

## How Do Teams Become Stronger Through Adversity? The Influence of Leader Mindfulness on Team Resilience Formation

**Authors:** Liu Beini, Zhang Zhixue, Zhang Zhixue

**Date:** 2023-01-29T00:00:00+00:00

### Abstract

In turbulent business environments, the key for teams to successfully withstand risks, rapidly recover, and even achieve growth lies in team resilience. Team resilience is not only a capability for teams to rebound in adversity, but also a dynamic psychological process and a shared belief. However, research on team-level resilience is quite scarce and dominated by the capability perspective, neglecting its dynamic development and the emergence of consensus, while antecedent research has seldom focused on leadership characteristics. This study integrates three perspectives—the capability perspective, the process perspective, and the consensus perspective—to delineate the internal mechanisms and boundary conditions through which leader mindfulness influences team resilience formation. The findings provide a relatively comprehensive theoretical integration framework and management practice strategies for how teams can remain unbroken in adversity and even become stronger through setbacks.

### Full Text

## What Enables Teams to Grow Stronger Through Adversity? The Influence of Leader Mindfulness on Team Resilience Formation

**LIU Beini**<sup>1</sup>, **ZHANG Zhixue**<sup>2</sup>

(<sup>1</sup> Business School, Beijing Technology and Business University, Beijing 100048, China)

(<sup>2</sup> Guanghua School of Management, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China)

**Abstract:** In turbulent business environments, team resilience is the key to successfully resisting risks, rapidly recovering, and even achieving growth. Team resilience represents not only a team's capacity to bounce back from adversity,

but also a dynamic psychological process and a shared belief. However, research at the team level remains scarce and dominated by the capacity perspective, neglecting its dynamic development and the emergence of collective consensus, while antecedent studies have paid insufficient attention to leader characteristics. This research integrates three perspectives—capacity, process, and consensus—to delineate the internal mechanisms and boundary conditions through which leader mindfulness influences team resilience formation. The findings provide a comprehensive theoretical framework and practical management strategies for how teams can withstand adversity and emerge stronger.

**Keywords:** leader mindfulness, team resilience, capacity perspective, process perspective, consensus perspective

**Classification Code:** B849: C93

## 1. Problem Statement

The world today is undergoing unprecedented changes, with new economies, business forms, and models constantly emerging, driving continuous flattening of organizational design and structure (Zhang et al., 2021). Team-based work modes have become increasingly prevalent, making team structure and design iterations critical factors for organizational success (Zhang et al., 2020). Operating in volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous business environments, work teams inevitably face various crises (King et al., 2016). Team crises manifest in multiple forms, ranging from chronic stressors (such as project deadline pressures, collective fatigue, and role overload) to acute shocks (such as equipment or technology failures, resource disruptions, and team conflicts) (Stoverink et al., 2020). These adverse factors severely impact team performance by disrupting critical team processes, impairing team functioning, and ultimately leading to high team failure rates (Barton & Kahn, 2019).

Nevertheless, some teams demonstrate remarkable ability to withstand adversity and even grow stronger through challenges. For instance, when faced with the acute shock of a cockpit windshield suddenly shattering, a co-pilot being partially sucked out, and rapidly dropping temperatures, the Sichuan Airlines Flight 3U8633 crew remained calm, collaborated effectively, and successfully executed an emergency landing with 119 passengers. Similarly, when confronting chronic workplace stressors, some teams that lose key members due to turnover can still succeed through role restructuring; other teams can constructively resolve conflicts and restore relationships even after interpersonal disputes. Why can some teams turn crises into opportunities and achieve renewal while others succumb to adversity? Existing research indicates that the key lies in “team resilience” —the capacity to successfully resist risks, overcome adversity, rapidly restore equilibrium, and even achieve growth and development (West et al., 2009; Carmeli et al., 2013; Kennedy et al., 2016; Hartmann et al., 2020). Consequently, enhancing team resilience represents both an important practical challenge for managers and a topic of growing scholarly interest. However, compared to individual- and organizational-level resilience research, team-level resilience

studies remain relatively scarce (Stoverink et al., 2020; Raetze et al., 2021).

Team leaders play a crucial role in shaping team resilience, with their influence becoming particularly invaluable during crises (Vera et al., 2017; Dimas et al., 2018). Faced with the suddenness and uncertainty accompanying crises, team resilience requires team members to maintain awareness of subtle changes, coordinate effectively to respond to disruptive and challenging events, and recover from setbacks (Carmeli et al., 2013; Kennedy et al., 2016). These requirements align perfectly with the core characteristics of leader mindfulness—“maintaining high levels of awareness, staying clear and calm across different environments, forming insights, and inspiring, empowering, and leading others from within” (Schuh et al., 2019; Decuyper et al., 2020; Lu & Xiang, 2021). In the aforementioned Sichuan Airlines case, Captain Liu Chuanjian demonstrated precisely these core features of leader mindfulness—self-control, high-quality communication, and timely, accurate information processing (Lu & Xiang, 2021).

Thus, leader mindfulness potentially influences team resilience cultivation, but unfortunately these two literature streams remain relatively independent. Antecedent research on team resilience has seldom examined leader characteristics, and empirical findings urgently need enrichment (Stoverink et al., 2020; Raetze et al., 2021). Meanwhile, scholars have called for examining the effectiveness of leader mindfulness at the team level (Chong et al., 2020; Decuyper et al., 2020; Jackson, 2021; Zhang et al., 2021; Shen & Ge, 2021). Therefore, theoretically exploring and empirically testing the influence of leader mindfulness on team resilience can not only enrich research on team resilience antecedents but also extend the level of analysis for leader mindfulness effectiveness.

Furthermore, what mechanisms underlie the formation of team resilience through leader mindfulness, and what constraints bound this relationship? A comprehensive understanding requires examining the nature of team resilience. Previous research indicates that team resilience is simultaneously a capacity for teams to bounce back from adversity (West et al., 2009; Alliger et al., 2015), a dynamic psychological process (Bennett et al., 2010; Morgan et al., 2013), and a shared belief (Carmeli et al., 2013; Kennedy et al., 2016). However, existing research overwhelmingly adopts the “capacity perspective,” neglecting questions about where resilience capacity originates (Lu & Xiang, 2021). Additionally, how does the team resilience process develop dynamically? How does team resilience as a shared belief and collective consensus emerge among team members? The capacity perspective alone cannot fully explain these questions. Scholars therefore advocate investigating team resilience formation mechanisms from dynamic “process” and interaction-based “consensus” perspectives (Chapman et al., 2020; Raetze et al., 2021).

In response to these practical concerns and theoretical calls, this study integrates capacity, process, and consensus perspectives on team resilience to conduct a comprehensive theoretical investigation of the relationship between leader mindfulness and team resilience formation, aiming to reveal its internal mechanisms and important boundary conditions. The research conclusions can deepen and

expand relevant research on leader mindfulness and team resilience, providing theoretical reference for team leadership development and crisis management practice.

## 2.1 Research Status of Team Resilience

First, the connotation of team resilience. Reviewing previous studies, scholars have explored the meaning of team resilience from three perspectives: capacity, process, and consensus. The “capacity perspective” definition, most commonly represented by West et al. (2009), describes team resilience as the ability to recover from failures, setbacks, conflicts, or any other threats a team might experience. This view has been subsequently cited as a state-like capability based on collective teamwork patterns or as the capacity to handle team adversity (Hartmann et al., 2020). Some scholars have expanded this definition based on dynamic collective interaction patterns, defining team resilience as the process through which teams manage adversity and setbacks (Bennett et al., 2010), thus giving rise to the “process perspective” connotation. Morgan et al. (2013) provide the most widely used definition from the process perspective: team resilience as a dynamic socio-psychological process that primarily protects team members from the potential negative effects of stressors they collectively encounter through interactive behavioral and attitudinal processes among members. From the “consensus perspective,” team resilience is defined as a shared belief held by the team that it can cope with disruptive and challenging events and recover from setbacks (Carmeli et al., 2013; Kennedy et al., 2016). In this view, team resilience is also understood as an emergent state where the team has confidence in dealing with difficulties (Kennedy et al., 2016).

This study adopts an integrated perspective for operationalizing team resilience: team resilience is the capacity, dynamic process, and shared belief through which a team’s functional trajectory remains essentially unaffected after exposure to adversity or recovers to normal levels after some deterioration. This integrated perspective on team resilience can be understood within the Input-Process-Output (IPO) model framework (Ilgen et al., 2005). Specifically, the “capacity perspective” on team resilience can be described as the “input” of capabilities for successfully addressing various threats (Alliger et al., 2015; West et al., 2009). The “process perspective” can be understood as the dynamic socio-psychological “transformation process” through which team members protect each other from the negative effects of failures, difficulties, and setbacks via social interaction (Morgan et al., 2013). The “consensus perspective” can be summarized as the “output” of shared beliefs among team members about resisting adversity and recovering from it (Kennedy et al., 2016).

Second, measurement of team resilience. Existing measurement tools fall into two categories: (1) adapting established individual or organizational resilience scales to measure team resilience through a referent-shift mode, and (2) scales specifically developed to directly measure team resilience. Typical examples of the first category include: a 6-item scale adapted from Luthans et al.’s (2007)

psychological capital resilience subscale; a 7-item scale adapted from Mallak's (1998) organizational resilience implementation principles; and a 4-item scale adapted from Sinclair and Wallston's (2004) brief resilient coping scale. Typical examples of the second category include: Salanova et al.'s (2012) 7-item team resilience subscale from the Healthy and Resilient Organization (HERO) scale; Stephens et al.'s (2013) 3-item team resilience scale; and Carmeli et al.'s (2013) 6-item team resilience scale.

Third, antecedent research on team resilience. Most qualitative and quantitative studies on team resilience focus on exploring its antecedents (Raetze et al., 2021), which can be roughly categorized into three types: team characteristics, team resources and interaction processes, and leader characteristics. Regarding team characteristics, team diversity, interdependence, size, and member tenure are closely related to team resilience (Morgan et al., 2015; McCray et al., 2016). Concerning team resources and interaction processes, research has empirically examined the positive effects of high-quality member relationships (Carmeli et al., 2013; Carmeli et al., 2021), collective efficacy and teamwork (Vera et al., 2017), trust among members (Stephens et al., 2013; Pavez et al., 2021), behavioral integration (Chen & Zhang, 2021), and voice climate (Brykman & King, 2021) on team resilience. Regarding leader characteristics, positive leadership styles can enhance team resilience (Morgan et al., 2015), but only transformational leadership's positive effect has been empirically tested (Vera et al., 2017; Dimas et al., 2018; Sun et al., 2021).

## 2.2 Research Status of Leader Mindfulness

First, the connotation of leader mindfulness. Leader mindfulness refers to leaders consciously, non-judgmentally focusing attention on the present moment while actively maintaining alertness and sensitivity to both internal and external environments (Dane, 2011; Leroy et al., 2013). As the effectiveness of mindfulness interventions gains recognition, consensus has emerged that mindfulness can be enhanced through training and practice (Good et al., 2016). Consequently, the state-like trait perspective of mindfulness has gained widespread support (Brown & Ryan, 2003; Zheng & Ni, 2018; Feldman et al., 2022), suggesting that while mindfulness is a relatively stable trait, it possesses some plasticity. This also makes it possible to develop and enhance leadership through external interventions such as mindfulness training and practice. Previous research indicates that mindfulness has characteristics of a root construct, meaning it first reshapes leaders' own cognition, emotions, and behaviors, then influences others through connections with the external world, achieving a dynamic leadership process (Good et al., 2016; Shen & Ge, 2021). This study treats leader mindfulness as a state-like trait of leaders, extending leadership trait theory. Based on previous leader mindfulness research (Reb et al., 2014; Reb et al., 2019; Schuh et al., 2019; Peng et al., 2019; Decuyper et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021; Shen & Ge, 2021) and the "mindful leadership interaction model" (Lu & Xiang, 2021), this study understands the process through which mindfulness enhances leadership

effectiveness as: leaders maintaining present-moment awareness through attentional self-regulation, perceiving environments, controlling themselves, and sensing others in an open, non-judgmental, observer perspective manner, thereby influencing others and responding to change.

Second, intrapersonal effects of leader mindfulness. The intrapersonal effects primarily manifest in enhancing leaders' work effectiveness and personal well-being. Regarding work effectiveness: mindfulness improves leaders' self-mastery (King & Haar, 2017), interpersonal justice (Reb et al., 2019) and procedural justice (Schuh et al., 2019), reduces automatic emotional reactions (Hülshager et al., 2013), enhances creativity and decision quality (Decuyper et al., 2020), and promotes high-quality listening and communication (Frizzell et al., 2016). Regarding personal well-being: mindfulness helps leaders alleviate work stress (Wasylikiw et al., 2016), increase sleep duration and reduce emotional exhaustion (Murnieks et al., 2020), enhance psychological need satisfaction and well-being (Reitz et al., 2020), and promote psychological capital thereby strengthening hope, resilience, and optimism (Decuyper et al., 2020).

Third, interpersonal effects of leader mindfulness. The interpersonal effects primarily manifest in enhancing subordinates' work effectiveness and physical-mental health. Regarding subordinate work effectiveness: leader mindfulness improves task performance (Schuh et al., 2019; Reb et al., 2019) and extra-role performance (Reb et al., 2019), while reducing workplace deviance (Reb et al., 2014). Regarding subordinate well-being: leader mindfulness increases subordinate well-being (Pinck & Sonnentag, 2017), promotes work-family balance (Reb et al., 2014), enhances leader-member exchange quality (Reb et al., 2019), improves subordinate resilience (Zhang et al., 2021), reduces hindrance stress (Liu et al., 2021) and emotional exhaustion (Schuh et al., 2019).

### 2.3 Research Review

Existing research has made meaningful explorations of team resilience and leader mindfulness separately, providing a foundation for this study. However, three aspects require further investigation.

First, the capacity perspective dominates team resilience research (Talat & Riza, 2020; Brykman & King, 2021; Carmeli et al., 2021). While this has advanced the field, a single perspective remains insufficient for revealing team resilience formation mechanisms and neglects comprehensive understanding of where capacity originates (Lu & Xiang, 2021). Process- and consensus-based perspectives can better enrich the capacity perspective's limitations, and scholars have called for comprehensive investigation of team resilience formation mechanisms from dynamic "process" and interaction-based "consensus" perspectives (Chapman et al., 2020; Raetze et al., 2021).

Second, because team resilience has multiple conceptual perspectives, scholars have not reached consensus on its operationalization, with some mismatches between conceptualization and measurement. For example, West et al.'s (2009)

definition represents the capacity perspective, yet their measurement adapted Luthans et al.'s (2007) psychological capital resilience subscale, which emphasizes resilience as a dynamic psychological state more aligned with this study's process perspective. Vera et al. (2017) conceptualized team resilience as a collective psychological construct emphasizing socio-psychological processes when teams face difficulties (process perspective), but used Salanova et al.'s (2012) scale that treats team resilience as a capacity. Thus, clarifying team resilience's connotation and selecting corresponding measurement scales will help better elucidate formation mechanisms and improve research validity.

Third, antecedent research on team resilience insufficiently examines leader characteristics. Team leaders are crucial for shaping team resilience (Vera et al., 2017; Dimas et al., 2018). Recent studies repeatedly note that empirical research on how leader characteristics influence team resilience urgently needs enrichment (Sun et al., 2021; Hartmann et al., 2021). While research suggests mindfulness-based leadership practices can enhance leader resilience (Reitz et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021), resilient leaders do not necessarily produce resilient employees, and a group of resilient employees does not automatically create a resilient team (Alliger et al., 2015; Meneghel et al., 2016). Therefore, investigating leader mindfulness's unique influence on team resilience at the team level is valuable, and scholars have called for testing leader mindfulness effectiveness at the team level (Chong et al., 2020; Decuyper et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021; Shen & Ge, 2021). Existing discussions of leader mindfulness and team resilience remain independent and require further exploration.

### 3. Research Design

This study develops three specific research designs from the capacity, process, and consensus perspectives. Study 1 examines the mechanism through which leader mindfulness influences team resilience capacity. Based on social information processing theory and the "team inputs-emergent states-interaction patterns-team outputs" framework, it investigates how leader mindfulness sequentially promotes team resilience capacity formation through team work anxiety absorption and team emotional carrying capacity, while examining team prior performance as a boundary condition. Study 2 reveals developmental patterns of how changes in leader mindfulness affect changes in team resilience. Based on conservation of resources theory, it examines within-team mechanisms through which changes in leader mindfulness influence changes in team resilience: a social resource mechanism (examining changes in team psychological safety) and a cognitive resource mechanism (examining changes in team cognitive reappraisal). Study 3 depicts the emergence process of team resilience consensus promoted by leader mindfulness. Based on sensemaking theory, it investigates how leader mindfulness as sensegiving promotes team resilience consensus emergence through team sensemaking, examining the contextual effect of team emotional fusion. The overall theoretical framework is shown in Figure 1 [Figure 1: see original paper].

**Figure 1. Overall Theoretical Framework of This Study**

*Note: Superscript 1 = content in Study 1, 2 = content in Study 2, 3 = content in Study 3;  $\Delta$  indicates the change in the variable between two time points.*

**3.1 Study 1: Leader Mindfulness and Team Resilience from the Capacity Perspective**

From the capacity perspective, team resilience refers to the ability to recover from failures, setbacks, conflicts, or any other threats a team might experience (West et al., 2009). Anxiety in team resilience research contexts refers to the worry, tension, and other emotional states employees exhibit when facing adverse work environments or events (Spielberger, 2013). Team work anxiety absorption occurs when teams confront and dissolve anxiety, diluting the power and intensity of painful emotions (Barton & Kahn, 2019). Team work anxiety absorption can be considered an emergent state of team affective cognition. Leader mindfulness promotes team work anxiety absorption in three ways. First, mindful leaders perceive environments clearly, provide explanations for uncertain events, establish cognitive order, and maintain open communication about work-related events (Burmansah et al., 2020). Therefore, leader mindfulness directly reduces confusion, anxiety, and tension among team members caused by cognitive barriers (Zhang et al., 2021), enabling better acceptance of negative emotions being experienced. Second, mindful leaders adopt a non-judgmental, accepting attitude toward what happens (Hyland et al., 2015), allowing team members to express their experienced anxiety without barriers. This state of confronting anxiety together with honest communication and joint facing is precisely the key to team work anxiety absorption (Barton & Kahn, 2019). Third, leader mindfulness helps team members understand their experiences (Burmansah et al., 2020) and respond with compassion and empathetic attitudes (Liu et al., 2021). This information transmission helps team members interpret the work environment as inclusive and caring, enabling free discussion of anxiety and weakening the feeling of being controlled by anxiety, thereby absorbing team work anxiety.

**Proposition 1:** Leader mindfulness positively influences team work anxiety absorption.

Emotional carrying capacity, developed from high-quality connection theory at the individual level, refers to team members' ability to express and carry more emotions and to do so in a constructive interactive manner (Stephens et al., 2013). Team emotional carrying capacity represents a pattern characteristic in team interactions. According to social information processing theory and the team process composition model (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978; Marks, 2001), team work anxiety absorption as an "emergent state" reflects how leader mindfulness as an information carrier shapes team affective-cognitive states, while "interaction patterns" represent behavioral manifestations based on this affective-cognitive state—namely, team emotional carrying capacity. Team work anxiety absorption promotes team emotional carrying capacity through three mechanisms. First,

after absorbing anxiety, team members create a more holding environment (Barton & Kahn, 2019), enabling them to express their feelings to each other without barriers, which is key to team emotional carrying capacity (Stephens et al., 2013). Second, when anxiety is effectively absorbed, team members confront rather than defensively avoid it, providing possibilities for more explicit acknowledgment and discussion of issues in subsequent interactions (Kahn et al., 2018), allowing both positive and negative feelings to be better expressed and transmitted. Third, when team members develop anxiety absorption states, they establish appropriate relational foundations (Kahn et al., 2013), enabling better interactions and more constructive emotional expression to enhance team emotional carrying capacity. Additionally, since emergent states can mediate between team input factors and interaction patterns (Marks et al., 2001), this study proposes that team work anxiety absorption transmits the influence of leader mindfulness as a contextual team input on team emotional carrying capacity as a core activity in interaction patterns.

**Proposition 2:** Leader mindfulness enhances team emotional carrying capacity by promoting team work anxiety absorption.

Team emotional carrying capacity emphasizes that team members express positive and negative emotions constructively and without barriers during interactions (Stephens et al., 2013). It enhances team resilience capacity through three pathways. First, frequent and timely expression of positive emotions helps team members recover from frustration and disappointment experienced during adversity (Kahn et al., 2018). Research has confirmed that positive affect transmission promotes team resilience (Meneghel et al., 2016). Second, expression of negative emotions among team members maintains vigilance and facilitates team learning (Barton & Kahn, 2019). Teams that cannot timely express negative emotions often amplify their impact, causing stagnation and dysfunction that damages team resilience capacity formation. Third, when emotions are expressed in threatening ways (such as blame or attack), team members become alienated (Kahn et al., 2013), hindering mutual learning possibilities (Gibson & Vermeulen, 2003) and reducing resilience responses. Therefore, when communication occurs constructively and caringly, it can prevent dysfunctional conflict, increase team learning, and make team resilience capacity more likely to emerge (Lawrence & Maitlis, 2012).

**Proposition 3:** Team work anxiety absorption promotes team resilience by enhancing team emotional carrying capacity.

Based on the relationships described above and integrating social information processing theory with the “team inputs-emergent states-interaction patterns-team outputs” framework, this study proposes that leader mindfulness (team input) practices and encourages open team communication, accepts all perspectives non-judgmentally, and creates an empathetic and compassionate team atmosphere, thereby effectively absorbing and dissolving team work anxiety (emergent state). This shared team affective-cognitive state promotes constructive communication among members, helping them transmit positive and negative

emotions timely through interactions, thus improving team emotional carrying capacity (interaction pattern). This interaction pattern prevents dysfunction, avoids ineffective conflict, and increases team learning, thereby enhancing team resilience capacity (team output).

**Proposition 4:** Leader mindfulness positively influences team resilience by promoting team work anxiety absorption to enhance team emotional carrying capacity.

Social information processing theory suggests that social information plays a greater role when the external environment is uncertain (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). The more uncertain the environment, the more team members seek clues from leader mindfulness to understand their work context. From a performance feedback perspective, teams may adjust subsequent focus and action decisions based on prior performance (Schippers et al., 2013). Therefore, team prior performance level represents an important contextual factor influencing how team members interpret information transmitted by leadership styles (Gao et al., 2020). Leader mindfulness better promotes team work anxiety absorption in teams with poor prior performance through two mechanisms. First, poor prior performance triggers increased job insecurity, making team members more needful of social information from leader mindfulness—such as non-judgmental acceptance and positive emotion regulation (Hülshager et al., 2013; Lippincott, 2018)—to better alleviate work anxiety. Second, teams with poor prior performance experience uncertainty about how they should perform, creating cognitive biases. Mindful leaders maintain awareness of environments and surrounding information (Brown et al., 2007) and possess stronger situational awareness and change adaptation abilities (Urrila, 2022). These help establish cognitive order through leader mindfulness in uncertain environments, thereby effectively alleviating work anxiety.

**Proposition 5:** Leader mindfulness better promotes team work anxiety absorption when team prior performance is poor.

Building on the aforementioned relationships, we can expect team prior performance to further moderate the indirect relationship where leader mindfulness sequentially influences team resilience through team work anxiety absorption and team emotional carrying capacity. Specifically, for teams with poor prior performance operating in more uncertain environments, leader mindfulness can better help members care for each other, rebuild cognition, and absorb anxiety, thereby facilitating smoother and more constructive communication of positive and negative emotions and enhancing team resilience. Conversely, if prior performance is strong, team members lose their sense of threat and urgency, falling into inertial operation. Leader mindfulness' s characteristic of rejecting inertial operation would not benefit team work anxiety absorption and dissolution, potentially creating relational rigidity that blocks emotional information exchange and damages team resilience.

**Proposition 6:** When team prior performance is poor, leader mindfulness

better enhances team resilience by promoting team work anxiety absorption to increase team emotional carrying capacity.

### 3.2 Study 2: Leader Mindfulness and Team Resilience from the Process Perspective

From the process perspective, team resilience refers to a dynamic socio-psychological process that primarily protects team members from the potential negative effects of stressors they collectively encounter through attitudinal and behavioral interactions among members (Morgan et al., 2013). Previous research has called for attention to the dynamic nature of team resilience and its change processes (Chapman et al., 2020; Raetze et al., 2021). Accordingly, this study introduces a dynamic change perspective to examine the dual mediation pathways through which changes in leader mindfulness influence changes in team resilience via changes in team psychological safety and team cognitive reappraisal.

Research has noted that mindful leadership is not merely a management technique but a lifestyle (Mahfouz, 2018), implying that mindfulness development in leaders may be a dynamic process. Additionally, the state-like trait nature of leader mindfulness emphasizes its plasticity and capacity for dynamic change and enhancement (Brown & Ryan, 2003). Changes in leader mindfulness promote changes in team resilience for three reasons. First, leader mindfulness can transmit positive affect, creating a joyful and caring workplace culture (Hougaard & Carter, 2018; Jackson, 2021) that promotes changes in workplace positive affect. Conservation of resources theory posits that shared team conditions can serve as resource caravans (such as positive affect) that promote dynamic increases in generative resources (Hobfoll et al., 2018), bringing about team resilience changes (Chen et al., 2015). Empirical research supports this, showing that positive changes in team joy culture significantly predict positive changes in team resilience (Hartmann et al., 2021). Second, changes in leader mindfulness bring about changes in team positive affect, placing the team on a positive growth trajectory. Conservation of resources theory's resource gain spiral effect indicates that resource gains promote further acquisition of other positive resources (Hobfoll, 1989), and team positive resources have been confirmed as important antecedents of team resilience (Meneghel et al., 2016; Carmeli et al., 2021; Pavez et al., 2021). Therefore, over time, changes in leader mindfulness bring about functional changes in teams, and team resilience changes accordingly. Third, research indicates that enhanced acquired resource endowments increase team resilience (Guciardi et al., 2018), and positive changes in leader mindfulness as a change in available team resource input can supplement team resource endowments to promote team resilience changes.

**Proposition 7:** Positive changes in leader mindfulness positively influence positive changes in team resilience.

According to conservation of resources theory, we further propose that after

acquiring resources (positive changes in leader mindfulness), teams use these resources to gain more resources (Hobfoll, 2011), including social and cognitive resources. Team psychological safety represents team members' perceptions of the consequences of interpersonal risks in the team (Edmondson, 1999) and constitutes an important social resource change mechanism. Changes in leader mindfulness potentially influence changes in team psychological safety in two ways. First, research shows that high-quality relationships generated through interpersonal interaction processes are important antecedents of team psychological safety (Edmondson, 1999). Increased leader mindfulness levels bring about positive interactions and high-quality connections between leaders and members (Reitz et al., 2020; Urrila, 2022). This helps create contagious atmospheres that cultivate high-quality social relationships, thereby changing team psychological safety. Similar empirical research demonstrates that collective positive affect promotes prosocial behavior among members and reduces interpersonal risk (West et al., 2021). Second, increased leader mindfulness enhances empathy (Liu et al., 2021), 预示着 greater self-other overlap and more complex understanding of others (Fredrickson et al., 2008). This makes developing inclusive team climates more likely, influencing changes in team psychological safety.

High-quality relationships are generative and vital, forming important resources for team functioning, especially team resilience (Carmeli et al., 2013; Stephens et al., 2013). Research also shows that team psychological safety reflects high-quality connections among members (Edmondson, 1999). Therefore, changes in team psychological safety may influence team resilience changes in two ways. First, when team psychological safety increases, members speak up more without fearing interpersonal risks such as embarrassment, rejection, or punishment. When adversity strikes, increased psychological safety reduces concerns that might cause members to become defensive or less willing to openly discuss significant issues (Carmeli et al., 2013), thereby promoting team resilience. Second, changes in team psychological safety bring high-quality relational experiences among members, and this generative relational resource enables members to possess resources for cultivating psychological capital (Carmeli et al., 2015), further promoting team resilience changes.

**Proposition 8:** Positive changes in leader mindfulness bring about positive changes in team resilience by promoting positive changes in team psychological safety.

As a cognitive resource change mechanism, team cognitive reappraisal involves team members cognitively changing the perceived meaning of situations (Gross & John, 2003). Changes in leader mindfulness influence changes in team cognitive reappraisal in three ways. First, changes in leader mindfulness enable leaders to experience internal phenomena from a detached observer perspective, helping team members decouple from painful situations they are experiencing (Good et al., 2016), thereby generating different cognitions about how to view situations. Second, increased leader mindfulness leads to more open and hold-

ing attitudes toward work-related matters (Burmansah et al., 2020), promoting members to consider issues from each other's perspectives (Liu et al., 2021), enabling better thinking about problems in different ways and from different angles. Third, increased mindfulness enhances leaders' information processing capacity (Lippincott, 2018), helping leaders flexibly adjust their own cognition and positively influence team members (Zhang et al., 2021). Team members adjust and change their thinking patterns based on leaders' cognitive reactions (DeChurch et al., 2011), thereby bringing about positive changes in team cognitive reappraisal.

Changes in team cognitive reappraisal further influence team resilience changes through three mechanisms. First, increased team cognitive reappraisal helps team members maintain calm when facing difficulties and stress (Gross & John, 2003), thereby avoiding team relational rigidity and dysfunction—key factors constraining team resilience enhancement. Second, positive changes in team cognitive reappraisal lead teams to interact with more positive thinking patterns, directly reducing possibilities for destructive team conflict (Kay & Skarlicki, 2020) and thereby facilitating team resilience cultivation. Third, positively developed team cognitive reappraisal helps teams alleviate potential negative emotions such as sadness, anxiety, and anger in more constructive ways (Weber et al., 2014), and absorbing team negative emotions is key to teams moving from brittleness to resilience (Barton & Kahn, 2019).

**Proposition 9:** Positive changes in leader mindfulness bring about positive changes in team resilience by promoting positive changes in team cognitive reappraisal.

### 3.3 Study 3: Leader Mindfulness and Team Resilience from the Consensus Perspective

From the consensus perspective, team resilience is defined as a shared belief held by the team that it can cope with disruptive and challenging events and recover from setbacks (Carmeli et al., 2013; Kennedy et al., 2016). In this view, team resilience is also understood as an emergent state where the team has confidence in dealing with difficulties (Kennedy et al., 2016). Sensemaking theory provides a theoretical lens for understanding how teams interpret and respond to adversity (Weick et al., 2005; Stoverink et al., 2020; Talat & Riaz, 2020; Sun et al., 2021). When facing crisis situations, team members need to use environmental cues to form understandings of crisis events and, through cyclical interaction between internal interpretation and external behavior, create new intersubjective meanings (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). Team sensemaking is a continuous, reciprocal process until consensus formation (Klein et al., 2010). The team sensemaking process involves team information communication, cognitive construction, and collective response (Akgün et al., 2012).

Leader mindfulness as sensegiving in crisis situations promotes team sensemaking in three ways. First, mindful leaders view internal experiences as detached

observers and approach team tasks with a beginner's mind (Wihler et al., 2022), thereby helping team members avoid experience-based constraints and view and discuss matters from different angles and in different ways, strengthening team information communication and promoting team sensemaking. Second, leader mindfulness promotes high-quality listening and communication in the workplace (Frizzell et al., 2016), enhancing affective exchange and connections among members and promoting emotional interdependence. Mindful leaders demonstrate more prosocial motivation and helping behaviors (Reitz et al., 2020; Sawyer et al., 2022), increasing social exchange and mutual assistance among members and promoting construction of team identity. This identity-based cognitive construction is an important aspect of team sensemaking (Akgün et al., 2012). Third, mindful leaders maintain open communication about work-related matters (Burmansah et al., 2020) and possess higher-level information processing capacity (Lippincott, 2018). Mindful leaders coordinate different perspectives among members and guide them to discuss work and review goals, which are concrete manifestations of collective response in team sensemaking.

**Proposition 10:** Leader mindfulness positively influences team sensemaking.

Based on sensemaking theory, team sensemaking helps teams establish reasonable interpretations of ongoing events in dynamic environments (Weick et al., 2005). These interpretations help teams optimally invest key resources, thereby becoming more resilient (Weick et al., 2005). Team sensemaking promotes team resilience in three ways. First, effective team sensemaking facilitates information communication, allowing real-time updating of reality understanding (Gray et al., 2015). This increases attention to weak signals and uncertainty, forming the foundation for team resilience cultivation. Second, team sensemaking helps form identity, promotes team cohesion, and thereby enhances high-quality connections among members (Welbourne & Paterson, 2017). Research has confirmed that high-quality member relationships facilitate team resilience formation (Carmeli et al., 2013; Carmeli et al., 2021). Third, team sensemaking includes team reflexivity, encouraging members to question existing assumptions and beliefs (Schippers et al., 2015), allowing teams to reconfigure established routines and propose new solutions and responses, thereby improving team resilience. Additionally, empirical results show that team sensemaking importantly influences team resilience (Talat & Riaz, 2020; Sun et al., 2021).

**Proposition 11:** Leader mindfulness enhances team resilience by promoting team sensemaking.

Team emotional fusion refers to trust, respect, and liking among team members (Cronin et al., 2011). Based on team interaction, it reflects overall working relationships among members (Cronin et al., 2011; Marks et al., 2001). Leader mindfulness promotes team sensemaking because it changes information communication, cognitive construction, and collective response among members, all of which facilitate team sensemaking. Team emotional fusion strengthens the positive effect of leader mindfulness on team sensemaking for three reasons. First, mindful leaders encourage members to view issues from other members'

perspectives (Liu et al., 2021), promoting representational transformation. However, if team emotional fusion is low, members may lack motivation to interpret sensegiving cues such as “perspective-taking” from leader mindfulness, reducing its promotional effect on team sensemaking through information exchange. Second, leader mindfulness promotes high-quality social exchange (Reb et al., 2019) and helping behaviors (Reitz et al., 2020; Sawyer et al., 2022), promoting team concept formation and enhancing member team identity. When members trust, respect, and like each other (Cronin et al., 2011), they develop stronger pro-team motivation, and this team state that better matches leader characteristics further facilitates identity-based team sensemaking. Third, mindful leaders maintain open communication about work-related matters (Burmansah et al., 2020), promoting team sensemaking. Emotional fusion increases tolerance for different opinions and conflicts among members (Bradley et al., 2012). In teams with high emotional fusion, members can openly discuss various viewpoints and see them as opportunities to optimize team processes rather than taking criticism or judgment personally (DeJong & Elfring, 2010). Therefore, the open communication culture and atmosphere created by leader mindfulness better promotes team sensemaking in teams with higher emotional fusion.

**Proposition 12:** Leader mindfulness better promotes team sensemaking when team emotional fusion is high.

#### 4. Theoretical Framework

Enhancing team resilience is key to teams turning crises into safety and growing stronger through adversity. However, compared to individual- and organizational-level resilience research, team-level resilience research remains scarce. Among limited team resilience studies, the perspective treating team resilience as a capacity dominates. While this has advanced research, a single perspective remains insufficient for revealing team resilience formation mechanisms. Existing research has neglected investigating resilience origins from dynamic process and shared belief emergence perspectives. Meanwhile, antecedent research on team resilience has insufficiently examined leader characteristics. Crisis management practice reveals that leader mindfulness may be an effective leadership characteristic for cultivating team resilience, yet theoretical research on leader mindfulness and team resilience remains relatively separate. This study pioneers the revelation of the relationship between leader mindfulness and team resilience, integrating capacity, process, and consensus perspectives to provide a more comprehensive theoretical explanation for how leader mindfulness influences team resilience formation. The theoretical contributions include:

First, constructing a capacity formation pathway between leader mindfulness and team resilience. Capacity perspective research has mostly focused on positive affect’ s important role in team resilience capacity formation (Carmeli et al., 2013; Meneghel et al., 2016; Carmeli et al., 2021; Hartmann et al., 2021). However, research indicates that negative affective defensive states in adversity

actually trigger team brittleness, while confronting and absorbing anxiety is key to team resilience formation (Barton & Kahn, 2019). Therefore, team work anxiety absorption may be an antecedent to team resilience capacity. Meanwhile, research shows that resolving and absorbing negative team emotions like anxiety facilitates timely transmission of authentic emotions (both positive and negative) (Kahn et al., 2018), which is precisely team emotional carrying capacity (Stephens et al., 2013). Thus, the capacity perspective, based on social information processing theory, constructs the sequential transmission effects of team work anxiety absorption and team emotional carrying capacity in the leader mindfulness-team resilience process. Simultaneously, it incorporates team characteristics (team prior performance) as a contextual factor, addressing the practical question of when leader mindfulness is more effective, and providing a theoretical framework for systematically clarifying when and how leader mindfulness promotes team resilience capacity formation.

Second, constructing a dynamic change mechanism between leader mindfulness and team resilience. Previous team resilience research has employed traditional static cross-sectional designs, neglecting team resilience's dynamic development (Chapman et al., 2020; Raetze et al., 2021). Leadership and organizational behavior research also emphasizes that dynamic investigation represents a developmental trend (Zhang et al., 2016). Therefore, adopting dynamic longitudinal tracking in research design is necessary to explore team resilience change processes. Previous research suggests considering team psychological safety changes in team resilience dynamics (Hartmann et al., 2021). Meanwhile, changing how team members view adversity and its perceived meaning to generate adaptive responses is key to team resilience changes (Barton & Kahn, 2019; Stoverink et al., 2020), which is precisely what occurs when team cognitive reappraisal changes. Thus, the process perspective, based on conservation of resources theory, constructs within-team "social-cognitive" resource change mechanisms through which changes in leader mindfulness influence changes in team resilience, providing theoretical support for understanding the dynamic relationship and its internal logic, and helping to better comprehend the potential driving forces of team resilience development.

Third, constructing a consensus emergence mechanism between leader mindfulness and team resilience. Previous consensus perspective research indicates that team consensus formation emerges through continuous interpretation, communication, and reflection among members (Kennedy et al., 2016). This emergent state depends on members continuously searching for and interpreting information in uncertain environments to construct meaning (Talat & Riza, 2020; Sun et al., 2021), which is precisely the team sensemaking process. Meanwhile, the sensemaking perspective emphasizes the important role of contextual information and cues in shaping team sensemaking (Maitlis & Christianson, 2014). Research suggests that team emotional fusion involving trust and reciprocity among members plays an important positive contextual role in consensus formation (Pavez et al., 2021; Carmeli et al., 2021), requiring attention to team emotional fusion's contextual effects in sensemaking. Therefore, the consensus

perspective, based on sensemaking theory, constructs the influence mechanism through which leader mindfulness promotes team resilience consensus emergence via team sensemaking, identifies the contextual effect of team emotional fusion in this process, and provides a more comprehensive explanation for clarifying and enhancing leader mindfulness' s effectiveness in promoting team resilience.

Overall, this study clarifies the rich connotation of team resilience. Through an integrated perspective, it treats team resilience not only as a team capacity but also as a team interaction process and consensus emergence. Consequently, the internal mechanisms through which leader mindfulness influences team resilience formation differ across these emphases. This study reveals the relationship between leader mindfulness and team resilience more comprehensively from capacity, process, and consensus perspectives, enriching research on leader characteristics as antecedents of team resilience, expanding the breadth and depth of team resilience research, and bridging the theoretical gap between leader mindfulness and team resilience literatures. The research provides a more integrated and clear theoretical explanation for how leader mindfulness influences team resilience formation, offering innovative theoretical explanatory approaches for practical concerns such as leadership development and team resilience cultivation in turbulent business environments.

## References

- Gao, Z., Zhao, C., Fu, Y., & Liu, Y. (2020). A multi-level chain-reaction mechanism of precautionary leadership on role performance in team contexts. *Management World*, 36(9), 186-201+216+202.
- Lu, J., & Xiang, P. (2021). Crisis process management: How to enhance organizational resilience. *Foreign Economics and Management*, 43(3), 3-24.
- Peng, W., Chen, J., & Bao, X. (2019). Mindful leadership: Conceptual connotation and integrated model. *Human Resources Development of China*, 36(11), 33-47.
- Shen, L., & Ge, Y. (2021). Mindful leadership: Mechanism and dynamic development model. *Business Economics and Administration*, (8), 16-28.
- Sun, M., Zhu, F., Guo, J., & Guan, Y. (2021). The influence of transformational leadership on team resilience: A sensemaking perspective. *Journal of Management Science*, 34(3),
- Zhang, J., Zheng, W., & Zhao, N. (2021). A multi-level mechanism exploration of leader mindfulness influencing organizational member resilience. *Human Resources Development of China*, 38(10),
- Zhang, Z., Shi, J., & Liu, J. (2016). Advances and frontiers in organizational behavior and leadership research. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 24(3), 317-326.
- Zhang, Z., Zhao, S., Shi, J., Qin, X., He, W., Zhao, X., Wang, Y., & Wu, G. (2021). Key scientific issues in organizational management research under

the digital economy—Academic summary of the 254th “Shuangqing Forum” . *Bulletin of National Natural Science Foundation of China*, 35(5), 774-781.

Zheng, X., & Ni, D. (2018). A review of mindfulness research in organizational management. *Management Review*, 30(10), 153-168.

Akgün, A. E., Keskin, H., Lynn, G., & Dogan, D. (2012). Antecedents and consequences of team sensemaking capability in product development projects. *Research and Development Management*, 42(5), 473-493.

Alliger, G. M., Cerasoli, C. P., Tannenbaum, S. I., & Vessey, W. B. (2015). Team resilience: How teams flourish under pressure. *Organizational Dynamics*, 44(3), 176-184.

Barton, M. A., & Kahn, W. A. (2019). Group resilience: The place and meaning of relational pauses. *Organization Studies*, 40(9), 1409-1429.

Bennett, J. B., Aden, C. A., Broome, K., Mitchell, K., & Rigdon, W. D. (2010). Team resilience for young restaurant workers: Research-to-practice adaptation and assessment. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(3),

Bradley, B. H., Postlethwaite, B. E., Klotz, A. C., Hamdani, M. R., & Brown, K. G. (2012). Reaping the benefits of task conflict in teams: The critical role of team psychological safety climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(1),

Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: mindfulness and its role in psychological wellbeing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(4), 822-848.

Brown, K. W., Ryan, R. M., & Creswell, J. D. (2007). Mindfulness: Theoretical foundations and evidence for its salutary effects. *Psychological Inquiry*, 18(4), 211-237.

Brykman, K. M., & King, D. D. (2021). A resource model of team resilience capacity and learning. *Group & Organization Management*, 46(4), 737-772.

Burmansah, B., Rugaiyah, R., Mukhtar, M., Nabilah, S., Ripki, A. J. H., & Fatayan, A. (2020). Mindful leadership: The ability of the leader to develop compassion and attention without judgment—a case study of the leader of Buddhist higher education institute. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 9(1), 51-65.

Carmeli, A., Dutton, J. E., & Hardin, A. E. (2015). Respect as an engine for new ideas: Linking respectful engagement, relational information processing and creativity among employees and teams. *Human Relations*, 68(6), 1021-1047.

Carmeli, A., Friedman, Y., & Tishler, A. (2013). Cultivating a resilient top management team: The importance of relational connections and strategic decision comprehensiveness. *Safety Science*, 51(1), 148-159.

Carmeli, A., Levi, A., & Peccei, R. (2021). Resilience and creative problem-solving capacities in project teams: A relational view. *International Journal of*

*Project Management*, 39(5), 546-556.

Chapman, M. T., Lines, R. L. J., Crane, M., Ducker, K. J., Ntoumanis, N., Peeling, P., Parker, S. K., Quested, E., Temby, P., Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C., & Gucciardi, D. F. (2020). Team resilience: A scoping review of conceptual and empirical work. *Work & Stress*, 34(1), 57-81.

Chen, Y., & Zhang, Y. (2021). Fostering resilience in new venture teams: The role of behavioral and affective integration. *Group & Organization Management*, 46(4), 773-816.

Chen, S., Westman, M., & Hobfoll, S. E. (2015). The commerce and crossover of resources: Resource conservation in the service of resilience. *Stress and Health*, 31(2), 95-105.

Chong, S. H., Kim, Y. Jin., Lee, H. W., Johnson, R. E., & Lin, S. H. J. (2020). Mind your own break! The interactive effect of workday respite activities and mindfulness on employee outcomes via affective linkages. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 159, 64-77.

Cronin, M. A., Bezrukova, K., Weingart, L. R., & Tinsley, C. H. (2011). Subgroups within a team: The role of cognitive and affective integration. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(6), 831-849.

Dane, E. (2011). Paying attention to mindfulness and its effects on task performance in the workplace. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 997-1018

DeChurch, L. A., Burke, C. S., Shuffler, M. L., Lyons, R., Doty, D., & Salas, E. (2011). A historiometric analysis of leadership in mission critical multiteam environments. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(1), 152-169.

Decuyper, A., Audenaert, M., & Decramer, A. (2020). Leader mindfulness: Well-being throughout the organization. In S. Dhiman (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of workplace well-being* (pp. 1-28), Springer Nature Switzerland.

DeJong, B. A., & Elfring, T. (2010). How does trust affect the performance of ongoing teams? The mediating role of reflexivity, monitoring, and effort. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 535-549

Dimas, I. D., Rebelo, T., Lourenço, P. R., & Pessoa, C. I. P. (2018). Bouncing back from setbacks: On the mediating role of team resilience in the relationship between transformational leadership and team effectiveness. *The Journal of Psychology*, 152(6), 358-372.

Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383

Feldman, G., Westine, M., Edelman, A., Higgs, M., Renna, M., & Greeson, J. (2022). Cognitive and affective mindfulness scale-revised (CAMS-R). In O. N. Medvedev, C. U. Krägeloh, R. J. Siegert, & N. N. Singh (Eds.), *Handbook of Assessment in Mindfulness Research* (pp. 1-24). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

- Fredrickson, B. L., Cohn, M. A., Coffey, K. A., Pek, J., & Finkel, S. M. (2008). Open hearts build lives: Positive emotions, induced through loving-kindness meditation, build consequential personal resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(5), 1045-1062.
- Frizzell, D. A., Hoon, S., & Banner, D. K. (2016). A phenomenological investigation of leader development and mindfulness meditation. *Journal of Social Change*, 8(1), 14-25.
- Gibson, C., & Vermeulen, F. (2003). A healthy divide: Subgroups as a stimulus for team learning behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48(2), 202-239.
- Good, D. J. (2016). Contemplating mindfulness at work: An integrative review. *Journal of Management*, 67(4),
- Gray, P., Butler, B. S., & Sharma, N. (2015). "The interacting effects of distributed work arrangements and individual dispositions on willingness to engage in sensemaking behaviors" . *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 66(10), 2085-2097.
- Gross, J. J., John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(2), 348-362.
- Gucciardi, D. F., Crane, M., Ntoumanis, N., Parker, S. K., Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C., Ducker, K. J., Peeling, P., Chapman, M. T., Quested, E., & Temby, P. (2018). The emergence of team resilience: A multilevel conceptual model of facilitating factors. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 91(4), 729-768.
- Hartmann, S., Weiss, M., Hoegl, M., & Carmeli, A. (2021). How does an emotional culture of joy cultivate team resilience? A sociocognitive perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(3), 313-331.
- Hartmann, S., Weiss, M., Newman, A., & Hoegl, M. (2020). Resilience in the workplace: A multilevel review and synthesis. *Applied Psychology*, 69(3), 913-959.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, 44(3), 513-524.
- Hobfoll, S. E. (2011). Conservation of resource caravans and engaged settings. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 84(1), 116-122.
- Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J. P., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of resources in the organizational context: The reality of resources and their consequences. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 5(1), 103-128.
- Hougaard, R., & Carter, J. (2018). *The mind of the leader: How to lead yourself, your people, and your organization for extraordinary results*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.

- Hülshager, U. R., Alberts, H., Feinholdt, A., & Lang, J. (2013). Benefits of mindfulness at work: the role of mindfulness in emotion regulation, emotional exhaustion, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(2), 310-325.
- Hyland, P. K., Lee, R. A., & Mills, M. J. (2015). Mindfulness at work: A new approach to improving individual and organizational performance. *Industrial & Organizational Psychology*, 8(4), 576-602.
- Ilgén, D. R., Hollenbeck, J. R., Johnson, M., & Jundt, D. (2005). Teams in organizations: From input-process-output models to IMO models. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 517-543.
- Jackson, K. T. (2021). Review of the mind of a leader: how to lead yourself, your people, and your organization for extraordinary results by R. Hougaard and J. Carter. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 159(3), 927-934.
- Kahn, W. A., Barton, M. A., & Fellows, S. (2013). Organizational crises and the disturbance of relational systems. *Academy of Management Review*, 38(3), 377-396.
- Kahn, W., Barton, M., Fisher, C., Heaphy, E., Reid, E., & Rouse, E. (2018). The geography of strain: Organizational resilience as a function of intergroup relations. *Academy of Management Review*, 43(3), 1-21.
- Kay, A. A., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2020). Cultivating a conflict-positive workplace: How mindfulness facilitates constructive conflict management. *Organization Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 159, 8-20.
- Kennedy, D. M., Landon, L. B., & Maynard, M. T. (2016). Extending the conversation: Employee resilience at the team level. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 466-475.
- King, D. D., Newman, A., & Luthans, F. (2016). Not if, but when we need resilience in the workplace. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(5), 782-786.
- King, E., & Haar, J. M. (2017). Mindfulness and job performance: a study of Australian leaders. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 55(3), 298-319.
- Klein, G., Wiggins, S., & Dominguez, C. O. (2010). Team sensemaking. *Theoretical Issues in Ergonomics Science*, 11(4), 304-320.
- Lawrence, T. B., & Maitlis, S. (2012). Care and possibility: Enacting an ethic of care through narrative practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(4), 641-663.
- Leroy, H., Ansee, F., Dimitrova, N. G., & Sels, L. (2013). Mindfulness, authentic functioning, and work engagement: a growth modeling approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 82(3), 238-247.
- Lippincott, M. (2018). Deconstructing the relationship between mindfulness and leader effectiveness. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 39(5), 650-664.

- Liu, B., Zhao, H., & Lu, Q. (2021). Effect of leader mindfulness on hindrance stress in nurses: The social mindfulness information processing path. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 77(11), 4414-4426.
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(3), 541-572.
- Mahfouz, J. (2018). Mindfulness training for school administrators: Effects on well-being and leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 56(6), 602-619.
- Maitlis, S. & Christianson, M. (2014). Sensemaking in organizations: Taking stock and moving forward. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 8(1), 57-125.
- Marks, M. A., Mathieu, J. E., & Zaccaro, S. A. (2001). Temporally based framework and taxonomy of team processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(3), 356-376.
- Mallak, L. (1998). Putting organizational resilience process to work. *Industrial Management*, 40, 8-14.
- McCray, J., Palmer, A., & Chmiel, N. (2016). Building resilience in health and social care teams. *Personnel Review*, 45, 1132-1155.
- Meneghel, I., Martínez, I. M., & Salanova, M. (2016). Job-related antecedents of team resilience and improved team performance. *Personnel Review*, 45(6), 505-522.
- Morgan, P. B., Fletcher, D., & Sarkar, M. (2013). Defining and characterizing team resilience in elite sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 14(4), 549-559.
- Morgan, P. B., Fletcher, D., & Sarkar, M. (2015). Understanding team resilience in the world's best athletes: A case study of a rugby union world cup winning team. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 16(1), 91-100.
- Murnieks, C. Y., Arthurs, J. D., Cardon, M. S., et al. (2020). Close your eyes or open your mind: Effects of sleep and mindfulness exercises on entrepreneurs' exhaustion. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 35(2), Article 105918.
- Pavez, I., Gómez, H., Laulié, L., & González, V. A. (2021). Project team resilience: The effect of group potency and interpersonal trust. *International Journal of Project Management*, 39(6), 697-708.
- Pinck, A. S., & Sonnentag, S. (2017). Leader mindfulness and employee well-being: The mediating role of transformational leadership. *Mindfulness*, 9(3), 884-896.
- Raetze, S., Duchek, S., Maynard, M. D., & Kirkman, B. L. (2021). Resilience in organizations: An integrative multilevel review and editorial introduction. *Group & Organization Management*, 46(4), 607-656.

- Reb, J., Chaturvedi, S., Narayanan, J., & Kudesia, R. S. (2019). Leader mindfulness and employee performance: A sequential mediation model of LMX quality, interpersonal justice, and employee stress. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 160(4), 745-763.
- Reb, J., Narayanan, J., & Chaturvedi, S. (2014). Leading mindfully: Two studies on the influence of supervisor trait mindfulness on employee well-being and performance. *Mindfulness*, 5(1), 36-45.
- Reitz, M., Waller, L., Chaskalson, M., Olivier, S., & Rupprecht, S. (2020). Developing leaders through mindfulness practice. *Journal of Management Development*, 39(2), 223-239.
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23(2), 224-253.
- Salanova, M., Llorens, S., Cifre, E., & Martinez, I. M. (2012). We need a hero! Toward a validation of the healthy and resilient organization (HERO) model. *Group & Organization Management*, 37(6), 785-822.
- Sawyer, K. B., Thoroughgood, C. N., Stillwell, E. E., Duffy, M. K., Scott, K. L., & Adair, E. A. (2022). Being Present and Thankful: A Multi-Study Investigation of Mindfulness, Gratitude, and Employee Helping Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 107(2), 240-262.
- Schippers, M. C., Homan, A. C. & Van Knippenberg, D. (2013). To reflect or not to reflect: Prior team performance as a boundary condition of the effects of reflexivity on learning and final team performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(1), 6-23.
- Schippers, M. C., West, M. A., & Dawson, J. F. (2015). Team reflexivity and innovation: The moderating role of team context. *Journal of Management*, 41(3), 769-788.
- Schuh, S. C., Zheng, M. X., Xin, K. R., & Fernandez, J. A. (2019). The interpersonal benefits of leader mindfulness: A serial mediation model linking leader mindfulness, leader procedural justice enactment, and employee exhaustion and performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(4), 1007-1025.
- Sinclair, V. G., & Wallston, K. A. (2004). The development and psychometric evaluation of the brief resilient coping scale. *Assessment*, 11(1), 94-101.
- Spielberger, C. D. (Ed.). (2013). *Anxiety: Current trends in theory and research*. New York: Elsevier.
- Stephens, J. P., Heaphy, E. D., Carmeli, A., Spreitzer, G. M., & Dutton, J. E. (2013). Relationship quality and virtuousness: Emotional carrying capacity as a source of individual and team resilience. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 49(1), 13-41.

Stoverink, A. C., Kirkman, B. L., Mistry, S., & Rosen, B. (2020). Bouncing back together: Toward a theoretical model of work team resilience. *Academy of Management Review*, 45(2), 395-422.

Talat, A., & Riaz, Z. (2020). An integrated model of team resilience: exploring the roles of team sensemaking, team bricolage and task interdependence. *Personnel Review*, 49(9), 2007-2033.

Urrila, L. I. (2022). From personal wellbeing to relationships: A systematic review on the impact of mindfulness interventions and practices on leaders. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(3), Article 100837.

Vera, M., Rodríguez-Sánchez, A. M., & Salanova, M. (2017). May the force be with you: Looking for resources that build team resilience? *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 32(2), 119-138.

Wasylkiw, L., Holton, J., Azar, R., & Cook, W. (2016). The impact of mindfulness on leadership effectiveness in a health care setting: a pilot study. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, 29(8), 893-911.

Weber, H., De Assuncao, V. L., Martin, C., Westmeyer, H., & Geisler, F. C. (2014). Reappraisal inventiveness: The ability to create different reappraisals of critical situations. *Cognition & Emotion*, 28(2), 345-360.

Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). "Organizing and the process of sensemaking" . *Organization Science*, 16(4), 409-421.

Welbourne, T. M., & Paterson, T. A. (2017). Advancing a richer view of identity at work: The role-based identity scale. *Personnel Psychology*, 70(2), 315-356.

West, B. J., Patera, J. L., & Carsten, M. K. (2009). Team level positivity: Investigating positive psychological capacities and team level outcomes. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(2), 249-267.

West, T. N., Le Nguyen, K. D., Zhou, J., Prinzing, M., Wells, J., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2021). How the affective quality of day-to-day social connections may contribute to public health: Prosocial tendencies account for the links between positivity resonance and behaviors that reduce the spread of COVID-19. *Affective Science*, 2, 241-

Wihler, A., Hülshager, U. R., Reb, J., & Menges, J. I. (2022). It' s so boring-or is it? Examining the role of mindfulness for work performance and attitudes in monotonous jobs. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 95(1), 131-154.

Zhang, Z. X., Dong, Y., & Yi, X. (2020). Building resilience via cognitive preparedness, behavioral reconfigurations, and iterative learning: The case of YunKang. *Management and Organization Review*, 16(5), 981-985.

*Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.*

*Source: ChinaXiv –Machine translation. Verify with original.*