

Strength-based parenting and life satisfaction in teenagers

Lea Waters

Centre for Positive Psychology

Melbourne Graduate School of Education, Melbourne

Abstract

Two studies demonstrated the positive associations that authoritative parenting and strength-based parenting have with life satisfaction in adolescents. In Study 1, teenagers' (N = 689; Mage = 15.20, SD = 3.80; 52% male) reports of the degree to which their parents demonstrated authoritative and strength-based parenting (SBP) explained over a third of the variance in life satisfaction scores (Adj. R² = 35%). SBP explained 19% of variation in life satisfaction scores above and beyond the effects of authoritative parenting. Furthermore, SBP prospectively and significantly predicted 5% of life satisfaction in teenagers 12 months later. Study 2 recruited 127 adolescent-parent dyads (Adolescent Mage 15.30, SD = 2.30; 58% female; Parent Mage = 46.01, SD = 11.02; 67% mothers) and found that parent-reports of the degree to which they are aware of their son/daughter's strengths and the degree to which they encouraged their son/daughter to use their strengths explained additional variance in life satisfaction in adolescents beyond their adolescent son/daughter's own strengths-knowledge and strengths-use. It was concluded that strength-based parenting is a significant contributor to life satisfaction during adolescence.

Keywords: parents, strengths, life satisfaction, adolescence, wellbeing, authoritative parenting

INTRODUCTION

The teenage years (i.e., adolescence, ages 13-19) are known to be a challenging developmental period, as evidenced by declines in life satisfaction during adolescence (Aquilino & Supple, 2001; Cimpian, Arce, Markman, & Dweck, 2007; Masten, 2004; Rindfuss, 1991). Such declines have been observed in youth samples in America (e.g., Suldo and Huebner 2004a), Israel (e.g., Ullman & Tatar 2001), South Korea (e.g., Park, 2005), and China (e.g. Chang et al., 2003). This is concerning given that life satisfaction is an especially important contributor to wellbeing during this life stage (Proctor, Linley, & Maltby, 2009). The current study focuses on the influence of two positive parenting styles—authoritative parenting and strength-based parenting—on life satisfaction during adolescence.

Mental health and life satisfaction during adolescence

Adolescence describes the period of transition from childhood to adulthood and is accompanied by wide ranging physical, biological, neurological, hormonal, social, cognitive, affective and behavioural changes (Lerner & Steinberg, 2009). These changes render adolescence a time of intensified vulnerability for the emergence of psychological disorders. Epidemiological research shows that the onset of Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) commonly begins in adolescence (Schwartz, Sheeber, Dudgeon, & Allen, 2012). The World Health Organization's 'Health for the World's Adolescents' report (2014) lists depression as the number one cause of illness and suicide is the third leading cause of death in teens.

Research has highlighted the important role that life satisfaction, defined as one's global subjective assessment of life quality (Diener & Diener, 1995), plays in youth mental health

(Proctor et al., 2009). Life satisfaction (LS) acts both as a buffer against the development of psychological disorders and as an enabler that promotes positive states of psychological wellbeing during adolescence. Illustrating the buffering effect of life satisfaction, adolescents with high life satisfaction have been shown to demonstrate less externalizing behaviours when confronted with stressful life events compared to their peers with low life satisfaction (Huebner, Funk, & Gilman, 2000; Suldo & Huebner, 2004). Demonstrating the enabling effects of life satisfaction, Suldo and Huebner (2006) reported that students who were high in life satisfaction had significantly higher levels of academic, emotional, and social self-efficacy, as well as higher scores on tests of interpersonal and cognitive functioning, and the highest levels of social support (see Proctor et al., 2009, for a review of the youth life satisfaction literature).

Longitudinal and intervention research shows that life satisfaction is both a casual factor in mental health as well as an outcome of good mental health (Gilman, Easterbrooks & Frey, 2004; Suldo & Huebner 2004). Indeed, in an extensive review, Proctor et. al. (2009) concluded that “The youth life satisfaction literature provides clear evidence to suggest that youth life satisfaction is more than just an outcome of various psychological states (e.g., positive affect, self-esteem), it is also an influential predictor of psychological states and psychosocial systems” (p. 604). Thus, more research is warranted into the factors that can boost life satisfaction during adolescence, particularly given the finding that life satisfaction declines during adolescence.

The importance of parenting on LS during adolescence

Recent neuroscientific developments demonstrate the existence of heightened neuroplasticity during adolescence, which renders the adolescent brain particularly sensitive to environmental influence (Andersen & Teicher, 2008; Bateson et al., 2004). The family environment, especially parental-adolescent relationships, is a potent influence in shaping the psychological health of adolescents during this time (Peterson, Bush, & Supple, 1999; Schwartz, Dudgeon, Sheeber, Yap, Simmons, & Allen, 2012; Steinberg & Morris, 2001). The current study, therefore, focuses on the influence of parenting style upon life satisfaction during adolescence. Schwartz et al. (2012) define parenting style as a “broad approach to parenting, including attitudes and beliefs that shape the emotional climate of the family” (p. 448).

Interest in the salutary adolescent outcomes stemming from positive parenting is growing across fields such as family therapy, developmental psychology and public health (Conoley & Conoley, 2009; Sanders, & Kirby 2014; Sheridan & Burt, 2009; Wilson, Havighurts, & Harley, 2012; 2014). To date, the most widely researched positive parenting style is authoritative parenting, which is characterized by parents who are warm, sensitive, supportive, and emotionally available but who also set clear boundaries and rules for behaviour (Gray & Steinberg, 1999).

Authoritative parenting has been shown to act as both a protective factor that buffers adolescents against mental illness and a promotion factor that builds mental wellbeing. As a protective factor, authoritative parenting is inversely related to depressive symptoms in early adolescence, mid adolescence, and late adolescence (Aquilino & Supple, 2001; Sheeber, Hops, Alpert, Davis, & Andrews, 1997; Schwartz et al., 2014). In Gaté et al.’s (2013) longitudinal prospective study, the research team concluded that “One effective preventive approach to improving mental health may be providing parents with psychoeducation concerning the importance of pleasant and affirming interactions with their children” (Gaté et al., 2013, p. 349).

As a promoting factor, authoritative parenting is associated with greater self-esteem, prosocial behaviour, parent-adolescent communication, adolescent behavioural autonomy, and, most relevant to the focus of the current research, life satisfaction in teenagers (Chang, McBride-Chang, Stewart, & Au, 2003; Herthington & Martin, 1986; Holmbeck, Paikoff & Brookes-Gun, 1995; Leung, McBride-Chang, & Lai, 2004; Peterson, Kennedy, & Sullivan, 1991; Seibel & Johnson, 2001; Suldo & Huebner, 2004b; Suldo & Huebner, 2006).

In summary, authoritative parenting is linked to positive adjustment, including life satisfaction, in adolescent samples. Given that life satisfaction has been shown to be an important predictor of mental health during adolescence, further research is required to examine the role of authoritative parenting and other forms of positive parenting on life satisfaction. The current study adopts a positive psychology approach to explore whether another form of positive parenting—strength-based parenting—also promotes life satisfaction in teenagers.

What is the potential role of strength-based parenting on life satisfaction of teenagers?

In the foundational paper introducing the field of positive psychology, Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) put forward a call “for massive research in human strengths” (p. 8) and also called for a scientific understanding of what builds thriving families. The current paper heeds both of these calls and examines whether strength-based parenting is related to life satisfaction in teenagers, above and beyond the effect of authoritative parenting.

Strength-based parenting is “a style of parenting that seeks to deliberately identify and cultivate positive states, positive processes and positive qualities in one’s children” (Waters, 2015, p. 690). Waters (2015) found that the degree to which children (Mage = 11.30) reported receiving strength-based parenting positively predicted the extent to which they used strength-based coping strategies and negatively predicted their stress levels. Following a strength-based parenting intervention with parents of pre-schoolers (Mage = 4.40), Sheely-Moore and Bratton (2010) found that parents reported fewer problematic child behaviors in their children. The Triple P positive parenting program which is underpinned by a strength based approach has been shown to lead to reductions in child problem behaviors (Mage = 5.90) (Nowak & Heinrichs, 2008; Saunders).

The empirical research on strength-based parenting has concentrated on child samples, rather than teenagers, and has focused on how strength-based parenting reduces negative outcomes such as stress and problematic behavior, rather than promoting positive outcomes like life satisfaction. Other strength-based approaches (e.g., school-based strengths interventions) have shown that such connecting teenagers with their strengths leads to increases in life satisfaction (Proctor, Tsukayama, Wood, Maltby, Eades & Linley, 2011; Suldo, Savage, & Mercer, 2013). However, to date, there has been no research on the effect of strength-based parenting on life satisfaction in teenagers. This study extends the current research by investigating whether strength-based parenting is associated with a positive outcome—life satisfaction—in an adolescent sample.

Across two studies, this research paper adopts the two aspects of strengths outlined by Govindji and Linley (2007)—strengths knowledge and strengths use—to test the relationship between strength-based parenting and life satisfaction in teenagers. Strength knowledge is defined as a person’s “awareness and recognition of their strengths” (Govindji & Linley, 2007, p. 146), whereas strengths use is defined as the extent to which individuals “use their strengths in a variety of settings (p. 147).

STUDY 1

Study one aimed to test whether: H1) strength-based parenting is associated with life satisfaction and H2) whether strength-based parenting explains additional variance in life satisfaction beyond the effects of authoritative parenting.

These hypotheses were formed on the rationale that strength-based parenting supports and extends the exploratory behaviour that is gained through authoritative parenting. Authoritative parenting creates safe attachment and fulfils the child's fundamental belongingness need (Bowlby, 1969; Baumeister & Leary, 1995). This need satisfaction then stimulates exploratory behaviour that allows children and teenagers to learn about themselves and the world, slowly becoming more autonomous and independent (Bowlby, 1969). It has been argued that strength-based parenting builds on the effects of authoritative parenting by encouraging young people to explore the world whilst deploying their strengths (Waters, 2015). When an adolescent is motivated to explore new situations and new relationships through their strengths, they interact with their environments using their positive traits and natural capacities (Clifton & Anderson, 2002), thus potentially leading to higher life satisfaction.

METHOD

Participants and procedure. Six hundred and eighty nine teenagers (Years 7-12; Mage = 15.20, SD = 3.20; 52% male and 48% female) from a public high school completed baseline measures (T1) of their life satisfaction and the degree to which their parents provided authoritative parenting and strength-based parenting. To test whether authoritative parenting and strength-based parenting longitudinally predicted life satisfaction, high school students reported their life satisfaction again after twelve months (T2). At T2, the sample size was reduced to 581 because final year students from the previous year had graduated.

MEASURES

Life satisfaction. Adolescents completed the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) to measure their global assessment of satisfaction with life. This scale consist of 5 items ($\alpha = .90$) assessed on a 5 point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree), with higher scores reflecting higher life satisfaction (e.g., "I am satisfied with my life"; "If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.").

Authoritative parenting. Teenagers completed the authoritative parenting sub-scale of Jackson, Henriksen and Foshee's (1998) Authoritative Parenting Index (API), which measures children's perceptions of parenting behaviors (parental warmth, acceptance, involvement, and intrusiveness [reverse-scored]). The scale consists of 9 items ($\alpha = .93$) rated on a 5 point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). Example items include "My parents make me feel better when I am upset" and "My parents are too busy to talk to me' (reverse-scored). Higher scores reflecting higher perceptions of authoritative parenting behaviours.

Strength-based parenting. Teenagers completed modified versions of Govindji and Linley's (2007) Strengths Knowledge Scale (SKS) and Strengths Use Scale (SUS). These scales define strengths as "the things you are able to do well or do best" (Govindji & Linley, 2007, p. 146). The original SKS assesses people's awareness and recognition of their strengths (8 items; e.g., "I know my strengths well"; "I have to think hard about what my strengths are" [reverse-scored]), whereas the original SUS assesses the extent to which individuals use their strengths (14 items; e.g., "I am regularly able to do what I do best"; "I use my strengths everyday").

In the current study, the items were modified, following Waters (2015), to measure teenager’s perceptions of parenting behaviors (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). For example, the SKS item “I am aware of my strengths” was adjusted to “My parents are aware of my strengths” and the SUS item “I am able to use my strengths in lots of different situations” was altered to “My parents encourage me to use my strengths in lots of different situations.” Both modified scales showed high internal consistency ($\alpha_{SKS} = .87$; $\alpha_{SUS} = .94$).

STUDY 1 RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics and Preliminary Analyses

Table 1 presents the descriptive and correlational data for the dependent (i.e., life satisfaction) and three independent variables of authoritative parenting, strength-based parenting (knowledge), and strength-based parenting (use). Correlational analysis revealed moderate sized positive associations between teenager’s life satisfaction and their assessment of their parents’ authoritative parenting ($r = .41, p < .001$), parents’ knowledge of their strengths ($r = .45, p < .001$), and parents’ encouragement to use their strengths ($r = .56, p < .001$). Parents strengths knowledge was moderately correlated with parents encouragement of strengths use ($r = .69, p < .001$). Authoritative parenting was moderately correlated with strength-based parenting (knowledge; $r = .43, p < .001$) and strength-based parenting (use; $r = .43, p < .001$). Interestingly, whereas mean adolescent-ratings of their parents’ use of authoritative approaches were high at 34.11 out of 45 (76%), ratings for strength-based parenting were much lower at 20.80 out of 40 (52%) and 35.71 out of 70 (51%).

Table 1: Intercorrelations between Authoritative Parenting, Strength-based Parenting (Knowledge), Strength-based Parenting (Use) and Life Satisfaction

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Scale range	1	2	3	4
1. Life satisfaction	18.52	3.81	5-25	1.00			
2. Authoritative Parenting	34.11	6.04	9-45	.41**	1.00		
3. Strength-based parenting (knowledge)	20.80	4.98	8-40	.45**	.48**	1.00	
4. Strength-based parenting (use)	35.71	9.22	14-70	.56**	.43**	.54**	1.00

$N = 662$; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Prior to conducting regression analyses, preliminary analyses revealed that the collinearity statistics (e.g. Tolerance and VIF) were within acceptable limits, and residual and scatter plots indicated no violations of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity for all analyses (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 2009). Thus, assumptions for hierarchical multiple regression were deemed to be satisfied.

Strength-based Parenting Predicts Unique Variance in Teenage Life Satisfaction

A two-step hierarchical multiple regression was used to investigate hypothesis 1. Teenagers’ ratings of their parents’ levels of authoritative parenting were entered at Step 1. Step 2 entered teenagers’ rating of the degree to which their parents had knowledge of their strengths and the degree to which their parents encouraged them to use their strengths.

At step one, authoritative parenting significantly and positively predicted teenager's life satisfaction, $F(1, 623) = 116.48, p < .001$, accounting for 17% of the variance. At Step 2, adding the two strength-based parenting variables as simultaneous predictors more than doubled the explained variance (adjusted R^2) to 36%, $F(2,621) = 93.22, p < .001$. Furthermore, the standardised beta weights reveal that adolescent-reports of the extent to which parents encouraged them to use their strengths ($\beta = .41$) substantially outpredicted authoritative parenting ($\beta = .16$) and the knowledge aspect of strength-based parenting ($\beta = .14$). Thus, strength-based parenting explained significant variance in life satisfaction beyond the positive effects of authoritative parenting, and perceptions of being encouraged to use one's strengths appear to be more influential than reports of whether parents know one's strengths.

Table 2: Results for Hierarchical Multiple regression Analysis Predicting Teenager Life Satisfaction

Variable	β	T	Sr^2	R	R^2	Adj. R^2
Step 1				.41	.17	.17
Authoritative parenting	.41	11.25***	.17			
Step 2				.60	.36	.36
Authoritative parenting	.16	4.33***	.03			
Strength-based parenting (knowledge)	.14	3.55***	.02			
Strength-based parenting (use)	.41	10.32***	.14			

$N = 624$ *** $p < .001$.

Strength-based Parenting Predicts Life Satisfaction 12 Months Later

A 3-step hierarchical multiple regression tested the longitudinal effects of strength-based parenting. T1 life satisfaction was entered at Step 1 in order to hold it constant in assessing the effect of T1 parenting on T2 life satisfaction. Authoritative parenting was entered at Step 2 and the two strength-based parenting variables (knowledge and use) were entered at Step 3.

Results showed that T1 life satisfaction significantly predicted increased life satisfaction at T2, accounting for 18% of the variance in T2 life satisfaction, $F(1,519) = 111.36, p < .001$. When teenager's assessment of the degree of authoritative parenting they received at T1 was added at Step 2, explained variance for T2 life satisfaction increased to 25%, $F(1,518) = 49.91, p < .001$. When the degree to which teenager's rated their parents strengths knowledge and strengths use at time 1 was added, the explained variance increased to 30%, $F(2,516) = 21.15, p < .001$. In sum, all three steps explained unique significant variance. Furthermore, with regard to the focus of the current study, teenagers' reports of the degree to which they received strength based parenting at time one significantly predicted their life satisfaction twelve months later and explained 5% unique variance.

DISCUSSION

Study 1 investigated the degree to which authoritative parenting and strength-based parenting were associated with life satisfaction in teenagers and whether strength-based parenting explains unique variance beyond the effects of authoritative parenting.

The results showed, firstly, that there was a significant positive relationship between authoritative parenting and life satisfaction. In fact, 17% of life satisfaction in teenagers came from the degree to which they reported that their parents were authoritative. This finding is consistent with past research that shows authoritative parenting is related to life satisfaction in teenagers (Suldo & Huebner, 2004; 2006), highlighting the importance of positive parenting. Even in a teenage sample, at a life stage where we think they are moving away from needing their parents (Calkins & Bell, 1999; Yap, Allen & Ladouceur, 2008; Steinberg, 2014), these teenagers reported that a significant portion of the satisfaction they received in their life came from whether or not their parents were warm, sensitive, supportive, and emotionally available.

When strength-based parenting was added to the regression equation, explained variance doubled from 17% to 36%. The importance of strength based parenting was shown again at the one year re-test and where strength-based parenting at T1 accounted for 5% of life satisfaction a year later.

The findings suggest that teenagers tend to report higher levels of life satisfaction when their parents are warm, sensitive, supportive (authoritative parenting) and when their parents also seek to identify and cultivate their strengths (strength-based parenting). However, whereas teenagers, on average, provided relatively high ratings of their parents' use of authoritative approaches, they reported that their parents only provided average levels of strength-based parenting. These results suggest that although parents are likely to understand the importance of providing love and emotional support (Eshel, Daelmans, de Mello, & Martines, 2006), they may not be as aware of the importance of deliberately and systematically identifying and building strengths in their children. As such, research exploring the antecedents and outcomes of strength-based parenting is worthy of additional attention.

The study had a large sample size and was longitudinal in nature. Both of these design elements lend confidence to the reliability of the findings and the potentially causal role of strength-based parenting. However, a limitation of the study is that strength-based parenting was assessed using the teenager reports about their parents rather than parents' reports. It may be that adolescents either under- or over-estimated the degree of strength-based parenting they were actually receiving. The second study of this paper addresses this limitation by using a multi-source design to further explore the effects of parent-rated strength-based parenting on life satisfaction in teenagers.

STUDY 2

Study 2 investigated the extent to which parent-rated strength-based parenting (knowledge and use) explains unique significant variance in adolescent life satisfaction beyond the adolescent's own strength knowledge and strength use.

To date, strength research with youth samples has predominantly relied on self-report and shows that a teenager's own rating of their strengths is related to school engagement, self-esteem, life satisfaction, positive affect, negative affect, academic efficacy, self-empowerment, extrinsic motivation, hope, and life satisfaction (Austin, 2005; Froh, Sefick & Emmons, 2008; Kern, Waters, Adler & White, 2015; Madden, Green & Grant, 2011; Marques, Lopez & Pais-Ribeiro, 2011; Proctor et al., 2011).

These self-report findings are useful but can suffer from common source bias and more rigorous designs also include ratings of the young person's strengths by significant others. For example, Seligman, Ernst, Gillham, Reivich and Linkins (2009) took teenager self-reports and also asked teachers and parents to rate their students/child's strengths before and after a

positive psychology intervention. In the Seligman et al. (2009) study, teachers reports were related to the degree to which students displayed strengths of curiosity, love of learning, empathy, cooperation, and creativity. The same pattern occurred for parents reports.

In another strengths study that went beyond youth self-report, Spreitzer, Stephens and Sweetman (2009) studied the effects of the reflected best-self exercise on adolescent leaders who were given strength-based feedback from professional and personal sources. Feedback from others was associated with positive emotions, sense of agency, and relational resources in the adolescents. This was the case for feedback sourced from adults with whom the teenager had a professional relationship (e.g., teachers, coworkers, coaches) and was found to be even stronger when the feedback was sourced from adults with whom the teenager had a personal relationship (e.g., parent, family member, friend). Thus, the strengths feedback provided to a teenager by significant adults in his/her life is an important factor in wellbeing.

The current study follows Seligman et al. (2009) and Spreitzer et al.'s (2014) lead by examining the effect of a parent's strengths assessment on the life satisfaction of a teenager. However, in Seligman et al. and Spreitzer et al., the effect of parent ratings on youth wellbeing outcomes was analysed separately from the effects of the teenager's own rating of their strengths which means that, while we know that the strengths ratings of a parent is associated with the teenager's wellbeing, we do not know whether it has more or less of an effect than the teenager's own ratings. The current addresses this gap by examining both the teenager's strengths ratings and the parent's strengths rating in the same analysis in order to compare their relative effects on the life satisfaction of a teenager.

In Study 1, teenagers' ratings of the degree to which their parents provide strength-based parenting significantly predicted levels of life satisfaction. Building on this finding, Study 2, compares the predictive ability of teenager's perceptions and parent ratings of the degree to which parents are aware of and encourage their children to use their strengths and how this relates to life satisfaction in teenagers.

METHOD

Participants and procedure. One hundred and twenty seven teenagers and their parents attended a 2-hour evening workshop run by the researcher who is a qualified psychologist. The workshop focused on using positive psychology techniques to build positive parent-teenager relationships. The invitation to the workshop suggested that the best configuration would be one parent and one teenager (rather than both parents or multiple offspring) because the techniques run in the workshop were based on pairwork. Parents (67% mothers, 33% fathers) ranged in age from 35 to 58 (Mage = 46.01, SD = 11.02). Teenagers (58% daughters, 42% sons) ranged in age from 13-19 years (Mage = 15.30, SD = 2.30).

At the start of the workshop all participants completed a brief battery of scales that assessed strengths knowledge, strengths use, and life satisfaction. Responses to these surveys were used as a starting point of discussion between the parent and teenager before the psychologist introduced participants to the workshop exercises based upon the Values in Action Framework (Peterson & Seligman, 2004) such as a strength card sorting exercise, strength analysis of the parent-teenager relationship, strength spotting, and strength family tree exercise. The surveys were collected at the end of the workshop and formed the data for this study.

MEASURES

Life satisfaction. As in Study 1, teenagers rated their life satisfaction using the SWLS (Diener, et al., 1985; $\alpha = .81$).

Strengths knowledge and use. Teenagers completed the original versions (i.e., using the self as the referent point) of Govindji and Linley’s (2007) Strengths Knowledge Scale (SKS; $\alpha = .94$) and Strengths Use Scale (SUS; $\alpha = .89$), described in Study 1.

Strength-based parenting. Parents rated the degree to which they felt they knew their son/daughter’s strengths, using an adapted version of the SKS (e.g., “I am aware of my son/daughter’s strengths”). Parents also rated the degree to which they encouraged their son/daughter to use strengths, using an adapted version of the SUS (e.g., “I encourage my son or daughter to use their strengths in lots of different situations.”). Internal consistencies of these modified scales were acceptable to good ($\alpha_{SKS} = .81$; $\alpha_{SUS} = .72$).

RESULTS

As shown in Table 3, teenager life satisfaction was positively and significantly correlated with all four independent variables: teenager-rated strength knowledge ($r = .32$), teenager-rated strengths use ($r = .36$), parent-rated knowledge of their teenage son or daughter’s strengths ($r = .23$), and parent-ratings of the extent to which they encourage their teenage son or daughters to use their strengths ($r = .43$). The two strongest correlations with life satisfaction were with strength-based parenting (use) and teenagers’ strengths use, followed by teenager’s strengths knowledge and strength-based parenting (knowledge).

Teenager strengths knowledge was correlated with the knowledge ($r = .22$) and use ($r = .38$) aspects of strength-based parenting. Teenager strengths use was also correlated with the knowledge ($r = .28$) and use ($r = .30$) aspects of strength-based parenting. Teenage life satisfaction was more highly correlated with the strengths use aspect than the strengths knowledge, as rated by both teenagers and parents.

Table 3: Intercorrelations between Teenager Strengths Knowledge, Teenager Strength Use, Parents Knowledge of teenagers’ Strengths, Parents encouragement of teenagers’ Strengths Use and Teenager Life Satisfaction

	Mean	SD	Scale range	1	2	3	4	5
1. Life satisfaction	17.36	3.28	5-25	1.00				
2. Strengths knowledge (teenagers)	27.06	6.34	9-45	.32**	1.00			
3. Strength use (teenagers)	50.95	12.25	14-70	.36**	.65**	1.00		
4. Parents knowledge of their son/daughters strengths	23.34	13.56	8-40	.23*	.22*	.28**	1.00	
5. Parents encouragement of their son/daughters to use their strengths	27.96	11.32	14-70	.43**	.38**	.30**	.31**	1.00

N = 127; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

A three-step hierarchical multiple regression examined the degree to which the four independent variables predicted life satisfaction in teenagers. The sample size of 127 was deemed to be adequate given the number of independent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2014). The collinearity statistics (e.g., Tolerance and VIF) were within acceptable limits (Coakes, 2005). Residual and scatter plots indicated no violations of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity (Hair et al., 2009).

Age and gender of teenagers and parents was entered at Step 1. Teenager strengths knowledge and use were entered at Step 2. Finally, Step 3 entered the two parent-rated strength-based parenting variables (knowledge and use).

Table 4: Results for Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Predicting Teenager Life Satisfaction

Variable	β	t	Sr ²	Adj. R ²
Step 1				.08
Teenager age	.27	2.81	.06	
Parent age	-.05	-.56	.00	
Teenager gender	.14	1.53	.02	
Parent gender	-.15	-1.65	.02	
Step 2				.20
Teenager strengths knowledge	.10	.95	.11	
Teenager strengths use	.30	2.71	.06	
Step 3				.27
Strength-based parenting (knowledge)	.08	.99	.01	
Strength-based parenting (use)	.28	3.09	.08	

The demographic variables of teenager and parent age and gender accounted for a significant 7% of the variance in teenager life satisfaction: $F(4,120) = 3.50$, $p < .01$. Specifically, older and male teenagers reported higher life satisfaction. Parent gender and age did not significantly predict teenager life satisfaction.

At Step 2, entering teenager strengths knowledge and strengths use in the regression equation increased the proportion of variance in life satisfaction explained to an adjusted R² of .20, $F(6,118) = 6.22$, $p < .001$. In other words, teenager's strengths knowledge and use accounted for an additional 13% of life satisfaction above and beyond the effects of age and gender. Of the two strengths variables, only strengths use was a significant positive predictor of life satisfaction. At Step 3, when the two strength-based parenting variables were included, the proportion of explained variance increased by a further 7%, $R^2 = .27$, $F(8,116) = 6.72$, $p < .001$.

.001). Of these parenting variables, only encouraged use was a significant positive predictor of life satisfaction.

DISCUSSION

The current results are consistent with past findings that have demonstrated positive associations between self-assessments of strengths and life satisfaction in teenagers (Froh et al., 2008; Marques et al., 2011; Proctor et al., 2011). The finding that strengths use has a stronger relationship with life satisfaction than strengths knowledge is also consistent with past research by Govindji and Linley (2007) who suggest that “it is more important to use your strengths rather than simply to know what they are” (p. 150).

The current study extended previous research by including parents-reports of the degree to which they had knowledge of their son/daughters strengths and the degree to which they encouraged their son/daughter to use their strengths. This type of third party observation overcomes common source bias and allows the relationship between teenager’s strengths knowledge and use with their parent’s knowledge and encouraged use to be compared vis-à-vis their relative predictive effects on life satisfaction

The strengths knowledge and use of teenagers was significantly correlated with their parents ratings and might suggest that when parents adopt a strength-based approach this spills over to their son and daughter allowing them to more readily see and use their own strengths. In this way strength-based parenting may “activate” a teenager’s strengths because it provides a form of relational scaffolding that allows a son or daughter to be more aware of, and make more use, of their strengths. In other words parents who identify and cultivate strengths allow their teenager’s to optimize their own strengths, thus enhancing life satisfaction.

In a related finding, Lavy, Littman-Ovadia and Bareli (2014) found that university students who participated in a relationship-based intervention used more of their strengths across 14 days than students in the placebo and control groups. They found that relationships help young people to know and use their strengths. Thus, relationship mechanisms, such as strength-based parenting, may increase strengths knowledge and use in teenagers. This finding adds to that of Study 1 which suggested that encouraging parents to take a strength-based approach is an important pathway for enhancing life satisfaction in teenagers.

However, as with the finding in Study 1 that teenagers rated their parents as providing only moderate levels of strengths knowledge and strengths use, the parents in Study 2 also rated themselves at moderate levels. This suggests that an important future research direction is to find ways to increase strength-based parenting approaches.

The current study overcame the limitation of self-report in Study 1 by using a dyadic design. Other strengths of this study include the use of valid, psychometrically sound surveys and appropriate multivariate statistical testing. However, the study is not without its limitations and given the cross sectional nature of this study, no firm causal conclusions can be drawn. For example, it may be that teenagers who have higher strengths knowledge and use cause parents to more readily see and encourage use of their strengths, rather than the other way around. Longitudinal and intervention research designs are needed to ascertain whether there is a causal connection between strength-based parenting and teenager strengths knowledge and use. This study would have benefited from also measuring a further authoritative parenting in order to see what the unique effect of SBP is.

In addition, the study may have suffered from sample bias given that there is likely to be a self-selection effect of the types of parents and teenagers who sign up for a positive psychology workshop. For example, it may be that the workshop attracted teenagers and parents who already had a good relationship and were motivated to build further positive aspects. Alternatively, the workshop may have attracted teenage-parents pairs who were struggling in their relationship and looking for some positive solutions. If either of these options is the case then this limits the generalizability to parents and teenagers whose relationships are not at these two extremes. The sample also had a higher proportion of female parents (67%) and female teenagers (58%) which may limit the generalizability to father and sons. Future strength-based parenting research could explore if there are differences between mothers and fathers and also for sons and daughters.

Finally, the survey results may have suffered from demand characteristics given that parents and teenagers were asked to complete the survey at the start of the workshop and were told that their answers would be explored during the workshop. The sample could have been motivated to over-rate themselves on strengths variables given that it was a positive psychology workshop. Moreover, parents may have felt the need to over-rate their scores seeing as they were going to be showing them to their son/daughter. However, the moderate mean scores provided by parents on the strengths knowledge and strengths use scales seems to indicate that the parents did not feel pressure to rate themselves overly-highly.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Life satisfaction is an important psychological outcome to maintain during the teenage years given its link to other mental health indicators (e.g., emotional and social self-efficacy, interpersonal and cognitive functioning). Yet research shows that it declines during adolescence (Aquilino & Supple, 2001; Cimpian, et al., 2007; Masten, 2004; Rindfuss, 1991). The two studies in this paper investigate whether positive parenting (authoritative and strength based) promotes life satisfaction in adolescence. The results of both studies suggest that there is an association between parents taking a strength-based approach and enhanced life satisfaction in teenagers

In speculating why strength based parenting enhances life satisfaction, one mechanism may be social verification. When a parent sees and labels the teenager's strengths, it corroborates and verifies the teenager's own strength knowledge, thus, enhancing their life satisfaction. Strength-based parenting, beyond simple confirming the teen's own view of their strengths, may actually help to show the teen some new strengths they did not know they had, thus overcoming "strengths blindness". Evidence in adult samples shows that about 2/3rds of people cannot identify their own strengths (Hill, 2001). To date there has been no equivalent data collected for adolescent samples, however, it is reasonable to assume that similar levels of strengths blindness would be prevalent in adolescent samples, if not even higher levels given that adolescence is a time where identity is shifting and unstable (Steinberg, 2014).

Biswas-Diener and his colleagues suggested that when people value a behavior they see the behaviour as being expected rather than extraordinary, or a strength. This leads to a "psychological blind spot" about strengths (Biswas-Diener, Kashdan, & Minhas, 2011). In an adult sample, Biswas-Diener (2012) discovered the phenomenon of strengths blindness in courageous individuals who viewed their courageous behaviour as ordinary and therefore did not classify it as a strength. Teenagers may also suffer from strengths blindness but if a parent

provides them with information about their strengths, this could help to overcome their potential strengths blindness and boost life satisfaction.

Drigotas, Rusbult, Wieselquist, and Whitton's (1999) notion of the Michelangelo effect can also be used to explain why strength based parenting boost life satisfaction in teenagers. Drigotas et al. (1999) suggest that positive opinions of romantic partners motivates individuals to pursue their best/ideal-self. Partner affirmation of the individual's "ideal self" motivates the individual to acquire the skills, traits, and resources that bring them closer to their ideal self (Rusbult, Kumashiro, Kubacka, & Finkel, 2009). The same phenomenon might occur between parents and their children. When parents look upon their children with a positive viewpoint, it might motivate the adolescent to live up to their expectations and deploy their strengths to be the best they can be.

CONCLUSION

Strength based parenting connects teens to their pre-existing strengths, capacities and talents and encourages teens to use their strengths. In the current study, this was found to be a significant predictor of life satisfaction, beyond the effects of authoritative parenting and a teenager's own ratings of their knowledge and use of strengths. Despite the increased salience of peer relationships during adolescence, parents continue to have a significant influence on wellbeing during this phase of life (Steinberg & Morris, 2001). Strength-based parenting is an exciting avenue of research in the field of positive psychology for how parents can promote positive outcomes for their teenage sons and daughters.

References

- Andersen, S. L., & Teicher, M. H. (2008). Stress, sensitive periods and maturational events in adolescent depression. *Trends in Neurosciences*, 31(4), 183–191. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2008.01.004>
- Aquilino, W. S., & Supple, a. J. (2001). Long-Term Effects of Parenting Practices During Adolescence on Well-Being Outcomes in Young Adulthood. *Journal of Family Issues*, 22(3), 289–308. <http://doi.org/10.1177/019251301022003002>
- Austin, D. B. (2005). The effects of a strengths development intervention program upon the self-perceptions of students' academic abilities. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*. <http://doi.org/3175080>
- Bateson, P., Barker, D., Clutton-Brock, T., Deb, D., D'Udine, B., Foley, R. a, ... Sultan, S. E. (2004). Developmental plasticity and human health. *Nature*, 430(6998), 419–421. <http://doi.org/10.1038/nature02725>
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497–529.
- Biswas-Diener, R. (2012). *The courage quotient: How science can make you braver*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Biswas-Diener, R., Kashdan, T. B., & Minhas, G. (2011). A dynamic approach to psychological strength development and intervention. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 6(2), 106–118. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2010.545429>
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss, Volume 1: Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Calkins, S. D., & Bell, K. L. (1999). Developmental transitions as windows to parental socialization of emotion. *Psychological Inquiry*, 10, 368-372.
- Chang, L., McBride-Chang, C., Stewart, S., & Au, E. (2003). Life satisfaction, self-concept, and family relations in Chinese adolescents and children. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 27(2), 182–189. <http://doi.org/10.1080/01650250244000182>
- Cimpian, A., Arce, H. M. C., Markman, E. M., & Dweck, C. S. (2007). Subtle linguistic cues affect children's motivation. *Psychological Science*, 18(4), 314–316. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01896.x>
- Clifton, D. O., & Anderson, E. (2002). *StrengthsQuest: Discover and develop your strengths in academics, career, and beyond*. Washington, D.C.: The Gallup Organization.

- Coakes, S. J. (2005). *SPSS: Analysis without Anguish: Version 12.0 for Windows*. Milton, Qld.: Wiley.
- Conoley, C., & Conoley, J. (2009). *Positive psychology and family therapy*. John Wiley & Sons: New Jersey.
- Diener, E., & Diener, M. (1995). Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfaction and self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(4), 653–663. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.68.4.653>
- Diener, E., Emmons, R., Larsen, J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction with Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71–75. http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
- Drigotas, S. M., Rusbult, C. E., Wieselquist, J., & Whitton, S. W. (1999). Close partner as sculptor of the ideal self: behavioral affirmation and the Michelangelo phenomenon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(2), 293–323. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.2.293>
- Eshel, N., Daelmans, B., Cabral De Mello, M., & Martines, J. (2006). Responsive parenting: Interventions and outcomes. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*. <http://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.06.030163>
- Froh, J. J., Sefick, W. J., & Emmons, R. a. (2008). Counting blessings in early adolescents: an experimental study of gratitude and subjective well-being. *Journal of School Psychology*, 46(2), 213–33. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2007.03.005>
- Gaté, M. A., Watkins, E. R., Simmons, J. G., Byrne, M. L., Schwartz, O. S., Whittle, S., ... Allen, N. B. (2013). Maternal Parenting Behaviors and Adolescent Depression: The Mediating Role of Rumination. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 42(3), 348–357. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2012.755927>
- Gilman, R., Easterbrooks, S. R., & Frey, M. (2004). A preliminary study of multidimensional life satisfaction among deaf/hard of hearing youth across environmental settings. *Social Indicators Research*, 66, 143–164
- Govindji, R., & Linley, A. (2007). Strengths use, self-concordance and well-being: Implications for Strengths Coaching and Coaching Psychologists. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 2(2), 143–153. <http://doi.org/10.1037/t01038-000>
- Gray, M. R., & Steinberg, L. (1999). Unpacking Authoritative Parenting: Reassessing a Multidimensional Construct. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61(3), 574–587. <http://doi.org/10.2307/353561>
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2009). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Hetherington, E. M., & Martin, B. (1986). Family factors and psychopathology in children. In H. C. Quay & B. Martin (Eds.), *Psychopathological disorders of childhood* (3rd ed., pp. 332–339). New York: Wiley.
- Hill, J. (2001). How well do we know our strengths? In Paper presented at the British Psychological Society Centenary Conference, Glasgow.
- Holmbeck, G. N., Paikoff, R. L., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (1995). Parenting adolescents. In M. Bornstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting*, Vol. 1, Children and parenting (pp. 91–118). Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Huebner, E. S., Funk, B. A., & Gilman, R. (2000). Cross-sectional and Longitudinal Psychosocial Correlates of Adolescent Life Satisfaction Reports. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 16(1), 53–64. <http://doi.org/10.1177/082957350001600104>
- Huebner, E. S., Suldo, S. M., Smith, L. C., & McKnight, C. G. (2004). Life satisfaction in children and youth: Empirical foundations and implications for school psychologists. *Psychology in the Schools*, 41(1), 81–93. <http://doi.org/10.1002/pits.10140>
- Jackson, C., Henriksen, L., & Foshee, V. a. (1998). The Authoritative Parenting Index: predicting health risk behaviors among children and adolescents. *Health Education & Behavior : The Official Publication of the Society for Public Health Education*, 25(3), 319–337. <http://doi.org/10.1177/109019819802500307>
- Kern, M. L., Waters, L. E., Adler, A., & White, M. A. (2015). A multidimensional approach to measuring well-being in students: Application of the PERMA framework. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 10(3), 262–271. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2014.936962>
- Lavy, S., Littman-Ovadia, H., & Bareli, Y. (2014). Strengths deployment as a mood-repair mechanism: Evidence from a diary study with a relationship exercise group. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 9(6), 547–558. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2014.936963>
- Lerner, R. M., & Steinberg, L. (Eds.). (2009). *Handbook of adolescent psychology, volume 2: Contextual influences on adolescent development*. Hoboken New Jersey: Wiley.

Leung, C. Y.-W., McBride-Chang, C., & Lai, B. P.-Y. (2004). Relations among Maternal Parenting Style, Academic Competence, and Life Satisfaction in Chinese Early Adolescents. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 24(2), 113–143. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0272431603262678>

Madden, W., Green, S., & Grant, A. M. (2011). A pilot study evaluating strengths-based coaching for primary school students: Enhancing engagement and hope. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 6(1), 71–83. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.umsl.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=59578546&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

Marques, S. C., Lopez, S. J., & Pais-Ribeiro, J. L. (2011). “Building Hope for the Future”: A Program to Foster Strengths in Middle-School Students. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 12, 139–152. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-009-9180-3>

Masten, A. S. (2004). Regulatory processes, risk, and resilience in adolescent development. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1021, 310–319. <http://doi.org/10.1196/annals.1308.036>

Nowak, C., & Heinrichs, N. (2008). A comprehensive meta-analysis of triple P-positive parenting program using hierarchical linear modeling: Effectiveness and moderating variables. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 11(3), 114–144. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-008-0033-0>

Park, N. (2005). Life Satisfaction Among Korean Children and Youth: A Developmental Perspective. *School Psychology International*, 26(2), 209–223. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0143034305052914>

Peterson, A. C., Kennedy, R. E., & Sullivan, P. (1991). Coping with adolescence. In M. E. Colten & S. Gore (Eds.), *Adolescent stress: Causes and consequences* (pp. 93–110). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://doi.org/313971759>

Peterson, G. W., Bush, K. R., & Supple, A. (1999). Predicting Adolescent Autonomy from Parents: Relationship Connectedness and Restrictiveness. *Sociological Inquiry*, 69(3), 431–457. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-682X.1999.tb00880.x>

Proctor, C. L., Linley, P. A., & Maltby, J. (2009). Youth life satisfaction: A review of the literature. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10(5), 583–630. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-008-9110-9>

Proctor, C., Tsukayama, E., Wood, A. M., Maltby, J., Eades, J. F., & Linley, P. A. (2011). Strengths Gym: The impact of a character strengths-based intervention on the life satisfaction and well-being of adolescents. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 6(5), 377–388. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2011.594079>

Rindfuss, R. R. (1991). The Young Adult Years: Diversity, Structural Change, and Fertility. *Demography*, 28(4), 493–512. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2061419>

Rusbult, C. E., Kumashiro, M., Kubacka, K. E., & Finkel, E. J. (2009). “The part of me that you bring out”: ideal similarity and the Michelangelo phenomenon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(1), 61–82. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0014016>

Sanders, Matthew R. and Kirby, James N. (2014) A public-health approach to improving parenting and promoting children's well-being. *Child Development Perspectives*, 8 4: 250-257.

Schwartz, O. S., Byrne, M. L., Simmons, J. G., Whittle, S., Dudgeon, P., Yap, M. B. H., ... Allen, N. B. (2014). Parenting During Early Adolescence and Adolescent-Onset Major Depression: A 6-Year Prospective Longitudinal Study. *Clinical Psychological Science*, 1(4), 1–15. <http://doi.org/10.1177/2167702613505531>

Schwartz, O. S., Dudgeon, P., Sheeber, L. B., Yap, M. B. H., Simmons, J. G., & Allen, N. B. (2012). Parental behaviors during family interactions predict changes in depression and anxiety symptoms during adolescence. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 40(1), 59–71. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-011-9542-2>

Schwartz, O. S., Sheeber, L. B., Dudgeon, P., & Allen, N. B. (2012). Emotion socialization within the family environment and adolescent depression. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 32(6), 447–453. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2012.05.002>

Seibel, F. L., & Johnson, W. B. (2001). Parental control, trait anxiety, and satisfaction with life in college students. *Psychological Reports*, 88(2), 473–80. <http://doi.org/10.2466/PR0.88.2.473-480>

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 5–14.

- Seligman, M. E. P., Ernst, R. M., Gillham, J., Reivich, K., & Linkins, M. (2009). Positive education: positive psychology and classroom interventions. *Oxford Review of Education*, 35(3), 293–311. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03054980902934563>
- Sheeber, L., Hops, H., Alpert, A., Davis, B., & Andrews, J. (1997). Family support and conflict: Prospective relations to adolescent depression. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 25(4), 333–344. <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025768504415>
- Sheely-Moore, A. I., & Bratton, S. C. (2010). A strengths-based parenting intervention with low-income African American families. *Professional School Counseling*, 13, 175–183. <http://doi.org/10.5330/PSC.n.2010-13.175>
- Sheridan, S. M., & Burt, J. D. (2009). Family-Centered Positive Psychology. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 551–559). Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195187243.013.0052>
- Spreitzer, G., Stephens, J. P., & Sweetman, D. (2009). The Reflected Best Self field experiment with adolescent leaders: exploring the psychological resources associated with feedback source and valence. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 4(5), 331–348. <http://doi.org/10.1080/17439760902992340>
- Steinberg, L. (2014) *the Age of Opportunity*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt: New York
- Steinberg, L., & Morris, A. S. (2001). Adolescent development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 83–110. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.83>
- Suldo, S. M., & Huebner, E. S. (2004a). Does life satisfaction moderate the effects of stressful events on psychopathological behaviour during adolescence? *School Psychology Quarterly*, 19, 93–105.
- Suldo, S. M., & Huebner, E. S. (2004b). The role of life satisfaction in the relationship between authoritative parenting dimensions and adolescent problem behavior. *Social Indicators Research*, 66, 165–195.
- Suldo, S. M., & Huebner, E. S. (2006). Is extremely high life satisfaction during adolescence advantageous? *Social Indicators Research*, 78(2), 179–203. <http://doi.org/10.2307/27522605>
- Suldo, S. M., Savage, J. A., & Mercer, S. H. (2013). Increasing Middle School Students' Life Satisfaction: Efficacy of a Positive Psychology Group Intervention. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 15(1), 19–42. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9414-2>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2014). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Ullman, C., & Tatar, M. (2001). Psychological adjustment among Israeli adolescent immigrants: A report on life satisfaction, self-concept, and self-esteem. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 30(4), 449–463. <http://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1010445200081>
- Waters, L. (2015). The relationship between strength-based parenting with children's stress levels and strength-based coping approaches. *Psychology*, 6, 689–699. <http://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2015.66067>
- World Health Organization (2014). *Health for the World's Adolescents*. http://www.who.int/maternal_child_adolescent/topics/adolescence/second-decade/en/
- Wilson, K., Havighurts, S., & Harley, A. (2014). Dads tuning in to kids: Piloting a new parenting program targeting fathers' emotion coaching skills. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 42, 162–168.
- Wilson, K., Havighurts, S., & Harley, A. (2014). Improving parenting of toddlers' emotions using an emotion coaching parenting program: A pilot study of tuning in to toddlers. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 42, 169–175.
- Yap, M., Allen, N., & Ladouceur, C. (2008). Maternal Socialization of Positive Affect: The Impact of Invalidation on Adolescent Emotion Regulation and Depressive Symptomatology. *Child Development*, 79, 1415–1431