



Applicability of Character Strengths at Work and Flourishing in Employees

Tahira Mubashar^{1,2*}, Quratul Ain¹, and Soulat Khan^{1,3}

¹Institute of Applied Psychology, University of the Punjab, Pakistan

²Institute of Psychology, Technical University of Darmstadt, Darmstadt, Germany

³Department of Psychology, Foundation University, Islamabad, Pakistan

*Corresponding author: mubashar.tahira@gmail.com

Abstract

Personal fulfillment is one of the fundamental criteria of character strengths which can be rooted back in the emergence of Values in Action Classification of Character Strengths. Recently, extensive research demonstrated the promising role of character strengths in well-being. Therefore, this research aimed to examine the role of applicability of character strengths in the flourishing of employees in the work domain specifically by examining the association between them as well as by analyzing the predictive role of applicability of character strengths in flourishing. Another aim of the research was to see the gender differences in the applicability of character strengths and flourishing. The sample consisted of 151 employees (77 men, 74 women) who had at least one year of work experience. Pearson product moment correlation was conducted to see the association between situational circumstances of character strengths and flourishing. The analysis indicated that 23 character strengths correlated with flourishing (an exception was found for humor). Regression analyses yielded that eight character strengths (i.e., curiosity, love of learning, perspective, perseverance, social intelligence, teamwork, prudence, and spirituality) emerged as significant predictors of the flourishing of employees. Lastly, independent samples t-test analysis showed that gender differences existed such as the applicability of 17 character strengths was higher in men as compared to women at work. The limitations, suggestions for future research, and implications are discussed.

Keywords: Character strengths, applicability, flourishing, situational circumstances

Introduction

The Values in Action (VIA) Classification of Character strengths being the major contribution of positive psychology has appealed variety of practitioners and researchers internationally. Character strengths in the classification are defined as positive traits that manifest in human thoughts, feelings, and behaviors and provide a sense of fulfillment (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). These are both relatively stable and malleable in individuals. The focus of the main of the classification was on the possession and endorsement of character strengths. Afterward, another group of researchers focused on the applicability of character strengths which are situational circumstances. The applicability of a given character strength may be defined as the “degree to which situational circumstances allow an individual to display strengths-relevant behavior” (Harzer & Ruch, 2013, p. 967). It is argued by Ten Berge and De Raad (1999) that conventional circumstances like the workplace may or may not motivate individuals to display behavior as per their trait pattern which contributes to different life domains (Wanger et al., 2021) including work-life such as flourishing (Harzer, 2020). Therefore, this research aimed to explore the role of applicability of character strengths in the flourishing of employees in Pakistani culture.

The 24 Character strengths have been arranged under six rationally derived categories (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Table 1 presents an overview of clusters of strengths and the relevant character strengths in each cluster.

Table 1

Clusters of Strengths and 24 Character Strengths included in the VIA Classification (Peterson & Seligman, 2004)

Clusters of Strengths	Character strengths
Strengths of wisdom and knowledge	creativity, curiosity, judgment, love of learning, and perspective
Strengths of courage	bravery, perseverance, honesty, and zest
Strengths of humanity	capacity to love and be loved, kindness, and social intelligence
Strengths of justice	teamwork, fairness, and leadership
Strengths of temperance	forgiveness, modesty, prudence, and self-regulation
strengths of transcendence	appreciation of beauty and excellence, gratitude, hope, humor, and spirituality

Note. The character strengths are grouped content-wise on a theoretical basis. Labels of character strengths and expressions in brackets emphasize family resemblance to acknowledge the heterogeneity of strengths and to minimize subtle (political or otherwise) connotations (Peterson & Seligman, 2004).

Possession of character strengths is important but there is use is important as well (Littman-Ovadia & Steger, 2010). Possession of a trait may become helpful in one situation but not in another situation depending upon the situation (i.e., workplace). Situational circumstances for character strengths (i.e., at work) include external and internal factors. The former is related to only of environment independent of the individual while the latter is related to the personal preferences and perception of the external factors (cf. Harzer & Ruch, 2013). One external factor

Applicability of Character Strengths at Work and Flourishing in Employees

in the applicability of character strengths includes the demand of the situation for character strength to display it, known as normative beliefs by which a participant perceives that certain character strength is demanded at work as per the norms of the work. The second external factor appropriateness and suitability of behavior within a given situation (at work) is the behavioral beliefs by which a participant perceives that a certain character strength is helpful at work (to manage job tasks). The internal factors are the perceived presence of personal elements which may inhibit or facilitate a behavior (e.g., time pressure) and the intrinsic motivation of an individual to display that behavior. Perceptions about the presence of personal factors are the control beliefs of the individual that he has the confidence to perform a certain character strength-relevant behavior and has control to perform in specific settings. Lastly, the intrinsic motivation factor goes beyond the perception part where the actual behavior is performed as the behavioral expression in a situation indicates the individual's motivation to perform it (Ten Berge & De Raad 1999).

In general, character strengths have been rigorously explored at work (e.g., Harzer & Ruch, 2013, 2014; Harzer et al., 2017) considering well-being (e.g., Littman-Ovadia & Lavy, 2012; Hausler et al., 2017; Huber et al., 2021; Kretschmar et al., 2022; Wang & Wang, 2016). Flourishing is of special interest in the present study. Deci and Ryan (2000) introduced flourishing as a new form of wellbeing in addition to subjective wellbeing, considering effective functioning and universal human needs. As per Ryan and Deci (2000), human beings had several psychological needs which are universal, for instance, the need for self-acceptance, relatedness, and competence. Considering this notion, Diener et al., (2010) defined flourishing as psychological well-being that assesses a desirability of the states of meaning and purpose of life, supportive and rewarding relationship with others, engagement and interest in the work, contribution toward the wellbeing of others, self-acceptance, competency, optimism, and being respected by others. According to Seligman (2002), the way people deploy their character strengths is strongly associated with how they will achieve wellbeing. People do not just pursue the lessening of misery or reduction of sorrow and concern, instead, they long for meaning and purpose in their lives (Lee Duckworth et. al, 2005).

Literature supported the association of the 24 character strengths with several measures of well-being (e.g., Proyer et al., 2011, 2013; Buschor et al., 2013; Martinez-Marti & Ruch, 2014; Wagner et al., 2020). The research showed that different character strengths contribute differently to various facets of well-being across different settings. The studies which assessed the role of applicability of character strengths in well-being mainly focused on the applicability of character strengths at work particularly the top four character strengths (Hausler et al., 2017; Höge et al., 2020; Huber et al., 2020; Strecker et al., 2020). Therefore, this study purposefully focused on the role of applicability of all 24 character strengths at work in the flourishing of employees.

Rationale

This research presents the applicability of character strengths in the specific work context of Pakistan contributing to the international literature which is mainly conducted in Western countries. The study aimed at examining the role of applicability of 24 character strengths at work and the flourishing of employees. Internationally, a large amount of research gives attention to the role of character strengths in well-being. However, the evidence particularly existed for the possession of character strengths but only a handful of studies considered the important role of situational circumstance (the perceived and behavioral aspect of character strengths). For example, one individual may have leadership, perseverance, creativity, kindness, fairness, modesty, and love of learning as their top character strengths. However, it is not necessary that all of these can be applied similarly in work settings or private life. The applicability of the character strengths depends upon the perception of the individual related to normative belief, behavioral belief, and control/confidence about the appropriate behavior. Moreover, it also includes the motivation to perform the specific behavior. Therefore, the focus of this research is on the applicability of character strengths and their role in the flourishing of employees. The greater interest was to see the predictive role of applicability of different clusters of character strengths at work in the flourishing of employees.

H1: There is likely to be a relationship between the applicability of character strengths at work and the flourishing of employees.

H2: Character strengths' applicability at work is likely to predict employees' flourishing.

Another aim of this research was to see the gender differences in the applicability of character strengths at work due to the prominent role of gender in character strengths (e.g., Anjum & Amjad, 2020; Linley et al., 2007; Littman-Ovadia, 2015; Redfern et al., 2014; Shiami et al., 2006; Singh & Choubisa, 2009). However, gender differences were explored and found mainly for possession of character strengths with few exceptions (Biswas-Diener, 2006; Harzer & Ruch, 2013). Therefore, the present research also aimed to fill this gap.

H3: Gender differences are likely to exist in the applicability of character strengths at work and flourishing.

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 151 employees (77 men, 74 women) from service and marketing distribution companies. Only those participants were considered who had at least one year of work experience and completed their matriculation. The mean age of the participants was 28.86 years (SD age = 6.86, range = 24 to 45 years). Most of the participants were educated as 60% indicated having a master's degree, 35 % had Bachelor's degree, and the remaining 5 % completed their intermediate. Most of the employees reported work conditions as pleasant ($n =$

Applicability of Character Strengths at Work and Flourishing in Employees

66) and neutral ($n = 84$) while only one of them reported them as unpleasant. Most of the employees reported that they feel good at work (42%) or neutral (48%).

Instruments

The *Applicability of Character Strengths Rating Scales (ACS-RS)*: Harzer & Ruch, 2013) is a 96-item measure that is used to assess the occurrence of 24 character strengths at work. For each of the character strengths, the defining short paragraphs describing character strengths-relevant behavior were provided (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Participants have to rate each of the four items for character strengths on a five-point Likert scale (1 = *never* to 5 = [*almost*] *always*). These four items measure (i) normative beliefs: demand of the strength, (ii) behavioral belief: perceived helpfulness of strength, (iii) confidence/control beliefs: perceived importance for the individual, and (iv) behavioral display: occurrence of strength in the daily working context. Scores are computed for each character strength based on these four ratings. Cronbach alphas of ACS-RS ranged from $\alpha = .71$ (zest) to $\alpha = .90$ (love and spirituality) with a median of .80 which indicated good internal consistencies (Harzer & Ruch, 2013).

The *Flourishing Scale* (Diener et al, 2010) is an 8-item measure used to measure flourishing in employees. The participants rated each item on a 7-point Likert scale (1= *strongly disagree* to 7 *strongly agree*). Scale scores are computed for the overall flourishing scale considering all items. A high score represents a person with many psychological resources. The reliability of the scale was good in the research ($\alpha = 0.79$).

Procedure

At the initial stage of research, sample adequacy was assessed using G power software which estimated a total sample of 134 for point bi-serial correlation. Then permission was sorted for data collection. After getting permission from the authorities, the data was collected from the workplace setting. Before the application of the questionnaire, the necessary information was provided to the participants about filling out the questionnaire. After acquiring consent from the participants, demographic information was obtained through a demographic form. Then the participants were requested to fill out measures of character strength and flourishing. Each participant was required to fill all scales. After that, scales were taken back from the participants and they were warmly thanked for their participation. Participants were also assured that all of their data will be kept confidential.

Results

Preliminary analyses were performed before the examination of the main research questions. To examine internal consistencies and descriptive information of study variables, reliability, and descriptive analyses were conducted. Furthermore, to check the assumption of normal distribution, skewness and kurtosis were computed. It was assumed that the applicability of 24 character strengths correlates positively with flourishing at work. Therefore, Pearson product moment correlation was also computed to examine the relations of applicability of 24 character

strengths at work and flourishing. Table 1 provides an overview of descriptive statistics, reliability, normality, and correlations.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics, Reliability, Normality, and Correlation of Applicability of Character Strengths at Work and Flourishing

Scales	Descriptive and Reliability					Normality		Correlation
	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α	Skewness	Kurtosis	Flourishing
Strengths of Wisdom and Knowledge								
Creativity	8.00	20.00	14.78	3.21	.80	-0.34	-0.77	.40***
Curiosity	9.00	20.00	15.17	3.06	.75	-0.24	-1.04	.48***
Judgment	5.00	20.00	14.63	3.70	.86	-0.39	-0.82	.47***
Love of Learning	9.00	20.00	15.69	2.87	.69	-0.45	-0.36	.49***
Perspective	4.00	20.00	15.09	3.53	.84	-0.67	0.35	.54***
Strengths of Courage								
Bravery	4.00	20.00	13.91	3.49	.82	-0.30	-0.17	.37***
Perseverance	8.00	20.00	15.23	3.04	.74	-0.25	-0.68	.49***
Honesty	7.00	20.00	15.83	3.54	.85	-0.64	-0.54	.47***
Zest	7.00	20.00	15.33	3.75	.88	-0.51	-0.78	.41***
Strengths of Humanity								
Love	4.00	20.00	14.07	4.00	.84	-0.26	-0.93	.34***
Kindness	4.00	20.00	14.75	3.75	.82	-0.54	-0.34	.42***
Social Intelligence	7.00	20.00	14.72	3.31	.80	-0.40	-0.46	.52***
Strengths of Justice								
Teamwork	7.00	20.00	15.04	3.22	.77	-0.43	-0.49	.42***
Fairness	7.00	20.00	15.52	3.33	.80	-0.56	-0.60	.40***

Applicability of Character Strengths at Work and Flourishing in Employees

Leadership	7.00	20.00	15.36	3.28	.80	-0.49	-0.49	.38***
Strengths of Temperance								
Forgiveness	8.00	20.00	14.75	3.34	.82	-0.24	-0.80	.31***
Modesty	6.00	20.00	14.70	3.18	.79	-0.48	-0.20	.42***
Prudence	7.00	20.00	15.08	3.35	.80	-0.54	-0.25	.47***
Self-regulation	4.00	20.00	14.32	3.64	.82	-0.49	0.02	.22**
Theological Strengths								
Appreciation	4.00	20.00	13.92	3.56	.81	-0.44	-0.34	.24**
Gratitude	8.00	20.00	15.87	3.15	.82	-0.81	0.17	.34***
Hope	4.00	20.00	15.32	3.48	.84	-0.57	-0.17	.35***
Humor	4.00	20.00	12.30	4.49	.87	-0.38	-0.82	.04
Spirituality	7.00	20.00	14.84	3.80	.85	-0.16	-1.14	.54***
Flourishing	15.00	56.00	44.84	7.47	.91	-1.51	2.04	-

Note: N = 151 employees (74 women, 77 men). Love = Capacity to love and be loved, Appreciation = Appreciation of beauty and excellence. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.

Table 1 shows that all scales demonstrated satisfactory variability in response. All of the scales showed good ($\alpha = .69$ for love of learning) to excellent reliability ($\alpha = .91$ for flourishing). Specifically, the reliabilities of the subscales of ACS-RS have a median of .82. The analyses regarding normality of data indicated that skewness and kurtosis values fell within the acceptable range (i.e., ± 2 ; Gravetter & Wallnau, 2014). Pearson product moment correlation of applicability of character strengths with flourishing showed that applicability of 23 character strengths related positively with flourishing at work. The only exempted character strength was humor. The range of the significant association was $r = .22$ (self-regulation) to $r = .54$ (perspective and spirituality) with a median of .42.

Linear regression analyses using the enter method were performed to examine the predictors of flourishing at work among applicability of 24 character strengths. Six sets of regression analyses were performed for pre-existing clusters of character strengths. For instance, for the first set of linear regression, character strengths of wisdom and knowledge (which included creativity, curiosity, judgment, love of learning, and perspective) were entered as

predictors of flourishing. Table 2 presents the linear regression analyses for all of the six clusters of character strengths.

Table 2: Predictors of Flourishing at Work

Predictor Variables	Adjusted R ²	F (4, 146)	β	S.E.	95 % CI	
					LL	UL
Strengths of Wisdom and Knowledge	0.37	18.66***				
Creativity			-0.02	0.21	-0.46	0.35
Curiosity			0.24**	0.21	0.16	1.00
Judgment			0.05	0.19	-0.27	0.47
Love of Learning			0.19*	0.23	0.04	0.96
Perspective			0.31***	0.20	0.31	1.09
Strengths of Courage	0.27	14.80***				
Bravery			0.16	0.19	-0.02	0.72
Perseverance			0.28**	0.25	0.20	1.19
Honesty			0.22	0.24	-0.004	0.93
Zest			-0.03	0.23	-0.51	0.39
Strengths of Humanity	0.27	19.21***				
Love			-0.02	0.18	-0.39	0.32
Kindness			0.17	0.20	-0.06	0.72
Social Intelligence			0.42***	0.22	0.52	1.39
Strengths of Justice	0.20	13.18***				
Teamwork			0.26**	0.22	0.16	1.03
Fairness			0.14	0.26	-0.18	0.83

Applicability of Character Strengths at Work and Flourishing in Employees

Leadership			0.13	0.25	-0.19	0.78
Strengths of Temperance	0.22	11.48***				
Forgiveness			-0.03	0.22	-0.50	0.37
Modesty			0.20	0.24	-0.01	0.96
Prudence			0.36***	0.24	0.31	1.27
Self-regulation			-0.01	0.17	-0.35	0.32
Theological Strengths	0.28	12.48***				
Appreciation			0.01	.01	-0.04	0.39
Gratitude			-0.04	-0.04	-0.58	0.39
Hope			0.13	0.13	-0.16	0.73
Humor			0.02	0.12	-0.21	0.26
Spirituality			0.49***	0.17	0.63	1.30

Note. Love=Capacity to love and be loved. Appreciation = Appreciation of beauty and excellence. $N = 151$ employees (74 women, 77 men). * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 2 shows that regression analyses explained 20 % (strengths of justice) to 37 % (wisdom and knowledge) variances. This indicated that 20 % to 37% of data fit the regression model. All of the regression models were significant [$F(4, 146) = 11.48^{***}$ (strengths of temperance) - $F(4, 146) = 19.21^{***}$ (strengths of humanity)] which indicated that the regression models better fits to the data. Applicability of eight character strengths at work (curiosity, love of learning, perspective, perseverance, social intelligence, teamwork, prudence, and spirituality) predicted flourishing. Specifically, the strengths of wisdom and knowledge contributed more to flourishing as three of them (curiosity, love of learning, and perspective) emerged as the predictors.

Independent samples t-test was performed to see the gender differences in applicability of character strengths at work and flourishing. Table 3 provides an overview of the results of the independent samples t-test.

Table 3: Independent Sample t-test for Gender Difference in Applicability of Character Strengths and Flourishing

Variables	Men (n = 77)		Women (n =74)		<i>t</i> (149)	<i>p</i>	95 % CI		Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	
Strengths of Wisdom and Knowledge									
Creativity	15.01	3.17	14.54	3.25	0.90	.37	-0.56	1.50	0.15
Curiosity	15.60	2.88	14.72	3.25	1.78	.08	-0.10	1.86	0.29
Judgment	15.21	3.57	14.03	3.76	1.98	.05	0.00	2.36	0.32
Love of Learning	16.21	2.88	15.15	2.77	2.30	.02	0.15	1.97	0.38
Perspective	15.62	3.64	14.54	2.96	2.01	.05	0.02	2.15	0.33
Strengths of Courage									
Bravery	14.23	3.79	13.57	3.14	1.17	.24	-0.46	1.79	0.19
Perseverance	15.81	3.04	14.64	2.96	2.40	.02	0.21	2.13	0.39
Honesty	16.68	3.34	14.95	3.55	3.08	.00	0.62	2.84	0.50
Zest	15.97	3.84	14.66	3.56	2.18	.03	0.12	2.50	0.35
Strengths of Humanity									
Love	14.86	4.14	13.24	3.70	2.53	.01	0.35	2.88	0.41
Kindness	15.73	3.64	13.74	3.60	3.36	.00	0.82	3.15	0.55
Social Intelligence	15.45	3.13	13.95	3.34	2.86	.01	0.47	2.55	0.46
Strengths of Justice									
Teamwork	15.69	3.21	14.36	3.12	2.57	.01	0.31	2.34	0.42
Fairness	16.08	3.13	14.93	3.44	2.14	.03	0.09	2.20	0.35

Applicability of Character Strengths at Work and Flourishing in Employees

Leadership	16.00	3.20	14.70	3.26	2.47	.02	0.26	2.34	0.40
Strengths of Temperance									
Forgiveness	15.32	3.33	14.15	3.27	2.19	.03	0.12	2.24	0.35
Modesty	15.00	3.15	14.38	3.20	1.20	.23	-0.40	1.64	0.20
Prudence	15.71	3.55	14.42	3.01	2.42	.02	0.24	2.35	0.39
Self-regulation	14.53	3.97	14.11	3.27	0.72	.48	-0.75	1.60	0.11
Theological Strengths									
Appreciation	14.40	3.75	13.42	3.31	1.71	.09	-0.16	2.12	0.28
Gratitude	16.43	3.07	15.30	3.14	2.24	.03	0.13	2.13	0.36
Hope	15.86	3.66	14.77	3.22	1.94	.05 4	-0.02	2.19	0.32
Humor	11.88	4.99	12.74	3.89	-1.18	.24	-2.30	0.58	0.19
Spirituality	15.61	3.77	14.04	3.67	2.59	.01	0.37	2.77	0.42
Flourishing	45.35	8.02	44.31	6.57	0.85	.40	-1.37	3.45	0.14

Table 3 shows that on average women reported applicability of all 24 character strengths at work and flourishing lower than the men. However, the differences were negligible at some points. Independent samples t-test showed that gender differences existed for 17 character strengths. The differences were mainly found for all character strengths for two clusters of character strengths (strengths of humanity and strengths of justice). More specifically, mean differences indicated that men applied character strengths significantly higher than women. Cohen's d indicated that the effect size for the significant differences was medium (0.32 - 0.55).

Discussion

The current study aims to investigate the relationship between character strength and flourishing as well as to investigate the prediction of flourishing by these character strengths. In addition, this was conducted to see the role of gender in the applicability of character strengths at work. This study as a whole added to the international literature by focusing on the applicability of character strengths in general and concerning gender roles in the specific cultural context of the Pakistani workplace. Overall the findings supported the hypotheses and are consistent with

the existing status of literature with respect to possession and applicability of character strengths. The findings were in line with the theoretical perspective presented by Niemiec (2020) that character strengths perform six functions in thriving.

The first hypothesis was about the relationship of the applicability of 24 character strengths at work with flourishing. The findings indicated that all character strengths (except humor) are positively associated with flourishing. The previous literature was consistent with the findings of the current research. Character strengths are associated with life fulfillment (Park et al., 2004), and the flourishing of positive qualities together at the individual and the group level (Engel et al., 2011). Seligman's (2002) model of happiness proposes an essential association between character strength and happiness, in addition to particularly proposing that the behavioral demonstration or the expression of strengths is connected to happiness. Castro Solano and Cosentino (2016) investigated strengths of character as important elements for life accomplishment and found a high agreement of participants (60 to 70%) that each of the character strengths contributed to all the areas of a fulfilling life (i.e., achieving life goals, working well with others, accomplishing personal well-being, contributing to a better country uplifting personal associations). Contribution of character strengths in various facets of well-being has been found in the literature (e.g., Hausler et al., 2017; Wang & Wang, 2016).

Association of Applicability of character strength of perspective and spirituality at work with flourishing was greater than .50 which indicated that these strengths are more meaningful for employees. In other words, situational circumstance (i.e., work setting) in Pakistan allows the employees to perceive these two character strengths as more demanded, and helpful and one may, perceiving the need to perform these behaviors, perform these two character strengths at work. On contrary, the non-significant association of character strength of humor with flourishing indicated the reverse for humor. Humor by definition aims to support the social fabric of society and flourishing is more related to the personal aspect.

The second hypothesis of the study is that the applicability of character strengths at work is likely to predict flourishing in the employees. Results of regression analysis showed eight character strengths (curiosity, love of learning, perspective, perseverance, social intelligence, teamwork, prudence, and spirituality) emerged as significant positive predictors of flourishing. Character strengths, as well as strengths-related behavior both, showed substantial correlations with flourishing in different life domains. For instance, Gillham et al. (2011) studied character strengths to predict future well-being. The future well-being was measured in terms of depression and life satisfaction. The sample consisted of 149 adolescent high school students. Results showed that kindness and teamwork predicted fewer symptoms of depression while love predicted greater life satisfaction. Harzer and Ruch (2013) found that applicability of strengths of wisdom and knowledge, character strength of leadership, and prudence were more at work than in private life. Similar to their findings, the prominent role of strengths of wisdom and knowledge, and prudence has been found in the present research on work life. A few differences

might emerge as a result of the measurement of applicability of character strengths, sample differences, and cultural differences. Another justification is that no Pakistani literature exists to support the current findings.

Lastly, gender differences were investigated which showed that men's applicability of seventeen character strengths at work was higher than women. The differences were mainly found for all character strengths from two clusters (strengths of humanity and strengths of justice). These findings were inconsistent with a meta-analysis (Heintz et al., 2019) which considered the possession of character strengths for gender differences. However, present research focused on the gender difference in the applicability of character strengths at work. Harzer and Ruch (2013) who examined the role of gender in the applicability of character strengths based on the data collected from German-speaking countries have reported findings consistent with the meta-analysis (Heintz et al., 2019). The reason for the difference in the present research might be the patriarchal culture of Pakistan and male-dominated workplaces where working women still face a lot of difficulties in terms of multiple roles, low wages, and glass-ceiling (Shoaib et al., 2010).

In a nutshell, the findings indicated that situational circumstances have an important contribution to the Pakistani work context. For instance, the data was taken from the employees of service and marketing distribution companies that need to grow rapidly in this era of the global marketplace. This justified the importance of external factors (normative beliefs and appropriateness of certain behavior) such as the marketing employee needs to be curious and having loved to learn new information by taking others' perspectives. On the other hand, service companies need their employee to know about their customers' feelings and perform teamwork to meet customers' needs by making careful choices. The internal factors associated with the applicability of character strengths also help the marketing and service employees to constantly move and behave in a certain way as discussed above. Moreover, the gender differences highlighted the prominent role of men in the marketing and service sectors.

Limitations and Suggestions

The correlational nature of this study prevents the researchers from making any causal inferences. A longitudinal or experimental study should be conducted to better infer the causality among applicability of character strengths and flourishing variables. This would help in signifying the true predictor of the outcome variables. Other variables such as work-related well-being, subjective well-being, and general well-being, which are crucial for a satisfactory relationship can be studied in organizational culture along with these variables. Future research can be done on how character strengths can be built and applied in fields other than work settings. Another limitation of this research was the measurement of applicability of character strengths only. Even though the literature guided that possession of character strength to a certain level is mandatory to apply it further (i.e., signature strengths use). However, due to the lengthy measurements, it was not done. Therefore, future research can be done by measuring both

possession of character strengths as well as the applicability of character strengths. Lastly, the scale which was used to measure flourishing was not specific to the work settings. In the future, specific measures can be used.

Implications of the Study

The present study provides initial evidence from the indigenous context as well as is a good addition to the international literature highlighting character strengths and their applicability that leads towards human flourishing. The prominent role of situational circumstances based on perception and the behavioral component can be helpful for both the employees and organizations. The employees can identify which character strengths are more applicable at work to perform job tasks and improve their performance. Moreover, they have an opportunity to identify their top possessed strengths and may find the jobs most suitable accordingly. Moreover, the organizations can plan workshops to identify the top possessed and applicable strengths and ultimately can design specific intervention programs to reap more benefits. In addition, the findings can be helpful for organizational psychologists to analyze mismatches of possession and applicability of character strengths with job requirements. The results will guide organizational psychologists to facilitate work productivity as a result of a better person-job fit.

References

- Anjum, A., & Amjad, N. (2020). Values in Action Inventory of Strengths (VIA-IS): Translation and validation in Urdu Language. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 35(1), 163-189. <https://doi.org/doi:10.33824/PJPR.2020.35.1.10>
- Biswas-Diener, R. (2006). From the equator to the North Pole: A study of character strengths. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 7, 293-310. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-005-3646-8>
- Buschor, C., Proyer, R. T., and Ruch, W. (2013). Self- and peer-rated character strengths: how do they relate to satisfaction with life and orientations to happiness? *Journal of Positive Psychology*, 8(2), 116–127. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2012.758305>
- Castro Solano, A., & Cosentino, A. C. (2016). The relationships between character strengths and life fulfillment in the view of lay-people in Argentina. *Interdisciplinaria*, 33(1), 65-80.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The " what" and" why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
- Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D., Oishi, S., & Biswas-Diener, R. (2010). New measures of well-being: Flourishing and positive and negative feelings. *Social Indicators Research*, 39, 247-266.
- Engel, R. H., Westman, M., & Heller, D. (2011). Character strengths, employee well-being, and performance: A field experiment. *The Henry Crown Institute of Bussiness Research in Israel*, 8.
- Gillham, J., Adams-Deutsch, Z., Werner, J., Reivich, K., Coulter-Heindl, V., Linkins, M., ... & Seligman, M. E. (2011). Character strengths predict subjective well-being during adolescence. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 6(1), 31-44.

Applicability of Character Strengths at Work and Flourishing in Employees

- Gravetter, F., & Wallnau, L. (2014). *Essentials of statistics for the behavioral sciences*. (8th ed.). Wadsworth.
- Harzer, C. (2020). Fostering character strengths to promote thriving and flourishing in organizations. *OrganisationsberatSuperv Coach*, 27, 37–50.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11613-020-00636-w>
- Harzer, C., & Ruch, W. (2013). The application of signature character strengths and positive experiences at work. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 14(3), 965-983.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-012-9364-0>
- Harzer, C., & Ruch, W. (2014). The role of character strengths for task performance, job dedication, interpersonal facilitation, and organizational support. *Human Performance*, 27(3), 183-205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2014.913592>
- Harzer, C., Mubashar, T., & Dubreuil, P. (2017). Character strengths and strength-related person-job fit as predictors of work-related wellbeing, job performance, and workplace deviance. *Wirtschafts psychologie*, 3, 23-38.
- Hausler, M., Strecker, C., Huber, A., Brenner, M., Hoge, T. & Hofer, S. (2017). Associations between the application of signature character strengths, health and well-being of health professionals. *Frontiers in psychology*, 8, 1307. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01307>
- Heintz, S., Kramm, C., & Ruch, W. (2019). A meta-analysis of gender differences in character strengths and age, nation, and measure as moderators. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 14(1), 103-112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2017.1414297>
- Hoge, T., Strecker, C., Hausler, M., Huber, A., & Hofer, S. (2020). Perceived socio-moral climate and the applicability of signature character strengths at work: a study among hospital physicians. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 15(2), 463-484.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-018-9697-x>
- Huber, A., Bair, A., Strecker, C., Höge, T., & Höfer, S. (2021). Do more of what makes you happy? The applicability of signature character strengths and future physicians' well-being and health over time. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 534983.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.534983>
- Huber, A., Strecker, C., Hausler, M., Kachel, T., Höge, T., & Hofer, S. (2020). Possession and applicability of signature character strengths: What is essential for well-being, work engagement, and Burnout?. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 15(2), 415-436.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-018-9699-8>
- Kretschmar, A., Harzer, C., & Ruch, W. (2022). Character strengths in adults and adolescents: Their measurement and association with well-being. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2022.2043879>
- Lee Duckworth, A., Steen, T. A., & Seligman, M. E. (2005). Positive psychology in clinical practice. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 1, 629-651.
- Linley, P. A., Maltby, J., Wood, A. M., Joseph, S., Harrington, S., Peterson, C., ... & Seligman, M. P. E. (2007). Character strengths in the United Kingdom: The VIA inventory of

- strengths. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43(2), 341-351.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.12.004>
- Littman-Ovadia, H. (2015). Brief report: short form of the VIA inventory of strengths–construction and initial tests of reliability and validity. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education*, 2(4), 229-237.
- Littman-Ovadia, H., & Lavy, S. (2012). Differential ratings and associations with well-being of character strengths in two communities. *Health Sociology Review*, 21(3), 299-312.
<https://doi.org/10.5172/hesr.2012.21.3.299>
- Littman-Ovadia, H., & Steger, M. F. (2010). Character strengths and well-being among volunteers and employees: Toward an integrative model. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 5, 419-430. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2010.516765>
- Martínez-Martí, M. L., & Ruch, W. (2014). Character strengths and well-being across the life span: data from a representative sample of German-speaking adults living in Switzerland. *Frontier Psychology*, 5, 1253. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01253>
- Niemiec, R. M. (2020). Six functions of character strengths for thriving at times of adversity and opportunity: A theoretical perspective. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 15(2), 551-572. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-018-9692-2>
- Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. (2004). Strengths of character and well-being. *Journal of social and Clinical Psychology*, 23(5), 603-619.
<https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.23.5.603.50748>
- Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press.
- Proyer, R. T., Gander, F., Wellenzohn, S., and Ruch, W. (2013). What good are character strengths beyond subjective well-being? The contribution of the good character on self-reported health-oriented behavior, physical fitness, and the subjective health status. *Journal of Positive Psychology* 8(3), 222–232.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2013.777767>
- Proyer, R. T., Gander, F., Wyss, T., and Ruch, W. (2011). The relation of character strengths to past, present, and future life satisfaction among German-speaking women. *Applied Psychology Health Well Being*, 3(3), 370–384. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1758-0854.2011.01060.x>
- Redfern, K. A., Simpson, A., & Ran, Z. (2014). Character strengths in employees in the people's republic of China: Analysis the factor structure of the VIA inventory of strengths. ANZAM 2014. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Stream-11-Organisational-Behaviour-Competitive-Only-Redfern/3207fe895268d2cc54ef0127f939e5898a31a0a2>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68–78

Applicability of Character Strengths at Work and Flourishing in Employees

- Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). Positive psychology, positive prevention and positive therapy. In C. R. Snyder, & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (pp. 3-7). Oxford University Press.
- Shimai, S., Otake, K., Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2006). Convergence of character strengths in American and Japanese young adults. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 7(3), 311-322. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-005-3647-7>
- Shoaib, S., Khan, R. S., & Khan, S. A. (2010). The glass ceiling effect: A Pakistani perspective. *Business Review*, 5(1), 79-90. <https://doi.org/10.54784/1990-6587.1258>
- Singh, K., & Choubisa, R. (2009). Psychometric properties of Hindi translated version of values in action inventory of strengths (VIA-IS). *Journal of Indian Health Psychology*, 4(1), 65-76.
- Strecker, C., Huber, A., Hoge, T., Hausler, M., & Hofer, S. (2020). Identifying thriving workplaces in hospitals: Work characteristics and the applicability of character strengths at work. *Applied Research in Quality of Life*, 15(2), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-018-9693-1>
- Ten Berge, M. A., & De Raad, B. (1999). Taxonomies of situations from a trait psychological perspective: A review. *European Journal of Personality*, 13(5), 337-360. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0984\(199909/10\)13:5<337::AID-PER363>3.0.CO;2-F](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0984(199909/10)13:5<337::AID-PER363>3.0.CO;2-F)
- Wang, J., & Wang, Y. (2016). The impact of character strengths on employee well-being: The mediating effect of work-family relationship. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology, International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic, Business and Industrial Engineering*, 10(5), 1600-1608.
- Wagner, L., Pindeus, L., & Ruch, W. (2021). Character strengths in the life domains of work, education, leisure, and relationships and their associations with flourishing. *Frontiers in psychology*, 12, 597534. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.597534>
- Wagner, L., Gander, F., Proyer, R. T., & Ruch, W. (2020). Character strengths and PERMA: investigating the relationships of character strengths with a multidimensional framework of well-Being. *Appl. Res. Qual. Life* 15, 307–328. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11482-018-9695-z>