pertaining to the indirect effects for both simple as well as complex mediation models in an uncomplicated manner (Yuan and MacKinnon, 2009). As in the Bayesian analysis, the parameters are processed as random variables rather than fixed values, the Bayesian perspective offers a more simple and natural analysis in multilevel models (Gelman and Hill, 2007; Yuan and MacKinnon, 2009).

(Insert Figure 4 here)

Furthermore, the trace plot of standardized indirect effect was also analyzed. This is a useful approach to visually examine the plot of posterior drawn against the iterations. And a stable, well-mixed, and straight trace plot of the standardized indirect effect was found (Figure 5),
which indicated the convergence of the chain, and confirmed the presence of indirect effect
in the data set (Arbuckle, J. L., 2010).

(Insert Figure 5 here)

The mediating role of emotional intelligence on the relationship between organizational resilience and employee performance was therefore confirmed on the basis of mediation results of SEM with Bootstrapping method and Bayesian estimates.

5. Discussion

The current study has investigated the mediating role of EI on the relationship between organizational resilience and employee performance during COVID-19 crisis in higher educational institutions of India. The overall results of study have shown partial mediation of EI on the OReg and EP relationship.

Hypotheses H1a, H1b, H1c and H1d (Table V) were confirmed and accepted as they have significant regression weights (\(\beta\)) 0.90, 0.94, 0.93, 0.91 respectively, \(\beta\) values more than 0.5 at \(p < 0.001\). Therefore, the hypotheses testing results exhibited that organizational capability and adaptability (OCA), resilient organizational culture (ROC), organizational crisis policy (OCP), and employee empowerment initiatives (EEI) are significantly and positively contributing to organizational resilience (OReg).

Similarly, Hypotheses H2a, H2b, H2c, and H2d predicted that self-awareness (SSA), self-management (SM), social awareness (SA), and relationship management (RM) positively and significantly contribute to the emotional intelligence levels of an individual. These hypotheses were also accepted and confirmed as their relationships were having positive and significant regression coefficients (\(\beta = 0.827, 0.838, 0.834, 0.86\) respectively, \(p < 0.001\)), where \(\beta\) values were > 0.5 on \(p < 0.001\). Thus, it can be concluded that self-awareness (SSA), self-management (SM), social awareness (SA), and relationship management (RM) are positively and significantly contributing to emotional intelligence levels of an individual, and this can be further confirmed from the Goleman and Boyatzis (2017)’s elements of EI.

Hypotheses H3a, H3b, and H3c assumed that initiatives/taking the lead (EPI), adaptability (EPA), and work life balance (EPWLB) are positively contributing to employees’ level of performance in the crisis period. These relationships were statistically significant (\(\beta = 0.828, 0.76, 0.82\) respectively, \(p < 0.001\)), and accordingly these hypotheses were accepted. The results of hypothesis testing supported Hypothesis 4, explaining that the organizational resilience positively and significantly influences employees’ level of performance in the current period of COVID-19 (\(\beta = 0.34, p < 0.001\)). Similarly, Hypothesis 5 was also accepted as organizational resilience positively and significantly affected emotional intelligence (\(\beta = 0.615, p < 0.001\)).
Hypothesis 6 was as well accepted ($\beta = 0.729$, $p < 0.001$) which confirmed positive and significant relationship among emotional intelligence and employees’ performance levels in the crisis period.

In Hypothesis 7, Emotional intelligence was hypothesized to mediate the relationship between organizational resilience and employee performance during the COVID-19 pandemic. As discussed earlier in the “Results section”, the mediation model was found to be a perfect fit (Table V) and acceptable model (Figure 3, Table V). The structural equation modelling (SEM) with bootstrapping results provided the evidence to support and accept Hypothesis 7, which confirmed the mediating role of emotional intelligence on OReg and EP relationship (standardized indirect effect-regression coefficient $\beta = 0.449$, $p < 0.001$). This mediation was also confirmed by the Bayesian estimates; additional estimands and trace plot (Figure 3, Figure 4). Moreover, the model was found to be perfectly fit with $\chi^2 = 113.982$ at $p = 0.110$ and df = 32; RMSEA = 0.046, PCLOSE = 0.000, along with other acceptable and good values of fit indices such as CFI=.967, GFI=.922, NFI=.955 and CMIN/DF=3.562 (Table VI).

In summary, there was confirmation of partial mediation effect of EI in the relationship between organizational resilience and employee performance. The results of current study suggested that organizational capability and adaptability, crisis policies, employee empowerment initiatives, and resilient culture positively contribute to the level of organizational resilience, and it helps in enhancing the level of emotional intelligence (in terms of self-management, relationship management, self-awareness and social awareness) of employees which ultimately improves their performance level during crisis. Similarly, the employees with higher level of EI exhibit higher level of performance. The study results also recommend that the employees, who take initiatives, are adaptable, and are able to manage their work and life effectively during crisis, demonstrate higher level of performance.

6. Theoretical Implications

In addition to Rutter’s principles of resilience (2012) and Luthar’s et al. (1991) description of resilience, the study builds on Lengnick-Hall’s et al. (2011) theoretical model which suggests that resilience is a capacity that is an amalgamation of cognitive, contextual and behavioural capabilities reflecting a dynamic process of change and adaptation (Akgun and Keskin, 2014). As depicted through the results, resilience capabilities have a significant role to play in developing emotional intelligence and the overall employees’ performance. Also, Goleman’s EI based theory of performance forms the basis for this study. In consonance with this theory emotional competence has an important role to play in individual, group and organizational success (Goleman, 2001). This study is an advance toward addressing the gap in understanding and managing resilience, emotional intelligence and the contribution of both the constructs towards performance. The results of the current study extend research in the field of organizational resilience and employee performance in the crisis scenario, and add significant
contributions to the existing literature. These findings also provide insights in building organizational resilience capacities and enhancing emotional intelligence of employees at the time of crisis as these are the key predictors of employees’ performance level. The current study results support findings of Parsons’ (2010), which explained significant relationship between organizational resilience and organizational culture. Furthermore, the results also support Suryaningtyas et al. (2019)’s findings that confirm positive and significant relationship among OReg and EP. In addition to this, organizational resilience contributes positively and significantly to employee performance indirectly, through the mediation of emotional intelligence. These findings are consistent with organizational and resilience theories which explain that adaptability and other factors at the individual and organizational level have a key role to play in enhancing resilience abilities of both the individual and the organization alike.

The contribution of the current study is in identifying the factors of organizational resilience and emotional intelligence which boost the employee performance level in the crisis period by managing their emotional needs. This suggests that organizational resilience (organizational adaptability and capability, resilient organizational culture, employee empowerment initiatives, and organizational crisis policies etc.) contributes to employees abilities of adaptability, taking initiatives, and managing work life balance effectively in torrid times of the pandemic. Moreover, the level of emotional intelligence of employees (self-awareness, self-management, social awareness, and relationship management) is also equally important during crisis, as it strengthens the relationship among organizational resilience and employee performance. Therefore, the HEIs practitioners should focus on improving their level of resilience and adaptability as well as their employees level of emotional intelligence to retain and promote the performance of their employees during the period of crisis.

7. Practical Implications

The current study contributes to the existing literature of HRM. This work offers concise suggestions to improve performance level of employees during the COVID-19 pandemic. Especially when the social distancing and work from home is the new normal, the challenges for HEIs’ employees are manifold as they are experiencing the mandate to impart education via digital modes for the first time and working from home without the adequate time for preparation and resource constraints make it even more difficult for them. The findings of the current study suggest that organizational adaptability, capability, crises policies, employee empowerment initiatives and resilient culture play key roles in retention and improvement of performance level of employees during crisis. Therefore, the HEIs should consider these organizational factors as well as the individual development of their employees skills in this lean and tough period to handle post pandemic effects in a better and efficient manner.

The results of this study also provide wonderful insights on how performance level can be improved by taking care of individual emotional needs like (self management, social awareness,
self awareness, and relationship management) in the pandemic. Hence, factors pertaining to individual emotional intelligence should be taken care of by an organization to improve the performance and productivity. The mediator (Emotional Intelligence) analyzed here is an important driving factor in retaining and improving employees performance in the period of crisis.

The potential mechanism among EI and employee performance as well as between organizational resilience and employee performance merit additional empirical analysis. This investigation and understanding will contribute in advancing our knowledge of the links among the indicators/antecedents and criteria to achieve higher level of performance of employees during turbulent times. Hence, the current study offers great practical suggestions and valuable insights to HEIs in the retention and improvement in performance by providing skill development opportunities and also by taking care of emotional needs of employees, when employees are not socially active due to remote working and nation-wide closures and also affected by other organizational and individual challenges.

In summary, the current study results will offer strong foundation for planning and deciding the effective strategies and tactics for the HEIs to maintain and improve employees level of emotional intelligence and performance by being more flexible in organizational culture which makes them resilient in the period of crisis. The current study results are in line with the findings of Suryaningtyas et al. (2019) and Parsons (2010). In light of the above results, higher educational practitioners must think out of the box and employ the confirmed strategies as highlighted in the findings of this study to cope up with the after-effects of the pandemic.

8. Limitations and Future Research

A few limitations of the present study that can be addressed in the future are as follows:

- The data collection was done from the same source (teaching and non-teaching staff of HEIs) and at the same time, which may have lead to common method error, even though the common variance estimate is 39% using Harman’s Single factor test of common method variance and indicates no major concern for the current data (Podsakoff and Organ, 1986; Podsakoff et al., 2003). However, Bliese and Jex (2002) disagreed on the measurement of individual-level perceptions based on high-level constructs, and accordingly it might be considered more accurate if based on objective scores (p. 271), which may reduce the risk of common method variance.

- The small sample size (n=390) was considered from large number of teaching and non-teaching employees of HEIs in India. Even though the sample size is sufficient, it may perhaps raise the concern of general applicability of the findings in different cultural contexts as all the countries are facing the issues relating to employee performance and retention during the COVID-19 pandemic. Furthermore, convenient sampling (non-
probability method) was used for data collection, the issue discussed above can be addressed by using probability sampling method. Thus, future studies are suggested to replicate the current study with a larger sample size in different contexts (e.g. organizations, industries, companies, and culture) with probability sampling methods to enhance the general applicability of these findings.

- Influence of time was not under the scope of the current study which can be mitigated by a longitudinal research design.

- The measurement scales were subjective and self–designed for all the study constructs, therefore both subjective and objective assessment instruments are encouraged to be used in the future research for better reliability. In the current study, quantitative data collection method from the employees has been employed, capturing leadership and top management view could perhaps be very beneficial in the future studies. Although the constructs examined in the present study were identified as relevant factors for COVID-19 crisis, other key factors contributing to employee performance in the post pandemic era may be addressed to come up with better mitigation strategies. Therefore, the future researchers are recommended to consider other predictors of employee performance and should expand present study by including other antecedents of employee performance with other consequences of emotional intelligence and organizational resilience.

In spite of the above discussed limitations, it is believed that the current study offers the insights on tackling the issue of employee performance in the pandemic by applying organizational resilience through mediation of emotional intelligence in the HEIs.
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Figure 1: Proposed Model of Research.

--- Denotes mediation
Problem Identification: Role of Organizational resilience and Emotional Intelligence in enhancing employee performance during the time of crisis.

Gap: Dearth of literature on the relationship between OR, EI and EP during crisis times.

Final Data Collection:

The questionnaire was sent to a total of 500 people across India, 390 complete and valid responses were received for further data analysis.

Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) along with bootstrapping to test mediation.

Bayesian Analysis was also performed to confirm Indirect effect.

Figure 2: The research Framework.
Collection of data from the target population i.e., teaching and non-teaching staffs of HEIs using a self-designed questionnaire circulated via google forms.

Confirmatory factor analysis to explore the highly loaded and key items of each indicator.

Notes: N= 390. ***

$p < 0.001$ level (two-tailed).

Pilot Study:

To test the validity and reliability of the instrument (n=120)

Reliability and validity analysis using Cronbach’s Alpha, Composite reliability and AVEs.

Harman’s Single Factor test to examine common method bias.

Figure 3: SEM results for the mediation in proposed model
Figure 4: The posterior distribution of the indirect effect
Figure 5: Trace plot for posterior samples of the mediated effect $\alpha\beta$ for the Bayesian single-level mediation analysis of the data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self -Management (SM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Awareness (SA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship Management (RM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table II: Reliability and Discriminant validity estimates for the proposed research model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Variable</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Composite Reliability (CR)</th>
<th>AVE values</th>
<th>Square root of AVE/ DV values</th>
<th>OReg</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>EP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OReg</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>0.959</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>0.855</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.657</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table III: Comparison of Standardized Regression Weights among the Models with and without Common Latent Factor (CLF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Without CLF Estimate</th>
<th>With CLF Estimate</th>
<th>Difference*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCA</td>
<td>OReg</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROC</td>
<td>OReg</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCP</td>
<td>OReg</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEI</td>
<td>OReg</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EISSA</td>
<td>EI</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EISM</td>
<td>EI</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EISA</td>
<td>EI</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIRM</td>
<td>EI</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPI</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPWLB</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Common method bias if the difference is greater than 0.2

Table IV: Correlation matrix of all constructs and descriptive statistics (N=390)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. OReg</td>
<td>67.671</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. EI</td>
<td>48.649</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>.590**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. EP</td>
<td>45.509</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>.713**</td>
<td>.815**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Here 1-OReg, 2-EI, and 3-EP
### Table V: Results of hypothesis testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Standardized regression weight</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Accept/Reject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Resilience (OReg)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1a</td>
<td>Organizational Capability and Adaptability (OCA) → Organizational resilience</td>
<td>0.909***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b</td>
<td>Resilient Organizational Culture (ROC) → Organizational resilience</td>
<td>0.948***</td>
<td>0.052***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1c</td>
<td>Organizational Crisis Policy (OCP) → Organizational resilience</td>
<td>0.931***</td>
<td>0.043***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1d</td>
<td>Employee Empowerment Initiatives (EEI) → Organizational resilience</td>
<td>0.912***</td>
<td>0.042***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional Intelligence (EI)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>Self-Awareness (SSA) → Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>0.827***</td>
<td>0.053***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>Self-Management (SM) → Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>0.838***</td>
<td>0.056***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2c</td>
<td>Social Awareness (SA) → Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>0.834***</td>
<td>0.053***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2d</td>
<td>Relationship Management (RM) → Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>0.860***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Performance (EP)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>Initiatives/ taking the lead (EPI) → Employee performance</td>
<td>0.828***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b</td>
<td>Adaptability (EPA) → Employee performance</td>
<td>0.763***</td>
<td>0.047***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3c</td>
<td>Work life balance (EPWLB) → Employee performance</td>
<td>0.820***</td>
<td>0.078***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediating effect of Emotional intelligence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Standardized Direct Effects - Two Tailed Significance (BC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>Organizational resilience → Employee performance</td>
<td>0.340***</td>
<td>0.031***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Organizational resilience → Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>0.615***</td>
<td>0.041***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>Emotional intelligence → Employee performance</td>
<td>0.729***</td>
<td>0.056***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Standardized Indirect Effects - Two Tailed Significance (BC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>Organizational resilience → Employee performance (through the mediation of emotional intelligence)</td>
<td>0.449***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***$P < .001$
Table VI: Fit indices of the proposed model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>CMIN/DF</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>PCLOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Model</td>
<td>113.98</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>3.562</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table VII: Standardized Direct Effects - Lower Bounds (BC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OReg</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>EP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table VIII: Standardized Direct Effects - Upper Bounds (BC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OReg</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>EP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table IX: Standardized Indirect Effects - Lower Bounds (BC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OReg</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>EP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table X: Standardized Indirect Effects - Upper Bounds (BC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OReg</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>EP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>