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Abstract

This study examines the influence of career satisfaction on employee resilience within the context of Lagos State Government workers, aiming to fill the gap in empirical evidence regarding this relationship in the Nigerian population. Utilizing a cross-sectional design, the research surveyed 200 participants using the Greenhaus and Hordlife scales to measure career satisfaction and employee resilience, respectively. Data analysis involved descriptive statistics and frequency distributions. Findings indicated there are no significant gender differences in resilience levels; however, employees aged 46 and above reported higher resilience compared to younger age groups. Additionally, a positive correlation was found between career satisfaction and resilience, suggesting that higher career satisfaction enhances employee resilience. The study contributes to understanding the impact of career satisfaction on resilience among Nigerian workers and highlights the importance of considering these factors in policy-making.
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Introduction

In recent decades, there has been an increasing interest in the domains of psychology and management studies in the overall concept of individual resilience when it is connected to human behavior (Ollier-Malaterre, 2010; Robertson & Cooper, 2011; Shin et al., 2012). Since the conception of the notion, larger study domains have begun to devote increasing attention to resilience (Ollier-Malaterre, 2010; Robertson & Cooper, 2011). The concept of resilience has recently received heightened interest from researchers in the behavioral and medical disciplines (Winwood et al., 2013; Britt et al., 2016; King, 2016). Clinical and developmental psychologists have done substantial prior work on the topic of resilience (Herrman et al., 2011; Luthar et al., 2020; Robertson et al., 2015. Since there is a vast body of research that varies between fields across time, resilience has not been conceptualized consistently. Numerous operational definitions of resilience have resulted from this (Rossi et al., 2013).

Traditionally, the idea of resilience has been seen as something that exists only inside an individual, with the proponents of this view arguing that the term encompasses a wide range of foundational traits that helps a person better adjust to adversity (Connor and Davidson, 2003). Wagnild and Young (1990) defined resilient individuals as those who show fortitude and flexibility in the face of adversity and who can bounce back from setbacks and go on with their lives despite having experienced traumatic events.
Rutter (1987) characterized a resilient person as someone who values themselves, has faith in their ability to solve problems, and has a positive outlook on life, describing resilience as a protective feature that keeps individuals from developing psychotic disease. Newman (Newman, 2005) defined resilience as the capacity to bounce back from adversity and maintain a positive outlook in the face of adversity, both short-term and long-term, and its long-term lasting effects. Southwick and Charney (2012) defined resilience as "the process of adjusting successfully amid adversity, trauma, disaster, and even large sources of harm." However, each of these studies defined resilience as the person's relative vulnerability to the environment's unfavorable consequences. From this point of view, resilience is a human trait that is defined by a fixed and consistent ability to thrive despite hardships and environmental pressures (Windle, 2011).

Resilience is now more often seen as a skill that people can learn, as opposed to the dispositional approach that formerly predominated. According to this viewpoint, developing resilience is a constantly evolving activity that people may do by deliberately interacting with their environment (Luthans, 2002; Rutter, 2012). There is disagreement among those who view resilience as a process as to whether it resides in people as a constant and constant condition (Ungar, 2011). This is incredibly significant because it implies that rather than being a feature that is inherited from one’s parents, resilience is an adaptive individual phenomenon that can be cultivated in employees via the utilization of suitable training (Winwood et al., 2013). Supporting this view, Luthar et al. (2000) described resilience as a "dynamic process comprising adaptive capacity in the face of considerable hardship."

Researchers who regard resilience as a process take into account that a person's capabilities and talents differ depending on the setting. Individuals may have demonstrated good reactions to hardship at one point in their lives, but this does not guarantee that they will do so in the future (Davydoy et al., 2010). Individual resilience is defined as a process in which people successfully adjust to hardship in a variety of contexts, including their present one. The dynamic approach often states that the individual exhibits various levels of resilience in various settings. According to the dynamic approach, environmental interactions can help people build and mobilize their resilience (Luthans, 2002; Moenkemeyer et al., 2012).

One key determinant of subjective professional success is career happiness, which is determined by each person’s unique assessment of their work (Abele & Spurk, 2009; Boudreau et al., 2001). Success in one's job is measured by how well one does in a variety of areas, such as financial stability, personal growth, and professional advancement (Hofmans et al, 2008). Career happiness is frequently measured as a form of personal career success that is determined by the individual's contentment with their professional achievements (Judge et al., 1995). To a large extent, an employee's level of job satisfaction may be predicted by the availability of social and material resources that help them achieve their individual goals inside their workplace (Barnett & Bradley, 2007). There has been a significant amount of research conducted on the topic of career satisfaction, making it one of the most substantially explored topics in the field of industrial and organizational psychology (Judge & Bono, 2001). The inferred role of career happiness has been supported by a number of work motivation theories. According to a widely accepted idea in the literature, contact with one's workplace might influence one's emotional state to some level. People define themselves in terms of their line of work, such as a teacher, doctor, or attorney. Consequently, a key component of the study is how well someone is doing personally at work (Judge & Klinger, 2007).

The most widely accepted theory of job satisfaction was proposed by Locke (Locke, 1976), who described job satisfaction as "a happy or pleasant psychological response coming from the evaluation of one's job or job experiences." There are behavioral, cognitive, and emotional aspects to career or work happiness (Bernstein & Nash, 2008). The emotional component pertains to sentiments associated with the job, including boredom, worry, appreciation, and enthusiasm. Regarding ideas about one's job, including whether it is respectable, cognitively taxing, hard, and fulfilling, we refer to the cognitive component of job satisfaction. The final part of conduct is how individuals act in connection to their employment, such as showing up late, staying late, or making up an ailment to skip work.
The factors affecting employees’ job or career satisfaction are intrinsic and extrinsic, personal attributes, and work environment (Lane, 2016). Extrinsic job satisfaction characteristics include elements that are independent of an individual's sentiments about their employment. Although they do not directly cause employee contentment, their absence may result in unsatisfied workers. In contrast, intrinsic job satisfaction aspects include things like responsibility and recognition that help to create sentiments inside of workers that might serve as an incentive. These might serve as motivating factors if they exist. Employees are not always unhappy, though, when these items are absent (Herzberg, 1966; Herzberg et al., 1959).

Limited research has been carried out on the link between career satisfaction and employee resilience globally. However, employee resilience has been linked to positive organizational outcomes such as commitment, job satisfaction, and job performance. Badran and Yousef-Morgan (2015) conducted a study on the significance of psychological capital (PsyCap), which is comprised of the positive psychological resources of hope, efficacy, resilience, and optimism. The idea of PsyCap was formulated and evaluated in connection to job satisfaction in a sample of 451 Egyptian workers working in 11 businesses representing some of Egypt's most important industries in terms of GDP, employment, and world economic integration. According to the results of their research, hope, effectiveness, resiliency, and optimism are all positively associated with the level of job satisfaction experienced by Egyptian workers, both individually and when integrated into a single multidimensional construct called PsyCap. White (2014) explored how direct care professionals' resilience impacts their sense of job fulfillment while caring for clients who have suffered traumatic brain injuries. The relationship between overall job satisfaction and resilience was looked at using a person's product-moment correlation. The result showed that there is a small negative correlation between overall job satisfaction and resilience, but it is not statistically significant and just happened by chance. Regression research demonstrates that resilience is not an effective predictor of work satisfaction. This is due to the statistical lack of significance of the regression model.

Kaspárková et al. (2018) examined the role of job satisfaction and work engagement in explaining the difference between resilient and non-resilient workers among 360 workers in helping professions in the Czech Republic. The findings indicate that work performance in the caring professions is affected by individuals' levels of resilience. Additionally, resilience was linked to two significant positive aspects of well-being at work, namely workplace engagement and job satisfaction. It has been discovered that more resilient individuals are happier and more involved in their jobs than their less resilient peers. Mohammadi and Khedmatian (2017) conducted a study to determine the relationship between resilience and job satisfaction in 276 employees of supporting institutions in Hormozgan province. The result showed a positive relationship between resilience and job satisfaction in employees of supporting institutions in Hormozgan province. The study's results showed that people who are happier with their jobs tend to be more resilient.

The degree to which people are satisfied with their career choices and experiences within their occupations, as well as with the specific positions they have held, is measured retrospectively (Greenhaus et al., 1990). The idea of "employee resilience" has been put forward in order to concentrate the empirical investigation of individual resilience in organizational settings on the context of "work-specific" resilient behaviors. This concept makes the important claim that organizational assistance in the form of "organizational enablers" may help to promote employee resilience. Employee resiliency is said to influence important performance factors, such as favorable employee attitudes and actions (Mulliner, 2018). Employee resilience may also be considered as a safeguarding element for workers' responses to transformation at work. According to the study, resilient workers are better at adapting to essential restructuring and recovering from interruptions at work than non-resilient workers in terms of their overall welfare at work (Shin et al., 2012).

Consequently, the concept of employee resilience represents a cognitive construct that is distinct from but connected to other constructs that characterize the ability to flourish in the face of or despite adversity. This idea of employee resilience focuses on how people "grow" from their experiences. This is
different from other modern ideas of individual resilience, which say that resilience is the ability to keep a stable balance or quickly return to it in the face of problems (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013).

Few Nigerian studies have examined the relationships between these variables. Some reported a positive association between resilience and job satisfaction, whereas others reported no significant relationship between them. Alola and Alola (Alola & Alola, 2018) researched to examine the impact of workplace rudeness on hotel staff. The research looked at the connections between workplace rudeness, organizational results, resilience, job happiness, and the desire to leave. According to the research, there is no apparent link between resilience and job happiness, nor between workplace rudeness and job satisfaction. Another Nigerian study was carried out on the relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, a similar psychological construct to employee resilience. They (Tella et al., 2007) carried out a study on the relationship between work motivation, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of the 200 library personnel. The results of the study suggest that job satisfaction had a significant positive relationship with work motivation but a negative relationship with organizational commitment.

Career satisfaction and employee resilience have seldom been studied side by side, and in other literature having studies on career satisfaction, scholars aimed to investigate factors affecting career satisfaction, including income norms and other factors that might be affected by actual job satisfaction. In the prevalent literature, however, the term "job satisfaction" tends to surface more often; this study intends to study how career satisfaction is related to employee resilience.

Methods and Materials

Setting, Design, and Period of Study

The research was carried out in Lagos State, Nigeria. The copies of the questionnaire were administered to participants who were Lagos state government workers working in Ikeja, Lagos. The questionnaire was shared across three offices, which includes: The Ministry of Science and Technology, the Civil Service Commission, and the Ministry of Housing, Lagos State Secretariat, Alausa-Ikeja. The research design employed for this study is non-experimental, specifically a correlational research design. This is because the study involves identifying the relationship between variables that are not actively manipulated. The study is restricted in terms of location, however, to Lagos, Nigeria. The study is also restricted to the 200 surveys conducted.

Study Population and Sampling Technique

The study population included participants who worked at the state capital’s secretariat of Lagos, Nigeria. Since the study focused on the working class population, the age range of participants recruited for the study was between 18 years and above.

The sample size used for the study was calculated using the sample size formula developed by Cochran (1963).

\[ n_0 = \frac{Z^2 pq}{e^2} \]  

(1)

Where \( n_0 \) is the sample size,

\( Z^2 \) is the abscissa of the normal curve that cuts off an area \( \alpha \) at the tails (1 - \( \alpha \) equals the desired confidence level, e.g., 95%) = (1.96)^2
p is the variability of the population (homogeneous or heterogeneous population) = 0.2 was used since the population is homogeneous (all participants were selected from the Lagos State Civil Service Commission).

\[ q = 1\text{-variability} = 0.8 \]  

(2)

e is the desired level of precision, sometimes called sampling error, it is the range in which the true value of the population is estimated to be \( \approx 57\% = (0.057) \)

The value for \( Z \) is found in statistical tables which contain the area under the normal curve.

\[ n_0 = (1.96)^2 \frac{(0.2)(0.8)}{(0.057)^2} \]  

(3)

\[ n_0 = 189 \text{ (calculated sample size)} \]

Although the sample size was found to be 189, the total number of questionnaires administered was 200. This was done to account for invalid and unreturned questionnaires. Only 196 of the 200 distributed copies of questionnaire were returned, yielding a 98 percent response rate. Participants were selected using non-probability sampling techniques, specifically a quota sampling technique. The study employed a quota sampling method because the researchers wanted to ensure equal representation of male and female participants in the study without any randomization. Hence, for this study, the basis of the quota was gender.

**Instruments and Tools**

Responses from all consented participants were obtained using a paper-and-pencil questionnaire that contained different sections. Section A of the questionnaire elicited information on the socio-demographic background of the respondents. Section B focused on the topic of research. It consists of two clusters. Cluster One (question 1–5) measures career satisfaction, while cluster two (question 6–18) measures employee resilience. The standardized psychological scales contained in the questionnaire include the Career Satisfaction Scale (CSS) developed by Greenhaus et al., (1990). The second scale is the Employee Resilience Scale (ERS) by Hodliffe (2014).

**Data Analysis and Procedure**

The research commenced by identifying the independent and dependent variables in the study and obtaining the standardized psychological instruments (CSS and ERS scales) that adequately measure these variables. These tools, together with other demographic inquiries were combined to create a questionnaire with several components. The individual was then contacted to get their permission to take part in the survey study. After receiving permission, a friendly connection was built with the participants to help them feel at ease before the questionnaire was administered. Instructions on how to complete each portion of the questionnaire were given to participants, and they were reassured that the information they supplied would be kept private. The overall testing environment was good, and the protocol was followed consistently. The questionnaires were given to participants, who had 20 minutes to complete them before their answers were evaluated and analyzed. Out of 200 questionnaires that were administered, 196 were considered valid, resulting in a response rate of about 98%.

The collected data was analyzed using SPSS Statistics 22 (SPSS Inc.). Descriptive statistics such as frequency and mean were used in describing the participants. Relationships between sleep, career satisfaction, and employee resilience were measured using product-moment correlations. Gender and age differences in employee resilience were tested with independent t-test and one-way ANOVA statistics, respectively.
Ethical Considerations
Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Lagos State University’s institutional review board. All participants were informed about the purpose of the study and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. Consent was obtained before participation.

Results
The results present the key findings from the study, focusing on the demographic characteristics of the participants, their reported levels of career satisfaction and employee resilience, and the outcomes of hypothesis testing. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Pearson's product-moment correlation, independent t-tests, and one-way ANOVA as appropriate.

Demographic Variables of Participants
The results presented in Table 1 shows the demographic representation of participants in the study. A near-even distribution of genders (53% male and 47% female) was observed in the study area. Age distribution showed a higher concentration of participants in the 26-35 year (37%) and 36-45 year (32%) ranges, with fewer in the 18-25 year (15%) and 46 years and above (16%) categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (age)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-above</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive Statistics of Variables of Interest
The results in Table 2 revealed the impact of gender on career satisfaction and resilience. The study found nuanced differences. Males reported a slightly higher level of career satisfaction (Mean = 15.54, SD = 6.06) than females (Mean = 13.26, SD = 6.11). However, when it comes to resilience, females exhibited marginally higher scores (Mean = 59.68, SD = 7.07) compared to males (Mean = 58.60, SD = 7.91). This suggests that while career satisfaction might be slightly higher among males, females tend to demonstrate a slightly greater degree of resilience.

Table 2. Distribution of Career Satisfaction and Resilience by Sex of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Satisfaction</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>58.60</td>
<td>7.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 3, the results of the distribution of career satisfaction and resilience by age in categories reveals that employees aged 46 years and above reported the highest levels of both career satisfaction (Mean = 20.45, SD = 3.66) and resilience (Mean = 61.77, SD = 5.54). Conversely, the youngest group of employees, those aged 18-25 years, scored the lowest on both dimensions, with career satisfaction at a mean of 9.97 (SD = 5.71) and resilience at 53.7 (SD = 9.78). This upward trend in both career satisfaction and resilience with age suggests that these attributes may be enhanced through accumulated work experiences and life skills.
Table 3. Distribution of Career Satisfaction and Resilience by Age Categories of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>18-25 years</th>
<th>26-35 years</th>
<th>36-45 years</th>
<th>46 years-above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career satisfaction</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypotheses testing

**Hypothesis 1**: There will be a significant positive relationship between employee resilience and career satisfaction.

The result supported a significant positive correlation between career satisfaction and employee resilience \( r = 0.264, p < .05 \), indicating that higher career satisfaction is associated with greater resilience among employees.

Table 4. Correlation Analysis Between Career Satisfaction and Employee Resilience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Career Satisfaction</th>
<th>Employee Resilience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Satisfaction</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.264**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Resilience</td>
<td>59.11</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **P < 0.05

**Hypothesis 2**: Female employees will be more resilient than male employees.

Contrary to expectations, the study found no significant difference in resilience scores between male and female employees \( t -value = -1.01, p = .314 \), suggesting that resilience does not vary significantly by gender in this sample.

Table 5. Independent Statistics Analysis of Resilience Between Male and Female Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58.60</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59.68</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 3**: Employees within the age range of 18-21 will be more resilient than employees in other age categories of 45 and above.

The study conducted a detailed examination of how resilience varies among employees across different age brackets. Significant differences in resilience were observed across different age groups \( F(3, 192) = 7.31, p < .001 \) as presented in Table 6a. Table 6b originally presented the findings of a post-hoc analysis following a one-way ANOVA, identifying significant differences in resilience scores across age groups.

From the Table, employees aged 18-25 years reported significantly lower resilience \( \text{Mean Difference} = -5.92, p < .005 \) compared to those in the 26-35 years category, suggesting a notable increase in resilience as employees move from early to late twenties. Similarly, the 18-25 age group exhibited lower resilience \( \text{Mean Difference} = -5.99, p < .005 \) when compared to the 36-45 age group, further indicating that resilience tends to grow with age and experience. The most significant difference was observed between the youngest (18-25 years) and the oldest age groups (46 years and above), with the latter demonstrating markedly higher resilience \( \text{Mean Difference} = -8.04, p < .001 \). This highlights a potential accumulation of resilience-enhancing factors over one's career span. When comparing the 26-35 age group with those aged 46 and above, the difference in resilience was not statistically significant \( p = .597 \), suggesting that the most substantial growth in resilience may occur earlier in one's career. Similarly, no significant difference in resilience was found between the 36-45 and 46 and above age groups \( p = .642 \), indicating a plateau in resilience growth as employees approach mid-career.
Thus, it could be pointed out that the post-hoc comparisons indicated that employees aged 46 years and above exhibited significantly higher resilience than those aged 18-25 years (p < .001), but no significant differences were found when compared with the 26-35 and 36-45 age groups.

Table 6a. One-Way ANOVA Analysis of Resilience Across Different Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>53.73</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>59.66</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>59.73</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-abov e</td>
<td>61.77</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6b. Post-Hoc Analysis of Resilience Across Different Age Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) age</th>
<th>(J) age</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>-5.92*</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>-5.99*</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>46-above</td>
<td>-8.04*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>5.92*</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>46-above</td>
<td>-2.12</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>5.99*</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>46-above</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-above</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>8.04*</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-above</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-above</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *P < 0.05

Discussion

This study investigated the influence of career satisfaction on employee resilience among Lagos State Government workers, providing insights into how these variables interact and the implications for organizational practices and employees’ well-being. The findings revealed a significant positive correlation between career satisfaction and employee resilience, supporting the hypothesis that higher career satisfaction is associated with greater resilience among employees. This aligns with the work of Badran and Youssef-Morgan (2015), who found that psychological capital, including resilience, is positively correlated with job satisfaction among Egyptian workers. Similarly, Mohammadi and Khedmatian (2016) observed a positive relationship between resilience and job satisfaction in supporting institutions in Iran, reinforcing the notion that satisfaction in one’s career contributes to an individual's resilience. These findings collectively suggest that interventions aimed at enhancing career satisfaction could be a viable pathway to bolstering resilience among employees.

Contrary to expectations, our study did not find significant differences in resilience between male and female employees. This outcome contrasts with some literature suggesting gender-based differences in resilience (Smith and Hollinger-Smith, 2015), but it is consistent with the findings of White (2016), who also reported no significant gender difference in resilience among care professionals. The discrepancy between studies highlights the complex nature of resilience as a construct and suggests that factors beyond gender, such as work environment, role expectations, and social support, may play more critical roles in determining resilience levels.

The study revealed that employees aged 46 years and above demonstrated higher resilience compared to their younger counterparts, particularly those aged 18-25 years. This finding is consistent with the notion that resilience may increase with age and life experiences, as suggested by Wagnild and Young (1993). It also parallels the findings of Kaspářková et al. (2017), who found that resilience contributed significantly
to job satisfaction and work engagement among older employees in caring professions. This age-related increase in resilience could be attributed to the accumulation of coping mechanisms and life experiences that enhance one's ability to bounce back from adversity.

The findings have several implications for organizational policy and practice. Firstly, the positive association between career satisfaction and resilience underscores the importance of creating work environments that foster job satisfaction and career development opportunities. Organizational leaders and HR professionals should consider implementing programs and policies that support career progression, work-life balance, and employee recognition to enhance career satisfaction.

Secondly, the absence of significant gender differences in resilience suggests that resilience-building interventions should be inclusive and tailored to the needs of all employees, regardless of gender. Finally, the observed age-related differences in resilience highlights the value of leveraging the experiences of older employees as mentors or resilience champions within the organization.

Conclusion, Implications, and Recommendations

This study explored the relationship between career satisfaction and employee resilience among Lagos State Government workers, aiming to understand the dynamics influencing employee well-being and organizational performance. The findings indicate a significant positive correlation between career satisfaction and resilience, suggesting that higher levels of satisfaction derived from one's career contribute to enhanced resilience. Contrary to initial expectations, no significant gender differences in resilience were identified, pointing towards the universality of resilience across genders within the professional context examined. Furthermore, the study uncovered age-related variations in resilience, with older employees demonstrating higher resilience levels than their younger counterparts.

These results contribute to the literature on organizational behaviour and psychology by emphasizing the importance of career satisfaction in fostering an adaptable and resilient workforce. They also challenge common assumptions regarding gender differences in resilience, offering a more nuanced understanding of the factors that contribute to resilience in the workplace. Thus, organizations should implement strategies aimed at increasing career satisfaction among employees. This could involve creating clear career pathways, offering professional development opportunities, and recognizing and rewarding achievements. Develop and introduce resilience-building programs that are inclusive and address the needs of all employees, irrespective of gender. These programs could include training on stress management, emotional intelligence, and adaptive coping strategies. Organizations might benefit from programs that facilitate mentorship and knowledge transfer from more experienced (and typically older) employees to younger employees. This could help in enhancing the resilience of the younger workforce by leveraging the life experiences and coping strategies of their older counterparts. Encourage the adoption of policies that promote a healthy work-life balance, which is crucial for career satisfaction and, by extension, resilience. Such policies could include flexible working arrangements and support for employees' mental health. Lastly, support initiatives that foster continuous learning and professional development across all career stages, recognizing that career satisfaction and resilience can be enhanced through ongoing skill development and personal growth.
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