

IMPACT OF RESILIENCE CAPACITY ON WORK LIFE BALANCE AND JOB PERFORMANCE OF EXECUTIVES IN THE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

Dr.Patiraj Kumari*

Vijayashree Sangwan**

Abstract

The Indian pharmaceutical sector is marked by fierce competition, innovations, research and development, increasing employment and assurance of improved quality in the health sector; severe regulatory framework etc. The executives play a critical role in the performance and the growth of the industry. In doing so, they need to perform their best on the job and are also supposed to strike a fine or satisfactory balance between the time and efforts they devote both in their work and personal life. Given the demands, pressures, stress, workload etc. caused by competition, requirement of best performance and a strong sense of social responsibility, it becomes very challenging to give one's best performance both at work and in personal life. As such, the positive construct known as resilience greatly impacts the psychology and behaviour of executives.

Objectives of the Study: To find out constituents of resilience capacity and relationship of resilience capacity with work life balance and job performance,

Research Methodology: The study has been carried out on a sample of 300 executives from pharmaceutical industry through multi-stage sampling method.

Results/Findings: The results showed a positive correlation between resilience capacity and work life balance and resilience capacity and job performance.

Suggestion: Resilience capacity can be studied in relation to job involvement, job satisfaction, organisational culture and climate etc.

* Professor, Department of Management Studies, Kanya Gurukul Campus, IInd Campus, Gurukul Kangri University, Haridwar.

** Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, Kanya Gurukul Campus, IInd Campus, Gurukul Kangri University, Haridwar.

Limitations of the study: Research Area, Sample size, and research design (descriptive-single cross sectional).

Originality/value of the paper: The paper has been written on observation of a research gap and unavailability of researches on resilience capacity in relation to work life balance and job performance in the pharmaceutical industry in Indian context. This research would be useful for researchers, managers and employees of any organization.

Key Word: Resilience Capacity, Work Life Balance, Job Performance, Pharmaceutical Industry.

INTRODUCTION:

The Indian Pharmaceutical industry is a huge source of employment to millions of people, great business opportunities for corporations and investors, and a huge promoter of research and development initiatives and has its importance in making quality medicines available to all at affordable prices. The industry has been valued \$12 billion (Business standard report, 2014). The Pharmaceutical Industry is marked by fierce competition, innovations, research and development, increasing employment and assurance of improved quality in the health sector; severe regulatory framework etc. The value attached to the pharmaceutical industry can be seen through the role it plays in providing medicinal solutions to the health related problems of individuals in the society. The industry can be described as a complex of processes, operations, and organisations involved in the discovery, development and manufacture of drugs and medications (Shah, 2004). Competition, high regulatory framework, Research & Development, innovations, technological changes, mergers and acquisitions to expand production and marketing of the medicinal products, outsourcing of manufacturing and R & D are various noticeable aspects existing in Pharmaceutical industry. Mergers and acquisitions among pharma companies have become a common strategy to enhance the efforts related to intellectual capital (Narayan, 2009). The internal and external environment of the organization poses huge challenges before managers such as workload and time pressures arising out of changes in regulatory, technological, economic and social environment. Also, workplace stressors, competition, requirement of performance and completion of a variety of tasks both in professional and personal life, emotional issues etc. make managerial positions very demanding. Expectations of high performance in the presence of such challenges may lead to increase in

stress level. Stress impairs performance and exemplifies itself in burnout, work life conflict, lowered morale, reduced customer service and higher medical and disability costs (Richman and Noble, 2004). Further, various occurrences like downsizing, changes in leadership style, anxiety born out of a feeling of insecurity at job due to mergers and acquisitions and economic cycle can also have their impact on employees and in turn on the organisation itself. Change and adversity are frequent in today's organisations and these adversities may come into existence as a result of downsizing, market changes, technology shifts, and conflict in the organisation or simply as a result of leadership change (Nadine, 2004). Taking into account the nature of pharmaceutical industry and the challenging business environment as a cause of high work demands, pressure, stress, anxiety, and strain for the executives working in the industry, the present study has been conducted with an aim to know about the impact of resilience capacity on work life balance and job performance of executives working in the pharmaceutical industry in India.

LITERATURE REVIEW: Resilience Capacity: Capacity for resilience envelops a range of factors at the individual level, family level and at the level of society, and strengthens an individual to face not only day to day hassles, stresses and difficulties but also works as a cushion against adversities, strain and trauma. Resilience has been defined by researchers as a capacity, a trait and even a process because resilience can develop over a period of time. According to Fraser, Richman, and Galinsky (1999) "The term 'resilience' is reserved for *unpredicted or* markedly successful adaptations to *negative life events*, trauma, stress and other forms of risk." Tugade and Fredrickson (2004) mention that in the face of loss, hardship or adversity, ability to effective coping and adaptation is psychological resilience. Furthermore, Robertson Cooper Ltd (2014) defines "Personal resilience is the capacity to maintain well-being and work performance under *pressure*, including being able to bounce-back from *setbacks* effectively. Our natural resilience is a combination of personal characteristics and learned skills - but most importantly the quality can always be developed whatever an individual's starting point; and in times of change and growth it's becoming increasingly important for individual and business performance"

Conceptual model of resilience includes two kinds of factors-**risk factors** (factors that increase vulnerability and victimise) and **protective factors**, which are present in any context wherein level of resilience of an individual is to be studied.

Fig.1: Protective Factors and Risk Factors for Executives

Protective Factors that provide support against risk factors and ensure success in a context	Individual characteristics-competence,autonomy,problem solving skills, experience, technical,behavioural skills ,self efficacy ,hope , optimism etc.
	Family and extended family Support: high expactations, encouragement, moral, emotinal and financial support etc.
	Social support: friends and community
	Organisational support: healthy work culture,work life balance policies,supportive management & colleagues, training and development, career growth opportunities,compensation and benefits
	Institutional support:legislations
Risk Factors (that causes maladjustment, anger etc. in a context)	Acute and chronic stress, strain,anxiety,fear of loss, time pressure, work load and pressure,conflict etc.
	Feelings of job insecurity, role ambiguity due to nature of work,technology, downsizing , restructuring etc.

Work life balance is about attaining a level of satisfaction out of contribution through various roles required to be played in work and personal life. This level of satisfaction differs from individual to individual depending upon situations and work specific to their lives. According to Evans, Carney and Wilkinson (2013) “Work life balance can be a process of findings personal meaning and satisfaction across multiple roles and aspects of one’s life”, and “a process of attempting to balance the demands and expectations of one’s career, personal life, interpersonal relationships, partnerships and family.” According to Chawla and Sondhi (2011) “Effective management and synchronization between remunerative work and the other roles and responsibilities that are important to people as ‘individualised’ human being and as a part of society, can be called work- life balance”.

Job Performance: Every employee of an organization is expected to perform efficiently on the job he is selected for in order to achieve the objectives as per pre-set standards by the organization. Campbell et al. (1993) have defined job performance as “Performance is what an

organization hires one to do and do it well,” And ‘performance consists of goal relevant actions under the control of an individual, regardless of whether they are cognitive, motor, psychomotor or interpersonal’. Furthermore, According to Campbell, Gasser and Oswald (1996) ‘performance is not the consequence or result of an action, it is the action itself’. Performance has been described as a function of knowledge, skills, ability and motivation. Research conducted on job performance predominantly includes three important domains related to performance: *Task performance, Organisational citizenship behaviour, and counterproductive work behaviour* (Dalal, Baysinger, Brummel and LeBreton, 2012).

Hypotheses:

H₀ : There is no impact of higher level resilience capacity on better management of work-life balance.

H₁: Executives possessing higher resilience capacity can manage work life balance better than low resilient individuals.

H₀: There is no impact of higher level resilience capacity on better job performance.

H₂: Executives possessing higher resilience capacity can perform better at job than low resilient individuals.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY: Participants in the study comprised of executives working with pharmaceutical industry. Multistage sampling method was used for the study. At first stage, 127 pharmaceutical companies from the list available from the Department of pharmaceuticals were selected (75 companies from Himachal Pradesh and 52 Companies from Uttarakhand were selected). At second stage, 300 executives from various departments of these selected companies were selected.

Procedure: Data for this study was collected through three questionnaires. The questionnaires were administered personally, by mail, and through chemists. To ascertain the genuine responses by the respondent the objectives of the study along with questionnaires were told either personally or by attaching covering note with the questionnaires. Respondents were requested to fill the questionnaires and not to leave any item unanswered. The response sheets were scored and the raw data was analysed through SPSS software. Research ethics were complied with

through making all the respondents aware of the research intentions and design. Research findings have been treated with confidentiality. The reliability of the questionnaires was assessed through Cronbach's Alpha. The Cronbach's Alpha value for resilience capacity questionnaire, work life balance and job performance questionnaires are .94, .66 and .72 respectively which is more than the acceptable value of .6(Nunally, 1978).The validity of the questionnaires has been determined by using translation validity (face and content validity through expert review and pilot study) and empirical validity(construct validity through exploratory factor analysis).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistics and Coefficients of Correlations

Table-1: Mean and SD of Dimensions of Resilience Capacity

Variables	Mean	SD	Range	Index
Autonomy	104.4867	12.17417	26-130	80.3743
Sense of Purpose	57.2833	7.40715	14-70	81.8332
Social Competence	40.3433	4.89681	10-50	80.6866
Problem Solving Skills	47.7100	6.30808	12-60	79.5166
Environmental Protective Factors	43.9000	6.07616	11-55	79.8181

Table 1 shows that Autonomy has highest mean score, followed by sense of purpose, problem solving skills, environmental protective factors whereas social competence has the lowest mean score. Range of scores according to number of items in each dimensions is shown, mean scores when divided by corresponding higher end of the range and the resultant figure multiplied by 100 provided index value for each dimension which can be seen in Index column of the table 1. According to Index value sense of Purpose has been ranked first by the respondents, followed in rank by social competence, autonomy, environmental protective factors, and problem solving skills.

Table 2: Mean and SD of Dimensions of Work Life Balance

Variables	Mean	SD	Range	Index
Satisfaction with Time With Self	13.6467	2.94120	5-20	68.2335
Satisfaction with time With Family	14.2233	2.51819	5-20	71.1165
Satisfaction with time spent in Social Activities	10.7200	2.22217	4-16	67.0000
Satisfaction with time spent on Work	8.6200	2.12854	3-12	71.8333
Satisfaction with Self Performance	18.6133	2.44891	7-28	66.4760
Satisfaction with Work Issues	16.9667	2.26037	6-24	70.6945

Table-2 presents the mean scores, standard deviation, range of scores of dimensions and Index scores on the six dimensions of work life balance. The mean column contains mean score of the dimensions: satisfaction with self -performance has highest mean score, followed by satisfaction with work issues, satisfaction with time spent with family, satisfaction with time spent with self, satisfaction with time spent in social activities, satisfaction with time spent on work. According to Index value given in the table satisfaction with time spent on work can be ranked first followed in rank by satisfaction with time with family, satisfaction with work issues, satisfaction with time with self, satisfaction with time spent in social activities, and satisfaction with self – performance.

Table -3: Mean and SD of Dimensions of Job Performance (Self-Audit)

Variables	Mean	SD	Range	Index
Work Responsibility	18.8833	3.23387	5-25	75.5332
Self-Efficacy at Job	26.9033	3.86312	7-35	76.8665
Presentation and Behavioural Skills	21.2433	3.39941	6-30	70.8110
Punctuality and Organizational Skills	11.7867	1.92010	3-15	78.5780

Table- 3 presents the mean scores, standard deviation, range of scores of dimensions and Index scores on the four dimensions of job performance (self- audit). Self-efficacy has the highest mean score followed by presentation and behavioural skills, work responsibility, and punctuality and organizational skills. According to Index value Punctuality and Organizational Skills has been ranked first followed in rank by self-efficacy at Job, work responsibility, and presentation and behavioural skills.

Table 4: Coefficient of Correlations between Resilience Capacity and Work Life Balance

	Autonomy	Sense of Purpose	Social Competence	Problem Solving Skills	Environmental Protective Factors
Time with Self	.176**	.176**	.236**	.253**	.370**
Time with Family	.377**	.354**	.345**	.359**	.439**
Time on Social Activities	.134*	.092	.139*	.159**	.171**
Time on Work	.427**	.457**	.385**	.447**	
Satisfaction with Self Performance	.306**	.347**	.335**	.339**	.382**
Satisfaction with Work Issues	.208**	.349**	.261**	.263**	.258**
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).					

Table 4 present correlation of coefficient of each dimension of resilience capacity with all the dimensions of work life balance. All dimensions of resilience capacity (autonomy, sense of purpose, social competence , problem solving skills, environmental protective factors) have positive relationship with all the dimensions of work life balance (satisfaction with time spent with self, satisfaction with time spent family, satisfaction with time spent in social activities,

satisfaction with time spent on work, satisfaction with work issues and satisfaction with self-performance) at significance level ($P < 0.01$) and ($P < 0.05$). However, correlation between the dimension sense of purpose and satisfaction with time spent in social activities is not significant ($P > 0.05$).

Table 5: Coefficient of Correlations between Resilience Capacity and Job Performance

	Autonomy	Sense of Purpose	Social Competence	Problem Solving Skills	Environmental Protective Factors
Work Responsibility	.344**	.430**	.286**	.314**	.323**
Self-Efficacy	.515**	.582**	.495**	.508**	.579**
Presentation and Behavioural Skills	.301**	.463**	.368**	.370**	.369**
Punctuality and Organisational Skills	.185**	.159**	.183**	.158**	.121*
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).					

Table 5 present coefficient of correlation of each dimension of resilience capacity with all the dimensions of job performance. All dimensions of resilience capacity (autonomy, sense of purpose, social competence, problem solving skills, environmental protective factors) have positive relationship with all the dimensions of job performance (work responsibility, self-efficacy at job, presentation and behavioural skills, punctuality and organizational skills) either at significance level ($P < 0.01$) or ($P < 0.05$).

Table 6: Regression Analysis for the Impact of Resilience Capacity on Work Life Balance

	B	Std. Error	
1 (Constant)	50.159	4.047	.000
Autonomy	-.079	.077	.305

SenseofPurpose	.116	.118	.326
SocialCompetence	.329	.139	.019
ProblemSolvingSkills	.149	.146	.306
Environmental Protective Factors	.583	.120	.000

$R^2 = .345$; Adjusted $R^2 = .334$; $F = 31.016$ * $P < .01$

Table 7: Regression Analysis for the Impact of Resilience Capacity on Job Performance

		B	Std. Error	
1	(Constant)	32.564	3.835	.000
	Autonomy	-.109	.073	.133
	Sense of Purpose	.663	.112	.000
	Social Competence	.342	.132	.010
	Problem Solving Skills	-.086	.138	.536
	Environmental Protective Factors	.228	.114	.046

$R^2 = .391$; Adjusted $R^2 = .380$; $F = 37.681$ * $P < .01$

Regression Analysis

Table 6 presents results of multiple regression analysis of resilience capacity on work life balance. The result indicates that work life balance increases when sense of purpose, social competence, problem solving skills and environmental protective factors increase whereas work life balance and autonomy have an inverse relationship. Each of the B value also has standard error corresponding to it as shown in the table which indicates the extent to which these values would vary across different samples. Environmental protective factors, social competence and problem solving skills have .380, .173, and .101 beta values respectively, these values indicate that environmental protective factors, social competence and problem solving skills are more important predictors than sense of purpose and autonomy of work life balance. The alternative hypothesis which is ‘Executives possessing higher Resilience capacity can manage work life balance better than low resilient individuals’ is accepted as F Value is 31.016 which is

significant at ($P < 0.01$). All dimensions of resilience capacity were found to have positive relationship with all the dimensions of work life balance either at significance level ($P < 0.01$) or ($P < 0.05$). However, correlation between the dimension sense of purpose and satisfaction with time spent in social activities is not significant ($P > 0.05$). The positive correlation of resilience capacity with work life balance is supported by the prior research findings of several researchers such as Behson (2005) and Adkins et al. (2007), Kossek et al.(2011),Bhargava et al (2010),Guest (2002) Clark (2000),Estes and Michael, 2005), Casper and Harris (2008), Van Daalen et al. (2006), and (Werner and Smith,1992).

In Table 7 the B values reveal the relationship between job performance and each predictor. Positive values indicate positive relationship between the predictor (IV) and the outcome (DV).Negative values indicate negative relationship between the variables. In this model sense of purpose, social competence, and environmental protective factors have positive values whereas autonomy and problem solving skills have negative values. This indicates that job performance increases when sense of purpose, social competence, and environmental protective factors increase whereas job performance has an inverse relationship with autonomy and problem solving skills. Each of the B value also has standard error corresponding to it as shown in the table which indicates the extent to which these values would vary across different samples. The Beta values in standardized coefficient column shows the importance of the predictor in the model. Sense of purpose, social competence, and environmental protective factors have .537, .183, and .151 beta values respectively, these values indicate that environmental protective factors, social competence and sense of purpose are more important predictors of job performance than problem solving skills and autonomy. on the basis of 37.681 ($P < 0.01$) the second alternative hypothesis which is 'Executives possessing higher Resilience capacity can perform better at job than low resilient individuals' is accepted .

The positive correlation between resilience capacity and job performance indicated that all dimensions of resilience capacity have positive relationship with all the dimensions of job performance at significance level ($P < 0.01$) and ($P < 0.05$). These findings are consistent with the prior researches conducted by various researchers: a favorable impact of Psychological capital on employee job performance (Shukla and Singh 2013); resilience decreases negative impact of perceived job insecurity on organizational commitment and job satisfaction, both these attitudinal outcomes are related to job performance (Rus and Baban 2013); resilience is related to

performance in the work place (Youssef and Luthans 2007); more resilient employees are more likely to face dynamic environment (Avey et al.2007); group cohesion increases moral and well-being (Griffith 1989); achievement orientation is predictive of performance according to Lowery et al.(2004); Chughtai (2008) indicate positive benefits of job involvement by supervisor and coworker support. In addition to this, Olayiwola (2011) find a significant correlation between self-efficacy and job performance; Kossek et al. (2001) report that climate of sharing in the home and at work has positive impact on performance and well- being; and Clark (2000) find that supportive supervision increases organizational citizenship behaviour

FINDINGS:

Autonomy (Resilience Capacity) was found positively correlated with satisfaction with time with self, satisfaction with time with family, satisfaction with time spent in social activities, satisfaction with time spent on work, satisfaction with self- performance and satisfaction with work issues. Sense of purpose (Resilience Capacity) was found positively correlated with satisfaction with time with self, satisfaction with time with family, satisfaction with time spent in social activities, satisfaction with time spent on work, satisfaction with self -performance and satisfaction with work issues.Social competence (Resilience Capacity) was found positively correlated with satisfaction with time with self, satisfaction with time with family, satisfaction with time spent in social activities, satisfaction with time spent on work, satisfaction with self-performance and satisfaction with work issues.Problem solving skills (Resilience Capacity) was found positively correlated with satisfaction with time with self, satisfaction with time with family, satisfaction with time spent in social activities, satisfaction with time spent on work, satisfaction with self- performance and satisfaction with work issues.Environmental protective factors (Resilience capacity) were found positively correlated with satisfaction with time with self, satisfaction with time with family, satisfaction with time spent in social activities, satisfaction with time spent on work, satisfaction with self- performance and satisfaction with work issues.

Autonomy (Resilience Capacity) was found positively correlated with work responsibility, self - efficacy at job, presentation and behavioural skills, punctuality and organizational skills.Sense of purpose (Resilience Capacity) was found positively correlated with work responsibility, self- efficacy at job, presentation and behavioural skills, punctuality and organizational skills.Social competence (Resilience Capacity) was found positively correlated with work responsibility, self-

efficacy at job, presentation and behavioural skills, punctuality and organizational skills. Problem solving skills (Resilience Capacity) was found positively correlated with work responsibility, self-efficacy at job, presentation and behavioural skills, punctuality and organizational skills. Environmental protective factors (Resilience capacity) were found positively correlated with work responsibility, self-efficacy at job, presentation and behavioural skills, punctuality and organizational skills.

According to regression analysis resilience capacity was found to be a significant predictor of work-life balance and job performance.

CONCLUSION : The study presents the constituents of resilience capacity and their relevance in maintenance of work life balance and job performance in Pharmaceutical Industry. Pharmaceutical Industry has such characteristics as fierce competition, necessity to manufacture high quality products, necessity to conduct activities such as research and development, extension of markets, need to follow intellectual property right or patent agreements, high international / national regulatory framework and standards, needs to adapt to changing economic, demographic and technological environment, high accountability due to association with health aspect of the society, etc. Consequently, the industry poses work demands due to high work load which in turn cause stress, pressure, and strain. Resilience capacity or the protective factors enable executives to maintain work life balance and job performance. The results of the study indicate that resilience capacity has a positive association with work life balance and job performance. Further, resilience capacity is a significant predictor of both work life balance and job performance.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY: A very little work has been done on resilience capacity or protective factors in association with work life balance and job performance in the context of risk factors caused by internal and external environment in Pharmaceutical companies, particularly in India. Researchers should conduct studies on impact of resilience factors on creativity and innovation, organizational culture, job satisfaction, job involvement, organizational commitment, employee satisfaction and organizational performance etc.

The study has some limitations as this includes executives from pharmaceutical companies located in two states only, which are part of northern India. Only one region has been covered in

the study. For the sample to be truly representative of the entire pharmaceutical industry, more companies and a larger sample size need to be covered from other states also. Future researches can be conducted in pharmaceutical companies located in other parts of India with a larger sample size. Due to constraints such as time, fund and geographical distances between company locations, period of data collection ranges from February, 2011 to December, 2012 and Pharmaceutical companies located in five districts of two states of northern India- Uttarakhand (Dehradun, Haridwar), Himachal Pradesh (Solan, Una, Kangra) has been covered. Resilience capacity is related to psychological aspects of an individual along with external factors. Therefore, in future researches, other techniques of data collection such as focus group and in depth interviews can be applied in order to have a deeper understanding of the employees' views and opinions. The present study is single cross sectional descriptive and correlational study conducted through sample survey, which can only depict and predict relationships among the variables. Resilience capacity may develop over a time and therefore a longitudinal or multi-cross sectional studies may be conducted on the executives.

REFERENCES

- 1) Baral, S., Bhargava, S. (2010). Work-Family Enrichment As A Mediator Between Organizational Interventions For Work-Life Balance And Job Outcomes. Shailesh J. Mehta School of Management, Indian Institute of Technology, Mumbai, India Journal of Managerial Psychology Vol. 25, Iss. 3, pp. 274-300 q Emerald Group Publishing Limited 0268-3946 DOI 10.1108/02683941011023749
- 2) Behson, S.J. (2005). The Relative Contribution Of Formal And Informal Organizational Work-Family Support. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, Vol. 66, Iss. 3, pp. 487-500.
- 3) Block, J. (2002). Personality as an Affect-Processing System: Toward an Integrative Theory Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum. Retrieved December 30, 2013 <http://www.questia.com>
- 4) Campbell, J. P., Gasser, M. B., Oswald, F. L. (1996). The Substantive Nature of Job. Retrieved December 05, 2012 <http://www.questia.com>
- 5) Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., Sager, C. E. (1993). A Theory Of Performance. In Schmitt, N., Borman W. C. (Eds.), Personnel Selection In Organizations. pp. 35-70. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- 6) Casper, W. J., Harris, C. M. (2008). Work-life benefits and organizational attachment: Self-interest utility and signalling theory models. Journal of Vocational Behaviour. Vol. 72. pp. 95-109.
- 7) Chawla, D., Sondhi, N. (2011). Assessing Work-Life Balance among Indian Women Professionals. Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol. 47, Iss. 2, pp. 341-352. Retrieved March 22, 2010 from <http://www.questia.com>
- 8) Chughtai, A. A. (2008). Impact of Job Involvement on In-Role Job Performance and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, Vol.9. Iss. 2, pp. 169-183. Retrieved January 07, 2013 from <http://www.questia.com>
- 9) Clark, S.C. (2000) "Work-Family Border Theory: A New Theory of Work-Life Balance", Human Relations. Vol. 53, Iss. 6, pp. 747-70.
- 10) Clark, S.C. (2000) "Work-Family Border Theory: A New Theory of Work-Life Balance", Human Relations. Vol. 53, Iss. 6, pp. 747-70.
- 11) Cloyd, T. (2013). Building Emotional Resilience: Finding And Calming Negative Self-Beliefs To Decrease Personal Distress And Become Stronger, Retrieved December 29, 2013 http://www.tomcloyd.com/lib_iudb06072-emotional-resilience.html

- 12) Dalal, R. S., Baysinger, M., Brummel, B. J., LeBreton, J. M. (2012). The Relative Importance Of Employee Engagement, Other Job Attitudes, And Trait Affect As Predictors Of Overall Employee Job Performance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol.42, Iss. S1, E295–E325
- 13) Estes, S. B., Michael, J. (2005). Work-family policies and gender inequality at work: A Sloan Work and Family Encyclopedia entry. Retrieved March 16, 2013 from http://wfnetwork.bc.edu/encyclopedia_entry.php?id=1230&area=All.
- 14) Evans, A. M., Carney, J. S., Wilkinson, M. (2013). Work-Life Balance for Men: Counseling Implications. *Journal of Counseling and Development* : JCD, Vol. 91, Iss. 4, pp. 436-441. Retrieved January 11, 2014 from <http://www.questia.com>
- 15) Fraser, M.W., Richman, J. M., Galinsky, M. J. (1999). Risk, Protection, And Resilience: Towards A Conceptual Framework For Social Work Practice. *Social Work Research*, Vol. 23, pp.131–144 Retrieved November 29, 2013 <http://www.questia.com>
- 16) Gilbert, M., Acton, R. (2006). Building a Foundation: Selecting and retaining resilient employees. Network, Spring. Retrieved January 25, 2012 from <http://ulistic.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Robert-G-Acton-CV-June-2012.pdf>
- 17) Griffith, J. (1989). The Army's new unit replacement system and its relationship to group cohesion and social support. *Military Psychology*, Vol. 1. Iss. 1, pp. 17–34.
- 18) Guest, D.E. (2002). "Perspective On The Study Of Work-Life Balance" *Social Science Information*, Vol. 41, pp. 255 DOI:10.1177/0539018402041002005. Retrieved on May 22, 2009
- 19) Kossek, E., Colquitt, J., Noe, R. (2001). "Caregiving Decisions, Well-Being, and Performance : The Effects of Place and Provider as a Function of Dependent Type and Work-Family Climates", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 44, Iss. 1, pp. 29-44.
- 20) Kossek, E.E., Pichler, S., Bonder, T., Hammer, L.B.(2011). Workplace Social Support And Work-Family Conflict: A Meta-Analysis, Clarifying The Influence Of General And Work-Family-Specific Supervisor Ad Organizational Support. *Personal Psychology*. Wiley Periodicals, Inc. pp. 289-313
- 21) Liana(2014). Work-Life Balance. Retrieved December 30, 2014 <http://www.communitybusiness.org/WLB/2014/faq14.htm>
- 22) Lowery, C. M., Beadles, N. A., II, Krilowicz, T. J. (2004). Using Personality and Cognitive Ability to Predict Job Performance: An Empirical Study. *International Journal of Management* Vol. 21, Iss. 3, pp. 300-306. Retrieved January 05, 2013 from <http://www.questia.com>
- 23) Nadine (2004). Building Personal and Organizational Resilience. Ryan-Bannerman Associates. Retrieved January, 13 2012 www.ryanbannerman.com
- 24) Narayan, D., Budhwar, P.S., Varma, A., Katou, A. A. (2009). The Role of HR in Cross-Broder Mergers and Acquisitions: The Case of Indian Pharmaceutical Firms, *Multinational Business Review*, Vol. 17, pp. 86-110.
- 25) Nayak, N. (2011). Competition Impediments In The Pharmaceutical Sector In India. Retrieved from <http://www.iica.in/images/Pharmaceuticals%20Sector.pdf>
- 26) Nunnally J.C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. 2nd edn. New York: McGraw-Hill
- 27) Olayiwola, I.O. (2011). Self-efficacy as predictor of job performance of public secondary school teachers in Osun State. *African Journals Online*. Vol. 19. Iss. 1. Retrieved from <http://www.ajol.info/index.php/ifep/article/view/64612>
- 28) Premeaux, S. F., Adkins, C. L., Mossholder, K. W. (2007). Balancing work and family: A field study of multi-dimensional, multi-role work-family conflict. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 28, pp. 705-727.
- 29) Richman, Noble (2004). When the going gets tough, does your workforce have the resilience to keep going?, summer 2004 Vol. 11, Retrieved November 15, 2013 http://www.wfd.com/documents/wfd_sum04_3.pdf
- 30) Robertson Cooper Ltd (2014). Resilience Training. Retrieved December 30, 2014 <http://www.robertsoncooper.com/how-we-do-it/our-solutions/resilience-training-overview/resilience-training>

- 31) Rus, C. L., Baban, A. (2013). Correlates of Positive Psychological Capital: A Synthesis of the Empirical Research Published between January 2000 and January 2010, *Cognitie, Creier, Comportament*, Vol. 17, Iss. 2. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com/library/journal/1P3-3016683821/correlates-of-positive-psychological-capital-a-synthesis>
- 32) Shah, N. (2004). Pharmaceutical supply chains: key issues and strategies for optimization, *Computers and Chemical Engineering* Vol. 28, pp. 929–941, Retrieved November 17, 2013 from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.123.3378&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- 33) Shukla, A., Singh, S. (2013). Psychological Capital & Citizenship Behavior: Evidence from Telecom Sector in India *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol. 49, Iss. 1. Retrieved from <http://www.questia.com>
- 34) Staal, M., et al.(2008). “Cognitive Performance and Resilience to stress”, *Bio behavioural resiliences to stress*, B.J. Lukey and V.Tepe, CRC press: Boca Raton, FL
- 35) Tugade, M. M., Fredrickson, B. L. (2004). Resilient individuals use positive emotions to bounce back form negative emotional experiences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 86, pp.320-333.
- 36) Van Daalen, G., Willemsen, T. M., Sanders, K. (2006). Reducing work-family conflict through different sources of social support. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, Vol. 69, pp. 462–476.
- 37) Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., Walberg, H. J. (1994). Educational resilience in inner cities. In M. C. Wang & E. W. Gordon (Eds.), *Educational resilience in inner-city America: Challenges and prospects*. pp. 45-72. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- 38) Youssef, C.M., Luthan, F. (2007). *Positive Organizational Behavior in the Workplace: The Impact of Hope, Optimism, and Resilience. Management Department Faculty Publications*. University Of Nebraska: Lincoln

