

STRENGTHS OF CHARACTER AND WORK

Christopher Peterson
University of Michigan

John Paul Stephens
University of Michigan

Nansook Park
University of Rhode Island

Fiona Lee
University of Michigan

Martin E. P. Seligman
University of Pennsylvania

(final draft: January, 2008)

running head: Character and Work

key words: character strengths, work, person-job fit, work satisfaction

prepared for P. A. Linley, S. Harrington, & N. Page (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology and work*. New York: Oxford University Press. (Forthcoming October, 2009)

correspondence

Christopher Peterson
Department of Psychology
University of Michigan
530 Church Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1043 USA
chrisset@umich.edu

STRENGTHS OF CHARACTER AND WORK

What is the best job for a person? Given the centrality of the work that one does to life and the multiple needs—economic, psychological, and social—potentially satisfied by work, organizational psychologists have long sought answers to this question (Brief & Nord, 1990). One sustained line of inquiry has focused on the fit between the individual and his or her work (Dawis, 1992). What has become clear is that fit is complex (Edwards, 1991; Kristof, 1996).

Fit has been examined vis-à-vis the interests, motives, talents, values, goals, and general personality traits of the worker. Person-work fit has been conceptualized with respect to the person and the job, the supervisor, the group, and the organization. Furthermore, fit has been assessed in terms of its contribution to job satisfaction, coworker satisfaction, organizational commitment, retention, and performance. A meta-analysis of 172 studies of person-work fit provided broad support for its benefits across types of fit and diverse outcomes (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, & Johnson, 2005). Effect sizes ranged from small to moderate. Separate “main effects” of person characteristics and work characteristics were also evident for most outcomes.

The emerging field of positive psychology provides its own perspective on fit (Peterson & Park, 2006). Borrowing from Aristotle’s (2000) notion of eudaimonia, Seligman (2002) proposed that a fulfilling life results from identifying one’s signature strengths of character and using them as much as possible on a regular basis. One important setting for the use of strengths is of course the workplace, where many adults spend so much of their time. For example, someone who is kind presumably is more satisfied with and more successful at work that entails individual service to others. Someone who is creative presumably flourishes at a job that requires new solutions to problems. Someone who is curious presumably does well with work that is complex and varied.

Positive psychology's emphasis on the fit between character strengths and the affordances of work echoes the management consulting philosophy of the Gallup Organization, which holds that workers should discover what they do best (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001; Clifton & Harter, 2003; Rath, 2007). Jobs should then be chosen or assigned based on a worker's strengths, as Norwich Union, the largest insurance company in the United Kingdom, has started to do (Stefanyszyn, 2007). Or existing jobs should be recrafted to capitalize on the strengths of workers already in them (Wrzesniewski & Dutton, 2001).

The VIA Classification

For the past few years, we have been involved in a project describing important strengths of character and ways to measure them. Our research program is sometimes identified as the Values in Action (VIA) Project, after the nonprofit organization—the VIA Institute—that sponsored the initial work. The VIA Classification includes two dozen strengths of character on which our research has focused (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Various VIA measures comprise a family of assessment devices that measure individual differences in the strengths that are included in the classification.

The VIA project approaches good character as a family of characteristics, each of which exists in degrees, with some people having more, and some people having less of any given character strength. The philosophy field of virtue ethics provided a useful way to think through the meaning of good character. Here is a representative definition of a virtue (Yearley, 1990, p. 13):

... a disposition to act, desire, and feel that involves the exercise of judgment and leads to a recognizable human excellence or instance of human flourishing. Moreover, virtuous activity involves choosing virtue for itself and in light of some justifiable life plan.

This definition of a virtue sounds very much like the meaning of a trait as used in personality psychology today and is consistent with the idea that character is personality evaluated (Allport, 1937; Baumrind, 1998). In other words, character strengths are the subset of personality traits on which moral value is placed. Introversion and extraversion, for example, are traits with no obvious moral weight. Kindness and teamwork in contrast are morally valued, which is why they are considered character strengths.

To systematize character strengths, the VIA project relied on a literature review by Katherine Dahlsgaard, who read the texts of the world's influential religious and philosophical traditions (e.g., the books of *Exodus* and *Proverbs* in the case of Judaism, the *Analects* in the case of Confucianism, and so on), exhaustively listed the virtues discussed in each, and then identified a core set of virtues acknowledged as important in all (Dahlsgaard, Peterson, & Seligman, 2005):

- wisdom and knowledge – cognitive strengths entailing the acquisition and use of knowledge
- courage – emotional strengths involving the exercise of will to accomplish goals in the face of opposition, external or internal;
- humanity – interpersonal strengths that involve “tending and befriending” others;
- justice – civic strengths underlying healthy community life;
- temperance – strengths protecting against excess;
- transcendence – strengths that forge connections to the larger universe and provide meaning.

This list is limited to literate traditions, but it is notable that field work by Biswas-Diener (2006) verified that these virtues were also acknowledged and cultivated among the nonliterate Maasai

and Inughuit. So, Dahlsgaard's core virtues appear to provide an overall scheme for classifying more specific character strengths.

The next step in the VIA project was specifying criteria for saying that a candidate strength belonged in the classification. These criteria were abstracted from our consideration of specific character strengths mentioned in what we call virtue catalogues: lists of morally-valued traits by philosophers, theologians, psychologists, psychiatrists, and educators. What properties did they tend to have?

- ubiquity – the strength is widely recognized and celebrated across cultures;
- fulfilling - the strength contributes to individual fulfillment, satisfaction, and happiness broadly construed;
- morally valued - the strength is valued in its own right and not as a means to an end;
- does not diminish others - the strength elevates others who witness it, producing admiration, not jealousy;
- nonfelicitous opposite - the strength has obvious antonyms that are "negative;"
- traitlike - the strength is an individual difference with demonstrable generality and stability;
- measurable - the strength has been successfully measured by researchers as an individual difference;
- distinctiveness - the strength is not redundant (conceptually or empirically) with other character strengths;
- paragons - the strength is strikingly embodied in some individuals;
- prodigies - the strength is precociously shown by some children or youth;
- selective absence - the strength is missing altogether in some individuals;

- institutions - the strength is the deliberate target of societal practices and rituals that try to cultivate it.

Not all of the VIA character strengths meet all criteria, but in each case, the great majority of the criteria are satisfied (Park & Peterson, 2006b). The VIA Classification includes 24 positive traits organized under the six broad virtues already described: (a) wisdom and knowledge (creativity, curiosity, open-mindedness, love of learning, perspective); (b) courage (bravery, honesty, perseverance, zest); (c) humanity (kindness, love, social intelligence); (d) justice (fairness, leadership, teamwork); (e) temperance (forgiveness, modesty, prudence, self-regulation); and (f) transcendence (appreciation of beauty, gratitude, hope, humor, spirituality). This classification provides a starting point for the systematic and comparative investigation of character.

We also created ways of measuring these 24 VIA strengths, including self-report questionnaires (Park & Peterson, 2006b; Peterson, Park, & Seligman, 2005). Our measures of the VIA strengths allow the study of character in multidimensional terms. Past research on good character has focused on one component of character at a time, leaving unanswered questions about the underlying structure of character within an individual. Some individuals may be creative and honest but are neither brave nor kind, or vice versa (Park, 2004). Furthermore, measuring a full range of positive traits may reduce concerns about socially desirable responding by allowing most research participants to say something good about themselves.

Although we are open to the possibility that some people may altogether lack the strengths in our classification, the data show that virtually everyone has some notable strengths of character. We have taken to calling these signature strengths, special cases of what Allport (1961) once identified as personal traits. Signature strengths are positive traits that a person

owns, celebrates, and frequently exercises. In interviews with adults, we find that everyone can readily identify a handful of strengths as very much their own, typically between three and seven (as Allport proposed for personal traits *per se*). We believe that the exercise of signature strengths is particularly fulfilling (Peterson, Ruch, Beerman, Park, & Seligman, 2007).

A Preliminary Study

We report here a preliminary study of character strengths and work. Measures of each of the VIA character strengths, occupation, and satisfaction with work were available to us from thousands of adult respondents to an Internet site (www.authentic happiness.org). The data were cross-sectional, precluding conclusions about the sequencing of these constructs, so unfortunately we cannot yet venture firm conclusions about whether having certain strengths of character influences work satisfaction or vice versa. The offsetting merits of the sample were its size and heterogeneity, allowing questions of interest to be explored across a variety of occupations, including homemaker.

Several questions guided our investigation. First, do individuals in different occupations have different profiles of character strengths? In a previous study, we ascertained the profiles of VIA strengths of adults from 54 different nations and found strong convergence (Park, Peterson, & Seligman, 2006). In almost all nations, from Azerbaijan to Zimbabwe, the most commonly-endorsed strengths were kindness, fairness, honesty, gratitude, and open-mindedness, and the lesser strengths included prudence, modesty, and self-regulation. These findings do not mean that there are no occupation-specific strengths¹, but they do suggest that there is a core of character strengths possessed by many people, regardless of the work that they do.

That said, we expected that professionals and perhaps managers and administrators might score higher on strengths of wisdom and knowledge, as well as on the strength of perseverance,

than individuals in other occupations, given the more stringent educational and entry requirements. We also expected that homemakers might score higher on strengths of humanity, given that the central concern of a homemaker is of course not the physical home but rather the family that lives there.

Second, which character strengths best predict satisfaction with work? In previous studies, we found that the strengths such as zest, hope, curiosity, gratitude, and love positively predict happiness and life satisfaction across the lifespan (Park & Peterson, 2006a, 2006c; Park, Peterson, & Seligman, 2004). Given the link between general life satisfaction and work satisfaction (Campbell, Converse, & Rodgers, 1976; Staw, Bell, & Clausen, 1986), we expected much the same patterns in the present sample, across different occupations.

Third, does fit between character strengths and occupation contribute to satisfaction with work? Although the data available to us were not fine-grained enough to study fit as a multidimensional construct, we were able to ascertain what strengths were more or less common in a given occupation. Accordingly, we were able to explore what has been called *supplementary fit*, where the worker and the environment (other workers) fit because they are similar (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). The greater the convergence, the greater is satisfaction with work. Character strengths more common among those in a given occupation should contribute more to satisfaction with that sort of work, presumably because the occupation in question affords the exercise of these strengths (cf. Chun, 2005), .

The opposite prediction follows from the notion of *complementary fit*, where the characteristics of the worker fulfill the needs of the work environment by compensating for what is missing in other workers, thereby leading to greater satisfaction (Muchinsky & Monahan, 1987). Many of the character strengths in the VIA classification are corrective virtues, meaning

that they counteract some difficulty (Yearley, 1990). For example, bravery is a character strength to the degree that the setting presents challenges and threats. In occupations where bravery is rare, an individual who exercises this strength as needed achieves greater fulfillment and satisfaction. In other words, complementary fit leads to the prediction that character strengths less common among those in a given occupation should contribute more to satisfaction with that work.

Method

The sample consisted of 7348 currently employed adult respondents from the United States² who completed surveys on the Authentic Happiness website (www.authentichappiness.com) between September, 2002, and December, 2003. Respondents first registered on the website and provided basic demographic information, including age, gender, educational level, occupation, and nationality. Because this website was intended for international use, it did not ask respondents about their ethnicity. After providing demographic information, respondents then completed surveys.

The *VIA Inventory of Strengths* (VIA-IS) is a 240-item self-report questionnaire that uses 5-point Likert-scales to measure the degree to which respondents endorse strength-relevant statements about themselves (1 = *very much unlike me* through 5 = *very much like me*) (Peterson, Park, & Seligman, 2005). There are 24 strengths of character measured by the VIA-IS, including zest, and each strength is assessed with ten items. Responses are averaged within scales, all of which have satisfactory internal consistency measured by Cronbach's alpha coefficient ($\alpha > .70$) and substantial test-retest correlations over a four-month period ($r_s \sim .70$). Scale scores are negatively skewed (X_s : range from 3.5 to 4.0) but variable (SD_s : range from .5 to .9). *Work satisfaction* was measured with a single item which requested a rating on a 7-point scale, from 1

= *completely dissatisfied* through 4 = *neither satisfied or dissatisfied* to 7 = *completely satisfied* (Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz, 1997).

After completing the measures, respondents received immediate feedback about their scores, a feature that presumably motivated participants to take part in the survey. The measures are presented on this website only in English, which means that respondents needed to be English readers.

As noted, only respondents currently employed were included (77% of those who registered), which means that our final sample excluded individuals who were retired, out of work, unable to work, or attending school full-time. For the relatively small number (~ 1%) of respondents who completed a given measure more than once, only the first set of scores was used.

Reported occupations were grouped into these six categories: (a) professional (chief executives; owners of large businesses; doctors; lawyers; dentists; professors); (b) managerial (managers or owners of medium-sized businesses; other professionals with special licenses or certificates: nurses, opticians, pharmacists, social workers, teachers); (c) administrative (administrative personnel; owners and proprietors of small businesses); (d) clerical (clerks; secretaries; administrative assistants; salespeople); (e) blue-collar (skilled and unskilled laborers); and (f) homemaker. Table 1 describes the demographic characteristics of each group. The typical person in each occupational category was about 40 years of age, but education and gender varied as would be expected.

Insert Table 1 about here

Results

Jobs and Character Strengths. Do workers in different jobs have different strengths of character? We computed a series of one-way ANOVAs with job category as the independent variable and each of the 24 VIA character strengths in turn as a dependent variable. Because of the large number of tests, we used a conservative significance level ($p < .001$) for these ANOVAs. Results are shown in Table 2, along with the results of post-hoc pairwise comparisons using Scheffé tests. Using age, gender, and education as covariates altered neither the patterns of results nor their interpretation, so only raw mean scores are reported.

As can be seen, there were differences across jobs with respect to most of the character strengths, but the effect sizes estimated by η^2 were uniformly small and never exceeded .04. The relatively larger effect sizes were expected and interpretable. Professional and managerial workers tended to score higher on strengths of wisdom and knowledge as well as perseverance, hope, and zest, whereas clerical and blue collar workers tended to score lower. Administrators and homemakers had intermediate scores with respect to these strengths. There was a trend for homemakers to score higher than those in other jobs with respect to the strengths of kindness and love, and for clerical and blue workers tended to score lower on love and social intelligence. Finally, modesty scores were higher for clerks, blue collar workers, and homemakers than for professionals. Also shown in Table 2 are work satisfaction scores across job categories. Again, the effect size was small (.04), but professionals and administrators were more satisfied with their work, and blue collar workers and especially clerks were less satisfied., administrators, and managers.

Work Satisfaction and Character Strengths. For different occupations, what character strengths predicted job satisfaction? We computed correlations between work satisfaction and

each of the 24 VIA character strengths, separately for each job category. Again, we used a conservative significance level ($p < .001$). Results are shown in Table 2, along with tests of differences between correlations based on Fisher r -to- z transformations. Partialling out age, gender, and education altered neither the patterns of results nor their interpretation, so only zero-order correlations are reported. Several character strengths—curiosity, zest, hope, gratitude, and spirituality—were moderately strong predictors of work satisfaction across job categories. There was a scattering of differences across job types in the magnitude of strength-satisfaction correlations, but none was dramatic. One intriguing pattern, perhaps, was that for blue collar workers, the strengths of honesty and fairness were more strongly associated with work satisfaction than for those in other occupational groups.

Character Strengths and Occupation Fit. Does fit between character strengths and occupation contribute to satisfaction with work? To test between the opposing predictions based on the ideas of supplementary versus complementary fit, we correlated—within each occupation—the mean score of each strength with the correlation of that strength and work satisfaction, using Spearman's ρ . For all six occupational groups, these ρ coefficients were negative ($p < .05$ by sign test), supporting the notion of complementary fit. For example, when the average level of bravery in an occupation is higher, the correlation between bravery and work satisfaction is lower. These were not robust associations, but it is interesting that their magnitude was smaller for professionals ($\rho = -.05$) and administrators ($-.03$) than for managers ($-.18$), clerks ($-.33$), blue collar workers ($-.28$), and homemakers ($-.19$), implying that fit of this sort is a less important influence on work satisfaction for those in higher status jobs. A statistically-minded skeptic might wonder if these negative correlations were an artifact of ceiling effects (i.e., common strengths had less variance within a group, which thereby reduced the magnitude

of correlations involving them), but our analysis of character strength standard deviations across occupational groups did not support this explanation.

Conclusions

What has been learned from this initial study of character strengths and work? First, across occupations, character strengths of curiosity, zest, hope, gratitude, and spirituality were associated with work satisfaction. All of these strengths, except spirituality, are also robust predictors of general life satisfaction (Park, Peterson, & Seligman, 2004). Spirituality may have been important in the present study because the sample was limited to U. S. respondents, for whom religious concerns are often more central than for people in other nations (Peterson et al., 2007).

Second, interpretable differences across occupations were evident for various strengths of character. Strengths of wisdom and knowledge were higher for professionals and managers, as were the character strengths of perseverance, hope, and zest. Clerks and blue collar workers tended to score lower on these strengths and also on several strengths of humanity—love and social intelligence. Homemakers scored higher on kindness and love than those in other jobs. Modesty scores were higher for clerks, blue workers, and homemakers than for professionals, administrators, and managers.

Third, all of the differences just described were quite small in magnitude. Researchers who are inclined to seek and emphasize differences might find these results disappointing. However, the implication of these findings is that good character is not the province of workers in any given occupation, despite obvious differences across jobs in educational requirements, status, and salary. Based on these results, it does not appear that individuals with different character strengths necessarily choose different occupations, or that different occupational

constraints and opportunities strongly foster or discourage different character strengths (Schneider, 1987). Clearly, future studies are needed to examine this question more closely. For example, longitudinal research that examines character strengths before and after occupational changes would shed light on whether character strengths change as situational demands change.

Fourth, there was some support for the notion of complementary fit between strengths of character and work satisfaction. If a worker in a given occupation scored higher on a less typical strength of character within that occupation, then he or she was more likely to be satisfied with work. Perhaps such an individual brings to bear strengths that are especially needed at work. Or perhaps such an individual feels distinct from his or her co-worker. For individuals who are motivated to be independent and differentiated from others, possessing an atypical character strength at work can be particularly fulfilling. Further research is needed to verify and understand this intriguing but tentative pattern. It will be particularly interesting to examine whether complementary fit extends beyond work to other social groups, such as friends, family, community, or the larger culture. It will also be interesting to see if fit varies across cultures. For example, in cultures where fitting in is more valued than standing out, supplementary fit may be more prevalent and more likely to contribute to satisfaction (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

In any event, our results did not support the notion of supplementary fit with respect to character strengths among U. S. workers, in contrast to previous research that focused on other worker characteristics (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). This difference may result from the fact that the VIA strengths were initially chosen for study because they are widely recognized and valued, in contrast to the more workplace-specific strengths of interest to the Gallup Organization (Buckingham & Clifton, 2001). Nevertheless, our results suggest that certain components of good character contribute to good work regardless of the job (cf. Cameron, Bright, & Caza,

2004).

Fifth, our conclusions about general similarities across occupations notwithstanding, clerks and blue collar workers were least satisfied with their work and tended to score lower than those in other jobs with respect to certain strengths of character. Do these findings reflect the worker or the job? As mentioned earlier, longitudinal data are needed to answer this question with any certainty, but it is worth considering the possibility that clerical and blue collar jobs do not readily encourage work satisfaction and the strengths that contribute to it. Although there are exceptions, many organizational behavior studies are devoted to managers, executives, or white-collar workers who have upward career mobility. However, our results show that, not surprisingly, blue collar workers and clerks may be dissatisfied with work and relatively low in character strengths that contribute to satisfaction in the workplace. Organizational research from their perspective is much needed.

We have described the present research as preliminary because of the starkness of its design and measures. Our Internet strategy yielded a large sample but one of unknown representativeness. The data were cross-sectional, so we had no way knowing how our constructs were sequenced over time. The correlational data do not allow us to make strong causal inferences about the variables. And finally, our classification of jobs was very rough. For instance, business executives and professors were put in the same category, as were managers and social workers. Although our findings show predictable and expected differences between these occupational categories, a more fine-grained assessment of occupational type is needed. We have recently corrected this shortcoming on our website, which now asks about dozens of specific jobs—actor, bartender, lawyer, teacher, and so on—which means that we eventually will be able to repeat the present study with a finer and more appropriate lens to gauge occupation-

specific strengths and occupation-specific predictors of work satisfaction.

Regardless, the overall conclusion from the present study is clear: No matter the occupation, character matters in the workplace. Although we find differences across occupations in the level of the strengths and their association with work satisfaction, these differences are small. In general, there are more similarities across occupational type than differences in the strengths that relate to satisfaction at work.

What are the implications for practice suggested by our work on character strengths and work? We conclude that the components of character can be measured and that different strengths of character have different consequences for the individual and—by implication—for the group. In particular, the strengths of curiosity, zest, hope, and gratitude were moderately strong predictors of work satisfaction across job categories. These might be worthy targets of deliberate cultivation within the workplace. Spirituality also predicted work satisfaction. If construed narrowly in terms of a specific religious faith or doctrine, spirituality of course falls outside the realm of what an organizational psychologist would want to encourage. But if construed more generally as a sense of purpose or meaning, then spirituality begins to sound like a secular calling and seems a worthy target for change (cf. Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz, 1997).

Despite the popular appeal of the notion of person-occupation fit, there was no strong evidence in favor of fit with respect to character strengths as we conceptualized and measured them. Accordingly, we wonder about the effect sizes associated with other approaches to character in the workplace. Perhaps strengths of character determine how one can best perform any job, whatever it might be.

Despite the lack of evidence for person-occupation fit in our research, future studies

should continue to look at characteristics of the setting and in particular how it does or does not afford good work (Gardner, Csikszentmihalyi, & Damon, 2001). The possibility of organizational-level virtues needs to be taken seriously (Park & Peterson, 2003). How might these interact with individual-level strengths of character? Longitudinal designs should be employed, along with hard outcome measures, like productivity and physical health. As noted, we also call for less organizational research emphasis on CEOs and managers and more on ordinary workers. .

In terms of future research, there is a need for strengths measurement that is less transparent. A 360° approach to assessment would be a good idea (Hedge, Borman, & Birkeland, 2001). More sophistication in the conceptualization of strengths is needed. In particular, researchers need to treat strength classifications like the VIA not as a mere typology but rather as a way to think about and to describe a worker's profile of greater and lesser strengths. Our ongoing analyses imply soft tradeoffs among certain strengths of character—e.g., intellectual strengths such as curiosity and love of learning versus social strengths such as love and gratitude. Different jobs also entail tradeoffs among their demands (Holland, 1985). Attention to these patterns might shed further light on the fit between the fit between individuals and their work.

Summary

In sum, here is what practitioners should know about strengths of character in the workplace:

- Character strengths matter, but it is important to ask *which* character strength for *which* job for *which* outcome.
- Differences in character strengths across jobs exist but are small in magnitude; character should not be the sole focus of practitioners.

- However informative and interesting measures like the VIA-IS may be, they are not strong diagnostic tests, and their results should *never* be used in and of themselves as the basis for selection or placement.
- Rather, knowledge of a worker's character strengths is probably more useful in helping a worker craft the job that he or she already has.
- With exceptions like hope, little is known about the cultivation of character strengths (cf. Park & Peterson, 2008), and rigorous studies are needed to evaluate any interventions intended to build good character among workers

And here are some possible directions for future researchers to pursue:

- *Longitudinal studies* that would allow better conclusions about the predictive role of character strengths
- *Profile analysis* of character strengths that capitalize on the VIA Classification and its associated measures as a multidimensional strategy for understanding good character
- *Hard outcomes* that go beyond self-report of work satisfaction that would convince skeptics focused on the bottom line that character in the workplace is important
- *Interventions* that build or enhance specific character strengths

References

- Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York: Holt.
- Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Aristotle (2000). *The Nicomachean ethics* (R. Crisp, Trans.). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Baumrind, D. (1998). Reflections on character and competence. In A. Colby, J. James, & D. Hart (Eds.), *Competence and character through life* (pp. 1-28). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Biswas-Diener, R. (2006). From the equator to the north pole: A study of character strengths. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 7, 293-310.
- Brief, A. P., & Nord, W. R. (Eds.) (1990). *Meanings of occupational work: A collection of essays*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Buckingham, M., & Clifton, D. O. (2001). *Now, discover your strengths*. New York: Free Press.
- Cameron, K. S., Bright, D., & Caza, A. (2004). Exploring the relationships between virtuousness and performance. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47, 766-790.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., & Rodgers, W. L. (1976). *The quality of American life*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Chun, R. (2005). Ethical character and virtue in organizations: An empirical assessment and strategic implications, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 57, 269-284.
- Clifton, D. O., & Harter, J. K. (2003). Strengths investment. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (pp. 111-121). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler

Dahlsgaard, K., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2005). Shared virtue: The convergence of valued human strengths across culture and history. *Review of General Psychology, 9*, 209-213.

Dawis, R. V. (1992). Person-environment fit and job satisfaction. In C. J. Cranny, P. C. Smith, & E. F. Stone (Eds.), *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance* (pp. 69-88). New York: Lexington Books.

Edwards, J. (1991). Person-job fit: A conceptual integration, literature review, and methodological critique. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial/Organizational Psychology* (Vol. 6, pp. 283-357). New York: Wiley.

England, G. W., & Whitely, W. T. (1990). Cross-national meanings of working. In A. P. Brief & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Meanings of occupational work: A collection of essays*. (pp. 65-106). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Gardner, H., Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Damon, W. (2001). *Good work: When excellence and ethics meets*. New York: Basic Books.

Hedge, J. W., Borman, W. C., & Birkeland, S. A. (2001). History and development of multisource feedback as a methodology. In D. W. Bracken, C. W. Timmreck, & A. H. Church (Eds.), *The handbook of multisource feedback* (pp. 15-32). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Holland, J. L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: an integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. *Personnel Psychology, 49*, 1-49.

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and

person-supervisor fit. *Personnel, Psychology*, 58, 281-342.

Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.

Matthews, M. D., Eid, J., Kelly, D. R., Bailey, J. K. S., & Peterson, C. (2006). Character strengths and virtues of developing military leaders: An international comparison. *Military Psychology*, 18, S57-S68.

Muchinsky, P. M., & Monahan, C. J. (1987). What is person-environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31, 268-277.

Park, N. (2004). Character strengths and positive youth development. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 591, 40-54.

Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2003). Virtues and organizations. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (pp. 33-47). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2006). Character strengths and happiness among young children: Content analysis of parental descriptions. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 7, 323-341. (a)

Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2006). Methodological issues in positive psychology and the assessment of character strengths. In A. D. Ong & M. van Dulmen (Eds.), *Handbook of methods in positive psychology* (pp. 292-305). New York: Oxford University Press. (b)

Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2006). Moral competence and character strengths among adolescents: The development and validation of the Values in Action Inventory of Strengths for Youth. *Journal of Adolescence*, 29, 891-905. (c)

Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2008). The cultivation of character strengths. In M. Ferrari & G.

Potworowski (Eds.), *Teaching for wisdom* (pp. 57-75). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). Strengths of character and well-being. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 23*, 603-619.

Park, N., Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2006). Character strengths in fifty-four nations and the fifty US states. *Journal of Positive Psychology, 1*, 118-129.

Peterson C., & Park, N. (2006). Character strengths in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Psychology, 27*, 1149-1154.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. New York: Oxford University Press/Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Peterson, C., Park, N., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2005). Assessment of character strengths. In G. P. Koocher, J. C. Norcross, & S. S. Hill, III (Eds.), *Psychologists' desk reference* (2nd ed., pp. 93-98). New York: Oxford University Press.

Peterson, C., Ruch, W., Beerman, U., Park, N., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2007). Strengths of character, orientations to happiness, and life satisfaction. *Journal of Positive Psychology, 2*, 1-8.

Pollay, D. J. (2006). *Strengths profiles of leaders in organizations*. Unpublished masters thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

Rath, T. (2007). *StrengthsFinder 2.0*. New York: Gallup Press.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology, 40*, 437-453.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). *Authentic happiness*. New York: Free Press.

Staw, B., Bell, N. E., & Clausen, J. A. (1986). The dispositional approach to job attitudes: A life-time longitudinal test. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 31*, 56-77.

Stefanyszyn, K. (2007, November). Norwich Union changes focus from competencies to

strengths. *Strategic HR Review*, 7, 10-11.

Wrzesniewski, A., & Dutton, J. E. (2001). Crafting a job: Revisioning employees as active crafters of their work. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 179-201.

Wrzesniewski, A., McCauley, C. R., Rozin, P., & Schwartz, B. (1997). Jobs, careers, and callings: People's relations to their work. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 21-33.

Yearley, L. H. (1990). *Mencius and Aquinas: Theories of virtue and conceptions of courage*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Footnotes

1. Studies of military cadets and student leaders found some strengths to be more common in these groups than in the general population—e.g., bravery in the former case and hope and leadership in the latter case (Matthews, Eid, Kelly, Bailey, & Peterson, 2006; Pollay, 2006).

2. In other studies using data from this website, we typically include both U. S. and non-U. S. respondents because our interest has been in commonalities across socio-demographic contrasts (e.g., Park, Peterson, & Seligman, 2006). The present study was concerned with differences across occupations, and in light of cross-national differences in the meaning of work (England & Whitely, 1990), it seemed prudent to limit our sample to individuals from one nation. Approximately 75% of the website respondents were from the U. S.

Table 1
Sample Characteristics (N = 7348)

<u>occupation</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>% male</u>	<u>typical education</u>
professional	1169	51%	post-baccalaureate
managerial	2531	30%	post-baccalaureate
administrative	2189	33%	baccalaureate
clerical	799	23%	some college
blue collar	358	49%	high school
homemaker	302	3%	some college

Table 2
Character Strength Means and Correlations with Work Satisfaction

	Collar (N = 358)	Professional Homemaker (N = 1169) (N = 302)	Managerial F (N = 2531)	Administrative η^2 (N = 2189)	Clerical (N = 799)	Blue (N =
work satisfaction	$\underline{X} = 4.53_b$	$\underline{X} = 5.10_a$ 67.85*	4.89 _a .04	4.44 _b	4.10 _c	4.27 _{bc}
<u>wisdom and knowledge</u>						
creativity	3.73 _{cd} .10 _{ab}	$\underline{X} = 4.00_a$ 32.04* r = .14* _a	3.85 _{bc} .02 .06* _b	3.91 _{ab} .11* _a	3.65 _d .00 _b	3.70 _d .09 _{ab}
curiosity	3.90 _c .37* _a	$\underline{X} = 4.22_a$ 60.06* r = .32* _{ab}	4.09 _b .04 .27* _{ab}	4.03 _b .27* _{ab}	3.81 _c .24* _b	3.87 _c .23* _b
open-mindedness	4.00 _b .07 ns	$\underline{X} = 4.20_a$ 45.57* r = .11*	4.08 _b .03 .09*	4.04 _b .08*	3.91 _c .08*	3.91 _c .16*
love of learning	4.02 _b .17 _{ab}	$\underline{X} = 4.21_a$ 59.62* r = .19* _a	4.09 _b .04 .12* _b	4.05 _b .08* _b	3.82 _c .06 _b	3.77 _c .11 _{ab}
perspective	3.68 _{cd} .16* _b	$\underline{X} = 3.97_a$ 55.12* r = .27* _a	3.85 _b .04 .23* _{ab}	3.77 _{bc} .21* _{ab}	3.62 _d .17* _b	3.63 _d .28* _{ab}
<u>courage</u>						
bravery	3.56 _c .18*	$\underline{X} = 3.78_a$ 20.25* r = .20*	3.73 _{ab} .01 .15*	3.68 _{ab} .15*	3.53 _c .15*	3.62 _{bc} .20*
honesty	3.94 _{ab} .08 _b	$\underline{X} = 3.99_{ab}$ 8.42* r = .13* _{ab}	4.00 _a .006 .17* _{ab}	3.93 _{ab} .13* _b	3.92 _{ab} .17* _{ab}	3.91 _b .24* _a
perseverance	3.39 _c .21* _{ab}	$\underline{X} = 3.77_a$ 43.05* r = .28* _a	3.69 _a .03 .17* _b	3.54 _b .22* _{ab}	3.44 _b .28* _{ab}	3.50 _b .28* _{ab}
zest		$\underline{X} = 3.67_a$	3.60 _{ab}	3.47 _{bc}	3.28 _d	3.39 _{cd}

3.39 _{cd}	41.62*	.03			
.41* _b	r = .50* _a	.41* _b	.47* _{ab}	.41* _b	.45* _{ab}

humanity

kindness	$\underline{X} = 3.87_b$	3.92 _b	3.88 _b	3.90 _b	3.91 _b
4.03 _a	5.95*	.004			
.16*	$r = .17^*$.19*	.15*	.19*	.25*
love	$\underline{X} = 3.89_{ab}$	3.91 _{ab}	3.83 _{bc}	3.76 _c	3.76 _c
4.00 _a	13.09*	.01			
.26*	$r = .27^*$.28*	.25*	.21*	.24*
social intelligence	$\underline{X} = 3.78_a$	3.74 _{ab}	3.70 _{abc}	3.60 _c	3.64 _{bc}
3.67 _{abc}	11.62*	.01			
.20*	$r = .15^*$.19*	.17*	.12*	.19*

justice

fairness	$\underline{X} = 4.01$	4.06	4.00	3.98	4.00
4.02	5.78*	.004			
.11* _b	$r = .14^*_b$.19* _{ab}	.13* _{ab}	.14* _{ab}	.29* _a
leadership	$\underline{X} = 3.74_{ab}$	3.79 _a	3.69 _{bc}	3.61 _c	3.66 _{bc}
3.67 _{bc}	18.68*	.01			
.20* _{ab}	$r = .17^*_{ab}$.20* _{ab}	.14* _b	.16* _{ab}	.26* _a
teamwork	$\underline{X} = 3.57_{ab}$	3.63 _{ab}	3.55 _b	3.58 _{ab}	3.61 _{ab}
3.66 _a	6.28*	.004			
.15*	$r = .19^*$.24*	.17*	.23*	.26*

temperance

forgiveness	$\underline{X} = 3.73_{ab}$	3.77 _a	3.67 _{ab}	3.63 _b	3.63 _b
3.68 _{ab}	8.80*	.006			
.20*	$r = .23^*$.23*	.20*	.19*	.23*
modesty	$\underline{X} = 3.30_b$	3.38 _a _b	3.30 _b	3.46 _a	3.43 _a
3.45 _a	11.22*	.008			
.01 _b	$r = .03_b$.05* _b	.03 _b	.15* _a	.10 _{ab}
prudence	$\underline{X} = 3.56_{ab}$	3.53 _{abc}	3.45 _{cd}	3.47 _{bcd}	3.38 _d
3.59 _a	13.13*	.01			
.11	$r = .09^*$.10*	.07*	.14*	.13*
self-regulation	$\underline{X} = 3.34_a$	3.27 _{ab}	3.19 _{bc}	3.13 _c	3.20 _{bc}
3.14 _c	15.30*	.01			
.16* _{ab}	$r = .18_{ab}$.13* _b	.14* _b	.17* _{ab}	.28* _a

transcendence

appreciation of beauty	$\underline{X} = 3.78_c$	3.89 _{abc}	3.91 _{ab}	3.83 _{bc}	3.80 _{bc}
4.00 _a	9.82*	.007			
.08	$r = .12^*$.11*	.05*	.06*	.13*
gratitude	$\underline{X} = 3.92_{ab}$	3.97 _{abc}	3.88 _{bc}	3.85 _b	3.80 _c
4.03a	10.10*	.007			
.28*	$r = .29^*$.29*	.25*	.28*	.32*
hope	$\underline{X} = 3.65_a$	3.63 _a	3.50 _b	3.38 _b	3.40 _b
3.40 _b	28.37*	.02			
.40 _{ab}	$r = .43^*_a$.35 _b *	.36 _b *	.34 _b *	.44 _{ab} *
humor	$\underline{X} = 3.77$	3.78	3.77	3.74	3.80
3.63	3.14	.002			
.20*	$r = .20^*$.21*	.20*	.20*	.27*
spirituality	$\underline{X} = 3.48_{bc}$	3.60 _{ab}	3.41 _c	3.43 _c	3.39 _c
3.70 _a	15.56*	.01			
.27 _{ab} *	$r = .30^*_a$.27 _a *	.20 _b *	.23 _{ab} *	.30 _{ab} *

* $p < .001$

Note.—Means in a row with different subscripts are significantly different ($p < .05$) by Scheffé test. Correlation coefficients in a row with different subscripts are significantly different ($p < .05$).