



# Current Research in Psychology and Behavioral Science (CRPBS)

Volume 3, Issue 4, 2022

## Article Information

Received date : 19 May, 2022

Published date: 30 May, 2022

## \*Corresponding author

Alvaro Acuña-Hormazabal, University of  
Bio-Bio, Chile

## Key Words

Hero; Mental health; Business; Hope;  
Efficiency; Resilience; Optimism

**Distributed under:** Creative Commons  
CC-BY 4.0

## A Hero to Survive?

Alvaro Acuña-Hormazabal\*

University of Bio-Bio, Chile

### Opinion

One of the first scientific publications on the importance of managing people in organizations corresponds to James Clark and it was published in 1962 [1]. In it, he details the serious consequences that organizations can have if they do not proactively take charge of the mental health of their employees, regarding the stress that accompanies the globalization process. A few years later, Potthoff [2] managed to expose the high costs that it meant for a company to deal reactively with the mental health problems that workers were experiencing. Sometime later, Cooper & Cartwright [2] state, based on their research, that the impact of the deterioration of workers' mental health on the organization's finances is very high, not only because of the high cost of taking care of it, exposed earlier by Potthoff [2], but also because of what it means -in performance and productivity- that a worker is absent or leaves the company, thus promoting that a good physical, psychological and mental health of the workers will contribute first to their well-being and second to the good financial health of the organization and the profitability of the business. With so much empirical justification, built over the years and exposed in many more publications than those mentioned here, published in the best magazines, and presented at major conferences, organizations and their workers should have understood this phenomenon. Therefore, the strategic planning of organizations should consider the mental health of their collaborators, both in values and principles, as well as in strategies and policies, to be prepared to better face life events and a globalized society.

Is this so? We certainly cannot generalize, but we have seen, with the arrival of COVID-19, how many organizations have not managed to survive the negative impacts that an event of this nature brings with it. But we have also seen how other organizations have managed to resist and remain in time, which, in most of the studied cases, has happened mainly because it has been the collaborators, the people, the only living resource of the company, who with resilience and optimism have developed their humanity and have been innovative in creating new processes that allow their organizations to adapt to new demands. From positive psychology, proposed by Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi [4], it has come over time, justifying the relevance of proactively developing people's strengths and not taking charge of them when they have already fallen: "we must not wait for the disease to arrive to attack it, but rather generate a defense system that finds people strengthened when they have to face adverse events, typical of life". With this, a new question arises: Are the workers the ones who must be strengthened autonomously or is the organization the one that must provide them with tools and accompany them in their development?

There are two possible scientific answers that have been developed in this context. The first is related to the strengthening of the psychological capital of workers, proposed by Luthans et al. [5] and reaffirmed by Donaldson et al. [6] who point out that hopeful, effective, resilient, and optimistic people are more prepared to face adverse events in their lives and their organizations than those who do not have these components of psychological capital. The second one promotes the development of resilient and healthy organizations [7], which through the implementation of practices and resources will generate healthy and resilient employees who, individually and as a team, will be able to face the various challenges that the global environment brings, which would imply healthy results for the organization. Which one is better? Which one should be applied in these times? Which one should be applied? I think that by chance of the acronym that is formed from the words that make up the name of each proposal, we find the answer:

- i. HERO, for Hope, Efficiency, Resilience and Optimism.
- ii. HERO, for Healthy and Resilient Organizations. It is not one or the other, but both.

Organizations are responsible for the mental health of their workers and workers are also responsible for themselves. Each organization must develop, in a planned and systematic way, practices and resources that promote the well-being, health and development of the psychological capital of its workers. a) With this we will be strengthening the workers and b) Will this just make people better workers?

If organizations manage to understand the relevance of generating a good work environment, with practices and resources aimed at strengthening the mental health of workers, but above all promoting the development of their psychological capital, without a doubt this will impact in a positive way on the worker, but also on the person, on the human, who day after day develops in different social systems with different roles: the father, the mother, the son, the friend, the student, among many others. In addition to the above, the implementation of these two HERO models involves the development of positive emotions in each worker, over negative ones, which according to psychoneuroimmunology [8] will promote the strengthening of their immune systems, making them stronger and healthier. As if all this were not enough, those positive emotions generated at work are contagious. This is how Hatfield et al. [9] who developed an investigation where he explains the role of "mirror neurons" in emotional contagion. In this manner the worker will become a social mobilizer of good emotions, spreading his happiness in the different areas of his life. Now, is it possible for all organizations to develop healthy resources and practices? Yes, at different levels and with different times, but yes. And that all workers can develop their psychological capital? In neuroscience we find an answer, which is the one related to the brain's ability to change and modify itself, according to the incentives it receives. This process has been called neuroplasticity [10], that is, we can be hopeful, effective, resilient, and optimistic if we set our minds to it. Now, as in organizations, each person has their basic conditions, their levels and their times, perhaps many should be accompanied by therapists and others simply will not make it, which is not bad if you are aware of other strengths that can be developed, organizations like society need and value diversity to progress. So, we don't need a HERO to survive, we need two HEROES to live.

### References

1. Clark JV (1962) A Healthy Organization. California Management Review 4(4): 16-30.



2. Potthoff E (1973) Precedence for healthy business financing. *Betrieb* 26(1).
3. Cooper CL, Cartwright S (1994) Healthy mind; healthy organization: A proactive approach to occupational stress. *Human Relations* 47(4): 455-471.
4. Seligman MEP, Csikszentmihalyi M (2014) Positive psychology: An introduction. *Flow and the Foundations of Positive Psychology*, pp. 279-298.
5. Luthans F, Luthans K, Luthans B (2004) Positive psychological capital: Beyond the human and social. *Business Horizons* 47(1): 45-50.
6. Donaldson S, Chan LB, Villalobos J, Chen CL (2020) The generalizability of HERO across 15 nations: Positive psychological capital (psycap) beyond the US and other WEIRD countries. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 17(24): 9432.
7. Salanova M, Llorens S, Cifre E, Martínez IM (2012) We need a hero! Toward a validation of the Healthy and Resilient Organization (HERO) model. *Group & Organization Management* 37(6): 785-822.
8. Ader R (2000) On the development of psychoneuroimmunology. *European Journal of Pharmacology* 405(1-3): 167-176.
9. Hatfield E, Cacioppo JT, Rapson RL (1993) Emotional contagion. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 2(3): 96-100.
10. Cramer SC, Sur M, Dobkin BH, O'Brien C, Sanger TD, et al. (2011) Harnessing neuroplasticity for clinical applications. *Brain* 134(6): 1591-1609.