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Abstract
Purpose – Hospitality is one of the industries severely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. It is vital to comprehend how to help the workforce in this service sector grow resilient through such a crisis. This paper aims to unpack the role of employer event communication in promoting hotel workers’ resilience.

Design/methodology/approach – The data were garnered from 462 hotel workers who were on unpaid leave or layoff during the hotel shutdown.

Findings – The results unfolded the positive link between employer event communication and hotel workers’ resilience, for which core beliefs examination served as a mediation mechanism. Family support was found to moderate the effect of employer event communication on core beliefs examination.

Practical implications – The findings indicate to hospitality organizations that in face of a crisis such as the COVID-19, their employee resilience can be activated if they implement event communication activities. They should further realize that their support should go hand in hand with family support in fueling employee resilience from the crisis.

Originality/value – This study advances the understanding of how and when to promote resilience among hotel workers during a pandemic crisis.
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Introduction
The COVID-19 outbreak has laid bare the susceptibilities of numerous industries (Gössling et al., 2020). One of the first and extensively affected industries has been tourism (Baum and Nguyen, 2020; Zhang et al., 2020). Hotels have been vulnerable to reduced travel along with a slowdown economic activity due to nationwide lockdowns and border closures (Hoisington, 2020). The shutdown of almost all hotels in Vietnam during this pandemic crisis (Morisset, 2020) have caused their workers to step into unpaid leave or layoff (Karim et al., 2020) with rare job opportunities from other employers and industries. The threat of the pandemic spread, job uncertainty and income uncertainty have left workers in the hospitality industry in frustration and anxiety (Lai and Wong, 2020).

The literature in the hospitality and tourism discipline has investigated the impacts of the crises in general and epidemics in particular on this industry (Brown et al., 2018;...
Brown et al., 2019). However, it has focused more on disasters (Brown et al., 2018; Brown et al., 2019; Prayag et al., 2020) than epidemics (Benjamin et al., 2020; Jiang and Wen, 2020; Mao et al., 2020; Sigala, 2020). Furthermore, research on the impacts of crises or epidemics on the hospitality and tourism industry has tended to assess the resilience of the industry or organizations in it (Brown et al., 2018; Brown et al., 2019; Prayag et al., 2020; Sigala, 2020). Scant scholarly attention has been devoted to how redundant or dismissed employees in the tourism industry experienced a pandemic crisis (Elshaer and Saad, 2017; Baum et al., 2020) as well as grew resilient through it (Karim et al., 2020; Mao et al., 2020; Martins et al., 2020). Resilience refers to an individual’s capability to adapt effectively and restore equilibrium in the face of severe adversity (Cooke et al., 2019a). Regardless of the magnitude of employees’ resilience through a crisis such as the COVID-19 (Mao et al., 2020), except for a work by Mao et al. (2020) on CSR impact on tourism employees’ resilience through the COVID-19 crisis, research has remained rather quiet about resilience among hospitality workers in a crisis event as well as what type of social support resource they need from their employer to develop resilience.

From a disaster communication ecology perspective (Spialek and Houston, 2018), an organization may use event communication ecologies to:

- connect with employees;
- correct inaccurate reports about the organization’s event-related policies; and
- confirm information about employees’ situation during the event.

Research has highlighted the salience of disaster or event communication in cushioning negative effects of crises on workers (Spialek and Houston, 2018) as well as called for further investigations into the predicting role of different forms of social support in the equation of resilience (Cooke et al., 2019a, 2019b). Despite these, to our best knowledge, there have been no studies on how employer’s event communication nurtures resilience among workers in face of a pandemic crisis such as COVID-19 particularly in an Asian hospitality context. Our study aims to cover this gap by examining how employer event communication impacts hospitality workers’ resilience. Understanding this will provide guidance for hospitality organizations on how to nurture employees’ resilience from the COVID-19 crisis.

As the relationship between employer event communication and resilience of workers in face of a crisis event has not been unravelled in general business as well as in the hospitality discipline, it has been unclear about how and when employer event communication is related to hospitality workers’ resilience. Cognitive processes have been viewed to be engendering positive changes in face of a crisis (Calhoun and Tedeschi, 2006; Calhoun et al., 2010). Drawing on the conservation of resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989) and the impact of social support on cognitive processes (Kelly et al., 2017), our study expects that employer event communication can function as a resource to set in motion core beliefs examination, which may, in turn, be associated with resilience. Core beliefs examination alludes to the examination or re-examination of one’s rudimentary assumptions about the world, the life, the self and others that results in the identification of positive changes following an event (Eze et al., 2020).

We further take a contingency perspective to explore when employer event communication exerts strong influence on hospitality workers’ core beliefs examination and in turn their resilience. Due to the role of family support as a vital resource for unemployed workers’ well-being (Huffman et al., 2015) as well as the complementary nature of organizational support and family support (Adler and Kwon, 2002; Greenhaus et al., 2012), our study builds upon the COR perspective (Hobfoll, 1989) to presume the positive
interaction between employer event communication and family support. Family support may add to the resource pool that workers build from event communication from the employer, leading them to proactively re-examine their assumptions about life.

Our study contributes to the stream of research on workforce resilience through crises in the hospitality and tourism industry. First, we investigate employer event communication as a novel social antecedent for hospitality workers’ resilience. Research has been silent about this role of employer communication for worker resilience during a crisis event while focusing on organizational antecedents such as HR practices and leadership (Cooke et al., 2019a, 2019b; Cooper et al., 2019). Second, it proposes employees’ core beliefs examination as a mediation mechanism underlying the nexus between employer event communication and worker resilience. Core beliefs examination has not been explored as a mediator to offer a cognitive approach to how social support in general and employer event communication in particular fosters resilience among workers. This has thus limited our understanding of how to activate worker resilience. Third, our study unravels the complementary effects of employer event communication and family support on hospitality workers’ core beliefs examination. This is crucial as it improves our understanding regarding when employer event communication is most effective in helping hospitality workers to re-assess their core beliefs and develop resilience in face of a pandemic crisis.

Hypothesis development

Employer event communication and worker resilience

Resilience refers to “developable capacity to rebound or bounce back from adversity, conflict, failure, or even positive events, progress, and increased responsibility” (Luthans, 2002, p. 702). Resilience has been reported to enhance individuals’ capability to cope effectively with adverse conditions such as traumatic experiences or major life events (Raghavan and Sandanapitchai, 2019; Waugh et al., 2008). Resilient individuals develop positive emotionality such as enthusiastic and optimistic attitude toward life and work (Cooke et al., 2019a; Tugade and Fredrickson, 2004). They are inquisitive and open to new experiences (Cooke et al., 2019a) as well as develop proactive learning and thriving through conquering challenges (Youssef and Luthans, 2007).

In line with the view of the conservation of resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989) as being related to human adaptation (Hou et al., 2010) and resilience (Cooke et al., 2019b), this study will adopt the COR perspective to cast light on how event communication from employer functions as a social resource to help workers grow resilient through the COVID-19 shutdown. Resources under the COR theory may consist of psychosocial resources such as social support (Hobfoll et al., 2003). Through the lens of the COR perspective, availability of resources, such as social support, can encourage individuals to develop positive psychological state, take proactive coping strategies (e.g. proactively seeking relationships or opportunities) (Ito and Brotheridge, 2003) and develop resilience, adaptation and action-focused growth (Bonanno et al., 2007; Hobfoll et al., 2007).

Effective communication in a crisis entails delivering precise information, reshaping individuals’ perceptions, remedying negative impacts and encouraging individuals to adopt appropriate behaviors (Liu-Lastres et al., 2019). From a disaster communication ecology view (Spialek and Houston, 2018), an organization may use event communication ecologies to:

- connect with employees;
- correct imprecise reports about the organization’s event-related policies; and
- confirm information about employees’ situation during the event.
Delivering concern, comfort and advice, social support can buffer workers against stressful events (Xu et al., 2019). In comparison with unemployed workers without social support, those with such support cope psychologically better (Blustein et al., 2013; Milner et al., 2016). As a form of social support, communicative processes, in which workers can receive care and express their emotions constructively (Spialek et al., 2019) as well as develop clear understanding of their organization’s event-related policies, can help alleviate workers’ repetitive thoughts on the negative consequences of the crisis event and develop positive attitudes (Lianchao and Tingting, 2020). Positive emotions and experiences can promote psychological capabilities and thought-action skills, which are a source of resilience (Bunderson and Thompson, 2009; Cooper et al., 2019; Malik and Garg, 2020). Moreover, well-supported employees are inclined to display networking-oriented resilient behaviors (e.g. proactively seeking support and connecting with others across areas of expertise), and further develop the supportive network with which they can address challenges and develop resilience (Kuntz et al., 2017; Nilakant et al., 2016).

Communicative processes can enable workers not only to engage with non-negative thoughts about the event but also to derive potential benefits from the event and adopt a future-oriented perspective (Spialek et al., 2019; Walsh, 2007). Resources built from event communication from employer may help workers more effectively re-establish cognitive balance and make sense of the event (Lianchao and Tingting, 2020; Ogińska-Bulik and Kobylarczyk, 2019). This is in tune with the COR perspective that with bountiful resources, individuals have the propensity to think and act proactively (Halbesleben et al., 2014) such as in the form of resilience.

In line with the COR perspective, relational regulation perspective (Lakey and Orehek, 2011) can shed further light on the effect of employer event communication on employee resilience. Through relational regulation lens, individuals can develop positive psychological state when their needs for personal relationships and social interactions are realized (Bowlby, 1969; Lakey and Orehek, 2011). Hence, sense of community and social contact that employer event communication builds can foster positive psychological state among hotel workers facing the COVID-19 crisis, leading them to appreciate life and proactively develop resilience (Bonanno et al., 2007; Hobfoll et al., 2007).

Despite no research on the direct link between employer event communication and employee resilience, prior research has provided some empirical implications. For instance, through their investigation into a sample of 999 Dutch employees, ter Hoeven and van Zoonen (2015) found the association between organizational communication effectiveness and employee well-being. Singh and Jia’s (2018) work on the data from 441 members from 10 laboratories of an Indian R&D organization provided evidence for the influence of organizational communication on employees’ well-being. Analyzing the data collected from 510 employees from information technology companies in India, Malik and Garg (2017) reported the impact of organizational efforts in inquiry and dialogue on employee resilience. Kim (2016) conducted a study among 313 employees from the medium and large corporations in the USA to garner evidence for the effect of organizations’ symmetrical communication and transparent communication on employee resilience. The above discussion leads us to formulate that:

H1. Employer event communication is positively related to hotel workers’ resilience.

Mediating role of core beliefs examination
Core beliefs allude to a “general set of beliefs a person has about the universe, how it works, and the individual’s place in it” (Calhoun and Tedeschi, 2013, p. 16). Core beliefs examination
refers to an individual’s serious assessment of their core beliefs about their abilities, strengths and weaknesses, relationships, expectations about the future, the meaning of life, as well as spiritual matters (Cann et al., 2010). Cann et al. (2010) developed the Core Beliefs Inventory (CBI) to gauge the extent to which an individual examines the core beliefs. An individual’s examination of core beliefs is viewed to be the point of departure in the developmental process (Cann et al., 2010; Janoff-Bulman, 2006; Taku and Oshio, 2015).

Several factors comprising individual factors and situational factors (e.g. social and relational influences) may affect an individual’s engagement in core beliefs examination (Calhoun and Tedeschi, 2006; Taku et al., 2015). In this study, we delve into the employer’s communication of the stressful event as a situational factor that determines whether an individual’s core beliefs are likely to be examined. Due to the relevance of perceived impact of an event to core beliefs examination (Taku et al., 2015), individuals may engage in re-examination of core beliefs in face of a stressful event, if they have a precise understanding of how the event may influence them. An organization that has a strong communication system enriches employees’ understanding in crisis times (Riolli and Savicki, 2003). As communication in general can reduce individuals’ concerns and ambiguity (Bordia et al., 2004) and communication of an event in particular can enhance individuals’ awareness of event-related policies (Spialek and Houston, 2018), event communication from the employer can help employees correctly understand organizational policies relating to the event as well as how the event has influenced their organization, thereby they can evaluate the degree to which the event may influence their work presently and in the future.

Greater optimism has also been reported to positively relate to examination of core beliefs (Wilson et al., 2014). Hence, the connection with employees and understanding of their situation through event communication, which can nurture their optimism and positive attitudes (Malik and Garg, 2017; Purcell et al., 2008), can fuel their motivation to reflect on themselves rather than giving up to the event. As a result, through employer event communication, employees may re-examine their core beliefs about themselves and the surrounding world, thereby they can identify the gaps in their abilities and expectations about the future that they may need to adjust to cope with or adapt to the event. For instance, they may discern the gap in their digital abilities or realize that their expectation to stay and grow with the current employer may need to be changed. Through employer event communication, employees may seriously examine their relationship with the organization and may need to seek new relationships for their career.

Furthermore, employer event communication is a source of resources for workers (Spialek et al., 2019; Walsh, 2007). In light of the COR perspective, with resources from the communication from the employer, hotel workers are inclined to proactively accrue further resources, develop positive psychological state and take active coping strategies (Halbesleben et al., 2014; Hobfoll et al., 2007; Ito and Brotheridge, 2003). Resources from employer communication may thus help workers proactively re-examine their assumptions about life, themselves and others (Lianchao and Tingting, 2020; Ogijkstra-Bulik and Kobylarczyk, 2019). Expressed differently, employer event communication can represent a resource to nurture core beliefs examination among hotel workers during the hotel shutdown. Moreover, by interpreting cues in the environment, individuals can make sense of it, which in turn rationalizes cognitive and behavioral development (Wu et al., 2019). Thus, by interpreting cues from event communication from the employer, hotel workers may proactively re-assess their assumptions about the crisis event.

Core beliefs determine how individuals will act and direct their efforts to influence events (Cann et al., 2010; Taku et al., 2015). In re-examining their core beliefs in face of an event, individuals may develop a need for growth (Tedeschi and Calhoun, 2004). The thoughtful
examination of core beliefs may signify personal growth for some individuals (Taku et al., 2015). The rebuilt assumptions may drive individuals to actively ruminate on the clues of the event and build meaning from it Zhou et al. (2015). Thus, core beliefs examination may enable individuals to explore the possibility of reconstructing beliefs and personal growth (Connery and Knott, 2013; Khechushvili, 2019), make positive meaning of their experiences (Cann et al., 2010) and come to realize positive changes in their world view and relationships with others that would not have existed (Taku et al., 2015). Core beliefs examination can further fuel individuals’ efforts to develop problem-solving coping behaviors (Lianchao and Tingting, 2020), which may lead to their engagement in seeking new possibilities and opportunities. In other words, core beliefs examination may nurture resilience among hotel workers in face of the crisis. In juxtaposition with prior reasoning, we can postulate the following:

H2a. Employer event communication is positively related to hotel workers’ core beliefs examination.

H2b. Core beliefs examination is positively related to hotel workers’ resilience.

H2c. Core beliefs examination mediates the relationship between employer event communication and hotel workers’ resilience.

Family support as a moderator

Family support is a type of social support for workers (Allen et al., 2000; Huffman et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2019). Family support refers to ones’ perceived notion of the care and understanding exhibited by family members such as spouse, children, parents and siblings (Huffman et al., 2015; Walen and Lachman, 2000). It is a crucial resource that makes individuals feel loved, cared for and valued (King et al., 1995; Zhang et al., 2019). Family members can provide availability to listen to and share about experiences and problems (Thompson and Prottas, 2006). Families are a primary source of support in collectivistic and family-oriented Asian cultures such as Vietnam (Matsumoto et al., 2017), where family members, including spouse, parents, children, and siblings (extended family), tend to share experiences and provide individuals with help when they are in difficulty (Aydin and Björk, 2019). Therefore, in family-oriented Asian cultures, in face of difficulties in life or work, a person can seek support not only from the spouse but also from other members of his or her extended family.

Different situational factors (e.g. social and relational factors) may influence an individual’s core beliefs examination (Calhoun and Tedeschi, 2006; Taku et al., 2015). In addition to employer event communication, family support can function as a source of resources for workers to engage in examining their core beliefs, as family may affect individuals’ intrapersonal attributes and alter their social attitudes (Kwok et al., 2015). Moreover, family support nurtures their optimism and self-efficacious thoughts, which may predict core beliefs examination (Wilson et al., 2014). Support and encouragement from family members may enable individuals to confront difficulties or life events and have better functioning, making them feel more positive and optimistic (Adams et al., 1996; Kwok et al., 2015). Family members’ encouragement and support may function as positive reinforcement, driving individuals to feel more capable and confident (Kara Kasıckoğlu and Alberto, 2007). It has been well documented that family support enhances individuals’ self-efficacious thoughts (Kwok et al., 2015; Ferry et al., 2000) and optimism (Kwok et al., 2015). Expressed differently, family support represents a source of resources, which may drive hospitality workers to engage in core beliefs examination.
Drawing on the COR perspective (Hobfoll, 2002), an ample resource pool can be cultivated from multiple resources such as family support and support from the employer, and this resource pool may nurture proactive coping strategies (Halbesleben et al., 2014; Ito and Brotheridge, 2008), adaptation and action-focused growth (Bonanno et al., 2007; Hobfoll et al., 2007). Ample resources from different sources such as family support and event communication from the employer may help workers further engage in re-examining and reconstructing their core beliefs. In other words, these two sources of resources may interact synergistically to nurture core beliefs examination among workers in the hotel shutdown.

Hobfoll (2002) further suggests that access to one resource (e.g. family support) may facilitate the use of another resource (e.g. event communication from the employer). Hence, we integrate the COR perspective with a complementary perspective of organizational and family support (Adler and Kwon, 2002; Greenhaus et al., 2012) to cast further light on the moderating role of family support. In light of this complementary perspective, on account of the complementary effects of multiple resources, the availability of a resource may have a greater influence on those who have access to another resource. Therefore, we presume that event communication from the employer is most useful when coordinated with support from the family due to greater consistency of messages and alignment of values (Hofmann et al., 2003). For instance, the employer’s communication relating to the event (e.g. policies, new possibilities and opportunities, training for new skills) may be more functional in stimulating hospitality workers’ re-examination of core beliefs and assumptions about life when their family is adequately encouraging and affectively available to further confirm advice from the employer in terms of positive aspects of the crisis. The above reasoning leads us to expect the moderating role of family support:

\[ H3. \] Family support moderates the positive relationship between employer event communication and core beliefs examination such that this relationship is stronger at a higher level of family support.

*Figure 1* is the depiction of construct relationships in our research model.

**Research methods**

**Sampling**

This study recruited participants from hotels operating in Vietnam. Via a researcher’s connections with five hotels, we were further connected to other hotels. When receiving the support for the surveys from the chief executive of each hotel, we approached HR managers for the list of employees who were on unpaid leave or layoff during the hotel shutdown due to the COVID-19 outbreak. We sent employees the link to the survey questionnaire and invited their voluntary participation.
Data were collected in the two survey waves with a six-week time lag (Wang and Huang, 2019). The separation of the independent construct variables from the dependent ones through this multi-wave survey process might mitigate common method variance risk (Podsakoff et al., 2012). Furthermore, mediation paths should be assessed based on the data collected from at least two measurement waves (Cole and Maxwell, 2003). The first wave measurement (T1) garnered the data on employer event communication, family support and core beliefs examination. The data regarding control variables were collected in this survey wave as well. In the second measurement time (T2), hotel workers participating in T1 were invited to provide the data on resilience.

We removed the data from hotels in which there were under five respondents (Chuang and Liao, 2010) as prior research has reported that with groups of five or more respondents, biases in using aggregate scores could be mitigated (Bliese, 2000; van Woerkom and Sanders, 2010). Nordén-Hägg et al. (2010) further indicated that reliable consensus scores can be yielded via the recruitment of five participants per group as a minimum threshold. After this data removal, participants who completed the two wave surveys consisted of 462 hotel workers (response rate: 58.2%) from 48 hotels (78.7%).

Measures
The questionnaire was first developed in English and then translated into Vietnamese in light of Schaffer and Riordan’s (2003) back-translation approach. Measurement items are shown in Table 1. Employer communication related to the COVID-19 event was measured using 12 items (1 = never; 5 = always) adapted from Spialek and Houston’s (2018) event citizen disaster communication scale. These items reflect three components: correcting, connecting and confirming. Hotel workers’ resilience was measured using Wang et al.’s (2014) 36-item scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree), which has been used in recent resilience works such as Cooke et al. (2019a, 2019b).

Second-order confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was implemented to estimate the unidimensional structure of employer event communication and worker resilience. After removing two items from the employer event communication scale and one item from the resilience scale with loadings lower than 0.30, the second-order CFA model of these constructs had good fit indices: $\chi^2 = 505.72, \text{df} = 269; \text{TLI} = 0.94; \text{IFI} = 0.94; \text{CFI} = 0.95; \text{SRMR}_{\text{within}} = 0.052; \text{SRMR}_{\text{between}} = 0.098; \text{RMSEA} = 0.057 (90\% \text{ CIs [0.049, 0.067]})$. These fit indices were better than those of the first-order model of employer event communication ($\chi^2 = 491.46, \text{df} = 260; \text{TLI} = 0.93; \text{IFI} = 0.94; \text{CFI} = 0.94; \text{SRMR}_{\text{within}} = 0.068; \text{SRMR}_{\text{between}} = 0.096; \text{RMSEA} = 0.072 (90\% \text{ CIs [0.066, 0.075]})$) and the first-order model of worker resilience ($\chi^2 = 458.91, \text{df} = 239; \text{TLI} = 0.94; \text{IFI} = 0.95; \text{CFI} = 0.93; \text{SRMR}_{\text{within}} = 0.061; \text{SRMR}_{\text{between}} = 0.092; \text{RMSEA} = 0.064 (90\% \text{ CIs [0.057, 0.072]})$). Moreover, the $\chi^2$ difference between the two models for employer event communication was non-significant ($\Delta \chi^2 = 14.26, \Delta \text{df} = 9, \text{ns}$) and for worker resilience was non-significant as well ($\Delta \chi^2 = 46.81, \Delta \text{df} = 30, \text{ns}$). These findings demonstrated that regardless of exhibiting good empirical approximation to the data, the latent second-order models, with more degrees of freedom, were more parsimonious. The unidimensional structure of employer event communication and worker resilience can therefore be used in the current study. All the second-order loadings were larger than 0.7, and all the $t$-values were greater than 2.0 (Table 1) (Vickery et al., 2003), which further supported the second-order structure of these constructs. Studies by Cooke et al. (2019a, 2019b) have endorsed the second-order structure of work resilience.

Core beliefs examination was gauged via Cann et al.’s (2010) nine-item Core Beliefs Inventory (1 = not at all; 5 = to a very great degree). Family support was gauged via four items adapted from Walen and Lachman’s (2000) family social support scale (1 = not at all; 5 = always).
### Constructs and items

**Employer event communication (α = 0.82; CR = 0.81; AVE = 0.60)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correcting</th>
<th>Standardized loading</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The company corrected rumors about its policies related to the COVID-19 shutdown</td>
<td>0.82a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company encouraged us not to spread rumors about the COVID-19 shutdown and its policies related to the shutdown</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>9.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company encouraged us to correct inaccurate information about the COVID-19 shutdown and its policies related to the shutdown</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>11.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company corrected inaccurate information about the COVID-19 shutdown and its policies related to the shutdown</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>12.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connecting</th>
<th>Standardized loading</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The manager talked to us to explore how we experienced the crisis</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>11.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager talked to us to see if we were safe</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>10.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager talked to us to confirm whether reports about the COVID-19 shutdown were true</td>
<td>0.24b</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager talked to us to see if we were OK during the COVID-19 shutdown</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The manager comforted us during the COVID-19 shutdown</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>10.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confirming</th>
<th>Standardized loading</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The company looked for information to confirm whether we received its crisis-related reports</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>11.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company looked for information to find out what was going on for employees during the COVID-19 shutdown</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>11.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company looked for information to confirm whether we received an event warning</td>
<td>0.27b</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Core beliefs examination (α = 0.86; CR = 0.86; AVE = 0.72)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core beliefs examination</th>
<th>Standardized loading</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because of the event, I seriously examined the degree to which I believe things that happen to people are fair</td>
<td>0.84a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of the event, I seriously examined the degree to which I believe things that happen to people are controllable</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>10.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of the event, I seriously examined my assumptions concerning why other people think and behave the way that they do</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>13.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of the event, I seriously examined my beliefs about my relationships with other people</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>12.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of the event, I seriously examined my beliefs about my own abilities, strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>12.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of the event, I seriously examined my beliefs about my expectations for my future</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of the event, I seriously examined my beliefs about the meaning of my life</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>12.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of the event, I seriously examined my spiritual or religious beliefs</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>10.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of the event, I seriously examined my beliefs about my own value or worth as a person</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>12.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Family support (α = 0.80; CR = 0.79; AVE = 0.64)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family support</th>
<th>Standardized loading</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much do family members (i.e. spouse, children, parents, siblings) understand the way you feel about things?</td>
<td>0.81a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do they really care about you?</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>11.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much can you rely on them for help if you have a serious problem?</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>11.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Measurement items
How much do family members (i.e. spouse, children, parents, siblings) really care about you?

Walen and Lachman’s (2000) family social support scale has been adapted and validated to assess the concept of family support in the management domain (Minnotte and Minnotte, 2018; Netemeyer et al., 2018), as well as among unemployed workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs and items</th>
<th>Standardized loading</th>
<th>t value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much can you open up to them if you need to talk about your worries?</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>10.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resilience ($\alpha = 0.85; CR = 0.84; AVE = 0.75$)

| I know what I want to achieve during my lifetime                                  | 0.80$^a$             |         |
| I have a strong determination to achieve certain things in my lifetime            | 0.84                 | 11.83   |
| My current work is a step toward achieving certain things in my lifetime          | 0.77                 | 9.27    |
| I know what I have to do to achieve my aspirations in life                       | 0.86                 | 12.44   |
| I am ambitious to achieve certain things during my lifetime                       | 0.82                 | 11.16   |
| I have a get up and go approach to life                                           | 0.85                 | 12.51   |
| I know what to do in most situations                                             | 0.87                 | 12.76   |
| I have a powerful self-interest in achieving what I want                          | 0.84                 | 12.39   |
| I enjoy the company of other people most of the time                             | 0.81                 | 11.28   |
| I have a unique personal brand that I frequently project to others               | 0.79                 | 10.71   |
| I always listen to and try to understand what others are talking to me about     | 0.87                 | 13.05   |
| I have a curiosity about people                                                  | 0.85                 | 12.63   |
| I share my innermost secrets with a selected number of friends                   | 0.82                 | 10.82   |
| I have a strong relationship with those who can help me achieve what I want      | 0.81                 | 11.47   |
| I have got friends to provide me with the emotional support I need                | 0.86                 | 13.26   |
| I see myself as self-sufficient                                                   | 0.83                 | 11.69   |
| I enjoy challenge and solving problems                                           | 0.85                 | 12.54   |
| I really enjoy exploring the causes of problems                                   | 0.82                 | 11.27   |
| I can solve most problems that challenge me                                      | 0.78                 | 10.38   |
| I help others solve the problems and challenges they face                        | 0.87                 | 12.76   |
| I like to plan out my day and write down my list of things to do                  | 0.81                 | 11.42   |
| I plan my holidays well in advance                                              | 0.29$^b$             | 4.17    |
| I tackle big tasks in bite sizes                                                 | 0.82                 | 11.56   |
| I review my achievements weekly                                                  | 0.83                 | 11.82   |
| I know how to tackle most challenges I face                                      | 0.88                 | 13.68   |
| I like taking the lead                                                           | 0.79                 | 10.92   |
| I feel comfortable in new situations                                             | 0.85                 | 12.54   |
| I know I’m a great person                                                        | 0.76                 | 9.63    |
| I approach a new situation with an open mind                                     | 0.86                 | 13.28   |
| I am able to adjust to changes                                                   | 0.84                 | 12.56   |
| I can easily find ways of satisfying my own and other people’s needs during times of change and conflict | 0.88 | 13.92 |
| I am able to accommodate other people’s needs while focusing on achieving my own ambitions | 0.85 | 12.84 |
| I view change as an opportunity                                                  | 0.84                 | 12.31   |
| When an unwelcome change involves me, I can usually find a way to make the change benefit myself | 0.86 | 13.75 |
| I am able to focus my energy on how to make the best of any situation             | 0.81                 | 11.14   |
| I believe my own decisions and actions during periods of change will determine how I am affected by the change | 0.83 | 11.86 |

Table 1.

Notes: $^a$Fixed item; $^b$Excluded item
(Huffman et al., 2015) and among those under a stressful condition (Shirai et al., 2009). In their work, Walen and Lachman (2000) separated social support of family members from social support of spouses. However, when adapting their scale to measure family support in Western contexts, scholars such as Huffman et al. (2015), Minnotte and Minnotte (2018) and Netemeyer et al. (2018) have included spouse as a family member. Furthermore, families in collectivist and family-oriented Asian cultures such as Vietnam are extended families (Matsumoto et al., 2017), where family members including spouse, children, parents and siblings tend to help each other in difficulty. Therefore, we adapted Walen and Lachman’s (2000) scale by defining family members as potentially comprising spouse, children, parents or siblings. This inquiry controlled for employees’ gender, age, marital status, education, organizational tenure and employment status, as well as firm size and family size on account of the relevance of these demographic attributes to employee attitudinal and behavioral responses (Augustine, 2014; Fu and Deshpande, 2014).

Data analysis strategy
By virtue of the nested nature of the data within hotels, as per Preacher et al.’s (2011) suggestion, multilevel structural equation modeling (MSEM) was conducted using MPlus version 7.2. Following Muthen and Muthen (1998/2012) view, maximum likelihood estimation was used with robust standard errors. Compared with other multilevel modeling techniques, MSEM was reported to attain unbiased standard errors for indirect effect estimates (Preacher et al., 2010). With 2.76 as the highest value, variance inflation factors (VIF) fell under Hair et al.’s (2010) 5.0 threshold value. Along with tolerance above the 0.3 cutoff point (Hair et al., 2010), those results indicated a low concern for multi-collinearity. Multi-collinearity risk was further attenuated by multiplying the mean-centered values of the predictor variables to yield interaction terms (Cohen et al., 2003).

Common method variance
Common method variance (CMV) risk might be alleviated in this inquiry via ensuring participant anonymity, reducing item ambiguity and using multi-wave surveys to garner data (Podsakoff et al., 2012). Nevertheless, as all constructs in the current research were estimated through participants’ perceptions, and the data were harvested from the same source (i.e. hotel workers), CMV bias might emerge in the data. CMV bias was thus statistically tested using Lindell and Whitney’s (2001) marker variable procedure. The marker variable “attitude toward social media usage” was added to the survey by virtue of its theoretical unrelatedness to other constructs. The elimination of the marker variable did not impact the significance of the significant zero-order correlations, demonstrating a low CMV risk. Significant interactional effects lent further credence to this low risk, as high CMV bias tends to deflate interactional effects (Siemsen et al., 2010).

Results
Demographic analysis
Hospitality workers’ demographic attributes, comprising age, gender, marital status, educational level, organizational tenure, employment status and family size are presented in Table 2 in terms of each attribute’s frequency, percentage and mean. As Table 2 displays, the sample of hospitality workers comprised more employees on unpaid leave (72.94%) than laid-off employees (27.05%). Survey participants’ age ranged from 18 to 61 with the 26–35 age group as the one with the highest percentage (30.73%). More female participants (56.70%) were recruited. The majority of the participants were unmarried (66.45%). Most
participants held bachelor degree (42.42\%) or lower (56.06\%) and worked for the organization from three to five years (32.68\%). The family of most participants consisted of five to eight members (62.98\%). In light of Harshman and Chachere’s (2000) classification of organizations in the service industry, the hotel sample was categorized by size as small (under 200 employees), medium (200–400 employees) and large organizations (above 400 employees). Table 2 indicates that the majority of the hotels were under 200 employees in size (54.16\%) and of urban location (93.75\%).
Measurement models
Confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) presented a decent fit between the hypothesized four-factor model and the data ($\chi^2/df = 505.72/269 = 1.88 < 2$, TLI = 0.94, IFI = 0.94, CFI = 0.95, SRMR within = 0.052, SRMR between = 0.098; RMSEA = 0.057 [0.049, 0.067]). It was a better fit than the fits of alternative models, which were constructed by amalgamating construct variables (Table 3). These results lent credence to discriminant validity among the constructs. Discriminant validity was further achieved due to the fact that each construct’s correlations with the other constructs were surpassed by the square root of its average variance extracted (AVE) (Fornell and Larcker, 1981) (Table 4). Discriminant validity issue was also addressed through the heterotrait-monotrait ratio of correlations (HTMT) (Voorhees et al., 2016). For each pair of constructs, the HTMT criteria were computed on the basis of the item correlations. Further support for the divergence of the estimated scales was provided through the computed values, which ranged between 0.17 and 0.61, meeting Kline’s (2011) 0.85 threshold.

Hypothesis testing
As indicated in Table 5, H1 on the positive link between employer event communication and hotel worker resilience was evidenced via the positively significant coefficient ($B = 0.34$, $p < 0.01$). H2a positing the positive nexus between employer event communication and core beliefs examination was statistically endorsed by virtue of the positively significant coefficient ($B = 0.31$, $p < 0.01$). The positively significant coefficient ($B = 0.38$, $p < 0.001$) lent credence to H2b on the positive effect of core beliefs examination on hotel workers’ resilience.

The indirect effect of employer event communication on hotel workers’ resilience through the mediating role of core beliefs examination was 0.11 ($SE = 0.06$, $p < 0.01$). The result from the Monte Carlo test unveiled that 95% confidence interval (CI) for the coefficient distribution varied from 0.03 to 0.29 without zero being straddled in the range, which lent further credence to H2c on the mediation mechanism of core beliefs examination for the relationship between employer event communication and employee resilience. H3 was supported on account of the significantly positive interaction term ($B = 0.27$, $p < 0.01$) for the interactional effect of employer event communication and family support on core beliefs examination. The slope test graph for this interaction (Figure 2) demonstrated that employer event communication was more positively related to core beliefs examination at high levels of family support (simple slope = 0.68, $p < 0.01$) than at its low levels (simple slope = 0.16, $p < 0.01$).

As supplementary analyses, t-tests were applied in comparing the responses from laid-off employees and ones on unpaid leave in terms of employer event communication and worker resilience. The results revealed no significant difference between the two cohorts of participants with reference to employer event communication ($t = 1.25; p = 0.208 > 0.05$) but a significant difference in terms of worker resilience ($t = 2.74; p = 0.016 < 0.05$). Further analyses revealed that the coefficient for the association between employer event communication and worker resilience was higher among laid-off employees ($B = 0.36$, $p < 0.001$) than among employees on unpaid leave ($B = 0.27$, $p < 0.01$). Applying Cohen’s (1983) procedure, the disparity between these coefficients for the linkage between employer event communication and worker resilience was significant ($z = 1.62, p < 0.05$).

Discussion and conclusions
Conclusions
The postulated relationships in our research model, which are built on the COR framework, garner the evidence from the data analysis. The findings unravel the positive linkage
### Table 3. Comparison of Measurement Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\Delta \chi^2$</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>IFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR within</th>
<th>SRMR between</th>
<th>RMSEA [90% CI]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesized four-factor model</td>
<td>505.72</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.057 [0.049, 0.067]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-factor model: Event communication and family support combined</td>
<td>631.04</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>125.32**</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.085 [0.078, 0.096]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-factor model: Event communication, family support, and core beliefs examination combined</td>
<td>706.93</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>201.21**</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.146</td>
<td>0.114 [0.103, 0.122]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-factor model: All variables combined</td>
<td>739.75</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>234.03**</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.132 [0.124, 0.141]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** **$p < 0.01**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee gender</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee education</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational sizea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family size</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer event communication</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core beliefs examination</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>34.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: CCR = Composite construct reliability, AVE = Average variance extracted; Values in parentheses exhibit the square root of the average variance extracted; Standardized correlations reported *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$; *Value is the natural logarithm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Description of path</th>
<th>Path coefficient (Unstandardized)</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Event communication → Employee resilience</td>
<td>0.34** (0.11)</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a</td>
<td>Event communication → Core beliefs examination</td>
<td>0.31** (0.13)</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b</td>
<td>Core beliefs examination → Employee resilience</td>
<td>0.38*** (0.09)</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2c</td>
<td>Event communication → Core beliefs examination → Employee resilience</td>
<td>0.11** (0.06) [0.03, 0.29]</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>Event communication × Family support → Core beliefs examination</td>
<td>0.27** (0.08)</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Model fit: $\chi^2/df = 505.72/269 = 1.88$, TLI = 0.94, IFI = 0.94, CFI = 0.95, $\text{SRMR}_{\text{within}} = 0.052$, $\text{SRMR}_{\text{between}} = 0.098$; RMSEA = 0.057 [0.049, 0.067]. *$p < 0.05$; **$p < 0.01$; ***$p < 0.001$. Standard errors are portrayed in parentheses.
between employer event communication and hospitality workers’ resilience, for which core beliefs examination serves as a mediation path. Family support synergistically interacts with employer event communication to predict core beliefs examination among hotel workers. These findings provide a managerial guideline for developing hotel workers’ resilience through a crisis such as the COVID-19 by attending to the roles of event communication, family support and core beliefs examination.

Theoretical implications
Our research contributes to the literature in four major ways. First, our study extends the stream of research on resilience from crises in the hospitality and tourism discipline by examining how hospitality employees, particularly redundant or laid-off ones, grow resilient amid the COVID-19 crisis in an Asian emerging market context (Vietnam). This distinguishes our study from the extant hospitality and tourism research, which has mainly investigated resilience from crises at the macro levels such as organizations or industry (Brown et al., 2018; Brown et al., 2019; Prayag et al., 2020; Sigala, 2020). Research has been scarce in terms of resilience among workers during crises, particularly in the tourism and hospitality industry (Mao et al., 2020; Prayag et al., 2020). Moreover, by examining resilience among hotel workers during a pandemic crisis, this study also differentiates itself from prior employee resilience research, which has focused on three domains of employee resilience, comprising employee resilience as openness toward organizational changes (Kuntz et al., 2016), resilience training for promoting employee well-being and performance (Wang et al., 2014), and career resilience as the “ability to bounce back after a career setback” (Moenkemeyer et al., 2012, p. 630).

Second, employer event communication was detected to nurture hospitality workers’ resilience in face of the COVID-19 pandemic. This finding lends credence to the magnitude of employer event communication as a resource particularly for individuals who work in service areas full of traumatic events and vulnerable to crises such as hospitality and tourism (Liu and Pratt, 2017; Zhang et al., 2019). This role has not been explored in research on hospitality workforce in the face of crisis events albeit communication has been identified as an effective tool and a social support resource to shape workers’ attitudinal and
behavioral responses (Petrou et al., 2018), especially in the hospitality industry (Berezan et al., 2016; King and Lee, 2016; Zach, 2016). Furthermore, by examining employee resilience in a pandemic context and in association with employer event communication, this study fills a crucial lacuna vis-à-vis the paucity of investigations into employee resilience within a crisis setting particularly by means of social support from the organization (Cooke et al., 2019b). Our finding adds employer event communication to the limited but growing body of social antecedents of employee resilience.

Third, our study advances the stream of research on workforce resilience through crises in the hospitality and tourism industry by lending credence to core beliefs examination as a mediation mechanism underlying hospitality workers’ resilience through a pandemic crisis. Core beliefs examination has not been empirically tested as a mediation channel for a social support impact on employee resilience though cognitive approaches have been viewed to play a role in translating social resources into resilience (Cooke et al., 2019b). Our study takes a step further to unfold the role of core beliefs examination in mediating the nexus between a social support resource (i.e. employer event communication) and resilience among hospitality workers in face of a crisis event.

Last, our results provide evidence for the contingency lens through, which employer event communication influences core beliefs examination, leading to resilience among hospitality workers. As a social support resource, family support can constitute a contingency approach for advancing our understanding of when employer event communication is the most effective in promoting core beliefs examination among hospitality workers. Prior studies have largely examined the separate effects of family social support and workplace social support on employee attitudes (Griggs et al., 2013; Russo et al., 2016; Selvarajan et al., 2013). Our analysis is in line with a complementary perspective of organizational and family support (Adler and Kwon, 2002; Greenhaus et al., 2012) by demonstrating that employer event communication and family support constitute synergistic partners when it comes to the relationship with hospitality workers’ core beliefs examination during a crisis event. This provides further support for the COR perspective highlighting the salience of ample resources (e.g. from both employer event communication and family support) in activating proactive thinking, proactive coping strategies and adaptation (Halbesleben et al., 2014; Ito and Brotheridge, 2003; Hobfoll et al., 2007) such as in the form of core beliefs examination to find meaning in the crisis.

**Practical implications**

Our research provides some practical implications for hotel organizations and hotel workers in the face of a crisis such as the COVID-19. First, this study indicates that employer event communication is positively related to hospitality workers’ resilience facing the COVID-19. Therefore, hotel organizations should correct rumors about their crisis-related policies, connect with employees on unpaid leave or layoff and understand their situations through event communication activities. The resources from these communications will help employees re-examine their core beliefs in coping with the crisis and spending time meaningfully while waiting for the return to work or seeking new opportunities.

Furthermore, the mediating role of core beliefs examination suggests that core beliefs should be explored during recruitment and selection as well as building the ability to re-examine and re-construct core beliefs should be one of the training objectives. Organizations in the hospitality industry should provide training on such an adaptability such as through cognitive mapping technique (Bell and Kozlowski, 2008) so that hotel workers can re-examine and re-construct their core beliefs to cope optimistically and adapt in face of an event. Cognitive mapping technique entails structuring and assessing a specific theme (e.g.
an event) expressed in verbal forms (e.g. interviews) (Sacchelli et al., 2017). The value of
nodes (i.e. concepts) and the nexus between them are weighted to enable their interpretation
(Papageorgiou et al., 2011). Training can apply cognitive mapping to interview employees
and help them build adaptation tactics to confront an event.

Second, it is imperative for hospitality workers to be aware of family as a vital social
support resource. Hotel workers should be concerned about their family, regularly
communicate with family members, share and discuss true thoughts and difficulties with
them, and proactively seek their support (Zhang et al., 2019). Through these ways, hotel
workers can build strong bonds with their family to garner sufficient support to grow
resilient from a crisis such as the COVID-19. During a crisis event, hotel workers should
discuss openly with family members the types and the extent of support that they need.
They may also need assistance from a family member as a facilitator to communicate with
other family members. In this way, family members can be aware of hotel workers’ current
needs as well as determine how they should contribute to promoting workers’ resilience.
Moreover, a person close to the worker, such as spouse, may learn how to provide effective
support by understanding the worker’s resilience efforts on a daily basis. This sort of daily
and timely support may give the worker opportunities to reflect on core beliefs and develop
resilience.

Limitations and directions for future research
This study notes some limitations. One of the limitations in the study is the application of
convenient sampling approach to the hotel selection, which may prevent generalizing the
findings and carrying their implications to the hospitality industry. Future research efforts
should control for this limitation to enable generalizations across the hospitality industry, as
well as examine the impact of hotel type and location on the relationship between employer
event communication and hospitality worker resilience. The generalizability of our results
was also limited on account of the focus of our research on hospitality service industry. The
current research model should be retested in other service industries or comparatively tested
across service and/or manufacturing industries.

Though some of the constructs of interest, such as core beliefs examination and
resilience, fall under the category of psychological constructs and should be assessed via
self-reports (Conway and Lance, 2010), the data of our research were susceptible to CMV
bias that might grow from self-report data (Podsakoff et al., 2012). However, this study
mitigated this threat through the multi-wave surveys, the marker variable technique, and
the interactional effect test. The CMV risk, nevertheless, can be further alleviated if future
research conducts a cross-lagged research design rather than a time-lagged research design
(Kasl and Jones, 2003). Failure to infer causal relationships, a limitation of the time-lagged
approach, can also be surmounted via the cross-lagged approach (Kasl and Jones, 2003).

As a single study is unable to unravel every mechanism underlying the nexus between
employer event communication and hospitality workers’ resilience, more mechanisms
should be explored in future research in similar or other contexts of crisis events. An
extension of the current study may entail examining other social variables as predictors of
resilience than employer event communication. Another extension should be to delve into
different mediation mechanisms. Rather than focusing on cognitive processes as influence
channels of employer event communication, future research may take affective processes
(e.g. positive affect, emotional regulation) into account. Our study focuses on social support
from family members as a contingency for the relationship between employer event
communication and core beliefs examination. Albeit kin support from family members has
obtained more attention from work-life research than friend support (Özbilgin et al., 2011),
the role of friend support should be considered in the retesting of the current research model. Additionally, training on sector-transferable skills can help laid-off employees move from a non-essential service to an essential service during the pandemic and grow post-pandemic (Martins et al., 2020). Future research should hence test the contingent role of sector-transferable skill training for the nurturance of hospitality workers’ resilience.
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