

## EFFECTS OF EMPLOYEE RESILIENCE ON EMPLOYEE WELLBEING IN THE INDIAN CORPORATE SECTOR

**Urvashi Bansal<sup>1</sup>**

Research scholar, Haryana School of Business, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology. Hisar, Haryana.

**Dr Anil Kumar<sup>2</sup>**

Professor, Haryana School of Business, Guru Jambheshwar University of Science and Technology. Hisar, Haryana

<https://doie.org/10.65985/APER.2026822257>

---

### ABSTRACT

Well-being of employees has been at the centre of many studies in organizational research as it impacts employee retention and productivity. Employee resilience has become a significant personal strength that enables individuals to handle challenges related to the workplace. This study examined how 7 dimensions of resilience (finding one's calling, managing stress, living authentically, keeping perspective, building networks, collaborating well, and staying healthy) relate to employee well-being in three distinct areas: psychological, life, and work-place wellbeing. A total of 250 employees within the corporate sector of India participated in this study, and a quantitative method was employed. Descriptive statistics and multiple regression using SPSS analyse the statistical data. Three out of the seven resilience dimensions found were statistically significant predictors of the overall wellbeing of employees: finding one's calling, maintaining perspective, and staying healthy. Overall, this study suggests that finding one's purpose, reframing one's thought process, and focusing on health promoting behaviours are critical for enhancing wellbeing of Indian employees.

The research adds to the expanding literature on the connection between resilience and wellbeing by offering empirical data from a developing nation; it also demonstrates that resilience is multifaceted and influences different components of wellbeing in various ways.. Practically, organizations can develop programs or policies that support their employees in finding their purpose, managing stress, and creating healthy habits to improve wellbeing. Limitations of the study include a cross-sectional methodology and a focus on a single industry. Future studies could employ longitudinal methodologies and use a more representative sample to further examine how resilience affects well-being over time.

**Keywords:** Resilience, employee wellbeing, performance, productivity.

### INTRODUCTION

Employees of today are being put under considerable pressure as they are required to continuously modify their performance due to volatile economic conditions, fast-changing technological advancements, worldwide competition, and ever-evolving organisational structures. As a result, employees experience an increased amount of stress, and consequently, there is a heightened risk of damage to employees' physical and mental wellbeing. For organisations, sustaining the wellbeing of employees is a huge challenge to overcome to speed up organisational growth and avoid decreased productivity, and also to decrease the cost of poor health insurance. Therefore, organisations need to understand what factors help protect employee's wellbeing. Of all of the factors that may assist protect employees wellbeing, employee resilience (the ability to adapt, recover, and thrive in difficult situations), has received increasing academic and managerial interest. Resilience acts as a personal resource

that will enable employees to successfully cope with workplace stressors and function at their best. Winwood et al. (2013) define employee resilience as a multidimensional construct consisting of seven key factors: living authenticity, finding your calling, maintain perspective, managing stress, interacting cooperatively, building networks, and staying healthy. The combined effect of these factors represents an employee's ability to remain stable emotionally and physically, and continue to be productive during adversity. Employees who have high levels of these resilience factors, can more easily deal with workplace stressors, remain motivated, and maintain their psychological stability. Research based upon positive psychology and the job demands/resources (JD-R) model, show that employees that are resilient are better suited to deal with adversity, display tenacity, and maintain emotional balance. Employee resilience has a significant impact on employee wellbeing. There are many different dimensions of employee wellbeing as well as many different dimensions of employee resilience. Zheng et al. (2015), identify three major areas of wellbeing for employees, namely: Life wellbeing, Workplace wellbeing, and Psychological wellbeing. Together, the three major areas of wellbeing, provide an overview of the wellbeing of employees in terms of their quality of life; job satisfaction at the workplace; and their emotional-psychological state. When employees are working in dynamic and fast paced work environments, such as those commonly found in the Indian corporate sector, resilience may be a key factor in the wellbeing of employees. Factors which impact wellbeing, in addition to the fast pace of the workplace, include: High levels of workload; Tight deadlines; Long hours worked; Rapidly changing organizational structures. Therefore, it is increasingly important, for organizations to understand the relationship between the seven dimensions of employee resilience, and the three dimensions of employee wellbeing to design effective Human Resource Strategies and Employee Support Programs.

Despite the increasing focus on both employee wellbeing and employee resilience, there is little research regarding the inter-relationship of the three dimensions of employee wellbeing and the seven dimensions of employee resilience in the Indian Context. Many of the studies that do exist, treat employee wellbeing or employee resilience as a singular construct, ignoring their various sub-dimensions. It is therefore essential to address this knowledge gap, to develop targeted interventions and HR practices, tailored to the specific needs of Indian employees. This study examines the impact of the seven dimensions of employee resilience (Winwood et al., 2013) on the three dimensions of employee wellbeing (Zheng et al., 2015) in the Indian corporate sector. This investigation expands on previous theoretical frameworks and develops evidence-based findings for organisations wishing to create a mentally and physically healthy, and resilient workforce.

## **Review of Literature**

### **Employee resilience**

**Resilience** was first used in the 1620s and was derived from the Latin word *resilio*, signifying “to jump back” Resilience is the result of individuals being able to connect with their current circumstances and the process that either promotes the well-being or secures them against the unavoidable effects of risk factors. Researchers study resilience from diverse disciplines, including psychological resilience, personality trait resilience, sociological resilience, emotional resilience, and career resilience in individual and organisational contexts. However, no consensus definition exists. Employee resilience is defined psychologically as the ability to react to stress in both external and internal climate in an adaptable manner (Klohen, 1996). Employee resilience is the ability to recover from adversity as well as the ability to utilise and proactively develop individual and workplace resources (Kuntz *et al.*, 2017). Employee resilience as a developable capability is characterised as an employee capability to utilise resources to persistently receive and thrive at work, regardless of being confronted with challenging circumstances (Kuntz *et al.*, 2016). In general, authors concur that resilience is a

capacity that reflects in behaviour (b) managing change and (c) conquering some undesirable situation. Winwood et al. (2013) conceptualized resilience as a multi-dimensional construct comprising factors such as Finding One's Call, Managing Stress, Staying Healthy, Looking Ahead, Maintaining Perspective, Interacting Cooperatively, and Building Networks. However, empirical studies show that not all dimensions contribute equally to employee outcomes; some dimensions may be more strongly connected to wellbeing and other positive psychological states (Shatte et al., 2017).

### **Employee wellbeing**

Wellbeing is outlined as an individual's subjective and global judgement of whether or not the individual is experiencing the presence of positive emotions and having satisfaction with their life (Diener, 1984). Although there is usually an accepted, precise definition that prevails. Ryan and Deci (2001) deduced two Main theories of wellbeing: (a) hedonic philosophy, (b) eudaimonism philosophy. Hedonic philosophy, outlined as positive, has an effect on and absence of negative affect, where eudemonia is defined as a higher order of construct where individuals try to succeed in their full potential. In the line of hedonic philosophy, Ryan and Deci (2001) proposed the concept of subjective wellbeing, which is defined as emotional wellbeing. Subjective wellbeing is defined as people's evaluation of their current state of happiness, joy, satisfaction and positive mood. Whereas within the line of eudaimonia philosophy, Ryan and Deci (2001) propose the psychological wellbeing concept, which is defined as a good state of positive psychological functions and fulfilment of non-public potential, such as personal growth, self-acceptance, and autonomy. Employee wellbeing is commonly conceptualised across life wellbeing, workplace wellbeing, and psychological wellbeing. Life wellbeing encompasses global life satisfaction and positive affect (Diener et al., 2003). Workplace wellbeing centres around fulfilment, job satisfaction, and positive experiences at work (Page & Vella-Brodrick, 2009). Psychological wellbeing refers to autonomy, personal growth, and emotional stability (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). Research consistently highlights the relationship between resilience and wellbeing. Resilient employees experience higher levels of personal growth, job engagement, emotional stability, and overall flourishing (Hartmann et al., 2020; Youssef-Morgan & Luthans, 2015).

### **Hypotheses Development**

Employee resilience, or the ability to adapt, cope, and recover from work-related stresses, significantly affects employees' psychological and subjective functioning (Bardoel et al., 2014; Winwood et al., 2013). Building on the theories of Resilience Theory (Robertson et al., 2015) and Positive Organizational Behavior (Luthans et al., 2006), studies identify employee resilience resource (e.g., authenticity, finding meaning, emotional regulation, social support, and maintaining physical/mental health) as contributing to employees' overall well-being (Robertson et al., 2015). Employee well-being, representing a comprehensive assessment of employees' functioning across three life domains (life, workplace, psychological) (Zheng et al., 2015), will serve as a foundation for developing the following hypotheses.

Hypotheses Development: Resilience Dimensions → Life Wellbeing

**H1:** Living authenticity positively influences life wellbeing.

Individuals who live authentically can align themselves with their core values and belief systems; consequently, they have reduced internal conflicts and increased life satisfaction (Kernis & Goldman, 2006). The resultant emotional stability and self-actualization through authenticity increase overall wellbeing in an individual's daily life. Thus, it can be hypothesized

that individuals living an authentic life will exhibit higher levels of wellbeing in their daily lives.

**H2:** Finding one's calling positively influences life's wellbeing.

Engaging in meaningful work provides a person with a sense of direction, and research has shown that individuals who have a strong sense of purpose report increased life satisfaction, fulfilment, and overall wellbeing (Steger et al., 2012). Individuals with a high level of purpose experience both cognitive and emotional enrichment and therefore enhance their overall wellbeing in daily life. It can be hypothesized that individuals who pursue a calling will experience increased wellbeing in daily life.

**H3:** Maintaining perspective will be positively associated with life wellbeing.

Perspective includes a person's level of optimism, clarity and ability to remain stable when facing challenges (Winwood et al., 2013). This dimension enables employees to reduce emotional instability and prevent "work spill over" into their personal lives. The research indicates that perspective taking and optimism can greatly improve life satisfaction (Carver et al., 2010). Therefore, perspective is expected to improve wellbeing in daily life.

**H4:** Managing stress will be positively associated with life wellbeing .

Managing stress will enable employees to better manage their emotions, avoid burn out, and ultimately enhance their overall wellbeing (Robertson et al., 2015). The effective management of stress will reduce the negative consequences of excessive pressure at work, thereby increasing life satisfaction. Therefore, stress management is expected to be positively associated with wellbeing in daily life.

**H5:** Interacting cooperatively will be positively associated with wellbeing in daily life.

Interpersonal connections within the workplace are essential for fostering emotional stability and achieving personal satisfaction. Collaborating effectively with coworkers will boost social support, an important factor in predicting life satisfaction and individual wellbeing (Diener & Seligman, 2002). Consequently, collaborating with others is anticipated to enhance wellbeing in everyday life.

**H6:** Staying healthy will be positively associated with life wellbeing .

Holistic wellbeing includes health as a central component. When employees maintain a healthy body and mind, they experience increased vitality, engagement, and personal satisfaction (Keyes, 2005). Therefore, maintaining good health is expected to be positively associated with wellbeing in daily life.

**H7:** Building networks will be positively associated with life wellbeing .

Social networks act as a source of support, information sharing, and emotional buffering (Helliwell & Putnam, 2004). Employees with strong social networks report improved levels of subjective wellbeing through enhanced coping mechanisms and social connections. Therefore, developing social networks is expected to increase wellbeing in daily life.

### **Hypotheses Development: Resilience Dimensions → Workplace Wellbeing**

**H1a:** Living authenticity will positively relate to workplace wellbeing.

Authentic employees tend to build trust, facilitate open communication and engage in meaningful work activities, which all lead to enhanced workplace experiences (Ilies et al., 2005). Therefore, authentic employees are expected to report improved workplace wellbeing.

**H2a:** Finding one's calling will positively relate to workplace wellbeing.

Research indicates that employees who find a sense of meaning and purpose in their work experience increased job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Duffy et al., 2012). Employees who identify a calling should therefore report enhanced workplace wellbeing.

**H3a:** Maintaining perspective will positively relate to workplace wellbeing.

Optimism and balanced judgement enable employees to deal effectively with workplace pressures and promote job satisfaction and positive work affect (Youssef & Luthans, 2007). Therefore, maintaining perspective is expected to improve workplace wellbeing.

**H4a:** Managing stress will positively relate to workplace wellbeing.

Managing stress will allow employees to reduce emotional fatigue and experience increased positive aspects of work (Kuntz et al., 2016). Employees who can manage stress effectively are expected to report greater workplace wellbeing.

**H5a:** Cooperating with others will positively relate to workplace wellbeing.

Employees who cooperate and communicate with their colleagues and manager in a positive way experience increased job satisfaction and collaboration quality (Chiaburu & Harrison, 2008). Therefore, cooperating with others is expected to improve workplace wellbeing.

**H6a:** stay healthy will positively relate to workplace wellbeing.

Employees who maintain their physical and mental health experience increased energy, productivity and job satisfaction (Grawitch et al., 2006). Therefore, maintaining good health is expected to improve workplace wellbeing.

**H7a:** Building networks will positively relate to workplace wellbeing.

Employees develop professional networks, receive support, exchange knowledge and experience emotional stability in their work environments (Burt, 2000). Therefore, developing social networks is expected to increase workplace wellbeing.

### **Hypotheses Development: Resilience Dimensions → Psychological Wellbeing**

**H1b:** Living authenticity will positively relate to psychological wellbeing.

Individuals who live an authentic life experience increased emotional stability and psychological health (Wood et al., 2008). Therefore, living an authentic life is expected to increase psychological wellbeing.

**H2b:** Finding your calling should have an overall positive relationship with psychological wellbeing.

Meaningfulness is positively related to emotional vitality, mental health and flourishing (Steger et al., 2012); therefore, it can be inferred that finding your calling will positively relate to psychological wellbeing.

**H3b:** Maintaining perspective will also have an overall positive relationship with psychological wellbeing.

Perspective taking has been shown to produce optimism as well as improve emotional balance; both of these factors have been identified as fundamental components of psychological wellbeing (Carver & Scheier, 2014); therefore, it can be inferred that maintaining a perspective will positively relate to psychological wellbeing.

**H4b:** Managing stress has an overall positive relationship with psychological wellbeing.

Emotion regulation allows for the maintenance of mental health as well as decreases psychological strain (Robertson et al., 2015), therefore, it can be inferred that managing stress will positively relate to psychological wellbeing.

**H5b:** Interacting cooperatively has an overall positive relationship with psychological wellbeing.

Social connections have been identified as a foundation of psychological wellbeing (Ryff, 2014), therefore, it can be inferred that cooperating with others will positively relate to psychological wellbeing.

**H6b:** Staying healthy have an overall positive relationship with psychological wellbeing.

Both physical and mental health are important in providing a foundation for emotional resilience, energy and overall psychological functioning (Keyes, 2005), therefore, it can be inferred that maintaining good health will positively relate to psychological wellbeing.

**H7b:** Building networks has an overall positive relationship with psychological wellbeing.

Social networks provide buffers against stress, support emotional stability and increase psychological wellbeing (Helliwell & Putnam, 2004); therefore, it can be inferred that developing social networks will positively relate to psychological wellbeing.

## **Research methodology**

### **Research design and data collection**

Quantitative cross-sectional study has been adopted as a research methodology to study the relationship among seven resilience dimension and their influence on the three-wellbeing domains of employees – Life Wellbeing, Workplace Wellbeing and Psychological Wellbeing. This type of research design is best suited to investigate predictive relationships among the variables within a real-world setting by means of statistical methods. The sample size of this study consists of 250 employees who are working in different organizational setups across India. The convenience sampling technique is being followed in order to increase accessibility and feasibility. In order to collect the data through the questionnaire survey, the researcher utilised the online Google Form questionnaire. The questionnaire was disseminated through e-mail, messaging platform and professional network. The questionnaire contained informed consent statements, and the respondent's identity was kept confidential in order to maintain ethics. Employees from different departments, function and at different job levels have been taken into consideration so as to obtain the variability in response. Participation of employees is entirely voluntary and anonymous. Respondents were clearly informed about the objectives of the study before they started filling up the questionnaire.

### **Measures**

**Resilience:** the Seven dimensions of resilience - living authentically, finding one's call, managing stress, keeping perspective, cooperating, building networks, and staying healthy - have been studied using Winwood et al. (2013) standardized resilience scale. This scale assesses behavioral and cognitive processes contributing to resilience. Responses were

recorded using Likert-type scale. The respondents were asked to rate on a five point Likert scale ranging from 'Strongly Disagree' to 'Strongly Agree'. The higher scores were indicative of the higher resilience.

**Wellbeing** :Three sub-domains of wellbeing namely, Life Wellbeing (LW), Workplace Wellbeing (WW) and Psychological Wellbeing (PW)-have been measured using Zheng et al., (2015) standardized scale. As mentioned earlier, these constructs were assessed using well-established wellbeing measures commonly used in occupational psychology research. The higher scores indicate the strong wellbeing perception.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis was conducted using SPSS Statistical Package for Social Science (version 24). Descriptive statistics, including frequency distributions and percentages, summarized respondents' demographic characteristics and explored variable trends. Reliability was assessed with Cronbach's Alpha to determine the internal consistency of all scales employed. To evaluate the predictive influence of seven resilience dimensions on life, workplace, and psychological wellbeing, multiple regression analyses were used. A p-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant. The regression outcomes indicated that finding one's call, maintaining perspective, and staying healthy were significant predictors of wellbeing in all three domains, aligning with previous research.

**Table 1: Socio-demographic Profile of sample (N=350)**

Characteristics	Classification	Percentage
<b>Gender</b>	“Male”	62.8
	“Female”	37.2
<b>Age</b>	Less than 20 years	45.2
	From 21 to 30 years	36.8
	From 31 to 40 years	13.6
	Above 40 years	4.4
<b>Marital status</b>	Married	48.4
	unmarried	51.6
<b>Education</b>	Up to 12th	9.2
	Graduate	24.8
	Post Graduate	51.2
	Other Specify	14.8

**Source:** author's calculation

Among the 250 participants who provided socio-demographic information, 62.8 per cent of respondents were male, while 37.2 per cent were female; most respondents (45.2 per cent) were younger than 20 years, and an additional 36.8 percent were between 21-30 years. Less than one-third of respondents (13.6 percent) were in their 31–40-year-old category, and only four percent of respondents were between 41-50 years. Nearly all respondents (48.4 percent) reported being married, and nearly as many (51.6 percent) reported being unmarried. Approximately 52 percent of respondents reported having at least a postgraduate degree, approximately 25 percent had graduated from college, and about 15 percent reported having some form of professional certification. About nine percent of respondents reported completing only through the twelfth grade. In general, the demographic data suggest that the majority of the respondents are young and highly educated, and thus may have influenced both perceived levels of resilience and wellbeing in the Indian corporate sector.

**Assessment of reliability and validity**

All the variables affecting resilience and employee wellbeing are tested for reliability and validity. Reliability of the data was tested by estimating Cronbach's alpha for all the factors affecting employee resilience and wellbeing. The Cronbach alpha value for factors was examined as stated in Table 2. Where all seven factors demonstrate acceptable criteria, exceeding the threshold of 0.70 recommended by Nunnally (1978)

**Table 2. Cronbach's alpha**

<b>Cronbach's alpha of employee resilience dimensions</b>		
Constructs	No. of items	Alpha
MS	4	0.881
FC	4	0.853
MP	3	0.835
LA	3	0.837
IC	2	0.819
BN	2	0.817
SH	2	0.724
<b>Cronbach alpha of employee wellbeing factors</b>		
LW	6	.890
WW	6	.911
PW	6	.876

Source: author's calculation

After assessing the reliability, we used the KMO test to assess the data validity for factor analysis. A KMO value higher than 0.60 was reported for each construct; a value closer to one implies the reliability of the data collected from the sample respondents (Hair et al.,2013). Table 3. Shows that the data is valid for further analysis through EFA.

**Table 3. KMO and Bartlett test**

<b>KMO and Bartlett's Test of Employee Resilience</b>		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Adequacy.	Sampling	.921
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2696.66 6

	df	190
	Sig.	.000
<b>KMO and Bartlett's Test of employee wellbeing</b>		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.952
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2737.654
	df	153
	Sig.	.000

Source: author's calculation

Table 3 above shows the appropriateness and suitability of the data for factor analysis. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity assesses the likelihood that the correlation matrix contains significant correlations among its elements. Based on the significance value ( $P < 0.001$ ), and chi-square values of employee resilience and employee wellbeing are 2696.666 and 2737.654. The value of Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sample Adequacy (MSA) is 0.921 and 0.952, respectively. In this regard, Data with an MSA value above 0.60 are considered appropriate for factor analysis. (Hutcheson & Sofroniou, 1999) Also considered a 'superb' value, showing that the sample size is adequate for the study.

### Exploratory Factor Analysis of Employee Resilience

The tables presented below outline the findings concerning 20 employee resilience-based items on factor analysis. These were examined using exploratory factor analysis (EFA) available in SPSS. The primary aim of factor analysis is to condense the data associated with the variables being examined while preserving as much information as possible. For the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), the Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and Varimax rotation method were applied, which accounts for all variance in the data. To isolate the item of medium/ strong item/ factor correlations, the minimum factor loadings criterion was set to 0.50 (Winwood et al., 2013). The communality of the scale, which indicates the amount of variance in each dimension, was also assessed to ensure acceptable levels of explanation. The result shows that all the communalities' values were over 0.50

The table below reports the component matrix with item/factor correlations for this seven-factor analysis solution. Varimax rotation clearly separated items into distinct components, including a clean factor structure.

Table 4

Rotated Component Matrix for Exploratory Factor Analysis.							
	Component						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
LA1				.750			
LA2				.750			
LA3				.749			
FC1		.689					
FC2		.752					
FC3		.745					
FC4		.755					
MP1			.834				
MP2			.742				
MP3			.738				
MS1	.785						
MS2	.762						
MS3	.7697						
MS4	.743						
IC1					0.810		
IC2					.844		
SH1							.793
SH2							.832
BN1						.838	

BN2						.873	
Note: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.							
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalisation.							

Source: Author's calculation

**Table 5. Summary of extracted factors**

Constructs	No. of items	% of Variance	Eigen value
MS	4	43.665	8.733
FC	4	7.284	1.457
MP	3	5.902	1.180
LA	3	5.585	1.117
IC	2	5.203	1.041
BN	2	4.855	.971
SH	2	4.469	.894

Source: author's calculation

The seven dimensions shown in Table 4 represent all the items from the EFA. The EFA supported the seven-dimensionally structured theory in our study. Only two factors (BN & SH; see Table 5) did not have eigen values over 0.1, but Fabrigar et al. (1999) state that "Kaiser's criterion (i.e., eigenvalue > 1) is not always reliable and should not be used as the sole criteria for factor retention" and therefore suggest that if a factor has an eigen value less than 1.0 but has a solid theoretical base and/or a pattern of high factor loadings, it may still be appropriate to retain the factor (in this case, we retained BN/SH because they had at least one factor loading greater than .5; see Table 4). Each item also has a factor loading greater than 0.5 (the commonly accepted threshold; see Table 4) indicating that all items were retained, and all items helped explain the variation in the study. The seven dimensions accounted for a total of 76.96% of the total variation among the items in the study (see Table 5). In addition, each item also had a communality greater than 0.6, further supporting that all items provided meaningful contribution to the variation in the study.

### **Exploratory factor analysis of Employee Well-being (EWB)**

EWB includes three key aspects of employee well-being: life, work, and psychological well-being, all of which relate to the employee's life in general and in his/her workplace. Therefore, EWB can be viewed as including the employee's subjective experience of satisfaction and feeling good in both his/her professional and personal life. Hence, the concept of EWB is multi-dimensional and contains elements of Life Well-Being (LWB), Work Well-Being (WWB) and Psychological Well-Being (PWB). The findings from the analysis of 18 items representing the various aspects of employee well-being are summarized in the tables below. The items were analyzed by means of dimension reduction techniques (EFA) using the statistical software package SPSS. The primary objective of factor analysis is to reduce the number of items related to the studied variables while retaining as much of the original information as possible. For the

exploratory factor analysis (EFA), principal component analysis (PCA) was performed with varimax rotation to capture all the variability in the data. A minimum factor loading criterion of 0.50 was established for identifying items with medium to strong factor correlation (Winwood et al., 2013). Additionally, the communalities of the scales were examined to determine how much of the variance was explained by each dimension. All the communalities in the study exceeded 0.50.

**Table 6.**

<b>Rotated Component Matrix</b>			
	Component		
	1	2	3
LW1	.735		
LW2	.665		
LW3	.722		
LW4	.719		
LW5	.703		
LW6	.757		
WW1			.779
WW2			.835
WW3			.644
WW4			.633
WW5			.805
WW6			.626
PW1		.718	
PW2		.671	
PW3		.661	
PW4		.784	

PW5		.711	
PW6		.737	
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.			
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.			

Source: authors' calculation

**Table 7. Summary of extracted factor**

Constructs	No. of items	% of Variance	Eigen Value
LW	6	50.844	9.152
WW	6	8.344	1.502
PW	6	6.893	1.241

Source: authors' calculation

Consistent with expectations, the factor analysis indicated a three-factor solution based on eighteen items, with each of the three factors composed of six items. Table 6 reports the results of the factor analysis, including an item/factor correlation component matrix for the three-factor analysis solution. In accordance with the factor analysis report, all of the loadings are valid and range from 0.633 to 0.835. Thus, collectively, the three factors account for 66.08% of the total variance. The exploratory factor analysis supported the three-dimensionally structured theory of the research, as shown by eigenvalues above the Kaiser criteria of 1.0 for factor retention. Each of the items has loadings greater than 0.50, which is considered sufficient for strong membership to the respective factor. Additionally, all of the item communalities are greater than 0.60, indicating that each item contributes well.

### Regression analysis

The hypothesis stated that living authenticity, finding one's call, managing stress, maintaining perspective, staying healthy, interacting cooperatively, and social networking significantly predict or contribute to life wellbeing, workplace wellbeing and psychological wellbeing. Therefore, the regression equation was used to test the hypothesis, with the life wellbeing, workplace wellbeing and psychological wellbeing being the dependent variable(s), and living authenticity, finding one's call, managing stress, maintaining perspective, staying healthy, interacting cooperatively and social networking as the independent variable(s) to test the hypotheses; as seen in table 8.

**Table 8.**

Hypothesis	Regression weights	Beta coeff.	R <sup>2</sup>	t-value	p-value	Hypothesis supported
H1	LA→LW	-.008	.336	-.097	.923	No
H2	FC→LW	.261		3.615	.000	Yes
H3	MP→LW	.044		.569	.570	No
H4	MS→LW	.155		1.984	.048	Yes
H5	IC→LW	.033		.485	.628	No
H6	SH→LW	.222		3.208	.002	Yes
H7	BN→LW	.046		.755	.451	No
Path to workplace wellbeing						
H1a	LA→WW	-0.10	.408	-.135	.893	No
H2a	FC→WW	.215		3.096	.002	Yes
H3a	MP→WW	.028		.371	.711	No
H4a	MS→WW	.282		3.753	.000	Yes
H5a	IC→WW	.058		.878	.381	No
H6a	SH→WW	.256		3.847	.000	Yes
H7a	BN→WW	.007		.121	.904	No
Path to psychological wellbeing						
H1b	LA→PW	.048	0.377	.670	.504	No
H2b	FC→PW	.129		1.963	.051	Yes
H3b	MP→PW	.071		.999	.319	Yes
H4b	MS→PW	.261		3.661	.000	Yes
H5b	IC→PW	-.017		-.277	.782	No
H6b	SH→PW	.187		2.962	.003	Yes
H7b	BN→PW	.088		1.1566	.119	No

**Source:** Author's calculation

According to the results displayed in table 8, three out of seven resilience dimensions (finding one's call (H2); maintaining perspective (H4) and staying healthy (H6)) are predictive of wellbeing at a significance level ( $p < .05$ ) with the large t-values shown across each model for all three of these factors. These three factors indicate that employees who maintain their perspective, find their calling, and remain healthy will generally report a higher level of wellbeing when they live authentically. The remaining four dimensions of workplace wellbeing; maintaining perspective (a dimension of employee resilience), managing stress (H5), and building network (H7), do not contribute to predicting wellbeing as well in the Indian

corporate environment as internal coping and health habits rather than social or identity factors. Maintaining perspective (MP), a factor of employee resilience, although it does not add to an employee's general wellbeing, does support an increase in an employee's psychological wellbeing through improved motivation and work focus. Therefore, maintaining perspective supports the H3b hypothesis.

## **Discussion**

The objectives of this study were to investigate the associations between employee resilience and wellbeing in the Indian corporate sector. The Study used the multidimensional resilience framework developed by Winwood et al. (2013) and the employee wellbeing structure identified by Zheng et al. (2015). This Study investigated how the seven resilience components — Living Authentically, Flexible Coping, Maintaining Perspective, Maintaining Purpose, Interacting Cooperatively, Staying Healthy and Building Networks -contributed to life wellbeing, workplace wellbeing, and psychological wellbeing. Overall, the Findings of this Study provide meaningful theoretical, empirical and practical insights into the association between employee resilience and wellbeing.

Predictors of Employee Wellbeing—Employee wellbeing was significantly predicted by employee resilience. However, it was found that each resilience component does not have an equivalent effect on wellbeing. Specifically, the three resilience components — Finding Your Call, Maintaining Perspective and Staying Healthy-were identified as consistent and statistically significant predictors of wellbeing in relation to all three wellbeing constructs. These Findings provide additional support for the notion that resilience is primarily driven by adaptive coping processes, positive cognitive reframing, and sustained health behaviours (Britt et al., 2016; Hartmann et al., 2020).

Strongest Contributor – finding your call exhibited the greatest and most consistent effect on life wellbeing, workplace wellbeing, and psychological wellbeing. This result is consistent with previous evidence showing that employees who utilise adaptive coping processes exhibit reduced perceived stress, enhanced emotional stability and increased work performance (Robertson et al., 2015). In the rapidly changing, competitive Indian corporate environment characterised by high job demands, flexible coping provides the essential resource for employees to sustain wellbeing (Pradhan & Hati, 2019).

Role of Maintaining Perspective and Staying Healthy—Maintaining Perspective also had a significant effect on wellbeing across all wellbeing constructs. Employees that can maintain a positive interpretation of challenges and remain cognitively balanced will likely possess emotional resilience, better psychological adjustment and stable wellbeing (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013). Furthermore, Staying Healthy was also a significant predictor of wellbeing, providing additional evidence that physical wellness behaviours, including rest, exercise, and work-life balance, greatly influence overall wellbeing (Sonntag, 2018). This supports the growing importance of employee wellness programmes in Indian organisations.

Limited Effect of Interpersonal and Identity-Based Resilience Dimensions —Interacting Cooperatively, Living Authentically, and Building Networks were not significant predictors of wellbeing across any wellbeing constructs. These results differ from the findings reported in studies based in Western organisational contexts where authenticity and social connection contribute to wellbeing (Kern et al., 2014). As compared to the Indian corporate environment, wellbeing in the Indian corporate environment appears to be more reliant upon individual coping and health behaviours and cognitive reframing than upon identity-based or social/interpersonal connections. These differences in the significance of various wellbeing contributing dimensions may be attributed to the hierarchical nature of many Indian

organisations and their collectivist culture that influences the way employees interact (Chatterjee, 2021).

Selective Predictor — Maintaining Perspective was a selective predictor of psychological wellbeing. This finding aligns with previous research showing that employees with a clear sense of purpose, are more motivated, engaged, and perform better in their jobs, although this may not always translate to increased emotional or life wellbeing (Steger et al., 2012). Purpose increases effort and focus, but purpose is only likely to influence overall happiness and life wellbeing if combined with effective coping and health behaviours.

### **Theoretical and practical implications**

This Study has made several contributions to the literature. The results demonstrate that resilience is multi-dimensional and that each dimension exerts unique effects on wellbeing. This supports emerging conceptual models that distinguish between emotional, cognitive, behavioural, and social types of resilience (Hartmann et al., 2020). The results indicate that different dimensions of resilience predict different aspects of wellbeing, thereby supporting Zheng et al.'s (2015) multidimensional wellbeing framework. The results also highlight that interpersonal dimensions of resilience may not contribute as much to wellbeing in Indian organisations as they do in organisations in other countries, thereby highlighting the need for context-specific models of workplace resilience. The practical implications of the findings for HR professionals and managers in Indian corporate organisations are as follows: Encourage employees to develop coping flexibility through resilience training, stress management workshops, and problem-solving programmes. Establish perspective building programmes, including mindfulness training, coaching, and cognitive-behavioural interventions. Develop health and wellness programmes for employees, including exercise programs, work-life balance policies, and medical support for fatigue management and other health issues. Recognise that social/interpersonal resilience components (i.e. networking, cooperation) will only significantly influence wellbeing when combined with individual coping and health behaviours. These practical measures may increase wellbeing and productivity in Indian corporate employees.

### **Conclusion**

The objective of this Study was to investigate how seven dimensions of employee resilience - Finding Your Call, Maintaining Perspective, Managing Stress, Interacting Cooperatively, Staying Healthy, and Building Networks -contribute to wellbeing in three dimensions of wellbeing — life wellbeing, workplace wellbeing, and psychological wellbeing. The findings of this Study provided important theoretical and practical insight into the complex ways in which employee resilience influences the wellbeing of employees in the Indian corporate sector. An important contribution of this research was the identification that not all of the dimensions of employee resilience exert equivalent effects on wellbeing. Three of the seven dimensions of employee resilience -Finding Your Call (FC), Managing Stress (MS) and Staying Healthy (SH) - were found to consistently and statistically predict wellbeing across the three wellbeing constructs in this study. These findings supported Winwood et al.'s (2013) view that employee resilience is a multi-dimensional construct, and that each of the employee resilience dimensions separately contributes to employees' function (Winwood et al., 2013). The two employee resilience dimensions-Staying Healthy and Managing Stress - were the most predictive of life wellbeing. These findings demonstrated the critical role that physical and emotional well-being play in contributing to an individuals' overall quality of life. Employees who can create and maintain healthy routines, utilize productive coping mechanisms and successfully manage the stress associated with work and other responsibilities are more likely to experience higher life-satisfaction and emotional balance. These findings are congruent with the body of literature related to stress management and wellness, and

indicate that long-term wellbeing and adaptive functioning will depend on physiological health and the implementation of effective stress-reduction behaviours. The influence of Finding Your Call had particular significance and strongly predicted both workplace wellbeing and psychological wellbeing. These findings highlight the strong link between purpose, meaning and workplace flourishing. When employees perceive their work as meaningful, they are more intrinsically motivated, more engaged and more satisfied with their working lives. Resilience based on purpose/meaning therefore serves as a motivational driver and a psychological anchor for enhancing mental stability and emotional fulfillment. These findings add to the existing literature and provide additional theoretical support for the idea that work meaning is a primary factor influencing wellbeing in today's rapidly changing and increasingly demanding organizational environment.

The three wellbeing constructs are interdependent and include emotional regulation, physical health and purposeful engagement. The significant contribution of MS, SH and FC in predicting psychological wellbeing illustrates this interdependency. Psychological wellbeing is influenced by more than just the cognitive resilience strategies of maintaining a perspective or looking forward. Emotional regulation, healthy habits and existential purpose also influence psychological wellbeing. This finding expands the existing body of literature by demonstrating that more deeply internalized forms of resilience (i.e., beyond the surface level cognitive aspects) are the most powerful contributors to promoting psychological flourishing.

Notably, many of the dimensions of resilience (i.e., looking ahead, maintaining perspective, interacting cooperatively, and building networks) did not predict wellbeing in this study. The lack of predictive power of these dimensions suggests that while they may be relevant to workplace performance and/or team effectiveness, they do not directly predict wellbeing. Their influence may be moderated by variables such as emotional engagement, job satisfaction and supervisory support. Thus, there exists an opportunity for future research to examine the interactional effects of the various dimensions of resilience.

Overall, this study supports the position that employee wellbeing is maximized when organizations develop and implement programs that promote purpose, emotional stability and health-enhancing behaviors. Examples of such programs include stress management workshops, mindfulness training, health promotion programs, and designing meaningful work. As such, organizations may find that investing in such programs may lead to greater increases in wellbeing than providing employees with traditional skill-based training programs.

In conclusion, this study expanded upon the current theory of resilience and wellbeing by identifying the most influential dimensions of employee resilience and demonstrating that wellbeing is a multi-dimensional construct influenced by psychological, emotional and existential factors. The findings of this study provide a solid empirical basis for developing targeted organizational policies and programs aimed at promoting both individual wellbeing and organizational success.

### **Limitations and Future Directions**

While this study has provided significant contributions to the body of literature regarding the impact of employee resilience dimensions on wellbeing, there are a number of limitations associated with this study that need to be recognized. Each of the limitations of this study represents an opportunity for researchers to build upon and extend their knowledge of the resilience – wellbeing relationship. First, as noted previously, the sample size of this study was limited, and further, this study was conducted within a single organization in India. Therefore, while the results of this study can be generalized to other organizations and contexts within India; the sample size and specific organizational context limit the generalization of the results to other industries, locations, and cultures. Future researchers should attempt to replicate the

study utilizing a larger and more representative sample of employees from various industries, locations, and cultures. Conducting cross-cultural and/or cross-industry analyses will enhance the external validity of the resilience – wellbeing model. A second limitation of the study is the fact that the study utilized a cross-sectional research design. Due to the nature of cross-sectional research designs, the researcher is restricted from inferring causal relationships between the employee resilience dimensions and wellbeing. Specifically, it remains unclear whether employee resilience contributes to wellbeing, or if employees who have higher levels of wellbeing inherently possess stronger resilience. Utilizing longitudinal research designs would enable researchers to examine the evolution of employee resilience and wellbeing over time. A final limitation of the study relates to the fact that several dimensions of employee resilience (i.e., living authentically, maintaining perspective, interacting cooperatively, and building networks) were identified as not being statistically significant predictors of wellbeing outcomes. Additionally, no assessments of performance-related or behavioral outcomes (i.e., job performance, organizational citizenship behavior) were made in this study. Thus, the implications of the study suggest that the influence of these dimensions of resilience may be either indirect or influenced by contextual factors. Researchers should investigate the presence of mediating (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational support, emotional engagement) or moderating variables (e.g., workload, leadership style, psychological safety) to better understand when the dimensions of employee resilience contribute to wellbeing.

## **References**

- Allan, B. A., Batz-Barbarich, C., Sterling, H. M., & Tay, L. (2019). Outcomes of meaningful work: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, 56(3), 500–528.
- Bardoel, E. A., Pettit, T. M., De Cieri, H., & McMillan, L. (2014). Employee resilience: An emerging challenge for HRM. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*, 52(3), 279-297.
- Britt, T. W., Shen, W., Sinclair, R. R., Grossman, M. R., & Klieger, D. M. (2016). How much do we really know about employee resilience? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 378–404.
- Burt, R. S. (2000). The network structure of social capital. *Research in organizational behavior*, 22, 345-423.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2014). Dispositional optimism. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 18(6), 293-299.
- Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Segerstrom, S. C. (2010). Optimism. *Clinical psychology review*, 30(7), 879-889.
- Chatterjee, S. S., Chakrabarty, M., Banerjee, D., Grover, S., Chatterjee, S. S., & Dan, U. (2021). Stress, sleep and psychological impact in healthcare workers during the early phase of COVID-19 in India: A factor analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 611314.
- chiaburu, D. S., & Harrison, D. A. (2008). Do peers make the place? Conceptual synthesis and meta-analysis of coworker effects on perceptions, attitudes, OCBs, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1082–1103.
- Cooper, C. L., Dewe, P., & O'Driscoll, M. P. (2001). *Organizational stress: A review and critique of theory, research, and applications*.sage
- Diener, E. D., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of personality assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.

- Diener, E., & Seligman, M. E. (2002). Very happy people. *Psychological science*, 13(1), 81-84.
- Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R. E. (2003). Personality and subjective well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 403–425.
- Ding, D., et al. (2021). Physical activity and wellbeing: A global perspective. *The Lancet Public Health*, 6(12), e894–e901.
- Duffy, R. D., Bott, E. M., Allan, B. A., Torrey, C. L., & Dik, B. J. (2012). Perceiving a calling, living a calling, and job satisfaction: testing a moderated, multiple mediator model. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 59(1), 50.
- Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4(3), 272–299.
- Fletcher, D., & Sarkar, M. (2013). Psychological resilience: A review and critique of definitions, concepts, and theory. *European Psychologist*, 18(1), 12–23.
- Folkman, S., & Moskowitz, J. T. (2004). Coping: Pitfalls and promise. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 745–774.
- Grawitch, M. J., Gottschalk, M., & Munz, D. C. (2006). The path to a healthy workplace: A critical review linking healthy workplace practices, employee well-being, and organizational improvements. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 58(3), 129.
- Hartmann, S., Weiss, M., & Hoegl, M. (2020). Team resilience in organizations: A conceptual and theoretical discussion of a team-level concept. In *Research handbook on organizational resilience* (pp. 39-52). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Helliwell, J. F., & Putnam, R. D. (2004). The social context of well-being. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 359(1449), 1435-1446.
- Hutcheson, G., & Sofroniou, N. (1999). *The multivariate social scientist: Introductory statistics using generalized linear models*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Ilies, R., Morgeson, F. P., & Nahrgang, J. D. (2005). Employee authenticity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3), 373–384.
- Kern, M. L., Waters, L., Adler, A., & White, M. (2014). Assessing employee wellbeing in schools using a multifaceted approach: Associations with physical health, life satisfaction, and professional thriving. *Psychology*, 5, 500–513.
- Kernis, M. H., & Goldman, B. M. (2006). Authenticity. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 283–357.
- Keyes, C. L. M. (2005). Mental illness and/or mental health? Investigating axioms of the complete state model of health. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73(3), 539–548
- Klohnen, E. C. (1996). Conceptual analysis and measurement of the construct of ego-resiliency. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 70(5), 1067.

Kuntz, J. R., Näswall, K., & Malinen, S. (2016). Resilient employees in resilient organizations: Flourishing beyond adversity. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 9(2), 456.

Kuntz, J., Connell, P., & Näswall, K. (2017). Workplace resources and employee resilience: The role of regulatory profiles. *Career development international*, 22(4), 419-435.

Leiter, M. P., Bakker, A. B., & Maslach, C. (2015). *Burnout at work: A psychological perspective*. Psychology Press.

Liu, C., et al. (2020). Stress management and employee wellbeing. *Occupational Health Science*, 4(1), 89–106.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Page, K. M., & Vella-Brodrick, D. A. (2009). The work-related wellbeing scale. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10(5), 665–683.

Pradhan, R. K., & Hati, L. (2019). The measurement of employee well-being: Development and validation of a scale. *Global Business Review*, 23(2), 385–407.

Quick, J. C., Wright, T. A., Adkins, J. A., Nelson, D. L., & Quick, J. D. (1997). *Preventive stress management in organizations* (Vol. 1997, pp. 89-110). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Robertson, I. T., Cooper, C. L., Sarkar, M., & Curran, T. (2015). Resilience training in the workplace from 2003 to 2014: A systematic review. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 88(3), 533-562.

Rosso, B. D., Dekas, K. H., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). On the meaning of work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 30, 91–127.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual review of psychology*, 52, 141.

Ryff, C. D. (2013). Psychological well-being revisited: Advances in the science and practice of eudaimonia. *Psychotherapy and psychosomatics*, 83(1), 10-28.

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological wellbeing revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719–727.

Schultz, A. B., & Edington, D. W. (2007). Employee wellbeing and productivity. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 49(7), 772–780.

Shatté, A., Perlman, A., Smith, B., & Lynch, W. D. (2017). The positive effect of resilience on stress and business outcomes in difficult work environments. *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine*, 59(2), 135-140.

Sonnentag, S. (2018). The recovery paradox: Portraying the complex interplay between job stressors, lack of recovery, and poor well-being. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 38, 169–185.

Steger, M. F., Dik, B. J., & Duffy, R. D. (2012). Meaningful work. *Counselling Psychologist*, 40(2), 229–252.

- Steger, M. F., Dik, B. J., & Duffy, R. D. (2012). Measuring meaningful work: The Work and Meaning Inventory (WAMI). *Journal of Career Assessment*, 20(3), 322–337
- Tetrick, L. E., & Winslow, C. J. (2015). Workplace wellbeing. In *APA handbook of career intervention* (Vol. 2, pp. 193–207).
- Windle, G. (2011). What is resilience? A review and concept analysis. *Reviews in clinical gerontology*, 21(2), 152-169.
- Winwood, P. C., Colon, R., & McEwen, K. (2013). A practical measure of workplace resilience: Developing the resilience at work scale. *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine*, 55(10), 1205-1212.
- Wood, A. M., Linley, P. A., Maltby, J., Baliousis, M., & Joseph, S. (2008). The authentic personality: A theoretical and empirical conceptualization and the development of the Authenticity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 55(3),
- Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2007). Positive organizational behavior in the workplace: The impact of hope, optimism, and resilience. *Journal of management*, 33(5), 774-800.
- Youssef-Morgan, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2015). Psychological capital and well-being. *Stress & health: Journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress*, 31(3).
- Zheng, X., Zhu, W., Zhao, H., & Zhang, C. (2015). Employee well-being in organizations: Theoretical model, scale development, and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36(5), 621-644.
- Zhu, Y., Zhao, C., & Zhuang, J. Y. (2023). Examination of daily abusive supervision effects on next-day employee wellbeing: a spillover perspective. *Australian journal of psychology*, 75(1), 2264938.