

A Study on Resilience Capacity in Relation to Work-Life Balance of Executives in the Pharmaceutical Industry

^aPatiraj Kumari, ^bVijayashree Sangwan

^aProfessor, Department of Management Studies, Kanya Gurukul Campus, IInd Campus, Gurukul Kangri University, Haridwar, India

^bResearch Scholar, Department of Management Studies, Kanya Gurukul Campus, IInd Campus, Gurukul Kangri University, Haridwar, India

Abstract

Pharmaceutical industry is one of the core industries and is featured with high regulatory framework, cut-throat competition, need to manufacture good quality of products, need to stay abreast of latest technology, need to conduct research and development and need to extend markets etc. The industry, due to its nature and social responsibility, poses huge work demands. The work pressure and stress is also caused by changes occurring in demographic, social, technological and economic environment as these changes cause business to respond effectively and efficiently in order to be successful. Resilience in the workforce is required to deal with both the distress and eustress caused by events occurring in the work place and in personal life as well, and work life balance needs to be maintained despite of work demand and pressures. The present study, with an aim to find out constituents of resilience capacity and relationship between resilience capacity and work life balance, has been carried out on a sample of 300 executives from pharmaceutical industry through multi-stage sampling method. The results showed a positive correlation between resilience capacity and work life balance. The present paper is divided into four sections: The first section explains risks, opportunities and challenges due to changing business environment in pharmaceutical industry. The second section mentions concepts and review of literature. The third section includes research methodology, results, and discussion. The fourth section includes conclusion, implications, and limitations of the study.

KEYWORD: Resilience Capacity, Work Life Balance, Pharmaceutical Industry.

INTRODUCTION: Pharmaceutical Industry is a very important Industry in terms of its contribution to the economy and society as the products it manufactures affect health directly.

Trends in Pharmaceutical Industry influence the firms and they have to align themselves to the changes occurring in the environment which includes technological, regulatory and legal, demographic and human environment etc. Several trends have taken place in the industry such as shifting markets due to pricing pressures, regulatory challenges etc. (CII and Indian Pharma, 2010), strengthening positions of Indian Pharma companies (PWC-Indian Pharma, 2010), expansion in market size, strategic alliances and safeguards against exploitative practices (Competition Act, 2002; Nayak, 2011), increase in government investment for the growth of healthcare (CII, 2010), growth in insurance coverage by government under RSBY and NREGA schemes and by private health insurers like HDFC, Tata AIG, Bajaj Allianz-Apollo, Royal Sundaram, MetLife etc., offering of incentives for setting up special economic zones by the government of India such as tax holidays and other

concessions for the companies who venture into setting up special economic zones. In addition, other important trends are: requirement of the member countries to have compliance with WTO conditions related to patent of products and 'Good Manufacturing Practices-GMP' standards as laid down by World Trade Organization in order curb manufacturing and sale of spurious drugs and to maintain good quality products.

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 & acquisitions among pharma companies have become a common strategy to enhance the efforts related to intellectual capital (Narayan, 2009). According to Pharma Consulting the pharmaceutical industry will continue to downsize drug development operations and have greater reliance on strategic CRO (contract research operations) alliances and collaboration. And as there is much stress in these relationships, there is need of good communication, hard work, sense of responsibility and trust. It is the management who is held responsible for the success or failure of any organization. Every decision related to the funds, production, marketing and distribution, research and development related activities, and expansion/contraction of the business is taken by the management. Responsibility and accountability for the execution and operations is also borne by middle and operational management. The very nature of management demands one to have comprehensive knowledge of an area of work and traits like being agile, responsible, accountable, and adaptable etc. In addition, 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. Pressure is part of the job of a salesperson or medical representative due to his nature of work and his working alone entire day enhances stress due to feeling of isolation and lack of support (Spencer, 2009). 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).

To retain employees and reduce attrition rates are huge challenges in the pharmaceutical industry. Besides better compensation several other factors have their influence on employees such as the reputation of the company, learning environment and well planned career path (IIHMR, 2012). Managers are required to align with new

strategies, manage relationships and also focus on entering into new markets. For survival in today's business environment adaptability is important (Rosen, 2013).

According to Price Water Cooper, MCE and OPPI-IIHMR Reports there are several factors demanding high performance of the pharmaceutical industry. These are: Increasing consumer awareness and facilitation of low cost medicines, research and development, competition, increase in productivity, access to new markets, growth in new areas, attrition, increase in collaboration, and increase in regulatory pressure. Executives being part of management working in this industry in a way need to be more responsible of their activities on the job. Work demands increase pressure, stress and strain. These factors may affect work life balance. Therefore, this study is an attempt to know about constituents of resilience capacity and its impact so as to find out its relationship with work life balance.

LITERATURE REVIEW: The main purpose of literature review is to explore the concept of resilience capacity, its constituents, and its relationship with work life balance.

Resilience Capacity and Its Constituents

Resilience capacity, trait or process can be defined as a confluence wherein protective factors (which enhance adaptation) such as individual traits, skills and competence, positive emotions, family support and social support interact with each other in such a pattern that enables an individual not only to face a situation but ensures his survival and success also in spite of the presence of risk factors (which enhance maladaptation) such as difficult and stressful life events, trauma and adversities in that situation or context.

According to Masten (1990), "The term resilience has a connotation of a personality trait."

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." In addition to this they state that "If we can understand what helps some people to function well in the context of high adversity, we may be able to incorporate the knowledge into new practice strategies". 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"

According to Benard (1991), researchers have used several other terms for resilience such as 'invulnerable', 'stress-resistant', 'hardy', 'ego-resilient', and 'invincible'.

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.

Resilience has various terms such as Ego resilience (Block, 2002, p. 185) Cognitive Resilience (Staal et al., 2008), Emotional Resilience (Cloyed, 2013), Educational Resilience (Wang, Haertel, and Walberg, 1994).

Work-Life Balance

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. An individual or an employee is required to perform multiple roles within limited time and resources. 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 synchronisation 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".

Operational Definitions of Constructs:

Resilience Capacity: Resilience capacity includes protective factors such as individual traits, family, community and organizational support. The dimensions of resilience capacity are Autonomy, Sense of Purpose, Social Competence, Problem Solving Skills and Environmental Protective Factors.

Work-Life Balance: Work-life balance is about having a satisfaction with quality time and efforts one is able to give to both personal life and work. The dimensions of WLB taken are- Satisfaction with time spent for self, Satisfaction with time spent with family, Satisfaction with time spent in social activities, Satisfaction with self-performance, Satisfaction with work issues

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.

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 two 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 and work life balance questionnaire are .94 and .66 respectively which is more than the acceptable value of .6(Nunally,1978)The validity of the questionnaire 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 DISCUSSIONS

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 presents the mean scores,standard deviation,range of scores of dimensions and Index scores on the five dimensions of resilience capacity.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
Satisfasction 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.According to Index value 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: Coefficients of Correlation among dimensions of Resilience Capacity

Correlation	R value	P value
Autonomy Vs Sense of Purpose	0.827	P < 0.01
Autonomy Vs Social Competence	0.718	P < 0.01
Autonomy Vs Problem Solving Skills	0.830	P < 0.01
Autonomy Vs Environmental Protective Factors	0.722	P < 0.01
Sense of Purpose Vs Social Competence	0.658	P < 0.01
Sense of Purpose Vs Problem Solving Skills	0.798	P < 0.01
Sense of Purpose Vs Environmental Protective Factors	0.749	P < 0.01
Social Competence Vs Problem Solving Skills	0.732	P < 0.01
Social Competence Vs Environmental Protective Factors	0.641	P < 0.01
Problem Solving Skills Vs Environmental Protective Factors	0.753	P < 0.01

Table-3 presents coefficients of correlation among the dimensions of the resilience capacity (autonomy, sense of purpose, social competence, problem solving skills, environmental protective factors). The R value for all the dimensions is positively significant ($P < 0.01$), which states that all dimensions of resilience capacity have positive effect on each other, which means that with increase in one dimension there is increase in the other dimension or vice-versa.

Table 4: Coefficients of Correlation among the dimensions of Work Life Balance

Correlation	R value	P value
Satisfaction with Time with Self Vs Satisfaction with time With Family	0.408	P < 0.01
Satisfaction with Time with Self Vs Satisfaction with time spent in Social Activities	0.332	P < 0.01
Satisfaction with Time with Self Vs Satisfaction with time spent on Work	0.400	P < 0.01
Satisfaction with Time with Self Vs Satisfaction with Self Performance	0.271	P < 0.01
Satisfaction with Time With Self Vs Satisfaction with Work Issues	0.020	$P > 0.05$
Satisfaction with time with Family Vs Satisfaction with time spent in Social Activities	0.318	P < 0.01
Satisfaction with time with Family Vs Satisfaction with time spent on Work	0.355	P < 0.01
Satisfaction with time with Family Vs Satisfaction with Self Performance	0.422	P < 0.01
Satisfaction with time With Family Vs Satisfaction with Work Issues	0.114	P < 0.05
Satisfaction with time spent in Social Activities Vs Satisfaction with time spent on Work	0.100	$P > 0.05$
Satisfaction with time spent in Social Activities Vs Satisfaction with Self Performance	0.167	P < 0.01
Satisfaction with time spent in Social Activities Vs Satisfaction with Work Issues	-0.063	$P > 0.05$

Satisfaction with time spent on Work Vs Satisfaction with Self Performance	0.313	P < 0.01
Satisfaction with time spent on Work Vs Satisfaction with Work Issues	0.330	P < 0.01
Satisfaction with Self Performance Vs Satisfaction with Work Issues	0.216	P < 0.01

Table 4 shows coefficients of correlation between the dimensions of Work-Life Balance (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, satisfaction with work issues). The R value between the dimensions such as 'satisfaction with time spent with self vs satisfaction with work issues', 'satisfaction with time spent in social activities vs satisfaction with time spent on work' and 'satisfaction with time spent in social activities vs satisfaction with work issues' are non-significant i.e. ($p > 0.05$), whereas R value between the dimensions 'satisfaction with time spent with family vs satisfaction with work issues' is significant as p value is < 0.05 . Coefficients of Correlation between the rest of the dimensions are significant as P value is < 0.01 , which reveals that all these variables have positive effect on each other, which means with increase in one dimension there is increase in the other dimension or vice-versa.

Resilience Capacity and Work –Life Balance

Table 5.1: Coefficients of Correlation: Autonomy(RC) with Work Life Balance Dimensions.

Correlation	r value	P value
Autonomy Vs Satisfaction with Time With Self	0.176	P < 0.01
Autonomy Vs Satisfaction with time With Family	0.377	P < 0.01
Autonomy Vs Satisfaction with time spent in Social Activities	0.134	P < 0.05
Autonomy Vs Satisfaction with time spent on Work	0.427	P < 0.01
Autonomy Vs Satisfaction with Self Performance	0.306	P < 0.01
Autonomy Vs Satisfaction with Work Issues	0.208	P < 0.01

Table 5.1 presents coefficients of correlation between the dimension 'Autonomy' of resilience capacity and all dimensions of Work-Life Balance. The R value for all the dimensions is positively significant ($P < 0.01$). However, R value between 'autonomy vs satisfaction with time spent in social Activities' is significant at 0.05 level ($p < 0.05$). These coefficients with their P value denote a positive relationship between dimensions of work life and autonomy.

Table 5.2: Coefficients of Correlation: Sense of Purpose (RC) with Work Life Balance Dimensions.

Correlation	r value	P value
Sense of Purpose Vs Satisfaction with Time With Self	0.176	P < 0.01
Sense of Purpose Vs Satisfaction with time With Family	0.354	P < 0.01
Sense of Purpose Vs Satisfaction with time spent in Social Activities	0.092	$P > 0.05$
Sense of Purpose Vs Satisfaction with time spent on Work	0.457	P < 0.01
Sense of Purpose Vs Satisfaction with Self Performance	0.347	P < 0.01
Sense of Purpose Vs Satisfaction with Work Issues	0.349	P < 0.01

Table 5.2 shows correlation between the dimension ‘Sense of Purpose’ of resilience capacity and all dimensions of Work-Life Balance. The R value for all the dimensions is positively significant ($P < 0.01$), these coefficients with their P value denote a positive relationship between dimensions of work life balance and sense of purpose. However, R value between ‘Sense of purpose vs satisfaction with time spent in social Activities’ is non-significant ($p > 0.05$).

Table 5.3: Coefficients of Correlation: Social Competence(RC)with Work Life Balance Dimensions.

Correlation	r value	P value
Social competence Vs Satisfaction with Time With Self	0.236	P < 0.01
Social competence Vs Satisfaction with time With Family	0.345	P < 0.01
Social competence Vs Satisfaction with time spent in Social Activities	0.139	P < 0.05
Social competence Vs Satisfaction with time spent on Work	0.385	P < 0.01
Social competence Vs Satisfaction with Self Performance	0.335	P < 0.01
Social competence Vs Satisfaction with Work Issues	0.261	P < 0.01

Table 7-C shows coefficients of correlation between the dimension ‘Social Competence’ of resilience capacity and all dimensions of Work-Life Balance. The R value for all the dimensions is positively significant ($P < 0.01$), However, R value between ‘Social Competence vs satisfaction with time spent in social Activities’ is significant at 0.05 level ($p < 0.05$). These coefficients with their P value denote a positive relationship between dimensions of work life balance and social competence.

Table 5.4: Coefficients of Correlation: Problem Solving Skills(RC)with Work Life Balance Dimensions.

Correlation	r value	P value
Problem Solving Skills Vs Satisfaction with Time With Self	0.253	P < 0.01
Problem Solving Skills Vs Satisfaction with time With Family	0.359	P < 0.01
Problem Solving Skills Vs Satisfaction with time spent in Social Activities	0.159	P < 0.01
Problem Solving Skills Vs Satisfaction with time spent on Work	0.447	P < 0.01
Problem Solving Skills Vs Satisfaction with Self Performance	0.339	P < 0.01
Problem Solving Skills Vs Satisfaction with Work Issues	0.263	P < 0.01

Table 5.4 presents coefficients of correlation between the dimension ‘Problem Solving Skills’ of resilience capacity and all dimensions of Work-Life Balance. The R value for all dimensions is positively significant at 0.01 level ($P < 0.01$). This means the problem solving skills has positive relationship with all dimensions of work life balance.

Table 5.5: Coefficients of Correlation: EPF-Environmental Protective Factors(RC)with Work Life Balance Dimensions.

Correlation	r value	P value
Environmental Protective Factors Vs Satisfaction with Time With Self	0.370	P < 0.01

Environmental Protective Factors VsSatisfaction with time With Family	0.439	P < 0.01
Environmental Protective Factors VsSatisfaction with time spent in Social Activities	0.171	P < 0.05
Environmental Protective Factors VsSatisfaction with time spent on Work	0.430	P < 0.01
Environmental Protective Factors Vs Satisfaction with Self Performance	0.382	P < 0.01
Environmental Protective Factors Vs Satisfaction with Work Issues	0.258	P < 0.01

Table 5.5 presents correlation between the dimension ‘Environmental Protective Factors’ of resilience capacity and all dimensions of Work-Life Balance. The R value for all the dimensions is positively significant (P < 0.01), However, R value between ‘Environmental Protective Factors vs satisfaction with time spent in social Activities’ is significant at 0.05 level (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
	Sense of Purpose	.116	.118	.326
	Social Competence	.329	.139	.019
	Problem Solving Skills	.149	.146	.306
	Environmental Protective Factors	.583	.120	.000

R² = .345; Adjusted R² = .334 ; F = 31.016 * P < .01

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 (autonomy, sense of purpose, social competence, problem solving skills, environmental protective factors) were found to 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) 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), VanDaalen et al. (2006), and (Werner and Smith,1992).

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

1. 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.
2. 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
3. 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
4. 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
5. 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

Conclusion:The present investigation is an attempt to study the impact of resilience capacity on work life balance of executives working in Pharmaceutical Industry in India. The study presents the constituents of resilience capacity and their relevance in maintenance of work life balance in Pharmaceutical Industry. Resilience capacity of an individual refers to all the protective factors that an individual has in the context of situations featured with risk factors. These protective factors such as individual characteristics, family and community support, organizational and institutional support protect an individual against risk factors such as stress, trauma, strain, pressures etc arising out of the events and situations that keep taking place both at work place and personal life. 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. The changing market demands, and business environment result into uncertainties, and the companies need to adapt themselves to changes in order to attain their goals. To stay ahead and survive in this entire work scenario, executives as employees of the Pharmaceutical companies face the risk factors such as high work pressure to meet deadlines, huge work demands such as travelling, stress arising out changing situations both at workplace and in personal life, lack of needed resources and facilities at times, lack of managerial support and understanding, lack of cooperation

among team and geographic dispersal of team members etc. These factors cause frustration, anxiety, anger, dissatisfaction etc. and these negative emotions lead to strain and maladjustment. Resilience capacity or the protective factors enable executives to work life balance. The results of the study indicate that resilience capacity has a positive association with work life balance and resilience capacity is a significant predictor of work life balance.

Suggestion for the Future Research and Limitations of the Study:

Researches should be conducted 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) had 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) Benard, B. (1991). Fostering Resiliency in Kids: Protective Factors in the Family, School, and Community. Portland, OR: Western Center for Drug-Free Schools and Communities.
- 4) Benard, B. (1996). Fostering Resilience in Children. Retrieved February 23, 2010 from <http://crahd.phi.org/papers/Fostering.pdf>.
- 5) 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>

- 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) CCI Report. (2013). A Brief report on pharmaceutical industry in India. Retrieved October 10, 2013 from www.cci.in
- 8) 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>
- 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) 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

- 11) Clutterbuck, D. (2003). "Managing the Work-Life Balance", UK: Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development. pp. 8-9.
- 12) Davis, N.J. (1999). Resilience: Status Of Research And Research-Based Programs. Working paper, Center for Mental Health Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; Rockville, MD. Retrieved July 12, 2011 from: <http://resilnet.uiuc.edu/library.html>
- 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) GSK (2010-11). GSK Energy & Resilience Programs. Case Study Published on Boston college Sloan Center for Aging and work. Retrieved on April 25, 2014 from. <http://capricorn.bc.edu/agingandwork/databse>
- 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) IJHMR (2012). Retrieved November 30, 2013 from <http://www.ijhmr.org/Journal of Applied Psychology>, Vol. 85, pp. 349-360.
- 20) Infante, F., Lamond, A. (2003) Ch. 7. Resilience and Biculturalism: The Latino Experience in the United States , pp.161-188, from Grotberg, E. H. (Ed.).

- (2003). Resilience for Today: Gaining Strength from Adversity. Westport, CT: Praeger. Retrieved May 09, 2010 from <http://www.questia.com>
- 21) Kofodimos, J. (1993). Balancing Act: How Managers Can Integrate successful Careers And Fulfilling Personal Lives. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
 - 22) 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. Willy Periodicals, Inc. pp. 289-313
 - 23) Lee, J. H., Nam, S. K., Kim, A., Kim, B., Lee, M. Y., Lee, S. M. (2013). Resilience: A Meta-Analytic Approach. Journal of Counseling and Development : JCD, Vol. 91, Iss. 3, pp. 269-274 Retrieved February 22, 2014 from <http://www.questia.com>
 - 24) Liana(2014). Work-Life Balance. Retrieved December 30, 2014 <http://www.communitybusiness.org/WLB/2014/faq14.htm>
 - 25) Masten, A.S., Best, K.M., Garmezy, N.(1990). Resilience and development: Contributions from the study of children who overcome adversity. Development and Psychopathology, Vol. 2, pp. 425-444.
 - 26) MCE Report, (2012). New Opportunities and Strategies in the Pharmaceutical Industry. The Executive Issue. Issue 38, Retrieved from <http://www.mce-ama.com/executive-issue-38-pharma-industry-2012/>
 - 27) Mitra, S., Ghosh, A.K. (2012). A Study On Effect Of Attrition Over Financial Performance Of The Companies In Life Insurance Sector In India. Retrieved from http://www.academia.edu/5657168/A_Study_on_Effect_of_Attrition_over_Financial_Performance_of_the_Companies_in_Life_Insurance_Sector_in_India.
 - 28) Nadine (2004). Building Personal and Organizational Resilience. Ryan-Bannerman Associates. Retrieved January, 13 2012 www.ryanbannerman.com
 - 29) 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.
 - 30) Nayak, N. (2011). Competition Impediments In The Pharmaceutical Sector In India. Retrieved from <http://www.iica.in/images/Pharmaceuticals%20Sector.pdf>
 - 31) Nayak, R., Ayre, Varpe, A. D., Vasa, R. N. (2011). Impurity Profiling Of Pharmaceuticals. ARPB, Vol 1, Iss.2, New York: Guilford.
 - 32) Nunnally JC.(1978). Psychometric theory. 2nd edn. New York: McGraw-Hill
 - 33) OPPI (Organisation of Pharmaceutical Producers of India). Retrieved from <http://www.indiaoppi.com/>
 - 34) Pharma Report (2012). CII-PWC, India Pharma Inc. Gearing up for the next level of growth. Retrieved from <http://www.pwc.com/pharma>
 - 35) Pharma Report (2013). CII-PWC, India Pharma Inc.: Changing landscape of the IndanPharma Industry. Retrieved from <http://www.pwc.com/pharma>
 - 36) 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.
 - 37) PwC, (2012). "From vision to decision, Pharma 2020, Retrieved from <http://www.pwc.com/pharma>

- 38) 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
- 39) 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>
- 40) Sarah, J., Spencer (2009). Neonatal overfeeding alters adult anxiety and stress responsiveness, *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, Vol. 34Iss. 8, pp.1133–1143. Retrieved February 5, 2013 from <http://doi: 10.1016/j.psyneuen.2009.02.013>
- 41) 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>
- 42) Staal, M., et al.(2008). “Cognitive Performance and Resilience to stress”, *Biobehaviouralresiliencs to stress*, B.J. Lukey and V.Tepe, CRC press: Boca Raton, FL
- 43) Stine-Morrow, E. A. L.,Chui, H. (2012). Cognitive resilience in adulthood. In Hayslip, J. B., Smith, G. C. (Eds.), *Annual Review of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, Vol. 32, pp. 93-114. New York: Springer.
- 44) Thomas, D. (2011). Reaching resilience: Research made readable /2011/04/08/wave-one-resilient-qualities/Retrieved from <https://denisanthomas.wordpress.com>.
- 45) 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.
- 46) 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.
- 47) 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
- 48) Werner, E. E., Smith, R. S. (1982). *Vulnerable but invincible: A longitudinal study of resilient children and youth*. New York : McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- 49) Werner, E. E., Smith, R. S. (1992). *Overcoming the odds: High risk children from birth to adulthood*.Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- 50) Werner, E. E., Smith, R. S. (2001). *Journeys from childhood to midlife: Risk, Resilience, and Recovery*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- 51) WTO-TRIPS – Goods Manufacturing Practices. Retrieved January 20, 2014 from [nopr.niscair.res.in/bitstream/123456789/.../JIPR%2013\(5\)%20432-441.p...](http://nopr.niscair.res.in/bitstream/123456789/.../JIPR%2013(5)%20432-441.p...)