CHARACTER STRENGTH AS AN INFLUENCE ON NURSES CLINICAL PERFORMANCE IN SELECTED TERTIARY HOSPITALS OF SAUDI ARABIA

William Dimasangal Taala, Rock Parreno Cordero and Jefferson Garcia Guerrero (Ph.D)

Fakeeh College for Medical Sciences, Jeddah, KSA

ABSTRACT: *Changes like the rapid increase in urbanization, population growth, developing gender sensitivity roles and the breakthroughs in science and technology would cause stress and added challenges to nurses working in high functioning health facilities. The many changes in society will certainly need nurses' utmost struggle to respond to these pressure and stress. High performing organizations promote employee productivity with the end in view of attaining organizational health and stability. Organizations that are able to manage or address job-related stress help individual, career, and organizational development. Failure to address this problem leads to organizational loss, customers dissatisfaction and decrease in profit. This research intends to assess the character strengths and clinical performance of nurses in selected tertiary hospitals of Saudi Arabia. The placement influences character strengths with excluding humanity and wisdom and the length of their service does not influence character strengths. As nurses perceived clinical performance increases, there is also a moderate increase of his or her practice of all the character strengths; namely, humanity, courage, justice,, transcendence, temperance, and wisdom.*

KEYWORDS: Character Strengths, Clinical Performance, Temperance, Positive Psychology

INTRODUCTION

Changes like the rapid increase in urbanization, population growth, developing gender sensitivity roles and the breakthroughs in science and technology would cause stress and added challenges to nurses working in high functioning health facilities. The many changes in society will certainly need nurses' utmost struggle to respond to these pressure and stress. Competitions among employees and corporations have become greater and wider to an extent that they need to pursue certain strategies that put them under conflict. In the context of work, work-related stress is an issue that impacts strongly every employee, organization, and communities (Harzer & Ruch, 2015; Hodapp, et. al, 2005; and Vagg & Spielberger, 1998).

Several factors, may they be internal or external, could combat the effects of stress. Internally, character strengths that basically determine "how an individual copes with adversity" (Peterson & Seligman, 2004, p. 17, as cited in Harzer & Ruch, 2015, p.1) is one of those factors. Character strengths are positively valued, narrow personality characteristics (e.g. being friendly, honest. and/or persistent appreciating excellent performances. They manifest in individual behaviors, thoughts, and feelings. They are seen as the inner determinants of a satisfied happy and successful life in addition to the external factors.

Background of the Study

High performing organizations promote employee productivity with the end in view of attaining organizational health and stability. Recent researches show a direct correlation between job-related stress and organizational productivity. Organizations that are able to

manage or address job-related stress help individual, career, and organizational development. Failure to address this problem leads to organizational loss, customers dissatisfaction and decrease in profit. This research intends to assess the character strengths and clinical performance of nurses in selected tertiary hospitals of Saudi Arabia.

Statement of the Problem

This study mainly seeks to determine the influence of character strength to the clinical performance of nurses in selected tertiary hospitals of Saudi Arabia. Further, this seeks to answer the following questions:

1.   What is the profile of the selected subjects in terms of the following:
1.1   Age
1.2   Gender
1.3 Highest Educational Attainment
1.4 Civil Status
1.5 Job Assignment
1.6 Length of Service at the hospital
2.   What is the level of clinical performance of nurses?
3.   To what extent the nurses demonstrate character strengths in selected tertiary hospitals of Saudi Arabia, as to:
3.1 Wisdom and Knowledge
3.2 Courage
3.3 Humanity
3.4 Justice
3.5 Temperance
3.6 Transcendence
4.   Is there a significant difference in clinical performance and character strengths of nurses when grouped according to profile variables?
5.   Is there a significant relationship between character strengths and clinical performance of nurses?

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Character Strengths

Most personality tests focus on negative and neutral traits, but the VIA Survey focuses on one's best qualities. Created under the direction of Dr. Martin Seligman, the "father of Positive Psychology" and author of Authentic Happiness and Flourish, and Dr. Christopher Peterson, distinguished scientist at the University of Michigan and author of A Primer in Positive Psychology, and validated by Robert McGrath, Ph.D., the VIA Survey is regarded as a central tool of positive psychology and has been used in hundreds of research studies and taken by over 5 million people in over 190 countries resulting in better workplaces... schools... teams...LIVES the world over.

Character Strengths are the positive parts of the personality that impact how one thinks, feels and behaves and are the keys to one's being one's best self. They are different than one's other strengths, such as his/her unique skills, talents, interests and resources, because character strengths reflect the "real" one — who one is at his/her core. The VIA Survey of Character

Strengths is a 120–item self–report questionnaire that uses a 5–point Likert scale to measure the degree to which respondents endorse strength–relevant statement about themselves.

The basis of Classification of Character Strengths and Virtues

There are criteria that need to be met because they are considered pertinent features that taken together, capture a "family resemblance" (Wittgenstein (1953) as cited in Peterson and Seligman (2004). First, a strength contributes to various fulfillments that constitute the good life, for oneself and for others. Although strengths and virtues determine how an individual copes with adversity, our focus is on how they fulfill an individual.

Second, although strengths can and do produce desirable outcomes, each strength is morally valued in its own right, even in the absence of obvious beneficial outcomes. To Peterson and Seligman, a pragmatic larger society will want to be convinced that character strengths produce more than their own reward, that their exercise reduces the likelihood of distress and dysfunction while encouraging tangible outcomes like: subjective well-being (happiness), acceptance of oneself, reverence for life, competence, efficacy and mastery, mental and physical health, rich and supportive social networks, respect by and for others, satisfying work, material sufficiency, and healthy communities and families. To say that strength is morally valued is an important qualification because there exit individual differences that are widely valued, contribute to the fulfillment, and qualify as signature characteristics but still fall outside the classification. Consider intelligence, facial symmetry, immunocompetence or athletic prowess. These talents and abilities are cut from a different cloth than character strengths like valor or kindness, but what is the difference? (Peterson, et.al, 2005).

Third, the display of strength by one person does not diminish other people in the vicinity. Onlookers are elevated by their observation of virtuous action. Admiration is created more than jealousy because character strengths are the sorts of characteristics to which most can--and do-- aspire. The more people surrounding us who are kind, curious or full of hope, the greater our own likelihood of acting these ways. All are winners when someone acts in accordance with his or her strengths and virtues (Wright, 1999 as cited in Peterson and Seligman, 2004).

Fourth, being able to phrase the "opposite" of a putative strength in a felicitous way counts against regarding it as a character strength." One can render its opposite in an undesirable way (as inflexibility to flexibility) but just as easily in a desirable way (as steadfastness). For almost all character strengths and virtues, anyone with a thesaurus can find approximate antonyms with desirable connotations, but the issue is the ease with which this can be done and the excess baggage that gets dragged along in so doing. One can weigh the baggage by a process of back-and-forth antonym creation. For example, one possible opposite of honesty is tact, but the obvious opposite of tact is not honesty but rudeness. Honesty, therefore, meets this linguistic test.

Fifth, a strength needs to be manifest in the range of an individual's behavior--thoughts, feelings, and/or actions--in such a way that it can be assessed. It should be trait-like in the sense of having a degree of generality across situations and stability across time. Strengths differ in terms of being tonic (constant) versus phasic (waxing and waning depending on their use). This distinction has important measurement implications. A tonic characteristics (e.g., kindness or humor) shows itself steadily in a variety of settings, which means that it can be assessed by deliberately general questions posed to an individual and/or informant. A phasic characteristic comes and goes because it is relevant only in settings that afford it. Bravery, for example, does

not --indeed cannot--show itself as one is standing in the checkpoint line of a grocery store. But if the store is being robbed, then a person can manifest varying degrees of valor (Peterson and Seligman, 2004).

Sixth, the strength is distinct from other positive traits in the classification and cannot be decomposed into them. For example, the character strength of "tolerance" meets most of the other criteria enumerated but is a complex blend of open-mindedness and fairness. The character strength of "patience" melds self-regulation, persistence, and open-mindedness. The reaction of people to the 24 strengths in the classification has never involved the criticism that has been concluded unimportant aspects of the character. Rather, the reaction has been "What about____?" In all cases to date, the suggested candidate strikes a blend of strengths that are included. The corollary of this criterion is that as assessment proceeds and the relevant data are obtained, one may decide to combine several strengths in the classification because of empirical redundancy and theoretical overlap. For example, curiosity and love of learning appear difficult to distinguish; that is, the same people are usually high, middling, or low on both.

Seventh, a character strength is embodied in consensus paragons. One important way in which the larger culture highlights strengths of character is by providing stories, parables, creeds, mottoes, pledges, songs, and poems that feature people who compellingly demonstrate a given positive trait (Burrell, 1997; Kilpatrick, Wolfe, & Wolfe, 1994 as cited in Paterson, et. al., 2005). Models may be real, apocryphal, and mythic. Regardless, children grow up surrounded by a bevy of potential role models, and a question of critical importance is when and why good lessons are learned from the media versus bad lessons. What leads some folks to fix on Madonna, Eminem, Donald Trump, or professional wrestlers as role models? People have been reading children's books and the moral role models that figure on them. Perhaps movies and the television are not the only culprits. Strengths are also encouraged by the recognition of actual people in the immediate vicinity who embody to a remarkable extent a given positive trait. These paragons of virtue display what Allport (1961) called a cardinal trait and the ease with which one can think of paragons in one's own social circles gives the lie to the claim that virtuous people we each know are not phony. They really are kind, or fair, or playful, and so on for all the entries the entries in the classification system.

Eighth, we do not believe this feature can be applied to all strengths, but an additional criterion where sensible is the existence of prodigies with respect to the strength. In his theory of multiple intelligences, Gardner (1983) directed people's attention to children who evidence at a particularly early age exceptional talents in such domains as music, mathematics, and athletics. Prodigies appear only in some fields of endeavor, and Gardner argued that these fields tap biologically based abilities inherent in the human species. Aside from their particular skill, prodigies are otherwise unremarkable children (Feldman, 1993). Popular stereotypes of child prodigies as miniature adults are incorrect. Suppose these arguments apply as well to the moral domain. Are there kindness prodigies? Are there children who display precocious fairness or bravery? These sorts of questions are completely unexplored, and all we have at present is anecdotal evidence to answer them. If character prodigies exist, one can make some predictions about them from what is known about other sorts of prodigies. First, their prodigious achievements will not be spontaneous. Rather, they will develop through steps or stages, although more rapidly than do other individuals. Second, prodigies will not achieve their advanced levels without some instruction. Third, and sadly, character prodigies may not grow up to be paragons of virtue because it is rare for a musical or mathematical prodigy to be hailed

as the genius when an adult. Perhaps the domain of character is different. One simply does not know.

Ninth, conversely, another criterion for a character strength is the existence of people who show--selectively--the total absence of a given strength. Borrowing again from Gardner (1983), he focused on the cases where the selective absence of a skill could be attributed to neurological damage, but the more general point is that certain skills or their absence may segregate themselves from other aspects of the person. They can, therefore, be regarded as natural groupings able to be approached profitably in biosocial terms. Some people do not want labels like "character imbecile" and it is perfectly understood. However, if there is something offensive here, it is not the label but to what it applies: people completely devoid of one or another character strength. Imagine a person with no curiosity about the world or one who is incapable of loving or being loved. We know these people exist, but we do not know whether their deficiency is specific to a given character strength or general. The assumption about the plurality of character would be supported by selectivity (Ruch, et. al, 2010).

Tenth, as suggested by Erikson (1963) discussion of psychosocial stages and the virtues that result from their satisfactory resolutions, the larger society provides institutions and associated rituals for cultivating strengths and virtues and then for sustaining their practice. The rituals that cultivate strengths can be thought of as simulations: trial runs that allow children and adolescents to display and develop a valued characteristic in a safe context in which guidance is explicit (cf. Unell & Wyckoff, 1995). Clash of opinions exists regarding whether individual parents and teachers try to encourage specific strengths and virtues. Some of may calculate praiseworthy characteristics, but others may regard their development as beyond control, trusting to the genetic roulette wheel, local schools, youth development programs, or a vaguely defined "society" to bring about strong virtuous children. People believe that strengths and virtues can be cultivated, but any interventions to nurture strengths need to be informed by what people, in general, believe about their origins. Moreover, just as important as creating strengths in the first place are the rules, roles, and norms that sustain them. Although it is regarded that character strengths are traits, they are not evident in any and all circumstances. Prevailing rewards and punishments in a given situation work for or against the display of a particular strength. If one is involved in an automobile accident, kindness is not the trait that should come to the fore, at least insofar as it would give the other participants leverage for an unwarranted insurance claim. Humor is a terrible trait to display when walking through a metal detector at an airport. Conversely, certain occupational roles demand specific strengths of character--for example, family court judges need to be fair, inventors need to be creative, therapist need to have social intelligence, telemarketers need to be hopeful--and it is expected that individuals in these roles will either develop the requisite strengths or soon seek other jobs (Harzer, et. al., 2014; 2015; 2012).

The 24 Character Strengths and Virtues (Ruch, et.al, 2010)

There are a total of 24 strengths of character in the VIA Classification:

- Courage
1. Bravery
2. Honesty
3. Perseverance
4. Zest
- Humanity

5. Kindness
6. Love
7. Social Intelligence
• Justice
8. Fairness
9. Leadership
10. Teamwork
• Temperance
11. Forgiveness
12. Humility
13. Prudence
14. Self–regulation
• Transcendence
15. Appreciation of Beauty and Excellence
16. Gratitude
17. Hope
18. Humor
19. Spirituality
• Wisdom
20. Creativity
21. Curiosity
22. Judgment
23. Love of Learning
24. Perspective

METHODOLOGY

This study will use the descriptive, correlational design. According to Polit and Beck (2010), descriptive research describes systematically a situation or area of interest factually and accurately. It is a method of description of phenomena based on the collection of data and statistical analysis of numerical values. The participants of this study are nurses working in selected tertiary hospitals of Saudi Arabia. They come from different departments of the facility and will use purposive sampling with the following inclusion criteria: has been working for at least 2 years in the facility as a nurse and willingness to participate in the research and signed an informed consent This research used a questionnaire which is divided into three sections: demographic profiles, clinical performance, and character strengths. The questions on clinical performance are researcher-made and adapted from several studies. The questionnaire was subjected to validity and reliability testing, in which it should be at least reliable scoring a α=0.8 using Cronbach alpha test.

To measure the Character Strengths at work the researcher will use VIA Survey of Character Strengths which is a simple self-assessment that takes less than 15 minutes and provides a wealth of information to help one understand own core characteristics.

18

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. What is the profile of the selected subjects in terms of the following:

1.1 Age

1.2 Gender

1.3 Highest Educational Attainment

1.4 Civil Status

1.5 Job Assignment

1.6 Length of Service at the hospital

2. What is the level of clinical performance of nurses?

Table 1. Summary of Demographic Profile

Demograph	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	17	5.1
Female	317	94.3
Missing	2	.6
Age		
21-25 yrs old	26	7.7
26-30 yrs old	122	36.3
31-35 yrs old	98	29.2
Above 35 yrs old	90	26.8
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	330	98.2
Master's Degree	4	1.2
Missing	2	.6
Civil Status		
Single	313	93.2
Married	17	5.1
Other's	4	1.2
Missing	2	.6
Job Assignment		
Medical-Surgical	77	22.9
OR	2	.6
ICU	107	31.8
Others	148	44
Missing	2	.6
Length of Service		
Less than a year	42	12.5
1-3 yrs	105	31.3
4-6 yrs	42	12.5
More than 6 years	144	42.9
Missing	3	.9
Perceived Clinical Performance		
Excellent	84	25
Very Good	219	65.2
Average	30	8.9
Poor	1	.3
Missing	2	.6

Table 1 reflects the demographic profile of the 326 participants of this study showing that majority of them are female (94.3%), belonging to the age group 26-30 years old (36.3%). However, age group 31-35 years old closely follows at 29.2% and above 35 years old at 26.8%. Of the 326 respondents, 98.2% finish their bachelor's degree in nursing and only 1.2% has master's degree. Also, 93.2% are single and only 5.1% are married. Majority of them are

19

assigned to various clinical areas (44%), while 31.8% are assigned in the ICU and 22.9% in Medical-Surgical units. Majority of them has been working with their institution for more than six (6) years at 42.9% and there are 31.3% who has been working for 1-3 years. Of the total 326 respondents, 65.2% perceived themselves as very good in their clinical performance and only 25% see themselves as excellent nurses.

3. To what extent the nurses demonstrate character strengths in selected tertiary hospitals of Saudi Arabia, as to:

Table 2. Summary of Character Strengths of Nurses

Character Strengths	Mean	S.D.	QI
Humanity	2.6	.41	Manifested to the highest extent
Courage	2.52	.39	Manifested to the highest extent
Justice	2.56	.41	Manifested to the highest extent
Transcendence	2.56	.38	Manifested to the highest extent
Temperance	2.6	.43	Manifested to the highest extent
Wisdom	2.57	.40	Manifested to the highest extent

Legend:

1.00-1.65 : Not much like me (Not manifested)

1.66-2.31: Like me (Manifested to an Extent)

2.32-3.00: Very much like me (Manifested to the Highest Extent)

It can be gleaned from Table 2 that among the character strengths, the respondents rated highest Humanity (x=2.6, SD=.41, highest extent), Temperance (x=2.6, SD=.43, highest extent), followed by Wisdom (x=2.57, SD=.43, highest extent),Transcendence (x=2.56,SD=.38, highest extent), Justice (x=2.56, SD=.41, highest extent), and last is Courage (x=2.52, SD=.39, highest extent). It is interesting to note that all of the character strengths were rated to the highest extent, which means these strengths can be observed at the highest level in the lives of the respondents. The results show that nurses are not just compassionate and kind—they have all medical smarts of a doctor too. Those who succeed in nursing and who gain the most personal fulfillment from it start their careers with certain unique qualities (Retrieved from http://nursinglink.monster.com/benefits/articles/5019-top-10-qualities-of-a-great-nurse?page=1) —the character strengths.

4. Is there a significant difference of character strengths of nurses when grouped according to profile variables?

Table 3. Difference of Character Strengths to Gender

Character Strengths	F-value	dF	p-value	QI	Decision
Humanity	.38	1,332	.54	NS	Accept Ho
Courage	.09	1,332	.77	NS	Accept Ho
Justice	.26	1,332	.61	NS	Accept Ho
Transcendence	1.02	1,332	.31	NS	Accept Ho
Temperance	.09	1,332	.78	NS	Accept Ho
Wisdom	2.99	1,332	.09	NS	Accept Ho

Table 3 suggests that gender has no influence on the character strengths of the respondents, particularly, Humanity ($F_{1,332}=.38$, p=.54), Courage ($F_{1,332}=.09$, p=.77), Justice ($F_{1,332}=.26$, p=.61), Transcendence ($F_{1,332}=1.02$, p=.31), Temperance ($F_{1,332}=.09$, p=.78), and Wisdom ($F_{1,332}=2.99$, p=.09). Thus, null hypothesis has been accepted or retained. Gender stereotypes still exist in the nursing profession (Kouta & Kaite, 2011) but with character strengths, it shows in this study that gender has nothing to do with it. This is may be because of the effort of the nursing education to prepare their male students to interact with female patients and provide counselors to discuss problems that emerge during their training and experience (Brady & Sherrod, 2003, as cited in Kouta & Kaite, 2011). Thus, the academe has a role to play to address gender discrimination.

Table 4. Difference of Character Strengths to Age

Character Strengths	F-value	dF	p-value	QI	Decision
Humanity	2.96	3,332	.03	S	Reject Ho
Courage	1.63	3,332	.18	NS	Accept Ho
Justice	1.89	3,332	.13	NS	Accept Ho
Transcendence	1.64	3,332	.18	NS	Accept Ho
Temperance	.93	3,332	.43	NS	Accept Ho
Wisdom	1.02	3,332	.39	NS	Accept Ho

When it comes to age, humanity as a character strength shows difference ($F_{3,332}=2.96$, p=.03), thus, null hypothesis has been rejected. Age has no influence on courage, justice, transcendence, temperance and wisdom, at least in this research study of Saudi Arabia nurses.

Table 5. Difference of Character Strengths to Educational Attainment

Character Strengths	F-value	dF	p-value	QI	Decision
Humanity	.55	1,332	.48	NS	Accept Ho
Courage	2.05	1,332	.15	NS	Accept Ho
Justice	2.45	1,332	.12	NS	Accept Ho
Transcendence	4.07	1,332	.04	S	Reject Ho
Temperance	.50	1,332	.48	NS	Accept Ho
Wisdom	1.26	1,332	.26	NS	Accept Ho

When it comes to educational attainment, Table 5 exemplifies that it has something to do with the practice of transcendence ($F_{1,332}=4.07$, p=.04), thus, null hypothesis has been rejected.

21

Educational attainment does not result to changes in humanity, courage, justice, temperance, and wisdom. Majority of the respondents are bachelor's degree holders. This shows that this age bracket leave everything to someone higher than us, the transcendent being. Spirituality is pervasive to those belonging in this bracket, as they are looking for niche in the society. Unlike those who have master's degrees and graduate studies, who have already established their niche and sometimes leave everything to hard work as experienced as they looked for their niche earlier in their career lives.

Table 6. Difference of Character Strengths to Civil Status

Character Strengths	F-value	dF	p-value	QI	Decision
Humanity	1.78	2,331	.17	NS	Accept Ho
Courage	3.11	2,331	.05	S	Reject Ho
Justice	2.68	2,331	.07	NS	Accept Ho
Transcendence	3.38	2,331	.04	S	Reject Ho
Temperance	1.46	2,331	.23	NS	Accept Ho
Wisdom	2.19	2,331	.11	NS	Accept Ho

It can be gleaned from Table 6 that Courage ($F_{2,331}$=3.11, p=.05) and Transcendence ($F_{2,331}$=3.38, p=.04) are influenced by a change of civil status. As the demographic profile shows, majority of the respondents are single, thus, single nurses exemplify courage and transcendence in their practice, which shows that these two are their character strengths.

Table 7. Difference of Character Strengths to Job Placement

Character Strengths	F-value	dF	p-value	QI	Decision
Humanity	2.21	3,330	.09	NS	Accept Ho
Courage	6.49	3,330	.00	S	Reject Ho
Justice	5.44	3,330	.00	S	Reject Ho
Transcendence	3.62	3,330	.01	S	Reject Ho
Temperance	3.80	3,330	.01	S	Reject Ho
Wisdom	2.03	3,330	.11	NS	Accept Ho

Moreover, Table 7 shows that with the exception of Humanity and Wisdom, job placement influences Courage ($F_{3,330}$=66.49, p=.00), Justice ($F_{3,330}$=5.44, p=.00), Transcendence ($F_{3,330}$=3.62, p=.01), and Temperance ($F_{3,330}$=3.80, p=.010), thus, null hypothesis has been rejected. There are areas in the hospital where nurses can maximize courage, but there are areas where courage is subdued due to some challenges like subservience to the doctor's orders, and other factors that inhibit nurses to fully exercise courage. There are areas where justice, transcendence and temperance are practices and optimized. Like the ICU, nurses can exercise transcendence as condition of their patients is beyond their control and nurses tend to leave the fate of the patient to someone transcendent. Nurses can exercise their spirituality more than in some areas that are less challenging like the MS ward. Temperance can also be observed on nurses in areas where patients are too demanding unlike other areas where patients are less demanding like the Out Patient Department. Thus, generally, it is safe to infer that an assignment or job placement has something to do with the nurses developing and maximizing his or her character strengths.

Table 8. Difference of Character Strengths to Length of Service

Character Strengths	F-value	dF	p-value	QI	Decision
Humanity	.54	3,329	.66	NS	Accept Ho
Courage	.66	3,329	.58	NS	Accept Ho
Justice	1.66	3,329	.18	NS	Accept Ho
Transcendence	1.00	3,329	.40	NS	Accept Ho
Temperance	1.70	3,329	.17	NS	Accept Ho
Wisdom	.56	3,329	.64	NS	Accept Ho

Furthermore, it can be gleaned from Table 8 that length of service does not cause any variation in the character strengths of the nurses or respondents, thus, null hypothesis has been accepted or retained.

Table 9. Difference of Character Strengths to Perceived Clinical Performance

Character Strengths	F-value	dF	p-value	QI	Decision
Humanity	9.23	3,330	.00	S	Accept Ho
Courage	12.13	3,330	.00	S	Reject Ho
Justice	9.34	3,330	.00	S	Accept Ho
Transcendence	14.31	3,330	.00	S	Reject Ho
Temperance	7.28	3,330	.00	S	Accept Ho
Wisdom	18.68	3,330	.00	S	Accept Ho

It is interesting to note, as gleaned from Table 9, that perceived clinical performance of nurses is a determining factor in the variation practice of the character strengths of nurses. In particular, Humanity ($F_{3,330}$=9.23, p=.00), Courage ($F_{3,330}$=12.13, p=.00), Justice ($F_{3,330}$=9.34, p=.00), Transcendence ($F_{3,330}$=14.31, p=.00), Temperance ($F_{3,330}$=7.28, p=.00), and Wisdom ($F_{3,330}$=18.68, p=.00), show variation when subjected to perceived clinical performance, thus, null hypothesis has been rejected.

5.   Is there a significant relationship between character strengths and clinical performance of nurses?

Table 10. Correlation between Character Strengths and Clinical Performance

Character Strengths	Spearman rho-value	p-value	QI	Decision
Humanity	-.26	.00	Significant, negative moderate correlation	Reject Ho
Courage	-.30	.00	Significant, negative moderate correlation	Reject Ho
Justice	-.26	.00	Significant, negative moderate correlation	Reject Ho
Transcendence	-.32	.00	Significant, negative moderate correlation	Reject Ho
Temperance	-.23	.00	Significant, negative moderate correlation	Reject Ho
Wisdom	-.33	.00	Significant, negative moderate correlation	Reject Ho

Perceived Clinical Performance: 1- excellent, 2-very good, 3- fair/average, 4-poor

It can be gleaned from Table 10 that character strengths such as Humanity (ρ=-.26, p=.00), Courage (ρ=-.30, p=.00), Justice (ρ=-.26, p=.00), Transcendence (ρ=-.32, p=.00), Temperance (ρ-.23, p=.00), and Wisdom (ρ=-.33, p=.00), have significant, moderate negative correlation with perceived clinical performance. This suggests that as nurses perceived their clinical performance (1 as the excellent and 4 as poor) increases, his or her practice of character strengths also increases.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are the conclusions of this study: (1) Majority of the nurses perceived their clinical performance as "very good."(2) Character strengths of the nurses are manifested to the highest extent with temperance as the highest and courage as the lowest. (3) Gender does not influence practice of character strengths. Ages, generally does not either influence character strength with the exception of humanity, because age influences humanity. (4) Educational attainment influences transcendence as a character strength of nurses. (5) Civil status influences courage and transcendence.(6) Job placement influences character strengths with excluding humanity and wisdom.(7) Length of service does not influence character strengths.(8) Perceived clinical performance greatly influence character strengths. (9) As nurses perceived clinical performance increases, there is also a moderate increase of his or her practice of all the character strengths; namely, humanity, courage, justice, transcendence, temperance, and wisdom.

From these conclusions, the following are hereby recommended: (1) Craft a program that aims at improving the character strengths of nurses and at the same time enhance their clinical performance; (2) Conduct further study on character strength using proportionate number of participants as to demographic profile; (3) Conduct a qualitative study to determine how nurses can improve or enhance their character strengths and eventually also enhance their clinical performance.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. Oxford, England: Holt, Reinhart & Winston.

Harzer C., Ruch W. (2012). *When the job is a calling: the role of applying one's signature strengths at work. J. Posit*. Psychol. 7 362–371 10.1080/17439760.2012.702784.

Harzer C., Ruch W. (2013). *The application of signature character strengths and positive experiences at work*. J. Happiness Stud. 14 965–983 10.1007/s10902-012-9364-0.

Harzer C., Ruch W. (2014). *The role of character strengths in task performance, job dedication,   interpersonal facilitation, and organizational support*. Hum. Perform. 27 183–205   10.1080/08959285.2014.913592.

Harzer, C., & Ruch, W. (2015). *The relationships of character strengths with coping, work-related stress, and job satisfaction*. Frontiers in Psychology. Doi:10.3389/fpsyg. 2015.00165

Hodapp V., Tanzer N. K., Korunka C., Maier E. R., Pestemer I. A. (2005). "*The German adaptation of the Job Stress Survey: a multistudy validation in different occupational*

settings," in Stress and Emotion, Vol. 17 eds Spielberger C. D., Sarason I. G., editors. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kouta, C. & kaite, CP. (2011). *Gender discrimination and nursing: A literature review*. Journal of Professional Nursing, 27(1): 59-63.

Peterson C., Park N., Seligman M. E. P. (2005) "*Assessment of character strengths,*" *Psychologists' Desk Reference*, eds Koocher G. P., Norcross J. C., Hill III S. S., editors. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Peterson C., Seligman M. E. P. (2003). *Character strengths before and after September 11*. Psychol. Sci. 14 381–384 10.1111/1467-9280.24482

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

Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2010). *Essentials of nursing research: Appraising evidence for nursing practice*. Place of publication not identified: LWW.

Ruch W., Proyer R. T., Harzer C., Park N., Peterson C., Seligman M. E. P. (2010). *Values in Action Inventory of Strengths (VIA-IS): Adaptation and validation of the German version and the development of a peer-rating form*. J. Individ. Dif. 31 138–149 10.1027/1614-0001/a000022.

Seligman, M. E. (2002). *Authentic happiness: Using the new positive psychology to realise your potential for lasting fulfillment*. London: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Spielberger C. D., Vagg P. R. (1999). *Professional Manual for the Job Stress Survey (JSS)*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Resources Assessment.

Top 10 Qualities of a Great Nurse. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://nursinglink.monster.com/benefits/articles/5019-top-10-qualities-of-a-great-nurse?page=1

Vagg P. R., Spielberger C. D. (1998). *Occupational stress: measuring job pressure and organizational support in the workplace*. J. Occup. Health Psych. 3 294–305 10.1037/1076-8998.3.4.294.