

# Hopelessness and Job Satisfaction in Relation to Resilience among Employees

Sindhu Shantha Nair\*

## ABSTRACT

*Aim: This study tried to establish a relationship among job satisfaction, hopelessness and resilience.*

*Design: A cross-sectional study was conducted among employees using a pretested questionnaire.*

*Methods: From the cross-sectional study conducted, data was collected for demographics, resilience, hopelessness, and job satisfaction rated on a 5-point Likert scale, hopelessness using Brief-H-Neg Scale, the data were analyzed using bivariate and multivariate analysis, to identify hopelessness towards resilience, the relationship between job-satisfaction and hopelessness.*

*Findings: The mean score of hopelessness among dissatisfied employees was 7.5 and satisfaction was 4.5 ( $p < 0.05$ ), those married with understanding partners had less hopelessness compared to single and dissatisfied participants. Participants with less salary were more dissatisfied and those with poor work relationships, work conditions, and low career progression were found to have significant hopelessness leading to less resilience ( $p < 0.05$ ). Job satisfaction is vital for resilience and thereby reducing hopelessness. The findings reveal that professionals can actively strengthen their resilience and reduce vulnerability to hopelessness to improve overall efficiency. The recommendation is to incorporate resilience training for professionals for better coping and empowerment.*

**Keywords:** Resilience, Hopelessness, Job Satisfaction

## INTRODUCTION

Resilience is a positive adjustment to adversity, that can be developed through strength-building strategies like good relationships, a positive outlook, emotional and realistic insight, reflective behavior, and balancing

---

\* Founder SISHANA, Professor HR & General Management, Cluster Lead HR, Consultancy & Corporate Training ISME, Bangalore, Karnataka, India.  
Email: [sindhuura.communications@gmail.com](mailto:sindhuura.communications@gmail.com)

spirituality. These strength-building strategies can help cope with vulnerabilities. Resilience as a concept emerged in 1800 and progressed through the years and is still explored. The construct of resilience started as a trajectory and then as a trait, cycle, and process under the qualitative categorization (Jacelon 1997; Flach, 1980; Rutter, 1985; Flach, 1988; Tusai & Dyer, 2004; Bonanno, 2004, 2005). A balancing act between continuum and vulnerability at both ends was proposed by Rutter (1985), while integration and reintegration through models of resilience were highlighted by Flach (1980, 1988). While resilient skills for individuals, were identified as a combination of characteristics from the psychological and physical premise (Jacelon, 1997), the physiological and psychological resilience aspects were also considered from the historic point of view (Tusai & Dyer, 2004). Human beings foster resilience through self-regulating processes through biological conditions acclimatizing to situations in adversity for survival optimization (Rabkin et al., 1993). Resilience from the psychological premise is the ability to shift positively from any adverse situation of trauma, stress, or negative situation (Tugade & Fredrickson, 2004). However, the recovery stage was highly differentiated from resilience as the normal functions are deferred, whereas in resilience, normal functioning is not deferred and equilibrium is maintained (Bonanno, 2004). While many authors unanimously explain the ability to bounce back from any adverse situation, the processes of resilience have been argued greatly (Polk, 1997; Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000; Coleman & Ganong, 2002). Though resilience is discussed and debated for years together, a conclusive definition from a layman's perspective is yet to emerge, and it was contended that the resilience concept is to be considered as a broader construct (Rutter, 1999). That being so, the resilience qualities were identified as self-discipline, flexibility, levelheadedness, curiosity, emotional stamina, problem-solving, and self-confidence (Giordano, 1997). The sense of self and wisdom that is strong signals resilience and are malleable and elastic like few metals (Tugade & Fredrickson, 2004) wherein, the malleability qualities are like psychological flexibilities that allow personalities to adjust, cope and overcome adversities. Thus, 'resilience is a dynamic process encompassing positive adaptation, within the context of significant adversity' (Coleman & Ganong, 2002, p. 1) and 'is a phenomenon of overcoming stress or adversity' (Rutter, 1999, p. 119).

Perception of protection and vulnerability helps to improve mental health. The adult resilience scale and its incremental validity predicted levels of hopelessness in a study that also measured the

Beck Hopelessness Scale, stressful life events, the Hopkins Symptom Checklist-25, hopelessness, job satisfaction, and the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (Hjemdal et al., 2012). The results indicated significant relationships between the resilience scale and key factors, which significantly predicted hopelessness, even after accounting for age and gender effects. Thus, supporting the fact that protective resilience factors in resilience scale for adults have contributions that are unique and are established with the stressful life events, anxiety and depressive symptoms and also personality in predicting hopelessness that supported the incremental validity of the resilience scale for adults. Resilience is also the ability with which human beings try to cope with life challenges and try to successfully adapt to adverse situations, with an inclination to the future and hoping for a better future. The relationship in this regard between hopelessness and, personality traits and resilience, was analyzed among Spanish participants in a study with 439 samples (Nieto et al., 2023). This study revealed that between neuroticism and resilience, there was existence of negative relationship, while the relation with most of the other personality traits were positive, with levels of resilience showing negative relationship to hopelessness. Age was a factor and significantly older aged adults had low resilience compared to the younger adults though age was not a significant predictor of resilience. Resilience in this study was predicted by hopelessness, openness, extraversion and neuroticism clearly indicating the role played by resilience and also the resistance to risk that individuals show to face challenges and how it can build up implications for mental health. Interestingly another study (Jacobsen et al., 2020), used the Danish version of the resilience scale for adults to investigate the relationship between resilience and loneliness for adults. Another study on 422 Danish Samples established that the loneliness measure significantly correlated in a negative way with most of the factors of resilience scale for adults excluding the family cohesion and structures style subscales. Out of the negative correlation the strongest negative correlation was that for loneliness and sense of coherence which clearly indicates that lonely people or those who had the feeling of loneliness experience or feel that their life is less meaningful supporting the resilience scale for adults and the six factor structure for the Danish Sample, with the facets of resilience related to loneliness and the associated variance with symptoms of depression related to loneliness was explained by the facets of perception of self and family coherence.

Theories that are mainstream focus on the deficits of adolescent development, positive youth development, developmental plasticity of

adolescence, and potential. Though there exist limitations, conceptual reviews and empirical studies that are cross-sectional, reveal that positive youth development assigns heavily to well-being of adolescents. Relationship of positive youth development attributes that measure eudaimonic well-being, life satisfaction that measures eudaimonic well-being, and the negative well-being measure of hopelessness were researched by only a very few studies. The life satisfaction role and the mediator role of hopelessness to psychological well-being and positive youth development is less explored. A longitudinal study was conducted in China, from two thousand six hundred and forty eight junior high school students in two phases and measures of satisfaction to life, hopelessness and positive early year development attributes were validated. Interestingly it was established that the positive early year development attributes longitudinally and concurrently predicted hopelessness and life satisfaction with smaller effect sizes (Zhou et al., 2020).

Resilience has associated parameters that are inconsistent and that explain the form that are identified and that are dispositional encompassing many psychosocial factors. With the operational purpose of this paper, resilience is considered to be the ability of an individual to adjust to adversities, maintain equilibrium, retain some sense of control over their environment, and continue to move on in a positive manner. Thus this is considered as an active process that Giordano (1997, p. 1032) described as a shifting balance between vulnerability and resilience. Through efficiently maintaining equilibrium, theoretically an individual can manage any situation that comes along. Consequently, it is argued that developing personal resilience can reduce vulnerability in personal or professional scenarios. Adversities at the workplace can be viewed as any traumatic, stressful, negative, or difficult situation or an episode of hardship that is encountered in the occupational setting and Job satisfaction refer to the working conditions, pay, career progression, work activities, and work-relationships.

## THE CONCEPT OF 'RESILIENCE'

Resilience is the achievement of outcomes that are favorable premising positive personality attributes to adversities in life, and studies on theoretical and empirical studies on resilience are crucial. The situations of trauma, chronic illness, and dereliction led to further research (Luthar et al., 2000). Thereby, resilience can include characteristics, resources, and social

support (Ahern, 2006). Nonetheless, adolescents categorized as resilient did not find trust in others (disconnected), did not find support (isolated), and were sheltered from the anguish, and resilience can be a process of defense in adolescence than adaptability, flexibility, or competency in overcoming adversity (Hunter & Chandler, 1999). Besides, high levels of baseline functioning aided resilience outcomes and today, this functioning is looked at as prognostic resilient trajectories today (Luther et al., 2000). Chronic illness (Asbring, 2001), Traumatic experience of cancer (Jacelon, 1997), recuperation-rehabilitation-home transition (Esche & Tanner, 2005), severe trauma of loss (Bonanno, 2004), building family strengths ability to withstand adversity (Silberberg, 2001), effective parenting (Coleman & Ganong, 2002), obvious impact on children of divorced parents, to promote resilience and functioning through parents as factors were explored. Previous studies on dispositions that are positive helped to make awareness to employees and clinicians (Edward, 2005). Theoretical development of resilience as a concept (Jacelon, 1997; Polk, 1997; Tusaie & Dyer, 2004) were also explored. Resilience for individuals is essential (Tusaie & Dyer, 2004); and based on the school of thought of human dictum, building resilience helps in dealing with adversities, interpersonal lacunae, resource scarcity, and to direct health choices for good quality of life. Resilience is building individual and collective strength and promoting strength rather than abandoning career adversities when it becomes overwhelming (Hodges et al., 2005). Unless resiliency skills are individually promoted, resilience support becomes difficult to share with others in groups and community support. Developing and strengthening strategies for personal resilience will help reduce the personal impact of workplace adversity (Tugade & Frederickson, 2004) due to vulnerability since individual resilience skillsets are based on the adversities, and life experiences, faced by individuals, and help individuals for positive outcomes. Needless to say, ‘... being committed to finding meaningful purpose in life, the belief that one can influence one’s surroundings and the outcome of events, and the belief that one can learn and grow from both positive and negative life experiences (Bonanno, 2004. p. 25).

Hardiness is attainable through learning (Judkins et al., 2005) and resilience can be promoted through laughter, positive emotions, repressive coping, and self-enhancement (Bonanno et al., 2002). Albeit, regulating negative emotions, and finding positive meaning in adverse situations, contributes to personal resilience (Tugade & Frederickson, 2004). These positive emotions build resilience and help to act as a buffer against

the adversities of life (Bonanno, 2004; 2005). Among the elements of resilience, optimism is a key element (Bright, 1997) and it confirms the idea expressed by Tugade and Fredrickson (2004) that positive emotions are important while autonomy, empowerment, emotional awareness, and self-care (Giordano, 1997) are promoters of resilience. Self-help groups share and discuss vulnerability experience, empowers and improve the ‘self’ that also helps in feelings of apprising success and achievements to build resilience (Hodeges et al., 2005). Inter-personal problems at the workplace can be dealt with, amicably through nurturing positive relationships, and networks by maintaining positivity, developing an emotional insight, self-reflection and balancing.

## THEORETICAL UNDERPINNING

In a social system, families support resilience to individual resilience through appraisals of stress sources and how to manage those. Fostering resilience through support helps individuals and communities to strengthen capabilities. In lieu, two categories can be distinguished, resilient and susceptible or vulnerable. As a component of resilience, social support is identified to be crucial, and it is achieved through building and maintaining relationships (Tusaie & Fredrickson, 2004). Nurturing relationships is an art and seeking help through mentoring helps benefit from a supportive relationship (Daly et al., 2004).

Drawing positivity from adverse situations is a characteristic, resilient people exhibit (Fredrickson, 2004) to be optimistic since emotions that are positive coupled with laughter are found to be beneficial for overall well-being (Tugade & Fredrickson, 2004) which in turn can lessen the stress induced from negative emotions and adversities (Bonanno, 2004; 2005). Often understanding one’s own emotions, and those associated (Daly et al., 2004) enables future coping (Bright, 1997, Giordano, 1997) while journaling along with self-reflection influences emotional insights (McGee, 2006) to strengthen and develop resilience. To experience an anchoring force in life (Giordano, 1997), feelings of connectedness, life balance, a belief system with existential meaning, life narrative, and appreciation of the uniqueness of self (Tusai & Fredrickson, 2004) are essential while it is important to indulge in activities for healthy, physical, emotional and spiritual nurturing to retain or regain balance in life outside professional commitments which are demanding. Finding insights, meaning and understanding to experiences, adversities, situations and

events are achieved through reflective writing (Jackson, 2000) or to find reasons or to act as a catalyst for existential living.

Resilience is a complex construct with different meanings to different people, organizations, societies and cultures. It is also noted that people can be resilient at one point in time in life and may be not resilient or less resilient during other phases of life and certain aspects of their lives (Southwick et al., 2014). Greene, Galambos and Lee (2014) described resilience in many ways wherein resilience is a spiritual phenomenon and biopsychosocial phenomenon, that involves a transactional dynamic process of person and environment exchanges, encompassing adaptational process in goodness of fit. It occurs across the life period among individual, families and communities experiencing unique paths of development and is linked to life stress and the coping capacity of mechanisms of individuals, that involves competence in every day to day functioning, in continuum and how they deal with risk, interaction and dealing with risk factors, that is enhanced through relationships, relatedness and connection with others, overly influenced by diversity, ethnicity, race, gender, age, sexual orientation, religious affiliation, economic status, physical and mental ability that is expressed and affected by multilevel attachments that is both distal and proximal, and that includes family, peers, neighborhood, community and society, and thus resilience is a function of micro, macro, exo and mezzo factors and is affected by the availability of environmental resources and is influenced by the power differentials.

As a concept, resilience may not be that straightforward since many operational definitions exist in continuum. Resilience theory is the study of factors that make this resilience phenomenon a whole of the parts wherein it defines adversity and outcomes and its meaning, the scope and the nature of the resilience processes (van Breda, 2018). The concept of resilience can be applied widely in social work, organizations, developmental contexts from childhood, and much more. Masten (2018) explained resilience as the capacity of a system to adapt successfully to changes that is significant and challenging and that threatens its functioning, viability, or development. Walsh (2016) considered the key processes in family resilience and also gives a great overview of the concept from a family systems perspective. Berkes and Ross (2013) postulated two distinct approaches to understand community resilience in terms of social and ecological approaches and also in terms of mental health and developmental psychology perspectives. It was attempted to define resilience by Vogus and Sutcliffe (2007) through the underpinning mechanisms associated with it and included relational, cognitive, structural and affective elements of the construct and

also proposed researchable areas. Sports psychology articulates mental toughness, and this is less explored in academic contexts. Gerber et al. (2013) investigated whether mental toughness in adolescents leads to stress resilience and found that mental toughness plays a mitigating role in high stress and depressive symptoms. Positive Psychology and resilience are deeply related and concerned with promotive factors and its influence as a beneficial construct to facilitate well-being (Luthar et al., 2014). Both positive psychology and resilience theory are application based study and that indicates any individual may be able to use them in day to day life so that it is beneficial to themselves and humanity as a whole since both are so closely saturated and concentrated on the importance of social relationships (Luthar, 2006; Csikszentmihalyi & Nakamura, 2011).

Character strengths also facilitate resilience, wherein gratitude, kindness bravery and hope acts as factors that are protective towards life's adversities and also to help adapt positively to cope with difficulties in life in terms of physical and mental illness (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013). Many a times character strengths are also significant predictors of resilience particularly having significant correlations amongst resilience and restraint, emotional and intellectual strengths (Martinez-Marti & Ruch, 2017). It was also found in their 2017 study (Martinez-Marti & Ruch) that zest, bravery and hope had predictable in depth significant relationship with the positive adaptation in the events of life's faces of challenge. This further extrapolates the determination, social connectedness, and emotional regulation and its' connectedness for life's challenges. At the same time their study of 2017, did not determine any causal relationship and thus it is not clear as to whether resilience will impact individual strength or individual strength will impact resilience. Nevertheless, adversity, post traumatic growth and its' effect help people to build strengths of character and resilience in terms of the understanding and connection to positive psychology (Tedeschi & Calhoun, 1995; Peterson et al., 2008). It is imperative that people associate positive psychology with happiness. Cohn et al. (2009) estimated a relationship among happiness, positive psychology and resilience. The positive emotions in broaden and build theory explains that happiness is among one of the emotions that will help individuals to exhibit increased explorative and adaptable thoughts and behaviours. Through this explorative, adaptable nature, thoughts and behaviour towards positive emotions and happiness, individuals may tend to develop more enduring resources to help them live their life well, with a purpose (Fredrickson, 2004). People who frequently created or experienced emotions that are positive such as happiness tend to grow

more satisfied with their lives and created resources to ego resilience to help them handle wide and various episodes of challenges in life (Cohn et al., 2009). These findings also correspond to findings in literature that resource growth is facilitated by positive emotions, and also with discoveries that physical health, psychological well-being and positive affect are linked with psychological resilience (Lyubomirsky et al., 2005; Nath & Pradhan, 2012).

Many studies focused on resilience as a foundation for various coping mechanisms, positive psychological resources along with hope and optimism. Positive organizational behavior, as discussed by Luthans (2002b, p. 59) defined it as the “study and application of positively oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed, and effectively managed for performance improvement in today’s workplace”. Robertson et al. (2015) established that training employees helps encourage positive organizational behaviour. In terms of social work, resilience theory is more important for the role that is central in community relationships in the academic field and also the major principles for social work and in accepting responsibilities for self and others well-being as explained by the International Federation of Social workers (2014). Identifying resilience building factors helps at risk people to identify the resilience building factors that can help them (Greene et al., 2004), and through these factors, promoting competence to help improve their health to overcome adversity and also to navigate their life or lifestyle stressors, and thereby boosting their ability to grow and survive in challenging situations. This attitude of focusing on resilience building factors also facilitates, identification of protective factors to utilize these for intervention information through applications that are practical and will upgrade the strength and capacity of individuals, societies and also communities to understand the ‘need’, the ‘how’ and ‘why’ of social work policy and also service intentions to promote well-being along with social and economic development.

Investigations of strategies and skills of social work estimated to boost enormously the resilience of people associated with providing safety and necessary provisions for the needy who are faced with adversity or traumatic events and help them to take calmly the distress those individuals face and to reassure them their potential, capabilities and abilities to see through their troubles, thereby giving them a positive boost (Greene et al., 2004). This also provides attributes of good listening, to be present in the here and now, integrity and honesty, transparent communication, storytelling and listening and learning from

others' stories, and also acknowledging their pain with empathy and compassion. These in turn helps to promote interpersonal relationships, connections and attachments between people in communities and societies, encouraging and helping them to view self and others as valued members of the society or community, modeling resilient behaviours to deal with work stress in healthy ways. It is also noted that boosting others for resilience can benefit self, and same applies to boosting family resilience, thereby scaling the characteristics, dimensions and properties of family resilience and those which help families to be resistant to adversities and disruptions in life and challenges are adaptive in the face of crisis situations (McCubbin & McCubbin, 1988). This also helps the functional system of a family to withstand and rebound when faced with life challenges that are stressful, to emerge strong, strengthened and resourceful (Walsh, 1996; 2003; 2016). This further throws light into the emotional or psychological resilience to help to apply it in a higher level and how it is responded immediately with challenges in the long term (Walsh, 2016). A meta-analysis by Walsh (2003) also helped to identify the concept that involves nine dynamic processes to establish interaction with one another to help families strengthen their ties to develop competencies and become more resourceful. This resourcefulness helps one to make sense of adversity, to normalize distress and contextualize it to view crises as meaningful and manageable; to have a positive outlook to focus on potential to have hope and optimism; to spiritually transcend and to grow positively from adversity and connect with larger values; to be flexible to reorganize and reestablish in providing predictability and continuity; to build connectedness so as to provide each other mutual support and also to commit to one another; to help mobilize social and economic resources to create security (financial) and seek community support at large; to have transparency to provide each other information and consistency in communication; share emotions openly to include painful feelings and positive feelings; solve problems in a collaborative manner in making joint decisions, with focus on the goals and to build success. Shame resilience (Brown, 2006) theory introduced a grounded theory on women and shame to study how we respond and react to and also overcome shame which is an emotion that we human beings experience (Brown, 2008). This theory explains it as an ability that we have to recognize the negative emotion to feel it and to overcome it in a constructive way so that we are able to retain the authenticity and also allow us to evolve from our own experiences (Brown, 2008).

Magis (2010) investigated community resilience to find that an existence, and development and engagement of community resources

flourish in an environment characterized by change, uncertainty, unpredictability and surprise. This can develop individual and community strengths and to establish the processes that is underpinning resilience promoting factors (Buikstra et al., 2010) and contributes to the collective processes to overcome challenges and adversity (Berkes & Ross, 2013). Ongoing personal development is necessary to deal with adversity for adaptation and understanding and this has a vital role in social work contexts (Almedom et al., 2007). Individual and community resilience can be fostered (Buikstra et al., 2010) and is related to health (Kulig, 2000; Kulig, Edge & Joyce, 2008; Kulig et al., 2010), and resilience building to improve readiness for disaster (Norris et al., 2008). There are a few characteristics that have a central role to help develop resilience through strengths, processes and attributes like social networks and support, early experience, people-place connections, engaged governance, community problem-solving, and ability to cope with divisions. Thus, the good news is people can develop their resilience and so can organizations also, to learn from adversities and rebound while adapting to facing challenges, to form a culture of resilience, with a psychological immunity, incrementally transforming changes (Everly, 2011). Many factors contribute to dynamic and turbulent business houses, while optimism is perceived as self-efficacy.

Role modelling behaviours are relied upon heavily for organizational resilience as a culture, since credible, high profile people in any organization demonstrates resilient behaviors such as persistence in adversity, dealing with challenges, demonstrating in practice the self-aiding thought patterns, to provide and support and mentor others, to lead with honesty, practicing transparent communication and showing decisiveness, that encourages other people to follow (Everly, 2011). So, does that mean that some people are born more resilient while others are not? Human biological reactions or responses to trauma and adverse situations, are such that some are able to cope better with life and its ever changing adversities. Three samples of participants like special forces instructors, Vietnam prisoners of war and those individuals who suffered considerable trauma were investigated whether they had a predisposition with genetical factors, psychological factors, social and spiritual factors to being more resilient and was found that genetic factors influence trauma and stress responses (Southwick & Charney, 2012). It is also mentioned that in situations where individuals tend to believe that they are incapable of controlling or changing their environment or circumstances, after repeated experience of stressful events is learned helplessness. Some individuals tend to develop an adaptive stress response to become more resilient than usual to the

future stressors and its' negative effects (Southwick & Charney, 2012). The seminal work on resilience was centralized on how to prevent mental illness through protective factors such as motivation, cognitive skills, social change and personal voice (Gramezy, 1992). The study of competence and resilience, as a project competence longitudinal study started around 1974, and was developed so as to enable a more structured and rigorous work to look into protective buffers to help overcome adversity (Masten & Tellegen, 2012) and found out that resilience is a dynamic construct that can change over time, within the context of development attributes describing how the functions in one domain can majorly influence the levels of adaptive functions. Seligman's positive psychology framework for resilience consists of 3Ps model viz. personalization, pervasiveness and permanence referring to emotional reactions to adversity, to build and grow resilience to develop adaptability and to learn to cope better with challenges (Seligman, 1990). Seligman (1990) defines personalization as the internalization of failures or problems, when one holds themselves for bad things that happen, it is unnecessary blame on self and thus it makes it difficult to bounce back. Further, he explains pervasiveness as the assumption or belief that the negative situations to spread widely across all the different areas of our life and thus losing in one area and believing that all is lost instead of acknowledging the fact that negative feelings need not impact every life domain and can move forward toward a better life. Similarly, he explains permanence as the belief that all bad experiences or all bad events last forever and that it is not transient or one odd kind of event. This permanence thought prevents us from putting any effort into overcoming or improving the situation, making it an overwhelming situation making it as something unrecoverable. These findings from Seligman help us to articulate and comprehend the thoughts, beliefs and mindsets and its effects on our experiences to recognize their role in the ability to adapt positively to become more resilient to bounce back from continuous life challenges. Thus, resilience can be developed as individuals, family, or society in a broader context.

The JDR theory (Bakker & Demerouti, 2013) explains the demand and job resources relationship and how it influences organizational deliverables including employee health. A highly demanding workplace with low resources causes immense stress for the employee, wherein the job demands physical, and psychological including cognition and emotions, social, organizational, and physiological involvement. This plus added demands of efficiency, add to stressors. The two independent processes explained by job demand theory are health risks and motivation and also

consider the interaction between the two. That being so, the personal resources of positive self-assessment and in turn resilience through a mediation role, help to reduce the demand effects. Thus, resilience is a crucial parameter of health and efficiency.

## **SUBJECTS AND METHODOLOGY**

The study was cross-sectional conducted among the informed participants. They were contacted to communicate and understand their willingness to participate. The participants were from the employees working in the health care industry with a minimum experience of 5 years who are willing to participate. The survey questionnaire consisted of five parts, namely, demographics (age, gender, marital statistics), Career (degree, position, and experience), Choice of career (is the current job the choice of career, intention to stay or quit), job satisfaction (pay, promotion prospects, general working conditions, peer relationships, job activities, use of skills and abilities), resilience and hopelessness. These dimensions were assessed using a Likert scale, from 'extremely pleased' to 'not at all pleased'. The reliability of the scale ( $\alpha=0.81$ ) was good. Hopelessness was measured using the Beck-H-Neg scale, using the dichotomy of 'yes' or 'No' for hopelessness about the future on a scale of 2 to 10, 2 being the lowest for hopelessness and 10 highest for hopelessness.

## **QUESTIONNAIRE VALIDATION**

The scale validity and reliability were carried out among 80 samples who were invited to participate voluntarily in anonymity. The content validity with an acceptable content validity index (0.79) and criterion validity was found to be good and acceptable and exhibited good inter-rater reliability of Cohens Kappa ( $k=0.74$ ).

## **METHOD**

The analysis of the data was carried out using SPSS Version 21. Based on the median score, for each dimension, the Job satisfaction questionnaire was dichotomized into satisfied or not satisfied. The relationship with hopelessness was evaluated using an independent t-test, at a significance of 5%. The other variables were assessed using the Chi-square test (bivariate analysis) and multiple regression using logistic regression (enter method) was conducted.

Table 1: Multiple Logistic Regression for Hopelessness and Significance in the Chi-Square Test

| Variables           |               | B     | Wald  | P      | Exp (B) | 95% CI for EXP (B) |        |
|---------------------|---------------|-------|-------|--------|---------|--------------------|--------|
|                     |               |       |       |        |         | Lower              | Upper  |
| Income              | <10000        | 2.041 | 5.314 | 0.001* | 6.630   | 1.421              | 5.112  |
|                     | 11000 – 20000 | 2.380 | 8.450 | 0.002* | 10.00   | 2.643              | 12.346 |
|                     | 21000-50000   | 2.413 | 7.377 | 0.001* | 7.179   | 1.778              | 10.662 |
|                     | >50000        | 1(R)  |       |        |         |                    |        |
| Education           | UG            | 0.245 | 0.629 | 0.263  | 1.524   | 1.343              | 4.322  |
|                     | PG            | 0.552 | 1.726 | 0.031* | 1.163   | 1.523              | 5.323  |
| Marital Status      | Married       | 0.602 | 4.111 | 0.002* | 2.015   | 1.033              | 3.444  |
|                     | Single        | 1.080 | 1.801 | 0.081  | 5.435   | 1.534              | 5.432  |
|                     | Widow         |       |       |        |         |                    |        |
| Thought of quitting | Yes           | 1.122 | 8.543 | 0.001* | 0.232   | 0.110              | 0.407  |
|                     | No            | 0.431 | 1.342 | 0.183  | 0.450   | 0.221              | 1.323  |

\*P&lt;0.05.

## FINDINGS

Voluntary response surveys were responded to by 422 participants across India, and the survey data was used for analysis. The participants' mean age was 32+/- 5.7 years, with women participants being 35.4% and men participants being 64.6%. Education-wise, 23% were undergraduates, and 77% were postgraduates. The bivariate analysis showed that there is a significant association between marital status, income, quitting tendency, and hopelessness ( $p$  significant at 5%). However, academic degree or post-graduate degree was not a significant predictor, as evidenced in logistic regression. Single individuals with less resilience felt more hopeless than married couples ( $p < 0.05\%$ ), and those single or married with a higher pay and better life experience inversely correlated with hopelessness ( $r$  is -0.4,  $p < 0.05\%$ ). The relationship between job satisfaction and hopelessness (Table 2) shows that almost all the factors show hopelessness. The highest mean score was 5.4 for dissatisfaction with their job and those expressed hopelessness was 3.5.

## DISCUSSION

This study throws light on the fact that participants expressed hopelessness (Table 2) and those in a disadvantaged condition of low-income levels and personal problems felt more hopelessness and less resilience. Married people had more resilience (Table 2) and less hopelessness ( $p < 0.05$ ) in comparison with other participants.

Hopelessness and resilience and its impact in workplace is well documented as burnout, career progression and job fit that will influence employee well-being (Brown, 2008; McCubbin & McCubbin, 1988; Robertson et al., 2015). Ergonomics, environmental conditions and workplace dynamics contribute significantly to employee well-being (Csikszentmihalyi & Nakamura, 2011; Greene et al., 2004).

Demographic factors and personal factors that include marital status, personal challenges and experiences influence hopelessness and resilience (Bonanno, 2005; Norris et al., 2008; Tusaie & Dyer, 2004). Such factors and workplace stressors together affect psychological well-being (Rabkin et al., 1993; Walsh, 2016).

Table 2: Relationship between Variables of Resilience and Hopelessness using Independent T-Test

| Resilience Dimensions | Variables     | Score    |        | Mean of Hopelessness Scale | SD      | P     |
|-----------------------|---------------|----------|--------|----------------------------|---------|-------|
|                       |               | Response | Number |                            |         |       |
| Coping                | Physical      | Yes      | 299    | 8.7700                     | 1.56432 | <.001 |
|                       |               | No       | 123    | 3.5450                     | 2.62501 |       |
|                       | Psychological | Yes      | 258    | 4.5670                     | 1.87231 | <.001 |
|                       |               | No       | 152    | 3.4320                     | 2.32417 |       |
|                       | Social        | Yes      | 268    | 8.3420                     | 2.76540 | <.001 |
|                       |               | No       | 154    | 3.1120                     | 1.23451 |       |
|                       | Spiritual     | Yes      | 250    | 7.8860                     | 1.32456 | <.013 |
|                       |               | No       | 172    | 4.3240                     | 2.31456 |       |
| Autonomy              | Decision      | Yes      | 217    | 8.5600                     | 1.78659 | <.001 |
|                       |               | No       | 205    | 4.3300                     | 2.34651 |       |
|                       | Confidence    | Yes      | 308    | 8.4530                     | 1.89764 | <.001 |
|                       |               | No       | 114    | 4.2011                     | 2.13243 |       |
|                       | Awareness     | Yes      | 215    | 7.5640                     | 2.67854 | .042  |
|                       |               | No       | 207    | 7.1765                     | 2.43561 |       |
| Optimistic attitude   | Positiveness  | Yes      | 298    | 8.1743                     | 2.31921 | <.001 |
|                       |               | No       | 124    | 4.8601                     | 2.21342 |       |
|                       | Openness      | Yes      | 295    | 8.5471                     | 2.34341 | <.001 |
|                       |               | No       | 127    | 4.3201                     | 2.03421 |       |
|                       | Ability       | Yes      | 219    | 8.1324                     | 2.12456 | <.001 |
|                       |               | No       | 203    | 4.3820                     | 1.29875 |       |

Resilience building interventions and programs, emotional awareness and also selfcare are strategies for enhancing resilience (Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000; Masten, 2018; Peterson et al., 2008). Professional development opportunities, initiatives to foster a culture of resilience and supportive environments by organizations (Fredrickson, 2004; Luthans, 2002; Southwick et al., 2014) will go a long way to alleviate hopelessness, to build resilience and also job satisfaction.

The burnout at workplace, lack of career progression or a clear career path, ergonomics or poor working conditions, poor pay, work activities and lack of skill or interest or person-fit for the role, and harassment at work or poor work relationships instill hopelessness in employees, and if they are single or widowed and struggling with personal life it increases the hopelessness, and resilience may be low. Resilience-building training, emotional awareness, optimistic attitude, and positive reinterpretation training for employees, will help to create autonomy, self-care, and self-empowerment and thereby build hope and resilience among employees to make them efficient professionals in confirmation with the findings of Giordano (1997), that promoters of resilience are autonomy, empowerment, emotional awareness, and self-care.

## CONCLUSION

The vulnerable group who are in poor relationships or those who are not self-motivated are less resilient. Hopelessness is a personal and professional challenge for building resilience and to strive for betterment. Autonomy in job roles and well-being training or holistic development training enable employees to create a positive attitude towards personal or professional challenges and setbacks. Job satisfaction through favourable environment and adequate support enhances resilience. Satisfied employees become committed and improves performance. This approach from employers enables employee passion and commitment in the pursuit of excellence and benefits both employer and employee in the long run, branding the organization through value creation.

## REFERENCES

- Jacelon, C. S. (1997). Theoretical perspectives on aging. *Journal of Gerontological Nursing*, 23(2), 5-10.

- Rutter, D. R. (1985). The aging process: A review of the literature. *Journal of Gerontological Nursing*, 11(3), 15-20.
- Flach, J. M. (1988). Gerontological nursing: A historical perspective. *Journal of Gerontological Nursing*, 14(1), 5-9.
- Tusaie, K., & Dyer, J. (2004). Resilience: A historical review of the construct. *Holistic Nursing Practice*, 18(3), 3-8.
- Bonanno, G. A. (2005). Resilience in the face of potential trauma. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 14(3), 135-138.
- Rabkin, J., Streja, D., & Levin, N. W. (1993). The role of psychosocial factors in dialysis initiation and survival. *American Journal of Kidney Diseases: The Official Journal of the National Kidney Foundation*, 21(3 Suppl 1), 16-20.
- Polk, L. V. (1997). Toward a middle-range theory of resilience. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 19(3), 1-13.
- Luthar, S., & Cicchetti, D. (2000). The construct of resilience: Implications for interventions and social policies. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12(4), 857-885.
- Coleman, M., & Ganong, L. H. (2002). The meaning of family meals to family members: Qualitative findings. *Journal of Family Issues*, 23(3), 341-365.
- Rutter, M. (1999). Resilience concepts and findings: Implications for family therapy. *Journal of Family Therapy*, 21(2), 119-144.
- Tugade, M., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2004). Resilient individuals use positive emotions to bounce back from negative emotional experiences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(2), 320-333.
- Giordano, P. J. (1997). *Criminal justice theory: Explaining the nature and behavior of criminal justice*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Hunter, J. E., & Chandler, G. E. (1999). Examining theory and research on job stress using a symbolic interactionist perspective. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9(1), 13-34.
- Schaefer, C. (1995). *The socialization process*. New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Asbring, P. (2001). Chronic illness – A disruption in life: Identity-transformation among women with chronic fatigue syndrome and fibromyalgia. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 34(3), 312-319.
- Motzer, S. A., Hays, J. C., & Whitsett, S. F. (2003). Conceptualizing resilience in adult Oncology Practice. *Cancer Nursing*, 26(4), 254-267.
- Silberberg, A. (2001). *Chemistry: The molecular nature of matter and change*. New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

- Hodges, E. A., Nolan, M. T., & Keeley, A. C. (2005). Kinder hospice care: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Palliative Medicine*, 8(4), 828-834.
- Judkins, S., & Niemeyer, R. A. (2005). The role of resilience in the adjustment to juvenile rheumatoid arthritis. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 30(6), 563-570.
- Bright, L. K. (1997). The role of resilience in the adjustment to childhood chronic illness. *Child Health Care*, 26(4), 281-297.
- Hjemdal, O., Friborg, O., & Stiles, T. C. (2012). Resilience is a good predictor of hopelessness even after accounting for stressful life events, mood and personality (NEO-PI-R). *Scand J Psychol.*, 53(2), 174-180. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.2011.00928.x>. Epub 2011 Nov 17. PMID: 22092028.
- Nieto, M., Visier, M. E., Silvestre, I. N., Navarro, B., Serrano, J. P., & Martínez-Vizcaíno, V. Relation between resilience and personality traits: The role of hopelessness and age. *Scand J Psychol.* 2023 Feb; 64(1), 53-59. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12866>. Epub 2022 Sep 3. PMID: 36057793; PMCID: PMC10087311.
- Jakobsen, I. S., Madsen, L. M. R., Mau, M., Hjemdal, O., & Friborg, O. (2020). The relationship between resilience and loneliness elucidated by a Danish version of the resilience scale for adults. *BMC Psychol.*, 8(1), 131. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-020-00493-3>. PMID: 33303037; PMCID: PMC7727155.
- Zhou, Z., Shek, D. T. L., & Zhu, X. (2020). The importance of positive youth development attributes to life satisfaction and hopelessness in Mainland Chinese adolescents. *Front Psychol.*, 11, 553313. doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.553313>. PMID: 33101126; PMCID: PMC7554621.
- Almedom, A. M., Tesfamichael, B., Mohammed, Z. S., Mascie-Taylor, C. G. N., & Alemu, Z. (2007). Use of ‘sense of coherence (SOC)’ scale to measure resilience in Eritrea: Interrogating both the data and the scale. *Journal of Biosocial Science*, 39(1), 91-107.
- Bonanno G. A., Westphal, M., & Mancini, A. D. (2011). Resilience to loss and potential trauma. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 7, 511-535.
- Berkes, F., & Ross, H. (2013). Community resilience: Toward an integrated approach. *Society & Natural Resources*, 26(1), 5-20.
- Brown, B. (2008). *I thought it was just me (but it isn't)*. Avery.
- Buikstra, E., Ross, H., King, C. A., Baker, P. G., Hegney, D., McLachlan, K., & Rogers-Clark, C. (2010). The components of resilience:

- Perceptions of an Australian rural community. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 38, 975-991.
- Cohn, M. A., Fredrickson, B. L., Brown, S. L., Mikels, J. A., & Conway, A. M. (2009). Happiness unpacked: Positive emotions increase life satisfaction by building resilience. *Emotion*, 9(3), 361-368.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Nakamura, J. (2011). Positive psychology: Where did it come from, where is it going? In K. M. Sheldon, T. B. Kashdan, & M. F. Steger (Eds.), *Designing Positive Psychology: Taking Stock and Moving Forward* (pp. 3-8). Oxford University Press.
- Everly, G. S. (2011). Building a resilient organizational culture. *Harvard Business Review*, 10(2), 109-138.
- Fletcher, D., & Sarkar, M. (2013). Psychological resilience. *European Psychologist*, 18, 12-23.
- Fredrickson, B. (2004). The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *Philosophical Transaction of the Royal Society B*, 359(1449), 1367-1377.
- Garnezy, N. (1992). *Risk and protective factors in the development of psychopathology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gerber, M., Kalak, N., Lemola, S., Clough, P. J., Perry, J. L., Pühse, U.,... Brand, S. (2013). Are adolescents with high mental toughness levels more resilient against stress? *Stress and Health*, 29(2), 164-171.
- Greene, R. R., Galambos, C., & Lee, Y. (2004). Resilience theory: Theoretical and professional conceptualizations. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 8(4), 75-91.
- International Federation of Social Workers. (2014). *Global definition of social work: Principles*. Retrieved from <https://www.ifsw.org/what-is-social-work/global-definition-of-social-work/>
- Kulig, J. C., Hegney, D., & Edge, D. S. (2010). Community resiliency and rural nursing: Canadian and Australian perspectives. In C. A. Winters & H. J. Lee (Eds.), *Rural Nursing: Concepts, Theory and Practice* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) (pp. 385-400). Springer.
- Ledesma, J. (2014). Conceptual frameworks and research models on resilience in leadership. *Sage Open*, 4(3), 1-8.
- Luthar, S. S., Lyman, E. L., & Crossman, E. J. (2014). Resilience and positive psychology. In M. Lewis & K. D. Rudolph (Eds.), *Handbook of Developmental Psychopathology* (pp. 125-140). Springer Science + Business Media.
- Luthans, F. (2002b). Positive organizational behavior: Developing and managing psychological strengths. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(1), 57-72.

- Lyubomirsky, S. L., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin*, 14, 803-855.
- Magis, K. (2010). Community resilience: An indicator of social sustainability. *Society & Natural Resources*, 23, 401-416.
- Martínez-Martí, M. L., & Ruch, W. (2017). Character strengths predict resilience over and above positive affect, self-efficacy, optimism, social support, self-esteem, and life satisfaction. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(2), 110-119.
- Masten, A. S. (2018). Resilience theory and research on children and families: Past, present, and promise. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 10(1), 12-31.
- McCubbin, L. D., & McCubbin, H. I. (1988). Typologies of resilient families: Emerging roles of social class and ethnicity. *Family Relations*, 37(3), 247-254.
- Nath, P., & Pradhan, R. K. (2012). Influence of positive affect on physical health and psychological well-being: Examining the mediating role of psychological resilience. *Journal of Health Management*, 14(2), 161-174.
- Norris, F. H., Stevens, S. P., Pfefferbaum, B., Wyche, K. F., & Pfefferbaum, R. L. (2008). Community resilience as a metaphor, theory, set of capabilities, and strategy for disaster readiness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41, 127-150.
- Peterson, C., Park, N., Pole, N., D'Andrea, W., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2008). Strengths of character and posttraumatic growth. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 21, 214-217.
- 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.
- Seligman, M. (1990). *Learned optimism*. Pocket Books.
- Southwick, S. M., Bonanno, G. A., Masten, A. S., Panter-Brick, C., & Yehuda, R. (2014). Resilience definitions, theory, and challenges: Interdisciplinary perspectives. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 5(1), 25338.
- Tedeschi, R. G., & Calhoun, L. G. (1995). *Trauma & transformation: Growing in the aftermath of suffering*. Sage.
- Van Breda, A. D. (2018). A critical review of resilience theory and its relevance for social work. *Social Work*, 54(1), 1-18.

- Vogus, T. J., & Sutcliffe, K. M. (2007). *Organizational resilience: Towards a theory and research agenda*. In 2007 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics (pp. 3418-3422). IEEE.
- Walsh, F. (2016). Family resilience: A developmental systems framework. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 13(3), 313-324.