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Abstract

Human flourishing or living well is widely accepted as a principal outcome of therapeutic recreation (TR) services but multiple conceptualizations of what it means to live well found in the TR literature raise questions of association and compatibility. The present investigation extends previous explorations of connections among the numerous notions, specifically appraising the relationship of Seligman’s theory of Flourishing to MacIntyre’s broadened theory of Flourishing, the Leisure and Well-Being Model, and the Flourishing through Leisure Model. Results indicate the two theories portray distinct views of flourishing and that a complementary relationship exists among Seligman’s theory and the two practice models. When considered as a whole, the extant body of scholarship supplies the profession with a solid philosophical and scientific foundation for promoting human flourishing.

Keywords

Character strengths, human flourishing, positive psychology, therapeutic recreation, virtues

James Wise is a professor in the Recreation, Parks and Leisure Services Department at Minnesota State University, Mankato.

Please send correspondence to james.wise@mnsu.edu
Human flourishing or living well is hailed as a principal outcome of therapeutic recreation (TR) services (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, 2012b; Heyne & Anderson, 2012; Wise, 2014a, 2014b, 2015, 2017, 2019, 2020; Wise & Barney, 2021). While the importance of living well is widely accepted, there is not a universally agreed upon notion of flourishing. To illustrate, in the TR literature, authors invoke multiple conceptualizations when talking about what it means to live well (e.g., Anderson & Heyne, 2012a; Carruthers & Hood, 2007; Sylvester, 2011; Wise, 2014a, 2020). Further complicating matters is that the notions represent different conceptual levels: some are at the level of formal theory (Sylvester, 2011; Wise, 2014a) while others such as practice models are practical applications of theories (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a; Carruthers & Hood, 2007).

Because the existing conceptualizations are diverse in terms of content and conceptual level, it is imperative to determine if the prevailing views are related and if they are related, whether the relationships are complementary or oppositional. Such determinations have pragmatic implications. Consider a scenario where entities are at different conceptual levels and complement one another. In this situation, therapeutic recreation specialists (TRSs) can use the conceptualizations in a collaborative manner to provide sound, efficacious services (Wise, 2020). For example, a formal theory may supply strong, convincing support for pursuing flourishing as a professional goal while a complementary practice model may delineate actions that maximize professionals’ efforts aimed at achieving the goal. Professionals’ effectiveness can be enhanced even if two notions are found to be oppositional. Specifically, effectiveness is bolstered by intentionally avoiding use of the antagonistic entities conjointly. Additionally, in-depth analyses are conducted on the antithetical notions to figure out which entity best promotes human flourishing, and this conceptualization is then employed by TRSs.

Progress has been made toward ascertaining interrelationships among conceptualizations of flourishing (Wise, 2018, 2020). A number of similarities between Nussbaum’s Capabilities Approach (2006, 2013) and the broadened version of MacIntyre’s theory (1999, 2007; Sylvester, 2007, 2009; Wise, 2014b, 2017) were identified, indicating the two theories of flourishing are compatible (Wise, 2018). Wise (2020) extended the investigatory scope to include a more recent version of MacIntyre’s theory, one that explicitly addressed recreation and its connection to flourishing (Wise, 2019), and the Flourishing through Leisure Model: An Ecological Extension of the Leisure and Well-Being Model (FTL; Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, 2012b). He found the three views correlated, complementary, and differentiated by degree of specificity. The Capabilities Approach is relatively abstract and accommodates multiple accounts of flourishing. MacIntyre’s expanded theory details a particular notion of flourishing and the components of leisure, recreation, and work. Finally, the FTL catalogs specific actions TRSs perform to foster service recipients’ flourishing through their engagement in leisure and recreation practices that transpire in favorable environments.

Continued exploration is warranted as there are additional views of living well. A logical next step is investigating the relationship between MacIntyre’s expanded theory and the positive psychology-based theory of flourishing authored by Seligman (2012). The science of positive psychology, besides spawning Seligman’s theory, has significantly influenced TR scholars’ notions of living well (Chen et al., 2018; Dattilo, 2015). For instance, positive psychology scholarship is a cornerstone of two TR practice mod-

Based on the preceding discussion, an investigation extending Wise's (2018, 2020) studies was conducted. The investigation scrutinized and appraised the relationship of Seligman’s theory to three other conceptualizations of flourishing: MacIntyre’s broadened theory, the LWM, and the FTL. The results are presented in this article which unfolds in the following manner. First, readers are supplied with a brief overview of Seligman’s scholarly works culminating in his theory of flourishing and an outline of the broadened version of MacIntyre’s flourishing theory. Second, similarities and differences between the two theories are reviewed and a correlation proffered. Next, connections among Seligman’s theory of happiness and his theory of flourishing, the field of positive psychology, and the two practice models are identified, and a relationship is forwarded. Then, all the entities examined by Wise (2018, 2020) and the present study are integrated into a foundation for TR. The article culminates with brief discussions of practical implications and future objectives.

**Selective Summary of Seligman’s Scholarship**

An intentionally selective, temporally ordered, summary of Seligman’s (2018) scholarship gives readers an idea of what led him to create a theory of flourishing. At the beginning of his professional career, psychologist Martin Seligman was concerned with understanding why some people quickly gave up when they experienced failure. The answer was learned helplessness, a concept he formulated into a theory in the 1960s. He reformulated the theory in the 1970s by incorporating recent cognitive-based explanations for human behavior. In 1975, he wrote a book on learned helplessness for the public (Seligman, 1998, 2018).

The theory hypothesizes people’s behaviors are explained by the causes they attribute to their failures. When people postulate that their failures across a wide spectrum of situations are due to stable, personally rooted causes such as a lack of skill or intelligence, they experience a profound sense of powerlessness to influence their lives in meaningful ways, now and in the future. Consistently employing this explanatory style leads to a paucity of motivation and perseverance, physical illness, hopelessness, and depression (Seligman, 1998).


Learned optimism is the opposite of learned helplessness. People with an optimistic explanatory style explain that their successes across a wide range of domains are due to stable, personally rooted causes such as one’s skill or intelligence. They believe they are the architects of their lives and make good things happen for themselves and others. People who employ an optimistic explanatory style initiate projects, perform at a high level, experience many positive emotions, persevere when they encounter setbacks and impediments, and enjoy physical and mental health (Seligman, 1998).

Seligman’s (2018) next major accomplishment coincided with his election as president of the American Psychological Association in 1998. Early in his presidency, Selig-
man implored the profession to move away from its historical emphasis on reducing deficits and adopt an emphasis on increasing well-being through exercising personal strengths in stimulating environments. He called on the profession to become “a science that seeks to understand positive emotion, build strength and virtue, and provide guideposts for finding what Aristotle called the ‘good life’” (Seligman, 2002, p. xi). The subsequent science was dubbed positive psychology and Martin Seligman became its recognized leader.

One of his first contributions to the science was a theory of well-being. The theory, called Authentic Happiness (Seligman, 2002, 2018), is composed of three elements: positive emotions, engagement, and meaning. Well-being is enhanced when people experience positive emotions generated by successfully participating in meaningful activities. Well-being is further enhanced when people become engaged or absorbed in those meaningful activities. Engagement occurs when personal skills match environmental challenges, there are clear goals and relevant feedback, people concentrate on the task and lose self-consciousness, and time transforms, either speeding up or slowing down (Csikszentmihalyi 1990, 1997). Finally, a life of meaning ensues when people utilize their personal strengths and virtues to improve the lives of other people.

A decade later, growing awareness of several shortcomings with the theory of Authentic Happiness led Seligman (2012, 2018) to address the deficiencies by formulating a more comprehensive theory of flourishing. The theory is often referred to by the mnemonic PERMA which represents the five “pillars” (Seligman, 2012, p. 24) of living well: Positive Emotions, Engagement, Positive Relationships, Meaning, and Accomplishment. First, according to the theory, flourishing people experience many positive emotions such as satisfaction, pleasure, and optimism. Second, flourishers also experience flow (Csikszentmihalyi 1990, 1997), a state of total engagement with or absorption in an activity due to negotiating challenges that match or slightly exceed personal abilities. Third, reflecting human beings’ social nature (Ryan & Deci, 2000), people who are flourishing develop and maintain strong, positive connections with others. Fourth, the lives of flourishers are meaningful lives marked by a sense of purpose cultivated by belonging to and serving something bigger than themselves. The focus of the fifth and final pillar or element of living well is goal-directed behavior: establishing, pursuing, and accomplishing challenging, personally relevant, aspirations.

**Broadened Version of MacIntyre’s Theory of Flourishing**

A second theory of flourishing depicted in the TR literature and applied to the profession was founded on the works of MacIntyre (1999, 2007), a philosopher who writes prolifically on virtue ethics. His theory, broadened to explicitly address recreation and leisure, has been extensively described elsewhere so only a synopsis, largely taken intact from Wise (2020), is presented here (Sylvester, 2007, 2009; Wise, 2014a, 2014b, 2015, 2017, 2018, 2019). Readers are encouraged to consult the references in the preceding two sentences for fuller accounts of the theory.

MacIntyre (1999, 2007) postulates the ultimate goal of living is flourishing which is defined as excelling at “the activities and achievements” that constitute living well as human beings (1999, p. 63). Excelling in practices is the heart of the theory. A practice is a “coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity” (MacIntyre, 2007, p. 187) and excelling enriches the lives of practice members who, in turn, provide socially valuable goods and services.
Practices encompass professions such as therapeutic recreation and physical therapy and social roles such as father and mother. Members of practices strive to excel which entails achieving exigent technical and ethical standards (MacIntyre, 2007). Technical standards often center on gaining and applying practice-related knowledge, skills, and abilities. Besides being good at the practice, members must be good people meaning they behave virtuously and treat others ethically. When members of a practice meet or exceed standards in both areas, they obtain internal goods. Internal goods are outcomes resulting from excelling in a particular practice and these outcomes can only be fully recognized and appreciated by people participating in the practice (MacIntyre, 2007). The outcomes are available to everyone who excels, better people’s lives, and benefit society (MacIntyre, 2007). Examples include quality services and products, satisfaction from delivering those services, pride from crafting those products, comradery with other members, and increased well-being.

To illustrate excelling, consider TRSs. Specialists excel when they possess knowledge and perform tasks delineated by the 2014 job analysis (National Council for Therapeutic Recreation Certification, 2018) and standards of practice (American Therapeutic Recreation Association; ATRA, 2015). Excelling TRSs create individualized treatment plans based upon sound assessment data, deliver effective therapeutic programs, author clear, concise, and accurate documentation, present results to relevant parties, labor to dispel stereotypes of people with disabilities, and advocate for patients. They also adhere to the profession’s code of ethics (ATRA, 2009) which entails respecting patients’ choices and treating them fairly, being honest with patients and colleagues, and maximizing therapeutic outcomes. These goods, services, and actions enrich lives and contribute to a better society. TRSs take pride and satisfaction in their work and form collegial relationships; service recipients experience improved health and functioning; and society benefits from the contributions of people with disabilities (Sylvester, 2009).

Leisure, Recreation, and Work

Sylvester (2007) applied MacIntyre’s (1999, 2007) theory to leisure. The initial document, a conference abstract, established an outline for envisioning leisure pursuits as MacIntyrean practices with a focus on describing internal goods and virtues common to all leisure practices. Wise (2014b) expanded Sylvester’s (2007) content and extended the application to recreation (2019) and work (2017). The series of articles strikingly convey how treating leisure, recreation, and work as practices ensures they operate harmoniously and contribute to flourishing. “The practice of leisure forms a synergy with other practices, such as work and family [and recreation], for the purpose of a unified good life” (Sylvester, 2007, p. 210).

Comparing Seligman’s and MacIntyre’s Theories of Flourishing

Similarities

There are similarities between the two theories of flourishing. To demonstrate, several aspects of MacIntyre’s theory correlate with Seligman’s five pillars: PERMA. The heart of MacIntyre’s (2007) framework is a practice, in which people achieve demanding technical and ethical standards through their relationships with one another. Striving to accomplish demanding standards often requires total concentration leading
to intense absorption or engagement in the practice's activities. Plus, achieving those standards results in internal goods or outcomes for participants which include positive emotions such as satisfaction and pride. Finally, excelling in practices is meaningful because the associated outcomes contribute to individuals’ well-being and the good of society (MacIntyre, 2007).

Differences

There are similarities, but there are numerous, significant differences between the two theories (Annas, 2004; Banicki, 2014; Fowers, 2008; Kristjánsson, 2018; Lambert et al., 2015; Martin, 2007; Nussbaum, 2007; Snow, 2019; Vaccarezza, 2017). One difference concerns orientation (MacIntyre, 1999, 2007). Philosophically based enterprises such as MacIntyre’s seek to discover what human flourishing is, elucidate the underlying theoretical framework including interrelationships among components, and advocate for pursuing that conceptualization (Fowers, 2008). In contrast, scientifically, empirically based enterprises such as Seligman’s (2012) seek to ascertain the extent people are flourishing and identify effective means of enhancing flourishing (Peterson & Seligman, 2004).

Accordingly, scientific endeavors describe what people actually do to live well while philosophical endeavors prescribe particular ways of living well (MacIntyre, 2007; Seligman, 2012, 2018). Positive psychology scientists find relationships between people’s actual behaviors and their personal perceptions of flourishing. Relationships are uncovered with statistical techniques and significant statistical values are translated into descriptions of actions that contribute to personal flourishing. However, statistical techniques do not evaluate the goodness of people’s behaviors nor the goodness of people’s notions of flourishing. Evaluating the morality of behaviors and concomitant conceptualizations of flourishing are tasks for philosophy. Philosophers conduct topical inquiries and based on their findings, endorse ways of living that have been judged as good and worthy of pursuit.

A second variation appears in the authors’ stances toward emotions (Annas, 2004). For Seligman (2002, 2012), positive emotions are a significant component of flourishing, so he emphasizes maximizing positive and minimizing negative emotions. In comparison, though MacIntyre considers positive emotions an aspect of flourishing; they are largely viewed as byproducts of excelling in practices, so he emphasizes excelling. Plus, “negative” emotions are part of and necessary for living well so they are meaningfully incorporated into personal narratives of flourishing (Banicki, 2014; Held, 2018; Lomas & Ivitzan, 2016; Nussbaum, 2007; Wong, 2011). Recognition that flourishing is more than hedonism was forcefully articulated by Edgar and Pattison (2016) who said a life well lived is “not a life spared contingencies, or even spared mistakes, setbacks and tragedies. It is rather a life that has engaged with and made sense of those contingencies” (p. 171).

A third distinguishing feature is the degree to which components are related to one another. MacIntyre’s theory of flourishing is relational and situated (Atkinson, 2013). This means the theory’s components are tightly intertwined and encapsulated within a person’s life story. These two conditions ensue from postulating flourishing as the final end or telos of human beings. Telos is an ancient Greek concept that stipulates people spend their lives pursuing a superordinate goal and the content of the goal guides and configures their actions in a meaningful, cohesive manner (Aristotle, 2001; MacIntyre,
Thus, MacIntyre (1999, 2007) argues that people must be virtuous and must excel in practices to flourish. They must also weave these and other actions into coherent personal narratives or stories that explain who they are, what matters most to them, and their reasons for acting as they did throughout their lives.

In contrast, Seligman’s (2012) theory, derived from “what people actually do to get well-being” (p. 20), portrays flourishing as a straightforward compilation of positive emotions, engagement, positive relationships, meaning, and achievement. His theory reflects a components approach to formulating a notion of living well (Atkinson, 2013). With a components approach, the composite elements are not necessarily causally linked nor unified in any particular way, a relationship encapsulated by Seligman’s use of the word pillars. Pillars are individual architectural features that are connected to one another by the structure they support. In his theory, the pillars represent five separate elements that support human flourishing. Each element is hypothesized to independently contribute to flourishing and there are no a priori postulated interrelationships. Furthermore, the high degree of independence among elements means flourishing is augmented by simply increasing each element as much as possible (Atkinson, 2013; Seligman, 2012).

A fourth distinction central to the present discussion, centers on virtues, a key constituent of both conceptualizations. Specifically, the commencing discussion focuses on relationships among virtues and relationships of virtues to flourishing.

MacIntyre’s Virtues

First, MacIntyre (1999, 2007) views virtues as interrelated and integrated into a coherent whole (Banicki, 2014; Titus, 2017; Vaccarezza, 2017). This means that virtues operate in conjunction with one another. For example, excelling in any practice requires people, at a minimum, to be honest, just, and courageous (MacIntyre, 2007). Thus, they must cultivate and employ all three virtues in concert. Coordinating multiple virtues leads neo-Aristotelians such as MacIntyre (2007) to identify phronesis as a meta-virtue (Aristotle, 2001; MacIntyre, 1988, 1999, 2007; Vaccarezza, 2017). Exercising phronesis or practical rationality entails considering the relevant details of a particular situation and then selecting and applying the right virtues in the right manner at the right time with the aim of fostering flourishing (Aristotle, 2001).

Second, in MacIntyre’s (1999, 2007) theory, virtues are contextualized entities so they cannot be fully understood without reference to corresponding conceptualizations of flourishing (Titus, 2017). As unambiguously articulated by Kinghorn (2017), virtue, flourishing, and social/cultural context are “deeply and necessarily connected” (p. 440); a “virtue can never be identified and articulated apart from particular socio-political contexts and particular accounts of individual and communal flourishing” (p. 437).

To illustrate this relationship between virtues and flourishing, let us consider the virtue of charity located within the philosophy of Aquinas (1952). Understanding charity demands an understanding of his notion of living well (Kinghorn, 2017; Titus, 2017). For Aquinas (1952), the telos of human beings is union with God which can only occur in Heaven. Until then, a principal goal for earthbound people is acting virtuously. The most important virtue in his catalog is charity which is composed of two closely related parts. The first part is recognizing and accepting the gift of God’s love and the second part is displaying one’s love of God through behaviors directed at
enhancing the lives of fellow human beings. Charity’s meaning and role in flourishing can only be understood in terms of God so without God, charity is no longer charity. Not surprisingly, extracting charity from this context and treating it as a secular virtue “trivializes and eviscerates Aquinas’ description of the theological virtue of charity” (Kinghorn, 2017, p. 443).

Seligman’s/Positive Psychology’s Virtues and Character Strengths

Virtues and character strengths comprise two levels of a three-level hierarchical classification designating components of good character (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). The hierarchy, arranged according to degree of abstractness, situates virtues as the most abstract classification. The universal virtues of courage, justice, humanity, temperance, transcendence, and wisdom were identified by combing relevant works of influential secular and religious thinkers spanning cultures and historical periods. The virtues are too abstract for scientific inquiry so three-to-five-character strengths, found on the middle level of the hierarchy, are “somewhat arbitrarily” associated with each of the six virtues (Seligman, 2018, p. 246). Strengths are the “psychological ingredients—processes or mechanisms—that define the virtues. Said another way, they are distinguishable routes to displaying one or another of the virtues.” (Peterson & Seligman, 2004, p. 12) Conceived as stable personality traits applicable to a range of contexts, strengths are amenable to scientific investigation meaning they can be operationalized, measured, and statistically linked to living well. Due to their ability to be scientifically studied, character strengths are the good character components of most interest to Seligman and positive psychologists. The final level of the hierarchical classification is composed of situational themes. Exhibiting the greatest level of detail, these specific habits are manifestations of character strengths displayed in particular situations or contexts.

In stark contrast to MacIntyre’s stance on virtues, positive psychology (Peterson & Seligman, 2004) regards virtues and character strengths1 as autonomous entities that may be correlated with one another and with certain notions of flourishing. Therefore, exercising a particular virtue or character strength does not inherently demand exercising any other virtues or character strengths in a coordinated manner. Consequently, no coordinating meta-virtue is necessary. Moreover, unlike the multitude of virtues MacIntyre (1999, 2007) claims are requisite for flourishing, Seligman (2012) declares people only need to cultivate a few signature strengths to flourish. The typically cited range is two to five well-developed character strengths that are frequently exercised (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Furthermore, as decontextualized entities, each virtue and character strength has a meaning which is not dependent upon and can be fully understood without reference to a certain notion of flourishing (Kinghorn, 2017). Strengths are “not limited to any particular place, time or social configuration” (Kinghorn, 2017, p. 436).

Illustrating the Difference

The difference in how the theories view virtues is illustrated with courage. For MacIntyre (2007), acting courageously is mandatory for excelling in any practice and indispensable to flourishing. The virtue is defined as “the capacity to risk harm or danger to oneself” (p. 192) while displaying care and concern for others. Since what it

---

1 Character strengths operate like virtues in neo-Aristotelian versions of flourishing such as MacIntyre’s theory (Banicki, 2014; Martin, 2007).
means to display care and concern differs from practice to practice, the core definition takes on nuances reflecting individual practices. For example, the manner in which soldiers demonstrate care and concern for fellow soldiers differs from how social justice activists manifest courage while advocating for oppressed people.

As one of the six virtues enumerated by Peterson and Seligman (2004), courage is “the exercise of will to accomplish goals in the face of opposition, either external or internal” (p. 199). Because courage falls into the most abstract level of the hierarchical classification, positive psychology focuses on the associated character strengths of bravery, persistence, integrity, and vitality (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). The four strengths share the feature of counteracting “some difficulty inherent in the human condition, some temptation that needs to be resisted, or some motivation that needs to be checked or rechanneled” (p. 199). Though interrelated, each strength is distinct. “Bravery is the ability to do what needs to be done despite fear” (p. 199) while persistence is defined as “finishing what one has started … despite obstacles” (p. 202). With integrity, “people are true to themselves, accurately representing—privately and publicly—their internal states, intentions, and commitments.” They “accept and take responsibility for their feelings and behaviors” (p. 249). Finally, vitality is defined as “feeling alive, being full of zest, and displaying enthusiasm for any and all activities” (p. 209). Besides being distinct from each other, the strengths, when viewed individually and as a composite, are not equivalent with the virtue of courage though a person is considered courageous “if he or she displays but 1 or 2 [associated] strengths” (p. 12).

It is clear MacIntyre’s definition of courage does not match the definition of courage forwarded by Peterson and Seligman. MacIntyre talks about risking harm to oneself while caring for others. The notions of harm, danger, and caring and concern for others are absent from Seligman’s definition. Nor does MacIntyre’s definition match any of the four associated character strengths’ definitions. The closest match is bravery if fear refers to the possibility of being harmed. Even so, the two are not equivalent because the definition of bravery does not mention caring about or being concerned for others.

Conclusion

The theories, exhibiting multiple, substantial differences, do not depict the same conceptualization of flourishing. At best, they are weakly correlated and even when theoretical elements go by the same name as with MacIntyre’s virtues and Seligman’s virtues/character strengths, corresponding, discrete instances of an element are not necessarily interchangeable as demonstrated with the virtue of courage (Snow, 2019).

Many readers are probably unfamiliar with the theories and concomitant specialized terminology. To assist, nontechnical definitions of key terms used in the Capabilities Approach (Nussbaum, 2006, 2013), MacIntyre’s (2007) theory, and Seligman’s (2012) theory are listed in Table 1.

Connections between Positive Psychology and the LWM and FTL Model

In this section, each practice model is described and its links with the field of positive psychology including Seligman’s (2002, 2012) theories of Authentic Happiness and Flourishing are established. Then, similarities shared by all the entities are highlighted. Finally, based on the tendered evidence, a conclusion is tendered.
Relationships among Flourishing Conceptualizations

Table 1
Nontechnical Definitions of Key Terms Related to Human Flourishing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flourishing</th>
<th>To live well and a significant contributor is participating in leisure and recreation activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capabilities Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functioning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MacIntyre's Broadened Theory of Flourishing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seligman’s Theory of Flourishing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character Strengths</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leisure and Well-Being Model (LWM)

As far back as 2004, Carruthers and Hood wrote about the relevancy of positive psychology for TR, reviewing the extensive body of literature and elucidating the scholarship’s connections with leisure and practical applications to TR. A few years later, the two authors published the Leisure and Well-Being Model (LWM; Carruthers & Hood, 2007; Hood & Carruthers, 2007) which was based on “research literature from a variety of fields, including positive psychology” (Hood & Carruthers, 2016a, p. 5). According to the model, TRSs strive to increase well-being which is defined as a “state of successful, satisfying, and productive engagement with one’s life and the realization of one’s full physical, cognitive, and social-emotional potential” (Carruthers & Hood, 2007, p. 280). Two dimensions of well-being are intentionally targeted by TRSs: positive affect and strengths. To boost both dimensions, TRSs facilitate quality leisure experiences and provide educational programs designed to enhance personal and environmen-
tal strengths (Hood & Carruthers, 2007). Quality leisure experiences are enjoyable, intrinsically motivated, freely chosen, autonomous, and fully engaging. Strengths are intrapersonal and interpersonal capacities and external contexts that foster well-being. Strengths span psychological, cognitive, physical, environmental, and social domains and a sampling of specific constructs includes increased optimism, concentration, energy, and social connectedness and improved interpersonal skills.

Articles describing the practice model (Carruthers & Hood, 2007; Hood & Carruthers, 2007, 2016a, 2016b) are replete with citations of scholarly endeavors drawn from positive psychology including Seligman’s (2002) theory of Authentic Happiness. Seligman’s (2012) theory of flourishing was not cited because the model appeared before the theory's origination. The citations corroborate the model’s guiding principle that alleviating people’s problems is insufficient for enhancing their well-being. Rather, well-being is enhanced by experiencing positive emotions stemming from participating in meaningful leisure that involves the cultivation and exercise of personal strengths in enriched environments (Hood & Carruthers, 2007; Seligman, 2002).

The influence of positive psychology scholarship extends to practical applications of the model. The LWM has stimulated fabrication of several therapeutic programs designed to enhance people’s well-being (Hood & Carruthers, 2016a, 2016b) and the programs incorporate techniques vetted through scientific research conducted by positive psychologists. For instance, a goal of the LWM is to help people learn how to savor leisure. Savoring, the maximizing of positive emotions engendered by leisure, is accomplished by executing certain actions before, during, and after leisure experiences. Actions proven to promote savoring include having people select leisure activities they enjoyed in the past, envision pleasant aspects of the upcoming activities, practice mindfulness during the activities, and share their memories of those activities with others (Lyubomirsky, 2008).

Flourishing through Leisure Model (FTL)

The FTL, an extension of the LWM, was constructed by adding the domain of spirituality, emphasizing the pivotal role the environment plays in flourishing, and expanding TRSs’ scope to encompass the addressing of environmental factors (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, 2012b). Reflecting the model’s underlying theoretical framework which consists of a strengths-based approach to human development, social model of disability, and ecological perspective, the TR process is driven by participants’ dreams, goals, and aspirations, not their problems or deficits. As such, TRSs collaborate with participants in their quest to flourish which occurs when people express their personal strengths in leisure environments.

As flourishing facilitators (Wise, 2014a), TRSs are charged with assisting people in gaining the knowledge and skills necessary for optimizing their personal leisure experiences and functional abilities in the leisure, psychological, emotional, cognitive, social, physical, and spiritual domains. Professionals are also charged with crafting inclusive environments that support application of that knowledge and performance of those skills and abilities.

When initially presenting the FTL model, Heyne and Anderson (2012) identified several compatible and foundational theories. Two of the theories are directly associated with Seligman. The first theory was Authentic Happiness (Seligman, 2002) and the second theory consisted of the virtues and character strengths enumerated by Peterson and Seligman (2004) and incorporated into Seligman’s (2012) theory of Flourishing. In
a later article, Anderson and Heyne (2016) described two other theories from positive psychology literature that underpin the FTL: Broaden-and-Build and the subsequent Upward Spiral Theory of Lifestyle Change (Fredrickson, 2001, 2013). The basic claim of these two theories is people adopt and sustain health promoting behaviors they find enjoyable. A corollary is that healthy leisure pursuits, because of the positive emotions they evoke, have a salutary impact on well-being. These claims are supported by a wealth of research from psychology and neuroscience, the study of brain structure and function.

Similarities among Seligman’s Theories and the Practice Models

Beyond Seligman’s theories and positive psychology’s scholarship serving as a basis of both models, the entities share a number of other features. For one, positive emotions play a substantial role in flourishing. The two practice models clearly stipulate a primary goal of TRSs is helping service recipients experience positive emotions. Creators of the LWM unambiguously state “the facilitation of positive emotion is … important … for TR practice” (Carruthers & Hood, 2007, p. 285) with a daily increase in positive emotions a sought-after outcome. Likewise, authors of the FTL said a primary goal of TR services is helping people engage in “leisure activities that create positive emotions” (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, p. 136). Finally, and as noted throughout this article, Seligman’s (2002, 2012) theories have consistently portrayed positive emotions as an element of flourishing.

Virtuous behavior, a second element of flourishing in both of Seligman’s theories, is another commonality among the conceptualizations. Seligman and his colleagues (Peterson & Seligman, 2004) created an extensive classification of virtues and character strengths that promote flourishing. Virtues and character strengths, when mobilized to serve others or a cause bigger than one’s self, contribute to fulfilled, meaningful lives. Ethical behavior also plays a prominent role in the practice models. In particular, “virtuous leisure is defined as the capacity to engage in leisure experiences that develop and/or mobilize personal strengths, capacities, interests and abilities in the service of something larger than oneself” (Hood & Carruthers, 2007, p. 316). Adopting Hood and Carruthers’ viewpoint of ethical behavior, Anderson and Heyne (2012) said “Virtuous leisure … is sharing of oneself with others through leisure experiences, whether it is volunteering, helping a neighbor, or sharing skills and talents with family members” (p. 137).

Conclusion

Based on the compiled evidence, it is concluded that Seligman’s theory of Flourishing and its precursor, Authentic Happiness, are strongly correlated and compatible with the practice models. This conclusion stems from the facts: the two practice models were based on research conducted by Seligman and scholars in the field of positive psychology, the FTL model is a direct extension of the LWM, and the three entities share several features. Since the theories and practice models represent different conceptual levels, the relationship is complementary. The models yield practical applications derived from the theories’ contents and gleaned from discoveries made by positive psychology researchers.
Discussion

Previously, Wise (2018, 2020) found Nussbaum’s Capabilities Approach (2006, 2013), the broadened version of MacIntyre’s theory (Sylvester, 2007, 2009; Wise, 2014b, 2017, 2019), and the FTL (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, 2012b) to be three strongly correlated, complementary views of flourishing. The findings reported here within extend Wise’s studies by determining that Seligman’s (2012) and MacIntyre’s (1999, 2007) theories portray two distinct views of flourishing and that a complementary relationship exists among Seligman’s theories of Authentic Happiness and Flourishing and the LWM and FTL.

The collection of conceptualizations listed in the previous paragraph can be ordered in at least two, related ways (Figure 1). One is according to level of abstraction, ranging from the abstract Capabilities Approach to the highly specified practice models. The other way is in alignment with Seligman’s pronouncement that “you first need the theory; next, the science; and then the applications” (2012, p. 70). This sequence designates the contribution each entity makes to a philosophical and scientific foundation for flourishing. The Capabilities Approach (Nussbaum, 2006, 2013) explicitly supports flourishing as a goal worthy of human pursuit and establishes the importance of recreation and leisure to flourishing. The approach’s abstract nature accommodates theories that supply thorough accounts of flourishing and MacIntyre’s (1999, 2007) theory does that, distinguishing and detailing components of flourishing with virtues positioned as a key element. Seligman (2002, 2012) and positive psychology supply the science, a growing body of empirical data that furnishes rich descriptions of virtues, attendant physical, psychological, and social outcomes of ethical behaviors, and environmental conditions that promote the acquisition and exercise of virtues (Peterson & Seligman, 2004; Titus, 2017). Finally, the LWM and FTL contribute applications germane to TR contexts. The models translate empirical data into actions and therapeutic programs that enhance flourishing (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, 2012b: Hood & Carruthers, 2016a, 2016b).

Figure 1
Level of Abstraction–Philosophical and Scientific Theories, and Practice Models
This arrangement accomplishes at least three linked objectives. First, it helps alleviate confusion TRSs may experience when initially exposed to the wide assortment of flourishing conceptualizations. Though all the notions incorporate the word flourishing, they are not identical and reflect different conceptual levels, ranging from abstract theories to concrete actions. The proposed configuration instills clarity by utilizing a nesting relationship format (Wise, 2020). In nested relationships, “[l]ess general theories are often subsets of, or related to, more general theories” (Pickett et al., 2007, p. 91). In other words, more detailed entities are nested within more abstract entities (Figure 2).

In the proposed arrangement, the FTL is nested in MacIntyre’s expanded theory which, in turn, is nested within the Capabilities Approach (Wise, 2018, 2020). Furthermore, the two practice models are nested within Seligman’s theories. The proposed relationship between the practice models and theories is in accordance with Mobily’s (1999) declaration that a model bridges “the difficult and tenuous ground between theory and practice” (p. 176) by “extract[ing] the essence of a …theory” (Pickett et al., 2007, p. 81) and converting the essence into practical applications.

Second, the configuration furnishes the profession and professionals with a solid foundation. Consisting of well-reasoned philosophical arguments and scientifically verified relationships, therapeutic programs, and outcomes, the foundation permits professionals to convincingly claim flourishing is a worthy professional endeavor and assure service recipients that their flourishing is enhanced through TR services.

Finally, the foundation, when coupled with recognition that leisure, recreation, and play are human rights and essential components of flourishing (Nussbaum, 2006, 2013; Sylvester, 1992; United Nations, n.d., 1989; Wise, 2015, 2019; World Leisure, 2000), specifies moral obligations for the profession and professionals. The profession must function as a just institution (Donnelly, 1985; Hemingway, 1987) because ensuring “the right to leisure [recreation, and play is] … the morally correct purpose of therapeutic recreation” (Sylvester, 1992, p. 19). Relatedly, TRSs must act as social justice agents who guarantee there are ample opportunities for all people to experience inclusive leisure, recreation, and play (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, 2012b; Wise, 2015, 2018).
Practical Implications

The preceding objectives lead to practical implications spanning the therapeutic process. First, personal narratives serve as assessments, conveying service recipients’ visions of flourishing and impediments to realizing those visions (Anderson & Heyne, 2012b, 2013; O’Keefe, 2005; Wise & Barney, 2021). The contents of narratives are complemented with data gathered with self-report measures of flourishing such as the Well-Being Index (Witman et al., 2014) which stemmed from the FTL model and the Adolescent Ethical Behavior in Leisure Scale (Widmer et al., 1996). In addition, TRSs can draw upon an assortment of scales compiled by positive psychologists (Gallagher & Lopez, 2019) and designed to measure relevant variables such as particular virtues (Kelley et al., 2019) and positive emotions (Tay et al., 2019).


Next, TRSs facilitate meaningful experiences (O’Keefe, 2005; Wise, 2021; Wise & Barney, 2021). Meaningful experiences ensue when service recipients work closely with specialists to select the recreation and leisure practices used in therapeutic programs (Van Andel, 1998). Furthermore, experiences are maximally therapeutic when they occur in supportive environments, demand service recipients use personal strengths, and are generated by therapeutic programs that are based on positive psychology science and feature techniques drawn from TR practice models (Anderson & Heyne, 2012a, 2012b, 2016; Dattilo & McKenney, 2016; Hood & Carruthers, 2016a, 2016b; Waterman, 1990, 1993).

Finally, specialists facilitate opportunities for service recipients to identify personally valued, flourish enhancing outcomes of therapeutic programs and integrate the outcomes into their personal narratives (Lawson et al., 2008; Wise, 2014a, 2021; Wise & Barney, 2021). Examples of opportunities include participating in debriefing sessions, authoring personal progress notes, filling out assessment scales a second time and comparing the responses to initial responses, completing homework assignments, and sharing their narratives with others (Hood & Carruthers, 2016b; O’Keefe, 2005; Wise, 2014a).

Future Objectives

The results of this study hold promise for the profession, professionals, and most importantly, the people we serve. However, there are two objectives yet to complete. First, the proposed organization of flourishing conceptualizations needs further validation. Validation can come from philosophical arguments made by other scholars and empirical data collected by other scientists that support the hypothesized relationships among the Capabilities Approach, MacIntyre’s expanded theory, Seligman’s theories, the LWM, and the FTL.
A second objective centers on continued illumination of the relationships among flourishing conceptualizations. Though it is intuitive to assume Seligman’s theories are nested within the Capabilities Approach and the LWM is nested within MacIntyre’s expanded theory, scholars should conclusively determine if intuition is correct. Additionally, the second wave of positive psychology (Held, 2004), also known as positive psychology 2.0 (PP 2.0; Wong, 2011), should be included in the mix of examined flourishing entities because the second wave addresses several shortcomings of Seligman’s (2012) theory of Flourishing. In the second wave, emotions and experiences traditionally deemed “negative” such as sadness, anxiety, anger, and trauma are recognized as possessing the capability to promote flourishing (Ivtzan et al., 2016; Lomas & Ivtzan, 2016; Wong, 2011). Of special interest for TR is the second wave’s claim that people can flourish because of, not despite, trauma due to illness, injury, and/or disability (Ivtzan et al., 2016; Lomas & Ivtzan, 2016). Furthermore, PP 2.0 explicitly acknowledges that visions of the good life and requisite virtues are not neutral concepts but moral in nature. Plus, virtues take their meaning and purpose from a concomitant vision of flourishing (Wong, 2011). These features make the scientifically based, theoretical framework of PP 2.0, in comparison to Seligman’s theory of Flourishing, more closely aligned with and complementary to MacIntyre’s philosophically based expanded theory.

**Summary**

Though there are multiple notions of flourishing in the TR literature, previous research (Wise, 2018, 2020) coupled with the findings of the present study indicate the notions are largely compatible and complementary, forming a comprehensive framework that portrays what it means to live well and describes how to foster flourishing. As such, the framework delivers philosophically derived support and scientifically derived guidance to the profession and professionals. First, the philosophical evidence supports TRSs acting as flourishing facilitators (Wise, 2014a) and accepting the moral imperative of ensuring people have ample opportunities to experience inclusive, life-enriching, leisure and recreation (Wise, 2015, 2019). Second, the scientific evidence enhances TRSs’ ability to promote flourishing through supplying empirically verified techniques. The end result is more people living well because of their involvement in leisure and recreation activities.
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